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PREFACE

The purpose of this volume is to illuminate the full extent of the ancient and mediaeval apocryphal Daniel literature, including the manuscript evidence, and to bring into focus certain issues fundamental to its three major types. The last such comprehensive survey, the entry on Daniel in J.P. Migne's *Dictionnaire des Apocryphes*, was published in 1858, and of course much has changed since then. This volume is also the first to examine the Daniel legenda, the apocryphal apocalypses, and the prognostica as discrete categories of texts and, significantly, to evaluate their generic relationship to the biblical Book of Daniel.

The study of apocryphal literature associated with or attributed to a specific biblical figure is fresh and vital, as is the study of the apocryphal and pseudepigrapha generally. This volume on the Daniel literature continues in the spirit of the investigation of the origins, purposes, and place of biblical apocrypha within the three Abrahamic traditions.

My views on the basic nature and purposes of the Daniel apocrypha, which underpin Chapters One and Five, were first aired in a 2003 lecture delivered during my tenure as NEH Research Fellow at the Center for Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies at Saint Louis University and in a 2003 paper presented at a conference at the Claremont Graduate University. Several minor sections in Chapters Two and Three reflect material discussed in my forthcoming article, "4QPseudo-Daniel\textsuperscript{a–b} (4Q243–4Q244) and the Book of Daniel," *Dead Sea Discoveries*. An abbreviated synopsis of a portion of the material in Chapter Three, §§2, 3, and 5, will surface in the published version of a paper I delivered at a 2004 conference on "Apocalyptic Themes in Early Christianity," which was the theme of the First Annual Pappas Patristic Institute Conference at the Holy Cross School of Theology. Portions of Chapter Four, §§2 and 3, appear in a very different form in an article, "Greek, Latin, and Hebrew Manuscripts in the Vatican Library of the Mediaeval Prognostica Somniale Danielis and Lunationes Danielis," *Manuscripta* 47/48 (2003–2004), 1–42. Finally, the Inventory of Chapter Six is based on—but radically augments in both content and scope—the information contained in the section

There is still much work left to do on the Daniel apocrypha, and particularly on the late antique and mediaeval Daniel apocalyptica, which is a complex and sometimes frustrating subject and one to which I expect to return in a series of future studies. My hope for this present volume, however, is that it clarifies the frequently confusing and sometimes contradictory data of the past centuries of scholarship and, through its own observations and conclusions, provides a firm foundation for further research.
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ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations of ancient texts and of the most common serials and series follow those suggested by the Journal of Biblical Literature. For those serials and series not listed there see the “List of Abbreviations, §III” in L. DiTommaso, A Bibliography of Pseudepigrapha Research, 1850–1999 (JSPSup 39; Sheffield Academic Press [T&T Clark/Continuum], 2001), 33–82 at 42–81.

Unless otherwise indicated, quotations of the Hebrew and Aramaic (MT) text of the Book of Daniel are drawn from W. Baumgartner, “Librum Danielis,” Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (edd. K. Elliger and W. Rudolph; Stuttgart, 1987 [edd. W. Rudolph and H.P. Rüger]). Quotations from the LXX Greek versions (both OG and θ') are taken from J. Ziegler, Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum graecum 16.2: Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco (Göttingen, 1968). Unless otherwise indicated, versification and the enumeration of the chapters of the Book of Daniel follow the MT version, which of course is divided into twelve chapters. The Greek Additions are referred to by their individual names (e.g., “Bel and the Dragon”) or in a collective sense as the “Greek Additions” or simply the “Additions.”

English translations of the Hebrew and Aramaic text of the Book of Daniel and Greek text of the Book of Daniel and the Greek Additions vary. I often use my own translations of the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek text, but a few times have occasion to employ the excellent English translation included in J.J. Collins, Daniel. A Commentary on the Book of Daniel (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, 1993). Examples of the latter are always distinguished by the use of quotation marks.

Quotations in Greek and English of Book Ten of Josephus’s Jewish Antiquities are drawn from R. Marcus, Josephus VI: Jewish Antiquities, Books IX–XI (LCL; Cambridge/London, 1937). The Greek text or English translation is cited by section (§§186–281), while Marcus’ notes on the text are usually identified in the footnote by his surname and are cited by page.
Unless otherwise indicated, English translations of words and passages from other ancient and mediaeval languages are my own.

**Supplementary Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a, b, etc.</td>
<td>[column] a, b, etc. [fol. 23 recto, column a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add.</td>
<td>Additional [MS or cod.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ar.</td>
<td>cod. arabi, arabicus, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aram.</td>
<td>Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arm.</td>
<td>cod. armeni, Armenian, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHG</td>
<td><em>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod(d).</td>
<td>[MS] codice(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>col(s).</td>
<td>column(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copt.</td>
<td>cod. copti, Coptic, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eth.</td>
<td>cod. ethiopic, Ethiopic, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expl.</td>
<td>explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fol(s).</td>
<td>folio(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fr.</td>
<td>French, français, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>germ.</td>
<td>German, germanicus, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr.</td>
<td>cod. greci, Greek, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heb.</td>
<td>cod. ebraici, Hebrew, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incip.</td>
<td>incipit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inscr.</td>
<td>inscriptio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory</td>
<td>The Inventory/Bibliography, which is Chapter Six of this work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ital.</td>
<td>cod. italiani, Italian, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(1).</td>
<td>line(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lat.</td>
<td>cod. latini, Latin, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LXX    Septuagint
MS($)  manuscript(s)
MT     Masoretic Text [of Daniel]
n.a.   nouvelle acquisition [MS or cod.]
n.s.   new series
No($)  number(s)
OG     Old Greek version [of Daniel]
Or.    Oriental [MS or cod.]
p(p).  page(s)
pers.  cod. persiani, Persian, etc.
re     regarding, concerning [MS or text]
slav.  cod. slavi, Slavonic, etc.
supp.  supplement [series (MS or cod.)]
syr.   cod. siriaci, Syriac, etc.
θ’     Theodotion-version [of Daniel]
turk.  cod. turchi, Turkish, etc.
v(v).  verse(s)

The abbreviations of manuscript sigla are my own, although I have attempted to conform somewhat to the guidelines suggested by the journal *Manuscripta*. I understand that current practice normalises sigla in the light of national tendencies or individual institutions (e.g., MS for manuscripts in British libraries, *ms* for those in French, HS or Hs for those in German, and so on). This process seems somewhat self-defeating to me, if only because it is futile to worry about national standards when so many of the manuscripts in any given national library were not products of that nation at all (e.g., the codices Palatini in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana—*apud* Heidelberg!). I have, however, attempted to reproduce faithfully the shelf marks can be unintelligible to those unfamiliar with the conventions (e.g., the shelf marks “Cott. Tib. A. iii, art. 26” or “Pal. lat. 235 f. 39v-c”: where does one start if one does not know that the first refers
to a British Library codex and the second to a Vatican one?), I have attempted to reproduce the shelf marks in full.

That being said, I have abbreviated the names of the great libraries, museums, and other manuscript repositories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Repository</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berlin, DSB</td>
<td>Deutsche Staatsbibliothek [now incorporated in SBPK]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin, SBPK</td>
<td>Staatsbibliothek Berlin Preußischer Kulturbesitz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, CCC</td>
<td>Corpus Christi College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, PC</td>
<td>Pembroke College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, TC</td>
<td>Trinity College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, UL</td>
<td>University Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erfurt, WBS</td>
<td>Wissenschaftliche Bibliothek der Stadt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firenze, BML</td>
<td>Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidelberg, UB</td>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>København, UB</td>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leipzig, U-B</td>
<td>Universitäts-Bibliothek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, BL</td>
<td>British Library [olim British Museum]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester, JRL</td>
<td>John Rylands (University) Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milano, BA</td>
<td>Biblioteca Ambrosiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>München, BSB</td>
<td>Bayerische Staatsbibliothek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>München, UB</td>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris, BNF</td>
<td>Bibliothèque Nationale de France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Gallen, SB</td>
<td>Stiftsbibliothek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Città del Vaticano, BAV</td>
<td>Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(codices) Barberiniani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(codices) Ottoboniani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(codices) Palatini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(codices) Reginenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(codices) Urbinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(codices) Vaticani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezia, BM</td>
<td>Biblioteca (nazionale) Marciana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wien, ONB</td>
<td>Österreichische Nationalbibliothek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The dates assigned to the manuscripts reflect the information contained in catalogues or secondary sources. Roman numerals refer to centuries, Arabic ones to specific dates, the latter usually but not always denoting that the manuscript is dated internally. All dates appear in brackets after the manuscripts shelf numbers and foliation and may be assumed to refer to the Common Era (ce) unless otherwise indicated (bce or ah). E.g.:

Cambridge, TC cod. O.1.57 [olim C.1] fols. 119r–124r [xv]

I have attempted to reproduce the text, titles, *incipits*, and *explicit* of manuscripts and secondary sources exactly as they appear in the
manuscripts of their transcriptions (exception: I normalise standard abbreviations in most manuscripts), and only rarely do I indicate variant or obsolete orthography with the word *sic*. Since spelling is rarely consistent in mediaeval manuscripts, this means that some non-English text might appear mispelled.
CHAPTER ONE

THE APOCRYPHAL DANIEL LITERATURE:
PARAMETERS OF THE STUDY

1. The Apocryphal Daniel Literature

This study examines the ancient and mediaeval apocryphal literature concerned with or attributed to the figure of Daniel the prophet, and investigates the manner in which this literature is conceptually related to the biblical story of Daniel.1 Every post-biblical legend about Daniel and every text which was composed, circulated, or copied under his name is in some way connected to this biblical story. The purposes for which these apocrypha were created and the reasons why they were specifically associated with the figure of Daniel cannot be fully understood without reference to the content and forms of the story.

The story of Daniel is told in the biblical book that bears his name. Daniel is an interpreter of dreams, a solver of mysteries, and a seer of visions. He is the Daniel of the lions’ den, of the writing on the wall, of the giant golden statue, and of the cryptic future revelations. A young exile from Jerusalem after the Babylonian conquest, his insight and his skill as a dream interpreter enable him to become the chief wise man at the court of the great and fearsome ruler, King Nebuchadnezzar. Although the story of Daniel tends to lack the subtle nuances of character associated with the more developed biblical figures of David, Jeremiah, or Paul, it nevertheless remains a compelling and complex one, no doubt due in part to

---

the sheer strangeness of the visionary chapters of the book, but also because it presents Daniel in those essentially human situations to which all persons can relate. Daniel is the model of the triumph of knowledge over ignorance and of steadfast faith in the face of oppression and mortal peril.

The Book of Daniel consists of two types of material radically distinct in form and content. Chapters 1–6 record a series of lively episodes about Daniel, his companions, and their life at the court of King Nebuchadnezzar and his successors. These “court tales” are purely narrative and are related in the third person. The narrative displays a clear chronological sequence and contains several editorial devices that connect the episodes. The focus of the court tales is on the present, and although there are instances where from the perspective of the Babylonian setting of the Book the attention shifts to a relatively limited exposition of the future, these instances always appear in the context of a second-party dream or vision that requires interpretation by Daniel. Chapters 7–12 on the other hand describe Daniel’s revelatory visions of the future and are properly called apocalypses. The visions are related in the first person, not the third, and involve interpretation by an angelic mediator. The perspective of the visions is meta-historical and their focus is firmly on the future. In these chapters there is no mention of Daniel’s life, his friends, or his situation in Babylon, and even the underlying chronology of the Book is pared down to a few brief statements that preface each vision.

The text of the Book of Daniel one finds in Hebrew Bibles is commonly called the Masoretic text (MT). MT Daniel is written in two languages, Hebrew, and a cognate language, Aramaic, which was the lingua franca of the Middle East from the Persian period well into Hellenistic and Roman times. The appearance of Aramaic is most unusual in the Hebrew Bible, however, and in fact only one other biblical book, Ezra, contains this odd mixture of two languages. Stranger still, in the Book of Daniel these two languages are not coincident with the two types of material, the court tales and the visions.3

---

The disjunctive nature of this and other internal evidence suggests that MT Daniel is a composite work, the result of a complicated process of composition and redaction that incorporated what for its author/redactor were both contemporary and older materials. In addition, it is widely held that it was not composed during the time of its sixth-century BCE setting in the Babylonian Exile, but rather reached its present form around the year 164 BCE, sometime around the end of the crisis precipitated by the actions of the Seleucid king, Antiochus IV Epiphanes.

I will have more to say about the Book of Daniel and its constituent parts in subsequent chapters of this study. There is the danger, however, that this skeleton model of the nature and composition history of MT Daniel unintentionally simplifies what in reality was a complex process which scholars only partially understand. For example, MT Daniel is not the only witness to the biblical story of Daniel. Although the fragments of the eight Dead Sea copies of the Book “reveal no major disagreements against the Masoretic text,”

---


5 The best overview of past research and most convincing synopsis of the process of the composition of the Book of Daniel is outlined in J.J. Collins, Daniel (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, 1993), 24–38. For a more recent and different views of this process, see R.G. Kratz, “The Visions of Daniel,” The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception (edd. J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint; VTSup 83; Leiden, 2001), 91–113, and, in the same volume, R. Albertz, “The Social Setting of the Aramaic and Hebrew Book of Daniel,” 171–204. It seems almost certain that the author/redactor of MT Daniel had at his disposal a five-chapter version of the court tales, the tales which with editing would become MT Daniel 2–6.

6 More specifically, from the time when King Nebuchadnezzar ordered some of the royal and noble youths to be educated for service in his kingdom (1:3–4) to the early years of the reign of Cyrus the Great (10:1), shortly before this king’s decree to restore the Jews to the land of Israel.

7 With a gloss added at 12:11–12 shortly before the rededication of the Temple.

8 As R.T. McLay correctly reminds us, “the MT is a witness to the HB [Hebrew Bible] just like the OG” (The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research (Grand Rapids/Cambridge, 2003), 7 [italics added]).

9 P.W. Flint, “The Daniel Tradition at Qumran,” The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception (edd. J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint; VTSup 83; Leiden, 2001), 329–367 at 331. The idea that these eight fragmentary texts were all copies of MT Daniel is perhaps in one case erroneous: Flint observes that 4Q116 (4QDan) might have included only part of MT Daniel (apud E. Ulrich, et al., Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms-Chronicles (DJD 16; Oxford, 2000), 287).
the Old Greek (OG)\textsuperscript{10} Daniel 4–6 presupposes an underlying text that differs significantly from the proto-Masoretic \textit{Vorlage}.\textsuperscript{11} In addition, MT Daniel was part of a much broader cycle of Hellenistic-era Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Daniel texts, some of which circulated in more than one version or are preserved today in reworked forms and/or in a language which might not be original.\textsuperscript{12}

At the same time, however, the formation of MT Daniel and the acceptance of parts or the whole of it as authoritative\textsuperscript{13} initiated the process whereby it and its translations were eventually considered canonical. More importantly, the authoritative status of the biblical Book established the conditions under which the later Daniel material could have been judged substantively and conceptually apocryphal.\textsuperscript{14} The adjective stems from the Greek plural noun τὰ ἀπόκρυφα

\textsuperscript{10} The term “Old Greek” or “OG” is used “to designate a text that in the judgment of the scholar represents the original [Greek] translation of a [biblical] book” (McLay, \textit{Use of the Septuagint}, 6).


\textsuperscript{13} Although Koch is correct in stating that the reference to the story of the three youth in the fiery furnace (Dan 3; cf. Chapter Two, §1) at 1 Macc 2:59–60 “does not necessarily presuppose a canonical status” for the Book of Daniel, its does presume an authoritative status, and this is the status with which I am concerned here (“Stages in the Canonization,” 425). On the issue of authority, see E. Ulrich, “From Literature to Scripture: Reflections on the Growth of a Text’s Authoritativeness,” \textit{DSD} 10 (2003), 3–25, and also the sources in the following note.

\textsuperscript{14} The process of the establishment of a canon of authoritative writings (Scripture) is one to which much literature has been devoted. See R.T. Beckwith, “The Formation of the Hebrew Bible,” \textit{Mikra. Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity} (ed. M.J. Mulder; CRINT 2.1; Assen/Philadelphia, 1988), 39–86. The process by which the Book of Daniel came to regarded as authoritative is not the subject of any sustained treatment in any of the articles in the otherwise fine collection by L.M. McDonald and J.A. Sanders, eds., \textit{The Canon Debate} (Peabody, 2002), nor is the Book of Daniel or its interpretation addressed in A.J. Hauser and D.F. Watson, eds., \textit{A History of Biblical Interpretation. Volume 1: The Ancient Period} (Grand Rapids/Cambridge, 2003). The idea of biblical apocrypha in any given setting depended upon many things, including the Bible used (LXX, Vulgate, Ethiopic, \textit{etc.}) and the relationship between a society and its sacred literature. For example, F.J. Thomson observes that “the Russian Church had no real notion of the canon of Scripture: in theory there was a distinction
(literally, “the hidden [things]”) and, in its common usage, presumes an explicit or implicit authority against which it is considered and measured.\(^{15}\) Even if the Book of Daniel was not deemed canonical by every Jewish or Christian group until the close of the first century \(\text{CE}\), there is ample evidence that it (or parts of it) were understood to be authoritative by many different communities at least as early as the close of the second century \(\text{BCE}\).\(^{16}\) What is more, the bulk of the Daniel apocrypha that is the subject of this study was composed in late antiquity or in the Middle Ages, periods where the Book of Daniel, in all its many reflexes and translations, was considered canonical by any measure of the term.

The Book of Daniel, therefore, was the sun around which the planets of the Daniel apocrypha coalesced and revolved, and is the touchstone by which the form and content of the full corpus of this apocrypha may be identified, labeled, and understood.\(^{17}\) With this in mind, the Daniel apocrypha may be defined formally as the body of literature which was composed in the light of an authoritative

---

\(^{15}\) This is how this term is understood throughout this study.

\(^{16}\) Koch, “Stages in the Canonization.”

\(^{17}\) I now prefer to describe this corpus of literature with the designation “apocrypha” rather than “pseudepigrapha”, even though I employed the latter in my *Bibliography of Pseudepigrapha Research, 1850–1999* (JSPSup 39; Sheffield, 2001) and still utilise it throughout the present volume to refer to strictly pseudepigraphic texts. One advantage of “apocrypha” is that it is not restricted to such pseudonymously attributed texts, but can refer also to the post-biblical legenda about a biblical figure such as Daniel. In addition, the term “pseudepigrapha” (or “pseudo-anything”) can imply an inherent spuriousness and deliberate fakery. Although in most cases it is impossible to know the precise motivations of an author who creates a fake work, I argue in Chapter Four that the authors and copyists of the Daniel prognostica did not so much pseudonymously (and so deliberately falsely) attribute their work to Daniel than they actually believed, in a retroactive and scholarly sense, that the root of these texts actually went back to Daniel and to the science he codified while he was at the Babylonian court. In other words, these authors and copyists felt that the Daniel prognostica were actually the product of the prophet, many dozens of generations removed. Similarly, one could argue that the constant recycling of apocalyptic oracles in Byzantine-era texts attributed to Daniel might imply that those who produced and read these texts truly felt that the original oracles could have been the product of the prophet’s pen. See my preliminary thoughts on the sociological place of these oracles in Chapter Three, §3; I will have occasion to develop these thoughts in a future essay on the Byzantine Daniel apocalyptica specifically (see the Preface).
story of Daniel and which recounts the life and deeds of Daniel the Prophet and/or is pseudonymously attributed to him.18

Among the earliest and best-known of these Daniel apocrypha are the so-called Greek Additions to Daniel, which are part of the ancient Greek witnesses to the Book of Daniel but which are not found in MT Daniel.19 The Additions probably date from the second century BCE20 and likely were originally composed in Hebrew or Aramaic.21 They consist of the textually independent tales of Susanna and of

18 This definition might seem to break down somewhat when we include the aforementioned Hellenistic-era cycle of Daniel texts within the compass of the category. For example, how can we speak of the biblical influence on apocryphal literature when in some cases the latter precedes the former? My response is three-fold. First, the vast bulk of the Daniel apocrypha discussed in the present volume is chronologically and conceptually post-biblical, so the use of the term is appropriate. Second, it is my belief that the authority accorded the biblical story of Daniel was also, to a lesser degree, first granted to the five-chapter, proto-MT version of the court tales. Indeed, the composition history of the Book presupposes this fact; see L. DiTommaso, “4QPseudo-Daniel“It (4Q243–4Q244) and the Book of Daniel,” DSD [forthcoming]. Third, LXX Daniel is in one sense part of the apocryphal Daniel corpus and in another sense part of the biblical Book of Daniel which exerted such an influence on the later Daniel apocrypha. We can speak, therefore, of LXX Daniel as being both “apocryphal,” in that the Greek additions (OG and θ) were composed in the light of at least some of the court tales, and “biblical,” in that LXX Daniel was the most important of all the witnesses to the story of Daniel by virtue of its tremendous influence in early and mediaeval Christianity. With only a few exceptions, however (such the Seventh Vision of Daniel, which is found in some Armenian Bibles), nothing else was added to the biblical story of Daniel after the era of the composition and transmission of the LXX.

19 On the subject of the Book of Daniel in the ancient Greek versions, see Chapter Two, passim.

20 The terminus ante quem is provided by the date of the translation of the Book of Daniel into Greek, which occurred around 100 BCE (cf. 1 Maccabees, which was written at about this time and which at 2.59–60 refers to Daniel 3 and 6). Susanna probably dates from this time (Moore, Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah, 92) or perhaps slightly later (D.W. Clanton, Jr., “(Re)dating the Story of Susanna: A Proposal,” jSJS 34 (2003), 121–140; n.b. his survey of the range of scholarly opinion). Collins suggests that Bel and the Dragon was composed in the first quarter of the second century BCE, but admits that his argument is very tentative (Daniel, 418). The date of the “Song of the Three Children” may be the late third century BCE or anytime during the second century BCE, and largely depends on how one understands the relationship between verse 29 [52] and Tobit 8:5. Several verses probably alluding to Antiochus Epiphanes and the desecration of the Temple indicate that the “Prayer of Azariah” was composed around the time of the final redaction of MT Daniel.

21 See, esp., K. Koch, Deuterokanonische Zusätze zum Danielbuch (2 vols.; AOAT 38.1–2; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1987). See also the summaries of the arguments for and against Semitic originals for the Greek Additions in Collins, Daniel, 199, 202–203, 409–412, and 427–428. It should be mentioned that the majority of past authorities assume Greek originals for at least some of the Additions.
Bel and the Dragon, both of which feature Daniel, as well as the lengthy interpolation between what in the Aramaic are verses 23 and 24 of MT Daniel 3, including the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Children. The tales of Susanna and of Bel and the Dragon are encountered in various places in the Greek Bibles and in the ancient translations which were based on these Bibles, depending on the version consulted. As for modern translations, the Greek Additions are lumped together with the rest of the Apocrypha in most Protestant Bibles, but are included as part of the Old Testament in Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox Bibles.

More pre-Christian Daniel apocrypha are preserved among the Dead Sea Scrolls. In addition to the eight partially preserved copies of MT Daniel, fragments survive of three Aramaic texts associated with the story of Daniel: the Prayer of Nabonidus (4Q242), 4QPseudo-Daniel (4Q243/244), and 4QPseudo-Daniel (4Q245). Sometimes a

---

22 Susanna: before Daniel 1 in θ; after Daniel 12 in OG, the Vulgate, and the Syro-Hexaplaric; after Bel and the Dragon in Papyrus 967. Bel and the Dragon: after Daniel 12 in θ; after Susanna in the OG, the Vulgate and the Syro-Hexaplaric; after Daniel 12 in Papyrus 967. See Collins, Daniel, 3, 409, 427, and Chapter Two, §3.

23 On the use of the term “copies” in this regard, see note 9, supra.

24 The Aramaic text 4QFour Kingdoms is preserved in two partially overlapping copies (4Q552 and 4Q553) and contains perhaps part of a direct speech and almost certainly an (angelic?) interpretation of a dream or vision. The relevant portion of this short and fragmentary document is an interpretation concerning the meaning of four trees. The trees, we are told, are kingdoms, and although three kingdoms are mentioned before the text breaks off, the name of only the first, Babylon, is preserved. That we only know the name of the first kingdom of 4QFour Kingdoms is unfortunate, for if we knew the names of the others we might be able to date the text provisionally. There are several reasons 4QFour Kingdoms might be classified as a Daniel apocryphon: the text is in Aramaic, like the other Qumran Daniel apocrypha; it in part describes a seer’s dream or vision and its interpretation; the subject of the dream or vision seems to be a king (4Q552 1 i 8) who is addressed in the vocative (as indicated by the use of the emphatic state of the noun (אֲלֹהִים); it seems to contain the four-kingdom schema (cf. Daniel 2); its references to God as the Most High; and the reference to trees as kingdoms might be paralleled in King Nebuchadnezzar’s dream, in which he was a tree (Daniel 4). Flint argues, however, that the text’s four kingdom schema of Babylon-Persia, Greece, Rome (?), and the eschatological kingdom of God represents a significant difference from the Babylon/Media/Persia/Greece schema of the Book of Daniel (“Daniel Tradition at Qumran,” 362–363). On the other hand, whether the second kingdom in the schema of 4Q552–553 is actually Greece is very uncertain. For the text, see also R. Eisenman and M.O. Wise, The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered (New York, 1992), 71–73 (where the text is called 4Q547 and is assumed to be from one copy only), and F. García Martínez and E.J. Tigchelaar, The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition (2 vols.; Leiden/New York/Köln, 1997–1998), 1102–1107.
fourth composition, 4Qapocryphe de Daniel (4Q246), commonly referred to as the “Son of God” text, is included as well.\(^{25}\) As with the other Dead Sea Aramaic texts, these four Daniel apocrypha were probably not products of the Qumran community, however this term is understood.\(^{26}\) None of the four Dead Sea texts appear in MT or LXX Daniel, although the Prayer of Nabonidus seems to preserve fragments of an older, more conservative form of the episode of the madness of Nebuchadnezzar in MT Daniel 4,\(^{27}\) and so dates to the period before 164 BCE and possibly as early as the third century BCE. I have argued elsewhere that the text preserved in 4Q243/244 also might be dated to the decades between the first appearance of five-chapter version of the court tales and the final redaction of MT Daniel,\(^{28}\) while 4Q245 contains historical allusions indicating its

\(^{25}\) On all four texts, see Chapter Three, Excursus III: “Dead Sea 4Q ‘Pseudo-Daniel’.”


\(^{28}\) DiTommaso, “4QPseudo-Daniel” (4Q243–4Q244),” J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint,
text is a product of the latter half of the second century BCE.\textsuperscript{29}

The Greek Additions and these fragmentary Dead Sea texts represent the sum total of the autonomous Daniel apocrypha\textsuperscript{30} that can be positively dated to the Second Temple period.\textsuperscript{31} All of this literature is Jewish and all of it was composed originally in Hebrew or Aramaic. The total is not particularly great when compared to the number of apocryphal texts attributed during this period to some of the other biblical figures, but neither is it insignificant. We should recall that the Book of Daniel was the latest book to have been included in the Hebrew Bible and that the figure of Daniel was a recent addition to the collective consciousness of Second-Temple Jewry as compared to the more traditional figures of Adam, Joseph, Moses, or Isaiah. For a relative newcomer, then, the figure of Daniel quickly caught the imagination of Second-Temple writers. There is a distinct possibility, too, that even more pre-70 Daniel apocrypha once existed. The Jewish historian Josephus, for example, in his \textit{Jewish Antiquities} refers to the “books” (in the plural) that Daniel wrote (§§267–269), which to my mind suggests something other than the Greek Additions\textsuperscript{32} or a truncated version of MT Daniel which for

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{29} Collins and Flint, “Pseudo-Daniel,” 158.

\textsuperscript{30} That is, not including the rewriting and augmentation of the Daniel story that appears in Josephus’ \textit{Jewish Antiquities} and the \textit{Lives of the Prophets}, although the final form of the \textit{Vita Danielis} in the latter is a Byzantine-era creation. On these texts see Chapter Two.

\textsuperscript{31} Some claims have been made that apocryphal Daniel apocalypses (\textit{viz.}, the Syriac Vision of the Young Daniel and the Syriac Revelation of Daniel the Prophet in the Land of Persia and Elam) either were products of Second-Temple Judaism or preserve material from that period (see Chapter Three, §§2.4 and 5). In my opinion these claims are false: the earliest extant apocryphal Daniel apocalypses date from the fourth or fifth centuries CE, and these are Byzantine Greek apocalyptic, not the two Syriac ones.

\textsuperscript{32} Pace Marcus (\textit{Ant.}, 305 note \textit{c}), who proposes that Josephus might have been referring to the “various apocryphal additions to the book of Daniel current in his time, either in Heb.-Aram. or Greek” when he employed the plural. C.T. Begg suggests that “Josephus’s reference to Daniel’s books/writings intends to further the parallelism between him and Josephus” (“Daniel and Josephus: Tracing Connections,” \textit{The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings} (ed. A.S. van der Woude; BETL 106; Leuven, 1993), 539–545 at 543 note 19). If the implication of this argument is that Josephus stretched the truth for the sake of the parallelism, it then presumes that his audience would be unaware of the extent of Daniel’s writings. Is it possible that Josephus understood the court tales of Daniel 1–6 and the visions of 7–12 as separate books?
\end{quote}
several centuries might have circulated throughout the Eastern Mediterranean.\(^3\)

Only a small proportion of the Daniel apocrypha seems to have been composed in the second, third, or fourth centuries CE, the period running approximately from the restoration of the Roman Empire under the Flavians to the time when it was irrevocably split in two. Why there should be such a great gap in the creation of apocryphal Daniel literature is unknown. Certainly the Book of Daniel itself was not ignored: besides its multi-faceted influence on early Jewish\(^3\) and Christian thought,\(^3\) it was the subject of significant commentaries or studies by several scholars and theologians, including

\(^3\) There is some evidence, however slight, that early, abbreviated, or paraphrastic forms of the Book of Daniel were produced and/or circulated in a limited fashion throughout antiquity. There is ample evidence suggesting the existence of a five-chapter, pre-MT Daniel collection of court tales, but no evidence for its presence in the years after 164 BCE. An early version of Dan 3:31–6:29 might have circulated as an Aramaic “Book of Daniel” for many decades prior to its redaction and assimilation into MT Daniel (the theory is discussed in Collins, Daniel, 37), and it is possible that a version of what is now MT Daniel 1–7 circulated independently as well. We also have to account for the possibility that 4Q116 represents an abbreviation of MT Daniel (see note 9, supra). Post-MT Daniel abbreviations or paraphrases might have circulated in the first few centuries CE afterwards; see Chapter Three, §2.4, on the “Little Daniel” of Ebed-Jesu and its importance to our understanding of the Syriac Vision of the Young Daniel. The evidence of the Sogdian Daniel fragment supports the idea that paraphrastic versions of at least part of the Book of Daniel were produced, although it is difficult to draw more specific conclusions here (on the Sogdian Daniel, see the Excursus of the same name in the Inventory of Chapter Six). Note, too, the comments of W.E. Crum concerning a Coptic fragment of the Book of Daniel: “A very small leaf on which Daniel xi 38 and xii 9 are discernable, though it is hard to see how all the intervening passage could be accommodated on so minute a page” (BJRL 5 (1918–1920), 498). One solution to the problem as outlined by Crum (but by no means the only solution) would be to posit that the Coptic text is paraphrase of Daniel 11 and 12.


Hippolytus of Rome, Origin, Porphyry, and Jerome. It simply might be the case that Daniel apocrypha were indeed produced but did not survive. All the same, I think that a case might be made that the extant material evidence is relatively faithful and that perhaps something characteristic to the Book of Daniel and the Daniel apocrypha which relates to their fundamental purposes might explain the presence of the gap in the apocryphal record. I will return to the problem of this gap in Chapter Five.

For whatever reason, the last century of the Roman Empire in the West represents another turning point in the history of the production of Daniel apocrypha, where over the next thousand years scores of new texts were composed. These late antique and early mediaeval Daniel apocrypha are preserved in the Jewish, Christian, and Islamic traditions and were produced or copied in almost every language into which these traditions historically took root. The range of languages in which this literature appears is staggering. Daniel apocrypha exist in Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, Latin, Syriac, Coptic, Arabic, Persian, Turkish, Armenian, Old Slavonic, Old English and Middle English, Old Irish, Old Icelandic, and various early versions of French, Italian, and German. The two notable exceptions are


37 For the purposes of this study, I set the boundary between the ancient and mediaeval worlds at 476 CE in the Latin West (the final collapse of the Western Roman Empire) and 621 CE (AH 1) in the Greek East (the traditional data assigned to the Hegira of Mohammad, which was followed shortly thereafter by the Arab invasions), although it must be stressed that these boundaries are quite arbitrary. The division between the mediaeval world and early modern one is the mid-fifteenth century in both the West and the East and is marked by the invention of printing, the re-emergence of nationalism, and the fall of Constantinople in 1453.
Ethiopic and Georgian, although again we must always account for the fact that texts did not always survive into the modern world and so their existence remains hidden from us.

Some of this late antique and mediaeval material was distributed widely throughout mediaeval Europe and the Near and Middle East. The oneirocritical *Somniale Danielis*, for example, survives in multiple languages and several recensions across over 150 manuscript copies and dozens of incunabula, and is part of a much broader tradition linking Daniel with the interpretation of dreams and meteorological and astrological phenomena. Other texts, however, never seemed to have circulated beyond very restricted circles whose boundaries were circumscribed by the vicissitudes of geography, language, or theology, or by some other factor, important at the time but which has been long since forgotten. The majority of the Daniel apocalyptica, for example, are preserved in a single language only, and, in some cases, in a single manuscript copy.

The scope of this apocryphal Daniel literature is similarly impressive. There are Daniel texts where the action is related in the first person and there are third-person episodes about Daniel’s life and times. There are Daniel apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles, Daniel astronomical and geomantic texts, Daniel mystery plays, and Daniel dream manuals. There are full-blown narratives involving the prophet, poems about him, and shorter traditions, embedded in a variety of formats, that touch on a particular aspect of his life, deeds, or death. There are even tales that revolve around other figures from the Book of Daniel, such as Nebuchadnezzar, the three youths from the fiery furnace, and Susanna. In short, the realia of the manuscript evidence suggests that, with the sole exception of Adam, no other figure from the Hebrew Bible had attributed to or associated with it more ancient and mediaeval apocryphal literature.

Despite the existence of so much and such diverse apocryphal Daniel literature, all of it may be classified by means of only three

---

38 On the subject of Ethiopic texts, see the short note on BL cod. Or. 496 in the Inventory of Chapter Six.

39 And possibly Ezra and Moses, although there is no way to be certain until a full account of the corpus of the apocrypha pertaining to each figure is tallied. On the research regarding the Adam apocrypha, see note 115, infra. We must also not forget that we are dealing only with extant texts or, if a text has been lost, a reference to that text. Much from the ancient and mediaeval worlds has been lost without a trace, and there is always an element of uncertainty when one assesses whether one figure was more popular than another.
separate categories: the Daniel legenda, the apocryphal Daniel apocalypses, and the Daniel prognostica. Over the course of the next three chapters, I will argue that the biblical Book of Daniel, particularly with respect to the two types of literature it preserves (viz., third-person narrative and first-person revelatory vision), provided the principal source of inspiration for the structure and content of the first two categories and was the primary, if indirect, inspiration for the third. 40

The legenda are third-person, post-biblical narratives which retell and augment the story of Daniel as it appears in Daniel 1–6. With a few exceptions, none of it is pseudepigraphic, nor does it tend to deal with descriptions of future events. Some legenda are relatively short texts, others are the length of the Book of Daniel itself, while still others are embedded in larger compositions such as the Lives of the Prophets. The Daniel legenda can encompass both expansions of and additions to the biblical narrative, and quite often both sorts of reworking are present in the same texts.

The apocalyptic apocrypha, in contrast, are first-person compositions pseudonymously attributed to Daniel. 41 There are over two dozen texts, which in form and focus resemble the descriptions of revelatory visions in Daniel 7–12. They are primarily concerned with the political events and historical figures of the author’s past and present and with the events of his immediate and long-term future. This information is communicated to the reader by means of a vision on the part of Daniel that is frequently but not always interpreted by a mediating figure.

40 The three categories of apocrypha listed here by no means exhaust the avenues for the transmission of post-biblical traditions about the figure of Daniel. Apocryphal data are found in annalistic form in the mediaeval Christian and Islamic histories of the biblical prophets and in the prologues to the Book of Daniel, the last a common feature of Western manuscript Bibles. Another source of ancillary Daniel material are the additions or explanations embedded in the many ancient and mediaeval translations of the Book of Daniel (outside autonomous narratives such as the Greek Additions) or which appear in the higher criticism of the antique and mediaeval commentaries and postilla. Finally, works of art also communicate the story of Daniel; see Chapter Two, notes 50 and 152.

41 This attribution is nearly always explicit, although sometimes certain texts are attributed to Daniel in one manuscript and to “historical” figures such as (Pseudo-) Methodius or Leo the Wise in others. Note, however, that it is never the case that a post-biblical apocalyptic text is attributed to Daniel in one manuscript and to another biblical figure in another manuscript.
Like the apocalyptica, the Daniel prognostica are pseudepigraphic. But where the apocalyptic texts are concerned with the meaning of past and future history as it relates to a community’s contemporary situation, the prognostica are essentially personal fortune-telling texts.\textsuperscript{42} As a result, beyond the explicit attribution to Daniel their first-person nature is much more implied than constantly affirmed by the sort of first-person pronouns and verbal forms that tend to characterise the apocalyptic texts.

The distinction between the categories of Daniel apocrypha is extremely rigid, just as it is between the types of material within the Book of Daniel. None of the Daniel legenda concern themselves in any detail with describing Daniel during the period in which he experienced his visions, nor are any of the apocryphal Daniel apocalypses especially interested in the multitude of facts about Daniel that one encounters in MT Daniel 1–6 or the Greek Additions. Just as in the biblical Book of Daniel, the legenda and the apocryphal apocalypses almost seem as if they have in mind two radically different figures of the prophet.\textsuperscript{43} Likewise, the Daniel prognostica pay little attention to the particulars of Daniel’s life and almost none at all to apocalyptic visions and their interpretations.

There are no apocryphal psalms pseudonymously attributed to Daniel, no hymns, odes, or songs, no lamentations, no meditations, no prayers, no annalistic histories or chronologies, no hortatory speeches, no wisdom literature or philosophical tractates, and no testaments.\textsuperscript{44} Again, this state of affairs is entirely the result of the influence of the Book of Daniel upon all subsequent Daniel apocrypha.

\textbf{2. The Structure and Purposes of This Study}

To purpose of this study is two-fold: i) to illuminate the full corpus of the ancient and mediaeval Jewish, Christian, and Islamic apoc-

\textsuperscript{42} For a fuller discussion of this and other dissimilarities between the focus of the apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha and that of the Daniel prognostica, see Chapter Four, §1.

\textsuperscript{43} The prognostica, too, preserve their own internal consistency and formal autonomy. See Chapter Four, §§2 and 3 for more details on the significance of the setting in Nebuchadnezzar’s reign of the Prologue to the \textit{Somniale Danielis} and the \textit{Lunationes Danielis}.

\textsuperscript{44} It is also noteworthy that, with the exception of the genre “testament,” most of the apocryphal literature composed in these other genres is not especially concerned with revelatory information about the future.
apocryphal Daniel literature; and ii) to identify and address the issues fundamental to its three major types: the legenda, the apocryphal apocalyptic material, and the prognostica. Although previous scholarship has addressed specific texts or discrete portions of the Daniel apocrypha, the present study represents the first attempt to identify and evaluate the complete body of texts and to clarify the state of their manuscript evidence. In addition, this study is the first to distinguish among the types of apocryphal Daniel literature and to examine them from a generic perspective, not only on their own terms as apocrypha, but also, significantly, with respect to the relationship between the biblical Book of Daniel and the forms, content, and overall tenor of each type. Why were some texts attributed to Daniel? Why did other texts devote so much effort to retelling the biblical story of the prophet? At the risk of repeating myself, this is a subject that has not witnessed much in the way of past scrutiny. Accordingly, an accent on the introductory and on the bibliographic characterises this study, particularly in the attempt to circumscribe the parameters of the three types of apocrypha. At the same time, however, this study is meant to be considerably more than either an Einleitung or a bibliography, and thus there is a strong emphasis throughout its core chapters on the interpretation and analysis of the literature, particularly in matters pertaining to the manner in which the figure of Daniel was both articulated and employed.

The chronological range of this study extends from the second century BCE, when MT Daniel attained its final form in the context of the cycle of Hellenistic-era Daniel texts, until the close of the fifteenth century of the Common Era, the final five decades of which witnessed the fall of Byzantium in the east and the critical transition from the manuscript codex to the printed book in the west. To be sure, the production of apocryphal literature did not terminate with the invention and spread of the printed word,45 nor did the

45 The Testament of Alexander the Great, which was composed in the first half of the nineteenth century by a Greek nationalist monk is a good example of the survival of the very ancient genre of the apocalyptic testament. The Book of Mormon is perhaps the most famous modern apocryphon that is an autonomous, narrative expansion of the biblical record (rather than a reinterpretation of it, such as Mary Baker Eddy’s Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures or Rev. Sun Myung Moon’s Divine Principle).
manufacture of manuscripts suddenly cease. The introduction of printing, however, and other developments in technology, culture, society, and economics throughout Western Europe signal the gradual progression from the Middle Ages to the early modern period and mark the advent of the liberal, humanistic, capitalistic, and scientific modern perspective.

Chapter Two concerns the story of Daniel as it is told in the Book of Daniel (principally in the court tales) and in the Daniel legenda. It would be impossible within the confines of this study to identify and evaluate every single instance where an ancient or mediaeval post-biblical text reworks, deviates from, amplifies, or augments the biblical story of Daniel. Instead, the focus of the chapter is on the broad contours of this relationship, and especially on the way in which the legenda resolve the tension between, on the one hand, the authoritative status of the Book of Daniel and, on the other hand, the fact that such reworkings, deviations, amplifications, and augmentations were part of an ongoing process that integrally included the biblical story. Although every expression of the Daniel story was composed or redacted for its own purposes, the post-biblical legenda consistently exhibit the same concerns with this story that we find in the biblical witnesses to the Book of Daniel. For example, both the biblical Book and the post-biblical legenda are obsessed with issues related to the story’s chronology, including the identification of the various foreign monarchs, since their reigns provide markers by which the relative and the absolute chronologies of the story are established. They are also concerned with filling in the story’s gaps, particularly regarding Daniel’s early years, his conduct at various points in the story, and his last days and death. What we find is that the reasons the various legenda have for addressing these concerns, inasmuch as they may be deduced from the evidence, are often the same as that which underscored the composition/redaction of the biblical forms of the story.

46 There are, for example, Ethiopic (Falasha) paper manuscripts of pseudepigraphic texts that were copied in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, some of which were made expressly at the request of European scholars. There are many Greek manuscripts, too, which date from the same centuries, often the products of monasteries.

47 The change is perhaps most noticeable in the decline of the practice of the copying of the Daniel prognostica; see Chapter Four, §6.
Chapter Three is dedicated to the post-biblical apocalyptic literature attributed to Daniel, a category which encompasses both apocalypses proper and apocalyptic oracles. The first part of the chapter is devoted to the basic identification of the texts. Over a century of intermittent scholarship on this body of literature has created confusion concerning not only the number and names of these texts, but also state of their manuscript evidence. Compounding the matter is the fact that several texts have been published only recently, while many others remain unedited, known only on the basis of a passing mention in a manuscript catalogue. In order to remedy this situation, the chapter presents a systematic investigation of these apocalyptic texts that clarifies but also augments the work of the previous scholarship, especially the studies of Alexander, Berger, Denis, DiTommaso, García Martínez, Haelewyck, Halkin, Macler, Pertusi, Schmoldt, and Stegmüller. Particular attention is devoted to each text regarding the issues of the date of composition, the presentation of the figure of Daniel, and the generic qualities of the text. Moreover, and unlike previous scholarship, the apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha are discussed in an approximate chronological order.

In itself, this primary work on this apocalyptic literature is important: an updating and clarification of the identification of the texts and the manuscript evidence is very much a desideratum, and the presentation of even a rudimentary chronological presentation is critical for the primary sequence of their composition. The second half of the chapter, however, analyzes the texts thematically. Our enquiry begins with an investigation of whether (and to what degree) this apocalyptic literature may be classified under the rubric of the genre apocalypse. From here we move to an examination of the relationship between the texts and the Book of Daniel. What did it mean for a text to be pseudonymously attributed to Daniel, specifically? In other words, were there good reasons why Daniel, rather than some other biblical figure, was chosen as the vehicle by which a certain type of information was communicated? Was this apocalyptic literature a response to a distinctive type of historical situation? The chapter concludes with a preliminary discussion on the impact that our clarification and expansion of the material evidence of the extant texts might have on the commonly-held thesis that many of them are in fact versions of or based on one early Greek apocalypse.

48 On this scholarship, consult the Appendix to this chapter.
Chapter Four investigates the issues of identification and analysis surrounding the surprisingly rich and diverse body of Daniel prognostica, which represents a stream of apocryphal literature that had a less formal relationship to the biblical tradition about Daniel than the legenda or the post-biblical apocalyptic texts. Major sections in this chapter are devoted to the Somniale Danielis, the Lunationes Danielis, the Praedictiones Danielis, and the sundry Daniel prognostica from the east, the most important of which is the anthological treatise known as the Malḥamat Dāniyāl.

The Somniale and the Lunationes are preserved in many copies and in multiple languages and were among the most popular compositions in mediaeval Western Europe. In contrast to the research on the apocryphal apocalypses, where much effort is devoted to the preliminary task of identifying the texts, in the case of the Somniale and the Lunationes the previous scholarship has been relatively excellent in this regard. As a result, our interest in the textual situation of both compositions is largely limited to the exploration of the full scope of their manuscript evidence, the result of which is reported in the Inventory of Chapter Six. My principal interest in the Somniale and the Lunationes in Chapter Four is their relationship with the biblical Book of Daniel, which, I argue, centers on the figure of Daniel and the ways it was understood in the post-biblical world.

The situation is slightly different for the Praedictiones Danielis and the Daniel prognostica from the East, which have been comparatively understudied to the point that it is clear to me that no one understands the full extent of the corpus. Accordingly, more time is spent on simply outlining the extent of the evidence, which is presented as a preliminary survey designed to precipitate interest in this diverse and little-known class of texts. One of my preliminary conclusions is that the little-known Praedictiones Danielis is either related to or is a Greek version of the Malḥamat Dāniyāl, although it must be stressed that this conclusion awaits verification by means of a detailed study of the relevant texts. Chapter Four finishes with some observations about the Daniel prognostica in general.

Chapter Five offers observations and conclusions regarding the Book of Daniel and the apocryphal Daniel literature as a whole.

Chapter Six contains the Inventory of texts and manuscripts and the Bibliography of the primary and secondary literature devoted to them. Previous survey studies on the Daniel apocrypha have tended to be derivative and somewhat myopic. One result is that the same
data are simply recycled time and again, introducing a new generation of scholars to the same material. Another result is that certain texts or types of texts have received more attention than others. A handful of apocalypses, for instance, have been accorded the lion’s share of scholarship, while the apocalyptic texts in general have been the subject of far more enquiry than the legenda and prognostica. The situation is the same for the monographs and editions dedicated to a specific text or group of texts. Apocalyptic and prognostic texts in particular are frequently mislabeled and/or conflated, and the record of their manuscript evidence is often incomplete.

This Inventory, which is inseparable from and in many ways a codification of the research in Chapters Two, Three, and Four, is meant to provide scholars with comprehensive account of the Daniel apocrypha. Each text in the Inventory is identified, named, and described. This task alone is sometimes daunting, given that a significant minority of the Daniel apocrypha have been known by different, conflational, or inaccurate names. The manuscript evidence for each text is thoroughly presented, including the title of each manuscript, its *incipit* (if the manuscript is not anacephalous) and *explicit*, and the catalogue references. In some cases, such as with the *Lunationes Danielis* and the *Somniale Danielis*, where the number of manuscript copies runs well into the hundreds, the list of the extant primary evidence represents the latest word on the subject. In other cases, such as with the apocalyptic literature, the list of texts and manuscripts, while a significant advance over previous studies, still awaits the final word which can be offered only after an examination by autopsy of all the manuscript evidence. Finally, each text is provided with a complete and annotated list of the editions, translations, and secondary studies. In its totality, therefore, the Inventory represents a fresh and more complete understanding of the extent of the apocryphal Daniel literature, correcting and greatly expanding on the work of past generations of scholarship while adding significantly more in the way of information about new texts, sources, and manuscripts.

---

49 In this it represents a radical expansion and clarification of the section on the “Daniel Pseudepigrapha” in my Bibliography of Pseudepigrapha Research; see note 98, infra.

50 As with previous surveys and bibliographies of this material, the texts in this final chapter are arranged according to the language in which they are preserved rather than by reference to genre, content, date, provenance, or faith.
NOTES ON PREVIOUS RESEARCH AND APPROACHES

A. The Apocryphal Daniel Literature

Over the centuries, scholarly interest in biblical apocrypha has waxed and waned with regularity. Many of the major discoveries of apocryphal texts were made in the six decades before 1914, a golden era which also saw the publication of much significant and lasting secondary literature, culminating in the appearance of the great pre-war German and English collections of translations. Alternately, the study of biblical apocrypha virtually disappeared in the subsequent six decades, with only a few bright lights illuminating an otherwise darkened landscape. The last twenty-five years, however, have witnessed an astonishing rebirth of the field. In every way, the current research on apocryphal texts is rich in scope, excellent in quality, and international in character. The history of the study of the Daniel apocrypha very much mirrors that of the field of apocryphal literature in general.

The apocryphal traditions about Daniel first were systematically collected by J.A. Fabricius, the father of modern pseudepigrapha research. Best known for his monumental works of classical bibliography, Fabricius’ pioneering 1722/3 compendium, the Codex pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti, contains over three hundred separate entries that are arranged alphabetically on the basis of the biblical figure to which each text is pseudonymously attributed.

---


53 I will concentrate on those studies that inventory or examine this literature in its entirety, many of which are survey-style in nature. Excluded from the review are the editions, translations, and secondary studies that focus primarily on a specific text, theme, or tradition. These will be referred to in the appropriate sections in later chapters of this study.

54 Most importantly, the Bibliotheca graeca, sive notitiae scriptorum veterum graecorum (14 vols., 1705–1728, but revised and continued by G.C. Harle (Hamburg, 1790–1809)) and the Bibliotheca latina (1697; revised and enlarged to 3 vols., 1721–1722).

55 J.A. Fabricius, Codex pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti (2 vols.; Hamburg, 1722–1723 [orig. 1713]). The second edition of this text is almost always cited in the research. The first volume contains 240 entries, the second another eighty-six, plus four texts. The Daniel material appears at 1.1124–1140.
The chapter on the Daniel apocrypha is particularly valuable, not so much for its completeness but for its citations of pre-eighteenth-century sources. In it we find the section “Vita Danielis & Prophetia Apocrypha” (§223), which details traditions concerning Daniel drawn from the *Chronicon Paschale* and the *Chronography* of John Malalas; “Conjectorius Danielis, sive Somniorum interpretatio sub Prophetae illius nomine jactata” (§224), a complex section on the *Somniale Danielis* and several other oneirocritica associated with Daniel, plus a reproduction of the first few stanzas of the Old German poem, “König Tyro von Schotten und Frídebrand sin Sun,” which mentions Daniel; and the sections “Prognosticon Danielis lingua Syriaca” and “Visiones Danielis” (§§225–226), both of which contain brief notes on their respective subjects. It is unclear whether the Daniel apocrypha listed in these sections are a selection of texts chosen by Fabricius or in fact represent the sum total of texts that were available and known to him.

Fabricius’ presentation of the apocryphal texts set the stage for all subsequent survey studies. His choice of material was guided by an inclusive philosophy rather than an exclusive one, a philosophy that many modern studies would do well to emulate. He accepted both the texts attributed to and the traditions about the biblical figures, and did not artificially restrict the latitude of his study on the basis of either language or chronology. At the same time, however, his study reads more like a collation of notices et extraits than a penetrating analysis of the texts or the underlying dynamics of their transmission history and their understanding of the figure of Daniel. Still, his work remains important not only in that it is the starting-point of all subsequent research, but also because it remains an invaluable record of the manuscript evidence at the time.

Over a century later, J.-P. Migne and his collaborators compiled the *Dictionnaire des apocryphes*, a digest of texts, legends, and fragments related to biblical figures and related topics that, despite the pervasive typographic errors and the dated quality of its material, still handsomely repays careful study. The article on Daniel in the *Dictionnaire* is patently reworked from Fabricius. It is a valuable mine of information nonetheless, full of references to manuscripts, apocryphal texts, and legends about the prophet. Its overarching intent is to provide the sum total of the knowledge on the topic and includes the post-biblical Susanna literature, which Migne felt ought to be considered part of the Daniel apocrypha. The presentation of this material is completely unsystematic—brief notes to diverse manuscripts or printed books are scattered among longer passages quoted from texts or paraphrased from Fabricius. It thus resembles more a desultory collection of notes on various topics and writings than a methodical study. Missing from the endeavour is a systematic analysis of the information.

---

57 “Daniel,” vol. 1, cols. 185–192.
The careful scientific study of the Daniel apocrypha began only in the last decade of the nineteenth century. A. Vassiliev,58 Klostermann,59 and V.I. Istrin60 each published editions of various Byzantine Greek apocalypses attributed to Daniel. But it was F. Macler, with his 1895 Faculté de Théologie protestante de Paris thesis, *Les Apocalypses apocryphes de Daniel*, and the series of later articles revised from it, who offered the first attempt to present a significant portion of the Daniel apocrypha in an academic format.61 Although the great bulk of his work is devoted to the presentation of the translations of the apocryphal Daniel apocalypses, Macler’s primary analytic interest with them is generic. As he remarks, “L’intérêt principal que présente l’étude de nos Apocalypses est de faire ressortir la longue durée de ce genre littéraire. L’inspiration apocalyptique fournie par la livre de Daniel n’est même pas épuisée par le Moyen Age. L’histoire de l’apocalyptique ne doit pas s’arrêter à la plus jeune des Apocalypses de Daniel; pour en avoir une vue d’ensemble; il faut poursuivre jusqu’à nos jours.”62

In the same year, W. Bousset published his monograph on the origins and development of the figure of the Antichrist63 and, five years later, an equally influential article on eschatology in the *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*.64 These two works represent, among other things, a watershed in the understanding of the history of the development of eschatological speculation in early Christian apocrypha. In them Bousset discusses many of the late antique and early mediaeval apocalypses, including (more in his article than in his monograph) the few apocryphal Daniel apocalypses that had been identified up to that time. Although Bousset does not comment on

60 V.M. Istrin, “Откровение Месфодия Патарского и апокрифических видов Даниила в византийской и славянорусской литературе...”, *KoIbR* Moskva 182 (1897.3) (Moskva, 1897), 253–329; idem, “Откровение Месфодия Патарского и апокрифических видов Даниила в византийской и славянорусской литературе...”, *KoIbR* Moskva 184 (1898.1) (Moskva, 1898), 135–162. On the arrangement of Istrin’s work, see Chapter Three, note 32. For a long time the editions of Vassiliev (note 58) and Istrin remained relatively unknown to Western scholars.
the development of these apocryphal apocalypses *per se*, he attempts to distinguish among the separate texts (to the point of assigning them idiosyncratic names) and offers some thoughts on their inter-relationship and to the development of certain themes.\(^6^5\)

None of the Daniel apocrypha was included in the aforementioned pre-war collections of the German and English translations of the biblical apocrypha. Virtually the only voice heard in the long silence that descended on the field after 1914 was that of L. Ginzberg, whose multi-volume *Legends of the Jews*—a classic work by any measure of the term—included many scattered references to Daniel and a dedicated chapter on the figure of Daniel and the Babylonian Exile.\(^6^6\) A compendium of the later Jewish tales that grew up around the characters from the Hebrew Bible and arranged in their traditional biblical sequence, the *Legends* is noted not only for the sweeping breadth of the material which it includes, but also for its magnificent and detailed endnotes, which reveal clearly Ginzberg’s copious and painstaking scholarship. Although its lack of systematic presentation can frequently tax one’s patience, particularly if one is searching for the appearance of a specific datum within a tradition complex, this shortcoming is more than compensated for by the sheer pleasure of reading each chapter and working through its notes.

As with the rest of the *Legends*, the section on the legends that circulated around the prophet Daniel is presented in a synthetic narrative, with little attempt to keep the various sources separate or to appraise their relative worth. Moreover, the *Legends* includes references not only to texts attributed to Daniel, but also to miscellaneous data and traditions about him, which Ginzberg gleaned from various rabbinic, gaonic, and other sources. For these reasons, the section on Daniel in the *Legends*, although technically neither a scholarly assessment of the material nor an interpretation of it, remains a valuable source-book on the later Jewish traditions and texts concerning the prophet.\(^6^7\)

---

\(^6^5\) One result of this and the other early scholarship on the Daniel apocrypha was the gradual formation of a loose consensus, which posited that there existed only one original Greek Daniel apocalypse and that the Greek, Armenian, and Slavonic apocalypses extant in manuscript copies represent various versions of this original text. This consensus has been remarkably persistent and often appears in reworked form in the scholarship from the late twentieth century. In Chapter Three, however, I will argue that this consensus is incorrect, since it is based on a seriously incomplete knowledge of the full range and scope of the apocryphal Daniel apocalypses.


\(^6^7\) The methodology of Ginzberg’s *Legends*, as G. Vermes accurately noted, was “to collect all the that available material from every possible source, and paying no attention to chronological data, to contruct a synthesis of the various interpretations” (*Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies* (SPB 4; Leiden, 1961), 1).
H. Schmoldt’s 1972 dissertation, “Die Schrift ‘Vom jungen Daniel’ und ‘Daniels letzte Vision,’” which he submitted to the Evang.-Theologische Fakultät der Universität Hamburg, marks the beginning of the revival of interest in the apocryphal Daniel literature. It is the first in a quartet of excellent studies on the Byzantine Daniel apocalypses that were written in the period from 1972 to 1988, a group that also includes K. Berger’s monograph on the Diegesis Danielis, P.J. Alexander’s unfortunately incomplete volume on the texts and history of the Byzantine apocalyptic matrix in general, and A. Pertusi’s study of the theme of the end of the world in the Byzantine tradition. Schmoldt’s dissertation also remains one of the very few studies which discuss a significant portion of the apocryphal Daniel literature beyond that which is naturally circumscribed by the boundaries of language, viz., both the Syriac apocalypse The Vision of the Young Daniel (Vom jungen Daniel) and several of the Greek Daniel apocalypses of the Byzantine period. Although devoted primarily to the presentation of the editions and translations of these apocalypses, the dissertation also discusses the identification of and relationship among the manuscripts, including an extremely valuable section on “Die übrigen griechischen Schriften unter dem Namen Daniels.” A brief but essential history of research prefaces the study.

For all of its inherent importance to the field, however, Schmoldt’s dissertation was never published and thus for many years remained largely unknown outside certain circles within German scholarship. As a result, Berger’s 1976 monograph on the Diegesis Danielis has become more or less the standard work on the subject of apocryphal Daniel apocalypses, even though its focus remains firmly on the Diegesis alone and does not include a detailed examination of it in the light of the other Byzantine Daniel apocalypses. (This criticism was first leveled in M.E. Stone’s trenchant but not unfavourable review of the book in the Journal of Biblical Literature.) Berger’s attention returns consistently to the common topoi of Byzantine apocalypses in general, including the Antichrist, a topic which has perhaps unfairly dominated the study of Christian apocalypses since Bousset. Besides its fine edition of and commentary on the Diegesis, what has proven most useful for scholars is the book’s exhaustive survey of the Byzantine apocalyptic tradition in particular and the apocryphal Jewish and Christian literature in general. In particular, his exhaustive list of ancient and mediaeval apoc-

---


70 JBL 98 (1977), 609–610 at 610: “This Daniel apocalypse is one of a number of works associated with this figure: Berger records 15 different items in his list of sources. It would have been helpful if the Daniel apocalypse edited by Berger had been set in its place in this literature . . .”
alyptic texts\textsuperscript{71} has been highly influential in shaping conceptions as to the
range and identities of the Daniel apocalypses.\textsuperscript{72}

Unfortunately left unfinished at the time of his death in 1977, Alexander’s
volume, \textit{The Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition}, remains a classic in its field and
is arguably the most important book ever written on the apocryphal Daniel
apocalypses.\textsuperscript{73} Alexander traces the history of the Byzantine apocalypses
from the decline of the Sibylline tradition in the Dark Ages of the seventh
century through the appearance of the Syriac (and later Greek) apocalypses
attributed to Pseudo-Methodius to several key Daniel apocalypses and a
number of other texts of the high Byzantine period. Many translations and
paraphrastic overviews of key texts are included. In the second part, Alexander
examines three of the most common themes in this and other late antique
and mediaeval literature, those of the “Last Roman Emperor,” “Gog and
Magog,” and the “Legend of the Antichrist.” In this last theme he builds
upon the work of scholars such as Bousset (\textit{supra}).

The overall picture that Alexander paints is one where texts and themes
were deliberately used and re-used. D. deF. Abrahamse reflects that,
“Byzantine apocalypses were indeed written for consolation in times of trou-
bles, and they reflected the hopes and despairs of contemporaries in very
concrete historical events. The localization of these texts shows how often
apocalyptic hopes arose in the fringes of Byzantine society, where the threats
of invasion were the greatest, and in response to events whose importance
has long since receded out of historical memory. As they were transmitted
from one portion of the empire to another, and translated from language
to language, themes developed in response to immediate concerns and local-
ities or out of a simple misunderstanding of the text. With all its unlikely
sources, however, perhaps the main impression of the Byzantine apocalypt-
tic tradition...is the extent to which it remained a concrete and creative
source for the expression of political and religious thought throughout the

\textsuperscript{71} “Alphabetisches Verzeichnis der weniger bekannten im folgenden zitierten
zumeist pseudographischen Schriften apokalyptischen oder visionären Inhalts” (Berger,
\textit{Die griechische Daniel-Di
gese}, xi–xiii). Stone (see previous note) implies that the “188
items” of “vision texts [that] Berger cites” are from the Byzantine period. It is very
minor point, to be sure, but it does reveal the scope of the tradition history against
which Berger sets his study of the \textit{Di
gesis}. A check of these 188 items reveals that
they are not simply Byzantine texts but comprise a list of ancient and mediaeval
apocryphal material in general.

\textsuperscript{72} In particular, Berger’s list of Daniel apocrypha supplements (but does not
always supersede) the information contained in F. Stegmüller, \textit{Repertorium biblicum
medii aevi} (Madrid, 1950) and F. Halkin, \textit{Bibliotheca hagiographica graeca} (3 vols.; SubH
8a; Bruxelles, 1957). On the subject of the identification of the Daniel apocalypses
in these studies—and the problems with these identifications—see Chapter Three.

\textsuperscript{73} P.J. Alexander, \textit{The Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition} (ed., with intro. by D. deF.
Abrahamse; Berkeley/Los Angeles/London, 1985). Alexander’s first work on the
subject is the equally classic article, “Medieval Apocalypses as Historical Sources,”
\textit{American Historical Review} 73 (1968), 997–1018.
early medieval world." Alexander did not live long enough to investigate the full implications of his fundamental point about the way in which Byzantine apocalypses recycled their material, but it remains, I think, the starting point for any future comprehensive study of the topic. Alexander’s other arguments about the composition and provenance of the specific Daniel apocalypses are too numerous and dense to be summarised in a short paragraph or two, and I will address them at length in Chapter Three.

A. Pertusi’s book, *Fine di Bisanzio e fine del mondo*, is the last of the aforementioned quartet of studies on the Byzantine Daniel apocalypses that were written in the period from 1972 to 1988. As with Alexander’s *Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition*, the work was printed after the death of its author, having been edited for publication by E. Morini. As its title indicates, this volume concerns the themes of the end of empire and the end of the world as they are expressed in the Byzantine apocalyptic texts, for some of which Pertusi provides critical editions and translations. In fact, several of these texts were hitherto unedited, and thus this volume provides a valuable service to process of the identification of the full corpus of the Byzantine Daniel apocalypses. Pertusi’s book is particularly valuable with respect to the oft-neglected topic of the points of contact among the many Byzantine apocalypses.

In addition to this research on the apocalyptic apocrypha, the past three decades have witnessed much new work on the Daniel apocrypha as a whole, including the fragments of the Daniel apocrypha that were discovered in Qumran Cave 4. F. García Martínez, for example, presents a synthetic edition and translation of these fragments along with a comprehensive canvass of the mediaeval Daniel texts. His aim is to introduce this literature to scholars in general. To this end, he lists many of the Daniel apocrypha known to scholarship, arranged according to the language in which they survive, along with a brief overview of the manuscript evidence and a description of each text. Moreover, this article is the first study to discuss the Qumran texts in the light of the later Daniel literature. Its conclusion, although summary in nature, offers several interesting observa-

---

74 Ibid., 8.
75 A. Pertusi, *Fine di Bisanzio e fine del mondo. Significato e ruolo storico delle profezie sulla caduta di Costantinopoli in Oriente e in Occidente* (Istituto storico Italiano per medio evo n.s. 3; Roma, 1988).
First, García Martínez observes that “all the works examined offer the same basic apocalyptic scheme: a discourse on history in the form of an oracle, vision, reading of a text, etc., followed by an eschatological section in which the figure of the Antichrist plays a leading role” (160). Next, he posits that, with the exception of the Syriac and Persian texts, both of which he understands to be Jewish, the later Daniel apocalypses are Christian works that were composed originally in Greek, that deal primarily with Byzantine history and the reaction to the Islamic conquest, and that incorporate elements from both the biblical Book of Daniel and the New Testament, especially the schema of the four kingdoms (Daniel 2 and 7). Finally, he concludes that there is no relationship between the Qumran Daniel texts and any of the later Daniel apocrypha, although he offers no comment on the relationship among the later Daniel apocrypha. Although his reconstruction of the text of the Qumran Daniel material has since been superseded by later and more complete editions of the fragments, and even though his survey basically recapitulates the work of other scholars, García Martínez’ article remains an excellent introduction to the Daniel apocrypha.

A.-M. Denis’ *Introduction à la littérature religieuse judéo-hellénistique* is a magisterial, two-volume study which, despite its title, is devoted to the full spectrum of the Jewish and Christian apocryphal literature of the ancient and early medieval worlds. This book is not only a worthy successor to Denis’ ground-breaking 1970 volume but also represents the zenith of French-language scholarship on the apocryphal literature in general. Indeed, and in several ways, this *Introduction* may be characterised as a thoroughly systemised

78 Ibid., 160–161. It should be mentioned, however, that García Martínez ignores a few of the apocalyptic and all the non-apocalyptic texts pseudonymously attributed to Daniel, and so his conclusions on this “apocalyptic scheme” apply only to certain of the post-biblical Daniel apocalypses. Moreover, even within his restricted sample, there are exceptions to his conclusions on the structure of the texts.

79 In his wide-ranging work on the post-biblical Jewish and Christian apocalyptic writings (*Zwischen Hoffnung und Gericht. Untersuchungen zur Rezeption der Apokalyptik im frühen Christentum und Judentum* (WMANT 82; Neukirchen, 1999)), G.S. Oegema touches briefly on the Daniel apocalypses. The presentation is very much a survey-style report that is based on previous research, in the manner of García Martínez’ article. Unlike García Martínez, however, Oegema does not offer much in the way of observation about these texts or their relationship.


81 A.-M. Denis, *Introduction aux pseudépigraphes grecs d’Ancien Testament* (SVTP 1; Leiden, 1970). This book re-introduced the study of the full corpus of the apocryphal texts and traditions, including the well-known pseudepigrapha like 1 Enoch, 2 Baruch, and 4 Ezra and also the lesser-known texts and citations of lost texts. This “inclusive” approach to apocryphal texts had been a hallmark of the scholarship of Fabricus and Migne (on whom, see supra), and most particularly of M.R. James, witnessed not only in his *Apocrypha Anecdata* (I: T&S 2.3; Cambridge, 1893; II: T&S 5.1; Cambridge, 1897) and his *Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament* (TED 1, Palestinian Jewish Texts 14; London/New York, 1920), but also (and this fact is often forgotten) in his numerous and excellent catalogues of the manuscript collections in British universities, museums, and other repositories.
and vastly revised and updated edition of Migne’s *Dictionnaire des apocryphes*. In both the 1970 and 2000 volumes, Denis reviews the apocryphal Daniel apocalypses in a discrete section entitled “Les Apocalypses de Daniel.” In 1970, the section appears as a the book’s final chapter (309–314). In the 2000 volume, published posthumously through the efforts of J.-C. Haelewtyck, the section is greatly expanded (1291–1304) and is appended to the final chapter, which is devoted to those apocryphal texts and traditions that are now known only through citations by later (usually patristic) authors. Unfortunately, and in the manner of García Martinez’ study, Denis does not present much more than a roster of the texts and brief summaries of the contents of each, almost all of which are based entirely on previous research. The footnotes are particularly detailed, however, and in them Denis offers several interesting observations regarding the manuscript evidence of each text and its contents. Despite the title of the section, Denis also includes a discussion of the Qumran Daniel apocrypha, the *Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius*, and (very briefly) the other Daniel apocrypha besides the apocalypses.

In his edition of the Syriac *Revelation of Daniel the Prophet in the Land of Persia and Elam*, M. Henze offers a solid introduction to the Daniel apocalypses, although his list of texts is largely derivative and tends to conflate many of the relevant texts. Taking his bearings from J.J. Collins’ oft-cited definition of the genre “apocalypse,” Henze posits that few of the Daniel apocalypses actually fit this definition. In addition, he argues that while certain traditions appear frequently among the Daniel apocalypses in the many languages in which they are preserved, this circumstance is due more to borrowing from a common stock rather than to “mutual dependencies or textual borrowings” among these apocalypses in particular. The sole exception to this lack of co-relationship is observed in the close connexion between this *Revelation* and the Syriac *Vision of the Young Daniel*, one of the texts edited by Schmoldt. These are meaningful observations and will be addressed in detail in Chapter Three.
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82 This chapter represents an updating of a long-standing concern with the subject of references to lost or otherwise unknown apocrypha. One of the first such studies, still quite valuable, is M.R. James’ *Lost Apocrypha* (see previous note). Cf. J.H. Charlesworth’s *Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research* (SCS 7; Missoula, 1976 [reprinted with a Supplement; Ann Arbor, 1981]). Note also that there are several places throughout Denis’ two volumes where very brief reference is made to Daniel apocrypha outside the apocalypses and to the influence of the Book of Daniel on other texts.

83 See *supra*.


85 *Ibid.*, 2–11, with the list of texts at 3–5.

86 See my comments on the entire issue of the Daniel apocalypistica and the genre apocalyptic in Chapter Three, §3.
The Daniel apocrypha have not been well-represented in the profusion of collections of translations of biblical apocrypha that have appeared over the past quarter century.\(^\text{87}\) In fact, the only appearance to date of a Daniel apocryphon in any of these collections is G.T. Zervos’ translation of the Diegesis Danielis, which appears in the first volume of J.H. Charlesworth’s important anthology,\(^\text{88}\) although the series Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit plans to include in a future issue a translation of the Syriac Revelation of Daniel the Prophet in the Land of Persia and Elam.\(^\text{89}\) There are several reasons for this relative lack of attention. As I mentioned, the Greek Additions tend to be included in modern Bibles, while the Qumran Daniel fragments generally appear only in collections of the Dead Sea texts. As for the late antique and mediaeval Daniel apocrypha, chances are that they are largely unknown to scholars who work primarily in the fields of ancient Judaism and Christianity or, if they are known, are deemed to have been composed well outside the chronological restriction of a collection devoted to ancient biblical apocrypha. At the other end of the spectrum, secondary and survey works on mediaeval literature and folk legends tend to mention the Daniel apocrypha only \textit{en passant}.\(^\text{90}\)

Commentaries on the Book of Daniel traditionally and perhaps unsurprisingly limit their discussion of the apocryphal Daniel literature to the Greek Additions, which, when included, are treated as part of the biblical text, albeit a portion peculiar to the Greek Bibles of antiquity. This characteristic is true both for the older and for the more recent commentaries.\(^\text{91}\) Collins’ 1993 Hermeneia commentary on the Book represents a departure from the norm, however. It contains a long and valuable section that covers the Jewish and Christian understanding of the Book of Daniel from


\(^{90}\) There is the chance that English introductions to and translations of some or most of the Daniel pseudepigrapha (apocalypses and prognostica) will be included in the projected volume, \textit{More Old Testament Pseudepigrapha}, which will be edited by R. Bauckham and J. Davila.

\(^{91}\) Older: see, among others, J.A. Montgomery, \textit{A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel} (ICC; New York, 1927); newer: see, among others, J.E. Goldingay, \textit{Daniel} (WBC 30; Dallas, 1989); G.W. Buchanan, \textit{The Book of Daniel} (Mellen Biblical Commentary 25; Lewiston, 1999).
antiquity to modern times, including a thorough essay on the influence of Daniel on the New Testament by A. Yarbro Collins.92 Although the main thrust of the section is the history of interpretation, Collins pays special attention to the Qumran Daniel apocrypha, the Jewish historian Josephus’ presentation of the life of Daniel, and, to a lesser degree, the Jewish and Christian apocryphal Daniel literature of the medieval period.

Many of the bibliographic surveys include the apocryphal Daniel literature, although, as with the commentaries on the Book of Daniel, more often than not their interest is limited to the Greek Additions.93 That being said, there are several studies that include a larger percentage of the full corpus of the Daniel apocrypha. Two fine older examples are F. Stegmüller’s _Repertorium biblicum mediæ aëri_94 and F. Halkin’s _Bibliotheca hagiographica graeca_ (with supplements),95 the latter being the more valuable study for our purposes. Both of these works contain checklist-style information about the identities of the apocryphal Daniel literature and the manuscript evidence, and both present identical difficulties. Texts are frequently mislabeled, manuscripts and titles are occasionally conflated, and the information presented is often so severely abbreviated that the primary function of both works as handbooks of ready and useful information is severely impaired.96

J.-C. Haelewyck’s 1998 _Clavis apocryphorum Veteris Testamenti_97 and my own 2001 _Bibliography of Pseudepigrapha Research, 1850–1999_98 are two more recent examples of such bibliographic works that include the majority of the Daniel apocrypha. The former concentrates on listing only the versions and editions of each text, while the latter is much more in the way of a comprehensive bibliography. Generally speaking, both books are useful research tools, but not without their faults with respect to the study of the Daniel apocrypha. Although its function is to serve as a basic bibliographic record only (and in this it is superb), Haelewyck’s survey nevertheless suffers from
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94 (8 vols., plus supplements; Madrid, 1950).
95 F. Halkin, _Bibliotheca hagiographica graeca_ (3 vols.; SubH 8a; Bruxelles, 1957); _Auctarium bibliothecae hagiographicae graecae_ (SubH 47; Bruxelles, 1969); _Novum auctarium bibliothecae hagiographicae graecae_ (SubH 65; Bruxelles, 1984).
96 See my comments on both works throughout Chapter Three.
97 J.-C. Haelewyck, _Clavis apocryphorum Veteris Testamenti_ (Turnhout, 1998), 203–211.
incomplete or contradictory information regarding the identification of the Daniel texts, their editions, and the manuscript evidence. For its part, the Bibliography, while more encyclopedic than the Clavis, does not always distinguish clearly enough among the Byzantine Daniel apocalypses nor does it account for the full range of the apocryphal Daniel texts, especially with respect to those unpublished texts known only from their appearance in manuscript catalogues.

Several characteristics are common to the previous research on the Daniel apocrypha. To begin, the primary function of much of it simply has been to catalog the texts. Of course, the manner in which this function is effected and the importance that it receives varies from study to study, but certain data appear regularly, including the identification of each text (an operation that often includes assigning it a specific name), the list of the manuscript evidence for that text, a description of its contents, and a brief history of the previous scholarship. More often than not the scope of the discussion is a circumscribed group of texts (such as the apocryphal Daniel apocalypses or the Daniel texts preserved in Islamic tradition) rather than the larger complex of which it is a part, and even in these cases the analysis tends to be summary and the observations preliminary. The net result is that these presentations of the Daniel material frequently have an introductory quality to them—to one degree or another, they are meant to acquaint scholars with a comparatively unfamiliar corpus of material.

The previous research has also been inclined to focus on certain texts or text types rather than on the entire corpus. For example, the strictly pseudepigraphic texts—i.e., those texts that are pseudonymously attributed to Daniel—have had far more attention paid to them in past studies than have the post-biblical tales and traditions about the prophet. In addition, even within the compass of the Daniel pseudepigrapha the emphasis has been largely on the study of the apocalypses rather than the prognostica. There are a number of reasons for these developments. First, the general study of the genre apocalypse and of apocalyptic literature has been the source of intensive scrutiny for several generations.\textsuperscript{99} Second, the study of apocalyptic themes and images has played a large role in several of the areas that are specifically important to the study of the Daniel apocrypha. The study of the Antichrist figure in early Christian apocalypses, for instance, has sometimes involved the examination of the apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha.\textsuperscript{100} Similarly, the Greek Daniel apocalyptic writings have been crucial.

\textsuperscript{99} The literature of this topic is too vast to summarise in a footnote, encompassing not only the ancient Jewish and Christian apocalyptic literature, but later medieval and even modern apocalypses. A good starting point is the three-volume collection of essays on the topic: The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism (edd. J.J. Collins, B. McGinn, and S.J. Stein; New York, 1998).

\textsuperscript{100} Bouisset, Der Antichrist. G.C. Jenks’ fine study, The Origins and Early Development of the Antichrist Myth (BZNW 59; Berlin/New York, 1991), does not extent past the second century CE and so does not touch on the apocryphal Daniel apocalypses. On the topic, see now B. McGinn, Antichrist: Two Thousand Years of the Human
to shedding light on the Byzantine reactions to the speed and ferocity of the Muslim conquests in the first centuries after the Prophet Muhammad’s death. At the same time, however, although they are generally mentioned in the lists of the Daniel apocrypha, many of the lesser-known apocryphal apocalypses rarely figure into the discussion of this material.

If some texts have enjoyed a certain priority, others have been relatively ignored, at least within the context of the study of the Daniel apocrypha as whole. The Greek Additions to Daniel, for example, are almost always never included in such studies. Modern scholars generally conceive the Greek Additions as belonging to the “biblical” Book of Daniel, as opposed to the other, “extra-biblical” or “intertestamental”101 category of Daniel texts. In other words, there is a scholarly preconception that there exist two sorts of Daniel material that one may examine, namely, that which is in the Bible and that which is not in the Bible. The Greek Additions tend to be discussed under the former category, the rest of the Daniel apocrypha under the latter. As a result, a false chronological divide was frequently assumed between the biblical Book of Daniel, which was rightly seen as precipitating out of Hellenistic-era Judaism, and the Daniel apocrypha, which without the Greek Additions were understood to be products of a much later mediaeval Christianity and Judaism. The effects of this assumption, however, have been partially ameliorated by the discovery of the fragmentary Daniel apocrypha preserved at Qumran, which have reminded scholars of the antiquity of the production of apocryphal literature as it is related to the figure of Daniel and underscored the fact that the relationship among the cycle of Hellenistic-era Daniel tales, the Book of Daniel, and the Daniel apocrypha is neither simple nor strictly linear.

Another category of Daniel texts which rarely makes its appearance in the previous research is that of the prognostica, including, most notably, the Somniale Danielis and the Lunationes Danielis, which were among the most popular non-biblical texts in mediaeval Europe. The fact that their attention to the figure of Daniel is normally limited to a declarative phrase or sentence in the incipit might account for the fact that these prognostica have been comparatively ignored by scholars of apocryphal texts. In addition, prognostica are as a rule repetitive and formulaic, and do not offer the sort of interesting information concerning the life of the prophet or the course of future-time events that one normally associates with the stories about or visions of Daniel. Furthermore, prognostica traditionally fall within the province of those who study magic, divination and geomancy, astronomy and astrology, medicine, and other such “scientific” disciplines.102 Not

---

101 A bankrupt term in any sense.
102 See S.M. Oberhelman, “The Oneirocritical Literature of the Late Roman and Byzantine Eras of Greece: Manuscript Studies, Translations and Commentaries to

much attention has been devoted to their literary or tradition-historical aspects and consequently they remain comparatively unknown to those who study ancient and mediaeval apocryphal literature. The net result is that the Somniale Danielis and similar texts are usually considered to be little more than generic fortune-telling literature which by chance were attributed to Daniel and which could as easily have been associated with Ezra, Joseph, Solomon, or even non-biblical figures such as Galen, Merlin, or Alexander. But nothing could be farther from the truth—there are many definite reasons why texts such as the Somniale and the Lunationes are attributed to Daniel specifically, reasons whose ultimate source are located in the Book of Daniel.

In the scholarly works that list or discuss the full corpus of the post-biblical Daniel literature, the texts are most often organized according to their language of composition rather than by their genre, provenance, date of composition, or religious tradition. The net effect is that such presentations of the Daniel apocrypha inevitably have a vaguely artificial quality to them. To employ an analogy, it would be as if the history of classical music from Mozart to modern times were strictly segregated along ethnic lines—“German Music,” “Italian Music,” “French Music,” and so on—rather than arranged diachronically, the latter being far more sensitive to cross-cultural influences and historical circumstances. Certain studies, however, will include specific Daniel apocrypha in the context of a broader survey of the literature of a particular faith, such as the medieval Jewish literature, the Byzantine Christian apocalyptic literature, or the Islamic Arabic writings.103

A further characteristic of the previous research is its tendency to be derivative, which is an unsurprising function of the methodological problems posed by such a wide-ranging and diverse corpus of material. Specialists in the ancient world, for example, will not normally possess a secondary expertise in Islamic, Byzantine, or late western medieval culture, and thus the bulk of the mediaeval apocrypha will fall outside their conceptual horizon. On the other hand, experts in the vulgar literature of the late Middle Ages very likely will know little more than the educated layperson about the Greek Additions or the Qumran material. This problem is especially acute in the realm of apocalyptic eschatology. Scholars familiar with Second-Temple and New Testament eschatological themes and motifs have no real

---

need to consult the apocalypses of the seventh to tenth centuries. Conversely, specialists in Syrian or Byzantine Greek Christianity frequently make conclusions about Jewish and Christian apocalyptic eschatology that are clearly based on a few primary sources and a smattering of the survey secondary literature. With respect to language skills, it is unlikely that many mediævalists are competent in Aramaic, Armenian, or Coptic, while only a few biblical scholars will be able to read Old English or Arabic. Some of the better-known texts (the Greek Additions, a few of the Byzantine Daniel apocalypses, or the Somniale Danielis) have been the subject of scholarship for centuries, a fair amount of which is one or two hundred years old and generally relatively difficult to locate.\textsuperscript{104} Other texts, such as the Qumran Daniel apocrypha, the Arabic Apocalypse of Daniel on the Events after al-Muʿtamid or the Syriac Revelation of Daniel the Prophet in the Land of Persia and Elam, have only very recently come into the public eye and are relatively unknown outside the confines of their immediate discipline. In fact, a good many of the apocalyptic texts attributed to Daniel remain unpublished, their existence noted only by a passing reference in a manuscript catalogue. Finally, and most critically, there is much confusion on the level of identification of the texts themselves, including the fundamental requirements concerning the isolation of the manuscript evidence for each text.

B. The Study of Apocryphal Literature

One characteristic of the modern research on apocryphal texts is that works devoted to the literature specific to one figure from the Hebrew Bible are not as common as the evidence would warrant. In another essay I have termed such works “cluster” studies, since they examine clusters of texts and traditions attributed to or associated with a particular figure.\textsuperscript{105} Although the works of Fabricius, Migne, and Denis and the bibliographic surveys concentrate on such clusters, to one degree or another these are all more in the way of catalogues or rosters of texts than a detailed investigation.\textsuperscript{106} Ginzberg’s Legends is somewhat of an exception to the rule, but it, too,

\textsuperscript{104} Especially the pre-Revolution Russian scholarship.

\textsuperscript{105} DiTommaso, “Pseudepigrapha Research since Charlesworth.”

\textsuperscript{106} Indeed, rarely addressed are the methodological issues concerning the study of the apocryphal literature associated with a particular biblical figure or the questions pertaining to what should or should not be included in such a study. A typical example is J. Barton’s fine essay on the post-biblical expressions of the prophet Jeremiah (“Jeremiah in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,” Troubling Jeremiah (edd. A.R.P. Diamond, et al.; JSOTSup 260; Sheffield, 1993), 306–317). Barton discusses the apocryphal traditions of Jeremiah as a historical figure, seer, wonder-worker, and eschatological figure, but one looks in vain for a reconstruction of the post-biblical rationale that lies behind these various trajectories of interpretation. The only indication that there may be a difference between one stream of this Jeremiah-tradition and another is when Barton distinguishes between the material that is closer in content to the Book of Jeremiah and those traditions he calls “free-floating.”
offers more in the way of synthetic narration than systematic analysis. Far more common are the monographs that track the origins and development of a particular theme throughout the literature.\textsuperscript{107}

G. Vermes’ ground-breaking examination of the post-biblical traditions associated with the patriarch Abraham is one of the first post-War studies on biblical apocrypha devoted to a figure from the Hebrew Bible.\textsuperscript{108} Vermes labels his approach a “retrogressive historical study,” which he defines as “a study which takes as its point of departure a comparatively late midrashic compilation with greatly developed traditions, and which determines, by means of the older material, the history and origin of all its constituent elements.”\textsuperscript{109} The first part of his study seeks to understand the story of Abraham in the \textit{Sefer ha-Yashar} in the light of the origins and development of these “constituent elements,” while the second part is an attempt to identify the haggadic developments of this story as it is expressed in the Qumran fragments of the \textit{Genesis Apocryphon} and with reference to other Second-Temple literature. The goal of the study is to understand the processes whereby the biblical story about a specific figure was altered, emended, or augmented.\textsuperscript{110} Most importantly, Vermes stresses the way that such later literature is “organically bound” to the biblical text. Whether it seeks to anticipate exegetical questions and “to solve problems in advance”\textsuperscript{111} or whether it is crafted “to make the biblical story more attractive, more real, more edifying, and above all more intelligible,”\textsuperscript{112} this literature is, to one degree or another, both a response to and a re-articulation of the biblical antecedent.

R.A. Kraft’s article, “‘Ezra’ Materials in Judaism and Christianity,”\textsuperscript{113} is another early attempt to examine the cluster of what he labels “traditions” and “literature” that are associated with a specific figure from the Bible. He concentrates his efforts on the figure of Ezra the scribe and the way that this figure was understood and articulated in the biblical and extra-biblical traditions and literature. Throughout his study, Kraft is concerned with the seminal issue, “How did various authors come to grips with the question, ‘Who was Ezra?’.” Since Ezra was considered a historical figure by these authors, there is a correspondingly strong historiographic flavour

\textsuperscript{107} J. Jenks, \textit{Origins and Early Development of the Antichrist Myth} (see note 100, supra) and Henze’s \textit{The Madness of King Nebuchadnezzar} (see note 34, supra) are prime recent examples of such scholarship.


\textsuperscript{109} \textit{Ibid.}, 67 note 1.

\textsuperscript{110} It should be remembered that Vermes’ work on these post-biblical interpretations of the figure and story of Abraham is conducted within the context of his larger concern with the historical development of ancient Jewish exegesis as a whole, and his specific conclusions (228–229) are limited to the study of Jewish exegesis through the Second Temple and late antique periods.

\textsuperscript{111} \textit{Ibid.}, 95.

\textsuperscript{112} \textit{Ibid.}, 125.

to Kraft’s observations and conclusions. At the same time, and similar to the case with Daniel, there arose a host of apocryphal writings associated with Ezra that were concerned with revealing or foretelling the future, although Kraft does not delve into this area too much. More important is the fact that he offers some postulates regarding the origins and development of the transmission of the traditions and literature, suggesting that perhaps, even at the earliest stages, “respective traditions about a priestly Ezra and a prophetic Ezra developed independently.”114 In this observation Kraft foreshadows the conclusion in this study that the apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha and the Daniel prognostica developed independently, with each tradition rooted in the biblical presentation of the figure of Daniel but evolving along a radically different trajectory.

Another figure that has been the subject of intensive study is that of Adam, and the primary vehicles by which the fruits of this study have been expressed are the many articles and books on the topic by M.E. Stone and G.A. Anderson.115 The research here is too great and the scope too large to permit anything but a summary statement on it. In a nutshell, these two scholars have thoroughly examined the history of the apocryphal Adam traditions and literature (particularly, in the case of Stone, with respect to the many and various Armenian texts and versions), with an eye to clarifying the complicated history of the transmission of both the texts and the themes. Many other figures have been the subject of similar attention, including Seth,116 Enoch,117 Balaam,118 Joseph,119 Moses120 and Jeremiah.121

114 Ibid., 134.
117 J.C. VanderKam, Enoch: A Man for All Generations (SPOT; Columbia, SC, 1995), an excellent work that covers the figure of Enoch in ancient Jewish and Christian literature.
118 J.T. Greene, Balaam and His Interpreters: A Hermeneutical History of the Balaam Traditions (BJS 244; Atlanta, 1992), which attends to the entire range of the Balaam traditions from ancient to modern.
119 M. Niehoff, The Figure of Joseph in Post-Biblical Jewish Literature (AGAJU 16; Leiden/New York/Köln, 1992), but limited to the figure of Joseph in Philo, Josephus, and the Genesis Rabhah.
120 S.J. Hafemann, “Moses in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Survey,” JSPP 7 (1990), 79–104. A modern comprehensive history of the late antique and mediaeval Moses literature has yet to be written.
121 See note 106, supra.
Three more recent studies examining the apocryphal texts and traditions associated with a particular biblical figure are worth a more detailed exposition. The first is *The Apocryphal Ezekiel* (2000), a slim but densely-packed volume edited by Stone, B.G. Wright, and D. Satran.\(^{122}\) The book is divided into two parts, the first concerned with the fragments of the ancient text(s) attributed to Ezekiel, which traditionally has been called the *Apocryphon of Ezekiel*, and the second devoted to the apocryphal traditions about the prophet. The most remarkable aspect of this book is its wide-ranging and largely inclusive scope, which admits not only the Ezekiel legenda and the Ezekiel pseudepigrapha, but also ancillary information about Ezekiel, such as minor biographical traditions relating to the prophet, brief notices concerning the location of his tomb, and information preserved in graphic form (e.g., the wall-paintings of Dura-Europus). Despite such an inclusive scope, the study is (deliberately) arbitrary to some degree and incomplete in several areas. For example, in the introduction to the book the editors note that some traditions were excluded: the Coptic, Slavonic, and Old Irish Ezekiel materials, the Ezekiel texts preserved in the early forms of the vernacular languages of Western Europe, and both the Islamic and the mediaeval Jewish sources. Moreover, with the exception of the overall thrust in the first part of the book to establish the parameters of the *Apocryphon of Ezekiel* (and perhaps other texts), there is little systematic analysis of the Ezekiel apocrypha as a whole, nor a discussion of the underlying methodology by which texts and traditions were included, excluded, and categorised.

The second recent study is P.A. Torijano’s 2002 *Solomon the Esoteric King*.\(^{123}\) The subject of this volume are the ways in which the figure of Solomon was understood and articulated in Hebrew Bible and the post-biblical ancient and mediaeval Jewish and Christian literature. Torijano demonstrates that, even as early as the time of the Chronicler, who emphasized certain aspects and downplayed others, the figure of Solomon the King was molded and reworked to fit specific needs and expectations. Later, Jewish writers of the Hellenistic period added the dimension of divinely-endowed wisdom to the regal picture, in effect crafting Solomon as the model of the Hellenistic king. Still later, and partly as a result of syncretistic influences from the Hermetic traditions and rustic astrological speculations (i.e., the same crucible from which would spring the Daniel prognostica), the attribute of divine wisdom was expanded to include the functions of the exorcist, the magicians, and the astrologer. *Solomon the Esoteric King* is an example of a successful study of the literature revolving around a biblical figure. Torijano employs nearly the full range of texts attributed to and traditions about

---

\(^{122}\) (SBLEJL 18; Atlanta, 2000). The volume also includes contributions from T. Bergren, M. Bregman, E. Chazon, L. Hogan, B. Hus, T.M. van Lint, J.E. Wright, and K. Wright.

\(^{123}\) P. Torijano, *Solomon the Esoteric King. From King to Magus, Development of a Tradition* (JSJSup 73; Leiden/Boston/Köln, 2002). On the subject of the figure of Solomon in the Slavonic tradition, which Torijano does not address, see K. Bondar, “King Solomon as Told in Russian Apocryphal Texts,” *Tirosh* 4 (2000), 154–160 [in Russian].
Solomon, and is careful to demonstrate thoroughly how the traditions about Solomon in some ways persisted and in other ways were remolded and reworked by later authors and redactors.

The third recent work is J.E. Wright’s 2003 *Baruch ben Neriah: From Biblical Scribe to Apocalyptic Seer*, which traces the way in which the figure of Baruch moved from scribe to sage to seer in the ancient Jewish and Christian literature.¹²⁴

Vermes’ study on the post-biblical Abraham texts, Kraft’s article on the Ezra materials, Stone’s work on the Adam literature, and the three aforementioned recent studies all share an approach that is inclusive rather than exclusive, encompassing both texts attributed to and traditions associated with biblical figures. In addition, they all seek to uncover the links between the post-biblical literature and their biblical referents. The present study very much follows in their path in this respect.

CHAPTER TWO

THE STORY OF DANIEL IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL
AND IN THE DANIEL LEGENDA

1. The Story of Daniel and the Book of Daniel

In the Hebrew Bible, the story of Daniel the Prophet is told primarily in the first six chapters of the Book of Daniel. In these chapters Daniel is always addressed in the third person—this is a tale told about the life and times of Daniel, not one that Daniel himself tells.

The story opens in the third year of Jehoiakim, king of Judah; by modern reckoning, sometime around the end of the sixth century BCE. Jerusalem has surrendered to the besieging Babylonian armies under their all-powerful monarch, Nebuchadnezzar (MT Dan 1:1). Among the spoils of war that the victorious Babylonians transport...

---

1 The last six chapters of MT Daniel are overwhelmingly concerned with the substance and interpretation of his apocalyptic visions and contain little personal information about Daniel. The vision in Daniel 7 is set in the second year of the reign of King Belshazzar (7:1), while that of Daniel 8 occurs one year later, adding that at the time Daniel is located at Susa in the province of Elam, beside the canal called Ulai (ylwa) (8:1–2). Daniel 9 is set in the first year of the reign of Daniel the Mede (9:1), while the final revelation of Daniel 10–12 takes place alongside the River Tigris [see J.J. Collins, Daniel (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, 1993), 373, on the name of this river] in the third year of the reign of Cyrus the Persian. This near-total lack of personal data is also a characteristic of the Daniel prognostica and the apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha, which if they relate some biographic information almost always limit it to notices about the time and place where the vision took place. The two notable exceptions are the first-person autobiographies that preface the Syriac Revelation of Daniel the Prophet and the Judaeo-Persian Qissa-yi Dāniyāl. The autobiographical sections of these apocryphal apocalypses will be discussed throughout this chapter. For a discussion of their apocalyptic vision sections, see Chapter Three, §2.5 and §2.14, respectively.

2 There are portions of Daniel 4 where King Nebuchadnezzar communicates the story in the first person, but even here Daniel is always referred to in the third person.

3 On the problems associated with the chronology of and the identity of the figures in Dan 1:1–2, see §3, infra. The principal deportations to Babylon occurred in 597 BCE (2 Kgs 24:14) and 587/586 BCE (2 Kgs 25:11–13); a number of those who remained fled to Egypt sometime around the year 582 BCE after the murder of Gedaliah (2 Kgs 25:25–26; cf. Jer 41:1–15).
home are gold and silver Temple vessels and a group of young prisoners of royal and noble stock (1:2). The young captives are placed under the stewardship of the chief eunuch of the court, where for three years they will be given food and shelter and trained in the language and literature of their Babylonian masters. The hope is that they will eventually serve the king and his far-flung kingdom in various capacities as functionaries and advisors (1:3–5). Among the deportees are Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, who as part of the process of cultural assimilation are assigned Babylonian names by the chief eunuch of the court. Thus Daniel becomes Belteshazzar, and his three companions, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego (1:6–7).

Despite his immersion into Babylonian court life, the young Daniel remains steadfast to the food restrictions of his heritage and refuses to eat the foreign fare. The official responsible for the training and well-being of his noble charges fears punishment should Daniel begin to appear wan and maltreated from a lack of food (1:8–10). Daniel in turn bargains with the official, proposing that for ten days he and his companions be given only vegetables and water, after which time the official would inspect them and judge accordingly (1:11–13). The official agrees, and after the set number of days examines Daniel and his companions. To his surprise, the official discovers that they appear markedly healthier than the youths who ate the regular fare. As a result, Daniel and his companions henceforth receive vegetables and water only (1:14–16).

Three years later, their training now complete, the chief of the eunuchs presents the young captives to King Nebuchadnezzar, where they are admitted into the royal service. God, however, gives them “proficiency in all literature and wisdom” and bestows upon Daniel

---

4 דמלסאסא (var. דמלסא, דמלסא, דמלסא): see MT Dan 1:7, 2:26, 4:5, 6, 15, 16, and 5:12. The Greek versions of the Book of Daniel preserve the name Βαλτάσαρ and so do not distinguish it from the name of Nebuchadnezzar’s crown prince and heir; cf. Βαλτάσαρς at Josephus, Ant., §189, etc. The discrepancy in the LXX is addressed in, inter alia, the Vita Danielis 4.5, where we are told that Nebuchadnezzar called Daniel “Baltasar” because he wanted to make him joint heir with his children. In reply, Daniel said, “Far be it from me to leave the heritage of my fathers and cleave to the inheritances of the uncircumcised” (translation apud D.R.A. Hare, “The Lives of the Prophets,” The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Volume II: Expansions of the “Old Testament” and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works (New York, 1985), 2.379–399 at 390).

5 These other youths could be non-Jews who are undergoing the same civil-service training, or they could be other Jews who do not follow Daniel’s adherence to his heritage.
a special “insight into all dreams and visions” (1:17–18).⁶ As a result, the king soon recognises that Daniel and his companions are “ten times better” than all the wise men in his kingdom, and so honours them and makes them privy to the kingdom’s affairs (1:19–20).⁷

MT Daniel 2 is set in the second year of Nebuchadnezzar’s reign.⁸ One night the Babylonian king is visited by a disturbing dream and upon wakening summons his wise men (2:1). The king commands them to tell him the substance of his dream and its interpretation, promising great rewards for success but terrible punishment for failure (2:2–6). The terrified wise men dissemble, beseeching the king to first disclose the nature of his dream. Nebuchadnezzar, however, is relentless in his royal purpose and prerogative. He repeats his command, whereupon the wise men confess that no one on earth could possibly do such a thing (2:7–9). Incensed, Nebuchadnezzar issues a royal decree: all the wise men of his kingdom are to be located and thereupon put to death (2:10–12).

As wise men, Daniel and his companions fall under the compass of the king’s decree. Daniel learns of the situation at court from the chief executioner, a man named Arioch, and through him gains an audience with the king (2:13–15). After assuring Nebuchadnezzar that he will fulfil all the requirements of the royal decree, Daniel returns to his house and with his three companions prays⁹ to God for assistance (2:16–18). God responds with a vision of the night

---

⁶ For more on the nature and extent of this proficiency (and on how they were understood in the apocryphal Daniel apocalypses and the Daniel prognostica), see Chapter Three, §2, passim, and Chapter Four, §§2 (particularly), 3, 4, and 5.

⁷ The text could be read as a continuous action, i.e., Nebuchadnezzar tested Daniel and his companions, found them ten times better than his regular wise men, and so honoured them and made them his counsel. To my mind, though, the Hebrew phrase יָשִׂימָה לְפָנָיו ("and they stood before the king") suggests that there is a break in the action and that the God-given proficiency of Daniel and his companions only becomes apparent to the king while they functioned in the royal service. Collins translates the phrase “and they were admitted to the king’s service,” which also gives this sense that the movement from training to honoured advisors was a two-stage process (Daniel, 128). The information that Daniel and his companions were not part of the king’s immediate retinue in Daniel 2 (after all, they were not present during the king’s initial summoning of his wise men) is somewhat at odds with the claim in this chapter that Nebuchadnezzar proclaims Daniel and his companions ten times better than the rest of wise men.

⁸ On the chronological discrepancy between this datum and the claim that Daniel and his companions were trained at court for three years, see §3, infra.

⁹ The action is implicit.
that reveals the mystery to Daniel, who responds with a short doxology on the goodness and power of God (2:19–23). Daniel returns to Arioch and is re-admitted into the king’s presence (2:24–25), where he announces that God has revealed the mystery to him (2:26–28). Daniel tells the king of his dream of a mammoth statue of fearsome appearance: its head was fashioned of fine gold, its breast and arms of silver, its loins and thighs of bronze, its legs of iron, and its feet partly of iron and partly of clay (2:29–33). Suddenly a stone, hewn not by human hands, struck the statue on its composite feet and shattered them. The rest of the statue thereupon crumbled to pieces and the detritus blew away like chaff in the wind, while the stone became a great mountain which filled the entire earth (2:34–36). The interpretation of the dream, Daniel reveals, is that the giant statue represents a sequence of human kingdoms. The head of fine gold is the mighty king himself, the breast and arms of silver represent the kingdom that is to follow, which is inferior to Nebuchadnezzar’s Babylon, the loins and thighs of bronze are a third kingdom, which will rule the entire earth, and the legs of iron are a fourth kingdom, which is as strong as the iron that shatters bronze (2:37–40). The composite feet and toes represent a divided kingdom, partly strong and partly brittle, while the stone that struck the feet and became a great mountain is the Kingdom of God that stands at the end of history (2:41–45). The chapter ends with Nebuchadnezzar honouring Daniel and acknowledging the power of his God. The king gives Daniel authority over the province of Babylon and appoints him chief of the wise men. In addition, and at Daniel’s request, the king also promotes Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego to positions of authority (2:46–49).

In MT Daniel 3 the focus of the narrative shifts from Daniel to his three companions. Nebuchadnezzar orders a giant golden statue erected and commands that all the people in his kingdom must fall

10 The Aramaic has the definite article.
11 The narrative is somewhat choppy at this point. Arioch’s words to Nebuchadnezzar imply that the king has never met Daniel. The name Belteshazzar (instead of Daniel) is used at 2:26.
12 Here and in other places there are discrepancies between what appears in the dream and what is explained in its interpretation. Nothing is said of the toes of the feet in the former, the meaning of which in the interpretation has been taken to refer to dynastic marriages between the Seleucids and Ptolemies or to a more general intermingling of races (see the discussion in Collins, Daniel, 170–171).
to their knees and worship it upon hearing the sound of musical instruments.\textsuperscript{13} Anyone who disobeyed was to be cast immediately into a fiery furnace (3:1–7).

Certain Babylonians seize the opportunity to use the king’s decree to their advantage. They inform Nebuchadnezzar that Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego—who are now these important administrators—have disobeyed the royal command and did not fall on their knees and worship the statue at the appointed signal (3:8–12). The angry king summons the three Jews and asks whether the charge is true. They reply in the affirmative, adding that they will never worship the statue and, besides, God will save them should the king follow his own decree and cast them into the fiery furnace (3:13–18).

Naturally this reply infuriates Nebuchadnezzar. The king instructs several of his soldiers to bind the three men and to cast them into the furnace, which upon his order has been stoked to such a raging firestorm that the hapless soldiers are themselves consumed by the intense heat and flames while carrying out their sovereign’s order (3:19–23).

But when Nebuchadnezzar peeks into the door of the furnace, he sees an amazing sight. There, walking unbound in the midst of the conflagration were Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, plus a fourth man, who is like an angel (\textit{ןַעַשְׁי הַנַּחֲלָה}, literally “like a son of the gods”)\textsuperscript{14} (3:24–25). The king commands the three Jews to exit the furnace. They obey, and the king and all his counselors are amazed to find that not a hair or an item of clothing of theirs has been singed (3:26–27). Nebuchadnezzar blesses the God of the three Jews, announcing that henceforth no one will be allowed to blaspheme this God, and once again promotes Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego (3:28–30).

The focus returns to Daniel in chapter 4, the beginning and end portions of which are in the form of a first-person epistle addressed from King Nebuchadnezzar to all his subjects. The epistle begins with an address formulation and a short doxology (3:31–33),\textsuperscript{15} after which the king tells his strange tale. He was in his palace when he

\textsuperscript{13} The date is not specified, but the statement that the three Jews are in positions of authority (3:12) presupposes the notice that they were put in such a position (2:49).

\textsuperscript{14} The perspective is Nebuchadnezzar’s.

\textsuperscript{15} The MT story of Nebuchadnezzar and his dream of the great tree actually begins at 3:31–33, but for the sake of convenience I identify it with Dan 4.
had a frightful dream (4:1–2). Summoning his wise men, he found none of them could interpret it (4:3–4). At that point Daniel arrived and so Nebuchadnezzar related the contents of his dream to him in the hope that the one who had in him the spirit of the holy gods (יְהוָה רָדָיו כְּרָדָיו)\(^{16}\) could reveal the mystery (4:5–6).

He had seen a tree, Nebuchadnezzar recounted to Daniel, a tree that stood great and tall, with beautiful foliage and bountiful fruit. Suddenly a Watcher (רשע) had appeared and had proclaimed that the tree would be cut down, its foliage stripped bare, and its fruit scattered. The root, however, would remain intact. The Watcher had also announced that the beast\(^ {17}\) would henceforth be fettered among the wild grasses that were his feed and under the dew of heaven, his heart having been changed from a man’s for a period of seven years (4:7–14). This was the king’s dream, and he ordered Daniel to interpret its meaning (4:15).

At this point the narrative voice of the story changes to the third person. Daniel ponders the dream for a while, clearly disturbed by its meaning, but the king prompts him to reveal the interpretation, regardless of whether it foretells good or ill (4:16). Daniel reluctantly explains that the tree which stands great and tall is none other than Nebuchadnezzar himself, who will be driven from human society and for seven years be made to live like a wild beast, eating grass and living without shelter (4:17–22a). The reason for the radical change in fortune is to strip the king of his arrogant belief that he, and not God, is the responsible for his success as king. God is in complete control of the processes of history—he alone decides which kingdoms rise and which ones fall. Daniel concludes by suggesting that the king postpone the inevitable by almsgiving and by showing mercy to the poor (4:22b–24).\(^ {18}\)

\(^{16}\) Again, the plural “gods” is understandable because the perspective is Nebuchadnezzar’s.

\(^{17}\) The abrupt change from tree imagery to beast imagery is one of the more perplexing aspects of Daniel 4.

\(^{18}\) These two and half verses are loaded with problems and meanings. I have suggested that the core cause of Nebuchadnezzar’s punishment is his unwillingness to accept God’s hand in his kingdom’s success, which harkens back to the way that the great and tall tree has lush foliage and much fruit (4:17–18) and anticipates the king’s comments regarding his role in causing his kingdom to prosper (4:27). In my opinion, this is an example of the distinction made in the final form of MT Daniel between, on the one hand, the relationship between God and individuals, wherein faith is rewarded and the element of free will remains efficacious and, on the other
One year later Nebuchadnezzar is walking in his palace and musing aloud on how he alone has caused his capital and kingdom to become exceedingly mighty (4:25–27). No sooner are the words from his mouth than a voice calls down from heaven. The voice informs him that the kingdom will pass from him and that for the next seven years he will live apart from human society like a beast of the field. Then all that which Daniel had interpreted from the king’s dream comes to pass, even to the point where the king’s hair and nails grew long, like an animal’s (4:28–30).

The narrative voice reverts to the first person with the return of the epistolary form in verse 31. Nebuchadnezzar relates that after he regained his senses after the allotted seven years, he praised the power of God and acknowledged his complete dominion over earthly affairs. His kingdom was then returned to him, his splendour and majesty were restored, and his counselors and nobles again sought him out (4:31–33). The epistle and the chapter terminate with another doxological statement (4:34).

MT Daniel chapter 5 takes place in the years after the death of King Nebuchadnezzar. Babylon is now ruled by his son, Belshazzar. The tale is set at a great banquet which Belshazzar is giving for his nobles and harem (5:1). The king, flush with wine, rashly orders that the Temple vessels of silver and gold—which had been part of his father’s spoils of war—be retrieved from storage and brought to the banquet. There the king and his nobles, consorts, and concubines drink wine from the sacred vessels, all the while toasting the idols of their own gods (5:2–4).

All of a sudden a disembodied hand materialises out of thin air and writes several words on the wall of the palace before disappearing. Belshazzar is so terrified at the sight that his knees literally began to knock together (5:5–6). He calls for his wise men, but none of them is able to read the writing, much less decipher its meaning,
and the king is profoundly disturbed (5:7–9). The Queen enters the banquet hall and suggests that her husband summon the one named Belteshazzar. This man, the queen explains, is knowledgeable and has the spirit of the holy gods (יִתֵּן חֲרוֹן יִהְוָה) in him. Moreover, he is reputed to be able to interpret dreams and reveal mysteries and was the one whom Belshazzar’s own father once appointed chief of all the wise men of the kingdom (5:10–12a).

Daniel is duly summoned and his identity confirmed. The king then explains his problem and promises honour and high authority—the chance to be one of only three men who oversee the entire kingdom—if Daniel is able to solve the mystery (5:12b–16). Daniel replies that he does not want the gifts, but will still read the writing and make its interpretation known (5:17). Before he does this, however, he explains to the king the reason for the writing: unlike his father, Nebuchadnezzar, who humbled himself before God after having been forced for seven years to live like a wild beast and apart from human society, King Belshazzar has never humbled his heart, but rather has exalted himself against God, drinking with his nobles and concubines from the Temple vessels and toasting lifeless idols (5:18–23). For this reason, Daniel reveals, the mysterious hand appeared and wrote the words מֵנֶה, מֵנֶה, בֵּי, יִפְאָרֵב (םְנֵמָם בֵּי יִפְאָרֵב) on the wall (5:24): מֵנֶה—God has numbered your kingdom and brought it to an end; בֵּי—you have been weighed on the scales and found wanting; יִפְאָרֵב—your kingdom is now divided and given to the Medes and the Persians (5:25–28).²¹

-course—recall that if the author of the final form of MT Daniel felt that Daniel and his three companions needed to be educated in the language and literature of the most important power in the region (Dan 1), it is very unlikely that the Babylonian wise men would have known of the script of what must have been a second-rate kingdom like Judah. That post-exilic Jews would have actually known of and been able to write the palaeo-Hebrew script is confirmed by its use in a few Dead Sea Scrolls, wherein the divine name is written in it. Most interestingly, one such example is 4Q243, one of the fragmentary Aramaic Daniel texts found at Qumran (see the previous note). On the use of palaeo-Hebrew at Qumran, see K.A. Mathews, “The Background of the Paleo-Hebrew Texts at Qumran,” The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth (edd. C. Meyers and M. O’Connor; Winona Lake, 1983), 549–568. The mediaeval Chronicles of Jerahmeel offers the wonderfully anachronistic explanation that while the letters were written in Hebrew characters, the writing was Aramaic (§67.3).

²⁰ The perspective is the Queen’s. Again (cf. 3:25 and 4:6), the explanation is presumably meant as one that would be given by a polytheistic Babylonian.

²¹ This brief synopsis smooths over several difficulties in the text and between this text and the text in the other witnesses. See Collins, Daniel, 250–252.
Despite this dire warning and Daniel’s initial refusal to accept a reward, King Belshazzar fulfils his royal promise, honouring Daniel and promoting him to the high position. That very night Belshazzar is killed, and the Babylonian kingdom passes into the hands of Darius the Mede (5:29–30; 6:1).\footnote{The MT story of Belshazzar’s feast and the hand-writing on the wall actually ends at 6:1, but for the sake of convenience I identify it with Dan 5.}

In MT Daniel chapter 6, the new king, Darius, restructures the Babylonian governmental apparatus, appointing 120 satraps and three principal administrators. Daniel is one of the three, and by virtue of his distinguished record and exceptional spirit is soon singled out by the king to become the chief minister of the entire kingdom (6:2–4). As usual, the native Babylonians are jealous of this Jew. Unable to fault Daniel as an administrator, they seek to attack him indirectly, through his religion (6:5–6).

The Babylonians approach King Darius and encourage him to pass a law stating that whoever supplicates a god or human for the next thirty days will be thrown into a den of lions (6:7–10). Daniel knows that this new law is in effect, but nevertheless goes to his house and prays to God, making supplication before Him. His enemies, waiting to spring their trap, witness this and speedily return to report their news to Darius. They first ask the king to confirm his law and then, triumphantly, inform him that Daniel has transgressed it (6:11–14). Darius is upset and seeks to exonerate Daniel, but the Babylonians remind the king of the letter of the law and Darius reluctantly compels himself to enforce it (6:15–16). Darius commands that Daniel be cast into the lions’ den, but before the stone is placed over its opening and the exit sealed, the worried king assures Daniel that his God will save him (6:17–18).

Darius returns to his palace and spends a sleepless night there, alone and in fasting. As soon as the dawn breaks, the king rushes back to the lions’ den and calls down to Daniel, asking him if his God had been able to save him from the great cats (6:19–21). Daniel answers from the den and tells the king that God had sent an angel to shut the mouths of the lions. Darius is overjoyed and orders Daniel removed from the den, and he is examined and found unmarked. Then Darius orders all Daniel’s slanderers cast into the den with their wives and children, whereupon they are promptly devoured by
the ravenous beasts (6:22–25). The chapter concludes with a brief epistle from King Darius to his subject peoples that they should tremble and fear the God of Daniel, and a note that Daniel prospered in the reign of Darius the Mede and in the reign of Cyrus the Persian (6:26–28).

Although each chapter of MT Daniel 1–6 is a self-contained tale, the narrative across the six chapters as a whole is linked by multiple editorial devices which betray the redactive nature of the final form of the Book and which are identified by their unifying function and consistent editorial design. The most important of these devices was the imposition of a chronological framework into which the narrative was situated. Short introductions to every episode in the Book inform the reader precisely when and where the action occurs. In this way—and allowing for the fact that two languages were involved, that two radically different genres had to be integrated, and that the author/redactor of the Book worked with a combination of received and original material—a collection of tales involving the figure of Daniel became a sustained, coherent narrative about him.

The patently redactive nature of the final form of MT Daniel also reminds us that the Book was part of a broad cycle of Hellenistic-era Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek writings attributed to or associated with Daniel. Some of these writings circulated in more than one version or are preserved in reworked forms and/or in a language that might not have been original. The tales of Susanna and of Bel and the Dragon, for example, which although might be ver-

23 The recurring reference to Daniel’s Babylonian name, Belteshazzar, the appearance of which in the narrative seems awkward and contrived, suggesting a deliberate harmonisation of multiple story-complexes, including one whose protagonist was this Belteshazzar. Other indications of the redactive hand are the anticipatory notations such as the remark that Belshazzar appointed Daniel to one of the three top posts in the kingdom (5:29), which adumbrates Daniel’s position within the administrative structure under Darius in Daniel 6, and the note that Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego were promoted to high positions in the province of Babylon (2:49), which sets the scene for the action of Daniel 3. See also §2, infra, on Daniel 1.

24 To my mind, the most convincing model of the composition of MT Daniel is the one which has been proposed by J.J. Collins, Daniel (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 24–38, and most recently accepted by E. Ulrich, “From Literature to Scripture: Reflections on the Growth of a Text’s Authoritativeness,” DSD 10 (2003), 3–25. For a slightly different view, see R.G. Kratz, “The Visions of Daniel,” The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception (edd. J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint; VTSup 83; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 91–113. The composition of the Book of Daniel is a subject to which I will return in a future study.
sions of older, Semitic stories, are not found in MT Daniel but rather in the Greek witnesses to the Book of Daniel and its translations, particularly the Latin. Other writings, such as the Aramaic Prayer of Nabonidus, preserve older or variant forms of tales that were eventually included in different versions in MT Daniel and the Greek Bibles, a fact which is underscored by the multiple differences between the Aramaic and Greek texts at Daniel 4–6. There are also several highly fragmentary Aramaic Dead Sea scrolls which mention the figure of Daniel or whose themes and vocabulary reflect those of the MT Book but which were never included in either the Hebrew or the Greek Bibles.

My point is that MT Daniel simply represents one stage—albeit the most important stage—of an ongoing and frequently overlapping dynamic process wherein the story of Daniel was told and, in the telling, employed as a vehicle to relate various messages. Underscoring this point are two seemingly contradictory ideas.

On the one hand, the “story of Daniel” was never completely stable or monolithic. It did not exist in an ideal form relative to which all the ancient and mediaeval expressions of it were merely imperfect copies or versions. Nor can we say that MT Daniel 1–6 ever functioned as this ideal form, since it was itself the precipitate result of a long history of redaction that was effected in the context of i)

---

25 The story of Susanna is a case in point here. On the argument for a Semitic original, see C.A. Moore, Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah (AB 44; Garden City: Doubleday, 1977), 81–84.
26 As R.T. McLay reminds us, the MT and LXX must be understood to be witnesses to the Hebrew Bible (The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2003), 7).
27 On the Greek Additions, see Chapter One, notes 20 and 21.
28 K. Koch, “Stages in the Canonization of the Book of Daniel,” The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception (edd. J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint; VTSup 83; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 421–446 at 426. For their part, the eight fragmentary Dead Sea copies of Daniel “reveal no major disagreements against the Masoretic text” (Flint, “The Daniel Tradition at Qumran,” The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception (edd. J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint; VTSup 83; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 329–367 at 331). Because the final form of MT Daniel is separated from OG Daniel by perhaps only two or three short generations, it is entirely proper to speak of these two witnesses as being products of the same era (so L.F. Hartman and A.A. DiLella, The Book of Daniel (AB 23; Garden City: Doubleday, 1978), 78). Daniel was produced perhaps fifty or a hundred years after this time, but, as Collins notes, it, too, must be dated before the end of the first century BCE (Daniel, 11).
29 This is not to say that the tellings and re-tellings of the Daniel story possess no entertainment value (n.b. §5, infra). But they are neither fiction nor folktale.
older traditions involving the figure of “Danel”\textsuperscript{30} and, more importantly, ii) this constellated heaven of a roughly contemporary, Hellenistic-era cycle of Daniel texts.

On the other hand, the swift acceptance of MT Daniel as authoritative\textsuperscript{31} effectively fixed the narrative structure, the character of the figure of Daniel, and a good proportion of the elements of the story. The fact that this acceptance neither rendered all the elements of the story inviolate nor suppressed the dynamic process by which the story was continually told and retold\textsuperscript{32} is seen most clearly in the form of LXX Daniel, which in turn fixed a slightly different version of the story.\textsuperscript{33} But the framework of the form and content of the Daniel story was established by the authoritative status of MT and LXX Daniel in a way it never had before. All post-biblical renditions of the Daniel story are in a sense retellings of the biblical version, regardless of their degree of drift from it.

In a nutshell, the process by which the story of Daniel was told and retold is characterised by a dynamic aspect and by a static aspect. The relationship between the Book of Daniel and the post-biblical Daniel legenda,\textsuperscript{34} which is the subject of this chapter, is entirely a function of this process.

---


\textsuperscript{31} This is implied by, among other things, the c. 100 BCE date of the OG Book of Daniel, the seemingly authoritative status of the figure of Daniel at Qumran, and the fact that Daniel and his three companions are included in the list of Jewish heroes at 1 Macc 2:59–60 (also c. 100 BCE) but not in the earlier list (c. 180 BCE) at Ben Sira 44–49. See E. Ulrich, “From Literature to Scripture: Reflections on the Growth of a Text’s Authoritativeness,” \textit{DSID} 10 (2005), 3–25, esp. 6 note 5, where he states his preference for the term “authoritative” in place of “canonical” regarding collections of Scripture in the second century BCE.

\textsuperscript{32} Nor did it interfere with the production of other, non-narrative literature attributed to Daniel but which did not tell the story of Daniel, such as the apocryphal apocalypses and the prognostica.

\textsuperscript{33} Hence, LXX Daniel is in one sense part of the Daniel legenda in that the OG and \textit{\theta} witnesses to the text were composed in the light of the MT Book and obviously incorporated material foreign to it, but in another sense biblical in that both MT and LXX Daniel formed this authoritative text from which the many later Daniel legenda took their inspiration (\textit{n.b.}, esp., the popularity of the story of Susanna in the Middle Ages; see notes 87 and 152, \textit{infra}).

\textsuperscript{34} The use of the term “legenda” serves multiple purposes. First, it reinforces the idea that all the court tales (biblical and post-biblical) are in a sense “court legends” and are primarily aimed at edification and concerned with the wonderful (see the discussion in Collins, \textit{Daniel}, 44–45). At the same time, however, I wanted to
The labels “Biblical Midrash” and “Rewritten Bible” are frequently used to describe the genre of literature of which the Daniel legenda are a part. G. Vermes defines the former as “a narrative that follows Scripture but includes a substantial development of supplements and interpretative developments,”35 while G.J. Brooke identifies the latter as “any representation of an authoritative scriptural text that implicitly incorporates interpretative elements, large or small, in the retelling itself.”36 Although both definitions are perfectly appropriate as broad descriptions, neither is free from difficulty. The use of the term “Biblical Midrash,” in particular, may imply a type of formal interpretative approach which is inappropriate in the case of mediæval Christian or Islamic Daniel legenda, and for this reason I prefer the label “Rewritten Bible.” Both definitions also fail in contexts where the authority of the scriptural referent is in question, since both presuppose that the midrash or rewritten text was informed by and thus composed after its scriptural referent. The dilemma is obvious when we consider a text such the aforementioned Prayer of Nabonidus, which if it truly predates the final form of MT Daniel cannot be considered either a midrash on or a rewriting of MT Daniel 4. That being said, however, the bulk of the Daniel legenda is of a late enough date to assume the unambiguous precedence and thus the authority of its scriptural referent.37

There is also the matter of the degree to which any post-biblical text may deviate from its biblical antecedent and still be considered within the compass of the genre (whatever term is preferred). Some scholars favour a comparatively narrow interpretation which covers only those writings whose narratives closely follow the biblical story, such as Josephus’ Jewish Antiquities, the Liber antiquitatum biblicarum of Pseudo-Philo, or Jubilees.38 Other authorities prefer a more expansive

37 This true also of the vast majority of biblical apocrypha in general.
38 P.A. Alexander, “Retelling the Old Testament,” It Is Written: Scripture Citing
definition which embraces literature associated with a biblical figure or setting but which is not as closely tied to the details of the biblical story.  

Such distinctions have not been lost upon scholars. J.H. Charlesworth, for example, divides the texts in the second volume of his *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* into two categories, “Expansions of the ‘Old Testament’” and “Legends.” The former is essentially what we have defined as “Rewritten Bible,” while the latter refers to texts such as the *Letter of Aristeas*, which do not focus on a biblical narrative as such, but which are located in a biblical setting or are otherwise peripherally related to biblical events. G.W.E. Nickelsburg highlights the distinction in a similar fashion. His category, “The Bible Rewritten and Expanded,” contains texts that are “closely related to the biblical texts, often expanding, paraphrasing, and implicitly commenting on them.” In contrast, his category, “Stories of Biblical and Early Post-Biblical Times,” is defined as “an older type of narrative, which is only loosely connected with biblical traditions about Israel’s past. Often this connection involves little more than the historical setting . . . and some figure(s) from the past.” With respect to the Daniel apocrypha specifically, Nickelsburg includes the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three in the former category and Daniel chapters 1–6, the *Prayer of Nabonidus*, and the tales of Susanna and Bel and the Dragon in the latter.

Yet the Daniel legenda tend to resist such simple classifications, and in fact demonstrate a far wider diversity of form, content, presentation, and degree to which they reflect the biblical text than such classifications would connote. Some legenda are autonomous units (e.g., the Aramaic Dead Sea text 4Q243/244 and the Latin *Ludus Danielis*), others preface longer works attributed to Daniel (the Judeo-Persian *Qissá-yi Dániyáll*), while still others are embedded in

---

thematic texts that are only partly devoted to his story (the *Mors Danielis* in the Irish *Deaths of the Chief Prophets*). Although many Daniel legenda closely follow the biblical story of Daniel, some, such as Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities*, cover most or all the material in the court tales,42 while others focus on discrete chapters only, such as the *Vita Danielis* in the *Lives of the Prophets*, which concentrates on Daniel 4, the retelling of the Daniel story in the *Chronicle* of John Malalas, which retells Daniel 5 and 6, or the brief section devoted to Daniel in the Byzantine Greek *Palaea historica*,43 which covers Daniel 6. Some Daniel legenda are greatly amplified renditions of specific episodes from the biblical story. The Greek Prayer of Azarias and the Old English *Daniel* are representative of the type, with the latter going so far as to make the figure of King Nebuchadnezzar the focus of the poetic retelling of the court tales and relegating Daniel to the status of *spelboda*, “the official interpreter of God’s ways to Nebuchadnezzar.”44 Other legenda preserve sections where the biblical story is instead radically truncated or condensed. The Syriac *Revelation of Daniel the Prophet* §§2–4 is a fine example here, as is possibly the Sogdian Daniel fragment.45 Some Daniel legenda recount episodes which extend well beyond the chronological horizon of the biblical story (the *Mors Danielis* in the Armenian *Names, Works, and Deaths of the Holy Prophets*), while others only peripherally involve Daniel (Susanna) or are connected to the Daniel story merely through a common setting or character (the *Prayer of Nabonidus*).

In sum, however useful they might be with respect to classifying the cycle of early, Hellenistic-era Daniel texts, two-category taxonomies are too simplistic where the object of scrutiny is the full range of the corpus of the Daniel legenda. Because the legenda may be classified on the basis of so many different variables—size, content, or degree of drift from the biblical text—any taxonomy based on a single variable seems fundamentally arbitrary. Similarly, the argument that a relationship exists between the form of a text and the period in which it was composed (*pace* Nickelsburg) does not apply beyond the very limited chronological context of these Hellenistic

---

42 In the case of Josephus, part of MT Daniel 8 is also addressed.
43 The text is also extant in a Slavonic version.
45 See the Inventory of Chapter Six, the Excursus on “Sundry Persian Daniel Apocrypha,” no. 1: “The Daniel Story in the Sogdian Tradition.”
texts. In addition, I am unsure whether any such categorisation would be anything more than an artificial imposition on the evidence, and all the more so because these texts can and do appear in so many different formats. As a result, I prefer to label both the Daniel texts in Nickelsberg’s two categories and the post-biblical retellings of the Daniel story simply as “legenda,” with the restriction that they must be narrative in form. Accordingly, the Daniel legenda may be defined as belonging to the genre of Rewritten Bible and may be said to include any sustained, narrative non-biblical text that retells, reworks, or augments the story of Daniel, primarily but not exclusively in the light of its authoritative expression in the Book of Daniel.

The subject of this chapter is the relationship between the Book of Daniel and the post-biblical Daniel legenda of antiquity and the early mediaeval period, a relationship which, as I mentioned, is a function of the ongoing, dynamic process by which the story of Daniel was told and retold. The format of this chapter, however, is unlike that of Chapters Three and Four, where in addition to addressing the thematic issues pertaining to the apocalypses and prognostica as a group (including their correspondence with the biblical Book of Daniel) we discuss each text separately. The legenda are too diverse and unrelated to be examined in this fashion, and, as we have seen, cannot be understood categorically in anything but the most general

---

46 The category “Rewritten Bible” should include all the narrative legenda which recount the biblical story, whether in whole or in part, from the time of Adam to the post-exilic period of Ezra and Nehemiah, and which do so regardless of the degree to which the individual texts deviate from this story. But what of the non-narrative apocrypha, such as rewritten Pentateuchal laws (e.g., the Temple Scroll) or of extra-biblical psalms and hymns (e.g., the Hodayot or the Psalms of Solomon)? Such literature reflects the biblical form and might even draw from or refer to their biblical antecedents but plainly represents new texts by any measure of the term. Can the Temple Scroll realistically be considered “Rewritten Bible” (as it is in Brooke, “Rewritten Bible,” 779) or is it more appropriate to state that its author(s) drew copiously on biblical antecedents to formulate a new Torah? This is the same difficulty we encounter with the Daniel prognostica and the apocalyptic Daniel apocalypses, neither of which should be called (for example) “Biblical Midrash” or “Rewritten Bible” since neither is a midrash on or rewrites anything.

47 A fluid adjective to be sure, but I mean to make a broad distinction between a snippet of tradition concerning the Daniel story (e.g., inter alia, the brief reference to Daniel in the lions’ den in the Questions of Ezra, Recension A 40) and a sustained episode or story about Daniel.

48 I include the Ludus Danielis in this category, since although it is a mystery play it does retell (and augment) the biblical story of Daniel and follows a narrative form.
sense—*i.e.*, they all in some fashion retell the story of Daniel. In addition, the Book of Daniel was the subject of ancient and mediæval commentaries and also formed the basis for numerous works of art, while the figures of Susanna (especially) and the three companions of Daniel were themselves the subject of mediæval legenda.

In their own way, these commentaries, works of art, and Additional legenda are as much a part of the process of the telling and retelling of the story of Daniel as the Daniel legenda themselves, and any study that seeks to recount the fullness of the expressions of this story in post-biblical times must necessarily include them.

In light of such restrictions and limitations, our goal in this chapter is not to identify and evaluate every instance where a post-biblical text reworks, deviates from, or adds to the biblical story of Daniel, but rather to focus on the key elements of Daniel's story that were later interpreted and retold in the post-biblical period.

---

49 The most important commentaries on the Book of Daniel are those of Hippolytus of Rome, Origen, Ephraem Syrus, Aphraates, John Chrysostom (perhaps spurious), Theodoret, Polychronius, Jerome, Jepheth ibn Ali, Rashi, (Pseudo-) Saadia, Abraham ibn Ezra, Gersonides, Isaac Abrabanel, and Joseph ibn Yahya (*pace* J. Braverman, Jerome’s Commentary on Daniel: A Study of Comparative Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Hebrew Bible (CBQMS 7; Washington, 1978)). On the mediæval Jewish commentaries see A.-F. Gallé, *Daniel avec commentaires de R. Saadia, Aben-Ezra, Raschi, etc., et variantes des versions arabe et syriaque* (Paris, 1900). These Christian and Jewish commentaries generally contain important explanations and explications of the Biblical text, many of which are paralleled in the material in the legenda. Note also, however, the mediæval Christian *postilla* on the Book of Daniel, including those by Richard of St.-Victor and Nicholas of Lyra. On Christian interpretations of elements of the Book of Daniel, see also note 53, *infra*.

50 Particularly the iconography and the illuminated manuscripts; *e.g.*, in the Romanesque period, Daniel, unlike the other prophets, was very often illustrated as holding a book, having a globe for a seat, making a curious flat-handed gesture, and sporting a beard, the last despite the tradition that he was youthful (R.B. Green, “Daniel in the Lions’ Den as an Example of Romanesque Typology,” (Diss: Chicago, 1948), 51–52). The book presumably refers to his own book; after all, Daniel 7–12 are a first-person account. The globe may call to mind the theme of the *translatio imperii*.

51 See the Inventory of Chapter Six.

52 It must be admitted that any comment on (or change to) a text, however minor, represents a reworking of that text, however insignificant. Of course, this logic quickly leads to a *reductio ad absurdum* situation, where even the fundamental act of physically copying the text may be considered a rewriting of it. This view takes into account the effect of the font on the reader (consider Arabic, which has a “royal” font for certain types of texts) and the physical dimensions of the texts (consider the products of the Kelmscott Press).

53 Nor is it to discuss the post-biblical interpretations of the meaning/identification of certain elements in the Book of Daniel (*e.g.*, the “seventy years” of MT Daniel 9 or the figure of the Son of Man). For excellent overviews of the Daniëlic Son of Man traditions in post-biblical literature, see Collins, “The History of Interpretation. A. The Jewish Tradition,” in *idem, Daniel*, 72–89, esp. 79–82, and A. Yarbro Collins,
but rather to describe the broad contours of the relationship. Despite these strictures, what will become clear, I believe, is that while every expression of the Daniel story was composed or redacted for its own distinct purposes, the post-biblical legenda consistently exhibit the same concerns with the story that we find in Book of Daniel. The legenda, for example, are concerned with filling in the gaps in the life and times of Daniel, particularly regarding his early years and his last days, death, and burial. They are also intensely concerned with issues related to the chronology of the story and thus with the identification of the various foreign rulers and the records of their reigns, since these elements are the vehicles by which the chronology is established. What is more, the reasons the various legenda have for addressing these concerns, inasmuch as they may be deduced from the evidence, often reflect long-standing concerns whose origins are in the biblical story itself.

A final point: even a cursory summary of some of the main themes and elements in the post-biblical Daniel legenda demonstrates that more work is still needed, particularly regarding the task of tracing the trajectories of these themes and elements through the Jewish, Christian, and Islamic traditions of late antiquity and the mediaeval period, including, as noted, the commentaries, works of art, and later legenda. This point cannot be stressed enough. Outside B. Fischer’s study of Daniel and his three companions in rabbinic traditions and L. Ginzberg’s classic *Legends of the Jews*, only a few scholarly works examine any of the Daniel legenda in the broader context of their history of ideas beyond the identification of ultimate biblical

---


antecedents. Indeed, on the basis of recent commentaries on and translations of various Daniel apocrypha, one might conclude that many of the post-biblical expressions of the story of Daniel were written in a vacuum. But such a conclusion would be erroneous, and the task of isolating the various strata and tracing their trajectories through the ancient and mediaeval worlds remains a desideratum.

2. The Young Daniel

One of the most enduring concerns in the Daniel literature is the subject of Daniel’s youth: his birth, lineage, and life before he became the trusted court advisor and dream interpreter to Nebuchadnezzar. In many ways MT Daniel 1 represents the first attempt to address this concern. The chapter is an entirely manufactured introduction to the court-tale setting of chapters 2–6 and exhibits several important integrative elements: it introduces the reader to Daniel and his three companions; it establishes the administrative/court setting in which the subsequent tales occur; and it fixes the dramatic tension of the five subsequent chapters in the terms of the conflict between royal prerogative and divine power. Moreover, Daniel 1 anchors the entire chronology of the Book, particularly with its reference to King Cyrus at 1:21. Beyond all this, however, it answers the basic question behind the court tales of the five chapters that follow, namely, from where did Daniel come and how did he find himself in Babylon as this valued Jewish wise man to foreign kings?

56 A notable example to the contrary is R. Kraft’s brief but rich essay, “Daniel Outside the Traditional Jewish Canon” (http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/rs/rak/courses/735/Parabiblical/jamesdan.htm—keeping in mind the fundamentally ethereal nature of web addresses). Even Ginzberg’s magnificent work needs sorting out; as Kraft remarks, the presentation of the Daniel material in the Legends “needs to be separated out into its various strata and streams…”

57 Collins, Daniel, 146.

58 Including providing Daniel with an education, a critical component in his later comparison with the Babylonian wise men; see Chapter Four, note 69.

59 Certain elements of Daniel 1 (this reference to Cyrus, the note that Daniel had special insight into all dreams and visions (1:17–18)) suggests that it was composed in light of chapters 7–12. Although this evidence could also suggest the reverse argument (i.e., the reference to Cyrus and visions in Daniel 1 precipitated the composition of vision accounts attributed to Daniel), I have elsewhere suggested that the reference to Cyrus at 10:1 perhaps preceded that at 1:21 (“4QPsuedo-Daniel” (4Q243–244”)).
But MT Daniel 1 did not provide all the potential answers to these questions, and various different or amplified versions of Daniel’s origins circulated in the late antique and mediaeval worlds. One of the more unusual of these was the opinion that Daniel was originally from Susa (Shushan) in Elam. In the mediaeval Chronicles of Jerahmeel, for example, this opinion is connected to the last days and death of Daniel, where post-biblical tradition held that Daniel died in Susa and was buried in the royal tomb there. Although the Chronicles omits the detail about the royal tomb, it does have Daniel end his days in “Shushan, his native place, in the land of Elam” (§74.3). In this way a few loose ends of the story of Daniel—at least the story as it would have been received by the author of the Chronicles—are neatly resolved, and Daniel is said to return to the place whence he originally came.

Most other post-biblical legenda, however, claim that Daniel was born in Judah and was of the royal line, a natural conclusion given the information of MT Daniel 1:2 that the deportees to Babylon were from royal and noble stock. Josephus, for example, states that Daniel was of the house of king Sakkias, i.e., Zedekiah (Ant., 10.188), Origen assumes that he was a descendant of King Hezekiah, while the Judaeo-Persian Qissa-yi Dâniyâl identifies Daniel explicitly as one of the sons of King Jehonchiah, i.e., Jehoiachin (Z 386), a view which is reflected in Bar Hebraeus’ Scholia on Daniel. The Qissa-yi Dâniyâl also presents what purports to be Daniel’s eye-witness account of the last days of Judah, replete with short vignettes involving the prophet Jeremiah and the Babylonian general Nebuzaradan. The Vita Danielis,
whose final form D. Satran demonstrates is a Byzantine-era creation,\textsuperscript{67} adds to the story the information that Daniel was from the tribe of Judah and was born in Upper Beth-Horon, a town approximately twenty kilometers north-west of Jerusalem (4.2). Finally, the Irish \textit{Deaths of the Chief Prophets} records that Daniel was the son of a man named Adba (§5).

The conquest of Jerusalem forms the background to the story of the young Daniel in MT Daniel 1, although explicit references to the battle and its causes are quite limited. The blatant passing over of the causes of the Babylonian conquest in MT Dan 1:1–2, which is very atypical among Second-Temple reviews of history, reflects the author/redactor’s rejection of the Deuteronomic theology of history that understood the Babylonian conquest and exile as a punishment for Israel’s sins.\textsuperscript{68} The same, however, cannot be said for the legenda, which tend to reimpose the sin-punishment perspective (usually in its Christian reflex) and so through it explain the conquest and exile as having been precipitated by Israel’s misdeeds. A classic example of the phenomenon is found in the opening coda of the Old English \textit{Daniel} (lines 1–87), which draws upon various biblical passages to recreate the story of the fall of Jerusalem and thereby explicitly establishes the historical and theological contexts for the story of the young Daniel.\textsuperscript{69}

In its present form, the story of Susanna probably represents the earliest example of an extra-biblical (MT) episode featuring the young


\textsuperscript{68} In another essay I suggest that the author/redactor of MT Daniel draws “a fundamental distinction between God’s relationship with individuals, which preserves the ideas of responsibility and reciprocity, and God’s involvement with the larger processes of world history, which while retaining its focus on Israel’s destiny is no longer a direct function of Israel’s actions” (“4Q\textit{Pseudo-Daniela}–\textit{b} (4Q243–4Q244))”.

\textsuperscript{69} Much has been published on the topic of the sources of the Old English \textit{Daniel}, but all future studies must now begin with the authoritative work by P. Remley, “\textit{Daniel} and Greek Scriptural Tradition,” \textit{Old English Biblical Verse: Studies in Genesis, Exodus, and Daniel} (Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 16; Cambridge, 1996), 231–333 (260–273 on Daniel 1). Remley argues that \textit{Daniel} was greatly shaped by the material in LXX Daniel, with the immediate vector being either a continuous Old Latin exemplar or, more probably, “an amorphous body of material that is generally grouped under the heading of ‘biblical lore.’ Examples include glosses, dialogues, encyclopaedic treatises in ‘question-and-answer’ format and (most certainly) innumerable oral reports” (331).
Daniel, although his appearance is limited to a small but critical role. The OG and θ’ witnesses to Susanna differ in their details but agree in the basic account, which in both is set sometime during the period of the Babylonian exile. The beautiful, married Susanna rejects the amorous advances of two Jewish elders, who respond by falsely accusing her of sexual impropriety. The congregation believes the testimony of the elders over that of Susanna and so condemns her to death. As she is led away to execution, the young Daniel (whose spirit was roused by God) cries out that she is innocent of the charge. Responding to the congregation’s demand for an explanation, Daniel interrogates each elder separately and asks the question, “Under what kind of tree did you see Susanna commit her crime?” When each elder offers a different answer, the congregation realizes that their accusation against Susanna was false. The elders are executed, Susanna is exonerated, and Daniel fame’s grows among his people.

The relationship of the story of Susanna to MT Daniel 1–6 is subject to debate. At one end of the spectrum, J.W. van Henten argues that the story of Susanna was deliberately composed as an addition to and commentary on MT Daniel 1. Its purpose was to clarify the facts and chronology of MT Daniel 1 and 2, particularly with reference to the traditions about Jehoiakim in 2 Kings, and to furnish a link between the note about Jehoiakim at Dan 1:1–2 and the tale of the deportees at 1:3ff. Yet the identification of Daniel and his three companions as the sons of Susanna, a critical element of van Henten’s theory, is gratuitous. The explanation that Susanna’s four sons are not named because Daniel and his three companions

---

70 As Collins notes, where the OG version is more a story of judgment, θ’ is more hagiographic in its concentration on Susanna (Daniel, 437).
71 OG: via an angel.
have already been identified in MT Daniel 1 is a circular argument, since it presumes van Henten’s central thesis that Susanna is a commentary on the chapter. Moreover, the identification of the Joakim husband of Susanna with Jehoiakim king of Judah is not made in the text and van Henten offers no good reason to resolve this discrepancy. If Susanna were composed in part to address chronological issues of MT Daniel, one wonders why it did not include an obvious and integrative chronological element of the sort witnessed at MT Dan 1:21 or Bel and the Dragon verse 1.

At the other end of the spectrum, Collins highlights the story’s many distinctive features vis-à-vis the court tales of Daniel 1–6. He notes that Susanna lacks the characteristic court setting, is centered around a purely Jewish conflict rather than a Gentile-Jewish one, and focuses more on Daniel’s cleverness than it does the miraculous. It seems to me, however, that the parallels between Susanna and the court tales more than outweigh these differences, which in any case are not as profound as they might initially appear to be. While Collins is correct in observing that there is no mention in Susanna of either a foreign king or the royal court (and this cannot be ignored), the setting is still Babylon during the exile and Daniel remains the protagonist of the story, just as we find in the court tales. The emphasis on Daniel’s cleverness in Susanna must be balanced by the equally heavy stress placed on Daniel’s abilities in the court tales and also by the fact that both the story of Susanna and the court tales focus on the spirit that is within Daniel as another element in the revealing of the truth. It could also be the case that this emphasis on cleverness reflects an established, general understanding of the figure of Daniel the Wise which circulated in the other Daniel stories of the late Hellenistic and early Roman periods, other examples of which include the Daniel in the story of Bel and the Dragon and of Josephus’ Jewish Antiquities. Moreover, some

---

75 Collins, Daniel, 428.
76 The identification that Daniel and his companions were of royal blood is made in Sanhedrin 93b, where they are said to have descended from Ruth and Boaz. But this tradition cannot be assumed to stand behind the presentation of the person of Daniel in the story of Susanna.
77 See §3, infra.
78 Collins, Daniel, 437.
79 Is this one of the sources of the figure of the mediating angel that is so essential to apocalypses?
80 On Josephus’ portrait of Daniel the Wise, see Chapter Four, §2.
of the fundamental aspects of the court tales also appear in Susanna: Daniel solves a mystery, and its overall message is that God rewards those who remain steadfast in their faith (and so to their Jewish identity) despite oppression and mortal peril. Even the confrontation among Jews in the story of Susanna must be understood in the light of Daniel’s refusal to eat the royal fare in MT Daniel 1 and the conflict that is thereby implied between Daniel and the other royal and noble deportees who presumably eat the king’s food. These other Jewish deportees are as guilty as the falsely-accusing elders in their breaking of the Mosaic Law. In both MT Daniel 1 and Susanna, therefore, the contrast between those who keep the Law and those who break it provides the basis for the locomotive plot of each tale.

In sum, there is nothing to suggest that the purpose of Susanna was to establish or anticipate the material in the court tales of Daniel 2–6, such as is overwhelmingly the case with Daniel 1. It was therefore probably an independent creation. At the same time, the clear thematic parallels between it and the court tales of the Book of Daniel confirm that, in its present form at least, it was redacted in some close relationship with these tales.

As is clear from the legenda, the place that the story of Susanna was thought to occupy in the chronology of the biblical story of Daniel was a subject of some debate. One clear clue is that Daniel is identified as being a young man (OG Susanna 44/45; θ' Susanna 45), which intimates that the story was set early in his life, perhaps shortly after his entering the Babylonian civil service. The versions of the Bible, however, differ in where they situate the story of Susanna, and so by implication in their assumption about the story’s place in the overall chronology. The OG, Vulgate, and Syro-Hexaplaric versions append it after what in the MT is Daniel 12 but before the story of Bel and the Dragon, which by virtue of its clear internal chronology was placed at the very end of the LXX. The arrange-

---

81 Contra Collins, who argues that the conflict between Jews in the story of Susanna is not paralleled in the court tales of Dan 1–6, which “all involve a confrontation between Jews and Gentiles” (Daniel, 437).

82 Thus there is no need (pace Collins) to draw the distinction in the story’s meaning between the issue of Jewish identity and that of personal morality. The issue is faithfulness to the strictures of the Law while living in a foreign land.

ment of the story of Susanna in these versions, however, sandwiched as it is between the last vision of Daniel and the story of Bel and the Dragon, is probably less a chronological statement (again, a sign that it was not composed as a commentary on Daniel 1) and more a sign of its secondary authoritative status as compared with the twelve chapters of the MT Daniel.

In contrast, the later θ'-version, which of course means the majority of the copies of the LXX, situates Susanna before what in the MT is Daniel 1. Although this placement correctly accounts for the datum of Daniel’s youth, it is not without its problems. The explicit citation that the story of Susanna is set in Babylon creates a disjunctive geographic tension with MT Dan 1:1–2, where the deportees have yet to be identified and gathered, much less sent along their way to Babylon. At the same time, the story could easily have been placed after MT Daniel chapters 1, 2, or even 3, in which Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah are still youths. The best explanation of the placement of the story of θ' Susanna is that it was composed/translated by someone who recognised that in it Daniel was a youth and understood the problems with the OG placement, but who was also well aware of the authoritative status of the court tales of MT Daniel and was loathe to interrupt its sequence.

In the Chronicles of Jerahmeel, the tale of Susanna (§65) was inserted in the Daniel story between the tale of the false and adulterous prophets Ahab and Zedekiah (§64; cf. Jer 29:21–23) and the episode of Nebuchadnezzar’s madness (§66). The reason for this placement, it seems, is that a post-biblical tradition—of which both Origen and Jerome were aware and which circulated widely in the mediaeval world—associated Ahab and Zedekiah with the two slanderous elders in the Susanna tale. The place of the tale of Susanna in the Chronicles is an implicit attempt to harmonise the various chronological strands of the story, although it does not explicitly identify the two judges of the Susanna tale with Ahab and Zedekiah.

---

84 A notable exception is Papyrus 967, where Susanna follows Bel and the Dragon, which follows Daniel 12.
85 Note that “the Hebrew translation of Daniel” (so Gaster, Chronicles) precedes the story of Ahab and Zedekiah (§64).
86 See the chapter on the subject in Braverman, Jerome’s Commentary on Daniel, 126–131.
Josephus’ retelling of the story of Daniel in his *Antiquities* does not shed any light on the place of the story of Susanna, since it does not include the Greek Additions, a strange situation that cannot be explained by the argument that he was only interested in the parts of the Book of Daniel that would furnish material for his overall purpose of writing history. If this was the case, one wonders why Josephus chose to include the tale of Daniel and the Lions’ Den (§§10.250–262). A more nuanced explanation is implied by L. Feldman’s view that for Josephus history was a vehicle by which the lesson may be communicated that God rewards those who obey his will and punishes those who do not. Yet, since this is as much the lesson of the Greek Additions as it is the generically similar conflict tales of MT Daniel 3 and 6, we must look elsewhere for the reason for the missing Additions. The simplest possibility is probably the correct one: whatever his reasons, Josephus tells us that he is only translating the “books of the Hebrews” into the Greek language (§10.218). To be sure, the biblical text which stands behind his presentation of the story of Daniel was almost certainly Greek. At the same time, the point is that he cannot refer to Susanna or any of the other Greek Additions when he tells us explicitly that he is translating from the Hebrew directly.

Josephus, though, does take pains to retell the story of Daniel 1, and here we encounter two important augmentations to the biblical text concerning the young Daniel: the idea that Daniel and his companions might have been made eunuchs (§10.186) and certain expansions related to Daniel’s problem with eating the royal fare (§10.190–194). These additions enjoyed a prolonged afterlife, appearing time and again in the later Daniel legenda and sometimes functioning as seeds for further developments of these ideas.

---

90 Vermes, “Josephus’ Treatment,” 151–152, and 161, who observes that “his immediate source was a Greek Bible and when the old LXX differs from ‘Theodotion,’ [his *Antiquities*] is more often dependent on the former than on the latter. Moreover, in one case at least, his account echoes Symmachus against both LXX and Th.” It is also telling that although Josephus claims that he translates from the Hebrew he does not mention the very unusual fact that half the Book of Daniel is written in Aramaic.
91 On the full range of the discrepancies between Josephus’ account of the story of Daniel and the biblical accounts, see Vermes, “Josephus’ Treatment,” *passim.*
To be fair, Josephus does not precisely say that Daniel and his companions were made eunuchs, but he certainly gives that impression. J. Braverman demonstrates that the datum that Daniel was a eunuch was well-known in rabbinic and patristic circles. This datum was understood to be the fulfillment of the prophecy spoken by Isaiah to King Hezekiah that the descendants of the royal seed would someday be taken and made eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon (Isa. 39:7), although the rationale behind the act varies depending on the source consulted. The *Vita Danielis* turns the table full circle by claiming that Daniel was such a chaste man that the Judaeans mistakenly thought him to be a eunuch (v. 2). In this way all the potentially contradictory permutations on this matter involving the biblical story and its post-biblical afterlife are resolved.

Daniel’s absence during the episode of the fiery furnace (Daniel 3) was also a concern for the rabbinic authors. They say that Daniel left Nebuchadnezzar after the episode of the dream of the great statue (Daniel 2) because he did not want honours or to be made object of veneration. Instead, Daniel either went to Tiberias, where he built a canal, or was otherwise engaged in commissions for the king that required his presence elsewhere. Another source tells how, in response to their query as to whether they should worship the great statue erected by King Nebuchadnezzar, Daniel refers his three companions to the prophet Ezekiel. Ezekiel consults God, who surprisingly tells the prophet that he will not stand by the three men should they refuse to worship the great statue, on account that God

---

92 Although this is asserted by S. Rappaport, *Agada und Exegese bei Flavius Josephus* (Wien, 1930), 66.

93 Feldman argues that Josephus’ education made him an excellent candidate to have been aware of the many first-century Jewish traditions that now exist only in rabbinic writings of a later period (“Josephus’ Portrait of Daniel,” 44 and 44 note 24). This much may be true, of course—there has been a great deal of academic discussion on the age of the material quoted or discussed by the rabbis—but it is impossible to say whether Josephus was responding to a tradition about Daniel’s being a eunuch or instead introduced the idea.


95 This connexion is not made explicit in Josephus, however, despite the assertion of Hare, “The Lives of the Prophets,” 389 note 4a.

96 For a list of the sources, see Braverman, *loc. cit.*

should not be called upon in such a fashion. Later on, after the three return to Daniel intending not to worship the statue, God tells Ezekiel that he will indeed stand faithful to the three, but that the three should not be informed so that their purity will remain untouched.98

Another insertion in the story of the Prophet’s early days designed to resolve an issue with the received version of the Daniel story concerns the Temple vessels, which are foundational to the episode of Belshazzar’s feast in MT Daniel 5. Later readers of the Daniel story clearly had questions about these vessels, if not so much as to their origins (obviously the Temple) as to the details about their nature and the particulars about how they came to Babylon to play such an important role in world politics. Again MT Daniel 1 provides the first response, this time in the form of a statement to the effect that the vessels were part of the spoils taken by Nebuchadnezzar (1:2). As to why King Belshazzar would think of calling for the vessels during his banquet (beyond the fact that he was inebriated), the Latin mystery plays, the *Ludus Danielis* and the *Historia de Daniel representanda*, tell us that he and his satraps had been singing songs of his father’s conquest of Jerusalem and had remembered the spoils which had been removed from the city. The Old English *Daniel* does not refer to this drunken recollection of past glories, but it does assert that this banquet took place when all around Babylon encamped the enemy army that would before the next dawn take the city (ll. 695–702).

A more developed example of this *aporiai kai luseis* style of expansion is found in the Syriac *Revelation of Daniel the Prophet*, which devotes a great deal of space to describing the precise roster of the vessels and instruments that were looted from the Temple and transported to Babylon (§2).99 Among the spoils was the throne of Solomon, which, as we shall see, plays a role in several of the legenda which touch on episodes from Daniel’s later life. Sometimes Solomon’s throne is described as golden, but other times, as in the case of the *Qissa-yi Dānīyāl*, it is understood to have been fashioned from ivory (Z 391). In any case, its fate was a subject of some fascination for both Jews and Christians. The core elements of the many rabbinic

versions of the story.superscript100 are that it followed the seat of world power as it moved from Egypt to Babylon to Greece and then finally to Rome (a symbol, perhaps, for the theme of the *translatio imperii*) and that its mechanism was so cleverly constructed that foreign rulers could not seat themselves upon it without injuring themselves. As Ginzberg relates, one of the oddest stories connected with this aspect of the throne is found in 2 *Targum Esther* 1.2, 4, and 7–8. Nebuchadnezzar attempts to ascend the throne but is unaware of its complex mechanism, which presumably had some sort of safeguards to protect against just this sort of occurrence. Suddenly a golden lion (part of the throne mechanism) reached out with its right paw and struck the king on his left foot, thereby rendering him lame.

Now, this story is known from other sources, although the figure of Esther is most frequently associated with it.superscript101 The *Qissa-yi Dāniyāl*, however, also links Daniel with the episode, and situates it between the tale of the removal of the captives to Babylon and that of the fiery furnace.superscript102 The tale runs as follows: Nebuchadnezzar breaks his right leg (not his foot) while attempting to mount the throne. In this stream of the tradition, there is no mention of a throne mechanism or its connexion with the king’s injury. Realising that he has sinned, Nebuchadnezzar entreats Daniel to pray to God that his leg be healed. This Daniel does, and an angel informs him that the king’s leg is healed. As a result, Daniel and his friends receive the king’s honours (Z 393).

### 3. Chronology and the Kings of Babylon, Media, and Persia

Besides an interest in Daniel’s early years, another consistent point of contact between the Book of Daniel and the Daniel legend is in their shared, intense concern with the chronology of the Daniel story and, by implication, with the historical texture of the story, since the chronology of the story is frequently expressed through references to foreign kings and the dates of their rule. This concern with chronology and kings was rooted in two, complementary objectives.

---


superscript102 But without mentioning Nebuchadnezzar’s dreams (Daniel 2 and 4).
The first objective was to articulate the relative chronology of the Daniel story, i.e., the temporal relationship among each of its episodes. Although this was a necessity both for the author/redactor of MT Daniel and for the authors of the post-biblical apocrypha, their underlying methodologies tended to differ on account of the unique authoritative status which was accorded to the biblical Book of Daniel.

On the one hand, the narrative in MT Daniel is structured by means of a coherent chronological framework into which the author/redactor situated his received and original material. This process was primarily accretive, in the sense that the author/redactor of the court tales of the Book strung together the episodes of Daniel’s life as if they were pearls on a string. There were, of course, limitations on the process. For one thing, the fact that the author/redactor was working with material written in two languages and expressed through two different genres imposed its own restrictions on the shape of the final form of the Book. In other words, the shape of the final form of the Book is not solely a function of its chronological framework. Also, the process had its integrative aspects, inasmuch as the received material was already arranged in some chronological order and so required the insertion of brief editorial comments (usually at the beginning and end of each episode) that helped contextualise the court tales with each other and with the rest of the Book. Still, the overall episodic, accretive character of the Book of Daniel is unmistakable.

On the other hand, the authors of the post-biblical Daniel legend were also highly sensitive to the internal chronological aspects of the Daniel story, but were far less concerned with creating a relative chronology that incorporated new and traditional materials than they were with integrating their own compositions into an already fixed and authoritative biblical narrative. In such cases, by integrating their work within the structure of an existing chronology, the authors of the post-biblical legenda could accord their work a sense of logic and legitimacy. The only real exception to the rule is with the tales of Daniel’s last days, death, and burial, which generally

103 The “received materials” are the court tales of Daniel 1–6 or, more likely, 2–6; see note 59, supra.
104 On the composition history of the Book of Daniel, see Chapter One, note 5.
105 For more on accretive and integrative approaches in the Book of Daniel and other Hellenistic-era Daniel material, see DiTommaso, “4QPseudo-Daniel” (4Q243–4Q244).
extended past the pale of biblical story and so in every example represent an accretion to it, although (as we shall see) even here the authors of the post-biblical legenda sometimes took pains to establish contacts with earlier elements in the Daniel story.106

The second objective was to clarify the elements of the chronology of the Daniel story with reference to the absolute chronology of the narrative, which in the Book of Daniel concerns the identities of the kings mentioned therein and to the sequence of their reigns. This was not so much a problem in the Book of Daniel as it was with the Book of Daniel, in the sense that many of the post-MT Daniel legenda (early or late) had to come to terms with the fact that the Book seemingly contained discrepancies with the biblical and historical records.

The effort to resolve the apparent inconsistencies in the relative and the absolute chronologies of MT Daniel was a concern from the moment it gained its authoritative status. The Greek witnesses abound with examples of both types. MT Daniel records that Daniel lived to see King Cyrus of Persia and died (12:13) shortly after either the first (1:21) or the third (10:1) year of his reign. The Greek versions attempt to address this contradiction by substituting “first” for “third” at 10:1.107 Perhaps the most extreme effort to normalise the internal chronological data of the Book is found in the OG Daniel text which is preserved in the pre-Hexaplaric Papyrus 967, where what in MT Daniel are chapters 7 and 8 are situated before chapters 5 and 6. This alteration corrects the retrograde progression of the sequence of kings across MT Daniel 5–9 and underscores the great importance that early readers and translators of the Book of Daniel accorded to the chronological record.

Similar attempts were made to harmonise the information in the Book with the biblical and historical record, although, curiously, the Greek witnesses do not address the difficulties inherent in the chronology of MT Dan 1:1–2.108 MT Dan 2:1, for example, contains the

106 To my mind, the Greek witnesses to the Book of Daniel represent the turning point in the shift from the (comparatively) accretive to the (comparatively) integrative. Both in their form and content, the Greek witnesses (esp. the OG) display characteristics of each hermeneutic. See below for examples.

107 Collins observes that the substitution could be accidental (πρώτω for τρίτω) (Daniel, 372).

108 As Collins notes, the chronological problems associated with the beginning of the Book of Daniel have always perplexed later commentators (Daniel, 130–132), including Hippolytus and Jerome.
note that the episode of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream of the giant statue occurred in the second year of the king’s reign. This datum, however, stood in tension with the claim made in 1:5 that Daniel and his companions were trained for three years before entering the royal service. As Collins observes, the simplest explanation for the chronological incongruity is that the date of 2:1 was not composed in light of MT Daniel 1 and that the incongruity went unnoticed during the redaction of the court tales.\footnote{Collins, Daniel, 155. Although this is the best solution, it is not without its problems, particularly if we assume that the author/redactor of MT Daniel was so active elsewhere with respect to harmonising the chronology of the Book.} But it plainly posed a problem for later readers of the Book, including Josephus, who modified the figure of two years to refer specifically to the period after Nebuchadnezzar’s conquest of Egypt (\textit{Ant.}, 10.10.3 §195), and OG Daniel, which famously substituted the figure of twelve years.\footnote{\textit{Apud} Papyrus 967. The date preserved in the MT seems to be original; see the discussion in Collins, Daniel, 154.} Jerome cites “the Hebrews,” who propose that the reference to the second year at 2:1 alludes to the second year of King Nebuchadnezzar’s reign over his entire empire; the precise source of this opinion, as Braverman notes, is difficult to trace.\footnote{Braverman, \textit{Jerome’s Commentary on Daniel}, 73.} Other patristic commentaries offer various other solutions to this chronological dilemma, but clearly they (and the rabbinic writers and mediaeval Jewish commentators) were disturbed by the apparent discrepancy.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, 73–76.}

The Greek witnesses also add information at 3:1 to the effect that the episode of the fiery furnace took place during the eighteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar’s reign,\footnote{The date reflects the datum of eighteen years in Jer 52:29 for the regnal year in which Jerusalem was destroyed (but cf. 2 Kgs 25:8). The OG adds the same figure at 4:1.} an addition which must be understood as another attempt to situate the data of the Book of Daniel within the broader boundaries of the historical landmarks furnished by the biblical record. A concern with chronology also stands behind the rabbinic tradition, which is partially reflected in Jerome’s commentary on the Book of Daniel, that Belshazzar erred in his calculation of the seventy years of Jeremiah’s prophecy, which the king took to have ended in the second year of his reign and as result deemed to have been invalid.\footnote{Braverman, \textit{Jerome’s Commentary on Daniel}, 79–80.} This calculation led the foolhardy...
king to call for the Temple vessels during his famous banquet, an action which precipitated the usurpation of his kingdom and the loss of his life.

The problems associated with King Darius and thus, by association, with the distinction made in MT Daniel between the Median and Persian kingdoms, represent major focal points of the Daniel legenda.\textsuperscript{115} It is beyond the scope of this section to discuss the modern attempts to identify the figures of Belshazzar or Darius the Mede, or to elucidate the actual nature of the historical relationship between the Babylonian, Median, and Persian kingdoms.\textsuperscript{116} What is significant to us here is that MT Daniel 6 explicitly identifies this figure of Darius the Mede as the successor to Belshazzar’s kingdom and that the court tales presuppose a sequence of historical empires which distinguishes between the Median and Persian kingdoms. It is with the apparent discrepancies between these biblical data and the historical record that so many subsequent expressions of the story of Daniel were concerned.

History does not preserve any record of a person named Darius the Mede, nor does it confirm that a Median Empire succeeded the Babylonian one. There were several kings named Darius, however, the most important of which, and the only one whose regnal dates could possibly intersect the chronological setting of the Book of Daniel, was Darius I, called the Great, who ruled from 522 to 486 BCE. The problem was that this Darius was a Persian, not a Mede, and his reign followed that of Cyrus the Great rather than preceded it (and was, moreover, at least one king removed from Cyrus’ reign). The thrust of all later attempts to harmonise the biblical and historical accounts centered on plausibly integrating this historical Darius into the biblical story and on fleshing out the details of a discrete Median Empire. Unfortunately, these two objectives were rarely anything but mutually exclusive.\textsuperscript{117}

\textsuperscript{115} The distinction between Media and Persia is particularly important to any understanding of the four-kingdom schema of Daniel 2 and 7; on this, see the excellent Excursus on the topic of the four kingdoms in Collins, Daniel, 166–170, and the sources cited there.

\textsuperscript{116} See Collins, Daniel, 30–33.

\textsuperscript{117} This is a topic that demands more study, and the paragraphs that follow are not meant to be anything more than a survey-style exposition of the various ways in which the post-MT retellings of the story of Daniel attempted to deal with the problem of the historicity of Darius the Mede and with the Median question in
Actually, the first attempt to integrate the biblical and historical records is found in MT Daniel itself, at chapter 9.\textsuperscript{118} As I mentioned, MT Daniel is a redacted text that incorporated what for its author was both received and original material. Part of this received material was the five-chapter, proto-MT version of the court tales, which established the primary data that Darius the Mede succeeded Belshazzar the Babylonian.\textsuperscript{119} The author/redactor’s original contribution in the matter of Darius is the statement that Darius was the son of Ahasuerus (9:1). Beyond the fact that this Ahasuerus is almost certainly fictitious,\textsuperscript{120} the integrative value of this addition is unmistakable, since it introduces an extra character into the story in order to bridge the generational gap between Belshazzar (Daniel 7 and 8) and Darius (Daniel 9). As it turned out, however, this addition created an entirely new historical dilemma for later writers—the author of OG Dan 9:1, for example, found it necessary to substitute the name Xerxes in the place of Ahasuerus.\textsuperscript{121} This in itself was part of a larger effort to insert more monarchs after Belshazzar, and thus to account for the missing years until the time when the historical Darius assumed the throne, an effort which includes OG Dan 5:31, which asserts that Babylon was taken by Artaxerxes.\textsuperscript{122}

The concern with the figure of Darius the Mede and the Median question in general did not disappear with these early chronological adjustments. The first verse of \textit{Bel and the Dragon}, for example, states that the story occurs during the reign of Cyrus, who, we are informed, succeeded King Astyages the Mede. Unlike Ahasuerus, Astyages was a historical figure, and although the introduction of this datum at \textit{Bel and the Dragon} verse 1 does not speak to the issue of the identity of Darius the Mede, it does seem designed to reinforce the MT statement that the Median kingdom existed autonomously. Josephus combines and amplifies several of these integrative streams, stating that Darius was the son of Astyages (who was known to the Greeks by a different name) and a relative of

---

\textsuperscript{118} Darius is identified as a Mede in 11:1 also.

\textsuperscript{119} For a fuller account, see DiTommaso, “4QPseudo-Daniel\textsuperscript{a} (4Q243–4Q244).”

\textsuperscript{120} Collins, \textit{Daniel}, 348.

\textsuperscript{121} Cf. Ezra 4:5–6, which preserves the correct historical sequence: Darius (the father) and Xerxes (the son).

\textsuperscript{122} Pap. 967: “Xerxes.”
Cyrus (\textit{Ant.}, 10.11.4 §248). In his commentary on Daniel 5:30–31 (MT 6:1), Jerome tells us that Cyrus and Darius besieged Babylon together, as king of the Persians and of the Medes respectively, but Darius’ name alone was associated with the conquest, since he was older than Cyrus (and also his uncle) and his kingdom was larger. As a result, the Book of Daniel faithfully records that Belshazzar’s kingdom fell to Darius.

The Judaeo-Persian \textit{Qissa-yi Dāniyāl} records that after Belshazzar blasphemed God—an act that included wearing the holy garments as well as drinking from the sacred vessels—Cyrus fought and defeated the one called “Masul”\textsuperscript{123} and so took power in the region. One year later, however, Cyrus was slain in battle by King Darius, presumably Darius the Great (Z 395–399). On the other hand, in the \textit{Chronicle} of John Malalas, Darius is identified as a mere governor who rebelled against Belshazzar and so claimed the kingdom for himself.\textsuperscript{124}

The Syriac \textit{Revelation of Daniel the Prophet} contains a far more convoluted explanation that involves the figure of Gemath the Magus and Herodotus’ account of the strange circumstances of the accession of Darius the Great (§9).\textsuperscript{125} Basically, the \textit{Revelation} tells of the period when Gemath killed King Cyrus and seized the kingdom of Persia, an action which prompted Daniel to flee for his life. Gemath, however, blasphemed by seating himself upon Solomon’s golden throne (another example of the association of the throne with the story of Daniel), a Belshazzar-like act of hubris which caused God to remove the kingdom from him.\textsuperscript{126} As a result, after six months Gemath was overthrown and killed by his nobles, and Darius the Great assumed the kingship.

Given their attention to the issues of the historicity of Darius the Mede and to the Median question in general, the Daniel legenda are surprisingly unconcerned with the identities of the four kingdoms,

\textsuperscript{123} That is, “Mosul,” another name for Babylon and thus another name for its king, Belshazzar, although it does seem that the text here employs Masul as a personal name. On Mosul = Babylon, see Ginzberg, \textit{Legends}, 6.430–431.


\textsuperscript{125} See the excellent and detailed commentary on this point by Henze, 71–72.

\textsuperscript{126} The element of the throne of Solomon entered the Daniel story through the datum of the Temple vessels (Daniel 5) and appears time and again in the Daniel legenda (\textit{cf.} §2, \textit{infra}).
even though these kingdoms serve as absolute historical markers on the path that leads to the expected events of the eschatological age.\footnote{127}{Much has been written on the antecedents of the topos of the four kingdoms in classical, Iranian and Near Eastern sources and the influences they might have had on its appearance in MT Daniel 2, which surely represents the earlier of its two manifestations in the Book of Daniel. The best synopsis of the scholarship on the subject is the dedicated excursus at Collins, Daniel, 166–170, who rightly questions arguments for a pre-Antiochene stratum of Daniel 7. In addition, Daniel 7 has a great sense of urgency and an implicit belief in the impossibility of Jew/Gentile co-existence, both of which are hallmarks, one would think, of a post-175/167 BCE date. Daniel 2 set the tone for everything that followed on the subject of the four empires; indeed, it contained the kernel of a new theology of history and understanding of God’s role in history, a theology that was more fully articulated in Daniel 9.\footnote{128}{See P. Kern, “Die Auslegung von Nabuchodonosors Traumgesicht (Dan 2, 31–35) auf die Lebensalter des Menschen,” Les ages de la vie au Moyen Âge. Actes du colloque du Département d’Études Médievales de l’Université de Paris-Sorbonne et de l’Université Friedrich-Wilhelme de Bonn. Provins, 16–17 mars 1990 (edd. H. Dubois and M. Zink; Cultures et civilisations médiévales 7; Paris, 1992), 37–55, and the sources cited therein.\footnote{129}{Although I am concerned only with the four-kingdom schema as it is articulated in Daniel 2 and 7 and in the later reflexes of and commentaries on these chapters, there were other four- and five-kingdom schemata which circulated throughout the ancient Mediterranean world and the Near and Middle East.\footnote{130}{Collins, Daniel, 38 [date of Dan 7], 296–297 [Canaanite influences].} Significantly, nothing in the later literature connected to the story of Daniel speaks of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream (Daniel 2) or Daniel’s vision (Daniel 7; see below) which includes anything but four kingdoms.\footnote{129}{In other words, the biblical story in this case imposed on the theme of the four kingdoms a rigid restriction on the degree to which later literature could deviate from it.} A classic example of this restriction is actually found outside the Danielic corpus, in an apocalyptic vision from the early centuries of the common era, the so-called “Eagle Vision” of 4 Ezra 11–12. To understand the Eagle Vision, however, we need to understand the referents of the four kingdoms in MT Daniel 7, which are presented as four beasts which rise from the sea. Despite its ultimate Canaanite influences, the vision of the four beasts is almost certainly a product of the early Antiochene persecution.\footnote{130}{The fourth beast thus refers to the kingdom of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, which, as one of several rump states that devolved from the far-flung empire of

Alexander the Great, may simply be called “Greece.” As with all apocalyptic literature of the historical type, the purpose of Daniel 7 is to reassure the faithful that God is in complete control of the full scope of history and that the end to their oppression is both foreordained and imminent. With this in mind, the message of the vision of the four beasts (and of the historical and eschatological data which follow) is that the end to foreign oppression will occur soon, in the epoch of the fourth kingdom, that is, in the time of Greek hegemony.

The events of world history, though, outpaced Daniel 7’s expected end-time resolution and Greece, rather than being the final kingdom before the end-time, was itself supplanted by the world-empire of great Rome. The later writers of course understood this, and what we find in the later literature, such as Jerome’s commentary on the Book of Daniel and the Eagle Vision, is an attempt to re-interpret the biblical record in the light of the present-day situation. Composed during the height of Roman power, the Vision describes a giant eagle, sprouting multiple wings and heads, rising from the sea. The eagle, which the angelic interpreter explicitly states to be the fourth kingdom of Daniel 7 (4 Ezra 12.11) is patently Rome and its many heads and wings represent various emperors and other imperial worthies. The climax of the Vision is the end of the final kingdom prior to the eschaton and the end of oppression, just as it is in Daniel 7. The way that the author/redactor of the final form of the Eagle Vision reconciles what on the surface are two disjunctive data—Daniel 7’s claim that Greece is the last kingdom and the historical fact that Rome had since supplanted Greece—was not to add a fifth kingdom to the sequence, but instead to have the angel remark that the interpretation of the fourth kingdom was now revised (12.12). In this way the tension between the static and the dynamic elements of the relationship between biblical story and post-biblical legenda are resolved.

---

131 See the discussion on this topic in Chapter Three, §3.
4. The Last Days, Death, and Burial of Daniel

Although the topic of Daniel’s last days, death, and burial is almost completely ignored in MT Daniel, there are clues that its author/redactor was concerned with establishing the *termini* of the Daniel story. As mentioned, MT Daniel 1 is a manufactured preface to the pre-Antiochene, five-chapter story of Daniel. As for the final years of the prophet, MT Daniel refers only to the fact that Daniel lived to serve King Cyrus of Persia and died (12:13) shortly after the first (1:21) or the third (10:1) year of his reign. Both of these data are essentially integrative in nature. OG Daniel attempts to harmonise the apparent discrepancy in dates by altering the reference at 10:1 to read the “first” year, but this is a relatively minor alteration, especially given the degree to which changes were made to the other chronological information of the MT. Other than that, the Greek witnesses add no new information either integrative or accretive, and so the relative silence on the topic of the last days of Daniel became part of the authoritative story of Daniel through the medium of the Book of Daniel. The reason, perhaps, was the topic was simply unimportant to the overall purpose of the Book of Daniel because it contributed nothing either to the assurance that God rewards personal faithfulness or to the overarching theology of history which situates God in control of the broad processes of world events.

Yet tales surrounding Daniel’s last days, death, and burial certainly appear in the later Daniel legenda. These tales very much revolve around the city of Susa (Shushan), the capital of the Persian Empire, where in his *Antiquities* Josephus records that Daniel lived out his days in the service of the Persian king, having built himself a most excellent fortress in Ecbatana (§§269–272). From that point there seems to be a divergence of traditions, both of which, as Ginzberg records, are preserved in the mediaeval Jewish stories about Daniel.

One stream of tradition has Daniel buried at Susa in a magnificent mausoleum, which did not crumble with age and so which in later centuries persons could visit for themselves. The *Vita Danielis* records that Daniel died in Persia “and was buried by himself and with great honor in the royal grotto” (v. 18). The Irish *Deaths of the Chief Prophets* echoes this tradition, stating that Daniel was buried alone in the

---

133 See note 59, *supra*.

134 Cf. the “fortress” at Susa at Dan 8:2.
royal tomb, and after his death no one else was ever interred there (§5). Related legends claim that beside Daniel's tomb was a large stone,\(^{135}\) under which were the Temple vessels (which Nebuchadnezzar had removed from Jerusalem and which his son Belshazzar had profaned with drink) that Daniel had retrieved and secreted away in this spot.\(^ {136}\) In certain Muslim traditions, the tomb of Daniel also contained a book, which when opened revealed information concerning future civil disorders and wars.\(^ {137}\) The association of Daniel and secret knowledge, whose origins must reside in the biblical stories of Daniel's ability to interpret dreams and function as the recipient of strange visions of future events, is also associated with the prognostic literature associated with his name. In addition, there seems to have been a shared interest with certain eastern Daniel prognostica concerning the connexion between Adam, Daniel, and the secrets of the Cave of Treasures.

The other stream of tradition has Daniel in his extreme old age return to Judah, where he became governor for a short while before Zerubbabel.\(^ {138}\) In the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel*, however, we find Daniel still in Babylon when he selects Zerubbabel to assume his place as leader of the Jewish community in exile. The transfer of authority complete, Daniel retired from court to Shushan in Elam (which, as was noted, the *Chronicles* states was Daniel's homeland), where he remained faithful to God until the day of his death (§74.1–3).

A different account of Daniel's return to Jerusalem is found in the Syriac *Revelation of Daniel the Prophet* (§§10–12). Darius the Great, having seen the golden throne of Solomon which had been taken from Jerusalem and upon which his predecessor Gemath had sat, decides to force Daniel into revealing the whereabouts of the rest of the Temple spoils. Suddenly the king is struck blind, and is shown in a vision that the only way that he could regain his sight would be if he made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem to worship God. So Darius and his army, accompanied by Daniel, travel to Jerusalem. There they find the city desolate, but Daniel washes Darius in the “Pool of Shiloah” (cf. the episode of Jesus and the blind man at John 9:1–12),

---

\(^{135}\) The idea that the vessels were hidden in the earth is also found among the pseudepigrapha at 2 *Baruch* 6.7–9 and 4 *Baruch* 3.


\(^{137}\) See Chapter Three, Excursus II: “The Figure of Daniel and the Arabic Muslim Daniel Apocalypses.”

Darius worships in the sanctuary, and in this fashion the king’s blindness is cured. After enquiring about the Temple and its vessels, Darius and Daniel return to Persia (§13).

A variant of the legend of Darius’ blindness and Daniel’s return to Jerusalem appears in the Judaeo-Persian Qīssa-yi Dāniyāl. Darius’ special focus is the temple vestments, which in the Qīssa-yi Dāniyāl are highlighted to the degree that they are explicitly included in the story of Belshazzar and the writing on the wall. Darius asks Daniel about the vestments, but Daniel refuses and is cast into prison. While in prison Daniel prays for deliverance, which arrives in the form of an angel, who strikes Darius blind. Darius confesses to Daniel that he has sinned against God, and Daniel tells him that they must journey together to Jerusalem. And so they travel west, the army in tow, until they come upon the desolate place where the holy city once stood. Through Daniel, the angel instructs King Darius to wash his eyes in the river, whereupon his sight is restored. Darius opens his treasury and passes out wealth to the Levites and the needy. Then they return to Shustar (Susa), and those whom they passed on their way home saw that the king had been cured and so converted to Judaism (Z 399–401).

Interestingly, many post-biblical traditions directly or indirectly associate Daniel with water. Water, of course, is an important element in the vision section of the Book of Daniel: Daniel 8 is set alongside the canal Ulai, while the vision of Daniel 10–12 involves the River Tigris. There is the tale that Daniel built a canal at Tiberius and, as we have seen, there are the stories which have the blinded King Darius washing his eyes either at the Pool of Shiloah or in a river. There is also an Arabic legend that Daniyāl (Daniel) possessed a magic stick that when touched to the ground would cause water to appear and follow it. In this way, the legend claims, the river Dijlah (Diyāla), between modern-day Iraq and Iran, was created.

M.R. James states that a Greek Passion of Daniel and the Three Children tells of how Daniel and his companions were beheaded by a certain tyrant named Atticus, who in this tale is identified as a successor to

---

139 See above, note 97, supra.
King Nebuchadnezzar.\textsuperscript{141} James also notes that an “abstract” of the story exists, along with an illustration in the “great illustrated Menology of Basil in the Vatican,” a reference which unfortunately I have not been able to verify by autopsy. On the other hand, Feldman reports that \textit{b. Sanhedrin} 93a preserves the tradition that the three eventually returned to Judah, where they married and raised families.\textsuperscript{142} Indeed, Daniel’s three companions were, as I have remarked, the subject of their own battery of legend. These include, most famously, the Greek Additions the Prayer of Azarias and the Song of the Three Young Men, as well as, among others, the Old English \textit{Azarias}, the Mediaeval German \textit{Die drei Jünglinge im Feuerothen}, and the Armenian (\textit{Vitae of}) \textit{The Three Children}. The latter text preserves the tradition that the three companions of Daniel were beheaded, but this time in the first year of the reign of Cyrus King of Persia, presumably by order of the king himself, on account of the fact that “he was forcing (them) to abandon the paternal laws.”\textsuperscript{143}

Some legend contain the information that in his later years Daniel continued to offer predictions about the future, that is, outside the formal, first-person apocalyptic apocrypha attributed to him. The \textit{Vita Danielis}, for instance, records that Daniel offered an eschatological prediction (vv. 19–21), which appears after the notice of his death (v. 18).\textsuperscript{144} The Latin mystery plays, the \textit{Ludus Danielis} and the \textit{Historia de Daniel representanda}, both culminate with a short extrabiblical prophecy based on the \textit{Ordo prophetarum}, where Daniel foretells the coming of Christ.\textsuperscript{145} A most unusual confluence of the biblical and classical oracular traditions appears in the \textit{Chronicle of John Malalas} (§§156.4–157.7). Cyrus asked Daniel whether he would be successful in a campaign against the wealthy Croesus, king of Lydia. Croesus, of course, is famous for his embassy to Delphi, where his query on whether he would emerge victorious from a war with Persia was answered with the quintessentially ambiguous reply that if he attacked the Persians a great empire would fall.\textsuperscript{146} The story of

\textsuperscript{141} M.R. James, \textit{The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament} (TED 1, Palestinian Jewish Texts 14; London/New York, 1920), 70.

\textsuperscript{142} Feldman, “Josephus’ Portrait of Daniel,” 44 note 23.

\textsuperscript{143} M.E. Stone, \textit{Armenian Apocrypha relating to Patriarchs and Prophets, Edited with an Introduction and Commentary} (Jerusalem, 1982), 154.

\textsuperscript{144} On this prediction, see Chapter Three.

\textsuperscript{145} On the \textit{Ordo}, see J.-P. Migne, \textit{PL} 42, cols. 1123–1124.

\textsuperscript{146} Herodotus, \textit{Histories} 1.52–53.
Croesus’ embassy to Delphi is repeated in the *Chronicle* but is paralleled with Cyrus’ command to Daniel. But Daniel refuses to answer Cyrus and is thrown into the lions’ den, *à la* Daniel 6. Unlike Daniel 6, however, and more in the tenor of Daniel 3, Cyrus is hostile to Daniel and only when the Prophet emerges from the den unscathed does the king repent his action and acknowledge the sovereignty of Daniel’s god. Daniel then predicts Cyrus’ victory, tying it into the idea that the Persian king is God’s right hand on earth,\(^{147}\) the one who will soon return the Jewish captives and rebuild the city of Jerusalem. Another variant of the last element of the Malalas account is preserved in the Syriac *Revelation*, where Daniel urges Cyrus to march against Babylon and in so doing recover the Temple vessels that had been brought there (§5).

5. *Observations and Conclusions*

The Daniel legenda were part of a long-term, evolutionary process whereby the story of Daniel was continually being told and retold. The story first appeared among certain Jewish groups, probably in the Persian era and perhaps drawing upon older tales of a wise and/or righteous man named Danel. During the late Persian or the early Hellenistic period, a loose constellation of tales slowly materialised around the figure of Daniel, one of the high-born inhabitants of Judah whom King Nebuchadnezzar had taken captive and had forcibly deported to Babylon. Most of these early tales featured Daniel as the wise courtier in the service of a foreign monarch.\(^{148}\)

By the beginning of the second century BCE, a distinct collection of at least five of these early “court tales” had coalesced,\(^{149}\) although

---

\(^{147}\) An idea which has biblical antecedents (2 Chr 36:22–23 [par. Ezra 1:1–3]; 1 Esd 2:1–7).

\(^{148}\) This statement is an extrapolation from the available evidence. We know that a five-chapter collection of court tales preceded the formation of MT Daniel, and there is enough internal evidence in the present form of the court tales to suggest that this five-chapter collection was itself redacted from even earlier, autonomous tales involving Daniel. Some of these very early tales might not have centered on the figure of Daniel at all; cf. the Aramaic *Prayer of Nabonidus*, the fragments of which do not mention Daniel but which should be considered to be an early, more conservative form of the episode of Nebuchadnezzar’s madness in LXX Daniel 4 and, in a moderately different form, in MT Daniel 4.

\(^{149}\) Although their precise date and provenance remain unknown, there is every reason to conclude that the court tales were meant to function, as W.L. Humphries
the evidence of the fragments of Aramaic scrolls from the Dead Sea indicate that other texts associated with Daniel circulated beyond the pale of this collection. Then, probably during the year 164 BCE, and certainly as a direct result of the events of the crisis precipitated by the actions of Antiochus Epiphanes, a redactor/author edited the five-chapter collection of court tales and amalgamated them with other material, much of which was new and was in the form of pseudonymous, first-person revelatory visions. The fruit of this editorial activity was the Hebrew/Aramaic Book of twelve chapters that we know as MT Daniel.

But the story of Daniel did not end there. Within a few short generations, a Greek witness to the Book appeared, replete with a host of minor and moderate differences between it and the Hebrew/Aramaic text. The most famous of these differences were the so-called Greek Additions: the tales of Bel and the Dragon and of Susanna, the Prayer of Azarias, and the Song of the Three Children. The importance of the fourteen-chapter LXX Daniel to the history of the story of Daniel cannot be overestimated. Not only was it the first sustained retelling and, to some degree, reworking of MT Daniel, but, because of its Scriptural authority and its long-term significance as a base text for numerous ancient and mediaeval translations of the Book of Daniel, its account of the biblical story of Daniel became extremely influential with respect to the form and content of the vast bulk of the subsequent Daniel legenda.

observed, as a broad guide of conduct for pious Jews in a land not their own (“A Life-Style for Diaspora: A Study of the Tales of Esther and Daniel,” JBL 92 (1973), 211–223).

The evidence suggests that the Prayer of Nabonidus (4Q242) antedates MT Daniel, and 4Q243/244 may be dated to the decades between the compilation of the collection of the court tales and 164 BCE (DiTommaso, “4QPseudo-Daniel” (4Q243–4Q244)). Here again, too, we must consider the possibility that pre-LXX forms of the Greek Additions were extant in the period before the redaction of the final form of MT Daniel.

Effectively θ’ Daniel, which almost completely supplanted OG Daniel.

The LXX became authoritative for much of both eastern and western Christianity, the latter until the acceptance of the Latin reflexes (cf. Chapter One, note 18). One indication that the Greek Additions to Daniel enjoyed this authoritative status is the frequency that the “Song of the Three” and the tale of Susanna were illustrated in manuscripts and painting; see M. Mentré, “Images juives et images chrétiennes du moyen âge liées au livre de Daniel, étude d’iconographie biblique,” L’Art juif au moyen âge (ed. M. Mentré; Paris, 1988), 55–88; J.-C. Prêtre, Suzanne: Le procès du modèle (Paris, 1990); C. Baskins, “‘La Festa di Susanna’: Virtue on Trial in Renaissance Sacred Drama and Painted Wedding Chests,” Art History
The authoritative status of the biblical Book of Daniel, particularly in its Greek form, overwrote or overwhelmed all the previous expressions of the story of Daniel, and also limited the degree to which the story could from that point deviate. As a result, all post-biblical renditions of the Daniel story, whether they are the product of rabbinic and mediaeval Judaism, of Christianity of late antiquity and the Middle Ages, or of early Islam, are fundamentally connected to the biblical versions, regardless of their degree of drift from it.

Yet, as I mentioned, the relationship between the biblical story and the post-biblical legenda included a dynamic aspect as well, which was manifested by the continuing need to tell and retell the story of Daniel. When we consider the static/dynamic nature of this relationship, we find not only that the figure of Daniel had bundled with it a core set of messages which could be employed time and again for different communities and under different historical circumstances, but also that the biblical and post-biblical articulations of the Daniel story consistently exhibited identical concerns.

Put another way, the expressions of the Daniel story often said the same thing and for the same reasons, even though on the surface they could appear quite different. In fact, we may identify several common characteristics regarding the form and content of the Daniel legenda and the purpose for which they were composed. To

14 (1991), 329–344; and B. Bohn, “Rape and the Gendered Gaze: Susanna and the Elders in Early Modern Bologna,” Biblical Interpretation 9 (2001), 259–286 (and the sources cited there). Another is the extent to which minor figures from the biblical Book of Daniel, such as Nebuchadnezzar, the three companions of Daniel, and, above all, Susanna, became foci for their own legenda; see, e.g., J.-A. George, “Repentance and Retribution: The Use of the Book of Daniel in Old and Middle English Texts,” BJRL 77 (1995), 177–192, and the Inventory of Chapter Six, esp. the Excurses on “Sundry Latin Daniel Apocrypha. ii. Mediaeval Italian Susanna Poems,” on “The Figure of Susanna in the Mediaeval German Tradition,” and on “Die drei jünglinge im Feuerofen.” Middle English references to Daniel and Nebuchadnezzar are similarly numerous: Chaucer’s Monk’s Tale, Parson’s Tale, and House of Fame; Gower’s Confessio Amantis; Piers Plowman; and Cleanness (this list apud A. Harbus, “Nebuchadnezzar’s Dreams in the Old English Daniel,” English Studies 75 (1994), 489–508 at 490–491 [reprinted = The Poems of MS Junius 11: Basic Readings (ed. R. Liuzza; London/New York, 2002), 261–286]). The Prayer of Azarias and the Song of the Three Children were also apparently quite popular in the liturgy of both the eastern and western churches [J. Mearn, The Canticles of the Christian Church Eastern and Western in Early and Medieval Times (Cambridge, 1914)]. Finally, the tale of Susanna was popular in mediaeval Jewish tradition as well; see, again, the Inventory of Chapter Six, the Excursus on “The Additional Greek Material in the Post-Biblical Jewish Tradition.”
begin, they are all court tales,\(^ {153}\) that is, they are narrative accounts which are set at the court of a foreign king. Daniel, a wise man, is usually in service to these foreign kings, just as he is in the court tales of MT Daniel 1–6, even though some of the later legenda have him fleeing the court wherever there was a radical change of government. In addition, almost all of the legenda are, as with the court tales, recounted in the third-person. The two, rare exceptions to the rule are the first-person narratives that preface the Syriac Revelation of Daniel the Prophet and the Judaeo-Persian Qissa-yi Dāniyāl, and both of these function as introductions to the apocryphal apocalypses which follow.

It is somewhat of a maxim among mediaevalists that in late antiquity and the Middle Ages the Book of Daniel was above all seen as a book of visions.\(^ {154}\) While this may be partially true with respect to the commentaries and postilla on the Book,\(^ {155}\) it is, in actuality, extremely rare for legenda proper either to include, discuss, or even mention the revelatory visions of Daniel 7–12\(^ {156}\) or to include new visions, which, as we shall see in Chapter Three, was the exclusive province of dedicated apocryphal Daniel apocalypses. Again, this division of labour in the post-biblical Daniel apocrypha finds a clear parallel with the binary structure of the genres (court tales and revelatory visions) in the Book of Daniel. What is more, there are no post-biblical hymns, odes, prayers, testaments, wisdom pieces, or annalistic-style histories associated with the story of Daniel. There are two Latin mystery plays, but in format and scope they are essentially no more than dramatic versions of narrative Daniel legenda which are set to music and meant for performance in a church or cathedral. The court-tale, narrative vehicle by which the story of Daniel was related in the Book of Daniel imposed a limitation of form on all subsequent expressions of the story.

\(^ {153}\) As this term is used to describe the genre of material in MT Daniel 1–6; see Collins, Daniel, 44–45. On the use of the term “court legends” or “legenda,” see note 33, supra.

\(^ {154}\) See, e.g., Caie, “The Old English Daniel,” 1; Remley, “Daniel and Greek Scriptural Tradition,” 234 note 12.


\(^ {156}\) A notable exception being the retelling of half of MT Daniel 8 in Josephus’ Antiquities.
As with the apocalyptica and the prognostica, the Daniel legenda readily traversed linguistic, cultural, and confessional boundaries. The story of Daniel was extremely popular throughout the ancient and mediaeval periods, and Daniel legenda appear in many different languages and were composed over the course of many centuries. The legenda are extant in Jewish, Christian, and Islamic literature, although it must be noted that the Byzantine and Islamic traditions appear to have placed less attention on the story of Daniel and more on the production and transmission of apocalyptic Daniel texts and of prognostic works attributed to the prophet. The story of Daniel was thus told and retold for many different purposes and different audiences, and frequently arose out of different theological perspectives. But the motivations behind the production of the legenda reflected a deep sense of ideological continuity with the biblical Book of Daniel, even if the specific context of the biblical court tales—the necessity for Jews living under foreign rule to maintain their ancestral faith in God and distinctiveness in society—was in many cases no longer appropriate. In this way the message of the biblical story of Daniel had the rare ability to transcend ethnic, national, and religious boundaries.

Above all, the figure of Daniel in both the court tales and the legenda was a model of steadfast faith, particularly the sort of faith which could endure even in the face of tremendous adversity and personal risk. It is no accident, for example, that an apocryphon especially concerned with martyrdom such as 4 Maccabees would cite the episodes of the lions’ den and the fiery furnace (13.9; 16.3, 21; 18.12–14) as prime examples of righteous endurance. The whole point of the Daniel story was to communicate the truth that a task or deed which was impossible or inconceivable in normal, human circumstances would become possible with God’s assistance. This is certainly the point of Josephus’ addition to the episode of the Lions’ Den, where in response to the claim on the part of Daniel’s accusers that the lions did not devour him because they were not hungry, food was provided to the great cats before his accusers were cast into their den but, even sated, the lions behaved as if they were famished and so consumed Daniel’s enemies (Ant., 10.257–258). We also find this message underpinning the biblical court tales, the other

---

157 See Chapters Three and Four.
Daniel legenda, the commentaries on the Book of Daniel, and sundry rabbinic \textsuperscript{158} and early Christian sources that briefly refer to the prophet. \textsuperscript{159} Also, there is a strong didactic and edifying element connected with the message of the Daniel story, an element which is present in both the court tales and the legenda. The concern with the message of steadfast faith also explains, I think, the popularity of the Additional legenda in the Middle Ages that was devoted to the figures of Susanna and to the three companions of Daniel.

Another purpose common to many of the Daniel legenda is to explain or clarify the received version of the Daniel story, especially regarding elements related to the chronology of the story and to the details of Daniel’s early life and his last days, death, and burial. Again, though, it cannot be stressed enough that the same concerns were, to one degree or another, also part of the mind-set of the author/redactor of MT and the author/translator(s) of the Greek witnesses to the Book. MT Daniel, LXX Daniel, and the Daniel legenda are filled with examples where a problem of chronology is resolved or a gap in the story is filled, and this procedure continued throughout the late ancient and mediaeval periods, whenever the story of Daniel was retold and reworked. Of course, this is true also with respect to the genre of Rewritten Bible as a whole. Sometimes there appears to have been an \textit{aporai\kai\ luseis} hermeneutic behind the procedure. Other times a special explanation or clarification was promoted in the service of particular theology, exegesis, or point of view. The net result was often, as Vermes remarks with respect to Josephus’s alterations to the biblical Book of Daniel, “a more detailed and coherent Daniel account which at the same time is smoother and more logical than the biblical story.” \textsuperscript{160} There are even some legenda, such as the \textit{Chronicles of Jerahmeel}, where in the best tradition of Herodotus and the classical historiographic tradition speeches are placed in the mouths of the major characters at every critical point in the story.

One also cannot help but think that among the reasons for the continual need to retell the story of Daniel was that folk were simply curious about the figure of Daniel, who for most persons was as

\textsuperscript{158} Pes.R. 45b, cited in Montefiore and Loewe, \textit{A Rabbinic Anthology}, 39.


\textsuperscript{160} Vermes, “Josephus’ Treatment,” 163.
much a historical figure as Alexander or Caesar. This need was particularly evident with respect to the uncertainty surrounding his early and later years, periods which extended beyond the chronological horizon of the biblical story. The need to preface or amplify the life stories of heroes, saints, and other figures of legend and history is seemingly common to all literary civilisations. Prime examples of this phenomenon are the infancy narratives about Jesus, the tales about the wanderings of the various Achaean heroes after the Trojan War, and the stories about the post-Easter missions of the apostles. Such tales provide a sense of completeness to cycles of stories which frequently begin and are left open-ended.

Nor, in related vein, should we discount the sheer entertainment aspect associated with the Daniel legenda. Many of the biblical episodes involving Daniel represent the art of story-telling at its finest, particularly in the case of MT Daniel chapters 3, 5 and 6, and the Additional tale of Susanna. These tales possess all the elements of fine entertainment: an eminently likeable and admirable protagonist who is also the underdog, a locomotive plot that steadily builds tension, an affirming resolution to the tension, and an overarching message that stresses what for many persons are inherently good values. In the end, these were stories that demanded telling and retelling, the sort of tales that no doubt were able to forge and to reinforce bonds in families, communities, and confessions.
CHAPTER THREE

THE APOCRYPHAL DANIEL APOCALYPSES

1. Introduction

There has always been ample anecdotal evidence testifying to the existence of lost or hitherto unknown Daniel apocalypses.\(^\text{1}\) The late antique Hebrew Apocalypse of Elijah, for example, contains a passage which is attributed to Daniel and concerns the attributes of the Antichrist but which is not found in the biblical Book of Daniel.\(^\text{2}\) Similarly, the Vita Danielis in the Lives of the Prophets, whose final form dates from the early Byzantine era,\(^\text{3}\) preserves an extra-biblical, apocalyptic-style prediction concerning the end times that is attributed to Daniel (vv. 19–21).\(^\text{4}\) The Vita also asserts that not all of Daniel’s visions during the time of the Persians were recorded (v. 17). Such a proposition was readily believable in the light of Dan 8:26 and 12:4, where the prophet is admonished to keep his visions and their interpretations secret, and also by analogy with the material evidence of prognostica such as the Somniale Danielis and the Lunationes Danielis.

\(^{1}\) That is, first-person (explicit or implicit) accounts of revelatory visions, generally articulated within the confines of an overarching apocalyptic historiography, which are attributed to Daniel. Apocalyptic apocrypha do not include instances where portions of the visions of Daniel 7–12 are quoted, reinterpreted, or otherwise employed by later writers (e.g., 4Q174 1–3 ii; Matt 24:15–16).

\(^{2}\) A. Jellinek, “Apokalypse des Elia,” Bet ha-Midrasch. Sammlung kleiner Midraschim und vermischter Abhandlungen aus der ältern jüdischen Literatur (1853–1877), 3.xvii–xviii, 65–68. Translated in A. Wünsche, “Apokalypse des Elia,” Aus Israels Lehrhallen (Leipzig, 1907–1910), 2.33–38 [rep. Hildesheim, 1967]. For a full bibliography of the Apocalypse, see L. DiTommaso, A Bibliography of Pseudepigrapha Research, 1850–1999 (JSPSup 39; Sheffield, 2001), 348–350. M. Buttenwieser observes that in this apocalypse the Antichrist-figure is called “Gigit” (Outline of the Neo-Hebraic Apocalyptic Literature (Cincinnati, 1901), 31). None of the extant apocryphal Daniel apocalypses preserve the name Gigit, however, and elsewhere in late antique Jewish apocalyptic speculation the Antichrist is called “Armilus” (as it is in the Ne’u’ot Daniel (§2.22, infra)).


\(^{4}\) The prediction is amplified somewhat in the Armenian translation; cf. J. Issaverdens, The Uncanonical Writings of the Old Testament Found in the Armenian Manuscripts of the Library of St. Lazarus (Venezia, 1901, 1934), 141–156 at 152.
which obviously contained extra-biblical material but which nevertheless were considered to have been written by Daniel in Babylon.  

We know that Mekhithar of Airivank, writing *circa* 1290, includes in his list of apocryphal books a work bearing the curious title of the “Seventh Vision of Daniel.” Similarly, the fourteenth-century Syrian Christian theologian Ebed-Jesu, in his catalogue of the writings of Hippolytus of Rome, alludes to a work called either “the Little Daniel” or “the Lesser Daniel.” In the portion of his *Chronicle* devoted to the years 1203–1204, Salimbene de Adam recounts how certain prophecies of Daniel were consulted in response to the dire threat posed to Constantinople by the soldiers of the Fourth Crusade. When the inhabitants of the city were informed that their current plight and its favourable resolution had been foretold by Daniel, they apparently sallied forth to engage the Latin invaders with renewed confidence and vigour. Finally, several centuries later in Old Russia, so G. Podskalsky informs us, “... im selben Jahr [1673] veröffentlicht N. Spatharios nach dem Vorbild seines Meisters (Ligarides) ein voraus-

---

5 See also Dan 7:28, where Daniel himself decides to keep his own counsel regarding what he has seen. At the end of the *Fourteenth Vision of Daniel* (§2.21, *infra*), an apocryphal Daniel apocalypse preserved in Coptic and Arabic copies, an unnamed angel urges Daniel to keep secret the information he has been shown, while in the Hebrew *Vision of Daniel by the River Kebar* (§2.17), the angel Gabriel bids Daniel to seal his words (i.e., what he has been told about the meaning of his vision) until the end of time. On the *Somnialia* and the *Lunationes*, see Chapter Four, §§2 and 3.


8 O. Holder-Egger (ed.), *Cronica fratis Salimbene de Adam ordinis minorum* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica, scriptores 32; Hannover/Leipzig, 1905–1913), 23–24. The description of the source consulted (it focused on the names of emperors and referred to the coming of a “Blond Race”) is completely in step with what we find in so many of the extant apocalyptic apocrypha attributed to Daniel. The Salimbene de Adam passage is also cited by J. Vereecken and L. Hadermann-Misguich, *Les Oracles de Lion le Sage illustrés par Georges Klontzas. La version Barozzi dans le Codex Bute* (Orients græcolatinus 7; Venezia, 2000), 23–24.
berechnendes Wahrsagebuch, in dem anhand der Danielpropheten von den vier Weltrichtungen die Herrschaft der Russen über Konstantinopel angekündigt wird.”9

Perhaps the most celebrated of all the anecdotal references to the existence of apocryphal Daniel apocalypses is preserved in the writings of Liudprand, bishop of Cremona, who after his famous embassy to Constantinople in 968–969 reported that, “Habent Graeci et Saraceni libros, quod ὥρασεως, sive visiones, Daniellis vocant, ego autem Sibyllanos, in quibus scriptum reperitur quot annis imperator quisque vivat, quae sint futura eo imperitante tempora, pax an simul- tas, secundae Saracenorum res an adversae.”10 In addition to this remarkable statement, Bishop Liudprand provided an abbreviated and frequently opaque description of the contents of several of these prophetic books which had so captivated the Byzantine imagination.11 Given Liudprand’s (and Salimbene de Adam’s) attestation of
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9 G. Podskalsky, “Der Beitrag der Griechen zur geistigen Kultur Rußlands nach dem Fall Konstantinopels (1453–1821),” KАΘΗΓΗΤΡΙΑ. Essays Presented to Joan Hussey for Her 80th Birthday (ed. J. Chrysostomides; Camberley, 1988), 527–543 at 536. Orthodox Russia, of course, was the natural heir to the trappings and expectations of the Byzantine Empire after the final fall of Constantinople in 1453, a situation that was later conflated with the foreign-policy hope of regaining the city from the Ottoman Turks and thereby fulfilling the long-held Tsarist dream of a warm-water port and naval access to the Mediterranean. Indeed, Zoe, the niece of the last Byzantine Emperor, married Ivan III, the Grand Muscovite Prince (ruled 1505–1533), and so became the grandmother to the future Tsar, Ivan IV (Ivan the Terrible).


11 On Liudprand’s assertion that these Daniel apocalypses were equally popular among the Saracens (i.e., the Arab Muslims), see the section on the Apocalypse of Daniel on the Events after al-Mut’amid (§2.18). J. Wortley states that he “can find no
the standing that these Daniel apocalypses enjoyed in Byzantium—and disregarding for the moment the bishop’s inherent antipathy towards the Byzantines and their court and culture—it is little wonder that a disproportionately large number of the extant Greek Daniel apocalypses are preserved in the venerable Biblioteca Marciana in Venezia, the institution which in the tumultuous period of the mid-fifteenth century was the beneficiary of hundreds of manuscript codices hurriedly rescued from Constantinople, courtesy of Cardinal Bessarion and others.\textsuperscript{12}

Yet despite such intriguing anecdotes and references which for centuries implied the existence of a large and diverse corpus of literature, virtually nothing in the way of material proof for the apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha was identified before the middle of the nineteenth century. In a way, the re-discovery of the manuscript copies of these lost apocalypses was part of the larger process of the recovery and identification of the documentary and archaeological monumenta of the ancient and classical worlds. This process began with the antiquarians, encyclopaedists, and gentlemen scholars of the Enlightenment, but reached its zenith in the great universities and Gesellschaften of Imperial Germany, and, to a lesser degree, of late Victorian and Edwardian England, Third Republic France, post-bellum America, and Romanov Russia. This was the golden age of classical and biblical studies, the age of Tischendorf and Mommsen, of Dillmann and Ceriani, and of Charles and James and Tikhonravov.

Since then, knowledge of the full extent of the corpus of the Daniel apocalypses has grown exponentially, if sporadically and not without an inordinate amount of confusion on the primary level of the identification of text and manuscript.\textsuperscript{13} Beginning with the one apoc-


\textsuperscript{13} The period from the start of the Great War of 1914 until the decade of the 1970’s saw comparatively little sustained research on apocryphal texts. Indeed, only in the last three decades has interest in the Pseudepigrapha and apocryphal texts in general reached the levels its enjoyed in the period from the mid-nineteenth century to 1914. See L. DiTommaso, “A Report on Pseudepigrapha Research since Charlesworth’s Old Testament Pseudepigrapha,” JSP 12.2 (2001), 179–207.
apocalypse that J.A. Fabricius mentioned in passing in 1722,\textsuperscript{14} scholars now find references to over a dozen apocryphal apocalypses in the valuable surveys of F. García Martínez and A.-M. Denis.\textsuperscript{15} The most recent count to date is furnished by K. Berger, who in a concise article on the subject for the third edition of the \textit{Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche} writes, “Unter diesem Namen [\textit{i.e.}, Daniel] lassen sich mindestens 16 bekannte unterschiedl. Texte des 3.–11. Jh. nC. zusammenfassen, die in arab., griech., armen., hebr., kopt., pers., altsyr., u. altkirchenslaw. Sprache erhalten sind.”\textsuperscript{16} This figure is slightly reduced from the roster of nineteen apocalypses Berger included in the “Alphabetisches Verzeichnis” which prefaces his earlier monograph on the \textit{Diegesis Danielis}.\textsuperscript{17} Given the long history of confusion and contradiction in the cataloguing of these apocalypses, it is perhaps unsurprising that his count in each instance is erroneous both in number and with respect to the identification of the apocalypses.\textsuperscript{18} The discrepancies, however, are more a function of the fractured state of the evidence than to any major error on Berger’s part.

This chapter is divided into two parts. The first part presents the roster of the full corpus of the twenty-four\textsuperscript{19} extant apocryphal Daniel apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles.\textsuperscript{20} The roster, which is

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{14} Fabricius, \textit{Codex pseudepigraphus VT}, 1140. The text is the \textit{Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel} (§2.23); the MS, Wien, ÖNB cod. iur. gr. 6, fols. 201v–202v.
\item \textsuperscript{15} For the bibliographic information, see note 21, \textit{infra}. The imprecise number is due to the fact that both authors at places allude to texts but do not discuss them.
\item \textsuperscript{16} K. Berger, “Danielapokalypsen,” \textit{LTK} \textsuperscript{3} (Freiburg, 1995), 3.12.
\item \textsuperscript{17} K. Berger, “Alphabetisches Verzeichnis der weniger bekannten im folgenden zitierten zumeist pseud-epigraphen Schriften apokalyptischen oder visionären Inhalts,” \textit{Die griechische Daniel-Dieges. Eine altkirchliche Apokalyypse. Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar} (SPB 27; Leiden, 1976), xi–xxiii. \textit{N.b.}: Subsequent references to this book: Berger, “Alphabetisches Verzeichnis” (if information in this list only is cited) or Berger, \textit{Daniel-Dieges} (if information in the rest of the monograph is cited).
\item \textsuperscript{18} Number: the text that he identifies as “No. 46, Frgm Hebr Daniel” is not a Daniel apocalypse (see note 310, \textit{infra}), while his Nos. 50, 183, 184, and 185 (“Slav Daniel” I, I, III, and IV) are not separate texts (see note 240, \textit{infra}); Identification: several of the Byzantine Greek Daniel texts are misidentified.
\item \textsuperscript{19} This number is certainly an approximation. Twenty-four apocryphal Daniel apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles are listed, but several of these are in some copies preserved under a different attribution, others are in some copies embedded in larger composition, and there are several manuscripts which could be Daniel apocalypses but which have yet to be verified by autopsy (see here the Inventory of Chapter Six, Excursus: “Notes on and Manuscripts of Unidentified Greek Daniel Apocalypses”). In addition, it is almost certain that unidentified copies of known and unknown Daniel apocalypses still remain undetected among the manuscript holdings of the world’s great libraries.
\item \textsuperscript{20} Most of these Byzantine Daniel apocalypses are apocalyptic oracles rather than
\end{itemize}
preceded by a graphic chronological overview of the Daniel apocalypses (Table I), is intended as a comprehensive supplementum and corrigendum not only to past lists and surveys of the Daniel apocalypses, notably those presented in the works of K. Berger, W. Brandes, A.-M. Denis, L. DiTommaso, F. García Martínez, J.-C. Haelewyck, F. Halkin, M. Henze, and F. Stegmüller, but also to those studies which specifically consult or address a significant proportion of the many Byzantine Greek Daniel apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles.

apocalypses proper; on the subject, see §3, infra. The manuscript copies of the Greek Praedictiones Danielis, which are frequently identified by the label “Danielis prophetae apocalypsis” or, in at least one case, the explicit title of ὀρασίς προφήτου Δανιήλ, are in fact not apocalypses but rather prognostica, and as such are discussed in Chapter Four, §4.


22 In alphabetical order: P.J. Alexander, The Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition (ed., with intro. by D. deF. Abrahamse; Berkeley/Los Angeles/London, 1965); W. Bousset, “Beiträge zur Geschichte der Eschatologie,” ἈΘ 20 (1900), 103–131, 261–290; G.S. Oegema, Zwischen Hoffnung und Gericht. Untersuchungen zur Rezeption der Apokalyptik im frühen Christentum und Judentum (WMANT 82; Neukirchen, 1999); Pertusi, Fine di Bisanzio; Rydén, “Andreas Salos”; idem, The Life of St. Andrew the Fool (AAU 4.1–2; Uppsala, 1995) [q.v. “Texts, Studies, Collections and Periodicals Quoted in Abbreviation,” 1.9–20]; and H. Schmoldt, “Die Schrift ‘Vom jungen Daniel’ und ‘Daniels letzte Vision.’ Herausgabe und Interpretation zweier apokalyptischer Texte,” (Diss: Hamburg, 1972). The term “Byzantine Greek Daniel apocalypses” or “Byzantine Daniel apocalypses” will henceforth refer to the apocalypses in the roster below which are preserved in Greek copies, plus the Armenian Seventh Vision of Daniel (§2.3) and the Slavonic Vision of the Prophet Daniel on the Emperors (§2.13), both of which may be traced ultimately to a lost Greek original. The Jewish mediaeval Daniel apocalypses are also connected to the Byzantine apocalyptic tradition, but I cannot at this point include them in the category without further study. For an overview of the Byzantine apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles, see my forthcoming study mentioned in the Preface to this volume.
The purpose of the roster is to identify and describe each text and to clarify the state of its material evidence. To this end, special attention is paid to the identification of the texts and the appropriate correlation of the manuscript evidence, as well as to the issues surrounding the date and provenance of each text and the description of its contents.23 The roster is designed to familiarize scholars with what is still relatively unfamiliar material, thereby continuing but greatly expanding on the earlier, valuable efforts to this end, especially those of García Martínez and Denis.24 Following the title of each apocalypse is a brief note in parentheses which indicates the section where the full bibliography for that text may be located in the Inventory of Chapter Six. In addition, because of the confusion regarding even the most fundamental matter of the identification of the texts, after the title of each apocalypse there is a short “identification” section, presented in a minor font, which lists the titles

23 Some apocalypses have been divided by their editors into chapters or sections and/or verses or lines; to avoid confusion the symbol § will be used wherever possible (e.g., Young Daniel §3.1). In some cases I will cite page numbers from the editions or translations of specific apocalypses without chapter or section divisions. Unedited texts and the Hebrew apocalypses The Vision of Daniel by the River Kèbar and the Nev‘ot Daniel, which are fragmentary texts from the Cairo Genizeh, are cited by folio/page and line number.

24 The words of García Martínez are apt and perfectly encapsulate the methodology behind the presentation of the roster of apocalypses in this chapter: “Pseudo-Danielic compositions are numerous and varied, but it cannot be claimed that they are generally known. It may be useful therefore to present them summarily” (“Pseudo-Danielic Literature,” 149). That such a basic familiarity with these texts is still needed cannot be questioned. For example, in the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, the highly influential collection of the Pseudepigrapha in English translation, the reader encounters only one apocryphal Daniel apocalypse, the Diegesis Danielis, a text dating from the last years of the eighth century (see G.T. Zervos, “Apocalypse of Daniel,” The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Volume 1 (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York, 1983), 755–770). The reasons why this text was chosen over all the others are never made clear, an omission made all the more acute by the fact that other Daniel apocalypses—such as the Armenian Seventh Vision of Daniel and the Syriac Vision of the Young Daniel—are unquestionably much older texts. Note also D. Olster’s more recent and insightful survey of the influence of apocalyptic texts and thought in the Byzantine Empire: “Byzantine Apocalypses,” The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism. Volume 2: Apocalypticism in Western History and Culture (ed. B. McGinn; New York, 1996), 48–73. Although Olster correctly notes that “Byzantine apocalyptic has remained for the most part understudied and under-exploited,” he discusses only one of the Byzantine Greek Daniel apocalypses, viz., the same Diegesis Danielis presented by Zervos. Similarly, although the figure of the Antichrist is a feature common to many of the apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha (Christian and Jewish), only one of them, the same Diegesis, is actually investigated for any length in B. McGinn’s seminal study, Antichrist. Two Thousand Years of the Human Fascination with Exíl (San Francisco, 1994).
and/or numerical sigla by which the major studies of the past have distinguished it.\textsuperscript{25}

The roster of apocryphal apocalypses is also meant as a vehicle by which to evaluate and augment the conclusions of the previous research in matters such as the date of composition of each text and the identification of its historical allusions. Such comments prepare the way for the thematic discussions that occupy the second part of this chapter, which is divided into several sections. One section examines the generic aspects of the apocalyptic Daniel literature. Another discusses the relationship between this literature and the vision chapters of Daniel 7–12. The chapter concludes with an investigation concerning the impact that this clarification and expansion of the material evidence of the Daniel apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles might have on the commonly-held thesis that many of them are in fact versions of or based on one early Greek apocalypse.

Despite the fact that much of this literature cannot be dated with precision, there is enough evidence to propose a very approximate relative chronology.\textsuperscript{26} The chronological arrangement of the texts diverges from the previous scholarship, which tends to organise the apocalypses on the basis of the principal language in which each is preserved in manuscript. The advantage of a chronological presentation is that the evolution, development, and historical transmission of themes is more apparent. The disadvantages are that trends occurring within a particular linguistic tradition become more occluded when the apocalypses are arranged chronologically, and that uncertainty about the date of composition for roughly half the Byzantine exemplars has forced their inclusion in a catch-all category of texts written between the seventh and tenth centuries. Yet, given that the focus of the second half of this chapter is on the Daniel apocalyptic\textit{a in toto} rather than on the texts in any one particular language, a chronological arrangement seemed an appropriate selection, despite such disadvantages.

\textsuperscript{25} The individual texts in the lists of Brandes and Henze are not specifically named, and so are not included in these minor-font “identification” sections. The information in both lists, however, is discussed in various footnotes associated with the relevant apocalypses. The individual texts in both of Ryden’s studies (see note \textsuperscript{22}, supra) are named and thus are included in the “identification” sections.

\textsuperscript{26} Since so many of the apocryphal Daniel apocalypses contain allusions to historical figures from the Byzantine Empire, at the end of the roster of apocalypses is included the reference Table II, “A List of the Byzantine Emperors, 379–1180.”
A final word of introduction: although this roster is meant to represent the latest word on the identification and understanding of the Daniel apocalyptica, in many ways it remains a prolegomenon. I have not had access to every manuscript copy of each text, nor can I read languages such as Armenian or Syriac. The Byzantine Daniel compositions represent a particularly knotty problem. Over a dozen of these apocalyptic texts are catalogued below, but perhaps as many more are known only from their entries in manuscript catalogues.\textsuperscript{27}

The textual, literary, and even chronological relationships among these Greek apocalypses is therefore tenuous, as are any conclusions regarding the relationship between them and other Byzantine apocalyptic literature, most notably the Oracles of Leo the Wise and the various recensions of the ubiquitous Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius.\textsuperscript{28}

What is ultimately required, and what is well beyond the scope of this chapter, is a critical examination by autopsy of all the manuscripts—edited, unedited, and not-yet-discovered. From there one should be able to progress beyond the basic requirement that the correct manuscripts be associated with the correct texts and toward a more complete understanding of the totality of these apocalyptic texts and the relationship among them.\textsuperscript{29} In the end, each text will require a critical edition and commentary of the quality of Berger’s

\textsuperscript{27} See the Inventory of Chapter Six, Excursus: “Notes on and Manuscripts of Unidentified Greek Daniel Apocalypses.”

\textsuperscript{28} On the date and transmission history of this Apocalypse, see §2.5, infra, on the Syriac Revelation of Daniel the Prophet. The Methodius to whom the apocalypse is falsely attributed should not be confused with the St. Methodius who with his brother St. Cyril were known as the “Apostles of the Slavs.” On Methodius and Daniel, note the 1590 Chronophraphia of the Cretan icon-painter, George Klontzas, an illustrated miscellany of visions and oracles attributed to Daniel, Methodius, and Leo the Wise (see A.D. Paliouras, ‘Ὁ ζωγράφος Γεώργιος Κλόντζας (Athínaí, 1977)), which includes copies of the Vision of Daniel on the Seven-Hilled City, the Vision of Daniel on the Island of Crete, the Vision of Daniel on the Island of Cyprus, and the Diegesis Danielis. Klontzas’ work is preserved at Venezia, BM cod. gr. VII.22; on this codex, see B. Laourdas, “Ho Markianos kódiç tou Geórgiou Klontza kai oi peri Krētês chrē-moi,” Κρητικά Χρονικά 5 (1951), 231–245; A. Rigo, Oracula Leoni. Tre manoscritti greco-veneziani degli oracoli attribuiti all’imperatore bizantino Leone il Saggio (Bodl. Baroc. 190, Marc. gr. VII.22, Marc. gr. VII.3) (Venezia, 1988). Cf. also Vereecken/Hadermann-Misguich, Les Oracles de Léon le Sage.

\textsuperscript{29} This is a topic to which I will return in future studies. It is also possible that some of this literature will be included in a proposed new collection of translations which will be assembled under the general editorship of R. Bauckham and J. Davila and whose working title is More Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.
Daniel Diegesis or Henze’s Syriac Apocalypse of Daniel. An anthology of translations of these texts—perhaps together with other important contemporary apocalypses and other texts containing apocalyptic material—would also be useful to the study of apocalyptic literature in late antiquity and the mediaeval period.

Table I: The Apocryphal Daniel Apocalypses: A Chronological Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century</th>
<th>Apocalypses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fourth century (but possibly much later)</td>
<td>§2.1 The Vision of Daniel on the Island of Cyprus (cf. the Inventory of Chapter Six, re Greek §VI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fifth century (but possibly much later)</td>
<td>§2.2 The Vision of Daniel on the Blond Race (cf. Greek §VII)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fifth/sixth century</td>
<td>§2.3 The Seventh Vision of Daniel (cf. Armenian §III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seventh century (or earlier)</td>
<td>§2.4 The Vision of the Young Daniel (cf. Syriac §II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.5 The Revelation of Daniel the Prophet in the Land of Persia and Elam (cf. Syriac §III)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seventh to tenth/eleventh centuries</td>
<td>§2.6 The Visions of Daniel and Other Holy Men (cf. Greek §VIII)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.7 The Oracle of the Prophet Daniel on Byzantium (cf. Greek §IX)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.8 The Proclamation of the Prophet Daniel (cf. Greek §X)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eighth century</td>
<td>§2.9 The Vision of Daniel on the Seven-Hilled City (cf. Greek §XI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.10 Diegesis Danielis (cf. Greek §XII)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.11 The Vision and Revelation of Daniel (cf. Greek §XIII)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenth century</td>
<td>§2.12 The Word of Daniel on the End of the World (cf. Greek §XIV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.13 The Vision of the Prophet Daniel on the Emperors (cf. Slavonic §I)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.14 The History of Daniel (Qissa-yi Dāniyāl) (cf. Persian §III)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.15 Discourses of John Chrysostom Concerning the Vision of Daniel (cf. Greek §XV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.16 The Vision of Daniel On the Last Times and the End of the World (cf. Greek §XVI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ninth/tenth century</td>
<td>§2.17 The Vision of Daniel by the River Kebar (cf. Hebrew §IV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenth century</td>
<td>§2.18 The Apocalypse of Daniel on the Events after al-Mu’tamid (cf. Arabic §III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.19 The Vision of Daniel as Related to Ezra, His Pupil (cf. Arabic §IV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The date assigned to each apocalypse in Table I and the roster that follows is the approximate date of the final form of the apocalypse, even though many apocalypses are clearly redacted texts that preserve or rework earlier material. I have not indicated dates when Greek apocalypses were translated into other languages. Note that because the date of composition for a large proportion of the Byzantine Greek apocalypses cannot be established with certainty, I have grouped them together and included them in class of texts written between the seventh and tenth centuries.
§2.2. The Vision of Daniel on the Island of Crete (cf. Greek §XVII)

§2.21 The Fourteenth Vision of Daniel (cf. Coptic §II)

The Vision of Daniel on the Island of Crete is extant in at least nine manuscript copies. In 1895 E. Klostermann published three short texts from a fifteenth- or sixteenth-century Venetian manuscript, Biblioteca Marciana codex gr. VII.3, fol. 8v. The first text is a copy of the beginning of an apocalypse that I call the Vision of Daniel on the Future of the Seven-Hilled City (see §2.9, infra). The second text is LXX Ezek 25:16–17, which is an oracle concerning Crete but which should not be confused with the Vision of Daniel on the Island of Crete (see §2.20). The last text is a copy of this Vision of Daniel on the Island of Cyprus and carries the title, Πέρι τῆς νῆσου Κύπρου τοῦ αὐτοῦ Δανιήλ, the referent apparently being the Χρησμός Δανιήλ which prefaces the title of the first text in the series.

Two years later, V.M. Istrin edited several compositions in Bodleian codex Barocci 145, one of which, at fols. 31–32, is a second copy of the Vision of Daniel on the Island of Cyprus. I have since gathered information on three further copies of this text: Palermo, Biblioteca nazionale codex I.E.8, fol. 9v; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France codex gr. 947, fol. 275r; and Biblioteca Marciana codex gr. IV.38 [olim Nanianus 260], fols. 18v–19r.

In addition to the five copies listed above, a section of the Vision of Daniel on the Island of Cyprus forms in other manuscripts part of the Oracles of Leo the Wise. Four copies are known, including the one

---

32 V.M. Istrin, “Откровение Мефодия Патарского и апокрифическая видения Даниила в библиотеке и славянословской литературе,” В. Тексты. II. Видения Даниила,” COIDRMoskva 184 (1898.1) (Moskva, 1898), 135–162 at 140–142. There has been some confusion surrounding the bibliographic details of Istrin’s work. Bousset provides a date of 1897 (“Geschichte der Eschatologie,” 287), while García Martinez cites issue numbers 191/193 (1897) of the series COIDRMoskva (“Pseudo-Danielic Literature,” 153 note 42, etc., referring ultimately to 152 note 38). Oegema, Zwischen Hoffnung und Gericht merely cites the title of the work and a simple date of publication (1897). Alexander is basically correct when he records that “the first part of this work (vol. 181) is entitled Izsladovanie (Investigation) and contains Istrin’s philological study of the texts edited in the second part (vol. 183) entitled Teksty (Texts)” (Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition, 13 note 1). But even this requires clarification. Istrin’s work is divided into two parts, as Alexander correctly remarks: A. Izsladovanie and B. Teksty. Each part is divided into two sections, however, with the first section of each part dealing with the Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius, and the second section of each part devoted to the Daniel apocalypses. There are, therefore, four sections to the work as a whole, with each section appearing in one of four consecutive issues of the series COIDRMoskva. Section A.I appears in issue 181 (1897.2), A.II in issue 182 (1897.3, but labeled—at least in the copy that I consulted—“книга первая,” a further source of confusion!), B.I in issue 183 (1897.4), and B.II in issue 184 (1898.1).

33 But not identified in H.O. Coxe, Bodleian Library, Quarto Catalogues. I: Greek Manuscripts (Oxford, 1853; Reprinted with corrections, 1969). The foliation of this copy as it is articulated by Istrin remains a problem.

34 Bouset, “Geschichte der Eschatologie,” 289, identifies the Istrin Barocci 145 text identified here as a copy of the Vision of Daniel on the Island of Cyprus as a copy instead of the Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel (§2.23). Vice-versa, Halkin, BHG and BHGN, correctly identifies three other manuscripts as copies of the Last Vision but then associates them all with Istrin’s edition of the Vision of Daniel on the Island of Cyprus. See the Inventory of Chapter Six for details.

35 See the list of the manuscripts for this text in the Inventory of Chapter Six for details.

preserved in the private “Codex Bute” at fol. 9r, edited by J. Vereecken and L. Hadermann-Misguich,37 and those at Bodleian codices Barocci 145, fol. 8538 and Barocci 170, fol. 10r,39 and Biblioteca Marciana cod. gr. VII.22, fols. 131r–133v.40 Given the way that discrete oracles were recycled within Byzantine apocalyptic circles, it is entirely possible that portions of the Vision are extant in other forms.

The Vision of Daniel on the Island of Cyprus is a very brief oracle-fragment. The subject of the text is an end-time conflict of peoples, with the invaders identified in the text as the Huns, the Scythians, the Persians, and the Assyrians.

Schmoldt tentatively suggests that the Vision might have been written in the second half of the fourth century, when the Persians and the Huns threatened the regions of the Eastern Roman Empire. If he is correct, the Vision is all that remains of what would be the oldest of the Daniel apocalyptica, which in its original form would have been composed at least a century before the Armenian Seventh Vision of Daniel. It is an intriguing theory, but because of the paucity of the text it is based on a small amount of circumstantial evidence. Allusions to hostile peoples are common in apocalyptic literature, and it is also possible that the allusion to the Huns, Scythians, Persians, and Assyrians could have been made at a later date or is simply representative of hostile nations in general. A study of the transmission history of the full corpus of the apocalyptic Daniel literature should help shed more light on the issue of the antiquity of the Vision.

2.2. The Vision of Daniel on the Blond Race (cf. Greek §VII)

Schmoldt: Unidentified Daniel B

The textual situation of this brief text is highly obscure. Schmoldt lists three copies.41 The first, which he does not identify, is partially published by Istrin under the attribution of one “Theophilos, Presbyter of Rome.”42 The other two are located in codices from monasteries

---

38 Rigo, Oracula Leonis, 32, 60.
39 Ibid., 32.
40 This is the George Klontzas codex; see note 28, supra.
42 V.I. Istrin, “Откровение Мефодия Патарского и апокрифических видений Даниила в византийской и славянорусской литературахъ. А. Исслѣдовани. II. Видѣнія
at Mount Athos: the first (codex Koutloumousion 220, fol. 201) is called the “Vision of the Prophet Daniel,” the second (codex Vatopedion 754, fol. 182) is embedded in part of the aforementioned Oracles of Leo the Wise.

A consultation of Istrin reveals more information, including the fact that the edition he publishes is located in codex 154, fol. 343v, in what he terms the “München Library.” Furthermore, Istrin asserts that the Vision of Daniel on the Blond Race is also preserved in the sixteenth-century Vatican codex Ottobonianus gr. 260, fol. 12.

As with the Vision of Daniel on the Island of Cyprus (§2.1), the Vision of Daniel on the Blond Race appears to be a fragment of a longer composition. The partial text printed by Istrin concerns the coming of the “Blond Race” against Byzantium and another race, which Schmoldt identifies as perhaps being the Western Goths, moving against Greece and the Peloponnese. On the basis of this identification, Schmoldt advances a date of circa 400 CE, shortly after the Visigoths had made their way south through modern-day Bulgaria and Macedonia and into Greece and the Peloponnese. If he is correct, then this text contains an extra-biblical, apocalyptic-style prediction on the part of Daniel concerning the end times (§§19–21) which with the Vision of Daniel on the Island of Cyprus would be one of the two oldest Daniel apocalypses. Again, though, a detailed study of the transmission history of the full corpus of Daniel apocalypses is in order before we can advance firmer conclusions as to this text’s date and provenance.

2.3. The Seventh Vision of Daniel (cf. Armenian §III)

Berger: No. 37, Armen Daniel
Denis: La Septième Vision de Daniel [see infra]
DiTommaso: The Armenian “Seventh Vision of Daniel”
García Martínez: Armenian Pseudo-Daniel
Haelewyc: No. 264, Septima uision Danielis
Oegema: ApkDan (armen)
Pertusi: La settima visione di Daniele

Danilla, COIDRMoskva 182 (1897.3) (Moskva, 1897), 253–329 at 319–320. On the arrangement of Istrin’s work, see note 32, supra.

Which I cannot locate in catalogue, but which is also mentioned by Istrin ("A. Изслѣдованіе. П. Видѣнія Даниила," 321).

See the Vision of Daniel on the Island of Cyprus (§2.1).

A search for this text has yet to yield any information.

Rydén, *Life of St. Andrew the Fool*: ApocDanArm = Apocalypse of Daniel in Armenian
Stegmüller: No. 117,4, Apocalypsis Danielis, versio armenica; No. 117,5, Apocalypsis (Visio septima) Danielis v. 1–39, translatio gallica versionis armenicae [see note 51, infra]

The *Seventh Vision of Daniel* is very likely a translation from a lost Greek apocalypse of the early Byzantine era, although the text survives only in Armenian, despite some assertions to the contrary. The Armenian title, which cannot be original, derives from the fact that the Book of Daniel is divided into six visions in some Armenian Bibles. This apocryphal vision, which is appended to the canonical Daniel in these Bibles, is thus the “seventh” vision of Daniel.

The *Armenian Seventh Vision* is extant in at least five manuscripts. The *editio princeps*, edited from three manuscripts and including a German translation, was published by G. Kalemkiar in 1892. In 1895 Macler provided a French translation, with divisions into numbered paragraphs. A year later S. Josephczantz published two versions

---

47 Although M.E. Stone remarks that “It is uncertain in which language this work was originally composed” (“The Armenian Apocryphal Literature. Translation and Creation,” *Il Caucaso: cerniera fra culture dal Mediterraneo alla Persia (secoli IV–XI)*, 20–26 aprile 1995 [Settimane di studio del Centro Italiano di studi sull’ Alto Medioevo 43; Spoleto, 1996], 611–643 at 618 note 27).
49 For anyone unable to read Armenian (as I cannot), the full range of the potential manuscript evidence is never truly within grasp. Indeed, I know from compiling my *Bibliography* the pitfalls of simply trying to list the apocryphal materials preserved in Armenian, which through the enormous efforts of scholars such as Stone have become far more accessible over the last thirty years. Stone notes that only three manuscripts are extant (“Armenian Apocryphal Literature,” 618).
50 Kalemkiar, “Die siebente Vision Daniels”: London, Lambeth Archiepiscopal Library cod. arm. 1209 (twelfth century), and Wien, Mechitaristenkongregation codd. arm. 14 and arm. 39 (fourteenth century).
of the text from different manuscripts.\textsuperscript{52} One of these was translated into English by J. Issaverdens.\textsuperscript{53} In addition to the editions and translations, numerous studies refer to this text;\textsuperscript{54} these usually concentrate on its presentation of the figure of the Antichrist.

The Armenian \textit{Seventh Vision of Daniel} is a long and detailed text. It begins (§1)\textsuperscript{55} with a vision which is shown to Daniel by the angel Gabriel in the third year of the reign of Cyrus the Persian (\textit{cf.} Dan 10:1; \textit{n.b.} also the Slavonic version of the \textit{Vision and Revelation of the Prophet Daniel} (§2.11) and the Coptic \textit{Fourteenth Vision} (§2.19)). After telling Daniel that the Messiah will be born in Israel (§2), Gabriel relates what will happen at the end of days, beginning first with an account of future history for the following regions or cities: Pontus, Phrygia, Galatia, Cappadocia Minor, Carpathia, Smyrna, Antioch, Alexandria, Egypt proper, Nicaea, Nicomedia, Carthage, Rome, and Byzantium, the last dealing clearly with Constantine the Great and his conversion to Christianity (§§2–18). Following this, the \textit{Seventh Vision} for a time narrows its focus to events in Rome and Byzantium, beginning with the notice of the third Byzantine king (§19)\textsuperscript{56} and running through several more rulers\textsuperscript{57} until the rise of Theodosius II (ruled 402–450, sole ruler from 408), who is explicitly named (§24).

The information that follows the description of the reign of Theodosius II is difficult to summarize. The Byzantine emperor Marcianus (ruled 450–457) is positively named (§25), there appears a figure

\textsuperscript{52} S. Josepheanz, \textit{Ankanon girk' Hin Kiakaranac} (Venezia, 1896), 237–250, 378–399. Because this book was published in Venezia and because Issaverdens\textsuperscript{'} translation of portions of Josepheanz (see the next note) specifically mentions that the manuscripts are from the Library of St. Lazarus in that city, one can assume that the two manuscripts in question are the Venezia manuscripts unknown to Kalemkiem (i.e., Venezia, S. Lazzaro codd. 935 (fourteenth century) and 1635 (fifteenth century)). The fact that the two texts in Josepheanz derive from two separate manuscripts is confirmed by the note of James, \textit{Apocrypha Anecdota II} (T&S 5.1; Cambridge, 1897), 165.

\textsuperscript{53} Issaverdens, \textit{Uncanonical Writings}.

\textsuperscript{54} See, most recently, Brandes, “Die apokalyptische Literatur,” 310; and Henze, \textit{Syriae Apocalypse of Daniel}, 3.

\textsuperscript{55} I employ the paragraph divisions of Macler.

\textsuperscript{56} So both Kalemkiem, “Die siebente Vision Daniels,” 230, and Macler, \textit{Les apocrapses apocryphes}. One would expect reference, however, to the “second” king, following Constantine; this is what Issaverdens, \textit{Uncanonical Writings}, 252, reports.

\textsuperscript{57} Including Theodosius I (ruled 379–395), the last emperor to rule over the entire Empire. After him, one may correctly speak of Roman and Byzantine emperors, a fact noted by the \textit{Seventh Vision} at §23: “Et d\’un sceptre sortiront deux sceptres” (trans. Macler).
identified as a wild beast, and then the “seven-hilled” city suffers
great devastation (§26). After this event, the Seventh Vision tells of
the military conflicts among diverse rulers, identified variously as the
dog, the wild beast, the dragon, the lion, the widow, the youth, the
tyran king, and even one who is called “Salamander” (§§26–34). In
this section certain proper names are also mentioned, including
“Theodosius” (§28), “Plakitas” (§30), and “Orlogios” (§31). History
comes to a climax with the appearance of an Arian king (§35), which
immediately precedes the advent of the Antichrist (§37). The rest of
the Seventh Vision details the physical characteristics of the Antichrist,
the woes that afflict humanity and the earth, the second coming of
Christ, the judgment of the righteous, and other eschatological hap-
penings (§§37–39).

The Armenian Seventh Vision is one of the earliest apocryphal Daniel
apocalypses, and was likely composed towards the end of the fifth
century or the beginning of the sixth. The few proper names that
appear in the text clearly refer to figures from that period, and even
if the majority of the allusions to historical persons and events cannot
be identified, a simple reckoning based on the number of kings
appearing in the ex eventu prophecy following the reign of Theodosius
II also confirms this date. What is more, the complete lack of ref-
ference to Justinian (ruled 527–565)—and this in an apocalypse that
seemingly focuses on the high politics and foreign policy of Byzantium
and Rome—suggests an absolute terminus ante quem for the composi-
tion of the text. As a result, and very much unlike the bulk of the

58 This could allude to a number of things, including the sack of Rome in 410
or the great fire in Constantinople in 469 (the last apud Macler, Les apocalypses apoc-
ryphes, 70 note 5). Much depends on how one identifies the “seven-hilled” city.
apocalypses apocryphes, 77, and Issaverdens, Uncanonical Writings, 258, although at 258
note 2 the latter observes that in the other Venezia manuscript the text reads
“Theodosius.”
60 Kalemkiar, “Die siebente Vision Daniels”; Oegema, Zwischen Hoffnung und Gericht,
129.
61 So P.J. Alexander, “Medieval Apocalypses as Historical Sources,” American
Historical Review 73 (1968), 997–1018 at 1002, although he does not cite his reasons
for arriving at this figure. This article was reprinted in the Variorum collection
the early date, see also Macler, Les apocalypses apocryphes.
62 Contra both Kalemkiar, “Die siebente Vision Daniels,” 113–114, and Denis,
Introduction, 1301, who date the text to the seventh century. Note also Bousset,
Antichrist Legend, 78: “The author of the Armenian Apocalypse of Daniel expected
the end to come in the time of Heraclius [ruled 610–641].”
Byzantine Greek Daniel apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles, which derive from a much later period, the Seventh Vision preserves an apocalypse that reflects a situation where the Western Empire is still important and the Arab Muslims have yet to enter upon the stage of history.

**Excursus I: History, Prophecy, and the Dating of Apocalypta**

Although the practice of dating pseudonymous apocalyptic texts by means of their *ex eventu* historical allusions is commonplace, surprisingly little has been written about the underlying methodology. One notable exception is P.J. Alexander’s influential article in the 1968 issue of *American Historical Review.*

The simplest way to go about the practice, he observes, is to date the composition of the apocalypse to a point shortly after its latest historical element, which is usually identified by the fact that it immediately precedes that shift from history to eschatology. The key to the problem is knowing where to draw the line between history and prophecy.

But on what basis can this line be drawn? Certain elements of apocalypses are clearly understood to occur in the future: the appearance of the Messiah and/or the Antichrist, the final judgment, the New Jerusalem, and so on, depending on the text and the contexts within which it was composed. Allusions to kings and queens, battles and sieges, and cities and kingdoms pose a more complicated problem. How can one decide whether the author had in mind events and figures from his historical past or whether he meant these things to be part of his prophetic canvas? Indeed, there are several elements of apocalypses which on the surface seem historical but in some contexts are clearly eschatological, such as the topos of the Last Roman Emperor or the notice of the final destruction of Babylon, Rome, or Constantinople. How then does one make a decision whether the last emperor in a series is the final emperor in the author’s memory of the historical record or an eschatological figure without historical basis?

One attempt to draw this line between history and eschatology is what may be termed the “maximalist” approach. In this case, the scholar assumes that anything which hints of history (*e.g.*, accounts of battles and wars, names of rulers and the lengths of their reigns, reports of the rise and fall of kingdoms, *etc.*) is in fact historical, that every allusion is potentially verifiable, and that if it is not actually verifiable, it is only due to the paucity of the historical record and not a product of the apocalypticist’s imagination. The point at which the review of history ends is the point by which one ought to date the apocalypse.

The difficulty with the maximalist method is that it is often too crude and prone to ignore those elements of genuine eschatological speculation that on the surface merely appear historical. One might always conclude

---

63 Alexander, “Medieval Apocalypses.”
that the Antichrist is an eschatological element, but, as Alexander correctly warns us, not every datum that deals with historical matters is a *vaticinium ex eventu*. Sometimes the notice of a specific event or figure might also be eschatological, the product of an author’s shrewd political judgment or, in dire circumstances, sheer blind hope. It would not require a singularly vivid or astute political imagination, for instance, for a Byzantine apocalypticist of the mid-fifteenth century to predict the imminent fall of Constantinople.

The “minimalist” method is more sensitive to the data. Here the scholar seeks not the latest historical element but rather the latest verifiable historical element. Using this method, even if a given apocalypse presents a review of history in which a dozen events or figures are mentioned, one would only date the text at the point where the last historical event or figure could be positively identified. This minimalist approach seems to be particularly popular with the scholars who offer dates of composition regarding the various apocryphal Daniel apocalypses, including those who understand nearly the entire “historical” section of the *Diegesis Danielis* (see infra) to be nothing more than a highly detailed eschatological exposition.

The minimalist approach has obvious advantages over the maximalist one. Its weakness is that it paradoxically seeks to evaluate the historicity of historical allusions which in themselves are inevitably cryptic and thus resistant to evaluation or, more properly, may permit several equally valid interpretations. This uncertainty, which is far more common than it is uncommon, leads to situations where various dates of composition may be proposed for a text on the basis that one allusion or another is the latest verifiable historical element and all that follows is prophecy. A good example of this phenomenon in action is the *Diegesis Danielis*, where several conflicting theories are offered on the basis of where the line between history and speculation ought to be set.

Another problem with the minimalist approach is that the historical record is itself full of gaps and self-contradictory. Therefore, not only are the data themselves cryptic (and sometimes suspect—editorial redacting and updating of the *ex eventu* data plague many apocalypses), but also the historical framework into which they are fitted is incomplete and dogged by inaccuracy and inconsistency. If texts were jigsaw puzzles and historical allusions were its pieces, half the these pieces would be blank (the missing historical record), the other half would have identical mortises and tenons.

---

64 Scholars working in the area of biblical and extra-biblical apocalyptic texts have for generations been quite familiar with dating texts on the basis of their latest verifiable historical element. For mediaevalists, however, the tendency is to ascribe the technique to Alexander, “Medieval Apocalypses.” For an example of the continuing influence of this excellent paper, see S. Bashear, “Apocalyptic and Other Materials on Early Muslim-Byzantine Wars: A Review of Arabic Sources,” *JRAS* 1.2 (1991), 173–207 at 173: “The standard criteria for using apocalypses as historical sources were established by... Alexander... [who] arrived at the conclusion that historical apocalypses are in fact ‘prophecies *ex eventu,*’ i.e. having actually already materialised around the time of their circulation.”
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(the cryptic data), and a few of them would clearly belong to another puzzle entirely (the redacted text). If the analogy is apt, one can see that the situation does not lend itself well to determining which one piece above all others ought to be identified as the key, latest verifiable historical element.

To be sure, not every apocalypse is as complicated as the one presupposed by this jigsaw analogy, and there are some texts where the minimalist approach can suggest without fuss the date of the composition of a text. A good example is the Apocalypse of Weeks of 1 Enoch, a short apocalypse that contains comparatively little detail. But a significant proportion of historical apocalypses, including the ones attributed to Daniel, contain a battalion of cryptic details that consistently confound attempts to draw the line between history and prophecy. Consider the so-called “Eagle Vision” of 4 Ezra, a redacted composition which presents a vision and interpretation (which are not identical) of an eagle festooned with heads and wings greater and lesser. The eagle is an empire and the heads and wings are its emperors (or kings), pretenders, rivals, and other figures. For a century and a half scholars have sought to date the Eagle Vision on the basis of these allusions, and it is a measure of the intractability of the problem that no less than four major categories of opinion have emerged, ranging in date from the first century BCE to the third century CE, with each category itself containing subtler variations on the major theories.

In cases such as the Eagle Vision, where the data are so numerous and cryptic as to permit more than one reasonable theory, the dividing line between history and prophecy should not be based solely on the verifiable historicity of any single allusion or on the degree to which the details in the text parallel the historical record, inasmuch as it can be reconstructed. Rather, attention should be given first to the form and scope of the full range of the allusions. Historical verification of the allusions and the claims about dates of composition based on such claims must follow from—and not proceed—an examination of the character of the allusions. More often than not there is a marked difference between the character of ex eventu reviews of history and the character of prophecies that are based on an perceptive author’s appraisal of the direction in which the political winds of his time are blowing. On the one hand, genuine historical reviews in apocalypses are considerably more detailed and cover a far greater chronological expanse; on the other hand, the statements about the future tend to be more general and do not chronologically extend too far from the author’s own time. Details such as the names of kings, the lengths of their reigns, the particulars of and participants in battles, particularly if they smack of historical content, and even if they are cryptically presented, are

---

66 The detailed battle in the Qumran War Scroll, for example, while extremely detailed and involving many named figures, presents many elements that quite clearly set it in the eschatological future.
important elements in such an evaluation. Where the character of the data changes from long-term to short-term and from delineated to vague, at this point one should draw the line between history and prophecy.

In sum, if there are simply too many of these specific details present in an apocalypse, and even if these details do not even halfway match the historical record, then it is probably wrong-headed to dismiss the lot as eschatological expectation. This is the approach that helps us cut through the Gordian Knot of the issue of the date of the Greek Diegesis Danielis and so provides an alternative to those theories that would ascribe the majority of the text’s review of history to eschatology. Of course, this approach should not be employed blindly, and one should not ignore obvious correlations between historical allusions and historical record. The role of the scholar’s intuition should not be ignored, either. As noted, the minimalist approach is best when there is no immediately apparent division between history and prophecy and when the apocalypse contains enough cryptic data so as to permit multiple theories as to the date of its composition.

The provenance of the Armenian Seventh Vision of Daniel is the East, not the West. The regions and cities which are singled out at the beginning of the apocalypse are, with the exception of Carthage and Rome, all part of the Eastern Empire. The preoccupation with the intricacies of Byzantine power politics might indicate that the apocalypse was written in or near Constantinople. The author pays special attention to Bithynia, the area on the north shore of Asia Minor immediately east of Constantinople, and to the Bithynian city of Nicomedia, forty miles east of Constantinople on the Sea of Marmara (§§2, 33). Nicomedia was in some respects the “original” capital of the Eastern Empire, the seat of the Roman Emperor Diocletian’s government in Anatolia, Syria, and Egypt, and was only eclipsed in this role when Constantine later chose to re-found the old town of Byzantium and make it, the new city bearing his name rather than Diocletian’s Nicomedia, the capital of the east. That Nicomedia is highlighted twice in the Seventh Vision is perhaps another indication that the apocalypse was composed at a relatively early date, when the memories of its once-important imperial status had yet to fade.

---

67 An examination of some of the apocalyptic reviews of history whose allusions have been for the most part identified (e.g., Daniel 8–10, 11; the Animal Apocalypse, the “Eagle Vision” of 4 Ezra) demonstrates that attention to historical detail and a concern with history that runs over many generations are hallmarks of ex eventu reviews of history, not prophecy.

The relationship between the Armenian Seventh Vision and certain other apocryphal Daniel apocalypses is not easy to elucidate precisely. Nineteenth-century scholars believed that it and a few of the Byzantine Greek apocalyptica were close enough in some cases to be considered versions of the same apocalypse. More recently, M.R. James, M.E. Stone, and Denis have made claims about the correspondence between the Seventh Vision and various other Daniel apocalypses. Denis, for example, argues (pace T. Zahn)\(^69\) that both the Armenian Seventh Vision and the Greek Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel (§2.23) are “dépendent indépendamment d’un Daniel apocryphe, peut-être judéo-rabbinique, qu'Hippolyte, selon Ébed Jesu...aurait commenté sous le nom de Jeune (plutôt que Petit) Daniel, dont il reste un fragment en syriaque.”\(^70\) The matter of the value of the testimony of Ebed-Jesu will be reserved for the next section on the Syriac Vision of the Young Daniel (§2.4), a work that several scholars have specifically identified as this “Jeune Daniel.” As for the question of Denis’ assertion of the dependence of the Armenian Seventh Vision and the Greek Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel on a lost Daniel apocryphon, and on other issues relating to the points of contact among all the Daniel apocalypses, we will resume this discussion in the last section of this chapter. What can be said, here though, is that the age of the Seventh Vision and its comparatively long and detailed text mean that, along with the Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius, it stands as a critical early source for many of the topoi that reappear consistently in the later apocalyptic literature attributed to Daniel.

2.4. The Vision of the Young Daniel (cf. Syriac §II)

Berger: No. 51, Syr Daniel
Denis: Jeune Daniel
DiTommaso: Syriac Daniel-Text
García Martínez: Syriac Pseudo-Daniel
Haelewyck: No. 260, De Domino nostro et de fine, auctore iuene Daniel
Oegema: ApkDan (syr)

The Syriac Vision of the Young Daniel is preserved in a unique, twelfth-century manuscript, British Library codex Additional 18715, fols. 239v–241r. W. Wright first identified and described the Vision in his

---

\(^{69}\) Zahn, Forschungen, 5.115–116. On James and Stone, see §5, infra.

\(^{70}\) Denis, Introduction, 1301.
1870 Catalogue.\textsuperscript{71} The editio princeps of the text, with photographs and a German translation, was included by H. Schmoldt in his important yet unpublished doctoral dissertation, which he submitted to the Evang.-Theologische Fakultät der Universität Hamburg, and which also contains texts and translations of and commentaries on several of the Byzantine Greek Daniel apocalypses.\textsuperscript{72} To date, Schmoldt’s edition remains the only public presentation of the Young Daniel.

The Young Daniel is composed almost entirely in poetical meter. The first two chapters, which are prefaced by a brief, prose, third-person introduction (1.1–4), focus on the Son of Man, his actions, and the various elements of the cult. Another prose passage (3.1–3), this time in the first person, sets the stage for the apocalyptic elements of the text in the subsequent chapters by establishing the (spurious) historical context on which its authoritative status is based. As Schmoldt translates,

\begin{quote}
(1) Und danach, als ich, Daniel, war in der Gegend Persiens und Elams in den Jahren des Königs Darius \[\textit{ergo}, after Daniel 9 but before Daniel 10–12], wurde mir offenbart vom heiligen Geist, was zukünftig sein wird in den späteren Tagen. (2) Und ich schrieb die Gesichte auf und versiegelte sie, die sein sollen für die späteren Geschlechter, damit die einsehen, die verständig sind, viel [sic] sein werden Bedrängnisse und Schrecken auf der Erde. (3) Und vollendet (ist) der Wille des Herrn.
\end{quote}

The apocalyptic sections proper contain a sequence of elements typical to the genre generally and to the apocryphal Daniel apocalypses specifically: cryptic allusions to kings and kingdoms, wars and conflicts, geological and meteorological signs and portents, and numerous instances of standard eschatological phraseology such as “in this/that time” and “on this/those day(s).” The Young Daniel ends with a description of the Antichrist and “der Sohn des Verderbens” (8.1–17).

According to Schmoldt, the Young Daniel is a composite, redacted text possessing two major components.\textsuperscript{73} The oldest portions, which are reflected in the apocalyptic sections of §§3–5 and 7–8 and represent the bulk of the text, are Jewish and may date from as early as the late first century or second century CE. Schmoldt posits that

\begin{footnotes}
\item[71] W. Wright, \textit{Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum Acquired Since the Year 1838} (London, 1870), No. XXXII, 1.19.
\item[73] \textit{Ibid.}, 106–113.
\end{footnotes}
this section may have been originally composed in Aramaic, although it is impossible to ascertain at which stage in the formation of the text it was translated into Syriac. In contrast, §§1–2 and portions of §6 are, in their present form, largely Christian and represent a slightly later addition to the text.

The issue of the date of the Young Daniel is potentially informed by several factors beyond the identification of the historical allusions of the text. The first of these external factors is the notice in Ebed-Jesu’s writings to a composition he calls the “Little Daniel” (or the “Lesser Daniel”), upon which the second-century writer Hippolytus of Rome may have commented. If it could be determined that this “Little Daniel” refers to the Syriac Young Daniel (or to the Syriac Revelation of Daniel the Prophet, §2.5, infra), this would have a profound impact on the date that one assigns to it.

The difficulty with employing Ebed-Jesu’s testimony in this regard is that it is ambiguous and allows several equally viable options. For example, as García Martínez74 tentatively suggests, the name “Little Daniel” could simply refer to Hippolytus’ well-known commentary on the Book of Daniel. Alternately, the name could be taken to refer collectively to the Greek Additions to Daniel,75 although, as J.B. Lightfoot opines, the Additions would be normally included under Daniel, and in Ebed-Jesu’s list Susanna is specifically mentioned.76 A third option is that the “Little Daniel” alludes to a portion of the biblical Book of Daniel that circulated independently, likely in translation; e.g., the Daniel narratives of Daniel 2–6, perhaps even including the Greek Additions to Daniel, or the Daniel visions of Daniel 7–12. The problem with this theory is that there is no manuscript evidence that such a book (or books) existed,77 but support might be found in the nature of Daniel apocrypha that are preserved, so many of which seem to follow either the model of the third-person Daniel legenda or that of the first-person Daniel revelatory visions. In other

---

74 García Martínez, “Pseudo-Danielic Literature,” 160.
75 So N. Bonwetsch, in a private communication with W. Bousset (reported in the latter’s Antichrist Legend, 71).
77 It is almost certain that a pre-MT collection of what would become Daniel 2–6 once existed and, indeed, formed part of the received material employed by the author/redactor of MT Daniel. But there is no evidence to suggest that this collection survived the creation of MT Daniel.
words, it is not completely impossible that someone could have been interested in only the narrative or the vision portion and so abridged the Book of Daniel to reflect this interest. Fourth, the name “Little Daniel” might refer to a composition directly dependent on the Book of Daniel: an abbreviation or paraphrase of the entire Book (as opposed to an abridged collection of either Daniel narratives or Daniel visions) or perhaps a “Daniel midrash” of the sort that L. Hartman suggests rests at the heart of the eschatological discourse in several sections of the New Testament.78 Fifth, the epithet “little” (or “lesser”) could indeed refer to our Syriac Young (i.e., “Little” or “Lesser”) Daniel. This is the cautious suggestion of Lightfoot,79 Zahn,80 and, as we have seen, Denis,81 and would require that the Young Daniel precede Hippolytus’ commentary on it, meaning a date of composition for the Young Daniel of no later than the beginning of the third century ce. The sixth option is that the reference could be to a commentary on the other Syriac Daniel apocalypse, the Revelation of Daniel the Prophet. In this case the adjective “little” might have reflected the status of the text, a “lesser” apocalypse compared to the “greater” ones in the Book of Daniel. Finally, the name “Little Daniel” might refer to an independent Syriac Daniel apocryphon other than the Young Daniel or the Revelation of Daniel the Prophet, which once was known and circulated in Syriac circles but which is no longer extant.

The fact that so many reasonable yet unprovable options present themselves confirms the fundamental worthlessness of the “Little Daniel” reference with respect to its shedding light on the question of the date of composition of either the Young Daniel or the Revelation of Daniel the Prophet. The evidentiary value of none of these options rises above the levels of speculation and circumstance, and for this reason the “Little Daniel” reference does not clarify the issue of the date of composition for either of the two Syriac Daniel apocalypses.

A second external factor that potentially informs the date of the Young Daniel follows from the delicate practice of dating portions of

81 Denis, Introduction, 1301.
the text on the basis of their eschatological expectations. The majority view follows Schmoldt in holding that the oldest sections of the Young Daniel date from the ancient rather than the mediaeval world. Schmoldt identifies the reference to the he-goat at 5.7 (cf. Dan 8:5, 8, and 21) with the era of the “good emperors” of Rome, during the period from Vespasian shortly after the destruction of the Second Temple to the end of Commodus’ reign at the close of the second century. García Martínez has no difficulty in stating that “the Jewish work (or works) on which it [i.e., the Young Daniel] is based perfectly concur with the apocalyptic writings of the first centuries,” while in a brief note offered without support, K. Berger dates the text to the fourth century. S.P. Brock is more cautious, and considers the Young Daniel to be “of completely unknown date.”

The only specifically dissenting voice is that of M. Henze, who edited the Syriac Revelation of Daniel the Prophet. He argues against the early date of Berger, noting that the parallels between the Young Daniel and the Revelation, which he dates to the first half of the seventh century, imply that “both texts derive from a similar milieu and thus were composed at approximately the same time.” Henze’s argument is suspect on several grounds, however. To begin, the issue of the consanguinity of the final forms of two texts cannot speak to the issue of the date of their original sources. Many Daniel apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles of Byzantine origin, for example, are in their present form relatively late pastiches of earlier prophetic material. Second, Henze’s argument regarding the close relationship between these two texts is suspect. As a result, his conclusion about their approximate date of composition is thrown into question. Third, despite his statement concerning the late date of the Young Daniel and the Revelation, Henze also holds that portions of the latter apocalypses might reflect first or second-century eschatological expectations. It is unclear how he reconciles these seemingly contradictory positions.

---

82 Schmoldt, “Vom jungen Daniel,” 95 (and followed in this by Oegema, Zwischen Hoffnung und Gericht, 131). Schmoldt also postulates that Young Daniel 6.1 might refer to the 70 CE destruction of Jerusalem (112).
83 García Martínez, “Pseudo-Danielic Literature,” 160.
86 Henze, Syriac Apocalypse of Daniel, 16.
87 See infra, §2.5.
At the same time, a case still can be made against an early date of the *Young Daniel*. This will be addressed in the following section, where we will discuss the relationship of this text with the Syriac *Revelation of Daniel*.

2.5. *The Revelation of Daniel the Prophet in the Land of Persia and Elam* (cf. Syriac §III)

Previously unidentified by any of the major studies before Slabczyk.

This Syriac text, which survives in its entirety, is extant in a unique, twelfth- or thirteenth-century Harvard University manuscript codex, Syr 42, fols. 117r–122v. The manuscript was first identified by J.T. Clemons and then described in more detail by M.H. Goshen-Gottstein in his 1979 catalogue of Syriac manuscripts at Harvard. In 2000 M. Slabczyk published the *editio princeps*, which was accompanied by a translation of the text, most curiously, in Esperanto. One year later M. Henze published a second edition of the text which contained an English translation, a full introduction, and an excellent and detailed commentary. By means of a linguistic analysis, Henze demonstrates that Syriac is the original language of the *Revelation* and that the text is not a translation from a lost Greek exemplar.

The Syriac *Revelation of Daniel the Prophet* is for several reasons an atypical text. Unlike the majority of the Daniel apocrypha, the *Revelation* preserves both a narrative section (§§1–12) and a vision section (§§14–40). The *Revelation* is thus identical in its basic structure to the biblical Book of Daniel. The only other Daniel apocryphon that also exhibits this dual, narrative/vision structure is the *Qissa-yi Dāniyāl*. Second, this narrative portion of the *Revelation*...
is composed in the first-person, which is so utterly unlike most other Daniel legenda, even including the narratives in the Book of Daniel 1–6 and the Greek Additions. The only exceptions to the rule are the narrative section that forms the first half of the aforementioned Qissa-yi Dāniyāl and the brief pseudo-autobiographical Prologues to certain Daniel prognostica. Finally, the Revelation is composed in both prose (the narrative sections) and in poetry (the vision section). Most of the other apocryphal Daniel apocalypses are strictly prose compositions, although the Syriac Young Daniel does contain some poetic sections and the Judaeo-Persian Dāniyāl-nāma is written wholly in poetic metre.

The vision portion of the Syriac Revelation of Daniel the Prophet is set in Persia, where Daniel is serving in the court of King Darius. In the transition §13, the reader is simply told that Daniel received many prophecies and visions while with Darius in Persia and Elam, and the general sense is that what follows in §§14–40 is meant to be read as a synthesis of this information. With the exception of the assertion in both the transition section and the final line of the text that this information was revealed to Daniel, the Revelation fails to furnish any indication that knowledge of the future has been mediated by an angelus interpres or any other figure. Indeed, after this introductory section Daniel is completely removed from the account; he is neither referred to directly, as a figure who interacts with a mediating angel, nor does he appear indirectly, telling the reader that “he saw” what is to happen or that these events “were revealed” to him.

The vision portion of the Revelation commences with the revolt of the peoples from the north, an event that precipitates the arrival of a cycle of afflictions that plague the earth and its population before the advent of the last days (§§14–20). As with the Young Daniel, most of the information in the Revelation is relatively general: the gathering of the four winds, the sun’s being blotted out, darkness covering the earth, and so on. The earth recovers for a spell at the beginning of §15, when angels walk among men, but after this comes another round of geological, social, and astronomical calamities, dur-

Syriac Revelation of Daniel the Prophet are related on the basis of these structural similarities.

95 On the information in the autobiographical section, see Chapter Two.

96 See Chapter Four, §§2,3, and 4, regarding the Sommiale Danielis, the Lunationes Danieli, and the Praedictiones Danieli, respectively.
ing which time all the iniquities of humans surface and parallel the earthly and cosmic woes. This cycle of afflictions are then succeeded by the advent of the figure of the Antichrist (§§21–24), whose origins, appearance, deeds, and death at the hands of a “reconciling angel”98 and his army of saints are related in detail. After the demise of the Antichrist, the earth and its suffering population prepare for the divine theophany (§§25–29). This is followed by the second coming of Christ (§§30–31), the building of the New Jerusalem (§33), the resurrection of the dead (§§34–36), the pilgrimage of the nations (§§37–39), and the paschal banquet of peace (§40).

Where the Syriac Revelation of Daniel the Prophet truly differs from the other apocryphal Daniel apocalypses is in its near-total lack of ex eventu historical review. It is, to use Collins’ distinction, a “historical” apocalypse without the history, since it appears to be solely concerned with eschatological events. I shall return to the issue of genre and definitions in §3, below.

The date and provenance of the Syriac Revelation of Daniel the Prophet are not immediately apparent, primarily because of this near-total lack of datable historical allusions so common to many of the other apocalyptic Daniel literature. Slabczyk, who does not appear to assign a date to the text, argues that its author was a Byzantine Greek, perhaps even from one of the Greek islands near Anatolia,99 but his evidence for this conclusion is unconvincing. He opines that references to the “inhabitants of the islands” (cf. §15) refer to the island archipelagoes of the Byzantine Empire and that the more general references to high mountains, volcanoes, many cities, and military fortifications indicate a provenance in the Eastern Mediterranean basin. If the context of these elements were an ex eventu review of history—where they likely would be associated specifically with historical figures100—then perhaps his conclusion might be more substantial.

97 This information seems to be unique and eschatological rather than repeatable and prognostic. On the differences between apocalyptic future and prognostic future, see Chapter Four, §1.

98 This figure remains unidentified. See the commentary by Henze, Syriac Apocalypse of Daniel, 95 note 150.

99 Slabczyk, Apokalipso de Daniel Profeta, 10, 12.

100 As, e.g., in an apocalypse if a particular people is foretold to suffer under or be conquered by a particular “king” or if a particular geographic event is foretold to take place in association with a specific ruler, one can subsequently match these elements with historical parallels. A good example of the latter would be the eruption of Vesuvius in 79 CE.
As it stands, however, these elements are part of a far more vague and almost completely unhistorical description of the end times and last days, where the appearance of such elements is common. What is more, it is clear that these elements are more reflective of their biblical antecedents, particularly the prophetic literature, than they are of the point of origin of the text. As a final point, the distinct lack of place names in the vision section of the Revelation of Daniel the Prophet (in marked contrast to the specifically named geographic references in the Armenian Seventh Vision, for example) renders Slabczyk’s claims difficult to evaluate.

Henze instead looks to Syria for the provenance of the Revelation of Daniel the Prophet, and here he prefers a Chalcedonian or Melchite origin rather than a Nestorian one, his contention being that the biblical Book of Revelation, which provides the basic structure for the last sections of the Syriac Revelation, held little place in eastern Syriac Christian circles. Of course, conclusions about date and provenance based on presupposed lines of transmission of themes and texts are generally open to debate, but Henze makes the most of a very limited amount of information. As for the date of the final form of the text, Henze suggests the first half of the seventh century on the basis of some of its themes and images. While not particularly substantial given the paucity of the evidence, his argument is nevertheless convincing, and is based on his evaluation of the lack of any points of contact between the Revelation of Daniel and the Syriac original of the Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius.

The Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius is a critically important text for the study of the nature and development of apocalypses and apocalyptic eschatology in general throughout the seventh to tenth centuries. Pseudo-Methodius was originally composed in Syriac, probably around the years 691 or 692 by a resident of Mount Singara, who wrote to urge monophysite Christians towards a more favourable

---

103 G.J. Reinink, “Pseudo-Methodius und die Legende vom römischen Endkaiser,” The Use and Abuse of Eschatology in the Middle Ages (ed. W. Verbeke, et al.; Leuven, 1988), 82–111. In private correspondence, M. Henze informs me that it is his opinion now that the Revelation is a product of perhaps the fourth century and that it was composed originally in a Semitic language.
view of the Byzantine Empire. The first half of the text presents a detailed exposition of world history from Adam through the world kingdoms of Daniel up to the Romans (including the Eastern Romans, i.e., the Byzantines). Following this review of history there is an equally detailed and painfully obscure account of the future, replete with all sorts of topoi and figures which time and again reappear in later apocalyptic texts, including the Daniel apocalypses.

Sometime during the eighth century the *Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius* was translated into Greek, which circulated in at least four recensions (the first of which was the most faithful to the Syriac) and enjoyed an immense and long-lived popularity throughout the Greek-speaking lands. The Latin translation of *Pseudo-Methodius* was made from the Greek, probably around the year 800, and this circulated in at least two versions. In addition, an Armenian version and at least two Slavonic versions (and an interpolated Slavonic version) are known.

Although the Syriac original of the *Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius* contains many elements that in the Greek recensions of the text would later clearly influence or in some cases be overtly reworked into several of the later Byzantine Greek Daniel apocalypses, Henze

---


105 The First Greek Recension is closest to the Syriac original. On the texts of three Greek recensions, see V.M. Istrin, Otkrivenie Mefodia Patararskogo i apokrificheskiia vidbina Daniila v vizantisskoi i slavianorskoi literaturakh. A. Izdelovanie. I. Mefoidia Patararskogo,” *COIDRMoskva* 181 (1897.2) (Moskva, 1897), 1–250; with the texts at *COIDRMoskva* 183 (1897.4) (Moskva, 1897), 5–131. Note the review of Istrin’s work by C.E. Gleye, *Byz* 9 (1900), 222–228. On the arrangement of Istrin’s work, see note 32, supra. On the text of the *Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius*, see A. Lolos, *Die Apocalypse des Ps.-Methodios* (BKPh 83; Meisenheim am Glan, 1976); idem, *Die dritte und vierte Redaktion des Ps.-Methodios* (BKPh 94; Meisenheim am Glan, 1978); and now, esp., W.J. Aerts and G.A.A. Kortekaas, *Die Apokalypse des Pseudo-Methodius. Die ältesten griechischen und lateinischen Übersetzungen* (CSCO 569–570, subsidia 97–98; Louvain, 1998).


107 Alexander, *Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition*, 61–62; see also the separate sections
argues that there are no parallels between it and the Syriac Revelation.\footnote{Henze, Syriac Apocalypse of Daniel, 12–15.} From his perspective, the terminus ante quem of the Syriac Revelation of Daniel the Prophet therefore cannot be later than the 691/2 date of the composition of the Syriac original of the Apocalypse.\footnote{The fact that Alexander dates the Syriac Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius to the period between 644 and 656 (or, less likely, 678) does not undermine Henze’s thesis (Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition, 25). But see S.P. Brock, “Syriac Sources for Seventh-Century History,” 17–36 at 34, where he observes that Alexander is misled in his dating. Brock remarks that the writer of the Syriac Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius “is clearly living in the last apocalyptic week (i.e. 685–692) [and] is writing shortly before Abdulmalik’s census of 692...” Denis, Introduction, 1295, prefers a date of 655. Martínez, who provides an outstanding summary of research to 1985, agrees in the main with Brock and the other scholars who prefer the later date, but advances it a few years to 688/689 (“Early Christian Apocalyptic,” 31). Martínez also notes that Alexander’s studies on Pseudo-Methodius, which interpreted the text from a Byzantine rather than a Syriac perspective, represented “a step backwards” (7).} Henze argues that the terminus a quo of the Revelation is suggested by the 629/630 date of composition of the Syriac Alexander Legend,\footnote{G.J. Reinink, “Die Entstehung der syrischen Alexanderlegende als politisch-religiöse Propagandaschrift für Herakleios’ Kirchenpolitik,” After Chalcedon. Studies in Theology and Church History (edd. C. Laga, et al.; OLA 18; Louvain, 1985).} which introduced the motif of the “Gates of the North” into Syriac apocalyptic literature, including the Revelation.

If the date of the final redaction of the text is settled, the matter of the date of the original version of and/or the oldest material preserved in the Syriac Revelation of Daniel the Prophet remains very much open to debate.\footnote{One issue is clear, however: the testimony of Ebed-Jesu can shed no light on the matter. The galaxy of seemingly equally defensible options for the identity of the “Little Daniel” precludes the use of this testimony in support of any one of them, including those that favour either identification with either the Young Daniel or the Revelation. See the discussion on this topic in the Syriac Young Daniel (§2.4).} Henze states that the Revelation has little in common with other apocalypses of the seventh century but bears a close resemblance in “message, language, and genre” to Jewish historical apocalypses of the Second Temple period and the early centuries CE.\footnote{Henze, Syriac Apocalypse of Daniel, 17–22; cf. 17: “Although the Syriac Apocalypse of Daniel reached its final form during the first half of the seventh century, it is shaped to a significant degree out of material that is quite older.”}

The second part of Henze’s statement is a water-colour version of the same portrait Schmoldt paints in oils for the transmission his-
tory of the *Young Daniel*. In both cases the idea is that the mediæval Syriac apocalypse in question either drew heavily from (Henze) or was actually composed in the milieu of (Schmoldt) first- and second-century CE Jewish apocalypses. Both cases run aground on the fact that there is no identifiable “ancient” type of eschatology common to Second-Temple Jewish apocalyptic literature that can operate consistently as a standard against which mediæval apocalypses may be measured, or at least not at the level at which the specific claims have been made, even though—and this is critical—there are elements of mediæval eschatology that do not seem to appear in ancient apocalypses. Topoi such as the appearance of Gog and Magog are common to many genres and periods, and it is impossible to say whether a late mediæval apocalypse that includes it drew upon the Book of Ezekiel, the *Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius*, the ninth-century Hebrew *Qissa-yi Dāniyāl*, or a late antique apocalypse no longer extant.  

To support his claim of comparable eschatologies, Henze focuses on the parallels between the Syriac *Revelation* and texts such as *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, which date from the first few centuries CE. It is true that the author of the *Revelation* drew heavily from many sources, in particular the Psalms, the biblical prophets, and the apocalyptic books, including, as Henze notes, *4 Ezra*. But Henze’s assumption that the author of the *Revelation* looked to *4 Ezra* specifically for the conception of the pre-existence of the Messiah is uncon-vincing. He claims that the pre-existence of the Messiah is expressed in various locations in *4 Ezra*, both the *Revelation* and *4 Ezra* employ the preposition for “before” as a technical term denoting pre-existence, and that both texts contain the general understanding

113 This point is conceded by Henze himself (*Syriac Apocalypse of Daniel*, 7). On the “manuscript no longer extant,” see the reference in the Talmud (*bSanh* 97b) to a scroll that was found by a Jewish soldier in the archives of Rome, circa 300 CE, which was written in the “Assyrian” (= square) script and which detailed the events of the end-time, including the wars of Gog and Magog [reported by L. Ginzberg, “Attitude of the Synagogue,” *JBL* 41–42 (1922–1923), 115–136 at 119–120].  
114 On the date of *4 Ezra*, see note 67, *supra*, and the text to which it refers.  
115 This aspect of the Syriac *Revelation* is virtually ignored by Slabczyk, but the detailed apparatus that accompanies Henze’s translation illuminates the text’s richness and does justice to the nuances of the biblical antecedents and extra-biblical parallels.  
117 And *1 Enoch*, in the context of its description of the Son of Man.  
118 But see Prov 8:22–26.
that God planned the end even before the Creation. Yet nowhere in Henze’s argument do we find a discussion of the conception of the pre-existence of the Messiah in late antique and mediaeval literature, that is, in sources perhaps more contemporary with the Syriac Revelation. What is more, the portrayal of the nature and function of the Messiah in the Revelation (§§31–32) does not rely on the information in 4 Ezra but instead draws heavily from the Book of Isaiah and the Psalms.

Henze’s other arguments are also open to debate. The conception of the transitory nature of the world, the expectation of end-time strife between nations and peoples, and the anticipation of the return of the exiles and of the revelation of the hidden things are common elements in many ancient and mediaeval apocalypses, and need not demand a thesis that the author of the Syriac Revelation drew them from 4 Ezra or similarly contemporary apocalypses specifically. The topos of the strife of the nations, for instance, appears in almost every one of the dozen or so Byzantine Greek apocalyptic writings attributed to Daniel.

To be fair, Henze’s points demonstrate that the author of the Syriac Revelation of Daniel the Prophet had a passing familiarity with some of the broad themes of ancient Jewish apocalyptic. It is doubtful, however, whether such broad thematic parallels permit Henze to conclude that the Syriac Revelation is more similar in genre to ancient Jewish apocalypses than it is to mediaeval apocalypses, particularly when this conclusion is offered without either a discussion of the generic differences between ancient and mediaeval apocalypses or, more significantly, a detailed comparison between the Syriac Revelation and the other Daniel apocalyptic.

The Revelation, for example, preserves the same sort of notices of geological and meteorological catastrophes that mark many of the other apocryphal apocalypses. There is also an emphasis in the Revelation on describing the signs and portents of the eschatological age, including the strife of the nations and the rise of various end-time figures, which again are common to many mediaeval apocalypses, including those attributed

---

119 See the fine discussion of the topic in M.E. Stone, 4 Ezra (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, 1990), 207–212.


121 Indeed, the only apocryphal Daniel apocalypse consulted by Henze appears to be the Diegesis Danielis (at 89 note 121 and 91 note 127).
to Daniel. In several places the *Revelation* reflects more of a mediaeval understanding of a theme or event than an ancient one. The lack of an *angelus interpres* is not typical to ancient Jewish apocalypses but is far more common in the mediaeval Daniel apocalypses. The comparatively developed angelology of the Syriac text connotes a late antique or mediaeval provenance. Most importantly, the *Revelation* makes use of a mediaeval Antichrist legend, including an interest in the physiognomy of the Antichrist, and the topos of the “peoples from the north.”

In sum, even if we allow for the fact that the author of the Syriac *Revelation of Daniel the Prophet* freely drew upon certain ancient biblical and extra-biblical texts, there is not much evidence to warrant the conclusion that it bears little resemblance to other early mediaeval apocalypses.

A final matter concerning Syriac *Revelation of Daniel the Prophet* is its relationship to the *Young Daniel*, the nature and extent of which could provide an insight into the issue of the date of composition of both texts. Both Slabczyk and Henze understand there to be a close connexion between the two texts. Although he does not provide supporting evidence, Slabczyk plainly considers the *Revelation* to be a “fuller recension” of the *Young Daniel*. Henze, who in every detail provides much more than Slabczyk in the way of scholarly attention to the discussion, claims that there are several points of contact between these texts: i) both are preserved in a single manuscript; ii) both were composed originally in Syriac and thus neither is a translation from the Greek; iii) biblical quotations and spelling in each text suggests that both employed the Peshitta (Syriac) Bible rather than the Greek; and iv) there are sections of the texts that show verbatim parallels.

It should be immediately clear that the first three items have no bearing on the issue of the consanguinity of the two texts. Many texts—including, for example, the Hebrew *Vision of Daniel by the River*

---

122 See the comparisons in Henze’s apparatus at notes 66, 80, 121, 125, etc.
123 Consult Table III, *infra*, for more information on this phenomenon.
125 Ibid., 91 note 127.
126 Slabczyk, *Apokalipso de Daniel Profeta*, 12, and contra Henze, *Syriac Apocalypse of Daniel*, 10 note 20, who states that Slabczyk “treats the two manuscripts in his apparatus as if they preserved the same document.”
Kebar—are preserved in a single manuscript, but this of course does not imply that all such texts are related. Second, the fact that two apocalypses are composed in the same language does not speak to issue of their relationship with each other. Following this logic, all the Greek apocalyptic attributed to Daniel must thus be similarly co-related, which they are not.\footnote{Henze does not seem to have accounted for Schmoldt’s assertion that the oldest portions of the Young Daniel might have been composed in Aramaic.} Third, the fact that both the Syriac Young Daniel and the Syriac Revelation used the Syriac Bible rather than the Greek, while an important fact in itself, is inconsequential to the relationship between the texts. Indeed, one would expect texts which were composed originally in Syriac and which make ample use of biblical passages and allusions to have employed the Syriac Bible.

Henze’s final point, which centers on parallel passages in the two Syriac texts, is not much more convincing. He identifies only one passage (Young Daniel 8.14–17 par. Revelation of Daniel §22), but even here the parallels, which are not exact, might also be explained via a dependence on Hab 1:7–9 or, more likely, on a common (Syriac?) tradition of interpretation of the Habakkuk passage. The careful reader will also observe that Henze’s excellent commentary on the text of the Syriac Revelation actually contains no references to the Young Daniel outside §22, a surprising detail indeed, given his claim of a close correspondence between the two texts.

Finally, there are two positive arguments against such a close correspondence. Whereas the form of the text of the Young Daniel is, like the bulk of the Daniel apocrypha, essentially a first-person vision-text (with a brief, interpolated Christian section preceding it), the Syriac Revelation of Daniel is one of only two Daniel apocrypha that preserve the unusual structure of a third-person narrative part and a first-person vision part. Second, even a cursory survey of the contents of the vision portions of both texts demonstrates that they are different texts. Given these points and the problems with Henze’s argument, there is simply nothing that would permit his bold conclusion that “the two texts preserve variant accounts of the same apocalypse.”\footnote{Henze, Syriac Apocalypse of Daniel, 11.}

My feeling is that these two Syriac Daniel apocrypha are fundamentally unrelated and that any points of contact are a result of
shared traditions or an independent dependence on sources. A Second
Temple date for all or parts of either apocalypse seems too far-
fetched, although admittedly more work is required on the subject
of the transmission of Second-Temple eschatological themes through
late antiquity and the mediaeval period. If Henze is correct in his
date of the final redaction of the text, perhaps the earliest sections
of Syriac Revelation of Daniel the Prophet date to the fifth or sixth cen-
turies. But this is speculative.

2.6. The Visions of Daniel and Other Holy Men (cf. Greek §VIII)

García Martínez: The Visions of Daniel and other Holy Men
Schmoldt: Unidentified Daniel C

The history of the understanding of this composition’s textual situ-
atation is complicated and confusing. In 1897 Istrin published some
Greek material under the title Ἐκ τὸν ὀράσεων τοῦ ἁγίου προφήτου
Δανίηλ καὶ ἐκ διαφόρων ἁγίων ἀνδρῶν. According to Istrin, this
material survives in three manuscripts: Bodleian codex Barocci 145,
fols. 43–52, in the same codex again at fols. 70 to 79, and Bodleian
codex Laud 27, foliation unspecified.

Schmoldt briefly mentions the Greek material printed by Istrin
but calls it “a short text.” García Martínez also refers to a “com-
position...published by Istrin, which deals with ‘The visions of
Daniel and other holy men’.” Neither Schmoldt nor García Martínez
address the issue of the manuscript evidence.

The problem with this understanding of the text, however, is that
Istrin only printed select portions from codex Barocci 145, fols.
70r–79r. As L. Pertusi demonstrates, these folio pages are in
reality a two-part composition which is also extant in a three-part
version in codex Laud. 27. What is more, the Laudian codex actually

131 Ibid., 318. In itself, the Russian is somewhat unclear as to whether three sep-
arate Daniel texts are meant, or whether these texts are three copies of the same
text. I assume the latter, however, on the basis of Pertusi’s edition (see infra), which
demonstrates that the second Barocci and the Laudian references cited by Istrin
are indeed copies.
133 García Martínez, “Pseudo-Danielic Literature.” 156.
134 This information is not apparent from a study of Istrin’s work alone, however.
135 Pertusi, Fine di Bisanzio, 171.
preserves two copies of this composition (fols. 25v–46v, *bis* fols. 60r–65r), the first copy being older and much longer. The title in both manuscript codices is ‘Εκ τῶν ὀράσεων τοῦ ἀγίου προφήτου Δανιήλ καὶ έκ διαφόρων ἀγίων ἀνδρῶν, and for this reason I will continue to use the title the *Visions of Daniel and Other Holy Men*.

The first part of the composition (Laud 27 fol. 25v, *bis* 60r; par. Barocci 145 fol. 70r) is a very short document that begins, ‘Ἀναστήσεται μετράκιον ὁ σφός κόνωπος.’... This was printed by Istrin, presumably from the Barocci 145 copy. The second part, a variant of the *Oracle of Leo the Wise*, is found in Laudian codex at fols. 25r–26r and again at 60v, but seemingly not in the Barocci codex. The third and major part of this composition has been critically edited by Pertusi, who calls it *La profezia pseudo-danielica dei codd. Laud. gr. 27 e Barocc. gr. 145 della Bodleiana di Oxford*. The text itself bears the long title, Παρεκβολαῖον σύν Θεῷ ἁγιῷ ἐκ τῶν ὀράσεων τοῦ ἀγίου προφήτου Δανιήλ καὶ ἐκ διαφόρων ἁγίων ἀνδρῶν ὁν ὁ βασιλεὺς φιλοσοφῶτατος Λέων συνήξε, ἔκτισε ἕσθενεν ... This was printed by Pertusi, *Fine di Bisanzio*, 73, who notes that it is mirrored in lines 67–72 of Venezia, BM cod. ital. XI.124, fols. 78r–79v (full text: Pertusi at 70–74), copied 1503 from a MS dated 1430.

The *Visions of Daniel and Other Holy Men* resembles more a long, unconnected series or collection of apocalyptic oracles than it does anything else. The short portions of the text published by Istrin are accurately described by Schmoldt: “Hier wird ein Ἰουνγλίνγκ ἀπὸ Λιβυῆς...”

---

136 This composition is in codex Laud 27 preceded in both instances by a *Prophecy of Constantine the Great* (fols. 24r–25v, *bis* 58r–59v), which is printed by Pertusi, *Fine di Bisanzio*, 54–56. On the copies preserved at Laud 27, see also Vereecken/Hadermann-Misguich, *Les Oracles de Léon le Sage*.

137 Printed also by Pertusi, *Fine di Bisanzio*, 73, who notes that it is mirrored in lines 67–72 of Venezia, BM cod. ital. XI.124, fols. 78r–79v (full text: Pertusi at 70–74), copied 1503 from a MS dated 1430.

mit dem blonden Geschlecht’ er wähnt, der die Siebenhügelige erober. Dann kommen ‘drei Drachen’ und ein ‘schöner König’.” From the information Pertusi includes in the apparatus to his critical edition of the full text, however, many minor passages are mirrored in some of the Byzantine apocalyptic material, including a number attributed to Daniel, plus several Greek versions of the ubiquitous *Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius*. The issue is the degree to which the *Visions of Daniel and Other Holy Men* should be considered an original composition or a redacted pastiche of older, recycled apocalyptic oracles. But this is also true of many of the Byzantine Daniel texts.

2.7. The Oracle of the Prophet Daniel on Byzantium (cf. Greek §IX)

García Martínez: The oracle of the Prophet Daniel on Byzantium
Halkin: No. 1875a [see note 142, infra]
Schmoldt: Unidentified Daniel D

This text remains unedited. It survives in one manuscript, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek codex Suppl. gr. 172, fols. 38v–39r (sixteenth century), and bears the long title Χρησμὸς Δανιήλ τοῦ προφήτου περὶ τῆς Βυζαντίδος, καὶ σημείωσι πρὸ τοῦ κτισθῆναι ὑπὸ Κωνσταντίνου μᾶλλον εἰπεῖν καὶ τοῦ Βυζᾶ. H. Hunger and C. Hannick, who describe the text in catalogue, consider it a copy of the *Vision of Daniel on the Future of the Seven-Hilled City*, likely on the basis of its

---

139 There are several elements which frequently appear in other apocryphal Daniel apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles: the “Blond race,” the focus on political oracles dealing with nations and cities, and the “seven-hilled” city. One also wonders whether the “drei Drachen” and the “schöner König” (so Schmoldt) are reflected in the figures of the three emperors and of the Good Emperor who rules for thirty-two years in the Greek Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel (and cf. the thirty years of the Greek Vision of Daniel on the Future of the Seven-Hilled City), the Greek Vision of Daniel on the Last Times and the End of the World, and the Slavonic Vision of the Prophet Daniel on the Emperors. In addition, the formula of the attack of the “Blond race” preceding the appearance of a Good Emperor who reigns for thirty-two years is paralleled in several texts, including Greek Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel and the Slavonic Vision of the Prophet Daniel on the Emperors.

140 On the value of Pertusi’s edition to future scholarship on the apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha, see §5.


142 *Ibid.* The manuscript is identified by Halkin, *BHGN*, as no. 1875a, implying that he agrees with Hunger and Hannick that it is a copy of the text we call the *Vision of Daniel on Future of the Seven-Hilled City* (*BHGN* 3 and *BHGN* no. 1875).
incipit of woe against the seven-hilled city. Schmoldt, however, understands it to be a separate text. 143 In this he is followed by Pertusi.144

As with several of the other Byzantine apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles, the Oracle of the Prophet Daniel on Byzantium is concerned with the advance of the “Blond Race,” which comes from the east. It is at this stage impossible to determine the date or specific provenance of the text, although it clearly stems from the same milieu which produced so many of the other Byzantine apocalyptic texts.

2.8. The Proclamation of the Prophet Daniel (cf. Greek §X)

Previously unidentified by any of the major studies.

This brief text is extant in one, sixteenth-century copy at Biblioteca Marciana codex gr. IV.38 [olim Nanianus 260], fols. 34r–35v. The title of the text is Κηρυξὶς τοῦ προφήτου Δανιῆλ καὶ ὀράσις περὶ τῶν χρησμῶν μεᾶλιοντος καρποῦ τῶν ἐπτὰ αἰῶνον. The text has been edited by S.P. Lambros.145

The text is a series of prophetic proclamations, in poetry and in prose, which are directed against various nations and regions. The focus of the first section appears to be Greece and the Peloponnese (cf. the Vision of Daniel on the Blond Race). Unlike many of the Byzantine apocalyptic literature attributed to Daniel, the Proclamation of the Prophet Daniel does not seem to contain sections of text that are paralleled by other apocalypses or apocalyptic oracles. This text requires more study.

2.9. The Vision of Daniel on the Future of the Seven-Hilled City (cf. Greek §XI)

Berger: No. 49, Gr. Daniel II; No. 43, Gr. Daniel V [see infra]
DiTommaso: Vision of the Monk Daniel on the “Seven Hills”
García Martínez: The Monk Daniel on the “Seven Hills” and on the Islands and Their Future
Haelewycx: No. 256, Visio monachi Danielis de septem colibus et de insulis (grece)
Halkin: No. 1875146

144 Pertusi, Fine di Bisanzio, 53.
146 Cited also by Pertusi, Fine di Bisanzio, 39, but see note 220, infra, re codd. 2187 and 128.
Oegema: 2 ApkDan (gr); 5 ApkDan (gr) [see infra]
Pertusi: (Profezia) del monaco Daniele sulla Heptalophos e sulle isole, quale sarà il loro futuro
Schmoldt: MD: Vom Mönch Daniel über die Siebenschügeligen

The manuscript and textual situations of the Vision of Daniel on the Future of the Seven-Hilled City is in flux. Klostermann edited the beginning of an apocalyptic text that bears the detailed title, Χρησμός Δανιήλ α’ περί τῆς ἐπταλόφου καὶ περί τῆς νήσου Κρήτης καὶ ἑτέρων καὶ τί ἔστι τὸ μέλλον ἐξῆς αὐτῶν. As I recounted in the section on the Vision of Daniel on the Island of Cyprus (§2.1, supra), this is the first of three texts that Klostermann edited from the Biblioteca Marciana codex gr. VII.3, fol. 8. Similarly noted was the fact that two years later Istrin edited several texts which are preserved in the Bodleian Library codex Barocci 145. There appears to be no question that the second of these texts, which occupies fols. 47v–50r and preserves the title Δανιήλ μοναχός περί τῆς ἐπταλόφου καὶ περί τῶν νήσων τι ἔστι τὸ μέλλον αὐτῶν, is a much longer version of the first text that Klostermann edited. This correlation is confirmed by Schmoldt, who presents a critical edition of the text based on the editions of both Klostermann and Istrin. According to Schmoldt’s division of the text into two chapters, the Klostermann (Marcian) text essentially parallels the first chapter of the Istrin (Bodleian) text.

Berger understands the textual situation differently. He considers both of the Istrin Barocci 145 texts to be copies of the same Daniel apocalypse, which he terms “Gr Daniel II.” As for the first and the

---

147 But not as much in flux as is suggested by the list of editions of the texts in Henze, Syriac Apocalypse of Daniel, 4. Henze lists several different Greek apocalypses (and several different editions of these apocalypses), but there is no attempt to distinguish among them or to indicate that there might be copies of the same apocalypse among the editions.

148 Klostermann, Analecta zur Septuaginta, 121. See note 31, supra, and the text to which the note refers.

149 Istrin, “Β. Τεκστο. II. Βιβλιαία Δανιίλα,” 135–162 at 140–142 (first text) and 143–144 (second text). Following the information presented in BHG, the conflation of the editions of both Klostermann and Istrin is identified in Halkin, BHG, as no. 1875, although he does not identify specific manuscripts. Halkin, BHG, identifies this edition as no. 1873 (following BHG).

150 And so noted by García Martínez, “Pseudo-Danielic Literature,” 154 note 44, and Haelewyck, Clavis apocryphorum VT, 207.

third Klostermann Marcian texts, he considers these to be texts separate from each other but also unrelated to the Istrin texts, and he labels these “Gr Daniel V” and “Gr Daniel VI” respectively. In effect, Berger identifies three separate apocalypses out of these four texts, with the two Istrin texts copies of the same document. In this schema Berger is followed by Oegema.152

To my mind, however, Schmoldt’s edition of the Vision of Daniel on the Future of the Seven-Hilled City clearly demonstrates that Klostermann’s first text and Istrin’s second are copies of the same document. Thus Berger’s “Gr Daniel V” must be the same as at least one of the Istrin texts that constitute his “Gr Daniel II.” Moreover, although I believe they are related in some fashion, even a cursory reading of Klostermann’s first and third texts indicates that they are not copies of the same document. If we admit that Klostermann’s third text and Istrin’s first are copies of the same document,153 it must follow that Istrin’s two texts cannot be copies of the same document, as Berger suggests they are.154

There are perhaps as many as eight or nine additional manuscript copies of the Vision of Daniel on the Future of the Seven-Hilled City, or at least of texts that preserve versions of this title and its incipit. These copies are unnoticed by Schmoldt (and, by implication, Berger) but have been gleaned from my study of catalogues and other sources. This tally includes: a Dresden copy;155 a second Biblioteca Marciana copy at codex gr. VII. 22, fol. 86;156 a second copy in the Bodleian codex Barocci 145 (this at fols. 94v–96r);157 a copy in the Bodleian codex Laud. 27, fols. 68v–71v;158 and two copies each from the Bibliothèque Nationale de France and the Mount Athos monasteries.159

---

152 Oegema, Zwischen Hoffnung und Gericht, 130 note 95.
153 Viz., the Vision of Daniel on the Island of Cyprus (§2.1).
154 If $a = d$ and $b = c$ but $a \neq b$, then $c \neq d$.
155 Öffentliche Bibliothek cod. Da 53, fol. 6; see F. Schnorr von Carolsfeld, Katalog der Handschriften der königl. öffentlichen Bibliothek zu Dresden. 1: Enthaltend die Abtheilungen A-D und F-H (Leipzig, 1882). As with all Dresden manuscripts, it is unclear whether this one survived the bombing of the city during the Second World War.
157 Coxe, Quarto Catalogues I, col. 248.
158 Ibid., col. 509.
159 Paris, BNF cod. supp. gr. 82, fols 9v–12v and 55v–57v; see F. Halkin, Manuscrits grecs de Paris. Inventaire hagiographique (SubH 44; Bruxelles, 1968), 282. Mount Athos: Monastery of Xiropotamos cod. 248 [Lambros no. 2581], fols. 530r–532v, and Monastery of Iveron cod. 181 [Lambros no. 4301], fols. 60r–63r; see S.P. Lambros
It is possible that the composition preserved in the Palermo codex, identified with the *Vision of Daniel on the Island of Cyprus* (§2.1), might instead be a copy of the *Seven-Hilled City*.

The *Vision of Daniel on the Future of the Seven-Hilled City* is a relatively brief text that opens with a word of woe to the “seven-hilled city,” that is, Constantinople (§1.1). This word of woe is typical to several of the Byzantine Daniel apocalypses, which at first blush seem generically more akin to a loose series of oracular pronouncements than to an apocalypse proper. This is an illusion, however: these Byzantine texts are apocalyptic.

The sequence of the text after the word of woe is not always easy to follow. Schmoldt divides the text into two chapters, the break seemingly placed at the dividing line between *ex eventu* historical review and eschatological anticipation. The major conflict takes place between the Byzantines and the Ishmaelites (i.e., the Arab Muslims; §1.20, 22–23), which, in the eschatological era, becomes a struggle between Christians and Ishmaelites (§2.13–22). Certain images typical to Byzantine apocalypses appear in the second chapter, including the legend of the strong emperor (who in this text appears to reign for thirty years) and the appearance of the Antichrist.

The *Vision of Daniel on the Future of the Seven-Hilled City* is related to the *Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel*, a text with which this apocalypse shares some elements. Perhaps the most important of these points of contact is a parallel series of *ex eventu* happenings that appears in the second (eschatological) chapter of the *Seven-Hilled City* and in §§55–65 of the *Last Vision*.

Berger dates the text to the eighth century but offers no support for this claim. The references to the Ishmaelites indicate a date later than the seventh century. The *Seven-Hilled City* mentions a specific year, 6981, in which the Ishmaelites are expelled from the seven-

---

[160] It sometimes appears in the *incipit* of an apocalypse (see the Inventory of Chapter Six for examples) but also can occur within the body of the composition itself. The city of Constantinople is not the only subject for the word of woe, either.

[161] The issue of genre is addressed in §3, *infra*.


hilled city, an event that is apparently followed by the launching of a great fleet by the Byzantines. One might tentatively advance an eighth- or ninth-century date. Again, though, this apocalypse requires much more detailed study at the level of the text and its interpretation.

2.10. Diegesis Danielis (cf. Greek §XII)

Berger: No. 38, Gr. Daniel-Dieges (Dn.-D.)
DiTommaso: Greek Apocalypse (or Narrative) of Daniel (Diegesis Danielis)
García Martínez: Daniel-Dieges
Haelewyck: No. 253, Apocalypsis Danielis graecae (Diegesis Danielis) [but see note 211, infra]
Halkin: No. 2036d
Oegema: Daniel-Dieges
Rydén, Life of St. Andrew the Fool: ApocDan = Apocalypse of Daniel

Often referred to by the more general appellation of the Greek Apocalypse of Daniel, the Diegesis Danielis is extant in two manuscripts, each of which preserves a different title. One copy of the text, which is part of Oxford University’s Bodleian Library codex Canonicianus 19 (fifteenth century) and which was first published by Istrin in 1898, is attributed to Methodius. It is inscribed Τοῦ ἐν ἀγίοις πατρός ἡμῶν Μεθοδίου ἐπισκόπου λόγος περὶ τῶν ἐσχάτου ἡμερῶν καὶ περὶ τοῦ Ἀντιχρίστου. Another copy, which preserves structurally the same text as the Bodleian manuscript but which differs in multiple minor details, is located in the fifteenth or sixteenth century codex 405 of Montpellier’s Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Médecine and is titled the Διηγήσεις περὶ τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ Ἀντιχρίστου τὸ μόνο μέλλει γενέσθαι

---

165 Perhaps this is a reference to the lifting of a siege. Cf. the Diegesis Danielis (§2.10) for a possible parallel.
166 As it is by Olster, “Byzantine Apocalypses,” 64–67, and Zervos, “Apocalypse of Daniel.”
168 Halkin, BHG (qv. “Apocalypse Methodius”), identifies this copy as no. 2036d (cf. BHGN no. 2036d).
169 Apart from these minor details, the divergent passages between the two manuscripts are located at 5.1–2; 8.1–2; 11.1–2, 27; and 12.9. Unless otherwise noted, I employ the chapter divisions of Berger, Daniel-Diegesis, rather than of Zervos, “Apocalypse of Daniel.”
In 1895 Macler published a partial translation in French of the Montpellier manuscript.\textsuperscript{170} A critical edition of the text, based on both manuscripts and with a German translation and an extended commentary, was published by Berger in his exemplary 1976 monograph.\textsuperscript{171} A synthetic English translation of the \textit{Diegesis Danielis}, based on a new examination of the Bodleian manuscript, was composed by G.T. Zervos and included as part of J.H. Charlesworth’s two-volume \textit{Old Testament Pseudepigrapha}.\textsuperscript{172}

Both Berger and Zervos assert that the \textit{Diegesis Danielis} is also preserved in a partial version in a third manuscript copy, which is bound in the important Biblioteca Marciana (Venezia) codex gr. VII.22. This copy is the only one which attributes the text to Daniel.\textsuperscript{173} Berger, who in his book presents the text of the Venezia copy as a separate edition, assigns the three manuscripts the sigla B, M, and V.\textsuperscript{174}

Upon further examination, however, it appears that the Venezia copy, while clearly related to the \textit{Diegesis Danielis}, is not precisely a partial copy of the text preserved in the B and M manuscripts. Instead, it appears to be a copy of another apocalypse, the \textit{Vision and Revelation of the Prophet Daniel} (§2.11), a slightly longer version of which is also extant in at least one Slavonic manuscript. Because of the traditional attribution to the figure of Daniel and the obvious relationship between the Venezia text and the text extant in the B and M manuscripts, I have decided to retain the title \textit{Diegesis Danielis}. What follows, however, is a description and evaluation of the \textit{Diegesis} based solely on the content of the B and M manuscripts.\textsuperscript{175}

The \textit{Diegesis Danielis} opens virtually without preamble\textsuperscript{176} and also without mentioning Daniel or when and where the revelation actually takes place. In fact, the entire text is nothing more than an unmediated \textit{ex eventu} recitation of what will come to pass. The first four

\textsuperscript{170} Macler, \textit{Les apocalypses apocryphes}, 108–110.
\textsuperscript{172} Zervos, “Apocalypse of Daniel.”
\textsuperscript{173} ἰηνήλ ὀρασις πρωτη, ὀρασις και ἀποκάλυψις ἰηνηλ του προφητου.
\textsuperscript{174} In his review of the book, Stone notes that an unexplained siglum, T, sometimes appears (\textit{JBL} 98 (1977), 609–610 at 609). It is unclear to which manuscript(s) this siglum refers.
\textsuperscript{175} In actuality, this is \textit{de facto} true also of Berger and Zervos, whose text and commentary (Berger), translation (Zervos), and evaluation of the \textit{Diegesis} (both) is based almost exclusively upon the contents of the B and M manuscripts.
\textsuperscript{176} As Berger comments, “Der Anfang ist für Apokalypsen singulär.” (\textit{Daniel-Diegese}, 43).
chapters are concerned primarily with the three sons of Hagar, called Ouales, Axiaphar, and Morphosar (§1.4),177 whose people are collectively known as Ishmael (§§2.1 and 3.4) and who disperse swiftly across the lands of the Romans (i.e., the Byzantine Empire),178 attacking various provinces and cities and spreading general ruin and destruction. They make life difficult for Christians and for Christian worship and go so far to as to attack the “seven-hilled city” (§4.5: ἐπταλόφος, in this case, clearly Constantinople), whose inhabitants, devoid of courage, will flee the city.179 Manuscript B ends the section with words of woe and despair as to whether anything can be done to alter this dire situation (§4.9).

The tide turns for the hapless Romans in the fifth chapter. God hears their prayers and sets his fury upon the sons of Hagar and the people of Ishmael (§5.4). He raises up a new king of the Romans, a man with a name beginning either with the letter κ (M) or the letter η (B), who had been reserved for this purpose in Persia and Syria and whom everyone thought was long since dead (§5.6–7). The king, with his two small boys (§5.13) gathers together a mighty army, which then meets and slaughters the Ishmaelites and the sons of Hagar. The carnage is so great, the reader is told, that the sea runs crimson and the streets of the seven-hilled city are awash with blood. The king himself pursues a thousand men but the two lads ten thousand, thus fulfilling the prophetic query of Deut 32:30, “πῶς διώξεται ὁ εἷς χιλίως καὶ οἱ δύο μετακινήσουσιν μυριάδας εἰ μή ὁ θεὸς ἀπωσάτο αὐτούς καὶ ὁ κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτούς” (§6.8).180

177 On these three sons, see note 272, infra.
178 The Byzantines consistently referred to themselves as Romaioi, or Romans. This appellation is encountered time and again in the Byzantine Greek Daniel apocalypses.
179 See Mango, “St. Andrew the Fool,” 311–312, for an evaluation of the points of contact between the account of the Arab invasion in the Diegesis and the historical record. The so-called “Andreas Salos Apocalypse” (so Rydén), which occupies ll. 3805–4364 of the Life of St. Andrew the Fool, certainly articulates some of its eschatological expectations in a fashion similar to several of the apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha, including the Diegesis. See Rydén, “Andreas Salos” and, idem, with the critical edition: The Life of St. Andrew the Fool (see note 22, infra). Following Mango and Rydén, I have highlighted several of these points of contact, but have not attempted to trace their transmission history through the various Byzantine-era Greek texts.
180 LXX: πῶς διώξεται ὁ εἷς χιλίως/καὶ οἱ δύο μετακινήσουσιν μυριάδας/εἰ μή ὁ θεὸς ἀπέδωκεν αὐτούς/καὶ ὁ κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτούς. R. Hoyland notes that the passage appears also in the First Greek Redaction of the Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius, although there is unconnected to specific figures (Seeing Islam as Others Saw It: A Survey and Evaluation of Christian, Jewish and Zoroastrian Writings on Early Islam [Studies
The apocryphal Daniel apocalypses

Follow the defeat and subjugation of the Ishmaelites, the king and his two lads will rebuild the empire, restoring peace and the Christian faith, and the land will be inhabited and fruitful (§6.9–20, 21–24). Zervos reads manuscript B as recording that the king will live for thirty-six years, but this information is missing in Berger’s edition of the text or its apparatus. Manuscript M inserts at §6.22 the note that the king will be called by the name of a wild beast. For their part, the two lads are said to reign for thirty-three years (§6.25).

After this happy period, the empire is again subject to woe and worry. A new king from the north brings iniquities upon the people and the church (§7.1–6). He is succeeded by either a foul and foreign woman (B) or a foreign man (M), one or the other of whom is said to reign over the seven-hilled city (§8.1–2). This event precipitates a fresh series of calamities: the incursion of the nations, slaughter, disturbances, and the destruction of churches (§9.1–7). The culmination is the destruction of Constantinople. The passage ends with the cryptic note that the kingdom passes from Byzantium to Rome (§9.8).

After this event, the reader is told that a new sceptre arises in Judaea, whose name is Dan, the king of the Jews, who have since gathered in Jerusalem and who now begin to persecute the Christians and (M only) oppress the Romans (§10.1–7). Then the Antichrist appears during the reign of Dan. He was conceived in human form of a virgin girl who bought a fish that had been inculcated with the presence of the Antichrist (§11.1–19). His appearance is strange and fearsome. He is ten cubits tall, with, among other things, long hair, bright eyes, and abnormally long appendages (§11.20–26), and, upon his forehead, he bears a mark: the letters α τ χ (M) or

---

182 These figures may be related to the figure of thirty-two years that in several other Daniel apocalypses is the period in which a good Emperor will rule. See note 435, infra.
At the time of the appearance of the Antichrist, the world is bountiful in seed, vine, and olive (§11.29–37). But when the Jews make the Antichrist their king, the bounty vanishes, disease spreads, demons plague good Christians everywhere, what was once fruitful and verdant becomes barren and desolate, and the Jews exult in their domination of the Christians (§12.1–25). Then the Jews go even farther, proclaiming this Antichrist as the true Christ, but a supposed miracle suddenly backfires when a stone transmogrifies into a dragon instead of transforming into a loaf of bread, and the dragon shames the Antichrist before his subjects (§13.1–14). Three men then appear, two of whom are from heaven, who urge long-suffering Christians not to believe that the Antichrist is the true Christ; but these three the Antichrist kills. The Diegesis ends with the Antichrist still reigning and the Jews still persecuting but with the note that the day of wrath and judgment is near, when all will be set right (§14.1–15).

The text represented by Bodleian and Montpellier versions of the Diegesis Danielis is unquestionably a redacted document, but the nature and date of its constituent sources are unclear. The obvious break occurs between chapters 9 and 10, separating what Berger calls the historical portion of the text from the eschatological part. Generally speaking, the presence in any given text of a simple division between an ex eventu review of history and a list of eschatological expectations that follows is by no means enough to warrant the conclusion that the text is an amalgamation. Indeed, one need only argue that the authors of such apocalypses had in mind the similar pattern already established by the Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius or even by the biblical Book of Daniel itself.

In the case of the Diegesis, however, the break is so sharp that one cannot help but posit a separate source for each of the constituent parts. The historical record of chapters 1–9, for example, ends on a sour note, with the world, having experienced prosperity under

---

184 Or χριστός (manuscript V = the Vision and Revelation of the Prophet Daniel (§2.11)). On the subject of the descriptions of the Antichrist in the ancient and mediaeval literature, see the superb overview by Berger, Daniel-Diegese, 115–118 (with the pullout chart).
185 Very probably Enoch and Elijah, a common motif, with the third man, from earth, the evangelist John; on these figures and the tradition, see Bousset, Antichrist Legend, 203–211.
187 The individual visions recorded in Daniel 7–12 are good cases in point.
the reign of the great emperor and his two lads, now groaning under the woes precipitated by the rule of either the foreign man or the foul and foreign woman. But chapter 11 assures the reader that, prior to the advent of the Antichrist, the world was a happy and bountiful place. The nature of the enemy in the Diegesis also supports Berger’s thesis. The enemies of peace, bounty, Christians, and Christian worship in chapters 1–9 are the Ishmaelites and the sons of Hagar, but they do not appear at all in chapters 10–14. Instead, in these last five chapters the enemy is now the Jewish people, who are not mentioned prior to chapter 10. That the object of the Jewish enmity is also peace, bounty, Christians, and Christian worship suggests that the two sources of the Diegesis have been redacted, woven together by a theological thread. The issue of multiple sources is also informed by existence of the obviously related Vision and Revelation of the Prophet Daniel (§2.11).

Berger’s conclusion that chapters 1–9 preserve an ex eventu historical record which was prefixed to an older eschatological section implies that the transition from history to prophecy occurs after the note in the text that the kingdom will pass from Byzantium to Rome (9.8). Leaving aside for the moment the issue of the date of the eschatological section, let us fill in the sparse historical record as he and Zervos, who generally follows Berger in these matters, reconstruct it. The strong emperor is identified as Leo III (ruled 717–741), whose name is indeed that of a wild beast (manuscript M only) and whose baptismal name was Konon, i.e., in step with manuscript M’s information that his name began with the letter kappa.188 The wicked ruler from the north is Constantine V (co-ruler with his father Leo III 72–741, sole ruler 741–775). The foul and foreign woman is the empress Irene (ruled 780–790, 792–802)189 and the passing of the kingdom to Rome represents the coronation of Charlemagne at Rome on Christmas Day, 800. The Diegesis was thus composed in 801, since there is no mention that this foul and foreign woman has been eliminated or deposed.190

188 Mango, “St. Andrew the Fool,” 312. Mango adds that the “Konon” prophecy was to survive for many more centuries; see note 193, infra.
189 Irene was co-ruler with her son Constantine VI from 780–790, banished by him in 790, returned as co-ruler with him again from January 792–797, and, having finally gotten her son out of her way by having him murdered, sole ruler from 797–802, when she was deposed by Nicophorus II.
190 Berger, Daniel-Dieges, 32–37; Zervos, “Apocalypse of Daniel,” 756. The date is also accepted by McGinn, Antichrist, 95.
Berger’s identification of the historical allusions of the *Diegesis* is for the most part accepted by D. Olster, but where Berger associates the strong ruler with Leo III, Olster prefers Constantine IV (ruled 668–685), who broke the first Arab siege of Constantinople in 674–678, whose name also begins with the letter kappa, and who (according to Olster) inspired the image of the victorious emperor in the First Greek Redaction of the *Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius.*

Much earlier dates for the historical section of the *Diegesis Danielis*, however, are proposed by C. Mango and R. Hoyland. Mango argues that the rule of “thirty-three years” of §6.25, which he assumes alludes to the length of the reign of the strong emperor rather than of the lads, does not tally with the thirty-four years for which Leo III actually ruled. More importantly, he wonders whether a Byzantine Greek of the time of Charlemagne’s coronation ever would have i) referred to Constantine V, the hero of great wars against the Arabs and the Bulgars, as a wicked king from the north; ii) described Irene, who was later canonised by the Orthodox Church for reintroducing icons, as a foul and foreign woman; or iii) considered the Arab threat over with after their defeat by the strong emperor. All these points have merit. Mango observes that the description of the Arab assault on Constantinople is accurate only to the point where they marshaled their forces outside the city wall in the winter of 716–717. The strong king of the *Diegesis*, he argues, is to be identified with Theodosius III (ruled 716–717), whose name begins with the letter theta, i.e., the eighth letter of the Greek alphabet. Mango theorises that the apocalypse was written during the first few months of the siege, when Theodosius was still king, but hurriedly updated not long after his removal by Leo III in early 717, a version of events that would explain why manuscript B preserves the letter eta but manuscript M (redacted only months after B) contains the letter kappa and the additional note that the strong king will have a beast’s name. Hoyland works forward from the postulate that the only historical event recorded in the *Diegesis* is the Arab siege of Constantinople in 716–717. He rejects Mango’s identification of Theodosius III as the strong king of the original text (and thus, by implication, the theory that

---

192 In this Mango is also followed by Brandes, “Liudprand of Cremona,” 440.
193 “St. Andrew the Fool,” 312: “Now, if we consult the Oxford MS, we discover that the liberator’s name begins εἰς τὸ ἡ’ στοιχεῖον τοῦ ἀλφαβήτου, and that
M was redacted a few short months after \( B \).\(^{194}\) He agrees with the argument that the \textit{Diegesis} should be dated to the winter of 716–717, that the strong king is Leo III, and that the data after this point, including the references to the two lads, the wicked king from the north, and the foul and foreign woman,\(^{195}\) are no more than eschatological speculation.

Each theory has its weaknesses and cannot fully address the claims of the other. On the one hand, many of the specific details recorded in the text do not fit Berger’s historical reconstruction. No Byzantine emperor of the period ruled for thirty-three or thirty-six years, or was succeeded by his two sons. The Arab army never breached the walls of Constantinople in the siege of 717, nor did the general Arab threat suddenly dissipate after that time. In addition, observation about the fundamental discrepancy between the opinion in the \textit{Diegesis} about the rulers of Byzantium and the ways in which an early ninth-century Byzantine author ought to have thought about Leo III (an iconoclast), Constantine V, or Irene cannot be ignored without comment. On the other hand, the identification of Theodosius III with the strong emperor in the original version is conceptually inelegant, since the Arab army and fleet marshaled outside Constantinople not in the winter of 716 but in the summer and autumn of 717, several months after the coronation of Leo III.\(^{196}\) This fact calls into question Hoyland’s dating as well. Even more questionable is the insistence of both Mango and Hoyland that the \textit{ex eventu} review of history ends with the notice of the Arab siege (either the one of 674–678 or of 717–718) and that everything after this event is eschatological speculation.

\(^{194}\) Both Zervos (“Apocalypse of Daniel,” 764 note 3m) and Hoyland (\textit{Seeing Islam}, 299 note 127) wonders if the \( \varepsilon \tau \alpha \) refers to Heraclius (610–641). See note 62, \textit{supra}, on Bousset, Heraclius, and the Armenian \textit{Seventh Vision of Daniel}.

\(^{195}\) Rydén argues that the reference to this foul and foreign woman is drawn from the stock elements of the “evil empress” topos (“Andreas Salos,” 249–251). See also Olster, “Byzantine Apocalypses,” 72 note 39.

\(^{196}\) Treadgold, \textit{History of Byzantium}, 104.
The key to the problem is knowing where one ought to position the dividing line between history and prophecy, a subject which was addressed in Excursus I, supra. Although Alexander correctly warns us that not every datum that deals with historical matters is a *vaticinium ex eventu*, there can be a vast difference in form and scope between genuine future-time utterances based on a perceptive author’s appraisal of the political *realia* of his time and *ex eventu* reviews of past history and present exigencies. Genuine apocalyptic prophecies tend to be general predicative statements that do not chronologically extend too far from the author’s own time. Historical reviews, on the other hand, generally are far more detailed and cover a much broader chronological expanse. With this in mind, the regnal data contained in the first part of the *Diegesis Danielis* is far more akin to *ex eventu* history than it is to prophetic statement. There are simply too many specific details present to dismiss the lot as eschatological expectation, even if these details do not even halfway match the historical record.

To reiterate: in the case of the *Diegesis*, most of the information is too specific and too definitive to be anything but historical. The text identifies a strong king, described once and named twice, who is said to have two sons and to have ruled for a set number of years, and who is followed by a wicked ruler and either a foreign man or a foul and foreign woman. Where the specificity breaks down, I propose, is not during the Arab siege of Constantinople early on in the *Diegesis* but rather the period in the text immediately following the accession of the foul and foreign woman, namely, the passage that notes the destruction of Constantinople and the kingdom’s passing to Rome (9.8). There is no history in this note, merely a vague statement that Berger and Zervos conveniently consider to find a historical reflection in the coronation of Charlemagne, but which was an event that scarcely could have prompted a Byzantine to conclude that the torch had been passed from the centre of Christian culture and the heir to the classical civilisations of Solon and Caesar to the (at the time) backwater, outremer Rome. Moreover, if the foul and foreign woman is to be identified with the empress Irene, where is the mention of her son, Constantius VI, with whom she sometimes shared and continually struggled for the imperial throne? Finally,

198 On the dates of their reigns, see Table II, *infra.*
and most importantly, Berger’s analysis does not explain why Constantinople is said to be destroyed before the kingdom is passed on to Rome, even though the city will not fall for another four centuries, and then at the hands of the knights of the Fourth Crusade rather than to the Muslims. If the reference to the kingdom’s passing is historical, as Berger and Zervos argue it is, what is to be made of this notice of the destruction of Constantinople? Is it a genuine prophetic kernel, lost in a series of ex eventu historical data?

If my reconstruction is correct, then the foul and foreign woman is indeed Irene, but the date of the redaction of manuscript B is not 800, 801, or even 802, but rather sometime shortly after 797, after Irene had engineered the final downfall of her son, Constantine VI, with whom she had ruled since 792. Everything after this is eschatological prediction, including the destruction of the city and the passing of its power to Rome. That Irene was from Athens speaks to her being foreign; that she is called “foul” implies that manuscript B was possibly redacted by a supporter of her son or any one of a number of officials who believed that a woman should not be ruling the empire alone. Mango may be correct in assuming that anyone associated with the church would hardly term Irene, the restorer of the icons, as “foul,” but, as Olster observes, the Diegesis is overwhelmingly unconcerned with the issue of iconoclasm. It is entirely possible that the Diegesis was written by someone outside the church (there is the sense that the Byzantine apocalypses are, to some extent, popular works) or by someone in the church who did not feel the same way about Irene that Mango thinks that he ought to have felt. Alternately, Irene’s gender might have been the critical factor rather than her view on icons; rule by a woman must have been hard to accept for some Byzantines. Indeed, the Word of Daniel on the End of the World (§2.12) contains a similarly poor view of the Empress Irene.

\[199\] Cf. Oegema, *Zwischen Hoffnung und Gericht*, 129, who dates the text to perhaps as late at 802, during the reign of Charlemagne.


\[201\] Olster, “Byzantine Apocalypses,” 65. This is true also of the other Byzantine apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles attributed to Daniel. See also note 577, infra.

Manuscript B was probably redacted from manuscript M (or a copy of it), which preserves an earlier version of the Diegesis. It is only in the earlier manuscript M that one finds the two crucial points of contact between the strong ruler and Leo III, namely, the note that his name began with the letter kappa and that it was also the name of a wild beast. This would mean that the wicked ruler is to be identified with Constantine V\textsuperscript{203} and the foreign ruler—recalling that manuscript M preserves this tradition rather than that of the foul and foreign woman—is none other than Leo IV (775–780), the son whose mother was a Khazar. This would mean that manuscript M dates from the period of the reign of Leo IV. In the redaction of the later manuscript B, it could be that the strong ruler is now Constantine V (with those stunning victories over the Arabs and Bulgars),\textsuperscript{204} the wicked ruler is Leo IV, and the foul woman, as I have suggested, is Irene. In the schema of manuscript M, Constantine VI does not appear because he has yet to rule; in that of manuscript B, the fact that he is a co-ruler with his mother Irene means that his reign is ignored so as to emphasize her characteristics.\textsuperscript{205} How this proposed reconstruction of the textual history of the Diegesis fits with the evidence of the Vision and Revelation of the Prophet Daniel (§2.11) remains to be clarified.

Zervos remarks that certain elements of the apocalyptic section of the Diegesis Danielis “could fit into the apocalyptic environment that produced such works as the Sibylline oracles, 2 Baruch, 4 Ezra, and the Revelation of John.”\textsuperscript{206} Whether Zervos means to trace some of the elements in the Diegesis to a much earlier period (pace the similar arguments by Schmoldt and Henze) is unclear. What is clear, however, is that the Diegesis fits much better into the apocalyptic

\textsuperscript{203} Mango’s argument could be turned against him at this point: Constantine V was a fervent iconoclast and well-deserving of the title “wicked,” if the author/redactor of the Diegesis was indeed concerned with such things.

\textsuperscript{204} Of course, this does not explain the \textit{èta}.

\textsuperscript{205} It must be admitted, however, that neither the tradition of the two sons of the strong ruler, a prominent feature of both manuscripts, or the notice that the strong ruler or his lads reigned for thirty-three or thirty-six years cannot be reconciled with data concerning any Byzantine ruler of the period, nor have any of the theories adequately addressed either issue. My feeling is that with the Diegesis we are looking at a cross-section of an immensely complicated history of transmission that in its entirety circumscribes many more apocalyptic texts, not all of which are attributed to Daniel. As with any cross-section, certain strata are visible, but their history is frequently obscured.

\textsuperscript{206} Zervos, “Apocalypse of Daniel,” 757.
milaieu that produced the majority of the other Byzantine Daniel apocalypses than it does into a first- or second-century environment.207

2.11. The Vision and Revelation of the Prophet Daniel (cf. Greek §XIII [Slavonic §II])

Berger: No. 38, Gr. Daniel-Diegese (Dn.-D.) [see infra]
Haelewyck: No. 253, Apocalypsis Danielis graeca (Diegesis Danielis) [see infra]
Pertusi: (Slav) Visione e rivelazione del profeta Daniele

In 1897 Istrin208 printed an edition of a Slavonic text from a manuscript copy in the Graf Tolstoy Library.209 The text was called the Vision and Revelation of the Prophet Daniel and was under this title later translated into Italian by E. Folco. This translation appears in Pertusi’s Fine di Bisanzio,210 along with a discussion of the Slavonic text in the context of the other Slavonic Daniel apocalypse edited by Istrin (i.e., the Vision of the Prophet Daniel on the Emperors (§2.13, below)) and other apocalyptic material attributed to Daniel.

A closer inspection of this Slavonic text, however, reveals that it is actually a version of the same apocalypse that is preserved in a Greek copy in the Biblioteca Marciana (Venezia) codex gr. VII.22.211 This is the MS V which both Berger and Zervos consider a partial version of the Diegesis Danielis (§2.10) and which has the title Δανιὴλ ὀρασίς πρώτη, ὀρασίς καὶ ἀποκάλυψις Δανιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου. Berger’s edition of the Greek text appears on pages 24–26 of his volume, Die griechische Daniel-Diegese.212

The Vision and Revelation of the Prophet Daniel appears to contain material extant in several other apocalypses, including various Greek

207 See the more detailed argument on this topic in general in the section on the Syriac Revelation of Daniel the Prophet in the Land of Persian and Elam (§2.5).
209 In his review of Istrin’s work (see note 105, supra, at 227), Gleye remarks that Istrin edits a Slavonic Vision of Daniel from two MSS, “Chilander” [Hilandarion] and a MS from the “Bibliothek des Grafen Tolstoj,” thereby implying that there is only one such Vision. But this is erroneous—these are different texts.
210 E. Folco, in Pertusi, Fine di Bisanzio, 81–89. Citations to the Slavonic Vision and Revelation of Daniel follow the line numbers in Folco’s translation.
211 On this codex, see note 28, supra. Haelewyck, Clavis apocryphorum VT, 203, asserts that the Daniel Diegesis is extant in Slavonic, but cites E. Kozak, who is referring to Slavonic copies of the Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel (§2.23); see notes 239, 423, and 425, infra.
212 Citations to the Greek text of the Vision and Revelation of Daniel follow the verse numbers in Berger’s edition.
recensions of the Apocrypha of Pseudo-Methodius, the Armenian Seventh Vision of Daniel (§2.3), the Vision of Daniel on the Last Times (§2.16), and, most importantly, the Diegesis Danielis. The precise textural relationship among all this apocalyptic literature, particularly between the Vision and Revelation of the Prophet Daniel and the Diegesis, as well as the history of the transmission of their constituent parts, still remains to be elucidated. What is now clear, however, is that the Greek text preserved by the Venezia codex, while certainly related to the Diegesis Danielis, is not a partial copy of it (pace Berger and Zervos) nor even an abbreviation or paraphrase, but rather is a virtual copy of approximately 103 of the 170 lines of the Slavonic Vision and Revelation of the Prophet Daniel that was published by Istrin and translated by Folco, including almost all the text in lines 85–170. It is also clear that this Slavonic text is not a unique translation of a lost Greek apocalypse but represents perhaps a slightly earlier version of the same apocalypse that is extant in the Greek in this one Venezia manuscript copy.213

The first forty-nine lines of the Slavonic Vision and Revelation of Daniel are not found in the Greek text. That being said, the first eighteen lines of the Slavonic are paralleled in the opening section of the Armenian Seventh Vision of Daniel, including the reference to the angel Gabriel, the note that the action takes place in the third year of the reign of Cyrus, and a historical review of the future fates of several cities. After this, the earth experiences many woes, and there are several cryptic allusions to individuals (Slavonic ll. 19–50).

At this point the Greek text begins and it parallels the Slavonic until line 66. In this span of text there appears the figure of the good emperor (cf. the Vision of Daniel on the Last Times, etc.), who brings peace and prosperity to the earth (Slavonic ll. 51–66; Greek vv. 1–13).

The sceptre of Ethiopia arises, followed by a sceptre from the West, who defeats Ethiopia, and another from Cappadocia, and then finally three more, who rule over various places in the Mediterranean. Then Ishmael enters the scene, attacking the seven-hilled city (Slavonic ll. 67–85). None of this material is extant in the Greek text, which instead simply preserves the line καὶ ὁ πύρῳ ὁ ἄναπτυχται σκῆστρον Ἀἰθιοπίας καὶ βασιλεύσει βασιλείαν ἱσχυράν (v. 14). It is more likely

---

213 The following description of the points of contact between the Slavonic and the Greek versions of this apocalypse is quite preliminary and meant only as a broad overview in lieu of a critical edition of this text.
that the historically detailed Greek text that ultimately stands behind the Slavonic translation represents an earlier version of the Vision and Revelation than the Greek text of the Venezia manuscript copy.

From this point the Slavonic and Greek texts almost perfectly mirror each other until the end of the apocalypse. The Ishmaelites (Arab Muslims) are repulsed, thereby fulfilling the prophecy of Deut 32:30 (Slavonic ll. 83–94; Greek vv. 18–19; cf. the same prophecy in a slightly different context in the Diegesis Danielis). More sceptres arise, and troubles stalk the earth and its inhabitants (Slavonic ll. 95–100a; Greek vv. 24–28). The Slavonic contains a brief note, not found in the Greek, about celestial and terrestrial signs and calamities (ll. 100b–105). Next, a foreign woman arises and more woes follow, with the sceptre finally passing to the Jews in Jerusalem (Slavonic ll. 106–121; Greek vv. 29–36).

From this point until the end of the text the Vision and Revelation of the Prophet Daniel and the Diegesis Danielis cover the same general events, although i) the Diegesis represents a far more detailed version and ii) there are numerous major and minor differences between the two texts. The Antichrist appears under the reign of Dan. His physical attributes are described (Slavonic ll. 122–130; Greek vv. 37–46), as are the conditions of the earth and for its inhabitants during this time (Slavonic ll. 131–154; Greek vv. 47–71). The Antichrist then offers to turn stone into bread, the stone is transformed into a snake, Enoch and Elijah make their appearance and are killed, and, in the end, the elect are saved (Slavonic ll. 155–170; Greek vv. 72–85).

The Vision and Revelation of the Prophet Daniel would benefit greatly from a critical edition of the Greek text prepared in light of the

214 Or translation/redaction; lines 100b–105 may have been inserted in the Slavonic.

215 This argument is based on the understanding of the role of history in historical apocalypses: the past is only meaningful inasmuch as it sheds light on the present situation and future expectations. The highly detailed events described in Slavonic ll. 67–85 precede the Muslim Arab invasions, and probably a century or more before the time when the original, lost Greek text was edited. In fact, portions of the material in this section are found also in the Armenian Seventh Vision of Daniel and in a passage quoted in Istrin, “A. Исследования. II. Видение Даниила,” 311 (so noted by Pertusi, Fine di Bisanzio, 84). So we are dealing with an old portion of the text. It seems likely, then, that the redactor of the Venezia version of the Vision and Revelation simply abbreviated a portion of detailed historical data which preceded the Muslim attacks on Constantinople and which thus had no meaning for a later audience.

216 Irene again, presumably.
Slavonic version and the points of contact with the *Diegesis Danielis* and the other texts I have identified.

### 2.12. The Word of Daniel on the End of the World (cf. Greek §XIV)

García Martínez: *Visions of Daniel*
Halkin: No. 1871a [see notes 217, 220, and 276, *infra*]
Schmoldt: Unidentified Daniel E

According to Schmoldt (and to García Martínez, who follows Schmoldt), this text exists in one manuscript copy, Cambridge, Trinity College codex O.8.33 [*olim* C.26], fols. 71v–81v, which remains unedited.\(^{217}\) When we consult James' catalogue description of this sixteenth-century manuscript, we find the interesting note, “After a few lines Christ quotes a vision of Daniel which continues to the end. Much of it is occupied by a contest between an Abbot Stephanus μεσοκλαξ and a wicked king.”\(^{218}\)

But there is more to this text than what would initially seem to be the case. R. Maisano has edited a composition that he titles *Leonis Constantinopolitanî de fine mundi homilia*.\(^{219}\) This text is extant in perhaps seven manuscript copies,\(^{220}\) including the one embedded in Trinity College codex O.8.33. It turns out that two of the seven manuscripts, the Trinity College codex and the fourteenth-century Vatican codex Vaticani gr. 1865, preserve versions of §§1–20 of the *Leonis Constantinopolitanî de fine mundi homilia*, attributed to Daniel.\(^{221}\) What is more, the Vatican copy carries the title λόγος Δανιήλ τοῦ προφήτου

\(^{217}\) Schmoldt, “Vom jungen Daniel,” 243; García Martínez, “Pseudo-Danielic Literature,” 156. Halkin, *BHG*, no. 1871a, apparently identifies this manuscript (by association with his no. 1871) as a copy of the *Discourses of John Chrysostom Concerning the Vision of Daniel*.

\(^{218}\) M.R. James, *The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1900), 1.430.


\(^{220}\) Including Athinai, Bibliothèkès tès Hellados cod. 2187, fols. 236r–238r, and Jerusalem, Patriarchikè Bibliothèkè cod. Sabaitikè gr. 128, which Halkin, *BHG*, no. 1871, identifies as copies of the *Discourses of John Chrysostom* (and which are correlated with Schmoldt’s edition of the *Discourses*). Note that Halkin also identifies Athinai, Bibliothèkès tès Hellados cod. 2187, fols. 228v–233r as a copy of this text (Catalogue des manuscrits hagiographiques de la Bibliothèque nationale d’Athènes [SubH 66; Bruxelles, 1983], 122–123). Pertusi, *Fine di Bisanzio*, 39 note 130, but in the context of the *Vision of Daniel on the Future of the Seven-Hilled City* (§2.9), remarks: “Pure di origine cretese l’altra versione della Visio Leonis che si legge nei codd. Athen. gr. 2187, s. XV, e Sabait. gr. 128, s. XV–XVIII, ed. Maisano, pp. 117–125.”

\(^{221}\) And so noted by Pertusi, *Fine di Bisanzio*, 39.
What we probably have here is either an apocalyptic text attributed to Daniel or a fragment of such a text which originally circulated independently—as evidenced by the Trinity College and Vatican copies—and which was later incorporated into this larger text *Leonis Constantinopolitanitani de fine mundi homilia*. It is also possible that what later would become an autonomous Daniel apocalypse was excised from its place in this larger composition.\textsuperscript{222}

Maisano proposes a textual stemma that posits an eleventh- or twelfth-century antecedent (which he labels *b*), no longer extant, of the Trinity College and Vatican copies.\textsuperscript{223} He dates the original version of the text to the ninth or the tenth centuries, perhaps closer to the end of the ninth century.\textsuperscript{224} Schmoldt, however, opines that perhaps the reference to the evil Empress before the coming of the Antichrist refers to the Empress Irene.\textsuperscript{225} If this is the case, then a date in the early years of the ninth century is possible. This would also mean that the Daniel apocalypses preserve another reference to Irene as the bad Empress (cf. the *Diegesis Danielis*, etc.).\textsuperscript{226}


Alexander: *Slavonic Daniel*
Berger: No. 50, Slav Daniel I; No. 184, Slav Daniel III [see infra]
Denis: *Visions de Daniel* en slave [see infra]
DiTommaso: Slavonic Vision of Daniel or “Vision of Daniel”
García Martínez: Slavonic Pseudo-Daniel
Haelewtyck: No. 265, *Visio Danielis* (slauice) [see infra]
Oegema: 1 ApkDan (slaw)
Pertusi: Visione del profeta Daniele sugli imperatori, sugli ultimi giorni e sulla fine del secolo

\textsuperscript{222} Istrin, “A. Изслѣдование. II. Видѣніе Даниила,” observes that MS 43 of the Moskva Publichnaia Biblioteka (now incorporated into the Rossiskaya Gosudarstvennaya biblioteka, I believe, having been called after 1925 but before the fall of the Soviet Union the Gosudarstvennaya biblioteka im. Lenina) preserves an untitled prophecy with Slavic text that is similar to the verses that commence the beginning of the *Oracle of Leo the Wise* as it is printed in Migne, *PG* 107. The identity of this text and its relationship to the apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha remains unclear.

\textsuperscript{223} Maisano, *Leon di Costantinopoli*, 56–63.


\textsuperscript{226} There is a third reference in the *Vision and Revelation of the Prophet Daniel* (§2.11).
As is the case with many of the apocryphal texts preserved in the Slavonic tradition, the understanding of the manuscript evidence of the Vision of the Prophet Daniel on the Emperors is plagued by conflicting and contradictory testimony.\textsuperscript{227} The only certainty, it seems, is that the Slavonic text is a translation from a lost Greek original.\textsuperscript{228}

For a long time it was believed that the Slavonic Vision of Daniel existed in two manuscripts only: Mount Athos, Monastery of Hilandarion (Chilander) codex 24, fols. 68r–69v, and Beograd, Narodna Biblioteka Srbije codex 651, fols. 243r–249r,\textsuperscript{229} the latter itself now lost, a casualty of the Great War of 1914. The Hilandar version, which is missing approximately the first two hundred words of the text, was edited by Istrin in 1897\textsuperscript{230} and again by P.A. Lavrov (with variants from the Beograd manuscript) in 1899.\textsuperscript{231}

The Beograd text of the Slavonic Vision of Daniel, which in codex 651 had been embedded in the \textit{Zbornik Popa Dragolia} and which contained numerous minor interpolations,\textsuperscript{232} was edited by P.S. Srečković.

\footnote{227} The manuscript tradition of biblical apocrypha in the Slavonic and Eastern European tradition is extremely complex and comparatively little-known to western scholars as a whole. On the problem in brief, see DiTommaso, “Report on Pseudepigrapha Research.” On the subject of the full range of texts in the Slavonic OT apocryphal tradition, see now the essays in the forthcoming collection: L. DiTommaso and C. Böttrich, \textit{Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition: Continuity and Diversity} (JSPSup; London/New York).

\footnote{228} Alexander, “Medieval Apocalypses,” 1003; \textit{idem}, \textit{Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition}, 63.

\footnote{229} On the date of this manuscript, see P.J. Alexander, “Historical Interpolations in the \textit{Zbornik Popa Dragolia},” \textit{Actes du XIV Congrès international des Études Byzantines, Bucarest, 6–12 September 1971} (Bucarest, 1976), 23–38 note 5 [rep. = \textit{Religious and Political History and Thought in the Byzantine Empire} (London, 1978)]. This MS is often identified as “cod. 466,” which is the number L. Stojanović assigns it in his catalogue (\textit{Katalog Народне библиотеке у Београду. IV. Рукописи и старе штампне књиге}) (Beograd, 1903), 290–294 at 293). I have reproduced the foliation as it is listed by Stojanović; others record it differently.


\footnote{231} P.A. Lavrov, “ВидЊня Даниила,” Апокрифические тексты (SORFXASIP 67.3; Sankt Petersburg, 1899), 1–5.

in 1890. Unfortunately, several sources have misunderstood the realia of this copy of the text or its relationship to other manuscripts. Both Stegmüller and Haelewyck, for example, record that the Beograd version of the Vision extends over pages 10–13 of Srečković’s selection of excerpts from the Zbornik Popa Dragolia. It is quite clear, however, as Pertusi observes, that the text of the Vision ends at page 11 and different material appears at page 12 and again at 12–13. Stegmüller also asserts that the text published by V. Makushev in 1882 is a copy or version of this Beograd Vision on the Emperors as published by Srečković. This is an error; the Makushev text is a Slavonic copy of the Greek Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel (see §2.23, infra) a point first made in a non-Cyrillic publication by E. Kozak in 1892 and later confirmed in two studies by V. Tupkova-Zaimova and A. Miltenova. Finally, Berger’s list of apocryphal apocalypses lists as separate texts “No. 50, Slav Daniel I” and “No. 184, Slav Daniel III,” but, as García Martínez correctly observes, the texts to which both of these numbers refer are identical.

Another source of some confusion regarding the manuscript evidence for the Slavonic Vision of Daniel are the two recensions of a Slavonic text which were published by A.N. Popov and M. Speranski

---

233 P.S. Srečković, Zbornik popa dragola, Spomenik 5 (Beograd, 1890), 10–11.
234 Stegmüller, Repertorium, No. 117,15; Haelewyck, Clavis apocryphorum VT, 211.
235 Pertusi, Fine di Bisanzio, 42 note 136.
236 The first text, which appears at the top of page 12, is actually one of the many Slavonic copies of the Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel, so noted by V. Tupkova-Zaimova and A. Miltenova, Историко-апокалиптичната книжина във Византия и в средновековна България (Sofia, 1996), 207–209. The second text is a copy of the so-called Interpretation of Daniel, described and edited (from this and several other MS copies) by Tupkova-Zaimova/Miltenova (and on which see the Inventory of Chapter Six, the Excursus on “Sundry Slavonic Daniel Apocrypha,” no. i).
237 See note 423, infra.
238 Stegmüller is followed in this error by DiTommaso, Bibliography. This is also the implication of Denis’ statement—upon which we have already commented in the section on the Armenian Seventh Vision of Daniel—that the Seventh Vision is preserved in a Slavonic apocalypse that is itself a copy of the Greek Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel that was published by Tischendorf (see note 406, infra). Denis could only make this statement if he understood the Makushev text to preserve a copy of the Slavonic Vision of Daniel on the Emperors.
240 Berger, “Alphabetisches Verzeichnis.”
241 García Martínez, “Pseudo-Danielic Literature,” 153 note 41.
in 1889. According to Haelewyck, these two recensions are copies of the same text that he lists in his *Clavis* under the title “Visio Danielis (slauice),” *viz.*, our Slavonic *Vision of Daniel*. In fact, these two texts are two further copies of the Slavonic version of the Greek *Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel*.

The Slavonic *Vision of Daniel* was translated into English by Alexander, based on the text from the Athos manuscript and including the introduction from the Beograd 651 manuscript, and into Italian by Pertusi, based on the text of both the Beograd 651 and Athos copies. According to Tupkova-Zaimova and Miltenova, however, the Slavonic *Vision* survives in three further manuscript copies, all of which are consulted in their excellent edition and translation of this text.

The Slavonic *Vision of Daniel* opens with a scene where Gabriel takes Daniel to a high, unnamed mountain and reveals a vision of four beasts rising from the sea (§1). No mention is made of the place where Daniel was before he was taken away, nor of the date, regnal or otherwise, at which this event takes place. The angel shows Daniel a series of empires and emperors (more than four) identified variously as sceptres, animals, or horns, and whose names are sometimes given cryptically, such as the emperor whose name begins with the first letter of the Greek alphabet but the eighth letter of the Roman one (§2). Gabriel then interprets the vision, identifying in more detail the succession of rulers and kingdoms which are to come, although these, too, remain largely enigmatic (§§2–4). It is difficult to separate the historical from the mythical, and at first blush it seems that the former is understood in light of the latter. The four beasts are eventually identified as four emperors, two from the east and two from the west, and it is further revealed that an emperor from Heliopolis will enter the “Seven-Hilled City,” which in this case must be Constantinople (§3). More strange place-names are men-

---

242 See note 425, *infra.*
243 Haelewyck, *Clavis apocryphorum* 1VT, 211.
245 Tupkova-Zaimova/Miltenova, Историко-апокалиптичната книжнина във Византия, 118–124.
246 I employ the chapter divisions as they are articulated by Alexander, *Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition.*
tioned: Tyrannis, Akrodunion, Mariana, and Enna, along with a reference to the Ishmaelites (§4). Overall, the interpretation complements the vision rather than explains it; only with reference to both is the full scope of history understood and, at the same, not understood, since so much in both remains cryptic.

The middle sections of the Slavonic Vision of Daniel, §§5–8, is paralleled in the Greek Discourses of John Chrysostom. Daniel asks Gabriel to explain why these terrible things will befall the world, to which the angel replies: because of the sins of those who reside in it. Gabriel then tells Daniel about the seventh age, when the Ishmaelites’ power over the nations waxes strong (§5), a section that Alexander identifies as substantively identical to a similar angelic reply in the earlier First Greek redaction of Pseudo-Methodius. Martial salvation appears in the form of an emperor, who defeats both the Ishmaelites (§6) and the blond-bearded peoples before arriving at Rome via Longobardia (§7). The emperor then marches from Rome to Constantinople (and while en route obliterates several rivals), where he rules for thirty-two years, promoting peace, assembling counsels of the wise, rebuilding churches, and protecting the pious (§§8–9).

The final two sections of the text (§§10–11) again borrow from the Greek Pseudo-Methodius. After the passing of the strong emperor, tribulation again stalks the earth. The Unclean Folk pollute everything and are only dispatched by the arrival of an archangel. Next to appear is the figure of the last Roman Emperor, who is followed

---

247 On these names, see Alexander, “Historical Interpolations,” 23–38 and Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition, 66–69, notes 31, 34, 39, and 41, although his descriptions of the place-names in the Zbornik do not always seem to match the manuscript evidence as it is presented by Srečkovič.

248 Alexander observes that the Greek term upon which the Slavonic is based, ξονθα εθη, is the “standard Byzantine designation of the Western peoples” (Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition, 70 note 49). On the fair- or blond-haired peoples in mediaeval apocalypses, see the discussion in Pertusi, Fine di Bisanzio, 40–77. Interestingly, by the eighteenth century, well after the fall of the Byzantine Empire, the designation came to seen as referring to the Russians, who of course assumed the mantle of the defender of Orthodox Christianity against the Muslims (D.M. Nicol, The Immortal Emperor. The Life and Legend of Constantine Palaiologos, Last Emperor of the Romans (Cambridge, 1992), 105). The topos of the Blond-haired invaders from the north appears in apocalyptic literature as late as the nineteenth-century Testament of Alexander the Great (see Chapter One note 45).

249 Part of this section is lifted from the Greek Pseudo-Methodius and is paralleled by a section in the Vision of Daniel On the Last Times and the End of the World.

250 On the subject, see P.J. Alexander, “Byzantium and the Migration of Literary Works and Motifs: The Legend of the Last Roman Emperor,” M&H 2 (1971),
by the “Son of Perdition,” i.e., the Antichrist. The Vision ends with the last Roman Emperor delivering the Christian empire to God, and with the Son of Perdition, after performing signs and wonders, slaying Enoch and Elijah on the cross of Cavalry.

As with many of the other Byzantine Daniel apocalypses composed in Greek, the Slavonic Vision of Daniel is based on the various eighth-century Greek redactions of the Syriac Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius. Relying on his identification of the historical allusions and the geographic references, Alexander posits that the Greek original of the Slavonic Vision of Daniel was composed in Sicily between 827 and 829, shortly after the rebellion of Euphemius and the start of the Arab occupation of Sicily in the summer of 827 but before the death of Michael II in October 829.

W. Treadgold has since further narrowed this date to the spring of 829, noting that the text also records an account of the expedition sent at that time to relieve the Arab siege of Henna. He further argues that since the Slavonic Vision of Daniel and a pamphlet mentioned in the Life of St. Euthymius both predict the death Michael II and were composed in the spring of 829, it follows that they were composed by the same author. Treadgold believes this person to be none other than the future patriarch Methodius, who emulated his fourth-century name-sake Methodius of Olympia by composing a series of political prophecies. Treadgold also remarks that the knowledge of this relief expedition from Constantinople means that the Greek original was written in the East, possibly in the capital itself, although, pace Alexander, he admits that the author’s knowledge of Sicily and Syracuse in particular suggests a familiarity with the island.

The Slavonic Vision of Daniel is conceptually similar to the Greek Diegesis Danielis, and it is possible that the two texts may represent


On the Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius, see the discussion concerning the Syriac Revelation of Daniel the Prophet in the Land of Persia and Elam (§2.5).

Which he understands to refer to the Byzantine emperors from Leo III (ruled 717–741) and ending with Michael II (ruled 820–829).


W. Treadgold, “The Prophecies of Pseudo-Methodius” [forthcoming in Revue des études byzantines]. Prof. Treadgold kindly forwarded me a draft copy of this paper.
successively updated versions of an earlier document. But this also is true of the Greek/Slavonic *Vision and Revelation of the Prophet Daniel* (§2.11), which, as we have seen, is related to the *Diegesis*. More work is required in this area.


Berger: No. 48, Pers Daniel I  
Denis: L’Apocalypse persane de Daniel  
DiTommaso: Hebrew-Persian Apocalypse of Daniel  
García Martínez: Persian Pseudo-Daniel  
Haelwyck: No. 263, Apocalypsis Danielis persica  
Oegema: 1 ApkDan (pers)  
Pertusi: Visione persiana di Daniele  
Stegmüller: Nos. 117,8–12, Apocalypsis Danielis, versio persica litteris hebraicis expressa

The *Qissa-yi Dāniyāl* is composed in Persian but written in Hebrew characters. It survives in one manuscript, codex héb. 128 of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France. The title, کهش دراگان، is provided by the superscription of the text itself.

In 1838 S. Munk introduced the *Qissa-yi Dāniyāl* to scholarship with a brief note on the text in the ninth volume of S. Cahn’s *Bible*. The *editio princeps* appeared, accompanied by a German translation, in an 1867 article by H. Zotenberg. In 1887 J. Darmesteter transcribed into Persian characters a portion of the apocalyptic section of the text (fols. 83v–88v), to which he appended a translation in French. Another pointed and somewhat re-worked edition appeared in Y. Ibn Shmuel’s 1943 anthology. The *Qissa-yi Dāniyāl* has been translated into Hebrew by A. Jellinek under the title of "מעש של דניאל" and again by J.D. Eisenstein into French by...

---


F. Macler (partial translation),261 into German by A. Wunsche (and based on Jellinek’s Hebrew translation),262 into English by G.W. Buchanan,263 and most recently into Danish by J.P. Asmussen and H. Dadkhah.264

Of all the Daniel apocrypha, only the Qissa-yi Dāniyāl and the Syriac Revelation of Daniel the Prophet preserve both an extended first-person narrative section (pseudepigraphic legendum) and a first-person vision section (pseudepigraphic apocalypse).265 Yet in spite of this immediate correspondence in structure and first-person narration, there appears to be little substantive connexion between the texts. For one thing, the narrative sections are very dissimilar in specific content and there is no need to suppose a dependence of one text on the other, even in the matter of the use of the highly unusual phenomenon of first-person narration. Another area where the texts are quite unrelated is in the content of their visions. The Qissa-yi Dāniyāl contains an extremely detailed, very specific, Byzantine-type ex eventu review of history that overwhelmingly centers on political figures and events. The vision text of the Syriac Revelation of Daniel, in contrast, is far more vague and concentrates on the geographic, social, biological, and meteorological signs and calamities that precede the advent of the Antichrist and the other events of the end times.

The action of the Qissa-yi Dāniyāl begins in Jerusalem but quickly moves to and around Shustar (شوشتر), the Persian capital. It is here, during the reign of Darius, that the reader encounters Daniel, scion of the royal line of Judah,266 weeping bitterly over his memories of

261 Macler, Les apocalypses apocryphes de Daniel. Macler slightly revised the section in his thesis on the Qissa-yi Dāniyāl (which he calls the Persian apocalypse of Daniel) in a later article (“Apocalypses apocryphes II”).
265 As with the Syriac Revelation of Daniel (§2.5), we will discuss in this chapter only the apocalyptic section of Qissa-yi Dāniyāl, since we have already addressed the description and analysis of the narrative portion in Chapter Two.
266 In the first line of the manuscript Daniel is identified as one of the sons of Jeconiah (יְהוָה) the king (cf. Bar. 1:3).
the fate of Jerusalem and the Temple (Z 402).\textsuperscript{267} God sends an unnamed angel\textsuperscript{268} to ask why Daniel is weeping; after Daniel replies, the angel shows him all the things that will happen to the Israelites (אש ואש) in the future. The vision and the interpretation are one in the \textit{Qissa-yi Dāniyāl}—the angel shows Daniel what is to happen, without the formal distinction between the vision and the interpretation.

The apocalyptic section of the \textit{Qissa-yi Dāniyāl} essentially contains two halves. The first half is concerned with the series of rulers, two dozen in all, who are almost always referred to as kings or as sons of kings and never as beasts or otherwise cryptically described animal or human figures (Z 404–414). Notable among the kings in this series are the third, in whose reign the scholars of Israel will flourish, the fifth, whom most commentators associate with Mohammad, the eighth, who comes from the west but is killed in the east, the twelfth, under whom Israel will prosper, the sixteenth, the great builder of mosques who will be exalted as a prophet, and the twentieth,\textsuperscript{269} whose three sons will make their way in the world, one to Babylon, one to the west (the twenty-first king) and one to the east (the twenty-second king), the latter later turning against his brother in the west and conquering his lands.

The second half of the apocalyptic section describes the appearance of two false messiahs, the true Davidic messiah, and the events of the end time (Z 414–426). At one point, at the end of the series of the two dozen kings (Z 414), the tenor of the text shifts from the \textit{ex eventu} historical to the genuine prophetic. This marks the turning-point between the two halves of the apocalypse, which occurs after the death of the last king, who as the angel tells Daniel will arise from the Romans and inflict great suffering upon both the Ishmaelites and the Israelites. After this the first false messiah appears, a giant over one hundred cubits tall, who will be joined in his war against the world by the armies of Gog and Magog. In the end times, the Messiah ben Joseph will run rampant over the world, but some of the Israelites will not believe his lies (Z 416–418). Because of the piety of these righteous Israelites, the angels Michael and Gabriel

\textsuperscript{267} None of the editions or translations divides the text by folio page, section, or line. As a result, I cite the Persian text throughout with reference to the pages in Zotenberg’s (Z) edition.

\textsuperscript{268} It is neither Michael nor Gabriel, who are mentioned in the third person later on.
intercede with God on their behalf and kill the Messiah ben Joseph, all of which happens before the advent of the Messiah ben David (Z 418–420). The Messiah ben David eradicates the armies of Gog and Magog, and then he, Elijah, and Zerubbabel climb the Mount of Olives. With successive blasts of Elijah’s trumpet comes the healing of the sick, the resurrection of the dead, the manifestation of the messianic age lasts 1,300 years, after which comes the great judgment, from which the righteous are sent to Eden and the evil to Gehinnom.

In contrast to many of the other apocryphal Daniel apocalypses, where the identification of the historical allusions can be a slippery task at best, the twenty-four kings in the Qissa-yi Dāniyāl match the historical record quite well, particularly, as Darmesteter outlines, from the fifth king onwards, most of whom find ready historical reflection in the list of ‘Umayyad caliphs. The twentieth king, he believes, is Hārūn al-Rashīd (ruled 786–809), whose three sons correspond with the three sons mentioned in the text. If this historical reconstruction is accurate, then the Qissa-yi Dāniyāl is a ninth-century text. Denis, however, prefers to date the Qissa-yi Dāniyāl to the First Crusade, at the end of the eleventh century.

There are clear parallels between the Qissa-yi Dāniyāl and the Hebrew Nev’ot Daniel (§2.22), including the reference to the two Messiahs of Joseph and David, although the parallels are not exact. On the other hand, although it shares some elements with some of the Greek apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha, my sense is that the Qissa-yi Dāniyāl stands more on the periphery than at the centre of the Byzantine apocalyptic tradition.

---

269 Not the twenty-first, as Hoyland states (Seeing Islam, 329).

270 The leveling of the topography of the land is a common feature in end-time speculation, particularly in articulations of the New Jerusalem; see L. DiTommaso, “The Dead Sea New Jerusalem Text: Contents and Contexts” (Diss: McMaster, 2001) [monograph forthcoming].


272 These three sons do not appear to be Ouales, Axiaphar, and Morphosar, the three sons of Hagar who appear in the Greek Diegesis Danielis. For one thing, the chronology is off: even the latest date of composition for the Diegesis (800 CE) is too early for the Qissa-yi Dāniyāl.

273 Denis, Introduction, 1302–1303.
2.15. *Discourses of John Chrysostom Concerning the Vision of Daniel* (cf. Greek §XV)

Alexander: Pseudo-Chrysostom
Berger: No. 42, Gr. Daniel IV
Bousser: M II
DiTommaso: Greek Discourses of John Chrysostom regarding the Vision of Daniel
García Martínez: Discourses of the Holy Father John Chrysostom on the Vision of Daniel
Haelewycx: No. 258, Sermo Chrysostomi e uisionibus Danielis (græce)
Halkin: No. 1871 and No. 1874m [see notes 217, 220 and 276, infra]
Oegema: 4 ApkDan (gr)
Pertusi: Discorso del santo padre nostro Giovanni Crisostomo sulla visione di Daniele
Rydén, “Andreas Salos”: First Greek Vision of Daniel
Schmoldt: LC: Der Logos unseres heiligen Vaters Johannes Chrysostomos aus den Visionen Daniels
Stegmüller: No. 117,1, Visio Danieleis, versio graeca

The *Discourses of John Chrysostom* survives in at least two Vatican manuscripts, codex Barberinianus gr. 284 [*olim III.3*], fols. 130v–141v, which also contains a copy of *The Vision of Daniel on the Last Times and the End of the World*, and codex Ottobonianus gr. 418, fol. 301, which also preserves a copy of the *Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel*. A. Vassiliev presented the *editio princeps* of the *Discourses* in 1893; the text was edited again and translated into German by Schmoldt in his oft-cited unpublished 1972 dissertation.

The *Discourses* is possibly preserved in a partial state in two further manuscripts. Halkin records that “Athen. codex 2605” (presumably Athínai, Bibliothèkos tēs Hellados codex 2605), fols. 257r–268v,

---


276 But not Athīnai, Bibliothēkos tēs Hellados cod. 2187, fols. 236–238, and Jerusalem, cod. Sabaitikos gr. 128. Halkin, *BHG* 5, no. 1871, identifies these two manuscripts as copies of the *Discourses of John Chrysostom* (and are so correlated with Schmoldt’s edition of the *Discourses*) but in reality are more likely to be copies of the *Word of Daniel on the End of the World* (see the discussion at §2.12, supra).
contains what he describes as “Narratio e Visionibus Danielis excerpta” attributed to Methodius, Bishop of Patara, a manuscript to which he assigns the number “1874m.” In his *Novum auctarium*, Halkin then correlates this identifying number with the information “Schmoldt 224–234, § 2 13–6 12,” i.e., with a portion of Schmoldt’s edition of the *Discourses*. It is worth recalling at this point that Halkin has already identified the full text of this edition with the numerical siglum “1871.” What seems to be the case, then, is that he considers the text which is preserved in this Athenian manuscript codex 2605 to be a version of part of the *Discourses*.

Halkin’s assertion is indirectly supported by E. Mioni, who in his catalogue of Greek manuscripts in the Biblioteca Marciana identifies codex gr. XI.25 [olim Nanianus 300], fols. 160r–165v as a second copy of the text preserved in the Athenian 2605 manuscript. Both the *incipit* and the *explicit* of the Venetian text are lost, making it difficult to identify on the basis of its description in a manuscript catalogue. In addition, Mioni cites Vassiliev at “34, 27–38,” which is an odd reference, given that none of Vassiliev’s pages have thirty-eight lines of text. At the same time, the reference “34,27” does point to a place in page 34 of Vassiliev’s edition of the *Discourses* that bears quite a similarity to the Greek text that Mioni records. In addition, both the text of the Vassiliev edition at this place and what Mioni records of the Venetian text exhibits a close resemblance to the *incipit* of the Athenian text as it is presented by Halkin.

---

277 Halkin, *BHG*¹, no. 1874m. Haelewyck, *Corpus apocryphorum VT*, 208, associates the number “1874m” with the *BHG* only (see the following note). Pertusi, *Fine di Bisanzio*, 39, simply lists Halkin no. 1874m as a separate text, without making a connexion with the *Discourses*.

278 Halkin, *BHG*, no. 1874m.

279 Ibid., no. 1871. See note 276, *supra*.


281 *Incip.*: (Ω) λυμπιάδα ἐπορεύθη εἰς βυζάντιον . . . ἔτεκεν δὲ ἡ βυζαντία υἱὸς τρεῖς καὶ τὸν μὲν ἐνα ἐπονόμασεν τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς σώτου προσηγορίαν Ἐρμῆλλον, τὸν δὲ ἔτερον ἔρβανον, τὸν δὲ τρίτον κλεούδιον; *expl.*: μετὰ τούτα γενησεται τῶν νεκρῶν ἀνάστασις καὶ ( . . . ).

282 . . . καὶ ἡ βυζαντία τρεῖς υἱούς καὶ τὸν μὲν πρῶτον ἀνόμασεν . . . ; cf. with the text in the previous note.

283 Τέτοκε δὲ Βυζαντία τρεῖς υἱούς, τὸν πρῶτον ὀνόμασε κατὰ τὴν προσηγορίαν τοῦ πατρὸς Ἐρμῆλλον, τὸν δὲ δεύτερον Ἐρβάνον . . .
My preliminary inclination concerning these Venetian and Athenian texts—if we recall the obvious pastiche nature of the Discourses—is that they might preserve an independent prophecy which was (originally?) attributed to Methodius but which in the two Vatican copies was later reworked into what Alexander calls the “second part” of our Discourses of John Chrysostom:

[The Discourses] consists of four parts. It begins with Pseudo-Methodius’ narrative concerning the Ethiopian princess Cusheth, her daughter from King Byzas, Byzantia, the latter’s marriage to Romulus, and the interpretation of Psalm 68:31 according to which the Christian Empire is to last until the end of time. There follows, as a second part, a piece not found elsewhere, in which it is said that God, because of the sinfulness of Christians, will call in the Ismaelites, who will then enter the city of the Seven Hills (Constantinople) with arms and horses, shed much blood, carry off large amounts of booty, and advance ἐος Ἀτταλίαν. The third part reproduces, again almost literally, certain parts of the (lost) Greek original of the Slavonic Daniel [i.e., our Slavonic Vision on the Emperors (§2.13)]. In section 5 of that work, where the angel speaks of the devastation by the Arabs of certain countries, Pseudo-Chrysostom inserts after the mention of Sicily the words “the so-called Rebel City” and then continues with the Slavonic Daniel’s prediction of a divinely revealed emperor anointed at Achradina and destined to defeat the Arabs at Petrinon. The fourth and final part is again literally taken from Pseudo-Methodius and is strictly eschatological: the coming of the Antichrist, the episode of Enoch and Elijah, and the Second Coming.

As for the date of composition of the Discourses, the terminus a quo is probably 827–829, that is, the period which saw the Arab invasion of Sicily and the composition of the Greek original of the Slavonic Vision of Daniel the Prophet on the Emperors. In fact, García Martínez opines that the description of the Arab conquests in the Discourses might correspond with this Arabian expedition to Sicily and so provide us with a date for the text.

Alexander, however, advances the idea that the reference to an Arab invasion ἐος Ἀτταλίαν indicates that the Discourses was written not in 827–289 but in the year 842, when the caliph al-Mu’tasim

---


285 Alexander, Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition, 72–73.

286 García Martínez, “Pseudo-Danielic Literature,” 155.
ordered an armada of 400 warships to set sail northwards from their Syrian ports to attack Constantinople. He argues that such a vast fleet would not have bypassed the important Byzantine naval stronghold of Attalia, and posits that the record of its fall is that to which the Discourses refers.\(^{287}\) The weakness with this theory is that there exists no corroborating evidence that the armada ever took Attalia. As it turns out, the Arab fleet never reached the Byzantine capital; it was utterly wrecked near the Chelidonian Islands, with only a handful of ships surviving to limp back to their Syrian ports.\(^{288}\) Still, Alexander places the composition of the Discourses in the short period between the report of Attalia’s fall, where the prospect of 400 warships spurred the spontaneous creation of this pseudonymous text, and the eventual foundering of the fleet.


Alexander: Daniel Ἐς τα"ν
Berger: No. 41, Gr. Daniel III
Bouret: D I
DiTommaso: Greek Vision of Daniel on the Last Times and the End of the World
García Martinez: Visions of Daniel on the Last Times and on the End of the World
Haelewyck: No. 257, Vision Danielis de tempore nouissimo et de fine mundi (graece)
Halkin: No. 1872
Oegema: 3 ApkDan (gr)
Pertusi: Visione del profeta Daniele sull’ultimo tempo e sul compimento del secolo
Rydén, “Andreas Salos”: Second Greek Vision of Daniel; *Life of St. Andrew the Fool*: Daniel Ἐς τα"ν = Vision of Daniel, and VisDan = Vision of Daniel
[see note 290, infra]
Schmoldt: VD: Die Vision Daniels über die letzte Zeit
Stegmüller: No. 117,2, Visio Danielis de tempore novissimo

The Vision of Daniel on the Last Times was first edited by Vassiliev\(^{289}\) and then almost eight decades later again by Schmoldt, the latter accompanied by a German translation.\(^{290}\) As with almost all the


\(^{288}\) See the sources cited at Alexander, *Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition*, 75 note 11.

\(^{289}\) Vassiliev, *Anecdota graeco-byzantina*, 38–43. For emendations to the text, see again Politis, *IV 4* (1897), 97. Edition identified in Halkin, *BHG*\(^3\), as no. 1872 (following *BHG*).

\(^{290}\) Schmoldt, “Vom jungen Daniel,” 202–219. The Vision of the Last Times is
Byzantine apocalyptic literature attributed to Daniel, there are questions surrounding the number of manuscripts in which this text is extant.

First, Vassiliev, who edits the text from the same Vatican codex Barberiniani gr. 284 [olim gr. III.3]291 from which he recovered a copy of the Discourses of John Chrysostom, remarks that the Vision of the Last Times appears also in two Biblioteca Marciana codices, gr. II.125 [olim Nanianus 181] and gr. VII.38 [olim Nanianus 154], although he does not provide the precise foliation for either copy.292 Vassiliev’s information about these two Venetian copies is reiterated by Stegmüller293 and Haelewyck.294 But this information is out of step with Alexander’s unambiguous statement that the text is preserved in one manuscript only.295 Schmoldt provides a resolution to the conundrum: he considers both Venetian manuscripts to be copies not of the Vision of the Last Times but rather of the Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel (§2.23).296 This assertion is supported by the comments of Mioni, who describes both codices in his catalogue of the Greek manuscripts in the Biblioteca Marciana.297

Second, Vassiliev also asserts that the text at Marciana codex gr. II.125 is paralleled by two Paris copies located in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France codices gr. 947 and gr. 2180, an assertion that is reiterated by Stegmüller but not by Haelewyck. These Paris texts, too, however, are copies of the Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel, a fact made clear by Mioni’s comments, by the fact that Schmoldt again

---

291 Fols. 141v–152v; Vassiliev lists fol. 142 ff., but the title actually appears near the bottom of the sheet at fol. 141v.
292 Vassiliev, Anecdota graeco-byzantina, xxiv.
293 Stegmüller, Repertorium.
294 Haelewyck, Clavis Apocryphorum VT, 207.
295 Alexander, Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition, 77.
lists them as such, and, most importantly, in Halkin’s *Manuscrits grecs de Paris*, the manuscripts of which he cross-indexed with Stegmüller’s identifying numbers.\(^{298}\)

In other words, both the two Venetian texts and the two Parisian texts in question are copies of the *Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel*, and not of the *Vision of the Last Times*.

Third, both Vassiliev and Haelewyck assert that this apocalypse also survives in the Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek codex phil. 58 [*olim* 211], fols. 44–50, listed by Haelewyck as dating from the sixteenth century.\(^{299}\) According to H. Hunger, however, codex phil. gr. 58 is a fifteenth-century manuscript of Pindar, while codex phil. gr. 211, which is from the sixteenth century, has only 33 fols.\(^{300}\)

From the perspective of its content, and thus its date and provenance, the *Vision of Daniel On the Last Times* is best described as a patchwork-quilt of material drawn from a diversity of sources from various historical periods. Alexander’s reconstruction of the composition of this text, the final form of which he dates to 867–869,\(^{301}\) is detailed, brilliant, and, in the main, convincing.\(^{302}\) He identifies no less than ten separate parts, five of which are historical and five of which are eschatological. The five *ex eventu* historical pieces describe various historical events from the eighth and ninth centuries. In order, these are i) the Muslim sack of Rome in 846, composed in Italy or perhaps even Rome; ii) the early eighth-century Muslim conquest of the southern Iberia; iii) the internecine strife of the second

\(^{298}\) See §2.23, on the *Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel*. For BNF codd. gr. 947 and gr. 2180, see Halkin, *Manuscrits grecs de Paris*, 92–93, 232. On the Venezia codd., recall also that the text at codex gr. II.125 has been edited twice: once by Tischendorf (employing variants from the two Parisian copies) and once in a critical edition by Klostermann (employing the text from the two Venetian copies at codd. gr. II.125 and gr. VII.38, and the two Parisian copies). There seems to be no question that all four codices preserve copies of the same manuscript.

\(^{299}\) Vassiliev, *Anecdota graeco-byzantina*, xxiv–xxv, and Haelewyck, *Clavis Apocryphorum VT*, 207. This is the same text that Istrin, “А. Изслѣдовыане. II. Видѣнія Даниила” and Bousset, “Geschichte der Eschatologie,” 298, identify as a copy of the *Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel* (see §2.23 and esp. note 417, *infra*). The reason cited below why cod. phil. 58/211 cannot be a copy of the *Vision of Daniel on the Last Times* also means that it cannot be a copy of the *Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel*.


\(^{301}\) Berger, “Hellenistisch-heidnische Prodigien,” 1462, however, dates the text to the eighth century.

quarter of the ninth century among the southern Italian principalities; iv) the murder of Michael III in 867; and v) the Arab-Byzantine conflict in Sicily, specifically the events of 852–853, but also possibly referring to the earthquake that struck Constantinople early in 869. The five eschatological pieces are as follows: i) a description of the coming of a victorious emperor (whose name begins with the letter lambda) that parallels a portion of the Discourses of John Chrysostom; ii) a passage on three emperors, again reflecting a section from the Discourses; iii) a note on a good emperor who will rule for thirty-two years, which agrees very closely with a section from the Slavonic Vision of Daniel the Prophet on the Emperors; iv) a section foretelling the coming of an angel of destruction; and finally v) a passage on the Last Roman Emperor, which recalls the articulation of the topos in the Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius and, in its last sentences, the Discourse.

Whether Alexander has correctly isolated of the constituent parts of the Vision of the Last Times and adequately recounted the process of their redaction is open to debate. He does not appear to account for Bousset’s hypothesis that the first so-called eschatological element (i.e., the notice of the victorious king whose name begins with a lambda) may be identified with the figure of Leo III, who, as we have seen already, plays an important role in other Byzantine Daniel apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles. While it is true that the notice of this emperor was lifted from its eschatological context in the Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius, the specific references to his name and his actions suggest that the redactor of the Vision of the Last Times may have adapted an eschatological motif to fit an ex eventu historical parallel. The fact that Leo III reigned after many of the events described in the earlier sections of the Vision of the Last Times seems unimportant given that these sections are themselves without an overall chronological order. In fact, it seems to me that the dividing line between history and prophecy should be set before the appearance of the

---

303 On the way that this information is presented in the text, see Rydén, “Andreas Salos,” 232 note 83.
304 See Vassiliev 36.17–34 (Discourses) and 39.15–40.16 (Last Times).
305 Vassiliev 36.34–37.13 (Discourses) and 40.16–41.10 (Last Times).
306 Vassiliev 41.10–24 (Discourses) with Slavonic Vision of Daniel §9.
emperor who will reign for thirty-two years, whose ultimate antecedent was an eschatological expectation of a coming king on the order of Constantine the Great, who is said to have ruled for such a span of time, or perhaps somewhere in the previous period of the three emperors, although again we must be sensitive to the fact that the author/redactor of the Vision of the Last Times might have been historicising the originally eschatological material he adapted from the Discourses.

A full analysis of this complex text is beyond the scope of this chapter. Regardless of the many issues surrounding the original date and provenance of its many constituent elements, what seems clear is that Alexander is correct in his argument that the extant version dates from the period 867–869.

2.17. The Vision of Daniel by the River Kebar (cf. Hebrew §IV)

Berger: No. 45, Hebr Daniel
Denis: La (Quatorzième) Révélation/Vision (de l’archange Gabriel) à Daniel
DiTommaso: Mediaeval Genizeh Fragment of a Hebrew “Vision of Daniel”
García Martínez: Hebrew Pseudo-Daniel
Oegema: ApkDan (hebr)
Rydén, Life of St. Andrew the Fool: VisDanHeb = Vision of Daniel in Hebrew

This Jewish apocryphal Daniel apocalypse is preserved in a unique manuscript folio, inscribed recto and verso, which was discovered by S. Schechter in the Cairo Genizah and later presented by him to

---

310 Both Berger (Daniel-Diegeze, xv, re No. 46: “Frgm Hebr Daniel”) and Oegema (Zwischen Hoffnung und Gericht, 129 note 90: “FrDan (hebr)”) refer to a fragment of a Daniel apocalypse, which is preserved at Oxford, Bodleian cod. heb. 2642, fol. 43 and which was published first under the title הומדש הוה by S. Wertheimer (Jerusalem, 1893–1897), 2.30) and again by I. Lévy (“Une apocalypse judéo-arabe,” REJ 67 (1914), 178–182). The text contains what appears to a portion of an ex eventu review of history, within which Lévy identifies historical figures dating from the end of the seventh and the start of the eighth centuries, although of course we cannot be sure as to what point in history this review ceases. García Martínez, however, rightly observes that the text is “a simple fragment of Arab history, seen from a Jewish perspective” and not a fragment of an apocryphal Daniel apocalypse. The text does not mention Daniel nor do its contents give any reason to believe that it should be associated with the prophet, despite a possible passing allusion to Dan 8:8. Although ex eventu references to kings and empires are hallmarks of Daniel apocalypses both biblical and apocryphal, they are by no means limited to them, and thus one cannot simply attribute an anonymous text to Daniel on this basis. Had the empires been four in number (cf. Daniel 2 and 7), a better case could perhaps be made.
the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. Although its formal title is לְעִיָּל נַחֲרַּנְבָּר (line 2 of the recto), we have added to it the phrase "by the river Kebar" (cf. Ezek 1:1, 3; 10:15, 20, 22; 43:3), which appears on line 4, in order to distinguish this apocalypse from the many others that bear this title or variations on it. García Martínez states that the title of this text is “the fourteenth vision” of Daniel, reading (apud L. Ginzberg) the phrase רִבְּקָה הָנָרָכָר (recto, line 3). Y. Ibn-Shmuel proposes the emendation רִבְּקָה הָנָרָכָר (“of the hand”), which would allude to the hand that grasped Daniel at Dan 10:10, a reading which A. Sharf considers preferable. If the adjective “fourteen” were unique to this text, one might tend to agree with Ibn-Shmuel and Sharf. The fact that the title “Fourteenth Vision” also appears—admittedly in a different context—in the Coptic Fourteenth Vision of Daniel at least proves that there is precedent for this otherwise unusual term.

The principal physical characteristic of this manuscript sheet that affects the reading of the text is a tear running from the half-way point along the right margin (viewed recto) to the bottom margin at a point one third of the way from the bottom left corner. The net effect is that the sheet is divided into two fragments; viewed recto, the second, smaller piece essentially encompasses the lower right quadrant. The folio recto contains twenty-two lines of text and several words scribbled in the right-hand portion of the upper margin. The first line is a single line of text from another composition, the second line is the title line, and the rest of the page contains the


313 Ibn-Shmuel, לְעִיָּל נַחֲרַּנְבָּר, 249.


315 Which Sharf (ibid., 120 note 11) calls “the concluding blessing of another composition.”
initial twenty lines of text. The *verso* contains twenty-six lines of text, the last five of which are seemingly only partially preserved. Because of the fractured state of the text at the bottom of the *verso*, and the fact that no photograph of the *verso* of the smaller piece exists (see *infra*), it is unclear whether the text ended here or continued on other sheets no longer extant.

The text of the *Vision* is apparently continuous, since the catchword in the bottom margin of the *recto* corresponds to the first word on the *verso*. The *editio princeps*, with the text arranged line by line, was published by Ginzberg in an essay in his 1928 volume dedicated to Schechter. The frontispiece to the volume contains a negative photograph of the *recto* side of the sheet, the smaller piece included.\(^{316}\) The text of the Hebrew *Vision of Daniel* was later edited by Ibn-Shmuel in a running, pointed text that in places differs significantly from Ginzberg’s edition,\(^{317}\) and by R. Bonfil (*verso* only, lines 5–24).\(^{318}\) Bonfil’s article also includes positive photographs of both sides of the manuscript sheet, but with the smaller piece missing. English translations of the text, which also to some degree differ both among themselves and from the editions, are offered by J. Starr (very partial),\(^{319}\) Sharf (almost complete, and based principally on Ginzberg’s edition),\(^{320}\) and G.W. Buchanan.\(^{321}\) Since no photograph of the *verso* exists with the smaller piece included, it is impossible to check these editions and translations in this regard.

The Hebrew *Vision of Daniel by the River Kebar* opens with the note that the revelation occurs during the reign of Cyrus, the king of Persia, although the regnal year is not identified (*recto*, line 3). As mentioned, the place is the River Kebar (line 4), which is a site that is particularly associated with Ezekiel’s vision of the divine presence. The vision is never revealed to the reader, but Gabriel, the captain of the celestial host (line 5), appears to Daniel and interprets that

\(^{316}\) Ginzberg, “חֵרֵנָה יָנוּש.”

\(^{317}\) Ibn-Shmuel, “חֵרֵנָה יָנוּש.” See, esp., the places in his text that correspond to *recto* lines 17–22 and *verso* lines 5–6. According to Sharf, “Byzantine-Jewish Historical Source,” 120, the poor state of the text on the *verso* of the sheet prompted Ibn-Shmuel to emend the text radically.

\(^{318}\) Bonfil, “חֵרֵנָה יָנוּש.”


\(^{320}\) Sharf, “Byzantine-Jewish Historical Source,” the translation of which was later reprinted in his “Vision of Daniel.”

\(^{321}\) Buchanan, “Vision of Daniel.”
which is to happen at “the end of days” (בְּמִשְׂרֹת הָדִבְרֵי; line 7). The first part of the vision is an ex eventu review of history that details the rise, rule, and fall of a succession of kings, who are identified cryptically. The first is identified by the sign ב ר ס (line 7), the second by the sign ב ר מ (line 11), the third by the name לֶאֶל (who will rule with the help of a “man of Cush” (מִרְהָמִים, lines 15–16), the fourth “a man from Arabia” (line 17), and so on for another three kings, until Tyre shall conquer the kingdom (verso, line 1).

There next follows a brief interlude wherein Gabriel tells Daniel to seal his words until the end of time (lines 2–5). Following this, the interpretation of the vision resumes with more references to end-time (?) events, beginning with the rise of a “son of a wicked man” (line 6), who will rule over אֶלֶף אָנָח の (line 7). For the most part, however, the description of events on the verso of the folio is concerned less with kings and more with social structures and physical phenomena. As with the rest of the text, the information here is enigmatic. Rome will be burned with a heavenly fire (line 10) but those (Jews?) who live in other places, including Rome, will be spared and blessed (lines 13–14). Climactic and meteorological calamities will follow (lines 16–22). Rome is again mentioned in line 24. The last four lines of the text are extremely fragmentary and unclear, although most of the editors and translators of the text insert—without evidence, in my opinion—a note that the Messiah will appear (line 26).

As with most of the other apocryphal Daniel apocalypses, there is some discussion surrounding the date of composition and provenance which invariably touches on the identities of the biographical and historical allusions. The general consensus is that the first three kings allude to Emperors Michael III, surnamed the Drunkard (ruled 842–867), Basil I, called the Macedonian (ruled 867–886, co-ruler

---

322 This is clearly a transliteration from the Greek, Ἑπτάλοφος. See below for further comment.
323 See Ibn-Shmuel, “laynd ἦ χ’”; Sharf, “Vision of Daniel”: “Then the Messiah will reign”; Buchanan, “Vision of Daniel”: “Then the [messianic king] will rule.” But note the text as edited by Ginzberg, לֶאֶל יְאָנָח חָרָם... וְיַעֲקֹב צַיָּה. Because the smaller piece of the manuscript sheet on which this text appears is not included in any of the published photographs, it is impossible to check the text at this point.
324 The ב ר ס is unexplained, however. Ginzberg אֶלֶף אָנָח גָּדוֹר, 313–314, and Ibn-Shmuel, אֶלֶף אָנָח גָּדוֹר, 245, understand the letters as referring to the word ב ר ס, or “enemy”; Starr, Jews in the Byzantine Empire, 135, calls the symbol “undecipherable”;
from 870),\textsuperscript{325} and Leo (\textsuperscript{¶\textsc{bl}}) VI (ruled 870–912, sole ruler from 886) and that the \textit{Vision} was composed in the milieu of the late ninth-century or early tenth-century Byzantine Empire.\textsuperscript{326} Oegema, however, remarks that the text could date from as early as the eighth century,\textsuperscript{327} while at the other end of the spectrum S. Krauss opines that allusions to “great Tyre” (\textit{verso}, line 1) and the burning of the “cities of Rome the guilty” (\textit{verso} line 10) could refer to the period surrounding the Crusader sack of Constantinople in 1204.\textsuperscript{328} So much remains unclear, however, even at the level of understanding the text of the \textit{Vision} itself, which in places permits several readings. As mentioned, the text and translations differ among themselves in many minor points, and a portion of the text appears to have been lost since Ginzberg’s time. These difficulties only add to the confusion surrounding the extremely cryptic allusions to other, perhaps historical figures and events,\textsuperscript{329} such as the “man from Arabia” (\textit{recto}, line 17) and the mysterious city \textit{ˆwpwlfpa}.\textsuperscript{330}

In addition, a lack of reference to the struggle with the Islamic Arabs robs us of a historical reference point that assists in dating

---

\textsuperscript{325} The \textit{bO ytç} likely stand for the first letters in both his title and his name: \textit{Vasileis Basileios}.

\textsuperscript{326} Sharf, “Byzantine-Jewish Historical Source,” 134–135, observes that the \textit{Vision}’s positive, even loyal, attitude toward Byzantium is in marked contrast to the anti-Byzantine Jewish sentiment of earlier periods (such as the second half of the seventh century) and that the contrast made between Rome and Byzantium might be reflective of the clash between the two over territories in southern Italy during the second half of the ninth century. This is also the era, Sharf notes, that Liudprand of Cremona made his famous embassy to Byzantium. Bishop Liudprand, it will be recalled, wrote of the importance of Daniel apocalypses to the Byzantine state.

\textsuperscript{327} Oegema, \textit{Zwischen Hoffnung und Gericht}, 129.

\textsuperscript{328} Krauss, “Un nouveau texte,” suggests the following order of kings: Michael III, Basil I, Leo VI, Romanos I Lakapenos.

\textsuperscript{329} See Starr, \textit{Jews in the Byzantine Empire}, 135: “This obscure composition . . . bristles with difficulties.”

\textsuperscript{330} Cf. note 322, supra.
many of the other apocryphal Daniel apocalypses. If we assume that the text as it stands is a product of the ninth century, it is extremely odd to find that it speaks so voluminously of the relationship among the nations (especially on the verso of the manuscript sheet) but offers nothing regarding what was in reality the central feature of Byzantine foreign policy, namely, the dire threat posed by the Muslim expansion. One answer is that the text antedates the struggle between the Byzantines and the Arab Muslims, but this seems unrealistic given the fairly solid historical allusions just mentioned. Another possibility is that because only a single sheet survives of what might have been a much longer text, all references to the Byzantine-Arab struggle might have been lost. A third possible answer is that the community that produced or redacted the Hebrew Vision of Daniel had a very restricted historical perspective, and was concerned—through the prophetic word—with historical figures and events only inasmuch as they were important to the community. A close analogy would be the way in which the Qumran community interpreted world events in light of biblical prophecy and filtered through the narrow lens of its own past history, present needs, and future expectations. In this scenario, the person or community that produced the Hebrew Vision of Daniel simply might not have been concerned with the Byzantine-Arab conflict as being particularly important. An analogous situation in the Daniel apocalypses exists in the way that the author/redactor of the Greek Diegesis Danielis seems to have been uninterested in the iconoclastic controversies of the eighth century, contrary to the modern expectations of his interests.

Bonfil argues that much of the text of the verso of the Vision of Daniel by the River Kêbar is a pastiche, drawn from or influenced by Byzantine Greek apocryphal Daniel apocalypses. García Martínez takes this to mean that “we cannot see in this work—in contrast to what Ginzberg suggested—the evidence of a Jewish apocalyptic tradition that would have emerged after a millennium of silence.”

This last statement, however, seems contra-indicated by the evidence that the Jewish apocalyptic tradition remained alive in post-Second Temple times. What is more, even if the Hebrew Vision of Daniel

---

332 See the texts contained in A. Jellinek, Aus Israels Lehrhallen (5 vols.; Leipzig, 1907–1910); n.b. also some of the texts discussed in M. Buttenwieser, “Apocalyptic Literature, Neo-Hebraic,” The
were a mere patchwork of Byzantine ideas and expectations, the fact that these were given Jewish expression (with Jewish concerns and a Jewish perspective) must to some degree speak to the existence of a community for which the apocalyptic voice had some meaning. I am not so sure that Bonfil is entirely correct, either. The pastiche form is common enough among the Byzantine apocalyptic writings attributed to Daniel, but whereas those texts are also noted for their distinct lack of literary ornamentation, the Hebrew *Vision of Daniel* is far closer in style to the non-Byzantine texts, with its comparatively rich introductory section and the clear sense that Daniel’s vision is mediated by an angel.

Whatever its origins, the Hebrew *Vision of Daniel* is no mere reflection of a Byzantine Christian antecedent, but more probably should be understood as a Jewish adaptation of the form. We should also recall that this text was likely composed in a culture that might have had access to both the Byzantine and Arab Muslim traditions of apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha.

The *Vision of Daniel by the River Kebar* gives the impression of being a redacted text, perhaps in places several times removed from the original. Even bearing in mind the adage that apocalypses in general are often cryptic and not always internally consistent, several items stand out. Most significant perhaps is the matter of the place in the text where the angel Gabriel orders Daniel to seal the interpretation until the end of time (*verso*, lines 2–5). Normally, such instructions or commands precede or conclude the description of a vision and its interpretation; they do not appear in the middle of it. One might argue that the Hebrew *Vision of Daniel* preserves more than one vision-interpretation, such as we find in Daniel 7–12, which contains a sequence of visions and their interpretations, each one framed by its own introductory and concluding formulae. If the *Vision of Daniel* could be shown to share this structure, then the seemingly odd placement of Gabriel’s instructions might be explained as the

---

conclusion to one vision-interpretation, which immediately precedes another vision-interpretation at line 6.

Yet this argument fails to hold water. To begin, despite the problems with reading this text, it is clear that Hebrew Vision of Daniel contains only one vision and its interpretation, not a sequence of visions, and there is absolutely no sense that the subject of the text on the verso after line 5 is different from what precedes line 2. Moreover, the clear introductory formula of recto lines 4–6 (where Daniel is standing at the Kebar and sees Gabriel) is not repeated before verso line 6. Furthermore, it is important to recognize that every one of the extant Daniel apocalypses consists of no more than a single vision or revelation and its interpretation, sometimes framed by introductory and concluding formulae.333 In other words, the Daniel 7–12 pattern of a sequence of visions and interpretations is never reflected in the any of the other later Daniel apocalypses, and there is no reason to think that anything is different here with the Hebrew Vision of Daniel. Given the unlikelihood, then, that the Hebrew Vision of Daniel contains more than one vision-interpretation or that it preserves a unique example of what should be concluding formula placed in the middle of an interpretation, another explanation for this unusual placement could be that its unusual structure is a result of editorial redaction.

Another indication that we might be dealing with a redacted text is the apparent confusion over the identity of the city called ˆwpwlfpa (verso, lines 6 and 14). Ginzberg suggests that it refers to Rome, the legendary seven-hilled city of antiquity;334 this view is also followed by Sharf in his studies.335 But Buchanan correctly observes that Rome is called by name several times throughout the text (verso lines 10, 12, and 24) and at verso lines 12–14 a clear distinction is made between Rome and ˆwpwlfpa.336 Now, the epithet “seven-hilled” is often employed in other Byzantine-era apocalypses to refer to Constantinople.337 The difficulty with assuming that ˆwpwlfpa is Constantinople is that in the list of blessed places, which includes Rome and which

333 The Persian Qissa-yi Dāniyāl contains both legenda about Daniel (unusually, told in the first person) and a concluding vision. But there is only one vision, with its own introductory and concluding formulae.
337 In fact, it appears in almost every Byzantine Greek Daniel apocalypse!
is contrasted by Buchanan with mention of the war in ṭb_water, also
includes ṭb_water, or Istanbul/Stamboul. Accordingly, if a distinc-
tion between Rome and ṭb_water is to be made, it also ought to be
made between Istanbul and ṭb_water. This means that ṭb_water can
be neither Rome nor Constantinople, and that makes no sense, since
“seven-hilled” cannot refer to anything else but Rome or Constan-
tinople. A possible explanation for this apparent contradiction is that
the Hebrew Vision of Daniel is a redacted document and there may
be several layers of text—including one wherein Rome is called
ḥṣṭlḥ and one wherein Constantinople is called ṭb_water—that are
not fully harmonized.

The author or redactor of the Vision of Daniel by the River Kēbar
borrows some terms and themes from the biblical Book of Daniel.
Most conspicuous is the theme of a succession of kingdoms, each
ruling in its turn, with the entire enterprise of history firmly under
the control of God. This is common enough to most of the other
apocryphal Daniel apocalypses as well. What is unique with this text,
however, is that, as in the court tales of Book of Daniel, righteous
kings are rewarded and wrong-headed or prideful kings are pun-
ished. The Vision, for example, asserts that God will increase the
kingdom of Leo, the third king, on account of his providing relief
to the people of the saints of the Most High (recto, lines 15–16), but
that God will shorten the reign of the king who tortures them
with expulsion (recto, lines 19–20).

Krauss argues that the Vision of Daniel by the River Kēbar is the prod-
uct of a Jewish convert to Christianity. Sharf firmly refutes this the-
sis.339 In its style, content, and tenor, this apocalypse is Jewish. As
Rydén observes, it is related to a “Vision of Daniel,” although I hes-
itate to agree with him that it is a version of the “Vision of Daniel,” since
this assumes that there was only one such “Vision” and that,
even if this archetype did exist, the Hebrew Vision of Daniel is no
more than a version of it. The Hebrew Vision also shares some ele-
ments with the Andreas Salos apocalypse which is part of the Life
of St. Andrew the Fool.

338 On what this exactly could mean, see the discussion in Sharf, “Byzantine-
Jewish Historical Source,” 127–128.
339 Krauss, “Un nouveau texte”; Sharf, “Byzantine-Jewish Historical Source,”
124–126.
340 Rydén, Life of St. Andrew the Fool, 345.

Previously unidentified by any of the major studies before Cook.

This apocryphal Daniel apocalypse is part of a larger composition, the *Kitāb al-malāḥim* of Ibn al-Munādī (died 947).341 The first study of this Daniel apocalypse appears in D. Cook’s 2002 *Arabica* article, most of which is devoted to an English translation of the text.342 Based on the internal evidence of the text, Cook dates the present form of the apocalypse to the years 934–947, although he notes that it is possible that Ibn al-Munādī updated an older text.343 If we judge the information in the text’s prologue to be at least partly true, then Ibn al-Munādī simply recorded what he had heard from others.

The Arabic *Apocalypse of Daniel* is by some degree the longest of all the apocryphal Daniel apocalypses. Cook has divided it into eight distinct sections,344 and there is no reason why we should not follow his lead here.345 The revelation,346 which is itself not recorded, is interpreted by an angel, but it is not the angel Gabriel, who plays a part in the interpretation and is referred to in the third person (pp. 88–91). The first section, a review of history, concentrates on the reign of a series of kings (pp. 76–77), which Cook identifies as the ‘Abbāsids of the end of the ninth and beginning of the tenth centuries. The second section revolves around the rise of the Sufyānī, the messianic figure—false, as it turns out—of the Syrian Muslims (pp. 77–86). The action, which ranges along the width of the Muslim world from North Africa to the Arabian peninsula, involves the conflict between the ‘Abbāsid sultan and this Sufyānī, who is supported by other local and tribal messianic figures. The third section concerns the downfall of the Sufyānī and the appearance of the Ḥasanī, who is the true messianic figure and a descendant of the

---


343 *Ibid.*, 59, 65: “. . . it is possible that it is based upon earlier documents and ideas.”

344 Cook’s translation contains the page numbers to the 1997 edition of the text (see note 341, *supra*). I employ these page numbers whenever I cite from Cook’s translation.


346 So it is called in the conclusion, p. 111.
Muhammad the Prophet (pp. 86–91) The Sufyânī emerges victorious in his conflict with the sultan, but God turns on him after a series of atrocities in Arabia. Here the text breaks off, and Cook notes that other sources tell us of a battle between the Sufyânī and the Ḥasanî in which the former is defeated and seeks asylum in Byzantium. The next section details the Ḥasanî’s war with the Byzantines (pp. 91–99), whom he overcomes.

The fifth section of the Arabic *Apocalypse of Daniel* somewhat jarrringly introduces the figure of the Antichrist and other figures seemingly opposed to the Ḥasanî (pp. 99–104). Much is said about the temptations offered by the Antichrist, but the section ends with his authority challenged by al-Hidr and then Jesus (also identified as Messiah), who kills him. The next section concerns the messianic kingdom (pp. 104–108) and the dynasty of rulers drawn from the grandsons of the prophet Muhammad. All the nations will accept the call to Islam and a host of good things will come to the population of earth. But this is not to be the end of tribulation, however. After the line of the prophet dies out, a mawla will be appointed to rule over the decaying kingdom. The appearance of the ḍabbat al-ard (Qurʾān 27:82) precipitates the death of all true believers and the removal of the Qurʾān from the world. The seventh section continues in the same vein, concentrating on the terrible events at the end of the world (pp. 108–110). Gog and Magog will appear, having broken through the barrier that hitherto had kept them from the land. The Tigris and Euphrates will dry up, and corruption and pestilence will stalk the earth. The Ethiopians will rise to strike Mecca and the Kaʿba, but God will smite them and also kill Gog and Magog. On the last day no non-Muslim will be left on earth. The final section (p. 111) is a conclusion to the apocalypse, wherein Daniel asks the angel why he did not identify all the historical figures to come. The angel answers that if this knowledge is known, enemies of these figures would use this to plan pre-emptive strikes against these figures and their families.

Excursus II: The Figure of Daniel and the Arabic Muslim Daniel Apocalypses

Sometime in the decades and the centuries following the death of the Prophet Muhammad there seemingly arose among the Arab Muslims an intense interest in the figure of Daniel. Although Daniel is not mentioned in the Qurʾān, he somehow came to be associated with a wide range of
pseudepigraphic texts. Included in the lot are the two apocryphal apocalypses, the *Apocalypse of Daniel on the Events after al-Mutanab* and the *Vision of Daniel as Related to Ezra, His Pupil*, plus a half-dozen prognostica, the most famous and well-known of which, an anthological scientific treatise often called the *Malhamaat Dāniyyāl*, enjoyed a very wide popularity.

The Arabic *Apocalypse of Daniel* begins with a curious prologue in which the history of its transmission is recounted (p. 76). In it, the author relates that the information about the future that he is about to record is fourth-hand. He says that an acquaintance spoke to him of a certain man from the *ahl al-kitāb* (Jews and Christians; literally, the “people of the book”) who collected accounts of apocalyptic wars. This non-Muslim told the acquaintance that this particular apocalypse had once belonged to the “elders” (i.e., the non-Muslim elders, although whether Jew or Christian it is impossible to say), who regarded its secrets with such awe that they rarely showed it to anyone whom they do not trust. Unfortunately, the tale of how or why they let it out of their possession is not preserved.

What do we make of this odd story? Even if the notice of the existence of this non-Muslim collector of apocalypses is fictitious, the fact that the author includes it is highly suggestive. It would seem to indicate that, in the author’s time at least, there were enough of these apocalypses publicly available that the idea that they could be acquired by a private person would not have been considered unbelievable. The story therefore supports Bishop Liudprand of Cremona’s assertion about the wide prevalence of Daniel apocalypses among the Byzantines and the Saracens (see §1, *supra* and Chapter Five note 9).

More to the point, if there were in fact many such apocalyptic books in circulation within the author’s Arabic and Muslim compass, this could mean that this Arabic *Apocalypse of Daniel* was not composed *in vacuo* but perhaps rather in the conscious conceptual context of other Daniel (Byzantine?) apocalypses. Certainly some of the topoi seem familiar. As for the transmission history of the text which this prologue purports to relate, it is difficult to know where to draw the line between record and invention. The obvious conclusion is that the prologue is a fabrication, prefixed to the apocalypse in order to accord it the musty odour of age and authority. It seems unlikely, for example, that a non-Muslim individual or a group of such elders would compose, know of, or even care about an apocalypse that is so clearly Arabic and Muslim in scope and orientation. On the other hand, this elaborate tale of transmission history, while grossly inaccurate, might actually contain the kernel of truth that the text was indeed one which had been preserved in some previous form, which the author then either recorded faithfully or redacted.

R. Hoyland remarks that “Muslim interest in this genre [apocalypse] is illustrated by the existence of numerous versions of the apocalypse of Daniel, one allegedly translated from a Greek manuscript at the behest of Mu‘awiya I, and also by the report that the caliph Marwān II was pleased at an “apocalypse of Enoch” compiled for him by Cyriacus, bishop of Sistanm,
for it showed him succeeded by his son.”  In the Kitāb al-Fitan (18–19), it is reported that the Muslims, upon conquering Shūhtar, where tradition located the tomb of Daniel, discovered a book in the treasury of Hurmūzân, the Persian commander. The book, which apparently was found along with the head of Daniel himself, told of fitan—civil disorders and wars. The book was taken to one ’Umar, who read it and sent it thence to a certain Ka’b, who copied it into Arabic. It should also be remembered that certain copies of the aforementioned Malhamat Dāniyâl contain prognostics concerning fitan.

Evidence for lines of literary transmission between the Byzantines and the Arab Muslims regarding the figure of Daniel is also suggested by the prognostica. In the case of the Lunationes Danielis (see Chapter Four, §3), there seems to be a shared interest with certain eastern Daniel prognostica concerning the connexion between Adam, Daniel, and the secrets of the Cave of Treasures. In addition, it is possible that the Byzantine Greek Praedictions Danielis (see Chapter Four, §4) and the Arabic/Syriac Malhamat Dāniyâl (see Chapter Four, §5) are in fact copies of the same text, although it is impossible to determine their precise relationship at this point. As for the Somniale Danielis (see Chapter Four, §2), which was one of the most popular extra-biblical compositions in the mediaeval West, Lamoreaux reports that the lost dream manual of Kirmâni, who flourished at the end of the eighth or beginning of the ninth centuries was based in part on “books” of the prophet Daniel.

2.19. The Vision of Daniel as Related to Ezra, His Pupil (cf. Arabic §III)

Berger: No. 36, Ar Daniel
Denis: L’Apocalypse arabe de Daniel
DiTommaso: Arabic Daniel Apocalypse
García Martínez: Arabic Pseudo-Daniel
Haelewyck: No. 262, Apocalypsis Danielis arabica
Oegema: ApkDan (arab)
Pertusi: L’Apocalisse araba di Daniele
Stegmüller: No. 117,3a, Apocalypsis Danielis, versio arabica; No. 117,3b

According to F. Macler, who transcribed the text and translated it into French in an article published in 1904, the Arabic Vision of Daniel is a translation from a lost Greek text composed by a Byzantine Christian during the period when the Empire was under dire threat.

---

347 Hoyland, Seeing Islam, 330. Enoch apocrypha outside 1, 2, and 3 Enoch are extant.
from the Arab Muslim invasions of the eight and ninth centuries. The manuscript itself (which is preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France under the shelf number arab. 150, fols. 14r–20r) does not preserve a title, but towards the end of the text Daniel calls what he has experienced a “vision” (§68). This title also helps us distinguish this text from the Arabic Apocalypse of Daniel.

There is some confusion concerning the number of manuscripts in which the Arabic text is preserved. García Martínez asserts that the Vision “has come down to us in two Mss,” but he does not identify them. In his Clavis, Haelewyck lists two editions of the Vision, each based on a different manuscript, the first partially edited and translated into English in 1888 by Gottheil and the second edited and translated by Macler. Denis cites Haelewyck on the matter and asserts that Gottheil’s text is based on “un autre ms. que Fr. Macler,” while Henze merely lists Gottheil’s edition under the general rubric of the Arabic apocalypse attributed to Daniel. Haelewyck’s argument is that Gottheil based his partial edition of the Vision on a short text from a manuscript codex belonging to the Union Theological Seminary in New York.

According to Gottheil, however, the text he presents in his brief article is a copy of the text contained in the Union Theological Seminary codex. In other words, he does not use this Union Theological Seminary codex at all; in fact, he tells us explicitly that his manuscript comes from Paris, “Arabic Paris MS. 107” to be precise. It could very well be that the previous scholarship has simply misunderstood what Gottheil says.

But what of this Union Theological Seminary manuscript codex? Even if Gottheil did not base his edition on it, he still maintains

---

351 I employ the divisions of the text according to Macler.
352 García Martínez, “Pseudo-Danielic Literature,” 150; n.b.: by assigning two distinct numbers to this text (viz., 117,3a and 117,3b), Stegmüller, Repertorium, appears to consider that Macler’s article refers to two separate and different texts.
353 Haelewyck, Clavis apocryphorum VT, 209.
355 Macler, “L’Apocalypse arabe.”
356 Denis, Introduction, 1303 note 130; see also Pertusi, Fine di Bisanzio, 38 note 120, where Gottheil’s work is cited as an edition of the Macler text.
357 Henze, Syriac Apocalypse of Daniel, 3.
that it contains a short text which itself is a copy of the Arabic *Vision of Daniel*. In fact, though, this short text was translated into English in a 1886 article by I.H. Hall, who titled it “The Vision of Ezra the Scribe Concerning the Latter Times of the Ishmaelites.”

A quick glance through this short text demonstrates, *contra* Gottheil, that it is not a second copy of the Arabic *Vision of Daniel* but is a copy of the Syriac *Apocalypse of Ezra*, another edition of which, coincidentally, was published by F. Baethgen in the same year but from a different manuscript. In sum, then, Gottheil does not use the short text from the Union Theological Seminary manuscript codex, nor is it a copy of the Arabic *Vision of Daniel*.

The problem with the number of manuscripts is not yet resolved, however. We have seen how Gottheil identifies his manuscript as “Arabic Paris MS. 107.” He does so on the basis of comments made by H. Derenbourg, whom Gottheil states had sent him extracts from the text. As we have seen, Macler, who is seemingly unaware of Gottheil’s work, employs the Paris codex arab. 150. On the surface, these statements would seem to imply that there are two Paris manuscript copies of the Arabic *Vision of Daniel*, *viz.* BNF manuscript codices 107 and 150, and that this could be the situation to which García Martínez refers. The solution to the problem is simple: codex arab. 107 is the old shelf-number of codex arab. 150. In other words, the Arabic *Vision of Daniel* is extant in one, unique Paris copy.

---


360 F. Baethgen, “Beschreibung der syrischen Handschrift ‘Sachau 131’ aus der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin,” *July* 6 (1886), 199–210. This is not the Syriac *version of* 4 Ezra. For further sources on this apocalypse, see DiTommaso, *Bibliography*, 473.

361 Denis, *Introduction*, 1303, states that the Arabic *Vision of Daniel* is not the “Récélation d’Esdras, qui est un titre erroné.” Why he should assert this is unknown; he certainly does not mean the Syriac *Apocalypse of Ezra*, which he cites explicitly a little further along in the same paragraph.


363 The text in both manuscripts—and, indeed, both editions—begins at fol. 14r and ends at fol. 20r, and a comparison of the Arabic text presented in Gottheil’s edition with the text provided by Macler’s edition demonstrates that the texts are identical. Furthermore, in characterizing their manuscripts, both Gottheil (again, *apud* Derenbourg) and Macler cite the same description from W. MacGuckin (the Baron de Slane), *Catalogue des manuscrits arabes de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris, 1883–1895), 1.34: “Explication de la vision que le prophète Daniel raconta à son disciple Esdras, et indication de ce qui doit arriver aux enfants d’Ismaël et d’Agar la Copte.”
The Arabic *Vision of Daniel* is one of the longest of the apocryphal Daniel apocalypses, and opens with Daniel’s exhortation to Ezra to listen to his story about what will happen to the sons of Ishmael (§§2–3). Presumably Ezra the Scribe is meant, which would then suggest that it was Ezra who recorded his master’s words. At the end of the text, however, we are told that Daniel himself wrote down what he had experienced (§68). Whatever the case, Daniel has had a vision of an angel, but he tells Ezra that he learned about the future not by seeing things and having them interpreted, but when the angel urged him to open and read a scroll (§§4–5; cf. Isa. 29:11; Ezek. 2:9–10; Rev. 5:1). Unlike the Daniel apocalypses in the biblical Book of Daniel (but in step with the majority of the other apocryphal apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles), the time and setting in which this *Vision* occurs are left unmentioned.

As with the two Syriac Daniel apocalypses and the Coptic *Fourteen Vision of Daniel*, the Arabic *Vision of Daniel* is a long text, much longer than the Byzantine examples of the genre. Unlike the Syriac compositions, however, but very much like the *Fourteenth Vision*, the Arabic *Vision of Daniel* pays great attention to the details of the (ex eventu) historical review, particularly to the names of the rulers and a description of their reigns, which are presented by means of characteristically cryptic allusions. The description of the kings and their effect on various populations is consistently interrupted by Daniel’s pleas to God and general statements about divine justice. The author of the Arabic *Vision of Daniel* seems to have seconded his allusions for the rulers and kingdoms of his historical review from both the Book of Daniel (horns, beasts) and 4 Ezra (eagles, wings, lions).

The date of the Arabic *Vision of Daniel* is open to debate. Oegema suggests “vielleicht aus der Zeit der Kreuzzüge,” although its staccato nature might suggest that it is a composite document constituted of older sources. Whatever the case, there is a close affinity between the Arabic *Vision* and the Syriac *Apocalypse of Ezra*, so much so that, as we have seen, Gottheil understood the former to be an Arabic version of the latter.

---

365 Gottheil, “Arabic Version.”

Previously unidentified by any of the major studies.

The Biblioteca Marciana codex gr. VII.22 [olim Nanianus 244], written by the Cretan George Klontzas in the year 1590, contains two copies—at fols. 59r and fols. 84r–86r—of what might be described as the *Vision of Daniel on the Island of Crete*. The second copy bears the title Ἐξερα ὄρασις τοῦ προφήτου Δανιήλ περὶ τῆς νῆσου κρήτης. It is possible but unlikely that these texts are copies of the *Vision of Daniel on the Island of Cyprus* or, given the reference to Crete, copies of the *Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel*. More information will require an examination by autopsy of both texts in this Venetian codex.

G. Morgan, however, states that the prophecies ascribed to Daniel in Marciana gr. VII.22 (he does not provide specific foliation nor does he give any indication that there might be two copies of the text in this codex) are actually a version of a Byzantine prophetic-satirical poem. The poem appears in two other versions in different manuscripts: Biblioteca Marciana codex gr. IX.19, fol. 338bis recto, and a codex from the Brontisi Monastery in Crete, wherein the prophecies are attributed to Daniel the Monk.

---

366 On this codex, see note 28, supra.


368 There are two reasons why I do not believe that these two BM cod. gr. VII.22 texts are copies of *The Vision of Daniel on the Island of Cyprus*: i) the island mentioned is Crete, not Cyprus; and ii) the *incipit* of the text at fols. 84r–86r is ὧν οὖσα σοι κρήτης πολιορκουμένης, which although begins with a word of woe, seems unlike the *incipits* recorded for the other copies of the *Island of Cyprus*. But ultimately an examination by autopsy is required.


370 Again, two reasons: i) Mioni is obviously familiar with *The Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel*, since in the same catalogue he explicitly identifies the text preserved at fol. 86r as a copy—clearly, he would have mentioned that these texts at fol. 59r and fols. 84r–86r were copies had he felt that this were the case; and ii) the *incipit* of the text at fols. 84r–86r is different. But, again, ultimately an examination by autopsy is required.

Morgan dates the original form of the poem to the middle of the tenth century on the basis of an allusion to the Empress Theophano, wife of both Romanos II and Nicephorus Phocas. Much later, and stripped of its chronology, its prophecies were attributed to Daniel by Klontzas and incorporated in his collection of eschatological pronouncements.


Berger: No. 47, Kopt Daniel  
Denis: La Quatorzième Vision de Daniel  
DiTommaso: Coptic and Arabic “Fourteenth Vision of Daniel”  
García Martínez: Coptic Pseudo-Daniel  
Haelewyck: No. 261, Quartadecima uisio Danielis  
Oegema: ApkDan (kopt)  
Pertusi: XIV Visione copta di Daniele  
Stegmüller: No. 117,3c, Visio Danielis, versio arabica; No. 117,3d, Visio Danielis, translatio germanica versionis arabicae; No. 117,6, Apocalypsis Danielis, versio coptica [see *infra*]

The title of this Christian apocalypse is derived from its terminal position in some of the Coptic Bibles, which contain the stories of Bel and the Dragon but split and label them as the “twelfth” and “thirteenth” vision respectively. The Coptic text is extant in at least three manuscripts, including John Rylands University Library codex 419 and British Library codex Or. 1314 (anno 1374), the latter also containing a mediaeval Arabic translation of the Coptic

---

372 The existence of a third manuscript of the Coptic text is suggested by an old note that refers to the Bibliothèque impériale, fonds Saint-Germain-des-près 21 and is provided by E. Quatremère (“Daniel et les douze petits prophètes. Manuscrits coptes de la Bibliothèque impériale, n° 2, Saint-Germain, n° 21,” *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque impériale et autres bibliothèques* 8 (1810), 220–229 at 228–229). Most interestingly, Quatremère observes that the MS preserves “une note Arabe, presque entièrement effacée, qui se lit au bas, contient ces mots: *Ceci existait dans l'original Arabe, et nous l'avons traduit de l'arabe en copte*” (229; italics original).


375 And not 1090, as is stated in both Denis, *Introduction*, 1302, and Haelewyck, *Clavis apocryphorum VT*, No. 261. The mistake may be traced to a misreading of Crum, *Catalogue*, 321, who notes that “the coptic of Daniel [was copied] on the 9th Hathor A.M. 1090 = AD 1374.”
text376 in parallel columns on each folio, recto and verso. That the Arabic is a translation from the Coptic and not vice versa is suggested by the gematria included in the text (vv. 24, 47, 56), which, if the reconstructions are accurate, assume a Graeco-Coptic alpha-numeric system rather than an Arabic one. That Coptic rather than Greek is the original language of composition is indicated by the geographic horizon of the text, which, as García Martínez observes, is thoroughly Egyptian.377 The Coptic text was first published by C.G. Woide in 1799,378 and again later by J. Bardelli,379 H. Tattam (and accompanied by a Latin translation),380 and Macler (with a French translation).381 The Arabic text was edited by C.H. Becker in 1916.382

The Coptic Fourteenth Vision of Daniel begins with a preamble reminiscent of Dan 10:1–5. Daniel, having fasted and remaining unanointed with oil for a fortnight and a half, stands by the River Tigris during the third year of the reign of Cyrus the Persian and experiences a vision (vv. 1–3). The general template for this vision is the one of the four beasts and ten horns in Daniel 7, although the Fourteenth Vision differs from the biblical text in the description of the details of the four beasts (vv. 4–10) and the fact that an additional nine horns are added, making nineteen in total (vv. 11–12). The next three verses describe how Daniel meets the angel who will interpret his vision.383 The four beasts are identified as the kingdoms of the Persians, the Romans, the Hellenes (Byzantium), and the “Sons of

---

376 The Arabic is definitely not a different text, as is implied by Stegmüller’s assigning it a discrete number (Repertorium, Nos. 117,3c–d).
377 García Martínez, “Pseudo-Danielic Literature,” 152.
379 J. Bardelli, Daniel copto-memphitice (Pisa, 1849), ix–xii, 103–112.
380 H. Tattam, “Visio decima quarta,” Prophetae maiores in dialecto linguae aegyptiacae memphitica seu coptica (Oxford, 1858), 386–405. To the best of my knowledge, it was Tattam who first divided the text into eighty-eight numbered verses. I follow his versification, as does most of the rest of the scholarship on this text.
382 Becker, “Das Reich der Ismaeliten.”
383 O. Meinardus is wrong to understand two visions here, the first running from verses 3–10 and the second from verses 11–15 (“A Commentary on the XIVth Vision of Daniel according to the Coptic Version,” OCP 32 (1966), 394–449 at 410) The information about the horns and the angel follow naturally from the scene of the four beasts, just as they do in Daniel 7.
Ishmael.” These Ishmaelites are the Islamic Arabs, who will destroy the cities of the former kingdoms and from whom will sprout the aforementioned nineteen horns, here interpreted as kings (vv. 16–23). From verses 24 to 64 the Fourteenth Vision is concerned with the description of the tenth thorough nineteenth kings and with the events during their reigns.

After verse 64, however, and continuing to the end of the apocalypse, the interpretation proceeds completely beyond the information detailed in the vision. The action revolves around two entities called “Pitourgos” and “Sarapidos,” who war with each other until the former destroys the latter (v. 75). After this, a “King of the Romans” will arise over the “Sons of Ishmael” and dominate them for forty years (vv. 76–77) before the appearance of Gog and Magog (v. 78) and the Antichrist (v. 79), who will slay Enoch and Elijah in Jerusalem (v. 80). But the Ancient of Days—who is identified as a “Son of Man”—will appear, raise Enoch and Elijah from the dead, and kill the Antichrist (vv. 81–83). The Fourteenth Vision ends with the interpreting angel bidding Daniel to conceal what he has written, which Daniel does, and Daniel’s praise of God, the master of the times and the years (vv. 85–88).

Unlike most of the apocryphal Daniel apocalypses, the Coptic Fourteenth Vision of Daniel has been the subject of a considerable amount of scholarly attention over the past two centuries. The bulk of this attention has been devoted to establishing the date of the composition of the text, primarily through the identification of its numerous but often obscure historical allusions, and to a discussion of the related topos of the nineteen Muslim kings. Becker understands the historical events and figures described in Fourteenth Vision as pertaining to the end of the ‘Umayyad dynasty (around the middle of the

---

384 I.e., pi (the Coptic article) + tourgos (representing “Turk”) = “the Turk” (so H. Suermann, “Notes concernant l’apocalypse copte de Daniel et la chute des Omayyades,” POr 11 (1983), 329–348 at 339 note 17). But Hoyland, Seeing Islam, 290, maintains that “the identity of the Pitourgos is unclear.” The identification of Pitourgou with the Turk is also possible if we assume that the name “Sarapidus” is an allusion to the Fātimīds, but cf. J.M. van Lent, “The Nineteen Muslim Kings in Coptic Apocalypses,” POr 25 (2000), 643–693 at 662 note 57, who notes that the name Pitourgos could refer to Salāḥ al-Dīn (viz., Salādīn) or to the Ayyubid dynasty (who took power from the Fātimīds) in general.

385 Hoyland suggests that the name alludes to Sarapis, the Graeco-Egyptian god, and “so probably the Fatimids.” (Seeing Islam, 290)
eighteenth century), while Macler argues these things best fit the context of the fall of the Fātimid dynasty and the time of the Third Crusade (*i.e.*, the last decades of the twelfth century).

In his 1966 commentary on and English translation of the text, Meinardus combined the elements of both theories. He suggests that the original version of the *Fourteenth Vision* dealt with the fall of the ‘Umayyads and was written in the second half of the eighth century, but that this version was redacted and updated almost five centuries later, perhaps “under the stress of the fall of Jerusalem (1244),” so as to incorporate the events concerning the fall of the Fātimids, the Mongol invasions, and the Crusades. As for the often tenuous nature of the correlation between the information preserved in the *Fourteenth Vision* and the historical record, Meinardus remarks that, regardless of the level of redaction, “it is unnecessary and unwarranted ‘to match’ every statement in the apocalypse with a historical event.”

In a later article, however, Meinardus changed his mind on the very late date of the final redaction of the *Fourteenth Vision*. He argues that the anonymous biographer of the Alexandrian patriarchs Mark III (1166–1189) and John VI (1189–1216) is also perhaps the author of *Vision*, since it is referred to in the prologue to his work on Mark III.

Following Meinardus, H. Suermann attempts to reconstruct the original apocalypse in an English translation, and accordingly omits the parts of the text that he understands to refer to the Turks, the fall of the Fātimids, the Arab-Nubian wars, and the like. Notably,
although he attributes much of the interpretation of the events beyond the beginning of the reign of the eighteenth Muslim king (vv. 54–75) to activity of the redactor, Suermann considers the section from the advent of the King of the Romans to the end of the apocalypse (vv. 76–88) to be part of the original text, positing that it “est composé des éléments traditionnels de la ‘légende de l’Antichrist’.”

More recently, Hoyland has questioned whether the historical allusions are clear enough to establish a definite date, instead postulating that if the original language of the *Fourteenth Vision* was Coptic, “one would not wish to place its composition much later than the eleventh century, when Arabic was becoming established as the principal language of Egypt.” In response to Meinardus’ arguments for a thirteenth-century date, Suermann’s reconstruction of an original apocalypse, and Hoyland’s claim that the bulk of the allusions of the *Fourteenth Vision* defy positive identification, J. van Lent notes that the *topos* of the nineteen Muslim kings appears in other Coptic Arabic apocalypses, including the *Apocalypse of Shenute II*, which he dates to the time of the collapse of the ‘Umayyad dynasty. For van Lent, the core of the *Fourteenth Vision* (including a fair amount of material which Suermann consigns to a later redaction) dates to the post-‘Umayyad period, many of its historical allusions are indeed identifiable, and, *pace* Macler, the *Fourteenth Vision* was redacted in the second half of the twelfth century, the focal point being the fall of the Fâtimîd dynasty.

Each of the theories regarding the date of composition of the *Fourteenth Vision* has its strengths but none of them stands pre-eminent. Despite the attempts to date the text precisely, I am inclined to agree with Hoyland’s assessment, if not for the same reason. While he states that the historical allusions are too indistinct to identify, it seems to me that the fact they permit many different and equally

---

394 Ibid., 347.
395 Hoyland, *Seeing Islam*, 290. On the subject of the decay of the Coptic language, see the sources cited in van Lent, “Nineteen Muslim Kings,” 663 note 63. The fact that these two languages existed side-by-side perhaps explains the aforementioned British Library codex (which contains the Coptic and Arabic text of the *Fourteenth Vision*) and also helps cement the idea that Egypt was the place where the text was composed.
396 van Lent, “Nineteen Muslim Kings,” 654.
397 Ibid., 661–662, 668. A date at the end of the twelfth century is also the assessment of Denis, *Introduction*, 1302.
compelling scenarios. In other words, it is not that the evidence cannot be made to fit a historical scenario, it is that it fits too many disparate scenarios. What is clear, though, is that the historical data embedded in this apocalypse appears to be unconnected with that of the other apocryphal Daniel apocalypses.

2.22. *Nevu‘ot Daniel* (cf. Hebrew §V)

Previously unidentified by any of the major studies.

The *Nevu‘ot Daniel* was discovered in the Cairo Genizeh and currently is located in Sankt Petersburg, Russia. It is unpublished, but M. Ben Sasson is currently preparing an edition of the text, a preliminary transcription of which he graciously made available for the purposes of the present study. It must be stressed that my presentation and analysis of this text is necessarily incomplete: we still await the publication of the text and a detailed study of its points of contact with other mediaeval apocalypses, Jewish and Christian.

The text of the *Nevu‘ot Daniel* extends over three and a half folio pages in manuscript, with a definite ending in the middle of page four *recto*. The transcription reveals that each folio page contains anywhere from twenty-four to twenty-seven lines of text.

The *Nevu‘ot Daniel* appears to have a definite structure, although—as is the case with much of the Byzantine-era apocalyptic literature—the precise sequence of events is frequently difficult to follow. It is possible that the beginning of the text is missing, since it does appear that the *Nevu‘ot Daniel* commences in the middle of the vision report. Whatever the case, the first half of the text is devoted to this report, which in the extant text begins with a fairly detailed but cryptic review of history involving, among others, figures such as the King of Babylon, the King of Edom (or the Red King), and a certain Mahmed (Moḥammad?). At the end of the historical review there is a brief section describing the physiognomy of the Antichrist, a common concern of the late antique and mediaeval apocalypses, including, as we have seen, the Syriac *Revelation of Daniel the Prophet* (§2.5).

398 So Henze, *Syriac Apocalypse of Daniel*, 5 note 7. The precise shelf-number is unknown. Fragment probably *apud* Firkovich or Kapustin.

399 In accepting Prof. Ben Sasson’s offer I stated that I would not quote from the text directly nor describe its contents in any great detail. I did not have access to photographs of the text but, as noted, had to work from a transcription; as a result, several of my comments regarding it are deductive.
In the *Nevu’ot Daniel* the Antichrist is named Armilius⁴⁰⁰ and identified as בַּיֶּלַע — the “son of Belial.”⁴⁰¹

The focus of the action now switches to Daniel himself, who is accompanied by an angel. The angel reassures Daniel, telling him not to fear, and then proceeds to interpret the vision. The interpretation—if indeed this is what the text describes—appears to be somewhat out of step with the events as portrayed in the vision. It begins with a short account of Armilius’ actions and proceeds to a description of the advent of the Messiah son of Joseph, a righteous man from the children of Ephraim. This Messiah performs three signs to prove his identity but he (or another person) is killed.⁴⁰² The children of Israel then flee to the desert, but they are not abandoned by God. Instead, under the banner of the Messiah they kill Armilius and, with God’s help, subdue the wicked nations. After this Zerubbabel and Elijah appear; Zerubbabel sounds a great *shofar* and the glorious and brilliant New Jerusalem descends from the heavens.

Next, Abraham and Moses materialise, followed by the Messiah son of David, the royal messiah. Aaron appears, and the world rejoices, singing songs to God, and the Levites and priests will make their sacrifices. The *Nevu’ot Daniel* ends with Daniel’s statement that he revealed to Ezra (*cf.* the Arabic *Vision of Daniel as Related to Ezra, His Pupil* (§2.19)) all that he has seen, which will be hidden until the end days.

It is impossible to date this text precisely without a more detailed study of its historical allusions, and for this reason I have situated the *Nevu’ot Daniel* chronologically towards the end of this roster of Daniel apocalypses. References to the kings of Ishmael and Mahmed suggest a date after the Arab Muslim expansion from the Arabian peninsula. Several references to Babylon might indicate a Babylonian Jewish provenance, although both Damascus and Egypt are mentioned. Even from this cursory description of its contents one should be able to recognise several points of contact with the other apocalyptic texts attributed to Daniel.

---

⁴⁰⁰ The only Daniel apocalypse to do so; see note 2, supra.
⁴⁰¹ And elsewhere “the Edomite.”
⁴⁰² The Messiah ben Joseph appears a bit later; the text is unclear. There is a reference to the dead being revived which immediate follows the killing of the figure and precedes the Messiah ben Joseph’s reappearance (a few lines later) at the head of an army.
2.23. *The Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel* (cf. Greek §XVIII [Slavonic §III])

Alexander: *Last Daniel*[^403] 
Berger: No. 39, Gr. Daniel I 
Bousset: D II 
Denis: L’Apocalypse grecque de Daniel [but n.b. the discussion in §5, *infra*] 
Di Tommaso: Greek Last Vision of Daniel 
García Martínez: Apocalypse of the Prophet Daniel on the End of the World or The Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel 
Haeleweyck: No. 255, Ultima uisio Danielis (graece) 
Halkin: Nos. 1873, 1874, 1874c [see note 415, *infra*], 1874d 
Oegema: 1 ApkDan (gr) 
Pertusi: Visione del profeta Daniele or Ultima visione del profeta Daniele or Profezia del santo padre nostro Metodio, arcivescovo di Patara, sugli avvenimenti che si verificheranno alla fine del settimo secolo su richiesta dell’imperatore signore Leone il Saggio 
Ryden, *Life of St. Andrew the Fool*: VisDanUlt = Vision of Daniel 
Schmoldt: LVD: Die griechische “Letzte Vision Daniels” 
Stegmüller: No. 117,3, Ultima visio Danielis [see note 412, *infra*]; No. 117,13, Visio Danielis, verso russica A; No. 117,14, Visio Danielis, verso russica B; 117,15, Visio Danielis, verso serbica

Of the many Byzantine apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles attributed to Daniel, the *Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel* is preserved in the most copies but is at the same time one of the most difficult to understand. To begin, the state of the manuscript evidence is extremely confusing, a fact exacerbated by the various (and often generic) titles that previous research has assigned to this text. As for its content, even a cursory reading of the text seems to confirm that García Martínez is entirely correct in terming the *Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel* more a haphazard collection of short oracles than a sustained apocalypse proper.[^404] But this is true also for the majority of the rest of the Byzantine Daniel apocalyptic literature, and it remains to be seen whether this form of literature may yet be included under the definition of the genre.

The *Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel* was first edited from three manuscript copies by K. von Tischendorf in his seminal work, *Apocalypses apocryphae.*[^405] The three manuscripts are Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale

[^403]: Although Alexander labeled this text the *Last Daniel*, he never discusses it in his book (*Byzantine Apocalyptic Tradition*, 62 note 6). The reason this minor note is cited here is to avoid a possible source of confusion: in it Alexander incorrectly remarks that Bousset refers to this text as “B V.”


de France codices gr. 947 and 2180, and a fifteenth-century codex from Venezia, Biblioteca Marciana gr. II.125 [olim Nanianus 181].

In 1893 A. Vassiliev published a second edition of the text from two different manuscripts: Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana codex Ottob. gr. 418, fols. 298v–300v, and Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek (as this library is now known) codex phil. gr. 162, fols. 164v–167v.

The year 1895 saw the publication of the edition of E. Klostermann, who employed the same three manuscripts consulted by Tischendorf plus a second copy from the Marcian Library, codex gr. VII.38 [olim Nanianus 154]. Later in that year Klostermann

---

406 See note 298, supra.
407 I think it is possible that the manuscript described by J.-P. Migne in 1858 (Dictionnaire des Apocryphes, col. 185) as preserving a Vision of Daniel but identified as “Codices Barocciani, n° 148” is actually a mistaken reference to Oxford, Bod. cod. Barocci 145 [SC 145], which preserves two copies of the Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel (fols. 61v–63v and 96v–97v). Migne’s note is copied by Stegmüller, Repertorium, no. 117. For more on this manuscript, see sub-section (i) of the Inventory of Chapter Six, Excursus: “Notes on and Manuscripts of Unidentified Greek Daniel Apocalypses.”
408 Not one manuscript, as indicated by Garcia Martinez, “Pseudo-Danielic Literature,” 154 note 43.
409 Vassiliev, Anecdota graeco-byzantina, 43–47.
410 Bousset, “Geschichte der Eschatologie,” 289, indicates that in his edition of the Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel Vassiliev did not employ this Vatican copy but rather the copy at Wien, ONB cod. phil. gr. 58 [olim 211], fols. 44–50. But Vassiliev himself seems to indicate otherwise; in his Anecdota graeco-byzantina, xxiv–xxv, he identifies the Wien 58/211 text as a copy not of the Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel but rather of the text he presents at 38–43, viz., what I call The Vision of Daniel on the Last Times and the End of the World (§2.16). Haelewycx, Clavis apocryphonum VT, 257, also lists ONB cod. phil. gr. 58 as a copy of this Vision on the Last Times. But the cod. phil. gr. 58/211 text is not actually a copy of either text; see note 417, infra, for more on Bousset, and note 300, supra (and the text to which this note refers) for more on the mysterious cod. phil. gr. 58/211.
411 Vassiliev, Anecdota graeco-byzantina, xxiv, records that the text begins at fol. 163, and in this is followed in this by Stegmüller, Repertorium, Haelewycx, Clavis apocryphonum VT, 206, the manuscript catalogue (H. Hunger and O. Kresten, Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der österreichischen Nationalbibliothek. Teil 2: Codices juridici. Codices medici (Museon n.F. 4.2; Wien, 1969), 265) and the on-line manuscript catalogue of the Viennese codices held by the Hill Monastic Manuscript Library. Schmoldt, “Vom jungen Daniel,” 115, indicates that the text begins at fol. 164, however.
412 Klostermann, Analecta, 113–120. The conflation of the Tischendorf, Vassiliev, and Klostermann editions (in the case of the latter, only the three manuscripts that Tischendorf also employs) is identified in Halkin, BHG, as no. 1874 (following the information in BHG), but identifies none of the manuscripts explicitly. As for the fourth manuscript Klostermann consults (i.e., the one not employed by Tischendorf), Halkin identifies this as no. 1874d. Note that both Vassiliev, Anecdota graeco-byzantina, xxiv, and Stegmüller, Repertorium, consider all the manuscripts employed by Tischendorf and Klostermann (i.e., the two Paris copies and the one [Tischendorf] or the two [Klostermann] Venezia copies) to be examples of a different apocalypse, the Vision
wrote a brief article listing variations of the text from a second Wien copy, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek codex iur. gr. 6, fols. 201v–202v.\textsuperscript{413} Still in 1895, Macler published a French translation based on Klostermann’s edition.\textsuperscript{414} Two years later, in 1897, V.M. Istrin produced what was in effect the fourth edition of the text published in the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{415} He employed as his base text codex 217 of the Monastery of Koutloumousion at Mount Athos, fols. 181–183, and accompanied by the variants from British Library codex Harley 5734, fols. 42–45,\textsuperscript{416} and the Monastery of St. John (Patmos) codex 529, fols. 13–21. In addition, Istrin printed a roster which included eleven manuscript copies of the text, while in 1900 Bousset provided his list of twelve manuscript copies of the text.\textsuperscript{417}

Despite the great interest throughout the last half of the nineteenth century in the Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel, comparatively little research was devoted to the text in the decades that followed.\textsuperscript{418}

\begin{footnotesize}


\textsuperscript{415} Istrin, “B. Тексты. II. Видъянія Даниила,” 135–139. Halkin, \textit{BHGN}\textsuperscript{2}, identifies this edition as no. 1873 (following \textit{BHGN}). [LVD2]

\textsuperscript{416} Istrin, “B. Тексты. II. Видъянія Даниила,” cites fols. 42–46.

\textsuperscript{417} Istrin, “А. Испльдованіе. II. Видъянія Даниила,” 269 note 1, and Bousset, “Geschichte der Eschatologie,” 289. One text which is listed by both scholars but which is not a copy of the Last Vision of the Prophet Vision of Daniel is Wien, ÖNB cod. phil. gr. 58 [\textit{olim} 211], fols. 44–50 (which, by the way, is the same text that Vassiliev \textit{Anecdota graeco-byzantina}, xxv, and Haelewyck, \textit{Clavis apocryphorum VT}, asserts is a copy of the Vision of Daniel on the Last Times and the End of the World (§2.16)). On the mysterious and ubiquitous cod. phil. gr. 58/211, see notes 299, 300, and 410, \textit{supra}, and the text to which note 300 refers. Tellingly, Schmoldt does not include cod. phil. gr. 58/211 in his roster of manuscript copies of the Last Vision of Daniel ("Vom jungen Daniel," 115–116). A second text which is identified by Bousset as a copy of the Last Vision is Oxford, Bod. cod. Barocci 145, fols. 31–32; on this, see note 34, \textit{supra}.

\textsuperscript{418} Halkin is really the only exception. He lists three of the manuscripts associated with this text (\textit{BHGN}\textsuperscript{2}: London, BL cod. Add. 25881, fols. 238–241 and Oxford,
This state of affairs persisted until 1972, when Schmoldt produced his edition, German translation, and commentary of the *Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel*. The only true critical edition of the text, it relies on nineteen manuscript copies, the oldest of which dates to 1332/1333.

In the Inventory of Chapter Six a further six copies of the Greek text of the *Last Vision* are now listed, bringing the potential total to twenty-five extant copies of the text. It is also quite probable that still more Greek copies have yet to be identified.

The *Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel* is also preserved in Slavonic copies, the current tally of which numbers eleven. A south-Slavonic copy of the text appears in V. Makushev’s article in the 1882 issue of the *PyccÍiÈ ÙËÎoÎo“˘ecÍiÈ B ©cÚÌËÍ cÚÌëÍ ·Ìifl ÑaÌiËÎa*.

As we have seen, Stegmüller incorrectly associates this copy with the copy of the Beograd *Vision on the Emperors* as published by Srećković. Two more copies of the Slavonic text of the *Last Vision* were edited by M. Speranski in the nineteenth (and penultimate) installment of the A.N. Popov’s bibliographical survey of the monuments of Russian literature. Actually, a fragment of one of the Speranski texts had already been published

---


420 Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Vat. gr. 1700, fols. 100–105. Many of these require examination and verification by autopsy.

421 The Greek *Last Vision* is periodically mistakenly identified with the Slavonic *Vision of the Prophet Daniel on the Emperors* (§2.13).

422 The connexion with the *Last Vision* is made by Kozak, “Bibliographische Uebersicht,” 139, and by a comparison of the title of this text with the title of Franko’s text (see note 427 and the list of manuscripts for this text in the Inventory of Chapter Six). Kozak describes the manuscript as a “serbsche Handschrift aus dem 17. Jahrhundert,” but Makushev seems to date it to “XVI вѣка” (17).

423 M. Speranski, “О нѣкоторыхъ рукописяхъ библіотеки въ Бѣлградѣ. II. Рукописи сербскаго письма,” *RPfV* 7 (1882), 1–29 at 23–26. The connexion with the *Last Vision* is by Kozak, “Bibliographische Uebersicht,” 139, and by a comparison of the title of this text with the title of Franko’s text (see note 427 and the list of manuscripts for this text in the Inventory of Chapter Six). Kozak describes the manuscript as a “serbsche Handschrift aus dem 17. Jahrhundert,” but Makushev seems to date it to “XVI вѣка” (17).


in 1854 by I. Sreznevskii.\footnote{426} Still another copy of the Slavonic \textit{Last Vision} was edited by I. Franko in the fourth volume of his seminal anthology of the early Russo-Ukrainian legenda and pseudopigrapha.\footnote{427} Tupkova-Zaimova and Miletova list several more copies in their excellent edition/translation of and commentary on the Slavonic text, including two more Beograd codices and one from the Monastery of Panteleimon at Mount Athos.\footnote{428} There is yet another complete copy located in the Národního Musea of Praha, codex IX.A 44, fols. 258r–v, which, according to the manuscript catalogue, is a copy of the Franko text, although the compilers of the catalogue draw no connexion between it and the Greek \textit{Last Vision}.\footnote{429} Finally, according to Pertusi, the \textit{Povest’o Car’grade} (\textit{The History of Constantinople}), by one Nestor Iskinder, preserves a long section that is mirrored by material in the middle parts of the Greek text of the \textit{Last Vision}.\footnote{430}

The Greek copies of the \textit{Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel} preserve several titles, possibly late additions all. Most common is ἡ ἐσχάτη ὀρασις τοῦ προφήτου Δανιήλ,\footnote{431} a few examples of which are extended to include additional data.\footnote{432} The Biblioteca Marciana codex gr. II.125 preserves the title ἀποκάλυψις τοῦ προφήτου Δανιήλ περὶ τῆς

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
    \item \textit{I. Sreznevskii, Učenyia zapiski Imperatorskoi Akademii nauk 1} (Sankt Petersburg, 1854), 135–136; cf. Stegmüller, \textit{Repertorium}, No. 117,14.
    \item I. Franko, \textit{Anpokrifi legemdi z Ukrainskih Prykonsiv IV} (L’vov, 1906), 255–258. Although a detailed comparison of this copy with the Greek copies of \textit{Last Vision} is beyond the scope of this chapter, at first blush it would appear that the Slavonic text seems to reflect closely the Greek text of Vassiliev’s edition.
    \item Tupkova-Zaimova/Miletova, \textit{Историко-апокалитичната книгина във Византия}; several of these copies were previously noticed by Istrin (\textit{“А. Искъдоване. II. Видъния Даниила,”} 268–287) who provided partial parallels from the Greek MSS.
    \item E.g., London, BL cod. Add. 25881, fols. 238–241, \textit{etc}; see further the list of manuscripts for texts with this title in the Inventory of Chapter Six.
    \item Venezia, BM cod. gr. VII.38 [\textit{olim Nanianus 154}], fols. 350v–352r: ἡ ἐσχάτη ὀρασις τοῦ προφήτου Δανιήλ καὶ περὶ τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως καὶ περὶ τοῦ εἰρηνικοῦ βασιλέως καὶ περὶ τῆς συντελείας; Wien, ÖNB cod. iur. gr. 6, fols.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
suntelēías toû kósmou,\textsuperscript{433} from which García Martínez draws the alternate title under which he discusses this text. In addition, a few manuscripts contain the title ὀράσις τοῦ προφήτου Δανιήλ ἀπὸ τῆς πεντεκαιδεκάτης and its variations.\textsuperscript{434}

The \textit{Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel} opens with the statement that three angels will be sent to the earth, each having a specific geographic area as its responsibility. The third angel’s compass is Asia, Phrygia, Galatia, Cappadocia, Syria and to the “mother of the cities,” i.e., Constantinople (§§1–9). A largely cryptic and somewhat choppy historical review follows, beginning with an eclectic mix of references to historical figures and geographic locations (§§10–46). Then the Byzantines discover a righteous man, who reigns for thirty-two years and defeats all the peoples, particularly the Arabs, the Ethiopians, the Franks, and the Tatars (§§47–59).\textsuperscript{435} He is followed by another emperor, who reigns for twelve years before surrendering his power to God at Jerusalem (§§60–61).\textsuperscript{436} This emperor has four sons, who reign in Rome, Alexandria, the seven-hilled city (Constantinople), and Thessalonica, but who will kill each other in civil war (§§62–65). A wicked woman then arises,\textsuperscript{437} after which time Constantinople disappears beneath the sea (§§66–71), while in Thessalonica another king rules until this city, too, slips under the waves (§§72–73). The

201v–202v: ἡ τελευταία ὄσις τοῦ μεγάλου προφήτου Δανιήλ, ἡτίς διὰ τοῦ ἐν ἄγιως πατρὸς ἡμῶν Μεθὸδίου Πατάρων ἐφανερώθη ἡμῖν; Wien, ÖNB cod. suppl. gr. 172, fols. 19v–24r: Ἡ ἐσχάτη ὄρασις τοῦ προφήτου Δανιήλ, ἡτίς διὰ τοῦ ἐν ἄγιως πατρὸς ἡμῶν Μεθὸδίου ἐπισκόπου Πατάρων ἐφανερώθη ἡμῖν.

\textsuperscript{433} Venezia, BM cod. gr. II.125 \textit{olim} Nanianus 181, fols. 6r–10r.


\textsuperscript{435} The topos of the good Emperor who reigns for thirty-two years is also found in the Greek \textit{Visions of Daniel and Other Holy Men} (§2.6), the Slavonic \textit{Vision of Daniel on the Emperors} (§2.13), and the Greek \textit{Vision of Daniel on the Last Times and the End of the World} (§2.16). It also might play a part in the \textit{ex eventu} historical review of the Greek \textit{Diegesis Danielis} (§2.10). See note 576, infra.

\textsuperscript{436} Rydén, “Andreas Salos,” 235, understands this action to indicate the point where the apocalypse switches from \textit{ex eventu} historical review to genuine prophecy, but the comparatively specific data of the four sons and the wicked women (this last must be understood in the light of the wicked woman in the \textit{Diegesis Danielis}) suggests that this is not the case. Note also the argument in Excursus I, “History, Prophecy, and the Dating of Apocalypses,” supra.

\textsuperscript{437} Is this yet another reference to Irene?
*Last Vision* ends with the advent of the Antichrist, the appearance of demons, the telescoping of history, and other eschatological events (§§74–85).

A number of passages in the *Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel* are reflected in other Daniel apocalypses, particularly, as Schmoldt demonstrates in his commentary to the text, in the Greek *Vision of Daniel on the Future of the Seven-Hilled City* (§2.9). The *Last Vision* also shares elements with apocalyptic texts attributed to figures besides Daniel, including the Andreas Salos apocalypse that is part of the *Life of St. Andrew the Fool*. Although the *Last Vision* unquestionably contains several older elements, whose original version may be among the oldest of all the Byzantine Daniel apocalyptic texts, the reference to the “great Philip” (ὁ μέγας Φίλιππος) in its extant versions might indicate a date around the eleventh or twelfth centuries, approximately around the time of the First Crusade at the turn of the century. Schmoldt provides several options for the identification of this figure, but the consensus opinion centers on Philippe I of France (1060–1108). J. Wortley states that the present form of the text “unmistakably reflects conditions at Constantinople in the thirteenth century” but recognises that an earlier form might have circulated in the ninth century.

I am critical of previous attempts to understand it as a form of the one Greek Daniel apocalypse from which most or all of the rest ultimately derived (including copies and versions in other languages). Still, the *Last Vision* should prove to be a significant piece of evidence in any future study which seeks to clarify the textual and thematic relationships among the full corpus of the apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha.

---

438 Berger, “Hellenistisch-heidnische Prodigien,” 1462, dates the text to the eighth century.
Like the *Qissa-yi Dāniyāl*, the *Dāniyāl-nāma* is a Persian text but is written in Hebrew characters. Unlike the *Qissa-yi Dāniyāl*, however, the *Dāniyāl-nāma* is composed in poetry rather than prose. The *Dāniyāl-nāma* is the one text that falls well outside the chronological limitations of our study, having been composed by one “K’āja Bokārāši” (apparently a title) in the Seleucid year 1918 (1606 CE) and then redacted ninety-eight years after that. All the same, I include a brief mention of it in this roster if only for the sake of completeness.

For a long time the *Dāniyāl-nāma* was believed to survive only in a unique, nineteenth-century manuscript, British Library codex Or. 4743, fols. 2r–65r, but recently an incomplete text, dating from 1913 and preserving only the first 234 distichs, has been discovered among the manuscripts of Jerusalem’s Hebrew University.

The *Dāniyāl-nāma* was introduced to scholarship in a 1935 article written by I. Levy. Since that time, almost all the comparatively slight amount of work on this text has been done by A. Netzer, including the publication of the *editio princeps* in his 1969 Columbia dissertation. To the best of my knowledge, outside of several essays that quote from part of the text, the *Dāniyāl-nāma* has never been translated in its entirety, although the aforementioned dissertation does contain some sections of the text translated into English.
Table II: A List of the Byzantine Emperors, 379–1180

The following list is adapted from the list of emperors in Treadgold, 857–861. I have omitted rivals and regents, made changes to many names, and added co-ruler and dynastic notations. The list begins with Theodosius I, the last ruler of the entire Roman Empire, and ends with Emmanuel I Comnenus, the last strong emperor before a quarter-century-long succession of weak rulers that preceded the fall of Constantinople to the soldiers of the Fourth Crusade in 1204. Asterisks indicate periods of co-rulership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emperor</th>
<th>Dynasty</th>
<th>Reign</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theodosius I</td>
<td>379–395</td>
<td>Theodosian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcadius</td>
<td>395–408</td>
<td>Theodosian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodosius II</td>
<td>*402–408, 408–450</td>
<td>Theodosian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulcheria</td>
<td>*414–416</td>
<td>Theodosian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcadius</td>
<td>395–408</td>
<td>Thracian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo I</td>
<td>457–474</td>
<td>Justinian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo II</td>
<td>*473–474, 474–474</td>
<td>Justinian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeno Tarasios</td>
<td>474–491</td>
<td>Justinian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basiliscus</td>
<td>*475–476</td>
<td>Justinian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anastasius I</td>
<td>491–518</td>
<td>Justinian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinus I</td>
<td>518–527</td>
<td>Basiliscus Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinianus I</td>
<td>527–565</td>
<td>Basiliscus Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinus II</td>
<td>565–578</td>
<td>Basiliscus Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius II Constantinus</td>
<td>*578, 578–582</td>
<td>Basiliscus Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauricius Flavius Tiberius</td>
<td>*582, 582–602</td>
<td>Basiliscus Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phocas the Tyrant</td>
<td>602–610</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclius</td>
<td>610–641</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantius III Heraclius</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclonas Constantinus</td>
<td>*641, 641</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constans II the Bearded</td>
<td>641–668</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantinus IV</td>
<td>*654–668, 668–685</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinianus II the Slit-Nosed</td>
<td>*685–695</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leontius</td>
<td>695–698</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius III Apsimar</td>
<td>695–708</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justinianus II Rhinometus</td>
<td>[66]</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippicus Bardanes</td>
<td>711–713</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anastasius Artemius</td>
<td>713–716</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodosius III</td>
<td>716–717</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo III the Syrian</td>
<td>717–741</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantinus V Name of Dung</td>
<td>*720–741, 741–775</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo IV the Khazar</td>
<td>775–780</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantinus VI</td>
<td>*780–790, 790–792, 792–797</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene the Athenian</td>
<td>*780–790, 792–802</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicophorus I</td>
<td>802–811</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stauracius</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael I Rhangabe</td>
<td>811–813</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo V the Armenian</td>
<td>813–820</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael II the Armorian</td>
<td>820–829</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theophilus</td>
<td>829–842</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael III the Drunkard</td>
<td>842–867</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basiliscus I the Macedonian</td>
<td>867–870, 870–886</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo VI the Wise</td>
<td>*870–886, 886–912</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>912–913</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantinus VII</td>
<td>913–959</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanus I</td>
<td>*919–944</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanus II</td>
<td>959–963</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basilii II the Slayer of Bulgars</td>
<td>*963–976, 976–1025</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicophorus II Phocas</td>
<td>*963–969</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ioannes I Tzimisces</td>
<td>*969–976</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantinus VIII</td>
<td>*976–1025, 1025–1028</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanus III Argyrus</td>
<td>1028–1034</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael IV the Paphylagonian</td>
<td>1034–1041</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael V the Caulker</td>
<td>1041–1042</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoe</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantinus IX</td>
<td>*1042–1055</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodora</td>
<td>*1042–1055, 1056</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael VI Bringas</td>
<td>1056–1057</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaac I Comnenus</td>
<td>1057–1059</td>
<td>Heraclian Dynasty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3. The Apocryphal Daniel Apocalypses and the Genre “Apocalypse”

The clearest and certainly most-cited definition of the literary genre “apocalypse” remains the one proposed by J.J. Collins in *Semeia* 14 and reiterated in both editions of his book, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*.447 It states that an apocalypse is “a genre of revelatory information with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisions eschatological speculation, and spatial as it involves another, supernatural world.” There have been alternate definitions proposed, but, as Collins demonstrates, these have been either too myopic in scope, in that important elements or characteristics are ignored so as to concentrate on a single theme or strand of tradition, or too hyperopic, in that the application of a relatively simple and general definition causes the importance of or the relationship among these elements or characteristics to become obscured.448

On the basis of his definition Collins discerns two categories of apocalypses, the “otherworldly” type and the “historical” type.449 Each type corresponds to a specific strand of tradition, at least within the context of the apocalypses of early Judaism, one strand marked by an over-riding interest in cosmological speculation, the other by

---


448 Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 9–11; n.b. also: “the genre is not constituted by one or more distinctive themes but by a distinctive combination of elements, all of which are found elsewhere” (12).

449 Note Alexander’s 1968 article, “Medieval Apocalypses,” 998 note 2, where he distinguishes between “historical” apocalypses and those “concerned primarily or exclusively with religious topics such as the afterlife.”
visions that betray an intense interest in history.\textsuperscript{450} The apocalyptic visions of the Book of Daniel are textbook examples of “historical” apocalypses.

The only serious challenge to the substance of Collins’ definition has been the proposal to append to it the aspect of function, in that an apocalypse is “intended to interpret present earthly circumstances in the light of the supernatural world and of the future, and to influence both the understanding and behavior of the audience by means of divine authority.”\textsuperscript{451} This functional aspect is an essential component of the definition of the genre,\textsuperscript{452} and transcends the division between cosmic and historical apocalypses. It also separates apocalypses from prognostic texts, where the element of free will at the level of the individual is inapplicable. At the same time, though, the functional aspect of the definition applies equally to some of the prophetic literature in the Hebrew Bible, particularly those portions pertaining to the geo-political fate of Israel or Jerusalem.

Are the Daniel apocrypha examined in this chapter actually apocalypses, at least from the perspective of the aforementioned definition of the genre? Scholars such as A.A. Vasiliev\textsuperscript{453} and Olster\textsuperscript{454} discuss them as such without comment. García Martínez states that all the “pseudo-Danielic” literature which he examines in his survey “offer the same basic apocalyptic scheme: a discourse on history in the form of an oracle, vision, reading of a text, etc., followed by an eschatological section in which the figure of the Antichrist plays a leading role.” Furthermore, and addressing the functional aspect of the definition of the genre, he asserts that all these texts, “emerge from the need to clarify the present situation which is reflected more or less in detail, in the light of the final conflagration.”\textsuperscript{455}

A different conclusion, however, is reached by Henze, who argues that “only a few of the apocalypses attributed to Daniel . . . fit Collins’ description. They are all concerned with what has been called ‘apoc-
alyptic eschatology,’ but this, too, can take many forms.” Henze adds that although there are certain motifs common to several apocalypses, these motifs were popular in many other apocalypses of late antiquity and the mediaeval period, and, as a result, little can be said from the study of the Daniel apocalypses in particular about the history of the genre apocalypse.

The raw data is presented in Table III on page 198. Along the left-hand margin of the Table there is a list of the texts, which, as they are in the roster above, are arranged in their approximate chronological order. Each text is referred to by its place in the roster of apocalypses above and by an abbreviated title.

A row of numbered columns runs along the top margin of the Table. The first twelve columns refer to characteristics of the genre apocalypse as they are listed by Collins and which are elucidated in the legend following the Table. The thirteenth numbered column in the row refers to the functional aspect of the definition. The penultimate column, which is labeled “time,” indicates whether the apocalypse in question refers to a specific time at which Daniel’s vision is reckoned to have taken place, while the final column, titled “angel,” refers to whether an angelus interpres is mentioned in the text and, if so, is explicitly named.

The information presented in Table III demonstrates that all the apocryphal Daniel texts discussed in this chapter are remarkably similar in content to the visions of Daniel 7–12. This is particularly true with respect to those categories corresponding to the three fundamental chronological components of “historical” apocalypses: an exposition of the present-day dilemma, a review of the historical

---

456 Henze, *Syriac Apocalypse of Daniel*, 6. I am not interested in “apocalyptic eschatology” with respect to these Daniel apocalypses other than to assert that all the apocalypses exhibit this type of eschatology.


459 As with the survey, the chronology is not exact and the texts are arranged by the hypothetical dates of their final forms.

460 Obviously, each of the apocalyptica addresses itself to a different historical plight, which will also be different from the plight that stands behind the vision of the Book of Daniel. Daniel 7–12 is addressed to Jews afflicted by Antiochus Epiphanes, while the majority of the Byzantine Greek Daniel apocalypses are addressed to Christians afflicted by the Arab Muslim invasions. But these are not generic differences, simply immediate ones of content. On the large-scale parallels between the Book of Daniel and the apocalyptic apocalypses in matters of content and form outside the concerns of genre, see §4.
Table III: The Daniel Apocalyptica: Generic Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>time</th>
<th>angel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Book of Daniel 7–12</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>various</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.1 V. of D. on Cyrus*</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.2 V. of D. on Blond Race*</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.3 7th Vision of Daniel</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Cyrus</td>
<td>Gabriel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.4 V. of the Young Dan.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Darius</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.5 Revelation of Daniel</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Darius</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.6 V. of D. on Holy Men</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.7 Oracle of Daniel</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.8 Proclamation of Daniel*</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.9 Seven-Hilled City</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.10 Diegesis Daníyál</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.11 V. and R. of Daniel</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Cyrus</td>
<td>Gabriel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.12 Word of Daniel*</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.13 V. of D. on the Emperors</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>Gabriel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.14 Qissa-ýi Daníyál</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Darius</td>
<td>“angel”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.15 Disc. of Chrysostom</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.16 V. of D. on Last Times</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.17 V. of D. by the Kebar*</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Cyrus</td>
<td>Gabriel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.18 Apocalypse of Daniel</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>“angel”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.19 V. of Daniel to Ezra</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>“angel”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.20 V. of D. on Crete*</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.21 14th Vision of Daniel</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Cyrus</td>
<td>“angel”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.22 Nevo’ót Daniel</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>“angel”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.23 Last Vision of Daniel</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2.24 Daníyál-náma</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**legend**

1. Cosmogony
2. Primordial events
3. Recollection of past
4. Ex eventu prophecy
5. Persecution
6. Other eschatological upheavals
7. Judgment/destruction of wicked
8. Judgment/destruction of world
9. Judgment/destruction of otherworldly beings
10. Cosmic transformation
11. Resurrection
12. Other forms of afterlife
13. The “functional” aspect

* text is certainly or probably fragmentary
circumstances that led to it, and an expectation of an imminent future resolution. Furthermore, our texts mirror historical apocalypses (and, again, similar to the visions of Daniel 7–12) in that they are unconcerned with cosmogony, primaeval history, and the judgment or the destruction of the world. It is also the case that all our texts disclose the temporal and spatial “transcendent reality” which stands at the heart of the definition of the genre and which is reflected in all its examples.

These apocryphal Daniel texts are clearly apocalyptic. But is the correspondence in content enough to conclude that they are also apocalypses? There are two formal differences between the visions of Daniel 7–12 and some of the apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha which are unreflected in the data of Table III and which might have an bearing on this question.

First, the introductions that preface each of the visions in the Book of Daniel are not always present in the apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha. These introductions may contain any or all of three distinct components: i) a chronological marker specifying the time at which the action in the narrative occurs, which in the Book of Daniel is identified with reference to a year in the reign of a specific king; ii) an affirmation that Daniel is the author of the narrative, which is sometimes accompanied by additional information concerning his actions or state of mind; and iii) a note on the place where the action of narrative takes place. Less than one third of the apocryphal texts examined in this chapter preserve such chronological markers, and fewer still contain an authorial affirmation in the text or a note about Daniel’s location. There seems to be no pattern to the appearance of any or all of these components in the apocalyptic apocrypha, and it may be the case that the inclusion of this information in any given text was merely a matter of the author’s discretion.

However, the lack of such introductory information in these apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha is ultimately unimportant to the issue of their genre. First, although critical to the processes underlying the

---

461 It must be remembered that not all apocalyptic texts are generically apocalypses. See Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination* (note 447, supra) for details.

462 Sometimes in the first person (Daniel 8 and 9), sometimes in the third (Daniel 7 and 10–12), although in all four visions Daniel refers to himself in the first person.

463 It should be noted that a concern with specifying the time and place of a vision is witnessed in the dream-poetry of the Middle Ages; see A.C. Spearing, *Mediaeval Dream-Poetry* (Cambridge, 1976), 12.
transmission of the messages of the text,\textsuperscript{464} this introductory material is not an integral part of Collins’ definition of the genre. Some apocalyptic apocrypha share with the visions of the Book of Daniel a concern for specifying the time and place of the vision, others do not, but in no way does the appearance or omission of some or all of these introductory elements inform the issue of their genre. Second, the clear references to regnal dates in the visions of Daniel 7–12 are one of the deliberate editorial devices that the author\textsuperscript{465} of the final redaction of MT Daniel employed to link together his various materials. The post-biblical authors, however, did not need to insert such editorial linkages.\textsuperscript{466} Moreover, when chronological information about the vision was included, its function was to reinforce the information that Daniel is the seer. This is the information which is most critical to the transmission of the messages of the text, not the data about the time or place. Third, even though the key information that Daniel is the seer appears in the first few lines in only a minority of the apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha,\textsuperscript{467} it was regularly conveyed in short notices within the context of the text (\textit{e.g.}, in the \textit{Nevu’ot Daniel}) or, more significantly, through the titles of most of the texts. Compositions such as the \textit{Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel} and \textit{Seventh Vision of Daniel} leave no room for doubt as to the identity of their (pseudonymous) author.\textsuperscript{468}

The second and more important formal difference between the visions of the Book of Daniel and some of these apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha involves the figure of the mediating \textit{angelus interpres}. In the Book of Daniel, revelatory information is always mediated by this otherworldly figure, even if it is not communicated in the context of a strict vision + interpretation formula.\textsuperscript{469} The net result is that

\textsuperscript{464} The message cannot be transmitted \textit{in vacuo}—it requires the twin attributes of authenticity and authority, which are in part provided by this introductory information. See §4.

\textsuperscript{465} On the use of the term “author” (instead of “redactor”) in this situation, see Chapter One note 4.

\textsuperscript{466} This is because of the authority exerted by the biblical Book of Daniel in the matter of the chronology of the story of Daniel; see Chapter Two, §3.

\textsuperscript{467} See, \textit{e.g.}, the personal affirmation in the first line of the \textit{Proclamation of the Prophet Daniel} (§2.8), which, while not mentioning Daniel per se, is clear enough.

\textsuperscript{468} The temporal and regnal references in the apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha and the Daniel prognostica are quite illuminating in their own right, apart from the matter of genre.

\textsuperscript{469} \textit{Cf.} Daniel 9, where there is no formal vision \textit{per se}. 


the mediated quality of the revelatory message of the text is unmistakable. This last point is true for all apocalypses and, as such, is a key component of Collins’ definition.

The figure of the mediating angel appears in nine of twenty-two apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha examined in this chapter. What this means is that nearly half of these texts are apocalypses. Not only do they share with the rest of the apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha a close correspondence with the visions of Daniel 7–12 in matters of content, but they also fulfil all the formal requirements of the genre, including the essential qualification that the revelatory information is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient. As a result, Henze’s assertion that only a few of these apocalyptic Daniel texts fit the definition of the genre is open to question.

The problem is with the twelve other texts in the roster, however, which do not include the *angelus interpres* or the typical verbal formulae and other such devices which indicate to the reader that the vision is mediated. The overall impression is that these twelve texts have been “streamlined” in form: stripped of all unnecessary ornamentation, only the substance of the revelatory information remains, which is communicated to the reader in an unmediated fashion.

This “streamlining” of form is largely characteristic to the Byzantine Daniel texts. I have remarked several times already that many of the longer examples resemble more a loose series of oracular pronouncements than they do apocalypses. This was also the judgment of García Martínez regarding the serial nature of the Greek *Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel*. In addition, there are several examples listed in the roster above of what appear to be short oracular fragments attributed to Daniel, which are themselves perhaps remnants of older and longer apocalypses. In all these texts, the lack of the

---

470 On the nature of these messages, see §4, *infra*.
471 Not including the *Daniyel-nāma* (§2.24) or the unedited Greek *Oracle of the Prophet Daniel on Byzantium* (§2.7).
472 Henze makes this claim without the knowledge of the full extent of the Byzantine Daniel texts, in which revelation overwhelmingly tends *not* to be mediated. In other words, he makes this claim based on a group of texts that I would say contains a high percentage of apocalypses proper.
473 Most typically, these are formulated by phrases such “And then he [the angel] showed me” or “And then I saw.”
474 Which number fifteen in total, including those which are now only preserved in other languages; See note 478, *infra*. 
angelus interpres indicates that they are not apocalypses, since they do not communicate a mediated revelation.⁴⁷⁵ Yet these Byzantine Daniel texts are not simply oracles, either. For one thing—and this is true for all the apocalyptic Daniel texts, Byzantine or otherwise—they closely mirror the historical type of apocalypses in every other respect. Furthermore, as I will outline in detail below, I am convinced that the missing mediating angelus interpres in these texts is not a function of their being oracles, qua oracles, but is a result of the evolution of the genre apocalypse in this particular context. In other words, for reasons which are intimately connected to the “streamlining” of the form in its Byzantine exemplars, the angelus interpres came to be omitted in a certain evolutionary branch of the apocalyptic form, which is not precisely the same thing as saying that it was never part of the form in the first place.

As a result, I prefer to use the term “apocalyptic oracles” to describe these Byzantine Daniel texts. Although it maintains a formal distinction with the genre apocalypse proper, the term recalls the origins of the form in that genre, rather than in the genre oracle. It also reflects the fact that regardless of their formal genre, these texts were almost certainly understood to be apocalypses and, more importantly, were understood to function as apocalypses (and here we refer again to the functional aspect of the definition of the genre). It also allows for the interesting possibility of the dynamic mutation of form resulting from a historic evolution of the genre.

To sum up the argument thus far, all the Daniel apocrypha discussed in the chapter are unquestionably apocalyptic, and in their content (and thus in their message)⁴⁷⁶ they share a close correspondence with the “historical” type of apocalypse. Approximately half are apocalypses proper, while the other half, which for the most part correspond with the Byzantine Greek Daniel texts, are apocalyptic oracles.

The question now is what does this taxonomy mean to the study of the genre apocalypse? As mentioned, Henze states that the study

---

⁴⁷⁶ The purposes of the biblical and post-biblical apocalypses specifically attributed to the figure Daniel are the subject of the next section.
of the Daniel apocalypses reveals nothing about the history of the genre, but I would think that the streamlining apparent in such a clearly delineated body of texts implies a radical generic evolution transpiring within its specifically Byzantine contexts. Although not much research has been devoted to the topic of the formal evolution of the genre from its antecedents in the early Jewish and Christian literature, it would appear that the streamlining of form common to the Byzantine Daniel apocalyptic oracles is mirrored in a great number of other Byzantine historical “apocalypses,” including the variations on the *Oracle of Leo the Wise* and the *Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius*. These as a class are far less likely to contain the mediated revelation and literary ornamentation more common to the visions of the Book of Daniel and the other ancient examples of the type.

Such an evolution might have resulted from a long-standing tension between a number of static and dynamic factors. Over time, a store-house of images and expectations built up in the collective consciousness of certain, probably interrelated groups within the Byzantine Empire, whose members consistently and for diverse reasons resorted to the device of apocalyptic historiography and the figure of Daniel to articulate their understanding of and response to various historical plights. This store-house represents a relatively static element, whose expressions consistently appear in the Byzantine Daniel apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles: the figures of the Antichrist and of Elijah and Enoch, the coming of the Blond-Haired race, the appearance of Gog and Magog, the legend of the Good Emperor, and so on. Another static element was a concern for the fate of the Empire and its citizens, which remained the focus of the Byzantine apocalyptic literature, since it was the stage upon which much of the divine plan for Christendom was and would be manifested. The dynamic element in the equation was the many different crises experienced

---

477 See note 457, *supra*.


by the Byzantine Christians in the period between the fourth and tenth centuries. These crises were precipitated by wars and dynastic struggles, many of which were connected fundamentally with the long conflict with the Arab Muslims.

The synthesis of these points produces a theory that might explain the evolution of the oracular nature of the Byzantine Daniel apocalyptic texts. As the Empire lurched from crisis to crisis, and as new apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles were composed to address each crisis, these images and expectations, which through sheer familiarity had become part of the collective consciousness of the Byzantines, were employed time and again in order to provide historical meaning and coherence to these crises. In his book on seventh-century Byzantium, J.F. Haldon speaks of the need to achieve a level of balance between the narratives which the Byzantines intended to describe and understand their world and the realities which they actually perceived or experienced.\textsuperscript{480} When the balance was no longer in evidence, either the narratives were altered to correspond with the world or the world was acted upon in order to make it fit the narratives. In a way, the constant updating of this apocalyptic historiography represented an ongoing response to historical crises wherein the narratives, which in this case are the apocalyptic texts, were constantly being produced to fit the changing reality.

It is possible, then, that through familiarity and overuse the genre became streamlined and more oracular in form\textsuperscript{481}—the message was the key element, and there became no need to prefix a long introduction to it or to couch it in the fiction of angelic mediation.\textsuperscript{482}


\textsuperscript{481} These apocalyptic texts are also quite short. The majority of the Byzantine apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles attributed to Daniel (the Armenian \textit{Seventh Vision of Daniel} is an exception) are approximately the same length as a chapter or two in the Book of Daniel, while the apocalypses written in the other languages generally tend to be much longer compositions. Cf. here the Syriac \textit{Vision of the Young Daniel}, the Syriac \textit{Revelation of Daniel the Prophet in the Land of Persia and Elam}, the Arabic \textit{Vision of Daniel}, the Arabic \textit{Apocalypse of Daniel on the Events after al-Mu'tamid}, and the Coptic/Arabic \textit{Fourteenth Vision of Daniel}.

\textsuperscript{482} Note that of the fifteen Byzantine Daniel apocalyptic apocrypha, the mediating angel is present in the Armenian \textit{Seventh Vision of Daniel}, the Slavonic \textit{Vision of Daniel on the Emperors}, and the Slavonic version of the \textit{Vision and Revelation of Daniel the Prophet} (the Greek version lacks the angel). Is it possible that the element of the mediating angel was reintroduced when the originally Greek apocalypses were translated?
And there is no question that the apocalyptic format and the storehouse of images and expectations were overused. Bishop Liudprand’s statement that Daniel apocalypses were commonplace in the Empire, and Salimbene de Adam’s record of the effect of one of these texts upon the inhabitants of Constantinople during the dark days of the Fourth Crusade, are certainly supported by the number of apocalyptic Byzantine texts explicitly attributed to the prophet.483

What is more, not only were the images and expectations part of the collective Byzantine consciousness, but so too were the literary applications of these images and expectations, that is, the discrete oracles. Entire portions of past apocalyptic texts were reused and updated, with the result that many of the Byzantine Daniel apocalyptic oracles consist of both new material and old, the latter often drawn from the *Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius* or other, even older Daniel apocalypses, including the original (but now lost) Greek version of the Armenian *Seventh Vision of Daniel*, which dates from the period before Justinian. In addition, texts such as the *Vision of Daniel on the Island of Cyprus* and the *Vision of Daniel on the Blond Race*, which exhibit an inordinate amount of this streamlining of literary form, are almost certainly oracular fragments of even older and perhaps longer apocalypses which unfortunately are no longer extant. The end result, as Alexander correctly understood, was a situation where both themes and texts were endlessly recycled and reworked. To borrow an idea from the geneticist R. Dawkins,484 these discrete oracles functioned along the lines of “memes,” or set clusters of ideas whose birth and evolutionary history were, in this case, determined by a combination of their innate qualities (what they said and in what contexts could they be applied) and the geo-political setting (the state of the Byzantine Empire at any given time). Again we see the interaction between the static and the dynamic elements.485

483 We should recall that this total does not include the still-unidentified texts residing in the manuscript collections of libraries and institutions or those which simply have been lost. Cf. also the manuscript copies of the Greek *Praedictiones Danielis*, which are frequently identified by the label “Danielis prophetae apocalypsis” or, in at least one case, the explicit title of ὅρασις προφήτου Δανιήλ; on these texts, see Chapter Four, §4.


485 The idea of oracles = memes will be fleshed out in my future extended study on the Byzantine Daniel apocalyptica and the broader medieval apocalyptic tradition; see the Preface to this volume.
The increasingly pastiche nature and the streamlined form of these apocalyptic oracles suggests that the genre apocalypse could have evolved within its Byzantine contexts. Over time, the Byzantine expressions of apocalyptic historiography concentrated on the message of the text, and what had tended to be articulated explicitly in the formal apocalypses through introductory formulae and explicit mediation was now in its Byzantine manifestations simply assumed. The authors of the apocryphal oracles, however, still thought that they were describing apocalyptic visions rather than oracles, and that is why so many of the titles contain phrases to this effect. Indeed, it is debatable whether anyone at the time would have noticed the difference between a formal apocalypse and any of these apocalyptic oracles. While it is true that there is a text called the Oracle of the Prophet Daniel on Byzantium and that a few of the manuscript copies of other Byzantine Daniel texts contain the description διήγησις or χρησμός, the overwhelming majority of the manuscript copies of all the texts preserve the description (in title or incipit) ὄρασις.

To conclude, in their basic form and substance the apocryphal apocalypses and the apocalyptic oracles match up extremely well the elements of historical-type apocalypses, with the one important exception being the issue of mediated revelation, which is largely uncharacteristic of the Byzantine apocalyptic oracles. Far more significant, though, is the fact that all the Daniel apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles fulfil the basic requirement of the genre in that they provide revelatory information within a narrative framework about an eschatological future which involves a supernatural setting. Indeed, the fundamental message of these apocryphal apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles alike is the same and is unaffected by the issue of mediation. As we shall see in the next section, the nature of this message illuminates a critical link between these apocryphal texts and the apocalyptic visions of the Book of Daniel.

Excursus III: Dead Sea 4Q “Pseudo-Daniel”

Preserved among the thousands of scraps of texts discovered in Qumran Cave Four are fragments from several compositions associated with Daniel. 4Q242, the Prayer of Nabonidus, does not mention Daniel but is part of the same tradition that is expressed in another venue at Daniel 4. Many commentators have assumed that 4Q243, 4Q244, and 4Q245 are copies of one document, although J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint, its DJD editors, argue persuasively that 4Q243 and 4Q244 (Pseudo-DanielII) each preserve fragmen-
As with all the Qumran “Pseudo-Daniel” texts, 4Q243/244 is written in Aramaic. The fragments are dated palaeographically to the first half of the first century CE, although the original composition is at least a century older. 4Q243/244 is a difficult text to understand, not only on account of its fragmentary nature (forty identifiable fragments belong to 4Q243, fourteen to 4Q244), but also because it is awkward to classify in the light of the material we find in the Book of Daniel. Most commentators, including J.T. Milik, who first published transcriptions of several fragments, have reconstructed the structure of the underlying document as a type of court tale, à la Daniel 1–6, where Daniel is the focus of the narrative and is speaking before a king. In 4Q243/244, the king is Belshazzar.

The most significant feature of 4Q243/244 is a long, ex eventu review of history which, if the reconstruction of the text is accurate, extends from the primaeval period through the Hellenistic era and into the eschatological age. In both its forms and content 4Q243/244’s review of history is atypical when compared to those in the Book of Daniel and the apocryphal apocalypses. To begin, it is embedded in a third-person narrative rather than the first-person, mediated revelatory vision of the sort that is encountered in Daniel 7–12 and in the apocryphal apocalypses. What this means is that the text which is preserved in the fragments of 4Q243 and 4Q244 is not, strictly speaking, a pseudepigraphon. Other disjunctive features of the review of 4Q243/244 include the fact that the historical information is not presented cryptically and displays a marked interest in historical events before the Babylonian Exile, the latter a feature of its underlying Deuteronomic theology of history. As we shall

---

486 They overlap at 4Q243 13 and 4Q244 12.
488 Collins and Flint believe that it was likely composed in the period from the mid-second century BCE to the coming of Pompey (“4Qpseudo-Daniel,” 137–138). But see below.
490 Contra García Martínez, “Pseudo-Danielic Literature,” 147.
491 The specific naming of figures in 4Q243/244 is unlike that which we encounter in the Book of Daniel or in the apocryphal apocalypses, although in a few instances (see the Seventh Vision of Daniel [§2.3]) there are places where a proper name is written en clair.
492 Collins and Flint, “4Qpseudo-Daniel,” note that their study of 4Q243, 4Q244, and 4Q245 casts doubt on what hitherto was thought to be several further points of contact between the fragments and the Book of Daniel, including the use in the former of a four-kingdom schema.
see in §4, below, one characteristic of the reviews of history both at Daniel 2 and throughout the visions of Daniel 7–12 is a total lack of interest in the primaeval history or, indeed, in events before Nebuchadnezzar. The reason for this phenomenon is that the *longue durée* is unimportant to the understanding of the immediate plight which has precipitated the composition of the apocalypse. It is also unimportant to the overall theology of history of the Book of Daniel, which is markedly different from that of 4Q243/244. A lack of interest in events before the Exile is also reflected in all the many apocryphal Daniel apocalypses, although whether these later apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles reflect all the elements of the Danielic theology of history is a matter for further discussion.493

The third-person narrative structure, along with the fact that the text lacks an angelic mediating figure, 494 throw doubt on its genre, even though its review of history is set in an apocalyptic context. Collins and Flint remark that the review of history in 4Q243/244 is *ex eventu* by virtue of some sort of revelatory writing (4Q243 6) from which, they suggest, Daniel reads. 495 It is unlikely that the author of this writing, if indeed a human figure, is either Daniel or Enoch. Interestingly, the connexion between ancient written knowledge (a topos most commonly associated with the figure of Adam and the Cave of Treasures) and the figure of Daniel appears consistently in the context of the Daniel prognostica. Its most developed expression is found in some copies of the anthology known as the *Malḥamat Dāniyāl*, wherein Daniel sojourns to a special cave in Jerusalem, from which he retrieves tablets which had been placed there by Adam and upon which much prognostic information is revealed.496

To summarise the argument I advance in another study, 497 certain integrative elements of 4Q243/244 suggest that it was composed in the first few decades of the second century, before the Antiochene oppression and in the light of an authoritative five-chapter collection of Daniel court tales (*i.e.*, what we know now as MT Daniel 2–6).498 The rejection of the Deuteronomic theology of history in Daniel 9 might also indicate that it was written as a response to 4Q243/244.

4Q245 is, as mentioned, almost certainly part of a composition separate from that which is preserved by the fragments of 4Q243 and 4Q244. It consists of four Aramaic fragments, the first of which contains the name

493 Which I intend to conduct in a future article.
494 The *possibility* that the book is of angelic origin is not enough to call 4Q243/244 an apocalypse (*contra* Collins and Flint, “4Qpseudo-Daniel,” 125).
495 Collins and Flint, “4Qpseudo-Daniel,” 135, and also 149, where they insightfully note that the same phrase (*דנס הבר*) is reflected at 4Q550 4 1, “where the reference is to an archival document.” Although the name of Enoch appears at 4Q243 9 1, Collins and Flint are careful not to associate this writing with him.
496 See Chapter Four, §5.
497 “4Qpseudo-Daniel*:*b* (4Q243–4Q244) and the Book of Daniel,” *DSY* [forthcoming].
498 See also the discussion on accretive and integrative chronological markers in Chapter Two, *passim.*
of Daniel, mention of a book or writing, and what appears to be a simple list of priests or High Priests (written en clair) rather than a review of history. The second fragment is deemed by Collins and Flint to be eschatological in nature, although, contrary to previous scholarship, they do not subscribe to the theory that a passage in it alludes to resurrection. The third and fourth fragments are very small.499

4Q245 may be dated to the early first century CE. The possible association of a book/writing with Daniel and the presence of an eschatological section calls to mind 4Q243/244, but whether 4Q245 is actually a specific Daniel apocryphon is impossible to determine.

4Q246, which consists of one fragment of two partial columns of text that has been dated paleographically to the last third of the first century BCE, is one of the most famous of all the Qumran Cave Four fragments because of its pre-Christian reference to a “Son of God” (מוכרים אחדון) at ii 1. The literature on this Aramaic fragment, the original text of which may date from the second century BCE, is extensive,500 and I shall confine my remarks to its relationship with the Book of Daniel.

4Q246 does not mention Daniel, nor is there any indication that Daniel himself is speaking. The text describes several expected eschatological figures and events, although the identification and meaning of these have been hotly debated, including whether the “Son of God” figure is a positive or negative one. One’s position on this figure, of course, will colour one’s view on the nature of the connexion between it and the יד הגר of Daniel 7, which is clearly a positive figure. But overall, 4Q246 seems to reflect the imagery and vocabulary of the Book of Daniel, although the latter never mentions or alludes to Assyria (see 4Q246 i 6). Compared to the review of history of 4Q243/244, the elements of 4Q246 are described in a language much more cryptic and vague, just as we find in the visions of Daniel 7–12 and the apocryphal apocalypses.

As for the relationship between the Cave Four Pseudo-Daniel texts and the later Daniel apocrypha, and in particular the apocryphal apocalypses, García Martínez is entirely correct when he states that no relationship exists at any level.501

4. The Book of Daniel and the Apocryphal Daniel Apocalypses

The apocalyptic visions of MT Daniel appear in chapters 7 to 12.502 They are witnessed by Daniel the prophet, are articulated by means

499 Collins and Flint, 4Qpseudo-Daniel,” 153–158.
500 See the Inventory of Chapter Six. As G. Vermes observes, many of the early theories on the meaning of 4Q246 were hampered by an incomplete knowledge of the text and the hypothetical reconstruction of the lacunae (“Qumran Forum Miscellanea I,” JJS 43 (1992), 299–305 at 301).
502 Unlike the court tales, where the Greek witnesses to the text are substantively
of a highly symbolic and cryptic vocabulary, and their interpretations are mediated by an angelic figure. Unlike the narratives of the court tales, the visions are communicated in the first person rather than the third. Also unlike the court tales, the visions relate little of Daniel’s life and deeds, no more than a few chronological and geographic notices informing the reader as to when and where each vision took place. It is reasonable to assume that such notices are products of the redactional process that occurred shortly before or during the production of the final form of MT Daniel.503

Daniel 7 is set in the first year of the reign of King Belshazzar, in the period after the events of Daniel 4 but before those of Daniel 5.504 Daniel is in his bed, which presumably is in the capital city itself (7:1).505 In his vision Daniel sees four great beasts rising from the sea, the last exceedingly strong, with great iron teeth and many horns, including a solitary horn which has eyes and which speaks aloud (7:2–9). Daniel then sees a figure called the Ancient of Days, clad in white, who takes his seat on his flaming throne in a court-like setting (7:10). The fourth beast is slain and its body destroyed, while the other beasts are deprived of their sovereignty, although they are allowed to remain alive for a short while (7:11–12). Finally Daniel sees the coming of “one like a human being” (כְּגַן דֹּבָק),506 who approaches the Ancient of Days and is given everlasting dominion over the earth and its inhabitants (7:13–14).

Daniel is distressed by all which he sees and seeks an interpretation from one of those who attends the divine throne (7:14–15). The interpreting angel507 tells Daniel that the four beasts represent four different from the MT witness (cf. Daniel 3–6 and the addition of Susanna and Bel and the Dragon), the apocalyptic visions do not contain such major discrepancies between the Greek and the Aramaic/Hebrew texts.

503 On the composition history of MT Daniel, see Chapter One note 5.

504 From the perspective of the redaction history of the Book of Daniel, of course, this date firmly sets the vision within the chronological context and court setting of Daniel 1–6 and so represents one way that the visions of 7–12 as a whole are integrated into the final form of the Book. On this redactive process, see also Chapter Two, §1.

505 Although Daniel has been forgotten by Belshazzar (MT 5:10–11), he is still close enough geographically to be summoned to court to explain the mystery of the writing on the wall (MT 5:12–13). It may be inferred, therefore, that Daniel’s bed and his house are within the city walls.

506 Literally, “like the son of man,” but this phrase is usually taken to mean “human being.” See the detailed and convincing excursus on this subject in Collins, *Daniel*, 304–310.

507 It can be none other, given the specific context of the interpreting figure in
historical kingdoms and that the “holy ones of the Most High” will eventually receive the final and everlasting kingdom (7:17–18). Daniel next enquires about the fourth kingdom specifically and its various horns, to which the angel replies that the fourth kingdom will be different from all the kingdoms which precede it, just as the king who is represented by the solitary horn will be different from all the kings who precede him (7:19–24). This king will seek to change the times and the law, but after a set time his dominion will be removed and replaced by the kingdom of the holy ones of the Most High, which all the other kingdoms of the world will obey and serve (7:25–27). The chapter ends with a note about Daniel’s being alarmed and his decision not to speak of what he has been shown (7:28).

Chapter 8 is also set during the reign of King Belshazzar, in the third year of his dominion. This time Daniel is located in the fortified city of Susa, beside the canal called Ulai (8:1–2). In his vision Daniel sees a two-horned ram that rampages over all the other beasts of the earth, and then a one-horned he-goat that comes from the west that engages and overthrows the ram, breaking its two horns (8:3–7). At the height of its power, the one horn of the he-goat breaks and is replaced by other horns. One of these horns itself waxes strong and transgresses against the “prince of the host” and his people in acts of desolation (8:8–12). Daniel then hears two holy ones speaking about the specific length of time that this horn would continue this desolating transgression, which is given as a figure of 2,300 evenings and mornings (8:13–14).

Daniel seeks to understand what he has been shown. Suddenly, out of the Ulai comes a figure “in the likeness of a man.” It is the angel Gabriel, who approaches Daniel—now prostrate in panic—and says that the vision is for the end-time (8:15–17). Daniel swoons at his words, but Gabriel revives him and explains the vision, noting the visions which follow and the more general context of Jewish apocalyptic form in the Hellenistic and early Roman periods.

508 Daniel’s query and the angel’s response adds some detail about this kingdom not in the first telling of the vision, e.g., that it will “wage war on the holy ones” (7:21) and the solitary horn will change the times and the law (7:25). Various explanations for such addition details have been proffered.

509 Dan 8:1 specifies that the vision about to be related to the reader occurred “after that which appeared to me in the beginning,” i.e., the vision recounted in Daniel 7.

510 The MT text, which has been written in Aramaic since 2:4b, now returns to the Hebrew at 8:1 and continues thus to the end of the Book.
again that what Daniel has seen is what will occur in the future and at the appointed time (8:18–19). The two-horned ram represents the kingdoms of Media and Persia, while the he-goat is the kingdom of Greece. The horns of the he-goat are individual kings, including, at the end, the one horn/king who will wax strong and who will act against the holy ones in the fashion detailed in the vision before being finally overthrown, but not by human hands (8:20–25). The chapter ends with Gabriel’s admonition to Daniel to keep the substance of the vision secret, following which Daniel returns to the king’s service, but only after being ill for many days (8:26–27).

Chapter 9 opens in the first year of the reign of Darius the Mede, that is, sometime around the action of Daniel 6. Daniel is contemplating Jeremiah’s prophecy (Jer 25:11–12; 29:10) that Jerusalem would lay desolate and abandoned for seventy years (9:1–2). Daniel prays to God, reflecting on how evil came upon Israel on account of its having turned away from the Law of Moses and asking God now to turn his anger away from Israel on account of the desolation of Jerusalem at this time of desolation (9:3–19). The underlying theology of Daniel’s prayer is clearly Deuteronomic. Gabriel then appears to Daniel to impart the understanding of the prophecy (9:20–22). The angel informs Daniel that Jeremiah’s seventy years are in reality seventy weeks (of years, i.e., seven times seventy years), a pre-determined period during which all that is foretold will come to pass (9:23–24). Seven weeks will pass before Jerusalem is rebuilt, and then another sixty-two before the events of the final week, when a ruler will destroy the city and desecrate the sanctuary with the desolating abomination before destruction is visited upon the ruler himself (9:25–27). Gabriel’s reply is a powerful rejection of the prayer’s Deuteronomic theology of history in favour of what I have identified elsewhere as the Danielic theology of history, that is, a broadly deterministic theology of history

---

511 The versions read “kings” or “king,” but the concept of “kingdoms” is surely meant, since the horns are explicitly referred to as specific kings.

512 The setting of the desolation in the context of the story is the Jerusalem of the Babylonian Exile of Daniel’s time—the city destroyed and mostly abandoned, without a Temple, its people scattered—but the setting of the desolation in the context of the intended audience is the Jerusalem of the time of the abomination of desolation of Antiochus Epiphanes.

513 See note 538, infra.

514 See Collins, Daniel, 357–358, for the range of options concerning the nature of this abomination. That it was a pagan altar is most likely.
found throughout the rest of the Book of Daniel and which stands alongside the idea of individual responsibility.\textsuperscript{515}

The final revelatory vision of Daniel extends over the last three chapters of the Book. Daniel is in mourning and fasting (10:2–3).\textsuperscript{516} The specific place of the vision is the banks of the river Tigris in Babylon, the date being the twenty-fourth day of the first month (10:4), in the third year of the reign of Cyrus the Great (10:1).\textsuperscript{517} The vision is therefore set in a period after the chronological compass of the court tales. Cyrus, of course, was the king of Persia and the conqueror of Lydia and Babylon, but more importantly to the Jews he was the anointed one of God (Isa 45:1), whose divinely-inspired decree had restored the exiled Jews to the land of Israel.\textsuperscript{518} In the chronology of MT Daniel, Cyrus is presented as the successor to Darius the Mede.\textsuperscript{519} Daniel is therefore an extremely old man by the time of this final vision, having been taken from Jerusalem as a youth (1:6) and now very near his own death (12:13).

In his vision Daniel beholds an angel in the form of a man of fantastic appearance. Although Daniel’s companions see nothing, they are nevertheless overwhelmed by an unexplained fear and trembling and flee. Daniel, however, sees a great vision and is rendered prostrate and unconscious by the event (10:5–9). An angelic hand shakes Daniel back to sensibility and the angel reassures him that he has been sent in response to his mourning. The angel also informs Daniel that for the past three weeks\textsuperscript{520} he has been battling with the prince of Persia,\textsuperscript{521} and only was only free to respond to Daniel when the angel Michael appeared to assume the struggle on his behalf (10:10–13).

\textsuperscript{515} DiTommaso, "4Q\textit{Pseudo-Daniel}–b (4Q243–4Q244)."
\textsuperscript{516} Why is Daniel in mourning? Collins draws on the parallels with 4 \textit{Ezra} and states that mourning constitutes part of the preparation for the visionary experience (\textit{Daniel}, 372). But the mourning here must be considered in the light of Daniel 9, where the subject of Daniel’s reflection is the sorry state of his people, and also with reference to the fact that the chronology of the Book of Daniel does not extend to the restoration under Cyrus. It would seem likely that Daniel is mourning over the state of his people at 10:2 also.
\textsuperscript{517} Even though Dan 1:21 states that Daniel served until the first year of Cyrus. The Greek versions preserve “first year” at 10:1. See Chapter Two, §3.
\textsuperscript{519} On the subject of Darius the Mede in Daniel 6, his place in the historical record, and the post-biblical attempts to harmonize the biblical and historical records, see Chapter Two, §3.
\textsuperscript{520} That is, throughout the period of the mourning of 10:2.
\textsuperscript{521} Not the king (ንጭ) of Persia. The kings are the sovereigns and the captains
But before the angel can interpret the vision (10:14), Daniel again falls to the ground, dumb (10:15). Again the angel revives and strengthens Daniel, telling him that although he must return soon to the conflict with princes of Persia and Greece, he will first reveal what is contained in the book of truth (10:16–11:2a).

The angelic interpretation of Daniel’s vision is essentially a long review of what in the context of the setting of the Book of Daniel is meant as future history. The angel informs Daniel about the coming of four Persian kings, about the rise of a king from Greece who conquers Persia but whose kingdom dissolves into smaller kingdoms upon his death, and about the complicated political machinations and military maneuvers of the king of the south and the king of the north (11:2b–20). The angel also tells Daniel about the rise of a contemptible and treacherous king, who after a failed expedition to the south will act against the people of the holy covenant and establish the desolating abomination (11:21–31). Some of the people of the covenant will fall (and so be refined and purified), while the king will exalt himself exceedingly and honour a strange god (11:32–39). At the time of the end, this king will engage the kings of the north and the south in battle; he will lose some of his land but gain Egypt, and then will perish on his return north (11:40–45).

The interpreting angel tells Daniel that after these political events, Michael the prince of Israel will appear and usher in a period of great distress (12:1). Daniel’s people, however, will be delivered, and

---

522 The reader is never made privy to the vision from Daniel’s perspective, only to its interpretation.

523 That is, the place where past and future history has been recorded (according to the divine will). The visions of Daniel (and the ex eventu historical reviews of Daniel 2 and 4) represent a cryptic and imperfect reading of the truths in this book of truth, which then have to be interpreted. The question is why these visions are cryptic in the first place, and perhaps the answer is in part due to the roots of the apocalyptic vision in the dynamic of the interpretation of notoriously cryptic dreams (roots that are clearly visible in the Book of Daniel).

524 Several data have been conflated at this point, and the sequence of the action of the section from 10:5–11:2a (and particularly from 10:15–11:2a) is extremely confusing. Although Collins rightly warns that attempts to improve the MT “must be viewed with caution” (Daniel, 376), the MT text is repetitive and cannot be read in a straightforward manner. 11:2b follows naturally from what is contained at 10:14, and the data of the prince of Greece (10:20) and Darius the Mede (11:1) seem to be redactive attempts to link the material with other portions of the Book of Daniel.

525 This phrase is frequently understood to indicate the transition from ex eventu historical review to genuine prophecy.
many of those who have died will be resurrected, some to everlasting life but others to everlasting disgrace (12:2–3). The angel then instructs Daniel to keep secret what he has been shown and told (12:4).

After this, Daniel sees two angels speaking to each other across the width of the Tigris. The subject of their conversation is the length of the time of the “awesome events,” to which one replies, “a time, times, and a half”\textsuperscript{526} (12:5–7). The interpreting angel tells Daniel that many will be purified and refined and many will act wickedly, but only the wise will understand what is truly happening (12:8–10). MT Daniel ends with two statements concerning the time between the desolating abomination and the end, and the angel’s promise of resurrection for Daniel (12:11–13).

There are several messages in the apocalyptic visions of Daniel 7–12 that contribute directly to the shape of the content and form of these chapters beyond the vision + interpretation format that is typical to the genre. Although each message is distinct, they reinforce and augment each other, creating in the final product a rich, polyphonic harmony.

The basic message is that God controls the broad processes of history. To some degree, this is also the message of the court tales of Daniel 1–6, but in the visions it underpins the more immediate assurances that God has not forgotten his people and that the current oppression, which has become acute, will be relieved in the imminent future. The emphasis in the court tales, that Jews can live righteously and prosper even while under foreign domination, is replaced in the visions by the belief that the present state of affairs is intolerable. The visions also feature a greater sense of a corporate distinction between the Jews and Gentiles, which is partly a result of this intolerable present-day situation. In the court tales, Daniel the Jew maintains his Jewish distinctiveness, but the righteousness of God that is result of the faithfulness of Daniel (and of his three companions)\textsuperscript{527} is almost entirely personal.\textsuperscript{528} In the visions,

\textsuperscript{526} I.e., three and a half years.

\textsuperscript{527} In fact, this personal relationship between Daniel’s faithfulness and God’s righteousness might also need to be considered in the context of the unfaithfulness of some of the other Jewish exiles; see Chapter Two note 5. If so, not only is Daniel faithful, but his faithfulness should be contrasted with the faithlessness of some of the other exiles.

\textsuperscript{528} Note that the madness that affects Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel 4, which is a result of the king’s prideful attitude, does not affect his kingdom, which seemingly continues on until the sentence is served, whereby the king regains his senses and resumes the throne.
however, the beneficiary of God’s imminent decisive action in history is the corporation, \(^{529}\) although such a perspective does not rule out the possibility of finer divisions within it. \(^{530}\)

As with historical apocalypses generally, Daniel 7–12 is oppression literature\(^ {531}\)—it articulates the perceived persecution of the present age and expresses its anticipated relief. \(^ {532}\) Significantly, the present plight is described not only as a discrete, immediate exigency but also historiographically, as a fundamentally interconnected event embedded within a review of past history and an exposition of future history, both of which are as a result characteristic of the form. Put another way, the present plight in any apocalyptic historiography is unintelligible outside the context of what has happened and what is to come. Accordingly, there is a stress, which is particularly evident in historical apocalypses such as Daniel 7–12, on identifying the past circumstances and future expectations which make this present state of affairs historically and eschatologically coherent. Since history in its broad strokes is understood to be a product of kings and generals and is measured by the rise and fall of kingdoms and by the results of military campaigns, \(^ {533}\) there is an overwhelming emphasis

---

\(^{529}\) See, e.g., the Holy Ones of the Most High (7:18, 25, 27), the Holy Ones (8:25), the Judaeans (the subject of Daniel 9), the Holy Covenant (11:30), “your people” (12:1), and the Holy People (12:7). In addition, the idea of supernatural princes of Israel and Persia (10:13) also fits into this idea of a struggle between corporate powers. A concern with the polity is also a hallmark of the prophetic literature.

\(^{530}\) MT Daniel, for example, speaks particularly highly of the מָשִכָרְלָם (11:32, 12:3, 8–10).

\(^{531}\) This term may be employed in two ways: first, as a response of a corporate entity (community, state, or nation) to an external situation (i.e., the sense that it is expounded in the following paragraphs); and second, as a response of a component of a larger corporate entity to an internal situation, which might be political, economic, or social in nature. B. Becking remarks that the Book of Daniel expresses the views of a religious minority, and that this minority was probably part of the lower classes (“Expectations about the End of Time in the Hebrew Bible: Do They Exist?” Apocalyptic in History and Tradition (edd. C. Rowland and J. Barton; JSPSup 43; London, 2002), 44–59 at 59). But can the same be said of the Byzantine period? If we are to trust Bishop Liudprand, the Byzantine Daniel apocalypses enjoyed great popularity, presumably among the upper strata of the Empire. One must also wonder who had the money to purchase copies of apocalypses and/or the ability to read them. On this, see Chapter Five.

\(^{532}\) Alexander argues that general millennial speculation also gave rise to the appearance of apocalypses (“Medieval Apocalypses,” 1002), but I would say that the opposite is true: historical apocalypses were most often precipitated by some sort of specific crisis.

\(^{533}\) This is a characteristic of ancient historiography but stands in contrast to the focus of the Daniel prognostica, which are essentially egalitarian in outlook. On the
on these elements in the historical review of the visions of Daniel 7–12.

The pseudonymous attribution of the visions to Daniel, a wise figure from the past, allows the past and present to be articulated as future prediction. This fiction allows for the fundamental unity of all the elements of the vision and its interpretation, regardless of their actual temporal status. It also contributes to the basic and immediate messages of the text by establishing an analogous line of reasoning: just as that which for the reader are past events have transpired according to Daniel’s vision, so too will those events yet to happen come to pass as foretold. In this way the vision guarantees and validates itself to its readers.

In the visions of Daniel 7–12 there is a marked supernatural dimension to the oppression and its history and resolution, which together are understood as part of a broader conflict between good and evil. As a result, the present situation and the past circumstances which precipitated it are articulated on both the natural and the supernatural planes, while the expected future relief from persecution is envisioned as a supra-historical and supernatural event.

Finally, the apocalyptic visions in the Book of Daniel lack certain features commonly exhibited in other ancient and mediaeval Jewish, Christian, and Islamic apocalypses. As noted, they do not detail an elaborate cosmology, nor do any of their reviews of history contain descriptions of primeval or patriarchal events. In fact, these reviews are always restricted in scope to the fairly recent past, the elements of which directly inform the present situation. The question of the origin of evil, which is often associated with a description of primeval history, is not discussed, although it does form an implicit part of

conceptual differences between the apocryphal apocalyptic literature and the prognostica, see Chapter Four, §1.

534 See Chapters Two and Four for more on the characteristics and effects of Daniel’s wisdom.

535 Becking argues that “there are no expectations about the end of time in the Hebrew Bible,” although the Book of Daniel is “on the edge” (“Expectations about the End of Time,” 44, 57–59). Statements such as Dan 2:44–45 clearly indicate the envisioning of the end of time, however.

536 Sometimes via a periodised schema of history, sometimes by means of a more conventional recounting of past events. In both cases, however, the function of the historical data is make the present situation coherent.

537 Particularly in the context of the sin of Adam or the episode of the giants at Gen 6:1–4, the latter extremely important to the Book of the Watchers at 1 Enoch 1–36 and the many texts that it influenced.
the counterpoint to the exposition of apocalyptic historiography of MT Daniel 9.\textsuperscript{538} In addition, the visions of the Book of Daniel do not contain long descriptions of heaven/paradise. Most pay no attention to issues surrounding the origin of evil, to the description of primeval history, or to the portrayal of heaven and/or paradise.

When we consider the apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha as a collection of texts that share the same pseudonymous attribution to the figure of Daniel, we find that, despite the expected differences in specific historical allusions, they mirror the visions of the Book of Daniel in their basic and underlying messages,\textsuperscript{539} and thus also in their fundamental content and form. All the apocryphal Daniel apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles are recounted in the first-person and utilise the fiction of pseudonymous authorship. All except two demonstrate little or no concern with the particulars of Daniel’s life.\textsuperscript{540} All make extensive use of highly cryptic language. Most contain an \textit{ex eventu} review of history, which explains the present plight, and an eschatological section, which articulates the expected supernatural relief from the plight. All function to some degree as oppression literature by reassuring their readers that God is control of history and that a favourable resolution to the present, often perilous dilemma is imminent.

To one degree or another, these characteristics are true also of the “historical” type of apocalypses in general, whether they are ancient or mediaeval or are associated with Daniel or with other biblical figures. Indeed, perhaps we should not be so terribly surprised to discover that historical apocalypses of late antiquity and the mediaeval period closely mirror the form and function of what arguably during these periods was the most representative example of the type, namely the visions of Daniel 7–12!

But such a sentiment does not account for the specific popularity of the figure of Daniel in the post-biblical apocalypses, which must be attributed to the paradigmatic quality of the visions of Daniel

\textsuperscript{538} Again, see the extended discussion on this topic (and the sources cited) in DiTommaso, “4Q\textit{Pseudo-Daniel}²” (4Q243–4Q244).”

\textsuperscript{539} The only real exception to this is the Hebrew \textit{Vision of Daniel} (§2.17), where there is an added sense, perhaps borrowed from the court tales of Daniel 1–6, that righteous foreign kings are rewarded on earth and wicked ones are punished.

\textsuperscript{540} The exceptions are the Syriac \textit{Revelation of Daniel the Prophet} (§2.5) and the Judaeo-Persian \textit{Qissa-yi Dāniyāl} (§2.14).
7–12. Far more than any other character from the Hebrew Bible, the figure of Daniel came to be employed whenever a community in distress understood its plight and expected its salvation in terms of God’s sweeping plan for history. One must not forget that MT Daniel is itself a redacted document containing many separate stories about and visions ascribed to Daniel the wise. The visions came to be associated with the court tales not by accident, but deliberately, through the attributes associated with the figure of Daniel the wise\(^{541}\) and probably also through the early apocalyptic historiography implicit in the dream of the great statue in Daniel 2. In other words, MT Daniel simply represents one stage—albeit an early stage—of an ongoing process wherein the figure of Daniel was employed to impart reassuring revelatory information about the past, present, and future, and the first stage inasmuch as this information pertained specifically to a community in distress. The apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha, however far removed in time from the apocalyptic visions of the Book of Daniel, are part of this process.

We must also recall that there are four separate visions in Daniel 7–12 and that these visions represent the sum total of the apocalyptic visions of the Hebrew Bible. It is reasonable to assume that the four visions of the Book of Daniel would have provided most of the necessary precedents for the post-biblical author who wished to explain his present-day plight in terms of a unified historiography and eschatology centering on the reassuring message that God controlled the broad sweep of human destiny.\(^{542}\) Indeed, there were relatively few other models upon which he could draw. A few apocalypses carried the name of Adam, Abraham, or Moses,\(^{543}\) but it is very doubtful whether any of these extra-biblical texts had the saturation-level circulation in late antiquity and the mediaeval period that was undoubtedly enjoyed by the visions of Daniel 7–12,\(^{544}\) embedded as

\(^{541}\) See the discussion in Chapter Four, §2. There seems to be no connexion between the apocryphal Daniel apocalypses and the Daniel prognostica.

\(^{542}\) Wortley is quite correct in stating that, “to a very large extent, Byzantine prose apocalyptic literature derives ultimately and directly from a single document, the latter part of the canonical Book of Daniel” (“Literature of Catastrophe,” 5).

\(^{543}\) The Apocalypse of Adam, the Apocalypse of Abraham, and the Apocalypse of Moses; the last, of course, is part of the Primary Adam Literature and, as J. Tromp observes in a personal communication, hardly qualifies as an “apocalypse.”

\(^{544}\) In fact, the Apocalypse of Adam is preserved in only one copy, which is contained among the Nag Hammadi codices, while the Apocalypse of Abraham is extant only in Slavonic. The Primary Adam literature and the Sibylline Oracles were quite
they were in the authoritative writings of the three Abrahamic religions. Moreover, figures such as Adam, Abraham, and Moses, as with many of the other biblical patriarchs and prophets, were also associated with testamentary and/or mantic texts. This comparatively wide breadth of association, however, is not a characteristic of the Daniel pseudepigrapha, which are entirely limited to “historical” apocalypses and a few, specific types of prognostica, most of which, as we shall discover in Chapter Four, were ultimately connected in some fashion to the biblical Daniel’s ability to interpret dreams. The figure of Enoch, meanwhile, was more associated with otherworldly apocalypses, while those of David and Solomon tended to appear in the context of apocryphal psalms and magical literature respectively, and not apocalypses.

To be sure, one encounters ancient and mediaeval historical apocalypses attributed to figures such as Baruch, Ezra, Leo the Wise, or Methodius, while apocalyptic revelation in testamentary form was commonly found under the names of various biblical patriarchs. But the number of apocalypses attributed to Daniel far outstrips the combined total of apocalypses and apocalyptic literature associated with these other figures. One need only consult the list of texts in the “Alphabetisches Verzeichnis” that prefaces Berger’s Diegesis Danielis for confirmation. Only one quarter of the 188 texts that Berger lists are apocalypses, and of these forty-odd texts, fully nineteen—approximately one half of the total number of apocalypses—are attributed to Daniel. These figures are rough estimates at best. Many times Berger lists versions of the same text under different numbers and, as we have seen, his listing of the apocryphal Daniel texts is incomplete and conflational. But we need to recall that in this chapter we have identified no less than twenty-four texts, and this is not counting those attributed to Daniel which are listed in the Excursus in the Inventory of Chapter Six, “Notes on and Manuscripts of Unidentified Greek Daniel Apocalypses.”
sustained series of “historical” apocalypses, and this was nowhere near the level of the Danielic apocalyptic tradition.

Despite the characteristically vast geographic and temporal scope of its historical reviews and eschatological expectations, apocalyptic literature tends towards a distinct myopia in that events and figures are significant only insofar as they are meaningful to the background to and resolution of the current plight. As we observed, the visions of Daniel 7–12 are directed to the corporation rather than to any specific individual: both the review of history and the articulation of the future are informed by the nature of the plight of a collection of Jews during the Antiochene oppression. The apocalyptic historiographies of Daniel 7–12 may rightly be considered a form of national-religious history. The chapters tell the story of one nation among other nations, with the historical dynamic—conquest, empire, oppression—formulated strictly in nationalistic terms.

Through these visions, then, the figure of Daniel became associated with revelatory information that had a specifically national focus. Later generations of peoples came to employ the figure of Daniel to interpret their own nationalist dilemma via the medium of apocalyptic literature. The Byzantine Christians are an excellent example of this phenomenon, their plight being a direct result of contact and then conflict with the Arab Muslims. From one point of view, the Byzantine Greek Daniel apocalypses are simply one expression of how national calamity was understood historically and eschatologically.

The figure of Daniel enjoys another critical advantage over other biblical and non-biblical figures associated with apocalypses. All historical apocalypses might be oppression literature with a national-religious focus, but not all of them are addressed to what for later readers was such a readily recognisable event in history. The fiction

---

548 The fact that 4 Ezra was a text that was sometimes included in biblical manuscripts must have ensured its fairly wide circulation.

549 This collection need not be specific, either, although the indications of finer distinctions in the polity (see note 530, supra) probably indicates that the author of the visions of Daniel had a certain group in mind. The corporation could be an ideal one—an idea of “Jewishness” (or “Byzantine” or “Syriac Christian”) that only partially overlapped with reality. More still needs to be said on this topic, however.


551 Even the supernatural world was arranged along national lines; cf. the angels of Israel and Persia.
of pseudonymous authorship, as I observed, allowed for the device of the *ex eventu* historical review and the guarantee of a vision’s authenticity. However, this guarantee is *de facto* internal, inasmuch as it applies solely to those persons who were currently experiencing the oppressive situation outlined in the review of history and who could understand and identify with the historical circumstances which had created it. Presumably some of these situations were also able to be understood by later readers, but many very likely were not, even beyond the limitations imposed by language.552 The modern-day difficulty with dating many of the Daniel apocalypticas on the basis of the identification of their historical allusions is a telling fact here.

The visions of the Book of Daniel, on the other hand, addressed themselves to a precise context by means of a definite vocabulary that despite its being couched in cryptic imagery was clearly understood by later readers.553 Jews, Christians, and Muslims in late antiquity and the mediaeval period could not have failed to observe that world events and the sequence of kingdoms in the period from the Babylonian Nebuchadnezzar to the Greek Antiochus Epiphanes had transpired pretty much according to the plan revealed to Daniel in his visions. The smooth confluence of the historical record and the revelatory information of the biblical visions provided a ready empirical verification of what faith had already affirmed. This in turn meant that Daniel 7–12 effectively enjoyed a double guarantee of authenticity. Not only did it have the aforementioned internal guarantee generated by virtue of the fiction of pseudonymous authorship, but it claimed an empirical, external guarantee for generations of later readers.

The double guarantee assured that the figure of Daniel became in effect a name brand, an iron-clad guarantee to a post-biblical audience that all visions associated with his name were to be considered authentic and authoritative: they were real and they were

552 For example, one wonders whether a Byzantine Greek would have been able to understand Arabic, Coptic, Hebrew, Persian, or Syriac, which together account for nine distinct apocryphal Daniel apocalypses.

553 The historical reviews of Daniel 7–12 tend to employ relatively precise descriptions of figures and events. This is not always true of later apocalypses, including a few attributed to Daniel. The Syriac *Vision of the Young Daniel* (§2.4) and the Syriac *Revelation of Daniel the Prophet in the Land of Persia and Elam* (§2.5) are good examples.
meaningful to their present plight. Authority and authenticity are the key elements here.

Olster argues that the Byzantine Greek visions attributed to Daniel came to represent a stream of apocalyptic that did not anticipate an imperial restoration, and so was distinct from the stream characterised by the Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius, which did.554 Unfortunately, Olster bases his claim on one apocalypse, the Diegesis Danielis, and a review of the other twenty-three apocalyptic Daniel texts—Byzantine Greek or otherwise—suggests that his argument is only partially correct. One regularly encounters the figure of the good emperor who at one point restores the Empire (and the churches) and who guarantees prosperity and security for its inhabitants. At the same time, imperial restoration never does seem to be the ultimate goal of these apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles, which tend to phrase their expectations of the future not so much in the way of a restored earthly Empire, but more in terms of eschatological events leading to the establishment of the Kingdom of God.

Olster’s argument must also be considered in the light of the visions of Daniel 7–12 (and the proto-apocalyptic vision of the great statue of Daniel 2). Daniel 2, 7, and 12 anticipate the coming Kingdom of God,555 while Daniel 8, 9, and 10–11556 are concerned with the expected imminent removal of Antiochus Epiphanes. Imperial, earthly restoration, however, is not a theme associated with the eschatological anticipations of the dream of Daniel 2 or the visions of Daniel 7–12, despite their steadfast corporate perspective.557 It is reasonable to assume that the figure of Daniel, which through the Book of Daniel had become indelibly associated with revelatory visions that did not stress imperial restoration, might have been preferred

554 Olster, “Byzantine Apocalypses,” 64.
555 On the influence of Daniel 2 and 7 in Byzantine eschatological thought, see G. Podskalsky, Byzantinische Reichseschatologie. Die Periodisierung der Weltgeschichte in den vier Grossreichen (Daniel 2 und 7) und dem tausendjährigen Friedensreiche (Apok. 20) (München, 1972).
556 Daniel 10–12, of course, comprise only one, long vision, but 11:40–45 speak to the end of Antiochus (see note 525, supra), while Daniel 12 moves from political expectations to questions of the ultimate destiny of humans and time.
557 One likely reason for this, of course, is the fact that the Book was redacted in a period centuries removed from the last independent state, the Kingdom of Judah. Imperial restoration—often expressed in the form of the theme of the New Jerusalem (see note 270, supra)—was popular among the prophets who lived in or could remember the days of an independent Israel and Jerusalem.
by later authors who wished to address similarly oppressive situations exclusive of the hope for a political restoration.

For these reasons the apocalyptic visions of the Book of Daniel spoke clearly to later generations. They saw in Daniel the ideal figure to whom they could attribute a certain type of literature through which they could interpret a dire national calamity in historiographic terms that included eschatological speculation about their ultimate destinies.

5. A Greek Apocryphal “Apocalypse of Daniel”? I have highlighted the immediate relationship between certain apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha in the roster of texts in §2, above, most notably the points of contact among several of the Byzantine Greek texts. Also, I have offered preliminary remarks in §3, above, concerning what I believe to be the “meme”-like character of the discrete oracles which constitute so many of these texts. Little attention, however, has been devoted to the far more complex subject of the relationship among the entire corpus of the apocalyptic Daniel texts, or between these texts and the influential Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius and other Byzantine apocalypses. Notable exceptions to the rule are the works of Schmoldt and Pertusi, and, in the limited context of the contacts between the Greek and Slavonic texts, those of Istrin and Tupkova-Zaimova/Miltenova.558 It is with these works that any future attempt to understand the complete expression of the apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha should begin.

This task is largely beyond the scope of this study, if only because the knowledge of the full range of the corpus remains incomplete. It is true that this chapter has identified several new texts and dozens of new manuscripts of known texts. It has also clarified what had been a morass of conflicting and contradictory information about these texts and has attempted to bring some order to the manuscript traditions of each. Yet, as I observed at the start of this chapter, in some ways it remains a preliminary study. Many of the apocryphal apocalypses, especially those which have been recently identified, require detailed analysis. The new manuscript copies of known apocalypses must be examined and evaluated, and there are at least a

558 Particularly Pertusi’s edition of the Visions of Daniel and the Other Holy Men (§2.6).
dozen further Daniel apocalypses that remain unknown beyond a brief citation in a manuscript catalogue. Furthermore, the manuscript holdings of the world’s major libraries and institutions undoubtedly preserve copies of texts that might prove critical to a study of the Daniel apocalypses. Even a cursory review of the catalogues of Greek manuscripts held by the Biblioteca Marciana or the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek (to cite only two examples) will uncover reference after reference to manuscript codices of apocalypses and other revelatory literature, much of it seemingly unedited. Given the complicated and nuanced relationship that seemingly exists among the Byzantine Greek Daniel apocalypses and between them and the various recensions of the *Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius*, it is quite possible that catalogue entries generically titled “Oracle on Byzantium” or “Apocalypse on Constantinople” will prove to contain invaluable evidence on the subject.\(^{559}\)

That being said, it is still possible to outline the basic arguments concerning the relationship among all this apocalyptic literature and to offer a few observations on the direction of future study. The only comprehensive theory regarding this issue is that most or all of them are versions of a single apocalypse, composed originally in Greek. Although the theory was born in the pre-1914 scholarship, and thus is based on the contemporary understanding of the extent of the apocryphal Daniel apocalypses, it reappears time and again in the modern scholarship, often in the context of an expanded corpus of texts but without the recognition that this expanded corpus might contain material which undermines a single-source hypothesis.\(^{560}\)

The apocalyptic Daniel writings most familiar to late-nineteenth-century scholarship were four Byzantine Greek texts: the *Discourses of John Chrysostom Concerning the Vision of Daniel*, the *Vision of Daniel On the Last Times and the End of the World*, the *Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel*, and, to a lesser extent, the Armenian *Seventh Vision of Daniel*,

\(^{559}\) Examples of such apocalypses are to be found in Trapp’s “Vulgärorakel aus Wiener Handschriften,” *passim*.

\(^{560}\) A more extreme example of the conflation of texts is to be found in T.N. Hall’s essay on “Medieval Traditions about the Site of Judgment,” *Essays in Medieval Studies* 10 (1993), 79–91 at 80, where he refers to “the Byzantine Apocalypse of Daniel.” See also the references to Pseudo-Daniel in A. Argyriou’s valuable *Les exégèses grecques de l’Apocalypse à l’époque turque (1453–1821)* (Thessaloniki, 1982), 95–96, 102–104, and 348.
itself a translation of a lost Greek original and perhaps the earliest and most influential of all the Byzantine Daniel apocalypses. The three Greek apocalypses are featured in the editions of Istrin, Vassiliev, and Klostermann, and it is no coincidence that the first three of the numbers corresponding to the Daniel apocalypses in the Bibliotheca hagiographica graeca are assigned to these three texts.\textsuperscript{561}

Zahn made the original connexion by positing that the Seventh Vision and the Last Vision of Daniel were dependent on a common source.\textsuperscript{562} Zahn’s view was later repeated\textsuperscript{563} and expanded\textsuperscript{564} by Bousset, who eventually included the Discourses of John Chrysostom and the Vision of Daniel on the Last Times in his deliberations. According to Bousset, all four texts are related to each other and may be traced in part to this source. Much of his argument is based on the presence of shared elements, particularly those that he understands to be illustrative of a underlying Antichrist myth which to his mind was common to early Christian thought and which resurfaced in diverse writings from the first dozen or so centuries of the Common Era.\textsuperscript{565}

Four decades later, Vasiliev stated that the Last Vision of Daniel, the Vision of Daniel on the Island of Cyprus, the Vision of Daniel on the Future of the Seven-Hilled City, the Diegesis Danielis, and the Slavonic Vision of Daniel on the Emperors were all versions of “the apocryphal composition Daniel’s Vision.”\textsuperscript{566} More recently, Denis has extended the compass of this original Daniel apocalypse to include the Syriac Young Daniel and went as far as to suggest that the Seventh Vision and the Last Vision of Daniel are “dependent indépendamment d’un Daniel apocryphe, peut-être judéo-rabbinique, qu’Hippolyte, selon Ébed Jesu . . . aurait commenté sous le nom de Jeune (plutôt que Petit) Daniel, dont il reste un fragment en syriaque.”\textsuperscript{567} This sentiment is echoed

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{561} Nos. 1871, 1872, and 1873.
\textsuperscript{562} Zahn, Forschungen, 5.115–116.
\textsuperscript{563} Bousset, Antichrist Legend, 66–68.
\textsuperscript{564} Bousset, “Geschichte der Eschatologie,” 288–290.
\textsuperscript{565} Bousset’s schema of the apocryphal Daniel apocalypses is also employed by F. Kampers, Alexander der Große und die Idee des Weltimperiums in Prophetie und Sage (Studien und Darstellungen aus dem Gebiete der Geschichte I.2, no. 3; Freiburg i. Br., 1901), 146–152.
\textsuperscript{566} Vasiliev, The Russian Attack on Constantinople, 160–161, esp. 160 note 28. What Vasiliev actually says is that the Greek and Slavonic versions of this “Daniel’s Vision” are edited by Istrin, pages 133–162 (= Istrin, “В. Тексты. II. ВидБиїа Дапіїла,” 133–162, covering the apocalypses listed in the text to which this note refers).
\textsuperscript{567} Denis, Introduction, 1301. See §2.3. Note also Argyriou, Les exégèses grecques, 96
by Wortley, who argues that the *Last Vision of Daniel*, the Coptic *Fourteenth Vision of Daniel*, and the Judaeo-Persian *Qissa-yi Dāniyāl* are versions of the lost Greek apocalypse that stands behind the Armenian text of the *Seventh Vision*.568

But are such conclusions justifiable and, if so, to what extent and can they be extended to the twenty other apocalyptic Daniel texts? On the whole, the few scholars who have commented on the matter have more or less accepted that some points of contact exist among the majority of the apocalypses. The research of scholars such Schmoldt, Alexander, and Rydén, for example, confirms that there are at least some shared elements among several of the Byzantine Daniel apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles, and in some cases entire apocalypses seem to have been woven together from bits and pieces seconded from other texts. The information in the roster of texts, above, confirms that several elements regularly appear in the Daniel apocalypses, Byzantine or otherwise.

But the presence of shared elements is not always enough to posit a common source, particularly when i) these elements were used and reused in the context of the Byzantine apocalyptic traditions, often in the venue of the “meme”-like oracles; and ii) they appear in so many other apocalyptic texts that are not associated with Daniel.569 For example, although some material in the *Seventh Vision* is clearly reflected or even paralleled in a few of the other Daniel apocalypses, James’ broad statement that the *Seventh Vision* exists in “versions in Greek, Coptic, Armenian and other tongues”570 is far too bold. Even a cursory reading of the Daniel apocalypses preserved in these languages is enough to confirm that the Coptic *Fourteenth Vision of Daniel* (for example) is not a version of either the Greek *Last Vision of Daniel* or the Armenian *Seventh Vision of Daniel*.

---

568 Wortley, “Literature of Catastrophe,” 10; he does not name the texts by their titles.
569 The charts in Berger’s *Daniel-Diegese* (inserted between pages 82 and 83 and between pages 116 and 117) are extremely effective in communicating this fact.
570 M.R. James, *The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament* (TED 1, Palestinian Jewish Texts 14; London/New York, 1920), 70. James was of course intimately familiar with the Western European libraries and manuscripts of his age and not someone wont to make unsupported statements. Perhaps he was thinking more in general terms, along the lines of related texts or themes rather than exact copies or close versions of the same text.
Stone offers a similarly general perspective, stating that a common source underlies the apocryphal Daniel apocalypses in the Armenian, Greek, and Slavonic traditions, and that “a Persian work called the History of Daniel [i.e., the Qissa-yi Dāniyāl] also contains similar materials.” In a later work Stone expands his canvas, positioning that the Seventh Vision “is clearly allied with the Greek and Hebrew medieval Daniel apocalypses. Likewise, and although it is based solely on the appearance of similar elements and parts of discrete oracles in several texts, the assumption throughout Rydén’s studies of the Andreas Salos apocalypse which is embedded in the Life of St. Andrew the Fool is that a common source stands behind several of the Daniel apocalypses, including the Seventh Vision, the Last Vision, the Discourses of John Chrysostom, the Vision of Daniel on the Last Times, and the Hebrew Vision of Daniel. Again, though, the presence of some basic elements, which are also found elsewhere in the corpus of apocalyptic literature of late antiquity and the early mediaeval period, is in itself not enough evidence to support such statements. Even Bousset, who rather extensively referred to the Judaeo-Persian History of Daniel, does not argue that it evolved from this original Daniel source. It is not so much that the assertions of Stone and Rydén are erroneous—they are not, given the nature of the evidence at the time—but rather that now they require nuance.

We must also recall that the correspondence of such common elements among the two dozen apocryphal Daniel apocalypses is by no means uniform. Seven or eight apocalypses might mention the Antichrist, but only two or three of these might also include the legend of the Good Emperor. The legend of the Good Emperor might then also be part of a further two or three other apocalypses, which in turn might contain the story of Elijah and Enoch, which is also to be found in one of the apocalypses that mention the Antichrist. All of a sudden it appears that there is some fundamental and stunningly obvious relationship among all the texts, when the reality is that there is a web of points of contact that is both more complex (as it refers to the connexions among these texts) and expansive (in that it extends outward to include material not attributed to Daniel).

573 Bousset, Antichrist Legend, 109–112.
The manner by which we evaluate potential points of contact among the various apocalyptic texts perhaps needs to be re-examined.

Scholars have also offered claims about the relationship among all the Daniel apocalypses apart from the single-source hypothesis. García Martínez argues that with the exception of the Syriac and Persian texts, both of which he understands to be Jewish, the later Daniel apocalypses are Christian works that were composed originally in Greek, deal primarily with Byzantine history and the reaction to the Islamic conquest, and incorporate elements from both the biblical Book of Daniel and the New Testament, especially the schema of the four kingdoms (Daniel 2 and 7). The understanding that most of the apocalypses were composed originally in Greek is also suggested by Brandes and followed by Henze.

Most of these conclusions can no longer be maintained without modification. Although the majority of the apocryphal Daniel apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles were composed in Greek, by Christians, and deal primarily with events and figures from the Byzantine Empire, our survey of the these texts demonstrates that there are more than enough examples which are composed in other languages, by either Jews or Muslims, and which do not appear to be particularly concerned about events from Byzantine history.

Nor is it precisely correct to say that the apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha incorporate elements from both the biblical Book of Daniel and the New Testament. It is true that in §4, above, I argued that the apocryphal apocalypses exhibit a close relationship to the visions of the Book of Daniel in function and thus in the general structures of both form and content. It is also true that several of these apocalypses, most notably the Arabic Vision of Daniel, reflect the symbolic images prominent in Daniel 7–12, such as the use of horns to represent rulers and beasts to represent kingdoms. At the same time, the apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha as a whole are patently dissimilar from their biblical antecedents in matters of specific content, primarily because they described historical circumstances very different from those which precipitated the biblical visions of Daniel. Each apocryphon is different, as is the degree to which it incorporates specific images from the Book of Daniel. As for the New Testament,

---

574 On the views of García Martínez, see the Appendix in Chapter One.
there does not appear to be anything in the Daniel apocalyptica that is not found in other apocalypses of late antiquity and the early mediaeval period. In other words, these Daniel texts may draw on the New Testament for many of its images and vocabulary, but so do other contemporary apocalypses and apocalyptic writings.

In conclusion, the idea that all or most of the Daniel apocalyptica are versions of a single apocalypse is unwarranted. More probable is the hypothesis, advanced in §3, above, that many of these compositions (and particularly the Byzantine texts) are linked through a series of common images and expectations\(^{576}\) and by means of reoccurring, discrete oracles. This would explain the obvious points of contact among texts such as the Armenian *Seventh Vision*, the Greek *Last Vision of Daniel*, and the Slavonic *Vision of Daniel on the Emperors*, without resorting to the far simpler theory that they are all versions of essentially the same texts. At the same time, more work is required on the full corpus of these texts before what I suspect is a very complicated system of relationships and linkages is revealed.

Finally, the hypothesis of multiple linkages also informs the subject of the conceptual relationship between the Book of Daniel and the apocryphal Daniel apocalypses. The old idea that all or many of these apocryphal texts are versions of an original Daniel apocalypse implies that they were only indirectly inspired by the Book of Daniel. The trajectory of influence in this schema is a simple straight line that runs from the Book of Daniel through this first, lost apocalypse and from there to its extant versions. The hypothesis of multiple linkages, however, keeps the Book of Daniel and the figure of Daniel the Prophet in the equation at all times, since it assumes that these elements formed an omnipresent background to the store of images and expectations upon which the apocalypses constantly drew. In this case, the relationship between the Book of Daniel and the apocryphal apocalypses is more radial than linear, with sub-trajectories also arcing among the various apocalypses. This picture is perhaps less elegant, but it is probably much closer to the truth.

\(^{576}\) The relationship between the Good Emperor who reigns for thirty-odd years and the Last Roman Emperor has yet to be explained satisfactorily.
CHAPTER FOUR
THE DANIEL PROGNOSTICA

1. Ancient and Mediaeval Prognostica

Fortune-telling, augury, and divination\(^1\) have been part of human history ever since humans first recognized the fundamentally causal nature of the world around them. Astronomers and sailors from time immemorial have observed the tides of the sea waxing and waning in quotidian harmony with the movement of the moon in the sky. Ancient winemakers knew that the best vintages resulted when the weather during the vine flowering in spring was warm and dry and when the grapes had enjoyed plenty of summer sun. Physicians discovered that broken limbs would heal if they were set into place and then splinted. Upon these and a thousand other simple observations were the principles of modern science, agriculture, and medicine founded.

Ancient science and medicine, though, embraced a world-view that permitted agency from different phenomena than are now normally accepted. Future events, for example, could be causally deduced from the observation of the movement of heavenly bodies, the patterns of the weather, or the state of being of animate and inanimate objects within the natural world. They could also be anticipated through the interpretation of dreams or by *computi*\(^2\) based on information gleaned from astrological lore, the calendar, the alphabet, or the number system. One might calculate the success or failure of an

---

\(^1\) These terms are sometimes interchangeable, and sometimes not, depending on the classification used. Since the Daniel prognostica are limited to a few specific types of texts, all of which may be classified as “divinatory,” that term will be employed throughout, particularly in order to distinguish these texts from apocalyptic revelations of the future.

endeavor based on the specific day of the month, the day of the
week upon which Christmas or Easter falls, the influence of a par-
ticular sign of the zodiac, and so on.

In late antiquity and the mediaeval period, certain prognostic texts
came to be associated with the figures from the past who were
thought to have had special insight or knowledge about how to fore-
cast the future.\textsuperscript{3} We find attributed to Joseph divinatory texts based
on the letters of the alphabet,\textsuperscript{4} to Solomon and to Merlin a slew of
magical, hydromantic, and other writings,\textsuperscript{5} and to Ezra (Esdras) the
eponymous \textit{Supputatio Esdrae}, which foretold the future based on
the day of the week upon which the \textit{kalends} of that month fell.\textsuperscript{6} The
phenomenon of pseudonymous accreditation also extended, in the case
of medical and astronomical prognostica, to learned men of the clas-
sical and post-classical past, including Hippocrates, Ptolemy, Apuleius,
and the Venerable Bede.

Daniel was no exception to this phenomenon, and over time his
name came to be affiliated closely with several prognostic texts. One
such text is the \textit{Somniale Danielis}, which was one of the most popu-
lar mediaeval pieces and which, while not always associated with
Daniel, is almost never found attributed to anyone else. Another,
the \textit{Lunationes Danielis}, was arguably even more popular; again, when
it was attributed in manuscript, the name in the \textit{incipit} is almost always Daniel’s.\textsuperscript{7} As we shall see, the \textit{Somniale} and the \textit{Lunationes} reg-
ularly appear as one text in the same manuscript and, what is more,
occasionally share the same Prologue. This Prologue explicitly attrib-
utes the work to Daniel the prophet and describes his circumstances
as a Jewish exile at the Babylonian court under King Nebuchadnezzar.
Although the original language of both texts was probably Greek,\textsuperscript{8}

\textsuperscript{3} In a way, the process by which these figures came to be affiliated with prog-
nostica was similar to that which underpinned the attribution of revelatory vision
literature to biblical figures such as Adam, Enoch, Moses, Ezra, and Daniel.
\textsuperscript{4} L.T. Martin, \textit{Somniale Danielis, An Edition of a Medieval Latin Dream Interpretation
\textsuperscript{5} On Solomon, see now P. Torijano, \textit{Solomon the Esoteric King. From King to Magus,
Development of a Tradition} (JSJSup 73; Leiden/Boston/Köl, 2002). See also §2, infra.
\textsuperscript{6} Martin, \textit{Somniale Danielis}, 91 note 19. See also Thorndike, \textit{History}, 678 note 1,
citing British Library cod. Harley 3017, fols. 63r–64v, München SB cod. lat. mon.
6382, fol. 42, and Città del Vaticano BAV cod. Pal. lat 235, fol. 39r.
\textsuperscript{7} For this reason it will continue to be referred to by this name. See further, §3,
infra.
\textsuperscript{8} Indeed, Greek copies of both texts survive, although they are all relatively late.
For a list of the manuscripts, see the Inventory of Chapter Six.
the Somniale and the Lunationes are preserved mainly in Latin manuscripts and thus should be considered part of the culture of medieval Christendom in the West. In particular, as the evidence demonstrates, they were extremely popular in Anglo-Saxon and Norman England and in the German cities and states of the High Middle Ages. Even though the affiliation between the figure of Daniel and prognostic texts was equally strong in medieval Syriac and Arabic Christian and Islamic literature, it does not seem that either the Somniale or the Lunationes proper was known to any great extent in the lands east or south of Constantinople.

The opposite is true of a large corpus of Daniel prognostica, the elements of which circulated throughout the medieval Near and Middle East but did not find their way to European lands in the Middle Ages. This corpus includes the Byzantine Greek Praedictiones Danielis, which was a popular text itself, and, among other things, the anthological treatise known as the Malhamat Dāniyāl and an amorphous collection of geomantic texts affiliated with Daniel. Both the Malhamat and the Daniel geomantica are common in Syriac, Arabic, and Turkish manuscript copies.

As with all the Daniel apocrypha, the first task with the prognostica is the discovery, identification, and cataloguing of the individual copies of the texts that together form the immense bulk and broad range of the manuscript evidence, the results of which are presented in the Inventory in Chapter Six. The question that concerns us in this chapter, however, is why these prognostica, and not others, were attributed to Daniel. This is a difficult question to resolve, since little in the way of direct documentation exists and most conclusions will necessarily be based on circumstantial evidence and inference. At the same time, this question must be addressed, since any answers will shed further light on the way in which the figure of Daniel was understood in late antique and medieval times. One

---

9 This is clear from the high percentage of manuscripts of English, German, and, to a lesser extent, French and Northern Italian provenance (also recall that the Palatine manuscripts of the Vatican Library were once part of the library at Heidelberg, having been removed from there to Rome during the Thirty Years’ War) and also from the fact that so many of the non-Latin copies are composed in Old English, Middle English, and Middle German, which presumes a certain readership and thus their provenance. Some of the Greek and Latin Vatican Palatine manuscripts, it should be said, were returned in 1816.

10 On the Somniale and the Lunationes in the Eastern traditions, see notes 205 and 252, infra.
thing is clear, however: in the post-biblical literature, the link between personal divination and dreams and revelations may be located in the figure of Daniel the prophet as this figure is presented in the biblical story of Daniel. Accordingly, just as Chapter Three investigated the formal relationships between the visions in the biblical Book of Daniel and those in the apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha, in this chapter I will explore, on a case-by-case basis, the biblical antecedents of the post-biblical Daniel prognostica.

Before proceeding to the discussion of the specific texts, a few points should be made about the differences between the apocryphal Daniel apocalypses—which, as we have seen, are of the historical type exclusively—and the Daniel prognostica.

Unlike the Daniel legenda, both the apocalypses and the prognostica are pseudepigraphic and are concerned with communicating knowledge of the future and making this information coherent and relevant. The information in the prognostica, however, is never presented by means of a revelatory vision, as it is in the apocalyptic apocrypha. Rather, the format of prognostica tends to be formulaic and unmediated, and its nature fundamentally repetitive and cyclical. To illustrate, if a lunation foretells that a son or a daughter born on the third day of the month is destined to become a lucky child, this information is equally and universally valid for every boy and girl born on the third day of each month. Similarly, if a dream-text pronounces that a dream of a golden crown signifies that a royal boon is in the offering, this signification applies to all who dream of a golden crown. In a sense, this is science, founded as it is on what to the authors and readers of these texts alike was an observable, measurable, universal, and repeatable causal relationship. Whether we in the modern world would agree with their assessment or its assumptions is irrelevant.

---

11 In both cases, too, this information about the future represents a power greater than that which is of earthly origin; kingdoms will rise and fall according to the divine plan and individuals will come into their fate as their dreams and stars indicate, no matter the machinations of the powerful and wise here on earth. On dreams in the Book of Daniel as a representation of the divine power, see D. Smith-Christopher, “Prayers and Dreams: Power and Diaspora Identities in the Social Setting of the Daniel Tales,” The Book of Daniel. Composition and Reception (edd. J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint; VTSup 83; Leiden/Boston/Köln, 2001), 266–290 at 281–282.
12 The texts note the difference between the two genders in approximately two thirds of the lunations that contain this information.
The subject of the apocalyptic Daniel material, however, is singular, not repeatable. The past and future events they describe are presented as a unique series of events, and even if the series is sometimes compartmentalised into epochs or periods, it proceeds along a clearly linear conception of time. If prognostica is science, then apocalypse is history.

Second, there are elements of causality and individuality peculiar to the prognostica which are not normally part of the *vaticinium ex eventu* reviews of past and future history characteristic to many of the ancient and mediaeval apocalypses.\(^{13}\) In the prognostica, specific results occur on the basis of whether certain preconditions are met: if, for example, condition \(x\) is met, then result \(y\) will surely follow. Again, too, the conditions and their results are repeatable and universal.

In contrast, history in the apocalyptic Daniel literature is presented as a *fait accompli*. It is true, of course, that causality in the apocalypses frequently remains a factor at the level of the individual; after all, one of the lessons of the Book of Daniel is that steadfast faith will be rewarded and that misplaced pride will be punished.\(^{14}\) At this level there is still a link between precondition and result, although to what level the causal link between personal behaviour and fortune also affects corporate structures such as peoples and kingdoms is, I think, a matter which in the context of the Book of Daniel is still open to debate. In the main, though, the future in its apocalyptic presentation is as much predetermined as is the past, and the grand sweep of world history, which is usually the focus of the review (even if it is narrated from the perspective of a certain individual or community), cannot be altered.

Third, prognostica are by nature egalitarian. What would cure a knight would also cure a knave, and the aforementioned dream of a golden crown meant a future royal boon regardless of whether the dreamer was a high-born prince or a common scullery-boy. Despite


\(^{14}\) In addition, some *ex eventu* reviews of history are very much concerned with sin and its consequences; cf., e.g., the review of pre- and post-exilic history in the *Animal Apocalypse*. Collins, “Pseudonymity,” 337 note 28, lists examples of the fusion of the covenantal model and *ex eventu* prophecy. On the distinction between individual free will and a relatively deterministic apocalyptic historiography, see L. DiTommaso, “4Q*Pseudo-Daniel*\(^{\text{iv-b}}\) (4Q243–4Q244) and the Book of Daniel,” *DSD* [forthcoming].
this fundamental inclusivity, however, the sole subject of almost every prognostic text is the nameless individual and his or her immediate fate. Little if any attention is devoted either to the individual’s past history or future fate beyond that which the text specifies or to the community or society of which he or she is a part, and only in very rare cases will a dream be interpreted as having a regional or national significance. Prognostica almost never mention specific historical figures;\(^{15}\) it is as if the Everyman who is their focus exists outside of the ebb and flow of history. Again, the parallel with science is strong.

This situation is completely reversed when we consider the biblical and apocryphal Daniel apocalypses. The only individuals mentioned in these texts are the kings and generals and holy men who sit at the heart of the world’s events, or at least those events that are of supreme import to the apocalypticist. The common folk are rarely noticed, and when they are, it is only in a collective sense and for the purposes of illustrating the effects of the actions of one of the principal figures.\(^ {16}\) Yet despite this inherent elitism, the focus of the world-view of any given Daniel apocalypse is not on the fate of a solitary individual but instead is very much centered on the expansive scope of world events and their meaning for the community to which the apocalypse is directed. The historical type of apocalypse is thus “Great Man” history in \textit{vaticinium ex eventu} dress.

\section*{2. Somniale Danielis}

The \textit{Somniale Danielis} is an \textit{oneirokritikon}, or a manual to dreams and their interpretations, the most popular of its kind in the Middle Ages.

\(^ {15}\) One exception is the Syriac \textit{Treatise of Shem}, which combines elements of prognostication (concentrating on meteorological and natural phenomena) with \textit{ex eventu} (?) political predictions. The task of dating this strange little text has proven to be a difficult problem indeed, with theories that run from last centuries BCE through the medieval period. See the introduction to the text in J.H. Charlesworth, “Treatise of Shem,” \textit{The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Volume I: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments} (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York, 1983), 473–486, but n.b. the review of this translation by S.P. Brock, \textit{JJS} 35 (1984), 200–209 at 203–204, and now, especially, A. Mengozzi, \textit{Trattato di Sem e altri testi astrologici} (Testi del Vicino Oriente antico 7.1; Brescia, 1998).

\(^ {16}\) We see this throughout the apocryphal Daniel apocalypses, where mention is made of the people or the church prospering or suffering under the reign of one king or another.
The head-words in the *Somniale* correspond to the subjects of the dreams and are arranged alphabetically, with a brief interpretation following each. A typical example: “Ascendere se videre in arborem: honorem significat” (“Seeing oneself climbing up a tree signifies honour”). This formula is repeated throughout the length of the text, often in manuscript with one head-word and its interpretation per line per column or page, thereby giving the text a distinctive, roster-like appearance. Some examples of the *Somniale* contain over 400 dreams, others are far shorter or are preserved only in fragmentary form. Among the copies, some dreams and their interpretations appear frequently, while others are preserved in only a few manuscripts.

The *Somniale Danielis* was composed possibly as early as the fourth century, but also perhaps a century or two later, during the early Byzantine period. Its original language was Greek, although it now survives primarily in a number of Latin recensions and in copies written in the vernacular languages of western and northern Europe. The regular occurrence of the *Somniale* in manuscript testifies to its popularity: it is extant in well over 150 manuscripts, of which at least two-thirds are in Latin. This popularity also extended into the age of the printed page; the *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke*, for example, lists no less than forty-one examples of the text in incunabula.

The translation of the Greek text into Latin occurred quite early in its history, perhaps around the seventh century (although the earliest surviving Latin manuscripts date from the ninth century) and possibly in Gaul. It was during this translation that the original

---

17 Not all dream-manuals are arranged in this manner; note Oxford, All Souls College cod. 81, fol. 186v, where dreams are interpreted using the letters of the Psalter.
18 Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 1321, fols. 160va–163ra. Unless otherwise indicated, modern capitalization and punctuation are included in the Latin phrases in this chapter, and full text rather than abbreviations are employed.
20 See the Inventory in Chapter Six.
21 *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke*, Band 7 (Leipzig, 1938), 240–249.
structure of the dream-book was rearranged in order to maintain the alphabetic order of the head-words. Later still, when the Latin versions of the Somniale were themselves translated into the various vernacular languages of late mediaeval Europe, the structure of the text was once again rearranged to maintain an alphabetic order.

The Somniale Danielis was the subject of antiquarian interest as early as the days of John of Salisbury in the twelfth century. The first serious academic research on the Somniale, however, was only undertaken in the first decades of the twentieth century, although portions of the Latin and vernacular texts had been included in older anthologies. The dominant figure in this early phase of research was M. Förster, who was as concerned with the vernacular versions of the text as with the Latin ones. The few extant Greek copies, which unfortunately are quite late, were also edited and published at this time.

More recently, several editions of the Latin text and a number of substantive secondary studies have appeared. The most important of these are S.R. Fischer’s synthetic edition of the Somniale, which is based on twenty-three manuscripts and incunabula, L.T. Martin’s

---

24 Reported by J.A. Fabricius, “CCXXIV. Conjectorius Danielis, sive somniorum interpretatio sub Prophetae illius nomine jactata.” Codex pseudopigraphus Veteris Testamenti (Hamburg, 1722–1723), 1130–1136. Among other things, Fabricius cites one “Jo. Sarisberiensis” (i.e., John of Salisbury, aka. John Davenant), notes that “Onirocritica Danielis damnari in decreto Gratiani,” and makes reference to i) the manuscripts in the catalogues of F. Sylburgius and G. Hickes, ii) a reproduction of a Daniel dream-text in Old French that “exstat in Bibliothecae Regia Berolinensi” (but which is probably a dream-text from Leo Tuscus), and iii) a note from an unidentified Sgambatus on the “Onerocritica Danielis, antiqua impostura.”


28 See the Inventory of Chapter Six.

fine critical edition of the Latin text, J. Grub’s edition of the ninth-century copy of the Somniale in the University Library at Uppsala, and A. Epe’s synoptic and critical edition of the Old English copies of the Somniale and a few of the Latin texts. Both Martin and Epe list many copies of the text, and Martin describes approximately two-thirds of those he lists. In a nutshell, Martin argues that there are two basic versions of the Latin text, which he labels a and b. Version b contains the Prologue, version a does not. These two versions are fairly well-represented in the manuscript tradition, and from these stem most of the other recensions, although one or two of the very earliest (and fragmentary) manuscripts might represent different versions that are direct copies from the Greek. The majority of the Latin manuscripts, however, are contaminated versions of the a/b type, which exhibit characteristics of both versions as well as many additions, omissions, and emendations. In his book, Martin presents a parallel edition of the a and the b versions, as well as the text of the Somniale from the ninth-century copy in British Library codex Harley 3017 and from All Souls College (Oxford) codex 81. In contrast, Epe identifies what he labels versions A and C and recensions D, E, F, G, H, and J. He also presents the six copies of the Old English Somniale, which are intra-linear glosses on the Latin text (all but one of which are part of the British Library codex Cotton Tiberius A.III), as well as portions of some of the Latin copies.

Fortunately, our work in this chapter on the Somniale Danielis does not demand an intense scrutiny of the relationship among its many recensions. In fact, any conclusions in this area would now be premature, since the survey of the Somniale manuscripts that is included in the Inventory of Chapter Six of the present work contains notices of over twenty Latin copies (i.e., roughly one fifth of the total) which do not appear in the most comprehensive of the previous lists. The

30 Martin, Somniale Danielis.
33 For a full account, see Martin, Somniale Danielis, 4–12, 63–78, esp. the stemmata at 78.
34 M.E. Wittmer-Butsch, Zur Bedeutung von Schlaf und Traum im Mittelalter (Medium Aevum Quotidianum 1; 1990), 172–181. In these pages there are three tables of
Inventory also contains several additional copies of the text in the vernacular languages that hitherto have gone unnoticed beyond their entries in the manuscript catalogues. Moreover, it is important to recall that in her tables M.E. Wittmer-Butsch merely lists the manuscripts by their shelf marks and that Martin describes only approximately two-thirds of those he lists.\(^35\) As a result of these considerations, any conclusions regarding the textual situation and transmission history of the *Somniale* would require an examination by autopsy of the additional manuscript copies of the text included in the Inventory and the dozens of copies listed but not adequately described by Wittmer-Butsch and Martin.

Some of the many types of dream manuals which circulated throughout the late antique \(^36\) and mediaeval worlds were anonymous, while others were ascribed to figures such as Artemidorus,\(^37\) Achmet ben Sirin,\(^38\) Astrampsychos, and of course Daniel. One might reasonably conclude that Daniel, as the biblical dream-interpreter *par excellence*, was the only and obvious choice to become the pseudonymous author of the *Somniale*. Yet the issue of authorship is not as simple or as clear-cut as it might appear to be. Why, for example, was the *Somniale* not also attributed to the Roman, Scipio Aemilianus, manuscript lists: “Verbreitung der lateinischen Handschriften und Fragmente des ‘Somniale Daniæ’ im 9.–13. Jahrhundert”; “Verbreitung der lateinischen Handschriften und Fragmente des ‘Somniale Daniæ’ im 14.–16. Jahrhundert”; and “Verbreitung der volkssprachlichen Handschriften des ‘Somniale Daniæ’.” The list of manuscripts in the Inventory of Chapter Six contains at least thirty more Latin copies than those which are listed by Martin.

\(^35\) Of course, some of these manuscripts are described in catalogues and other reference sources elsewhere; again, see the Inventory in Chapter Six.

\(^36\) For an overview of the extant Byzantine dream manuals, see S.M. Oberhelman, “The Oneirocritical Literature of the Late Roman and Byzantine Eras of Greece: Manuscript Studies, Translations and Commentaries to the Dream-Books of Greece during the First Millennium AD, with Greek and English Catalogues of the Dream-Symbols and with a Discussion of Greek Oneiromancy from Homer to Manuel the Palaeologian” (Diss: Minnesota, 1981), 53–124 at 53–76.


\(^38\) Achmet’s dream manual and the *Somniale Daniæ* are not the same text; indeed, both appear together in some manuscripts (e.g., Milano, BA cod. T.81 sup.). Achmet claimed to be the dream-interpreter to a minister of the Caliph’s court (but was in reality likely a pseudonym for a Greek Christian), and his work in turn was translated into Latin by Leo Tuscus, the imperial interpreter of letters under the Byzantine emperor Comnenus. On the subject of Achmet, see J.C. Lamoreaux, *The Early Muslim Tradition of Dream Interpretation* (Albany, 2002), 140–154.
who in one of the most popular texts of the mediaeval period dreamed of the cosmos and of the place of humans and kingdoms within it? Why was it not associated with Adam or Solomon, around whom coalesced an impressive constellation of mantic and magic texts? More importantly, the patriarch Joseph is also a biblical dream-interpreter of the same calibre as Daniel, but why in only extremely rare cases is the Somniale attributed to Joseph? After all, the biblical archetypes of the symbolic dream which required second-party interpretation were as much to be found in the account of the dreams of Pharaoh and his chief butler and chief baker (Gen 40–41) as they were in the dreams located in the court tales of the Book of Daniel.

39 M. Steinschneider reports that there is a post-incunabula printed edition of the Somniale which is attributed to Solomon (“Das Traumbuch Daniels und die oneirokritische Litteratur des Mittelalters: Eine bibliographische Studie,” Serapium 24 (1863), 193–201, 209–216 at 199).

40 On the relationship between the figure of Joseph as a Hebrew dream-interpreter who serves in a foreign (Egyptian) court under a powerful king (Pharaoh) and the figure of Daniel as a Jewish exile dream-interpreter who serves in a foreign court (Babylon) under a powerful king (Nebuchadnezzar and his successors), see J.J. Collins, Daniel (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, 1993), 39–40. Collins quite rightly states that Daniel 1–6 is not simply a midrash on the Joseph story. C.G. Labonté argues that Daniel 2 does not depend on Genesis 41, but rather that both were composed in the same period of history and so sprung from the same historical and social context (“Genèse 41 et Daniel 2: question d’origine,” The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings (BETL 106; ed. A.S. van der Woude; Leuven, 1993), 271–284). But Labonté’s arguments, while illuminating, do not speak to the fundamental difference between the two texts regarding their conception of time and history. Also, one need not presume a chronological development between the two texts to explain the disparity, since they might simply be the product of different communities, streams of Judaism, etc.

41 None of the manuscripts described by Martin, Somniale Danielis, 13–62, mentions an attribution to Joseph. Of the hundreds of manuscripts I have examined by autopsy or through a reference in a catalogue, I have found only one that includes the names of Joseph and Daniel: Toledo, Librería del Cabildo cod. 378, fols. 5r–30v, entitled “Vera Somniorum Interpaetatio [sic] ex Danielo et Iosepho” (see J.M. Octavio de Toledo, Catálogo de la Librería del Cabildo Toledano. I.ª parte—Manuscriptos (Biblioteca de la revista de archivos, bibliotecas y museos 3; Madrid, 1903), 185). There is, however, a reference to a “Somniale Joseph” in a late-fourteenth- or early-fifteenth-century manuscript: Melk, Benediktinerstift cod. 728, fols. 58vb–59ra (see C. Glassner, Inventar der Handschriften des Benediktinerstiftes Melk. Teil 1: Von den Anfängen bis ca. 1400 (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Schrift- und Buchwesen des Mittelalters II.8; DAWWien, philos.-histor. Klasse 285; Wien, 2000), 307). According to Glassner, the text bears the title “Incipient interpretaciones somniorum quas composuit Joseph cum fuit captus a Pharaone . . .” and is a copy (?) of a text edited by A.E. Schönbach, ZdfA 34 (1890), 1–6. It is significant that only one incunabulum, GKW 7938, Somnia Danielis & Ioseph (see the Inventory in Chapter Six), includes the name of the patriarch as well as the prophet.
I do not set up a straw man with these questions. The quantity and variety of ancient and mediaeval Jewish, Christian, and Muslim texts which were pseudonymously attributed to biblical figures is astonishing.\footnote{As an illustration of the great range of known texts, see the “List of Writings” included in L. DiTommaso, *A Bibliography of the Pseudepigrapha, 1850–1999* (JSPSup 39; Sheffield, 2001), 83–90, a list that covers only the texts based of figures from the Hebrew Bible. As for the possibility that there are many more pseudepigrapha still to be found in manuscript, see *idem*, “A Report on Pseudepigrapha Research since Charlesworth’s *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*,” *JSP* 12.2 (2001), 179–207, and, with reference to the texts in the Arabic tradition specifically, Lamoreaux’s comments at note 209, *infra*.} In many cases, the connexion between a text and its pseudonymous author is obscure, since the post-biblical rationale that actually made this connexion was only partially based on the information contained in the biblical record, or was at the very least grounded on an autonomous extrapolation or amplification from this information. For example, at first glance there appears to be no good reason why a group of mediaeval texts focusing on demonology would have been composed and copied under the name of King Solomon. Yet, as P.A. Torijano explains in his comprehensive volume of the transformation of the figure of Solomon from king to magus, traditional lore connecting Solomon with exorcism provided the initial basis for later texts where Solomon was associated with the science and study of demonology.\footnote{Torijano, *Solomon the Esoteric King*, 190–191. On the astrological text *Tabula prenotistica Salomonis* (Paris, BNF cod. lat. 16208, fol. 135r), which Torijano does not discuss, see C.S.F. Burnett, “A Note on Two Astrological Fortune-Telling Tables,” *RHT* 18 (1988), 257–262.} The view that the initial basis for this development was the biblical characterisation of Solomon as a wise king\footnote{Torijano, *Solomon the Esoteric King*, 228.} need not require the proposition that all the elements of the post-biblical development must be present in the biblical antecedent from which such a development was extrapolated or amplified.\footnote{Of course, this process was already ongoing in the creation of texts that eventually would become part of the Hebrew Bible. It is well-known that a collection of prophetic utterances composed over a number of centuries gradually came to be associated with the figure of the prophet Isaiah, and the composition of the Book of Daniel itself is an excellent case study of how a figure (the wise man in a foreign court who could interpret dreams) later took on a new but related role (the seer of revelatory visions).} Put another way, there is frequently a conceptual gap that resides between the post-biblical text and the biblical figure with which it is associated, a gap which modern scholarship must strive
to bridge. Sometimes this process is easy, sometimes it is not, but one cannot with the benefit of hindsight simply assume that it was only natural that one text and not another was attributed to a particular biblical figure. In the end, therefore, the question of why certain texts came to be associated with certain figures is both proper and necessary.

To return to the issue of attribution of the *Somniale*, an initial response might be to assert that once a text became associated over time with a particular figure, this relationship would, to one degree or another, be more “fixed.” In other words, once several copies of the *Somniale* began to circulate under Daniel’s name, the text from that point on became irrevocably affiliated with Daniel and no one else. But this hypothesis suffers from two flaws. First, it does not speak to the issue of why the *Somniale* was originally attributed to Daniel. Second, it is not supported by the material evidence from other texts. Lunations, for instance, while frequently accredited to Daniel, were in a small minority of cases also attributed to Adam, Esdras, Merlin, or the Venerable Bede, and there is even a *Lunation of Solomon*. Similarly, in the realm of the Byzantine Greek Daniel apocalypses, not only does one encounter cases where only a portion of the copies of a specific text are explicitly attributed to Daniel (e.g., the *Diegesis Danielis*), but there are a few cases where an apocalypse is attributed to one figure in one manuscript and to another figure in a different manuscript (e.g., the *Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel*). The point is that while it was possible—albeit within a limited range—for substantively identical texts to be associated with more than one biblical, mythological, or historical figure, the *Somniale* resolutely remained the sole province of Daniel. To understand this

---

46 See below, §3.
47 There is a text, London, BL cod. Harley 2253, fol. 119v [*script circa 1310*], which the *Catalogue of the Harleian Manuscripts in the British Museum* (4 vols.; London, 1808), 1.590, describes as “An English Poem upon the Interpretation of Dreams, pretended to have been found by David a Prophete of grete pris, in a Cyte of Babylayne.” The text is published in T. Wright, *Reliqiae Antiquae* (London, 1841), 1.261–268, and again (with corrections) by Förster, “Beiträge V.6,” 36–46. The attribution to David is probably a mistake, however, as the setting of the “Cyte of Babylayne” makes clear. The full text of this Prologue is published in Fischer, *Complete Medieval Dreambook*, 22, and it, too, leaves no doubt that Daniel rather than David is meant: “Her comensez a bok of sweuenyng,…at men mete þ in slepyng;…ur þ David [Fischer: Daniel] hit yfounden ys,…at wes prophete of gret pris. /þ o he was in a cyte/of Babylone of gret pouste,…e princes him bysohten alle,/boþe in toun & in halle,/þ he huere sweuenes aredde,/þat huem þohte anyht in bedde/ant
post-biblical connexion and why it was so strong, it must first be set in its larger context of the phenomena of dreams and visions in antiquity and the Middle Ages.

Dreams and dream interpretation have a long and rich history among the cultures and civilisations of ancient and mediaeval Europe and the Near and Middle East. Dream manuals per se do not appear in the Bible, but are extant in Ancient Near Eastern sources that likely predate most parts of it. Dream manuals also appear in classical sources, and it is this dual heritage that forms the crucible in which the Somniale Danielis was formed.

Perhaps the most famous expression of the extended dream-vision in classical literature was Cicero’s celebrated and popular Somnium Scipionem, which forms the conclusion to his political treatise, De re publica, and which was the only portion of the book that was known to mediaeval authors. A beautiful and moving vision of the transitory nature of human life and individual accomplishment, the Somnium, as its title suggests, is quite clearly a dream that fuses elements of the personal (Scipio’s future) and the corporate (Rome’s destiny) with a complicated yet orderly cosmology. Although it is not an apocalypse, if one were to consider it in the light of that por-
tion of J.J. Collins’ definition of the genre which centers on content,\textsuperscript{53} one might say that the Somnium possessed generous qualities of both the “historical” and “otherworldly” types in its perspective and substance.

In its content the Somnium Scipionem is unambiguous; what Scipio experiences in his dream is what the reader is meant to understand, bereft of the need for an intermediary agency to explicate meaning. The Jew, Christian, or Muslim of the post-biblical period, however, would have been quite familiar with the idea of mediation, since in the Hebrew Bible the word or will of God can be communicated in several ways, including dreams and visions\textsuperscript{54} that are sometimes highly cryptic and therefore require second-party interpretation.\textsuperscript{55} By virtue of their essential purpose of imparting coherence, all prognostica—ancient or mediaeval, dream-texts or moon-books, anonymous or attributed, including those associated with Daniel—are mediated texts. The interpretations of the dreams in an alphabetical dream manual such as the Somniale are as much mediated by Daniel as is King Nebuchadnezzar's dream of the great statue in Daniel 2.

\textsuperscript{53} See Chapter Three, §3.

\textsuperscript{54} One should not make too much of the difference between dreams and visions, words which in English can express a difference in substance and setting that is not always the case in the Hebrew or the Aramaic. By any measure the content of dreams and visions are indistinguishable. Husser has attempted to distinguish between them on the basis that dreams have a visual element, whereas visions do not (\textit{Le songe et la parole}, 24–25), but, as L. Grabbe demonstrates, this distinction is too facile (\textit{Priests, Prophets, Diviners, Sages: A Socio-historical Study of Religious Specialists in Ancient Israel} (Valley Forge, 1995), 147). For example, the disembodied hand of Daniel 5, which appears in a waking vision and not a sleeping dream, is clearly visual in nature. Moreover, at times the Hebrew words for “dream” (בִּקְרָא, less commonly בִּקְרָא) and “vision” (יָרָא, less commonly יָרָא) appear together in a context which implies their commensurability (e.g., Job 20:8, 33:15; Isa. 29:7). There are a few instances in the Book of Daniel where there is a preparatory aspect to the vision (9:3–4, 10:2–4), but by and large both dreams and visions occur without any preliminaries. Daniel’s visions in chapters 7 and 8 seemingly come upon him without warning, Nebuchadnezzar merely dreams his dreams in chapters 2 and 4, while the sudden appearance of the aforementioned hand of chapter 5 abruptly intrudes on the festivities of Belshazzar and his drunken guests. Furthermore, in the Book of Daniel there is an emphasis in the reports of both dream and vision in specifying the precise time and place during which these events occur, as if to record an anomalous event, a characteristic that was faithfully preserved in many of the later apocryphal Daniel apocalypses.

\textsuperscript{55} On dreams as divine communication, \textit{cf.} 1 Sam 28:6; Joel 3:1; and Job 33:15. There are several dreams in the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament whose meaning is plain, including Gen 20:3, 6–7; 31:10–13, 24; 1 Kgs 3:5–15; Matt 1:20–24, 2:13–15; and Acts 9:10.
It was in this context of classical and biblical dreams and visions that, on or around the year 400, the pagan author Macrobius composed his popular commentary on the Somnium Scipionem, which included a systematic classification of dreams. Macrobius argued that there were five distinct types of dreams. The first and second types, the nightmare (insomnium) and the apparition (visum), he judged to be imaginary and thus to have no prophetic significance. The other three types had prophetic value. There was the enigmatic dream (somnium), where knowledge of the future was concealed behind the ambiguity of the subject of the dream. For this reason dreams required interpretation. The fourth type was the prophetic or revelatory dream-vision (visio), where future events are witnessed exactly as they occur. Finally, there was the oracular dream (oraculum), in which a figure appears to give advice or to suggest a course of action.

Macrobius’ categories and descriptions would influence greatly the presentation of dreams and dream-visions in the subsequent literature and poetry. The dream-type in the Book of Daniel and in the Somniale Danielis is without question the somnium, that is, the dreams are cryptic and thus require interpretation. Of course, the author/redactor of MT Daniel did not work in the light of Macrobius’ classification, but the author and the later copyists and redactors of the Somniale probably did. Neither Adam nor Solomon are dream experts. While Adam was renowned in later writings for his insight, this insight did not extend into the realm of dream interpretation. Similarly, in the post-biblical literature the name of Solomon became associated with magic, but, again, this is not the same as dream interpretation. And Scipio’s specialty was clearly the visio, not the somnium.


57 The strange episode of the writing on the wall in Daniel 5 seems to find no reflection in Macrobius’ categories. It is not a dream per se, but nor is it a vision, either, which typically do not appear to anyone but the seer. In the case of the writing on the wall, the narrative highlights the fact that the words were seen by everyone, including King Belshazzar. The question arises whether the revelers at the feast were drunk; if so, perhaps their state of mind was thought to have been akin to sleep, wherein a visio was possible. But even this would not explain the persistence of the writing after the fact.

58 A.C. Spearing, Mediaeval Dream-Poetry (Cambridge, 1976), passim.

59 See below, §§3 and 5, regarding the legend of the Cave of Treasures.

60 Torijano, Solomon the Esoteric King.
Although the biblical and classical types could be stretched to some degree in order to accommodate related post-biblical material, there was a limit, and this limit was in part defined by the Macrobian classification. In the light of this classification, Daniel fit the Somniale where Adam and the rest could not.

All of this, however, does not address the problem as to why the Somniale was attributed to Daniel and not to Joseph, who, as mentioned, was also firmly affiliated with the interpretation of symbolic dreams.\textsuperscript{61} The answer to this problem is to be found in the nature

\textsuperscript{61} Unfortunately, the specific contents of the Somniale Danielis reveal nothing concerning this issue. Regardless of the Somniale, the subject of the dreams is always the same: animals, birds, plants and trees, inanimate objects, actions, states of being, and the like. Allowing for changes due to historical and conceptual circumstances, these are the sorts of things about which a person living today might dream. What is critical here is that there is nothing in the head-words or their interpretations that implies any specific connexion to Daniel the prophet. The dreams are not at all concerned about eschatological subjects (which would favour their attribution to Daniel rather than to Joseph) nor is there an eschatological tenor to the interpretations, which usually describe how a person's life will be forecast by his or her dreams. More importantly, neither the dreams nor the interpretations are particularly historical or political in content. In Chapter Three I remarked how the apocryphal Daniel apocalypses overwhelmingly tended to be concerned with the grand historical, political, and military figures and events of the past and the future, and suggested that the concern for such things helped explain the association of this literature with the figure of Daniel. This is not the case with the Somniale Danielis, however, whose dreams and interpretations are far more mundane and revolve around the individual and his or her dreams rather than the circumstances of state.

\textsuperscript{62} Two points on the figure of Daniel in the Book of Daniel: i) As was detailed in Chapter One, there are significant differences between the MT Hebrew/Aramaic text of the Book of Daniel and the texts of the Greek versions and the other ancient and early mediaeval translations of the book, and for that reason we must be sensitive to the possibility that the antecedent for an apocryphal tradition or topos might be found in one version but not another. In some cases, as with MT and OG Daniel 4, for instance, the differences between the two variants of the text can be profound. “Variant” is the correct term, as Collins demonstrates, since “the MT and OG of Daniel 4 preserve variant formulations of a common story. Neither one can be regarded as the Vorlage of the other” (Daniel, 221); ii) Because we are dealing with a redaction, it is difficult if not fruitless to try to ascertain the development of the conception of Daniel as a wise man, and so determine whether he was in the earliest tales primarily conceived of as an astrologer and then gradually came to assume the roles of dream-interpreter and prophet-seer. And even if one could isolate such a development (if such a development indeed exists), this chapter is interested in the final product of a second-century BCE author/redactor, namely the MT Book of Daniel, even though this final product was for a long time not that final at all and would itself be the subject of reworking and expansion in the context of its transmission and translation into other ancient languages. Yet since the reception and interpretation of the figure of Daniel in the post-biblical prognostica are the focus of this chapter, it is the redacted and received texts of the
and functions of Daniel the prophet as they are expressed in the biblical book which bears his name.  

The primary setting of the Book of Daniel is Babylon, where Daniel is located along with the other exiles of Judah. Daniel is habitually referred to as Belteshazzar, and throughout the Book he is explicitly or implicitly at court and in service to the Babylonian kings, in particular the mighty King Nebuchadnezzar. MT Daniel is an obviously redacted document, and part of the manner in which the redactor shaped his materials into a coherent whole was to employ a series of intermittent explanatory devices throughout the narrative. The recurring reminder that Daniel is also known as Belteshazzar was one of these devices, as was the important topos that Daniel was far more adept and knowledgeable than the other wise men at the Babylonian court.

Our first indication of the way that the role of Daniel is understood comes in MT Daniel 1, where Daniel and his three compatriots, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, having refused to partake of the defiling food and drink of the Babylonians, are examined by the chief eunuch of the court and are found to be in better physical condition than those who ate the royal fare. The reason that these four are in this position is that they were part of a group of young men of royal and noble birth who were deported to Babylon as spoils of war. For the past three years Daniel and his companions were thoroughly educated in the language and the literature of their Babylonian conquerors, including, presumably, astronomical and oneirocritical knowledge. At the end of this section (1:17), the
reader is told that God gave the four “knowledge and proficiency in all literature and wisdom,” while Daniel personally was awarded special insight into all visions and dreams. A little later, after having tested the four himself, Nebuchadnezzar is said to have found them “ten times better than the dream interpreters and exorcists” in his whole kingdom (1:20).

This wide compass of knowledge, covering dream and vision interpretation and the arcane arts, is recalled in Daniel 2. By virtue of his success in describing and interpreting Nebuchadnezzar’s dream, Daniel is by implication more knowledgeable and proficient than all the king’s “dream interpreters, exorcists, sorcerers, and Chaldeans” (2:2, cf. 2:10). Later in the same chapter, after the language of the MT text has moved from the Hebrew to the Aramaic, Daniel tells the king that none of the royal “sages, exorcists, dream interpreters, or diviners” (2:27) has the ability to do what he, Daniel, was about to do, i.e., to recount the king’s dream and then interpret it.

The same circle of wise men is more or less cited again in Daniel 4, where Nebuchadnezzar once again dreams a dream and so summons his wise men, here listed as “dream interpreters, exorcists, Chaldeans, and diviners” (2:27) (4:4). Similarly, that Daniel and his three companions were well-trained, which establishes the context by which Daniel’s knowledge is judged superior to that of the Babylonian wise men. For this reason I think that Collins is perhaps wrong in assuming that “the prominence given to the education of the youth in chap. 1 must be taken to reflect the author’s ideal of a Jewish sage” (ibid., 146). Would a Hellenistic-era Jew consider divination, dream-interpretation, sky-watching, and other traditionally Babylonian forms of education part of the characteristics of Jewish sage? Or is this type of education better understood in its role in the later comparison between Daniel and the wise men?

70 θ': τοὺς ἐπαινοῦσι καὶ τοὺς μάγους; OG: τοὺς σοφιστάς καὶ τοὺς φιλοσόφους. “Exorcist” is used in the sense of “enchanter of incantations.”

71 OG: ἐπαινοῦσι, μέγιο, φαρμακοί. It is unclear what the last Hebrew term, “sorcerer,” refers to (it is mentioned in Daniel only at this point, although it found elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible; cf. Exod 7:11, 22:17, and so on), although the context could be divinatory (geomantic, astrological, etc.); see 2:27 and 4:4. The Greek φαρμακοί could also refer to those who are involved with medicine, which in the ancient and mediaeval worlds was also frequently associated with prognostication.

72 On “diviners,” see Collins, Daniel, 161: “The generally accepted meaning is ‘fate determiners.’” The emphasis seems to be on personal fortune-telling. See §3, infra.

73 Note that the OG variant of the story does not preserve the information that the king first summoned his wise men before he called for Daniel.
in Dan 5 the reader finds the new king, Belshazzar, who is confronted by the unknown writing on the wall and so calls for his “exorcists, Chaldeans, and diviners” (5:7). These groups of men, whom the text refers to collectively as “the sages of Babylon” (5:7) or “all the sages of the king” (5:8) are unable to make sense of the writing. Later on, at 5:21, the “sages” are grouped with the “exorcists”, why this contrast should be made here and not at 5:7 or 5:8 is unknown.

It is clear that the various groups of wise men mentioned throughout the Book of Daniel have a collective rather than an individual function. This is not to say that each group of specialists has no meaning apart from that which is assigned by the whole. The fact that some care was taken to specifically identify certain types of wise men and not others (no oracles or magicians are mentioned, for example) implies that the author or redactor of this information attempted to reproduce the court situation in Babylon as accurately as possible, although it is probably the case that his knowledge of the Babylonian castes was more romantic than it was historical.

---

74 There are variations on this list in certain manuscripts and the other ancient translations of the Book of Daniel. Note that 4QDan includes “dream interpreters.” OG: τοὺς ἐπανοίδος καὶ φαρμακοῦς καὶ Χαλδαίους καὶ γαζαρηνοῦς.
75 Here and at 5:8 θ’ preserves “wise men” (σοφοί).
76 Some manuscripts contains “sages of Babylon”; cf. BHG, loc. cit.
77 OG: οἱ ἐπανοίδοι καὶ φαρμακοὶ καὶ γαζαρηνοί.
78 θ’ adds “diviners.” Omitted in OG.
79 H.I. Avalos suggests that the long list of the Babylonian court officials in Daniel 3 serves a humorous purpose that underscores “a socioreligious critique of pagan social institutions such as the Babylonian government bureaucracy” (“The Comedic Function of the Enumerations of Officials and Instruments in Daniel 3,” CBQ 53 (1991), 580–588 [quotation at 587]). Avalos does not comment on the similarly long lists of the Babylonian wise men in other places in the Book of Daniel, but it is not impossible that these lists might also have been appreciated by the reader for their potential comedic value. Whether this was the author’s intent, however, is obscure: it seems more likely that the lists of the Babylonian wise men are an honest attempt—if perhaps an anachronistic and romantic one—to present the full range of the wise men whose function it was to serve as a foil to Daniel and his God-given knowledge.
80 Collins observes that “there is no evidence that the biblical author understood the specializations of the Babylonian castes or was familiar with their methods. The use of . . . σοφοί . . . requires no intimate acquaintance with Babylonian learning. We find in Daniel an acquaintance with a wide range of material but little mastery of history or of the scientific learning of the day” (Daniel, 139). This sentiment is echoed by K. van der Toorn, “Scholars at the Oriental Court: The Figure of Daniel against Its Mesopotamian Background,” The Book of Daniel. Composition and Reception (edd. J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint; VTSup 83; Leiden/Boston/Köln, 2001), 1.37–54 at 41,
The fact that specific types of wise men were deliberately identified would not have been lost on a post-biblical audience, and for this reason there are no apocryphal tales featuring Daniel as oracle or magician. But as for their meaning to the Book as a whole, the group of wise men collectively delineate the full compass of knowledge of which Daniel was master. The court dream interpreters, Chaldeans, diviners, and sorcerers of the Book of Daniel are presented together corporately so as to provide a means of comparison with the figure of Daniel. True, Daniel’s steadfast faith meant that he was given special insight by God to reveal the mysteries, but he is not alien to the ways and means of the wise men of Babylon. He is an interpreter of dreams and visions, just as they were (or at least some of them).

The figure of Daniel the wise is thus circumscribed by means of this comparative relationship to the wise men of Babylon. At the same time, however, the primary means by which his function as dream interpreter is articulated is through his actions. I have already mentioned the fact that Daniel was given proficiency beyond all others in matters of knowledge and the interpretation of these mysteries (1:17). This proficiency was later rewarded when Daniel was made the chief officer of the wise men of Babylon (2:48). Later on he is called the chief of all the dream interpreters and the “chief of dream interpreters, exorcists, Chaldeans, and diviners” (5:11).

This proficiency is stressed time and again. In MT and _translate_ Daniel 4 who adds that the description of the wise men at the Babylonian court is reminiscent of the depiction of the various servants at the court of Pharaoh.

An analogy, perhaps, may be found in the references to the Canaanites, Amorites, Hittites, Perizzites, Hivites, and Jebusites that pepper the Hebrew Bible (cf. Exod 33:2; Josh 9:1; 1 Kgs 9:20, etc.). Individually, each of the groups of peoples has a meaning: the Jebusites are Jebusites, not Hittites. From the point of view of function, however, this group of peoples collectively represent the enemies of Israel who occupy the land and so for this reason are so often presented in a series, even though in some cases some of the parts of the series are missing and in other cases the order of the parts varies. This is precisely the case with the groups of the wise men of Babylon.

See my response to the argument of R.G. Wooden, note 273, _infra_. On the term “mystery” (זָרַע), see Dan 2:19–20. The term could have cosmological or eschatological connotations (see Collins, _Daniel_, 159) and so likely either formed that part of the court tales of Daniel 2–6 that facilitated the later addition of visions of 7–12 to the Book of Daniel or was part of the redactor’s attempt to unify his materials.

The story actually begins at 3:31.
whose lush foliage and fruit are for a set period of time stripped away to the root by a Watcher from Heaven. Daniel interprets the dream to mean that Nebuchadnezzar would lose his mind and his crown for a set period of time, after which both would be restored to him. The story is related in both the first and third person, and is set within an epistolary framework, as a message from the king to the inhabitants of the land. In OG Daniel 4, the structure of the story and the shifts in perspective are different, as is the content of the narrative in many minor points. In all the witnesses to the tale of Nebuchadnezzar’s madness, however, the dream of the king is completely personal and concerns almost exclusively what is to come to pass in the future.

In Daniel 2 the reader encounters another personal dream. King Nebuchadnezzar dreams of a giant statue composed of many elements—head of gold, breast and arms of silver, belly and thews of bronze, legs of iron, and feet of iron and clay. The statue stood in its place until it was struck upon the feet by a stone hewn not by human hands, which shattered the statue and which then grew into a great mountain. Daniel interprets this dream historiographically, with reference first to the personal and then to the corporate. The constituent elements of the statue, he announces, represent a series of kings, who symbolise historical kingdoms, each of which rules in its turn until the time when final kingdom, represented by the feet of iron and clay, is overthrown by the advent of the Kingdom of God, which shall reign forever.

Somewhat different in form from the dreams of Daniel 2 and 4 is the waking vision of Daniel 5. Here Belshazzar, the son of and successor to Nebuchadnezzar, throws a massive banquet in which the captured Temple vessels are used for the guests’ wine. Suddenly, on the wall in front of the king and all his guests, appears a dis-

---

85 Nebuchadnezzar, not Daniel. As with all the tales of Daniel 1–6 and the Greek Additions, the story is about Daniel, not written by him.
86 On the difficulties between the information preserved in the Book of Daniel and the historical record, and also on the responses to the difficulties in the Daniel legend, see Chapter Two.
embodied hand. The hand writes a few words on the wall, the nature of which the king and his wise men are utterly unable to understand. Daniel is summoned, reads the words, and deciphers their complex historiographic meaning, which like the interpretation of the dream at Daniel 2 has both a personal and a corporate tenor. The kingdom of the Babylonians, he announces, is destined to be ruled by a succession of monarchs of diminishing ability, the last of whom, King Belshazzar, would suffer the fate of having his kingdom conquered and divided among the Persians and the Medes.

In all three of the dreams and visions just described, the forecasting of personal fortune plays a paramount role, even in the cases where the interpretation has clear corporatist overtones. If the Book of Daniel had only consisted of the apocalyptic visions of Daniel 7–12, where the corporate element dominates, the dream-book that now bears his name likely would have been attributed not to Daniel but to Joseph, who demonstrates the ability to interpret the dreams and forecast the futures of individuals, namely, Pharaoh’s butler and baker. It is this conflation of two elements—the ability of Daniel to forecast personal fortune and the continual affirmation that he stood head and shoulders above what were collectively regarded as the most knowledgeable and puissant wise men of all time—that helped make him the ideal figure with whom the Somniale could be associated.

The manner in which the Jewish historian Josephus describes the abilities of Daniel is instructive. In his retelling of portions of the Book of Daniel in the Jewish Antiquities, although for sensitive political reasons he removes the note that Nebuchadnezzar judged Daniel ten times better than his Babylonian counterparts, Josephus continually accentuates the wisdom of Daniel. L. Feldman perceptively observes that five of the thirteen occurrences of the word σοφός (thirty-eight per cent) in Josephus’ paraphrase of the Bible and seven

87 There is no need to discuss here Daniel and the apocalyptic revelatory visions of Daniel 7–12, a subject that was addressed in great detail in Chapter Three. Although the vision in Daniel 7 is clearly a dream (7:1) and in Daniel 8, while not explicitly a dream “conforms to the pattern of the symbolic dream vision” (Collins, Daniel, 342), there are substantive differences in form and content between, on the one hand, the dream-visions embedded in Daniel 1–6 and, on the other hand, the revelatory visions of Daniel 7–12. Indeed, one of the major theses of this study is that the post-biblical writers also made this distinction.

88 A patron of Rome, Josephus was always careful not to undermine or ridicule the ideas of kings and empires, even if this meant glossing over the accounts where Jews had done so in the past.
of the thirty-five appearances of the word οφία (twenty per cent) occur in the section devoted to the Book of Daniel. Moreover, Josephus’ view is that Daniel’s wisdom is especially manifested in his ability to interpret dreams. Josephus’ portrait of Daniel the Wise may have played a part in forming this bedrock from which the Somniale was formed, in the sense that it augmented a biblical story that already stressed the quality of Daniel’s knowledge and abilities.

Another reason why the Somniale might have been accredited to Daniel and not to Joseph is rooted in the way that the text might have been understood by its copyists and audience. Although there are various reasons why a text might be attributed pseudonymously and/or received as a pseudonymous text, and even though I have previously reviewed a case where pseudonymous apocalypses were created for a greedy and gullible market, there is good reason to postulate that, generally speaking, texts such as the Somniale Danielis, the Lunationes Danielis, and the Praedictiones Danielis were understood as ultimately to have come from the pen of the prophet himself.

In many copies, the text of the Somniale is preceded by a short title (in Greek: ονειροκριτικὸν βιβλίον τοῦ προφήτου Δανιήλ πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Ναβουχodonόσορ κατὰ ἀλφάβητον; in Latin: Incipit Som(p)niale Danielis prophete) or by a brief but highly informative Prologue that leaves the attribution to Daniel in no doubt. There are several versions of this Prologue, most of which are variations on the following, a version included by Martin in his edition of the text:

Incipit Somniale Danielis prophetae, quod vidit in Babilonia in diebus Nabuchodonosor regis. Quando petebatur a principis civitatis et ab omni populo ut eis somnia quae videbant iudicaret, tunc Daniel propheta haec omnia scripsit, et eis ad legendum tradidit, dicens: “Ego sum

---

90 Ibid., 49–50.
91 See the literature cited in DiTommaso, Bibliography of the Pseudepigrapha, 115–121.
92 See Chapter Three, Excursus II: “The Figure of Daniel and the Arabic Muslim Daniel Apocalypses.”
93 Apud de Stoop, “Onirocriticon du prophète Daniel.”
94 W. de Gray Birch reports that prefixing the copy of the eleventh-century Latin copy of the Somniale that appear in BL cod. Cotton Titus D.xxvi is a title written in a sixteenth or seventeenth-century hand, “Alphabetum somniae excerptum ex Danielis libro” (“On Two Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in the British Museum,” Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature 11 (1873), 463–512 at 481). This suggests that even five centuries later the Somniale was still understood as having come from the hand of Daniel.
95 Cf. Wien, ÖNB cod. lat. 271 (apud Fischer, Complete Medieval Dreambook, 13).
Daniel propheta, unus de filiis Israel, qui captivi ducti sumus de Hierusalem, civitate sancta. Haec omnia a Deo facta sunt, nihil tamen per memetipsum dixi vel sustuli, sed ea a Domino accepi.” Quicumque legerint, Danielem intellegant.

A different version of the Prologue which also contains interesting bio-bibliographic information is found in manuscript codex 466 (fourteenth century) of Cambridge University’s Corpus Christi College:

Sic autem factum est in diebus nabugodnosor [sic] regis in babylonia quando petebant principes ciuitatis et populus ut sompnia que uide-rant exponerentur. Tunc daniel propheta sedit et hec omnia scripsit et populo ad legendum tradidit a deo autem hec palam facta sunt quibus ipse nichil addidit nichil sustulit sed quemadmodum ea accep-tit ita populo tradidit. Omnia sompnia intellexit sed quia intellexit hec omnia per spiritum sanctum sibi reuelata esse ideo scripsit hec e. [sic] in honore dei omnia sompnia danielis recitantur.96

Besides the consistent claim of attribution to Daniel, what is particularly interesting is the equally constant reference to the setting, “in Babilonia in diebus Nabuchodonosor regis,” which may be translated loosely, “in Babylon during the time of King Nebuchadnezzar.”

As I have stressed repeatedly, one way in which the author/redactor of the Book of Daniel shaped his material was by means of the deliberate imposition of a coherent, comprehensive, and numbingly obvious chronology. Throughout the Book, short introductions to each episode inform the reader as to exactly when and where the action takes place. King Nebuchadnezzar occupies centre stage throughout MT Daniel 1–4, Belshazzar is the king at Daniel 5, and Darius the Mede at Daniel 6. King Belshazzar reappears at Daniel 7–8, Darius at Daniel 9, and finally the reader is introduced to Cyrus the Persian at Daniel 10–12. The reasons why the chronology of the revelatory visions of 7–12 is out of step with that of the court tales of 1–6 need not concern us here.97 Of importance are facts that the chronology from Belshazzar through Darius is consistently

---

96 Cambridge, CCC cod. 466 [olim MS Misc. L], pp. 131 (incipit), 228–231; see M.R. James, Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (Cambridge, 1909–1913), No. 466. Note also the radically abbreviated Prologue found at the start of the lunation at New Haven, Yale University Beinecke cod. 163 (Wagstaff Miscellany), fol. 28v: “Dies Nebugodonosor Regis omnis populus tradebat ei sompna que videbat ut solueret Daniel propheta.”
97 Although it did concern the authors of the post-biblical Daniel legenda; see Chapter Two.
maintained over both parts of the Book of Daniel and that none of the revelatory visions is set in the period prior to the reign of Belshazzar.

By explicitly identifying the setting of the composition of the *Somniale Danielis* as Babylon in the time of Nebuchadnezzar, both the author and the later copyists who maintained this choice of setting reinforced a number of points. For one thing, the selection of this setting firmly associated the dream manual with the Daniel of the court tales and not with the Daniel of the revelatory visions. As we have seen, precisely the opposite tack was taken by the authors of the apocryphal Daniel apocalypses, who invariably located their compositions during the reigns of one of Nebuchadnezzar’s successors and also opened them with ample references to elements reflecting the revelatory preliminaries of Daniel 7–12 (e.g., explicit mention of rivers and other bodies of water, a preparatory period of fasting or other actions, the appearance of mediating figure, etc.). What is more, the choice of setting the *Somniale* during Nebuchadnezzar’s reign only further limited the implied referent to the phenomenon of third-person interpretation of dreams specifically rather than to the interpretation of both dreams and visions, as would have been the case had Belshazzar (Daniel 5) been cited as well. Finally, it is during Daniel’s time under Nebuchadnezzar in MT Daniel 1–4 that the reader is assured several times that in his knowledge of the secrets the prophet stands head and shoulders above his companions and the Babylonian wise men. By citing Nebuchadnezzarian Babylon as the setting for the *Somniale Danielis*, the author and copyists of the *Somniale* were drawing a connexion between it as a dream manual solely concerned with the forecasting of personal fortune and a specific type of interpretative knowledge on the part of Daniel the wise.98

The selection of setting is also critical from the perspective of plausibility. On several levels Daniel and Babylon work better than Joseph and Egypt. The fact that the *Somniale* was set in Babylon was probably historically quite believable in the context of the science of late antiquity and the mediaeval period. Nebuchadnezzarian Babylon stood at the threshold of the ancient world, the first of a succession of historical kingdoms that the reader is assured in both Daniel 2

98 See also the observation on the same subject, but with the focus on the apocryphal apocalypses and the kings who reigned during Daniel’s visions of Daniel 7–12 in Chapter Three, §3.
and 7 would culminate in the Kingdom of God. The wise men and learned doctors of late antiquity and the Middle Ages could trace their storehouse of knowledge back to this time, when the Babylonians invented or perfected the sciences with which they were familiar and when the classical Greeks composed the scientific treatises on medicine, mathematics, and geometry that they knew and consulted. This scientific context is also implicit in so many of the Daniel prognostica from the East, where the figure of Daniel is employed in a manner which clearly suggests that he was considered to be among the first of a long line of learned men whose thoughts and writings formed the basis for the science of the mediaeval Middle East. In contrast, locating the composition of the Somniale in Joseph’s Egypt would have been too much of a stretch of the imagination, if only because it would have required a plausible reason to explain how the text survived, located as it was among a very small group of Israelites, who subsequently endured a centuries-long bondage, a forty-year exodus in the wilderness, a kingdom that eventually split into two, and then destruction at the hands of first the Assyrians and then the Babylonians.

Another issue related to this idea of plausibility is the understanding of Daniel as the keeper of secrets, which was investigated in more detail in Chapter Three. The references to Daniel as a solver of mysteries and the notice that he was to “keep the words secret and seal the book until the time of the end” (12:4) combined to provide post-biblical authors with a biblical justification for the creation of extra-biblical Daniel apocalypses. This relationship between Daniel and secret wisdom had a long post-biblical afterlife in itself as well, one permutation of which was the forging of a link to Adam and the legendary Cave of Treasures. This notion of Daniel as a keeper of secrets was perhaps yet another factor in the decision to accord and then maintain Daniel as the author of the Somniale. In the biblical account of the life and deeds of Daniel (and unlike the account of Joseph) there was room and precedent for a later argument that

---

100 Note also 7:28, 8:26, and see Chapter Three, §1, on the idea of hidden knowledge and the basis for the post-biblical Daniel apocalypses.
101 See §§3 and 5, infra, for more on this link and its meaning.
Daniel could have written something that did not appear in the Book of Daniel but that could have resurfaced a little later on. This is a minor point, perhaps, but one that helps to flesh out the overall picture.

Finally, in approximately one quarter of the extant manuscripts the Somniale Danielis immediately precedes, follows, or is in some other way intimately connected to a copy of the lunar prognosticon we identify as the Lunationes Danielis. More significantly, the Somniale regularly appears bound in manuscript codices alongside other prognostica, typical of which are lunar prognostica, zodiacal prognostica, the “Egyptian Days” (Dies Aegyptiaci, a compendium of lucky and unlucky days), the Mansions of the Moon (which concentrate on the moon’s passage through the zodiac, sub-divided into twenty-eight “houses” or “mansions”), brontologia, horoscopes, physiognomies, medical recipes, and various and diverse calendar computi. Frequently included in such codices are diverse astronomical and astrological tables, charts, maps, and other data. Regardless of what one might think of the practice of systematic dream interpretation, the Somniale was a text that was clearly understood to fall under the domain of the science of late antiquity and the mediaeval period and formed part of the collective scientific knowledge of the era.

---

102 This percentage is only an approximation, given that I was not able to examine all the manuscripts by autopsy, nor can I be sure that I have identified the full corpus of extant manuscripts of each text.

103 E. Svenberg, “De latiniska lunaria” (Diss: Göteborg, 1936); idem, *Lunaria et zodiologia latina*, edidit et commentario philologico instruxit (Studia graeca et latina Gothoburgensia 16; Göteborg, 1963); more recently, W. Hübner, *Zodiacus Christianus. Jüdisch-christliche Adaptationen des Tierkreises von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart* (BKPh 144; Königstein, 1983).


106 Curiously, despite the fact that such medical and astronomical codices are often copiously illustrated, one very rarely sees illustrations accompanying either the Somniale Danielis or the Lunationes Danielis. My thanks to J. Folda of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, who during a conference at the Claremont Graduate University in February 2003 asked the question that precipitated my thought on the matter. I have yet to tender a satisfactory answer, however.

107 London, BL Cotton Titus codices D.xxvi and D.xxvii together preserve a copy
Each of these points—Daniel as a Babylonian wise man \textit{par excellence}, the connexion between Daniel and personal forecasts, the setting during the reign of King Nebuchadnezzar, the issue of plausibility, the view of Daniel as keeper of secrets—are important in and of themselves as reasons why Daniel was the ideal figure to whom the \textit{Somniale} could be attributed. But what of the overall picture of Daniel that might be drawn from these points, a picture of which the post-biblical writers were aware and upon which they drew? The basic equation which proceeds from their amalgamation is that dream interpretation was considered a science, that the \textit{Somniale} was a scientific text and, in the apocryphal imagination at least, that Daniel was a scientist, perhaps the greatest scientist of the biblical tradition. No other biblical figure besides Daniel could have been understood in this fashion, with the possible exception of Adam and Ezra, and neither one of them interpreted dreams. The \textit{Somniale Danielis}, therefore, reflects the transformation of the biblical character of Daniel as wise man and seer of revelatory visions into a post-biblical scientist. I will have more to say about this transformation in subsequent sections of this chapter.

3. \textit{Lunationes Danielis}

The other Daniel prognosticon of western mediaeval Christendom is the \textit{Lunationes Danielis}. Although the terms “moon-text,” “lunary,”

of the \textit{Somniale} and a half dozen lunations. Of them, de Gray Birch writes, “Although these two manuscripts are now separately bound, there is no doubt that they originally were united under one cover... [their characteristics] all point unmistakably to the conclusion that they are the collective work of one hand, and that they formed the stock of wisdom stored up by one individual at a period when the fortunate possessor of such a volume would indeed have passed as knowing much beyond the ordinary run of his contemporaries. That those books belonged to a church dignitary is a matter of course, when we remember that all science in the tenth and eleventh century in England, with hardly an exception reposed in ecclesiastical people exclusively” (“Two Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts,” 463–464; cf. the comments of R. Liuzza, “Anglo-Saxon Prognostics in Context: A Survey and Handlist of Manuscripts,” \textit{Anglo-Saxon England} 30 (2001), 181–230 at 219). Note also the dream compendium that in one manuscript begins “Cy commence le livre des exposicions et significacion des songes par Daniel et autres exposez.” Again there is the sense that Daniel is part of a centuries-long scientific tradition. On this text, see the Inventory of Chapter Six; for the critical edition, see F. Berriot, \textit{Exposiciones et significaciones des songes et Les songes Daniel} (manuscrits français de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris et de la Staatsbibliothek de Berlin, XIV\textdegree, XV\textdegree et XVI\textdegree siècles) (Travaux d’Humanisme et Renaissance 234; Genève, 1989), 55–298.
and “lunare” (Σεληνοδρόμα, or lunarium) in the past have been used interchangeably with “lunation,” the latter is strictly employed throughout this chapter as a formal designation only for those texts that list in order the thirty days of the month, from new moon to new moon, on which it is fortuitous to undertake a variety of actions or upon which certain things will or will not come to pass. The forecast for each day of all lunations follows a set formula that begins with the word or abbreviation for “moon,” continues with a notation marking the specific day of the month, and concludes with the prognostication for that day. To illustrate, one variety of lunation commences with the prognosis: “Luna I: tota die bona est,” which is translated idiomatically as “The first moon: It is a good [i.e. propitious] day for everything.” In contrast, “lunaries” refer in this chapter to a broader category of texts that embraces the full range of lunar prognostica, including not only the lunations proper.

108 The manuscript evidence preserves a wide variety of titles, usually with the word “moon” in its nominative state or an abbreviation thereof (e.g., “Luna” or “L” [more often the abbreviation L] in the Latin texts). One occasionally sees the term “Lunationes” (cf. Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Reg lat. 567, fol. 37v), but more often the lunation is simply identified by its purpose (e.g., the “De egregiotoribus” of Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 235, fol. 39vb). Colophons are rare but not unknown; rubrication of the initial letter of “luna” is common. On the titles in manuscript, C. Weißer observes, “Die zeitgenössischen lateinischen Texte bezeichnen sich nämlich als ‘lunarium,’ ‘lunaris,’ ‘lunares,’ oder ‘lunare,’ und ein französischer Text gebraucht als Gattungsname ‘lunaire.’” (Studien zum mittelalterlichen Krankheitslunar: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte laienastrologischer Fachprosa (Würzburger medizinhistorische Forschungen 21; Würzburg, 1982)).

109 This might seem strange to the layperson, who thinks in terms of lunar months of approximately 28 days, but lunations depend on the moon’s light over the course of a synodic month of 29.53 days, which is rounded to 30 (I. Taavitsainen, Middle English Lunaries. A Study of the Genre (Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki 47; Helsinki, 1988), 45–48). Disregarding the fragmentary texts, one of the few exceptions to the rule is found at Berlin, SBPK cod. lat. 2° 186, fols. 157v–158r, which is a lunation that extends to 31 days.

110 H. Craig, The Works of John Metham, Including The Romance of Amoryus and Cleopes, Edited from the Unique MS. in the Garrett Collection in the Library of Princeton University (Early English Text Society 132; London, 1916), xxxviii: “The prognostications for every day of the moon’s age... are usually known collectively in Latin as ‘lunations,’ and are frequently found in conjunction with the Esdras prognostics, the Somnium Danielis and other forms of the minor literature of superstition...”

but also the zodiacal lunaries,\textsuperscript{112} the “Mansions of the Moon,” and texts based on schemata involving the twelve months of the year.\textsuperscript{113}

The variety of lunations reflect their function.\textsuperscript{114} Some are austere forecasts for favourable and unfavourable days—an analogy from the classical world is the calendar of the old Roman Republic, with its days \textit{fasti} and \textit{nefasti}. Others deal with specific tasks: when it is propitious to let blood, for instance, or to pursue a fugitive. Still others concentrate on whether events will come to pass, such as whether dreams will be interpreted or what children born on a specific day of the month will be like when they become adults. Lunations therefore may be classified in various ways, depending on their form, contents, state (conditional or absolute), or compass (individual or corporate).\textsuperscript{115} A distinction based on form, however, is the easiest and perhaps the most functional method of classifying lunations. “Simple” lunations are generally brief and concern themselves with one subject only: dream interpretation, blood-letting, illness, and the like. “Complex” lunations are inevitably longer, deal with a series

\textsuperscript{112} Note, however, the rare cases where some lunaries (see Excursus I, \textit{infra}) may contain as part of their non-divinatory portion information about the zodiac (\textit{e.g.}, London, BL cod. Egerton 821, fols. 8v–12r).


\textsuperscript{114} And thus quite frequently lunations or lunaries are referred to in modern studies by their function rather than by their method of divination. As a result, terms such as “Bauernpraktik,” “Medizintext, or “Krankheitslunar” are sometimes seen.

\textsuperscript{115} In addition to the classifications outlined in the following notes, see also Epe, \textit{Wissenschaftliteratur im angelsächsischen England}, 54–64. His schema begins with the larger classification of magical and mantic Anglo-Saxon texts, which he segregates into five categories, including those of dream manuals and “die laienastrologische Prognostik.” He divides the latter into six sub-categories of prognostica: those that concern themselves with the day on which the year begins; with fortunate and unfortunate days; with the day of the week on which one is born; with the times regarding pregnancy; with the day of the week on which the new moon falls; and with the thirty days of the month, namely, lunations (“Das Lunar”). There are six types of lunations, each corresponding to the function or functions of the text: “Das Tagwählunlar,” “Das Geburtslunar,” “Das Krankheitslunar,” “Das Aderlaßlunar,” “Das Traumlunar,” and the anthropological catch-all type, “Das Sammellunar.”
of topics, and sometimes even include additional almanac material such as short quotations from the Bible (almost inevitably the Psalms) or notations that certain biblical figures were born or died on specific days of the month.

As with the *Somniale Danielis*, the early scholarship on the *Lunationes* concentrated on the Old English and the other vernacular copies of the text, and here again the name of M. Förster is conspicuous.\footnote{116} More recently, I. Taavitsainen\footnote{117} and L. Means\footnote{118} have each produced a valuable volume of editions of the various Old English and Middle English lunaries, including the *Lunationes*. Eleven of the twelve Greek copies are edited in the *Catalogus codicum astrologorum graecorum*.*\footnote{119} As for the Latin copies, which constitute the majority of the extant manuscripts, the reference works of A. Beccaria\footnote{120} and of L. Thorndike and P. Kibre\footnote{121} remain indispensable in the task of their identification. Curiously, although many varieties of lunations are medical in nature and the structure of the genre itself is based firmly on the motion of the moon, studies of mediaeval medicine or science that discuss lunations in any depth are rare.\footnote{122}


\footnote{117 Taavitsainen, *Middle English Lunaries* (see note 109). See also *eadem*, “The Identification of Middle English Lunaries,” *NPhM* 88 (1987), 18–26; “Storia Lune and Its Paraphrase in Prose.” *Neophilologica Fennica: Modern Language Society 100 Years* (Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki 45; Helsinki, 1987), 521–535. Taavitsainen classifies texts by their function: 1. Encyclopaedic Treatises (aims at explaining the existing order); 2. General Predictions (predicts future of societies); 3. Nativities (predicts future of individuals); 4. Elections (choosing the right moment for the right action); 5. Horary Questions (solving personal problems); and 6. Occult (influencing the outcome of illnesses or actions).


\footnote{119 For full citations, see the list of manuscripts in the Inventory of Chapter Six. The exception is London, BL cod. Royal 16.C.ii, fols. 1r–7v.}

\footnote{120 A. Beccaria, *I codici di medicina del periodo presalernitano (secoli IX, X e XI)* (Roma, 1956).


\footnote{122 The exception is Thorndike, *History*. More typical is the comment by M.L. Cameron: “In the same manuscript [London, BL Cotton Tiberius A.iii] there is also a prognostication by the moon’s age concerning the character of a child born on each day of the moon. There are many of these charts in medieval documents and many versions of the charactertics for each day. There is no need to pursue the matter further, as it is only another example of the long-held belief in the
The outstanding figures in the study of lunations are E. Wistrand, E. Svenberg, and C. Weißer. Weißer’s work especially is of a very high and enduring quality, and in it he furnishes a long and detailed list of approximately half of the over 250 extant Latin and vernacular manuscripts, many of which he edits in his volume. Just as is the case with the Somniale Danielis, however, the list of manuscripts of the Lunationes in the Inventory of Chapter Six in the present work includes dozens of additional and hitherto unnoticed Latin and vernacular manuscripts, many of which appear only as a brief entry in manuscript catalogues and are not included in any of the previous studies and lists. For instance, of the approximately 160 Latin copies of the Lunationes included in the Inventory, Weißer lists just over half, and in some cases this percentage is drastically lower. These relatively low percentages should not be taken as an indication of the value of Weißer’s work, however—just as he built on Svenberg’s and Wistrand’s scholarship, this work builds on his, and his long list of manuscripts have been of enormous assistance to my efforts in this regard. The point is that any conclusions regarding the textual situation of the Lunationes should be tendered only after a full investigation by autopsy of these hitherto unlisted and unnoticed copies.

---

123 E. Wistrand, Lunariastudien (Göteborgs högskolas årsskrift 48.4; Göteborg, 1942). This work is seemingly quite rare and relatively unknown, since only a few of the subsequent studies mention it.

124 See note 103, supra, for the sources. Svenberg segregates the prognostica into three major types based on the divinatory method by which information about the future is gleaned. The first type, which he terms “Speciallunaria,” corresponds to the definition of a lunation proper employed in this chapter and thus concerns us most. Svenberg divides the Speciallunaria into five sub-types, identified by their function: “Drömprognoser” (“dream-forecast”), “Födelprognoser” (“birth-forecast”), “Sjukdomprognoser” (“illness-forecast”), “Aderlätningsföreskrifter” (“prescription for blood-letting”), and “Enkel uppgift om gymsam resp. ogynnsam dag” (“simple enquiry as to whether a day is favourable [i.e. fortuitous] or unfavourable”). There is no mention of lunations that are concerned with the catching of criminals and fugitives. The second type covers other prognostica with similar forecasts; here Svenberg distinguishes three sub-types that correspond to the zodiacal lunary, the “30 olika planetsammanställningar,” and the Dies Aegyptiaci. The third and final major type he identifies as prognostica related to the calendar year and its divisions and covers what may be identified as the Supputatio Esdrae and related texts.

125 Weißer, Studien zum mittelalterlichen Krankheitslunar; idem, “Lunare.”

126 Of the twenty-seven copies in the Vatican holdings, for example, he lists only seven. On the identification and description of these copies, see L. DiTommaso, “Greek, Latin, and Hebrew Manuscripts of the Somniale Danielis and Lunationes Danielis in the Vatican Library,” Manuscripta 47/48 (2003/2004), 1–42.
Like dream-books, lunar prognostica in general and lunations in particular do not appear in the Bible, but without question antedate most parts of it. Lunar prognostica also appear in classical sources, perhaps most notably in reflective, bucolic works such as Hesiod’s *Works and Days* and Virgil’s *Georgics*. Despite these antecedents, however, the *realia* of manuscript evidence and the variety of the extant late antique and mediaeval copies suggest that the *Lunationes Danielis* developed in the general context of ancient lunar prognostica rather than descended from any one exemplar directly. This is probably also true for the other various astronomical prognostica and *computi* of late antiquity and the Middle Ages.

Our earliest manuscripts of the *Lunationes* date from the ninth century. There are quite a few of these, however, so it follows that the text had to be composed early enough to allow for their relatively widespread diffusion, and all the more so since these ninth-century texts already preserve evidence of the wide variety of *Lunationes*. It is certainly possible, then, that the text is a product of the early Middle Ages, perhaps the seventh or the eighth century, maybe earlier. As for provenance, the Byzantine Empire is likely the ultimate origin of the *Lunationes*. Although the earliest surviving Greek copies date from the thirteenth century and most are much later, there is no reason to suspect it is a translation from the Latin, but rather

---

127 For examples in Babylonian and Egyptian literature, see Weinstock, “Lunar Mansions,” 57–60.
129 Berlin, DSB cod. Phillipps 1790 (several lunations); Bern, Burgerbibliothek MS 441, fols. 15v–16r; Firenze, BML cod. Strozzi 70, fol. 100rv; Paris, BNF cod. lat. 6882, fol. 18v; BNF cod. lat. 7349, fols. 31v–32v; BNF cod. lat. 11218, fol. 101r; BNF cod. n.a. lat. 1616, fols. 10v–12r; St. Gallen, SB cod. 44, pp. 226–228; St. Gallen, SB cod. 751, pp. 175–176 and again at pp. 376 and 428b and 428c–429; Uppsala, Universitetsbibliotek cod. C.664, p. 23; Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 485, fol. 13v and again at 15v.
130 On the Greek copies of the lunations (and lunaries in general), see F. Cumont, “Les préages lunaires de Virgile et les ‘Selenodromia’,” *L’Antiquité classique* 2 (1933), 259–270 at 261–264.
more probably the Greek original was translated into the Latin versions, which then served as multi-form exemplars for the vernacular copies. The fact that all the ninth-century copies are Latin supports the thesis that most the varieties of the text were known in the Latin before they appeared in the vernacular, although it is unclear whether all these varieties can be traced back to a Greek text or whether they are themselves products of the process—probably sporadic and occurring at various locations—by which the Latin translations were first made.

Unlike the *Somniale Danielis*, which is almost always attributed to Daniel, lunations were attributed to other biblical and historical figures or were anonymous. There are lunations attributed to Adam, 132 Esdras, 133 and Merlin, 134 and there is even one text associated with King Solomon. 135 Significantly, there are no lunations under the name of Joseph.

One historical figure who came to be associated with lunations pertaining specifically to the art of blood-letting was the seventh-century Anglo-Saxon historian and scholar known as the Venerable Bede. 136 Bede of course wrote many scientific treatises, and in a few manuscript codices we find embedded among his works a copy of a medical lunation. 137 This false attribution survived the transition from manuscript to book largely due to the efforts of one John Herwagen (Hervagius) of Basle. 138 In 1563 Hervagius published the first complete folio edition of Bede’s works and included in its contents a battalion of unauthenticated theological and other treatises

132 See below, where these cases are discussed separately.
133 But in conjunction with the name of Daniel; cf. Basel, Universitätsbibliothek MS B VII 4, fol. 140va–b: “Somniæ quod reuelatum est esdre siue ex daniele iumentum.”
134 Gent, Universiteitsbibliotheek MS 5 (416), fols. 157v–158v.
136 Another historical figure associated with lunations is the great English astronomer, Edmund Halley, who famously discovered the comet that would come to bear his name. The lunation is found at Princeton, University Library Garrett MS 141, fols. 79r–83v; see Craig, *The Works of John Metham*, 148–156. There is some question as to the date of this manuscript, however (see the Inventory of Chapter Six).
137 The nineteenth- or twentieth-century authors of the catalogues that listed this material knew enough, however, to attribute the lunation to “Ps.-Bede” rather than to Bede himself.
that he felt certain belonged among the corpus of writings of the Venerable One. Among these treatises was the *De minutione sanguinis*, which among things incorporated a very simple lunation of the type preserved in Cambridge, Trinity College codex O.7.23, fol. 70v, and similar copies.139 Unfortunately, subsequent editions of Bede’s works, while managing to purge the corpus of the other Hervagius Bede pseudepigrapha, somehow ignored this particular treatise. As a result, the *De minutione sanguinis* and its lunation sporadically resurfaces under the name of Bede, most conspicuously in the ninetieth volume of J.-P. Migne’s *Patrologia latina*.140

To summarise: there are a variety of lunations, the majority of which are anonymous, and even when they are attributed, the author is not always Daniel. These facts probably explain why none of the other scholars who have studied lunations have ever considered the genre to be associated with the prophet.141 That being said, there are five compelling reasons as to why I am firmly convinced that the genre belongs among the Daniel apocrypha and that the collection of lunations proper ought to be known as the *Lunationes Danielis*.

First, the presence of anonymous copies of the *Lunationes* does not speak to the issue of its overall attribution to Daniel. The *Somniale Danielis* aside, it is not uncommon for prognostic texts to be attributed to a biblical or classical figure in one manuscript copy and be anonymous in another.

Second, the actual percentage of copies attributed to someone other than Daniel is very low. That there are so many anonymous lunations does not change the fact that if a lunation was attributed to a figure, that figure was almost always Daniel. In addition, the extension of the attribution of pseudonymous authorship to other biblical figures in these few instances was a relatively late development in the history of the text.142 When they are not anonymous, all the earliest copies of the *Lunationes* are attributed to Daniel.

139 See the Inventory in Chapter Six.
141 If a lunation is specifically attributed to Daniel, then one will occasionally encounter some sort of notation marking this fact in the scholarship or in manuscript catalogues. But the appreciation of the entire genre as part of the Daniel apocrypha is without precedent.
As for Adam’s association with the lunations,\textsuperscript{143} we observe that, strikingly, the only two examples are preserved in the same manuscript, Bodleian Library codex Ashmole 361, at fols. 156 \textit{verso} to 158 \textit{verso} and again at 159 \textit{recto} to \textit{verso}. It is worth investigating these attributions in detail. At the beginning of the first lunation there appears a brief introduction:

\begin{quote}
Iste sunt lunaciones quas Adam primus homo disposit secundam veram experientiam quam etiam suis filiis tradidit et quam maxime Abel et ceteris de posteritate ad quos etiam concordavit Daniel prophet\texta.\textsuperscript{144}
\end{quote}

The second lunation contains a different and far longer introduction:

\begin{quote}
[M]odo agitur de numero lune ad videndum que sit bona uel que mala. Et vsum istarum lunacionum inuenerunt Adam et Daniel prophet\texta, quibus dedit sensum deus et pulcritudinem et fortitudinem huius mundi.

Et ideo omnes homines qui nascantur: omni debet peccatum ipsius Ade et mulieris peccatum Æ nude, sicut quod masculus quando nascitur, dicit ‘o a’, et femila dicit ‘o e’. Primum dixit, quod vidit Adam, quando fuit factus, quia primo creatus uidit lunam, et ideo uocata est sic, quia dixit ‘lunam’ primam, et deus dedit lune potestatem super res inferiores creatas. Et Adam scit tectum suum posse, et inst[it]uit lunam uocari primam, postquam conjuncta est soli facta revoluclione, dum jncipit nouiter apparere, et ideo propter creationem suam dixit: [then follows the lunation, beginning with Luna I]…\textsuperscript{145}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{143} It is important, however, not to mistake the lunations attributed to Adam with lunations that include as part of the information contained for the first moon the notation about Adam (on which, see Excursus I, “The Figure of Daniel in the Combination Lunations and the Zodiacal Lunaries,” infra). For manuscripts of combination lunations that begin the first moon with the information that “Adam fuit creatus,” “Adam factus fuit,” or something similar, see [Latin]: Berlin, SBPK cod. lat. 4° 70 [Electoralis 968], fols. 229vb–232rb; Firenze, BML cod. Ashburnham 130, fols. 25–26; Firenze, BML cod. Ashburnham 204 \textit{[olim] 136}, fols. 25r–26r; London, BL cod. Additional 15236, fols. 169v–171v; London, BL cod. Sloane 282, fols. 82v–85v; London, BL cod. Sloane 2641, fols. 62r–64v; Modena, Biblioteca Estense cod. lat. 697, fols. 24v–27r; Oxford, Bod. cod. Ashmole 361 \textit{(supra)}; Paris, BNF cod. lat. 3660, fols. 53r–57r; Paris, BNF cod. lat. 4147, fol. 112; Venezia, BM cod. \textit{VII.33} \textit{[olim] lat. 106}, fols. 7vb–8vb; [French]: New Haven, Yale University Beinecke cod. 395, fol. 180r and again at 182r; Worcester Cathedral, Chapter Library 4° MS 61.

\textsuperscript{144} Cited in Thorndike, \textit{History}, 682 note 1.

\textsuperscript{145} Cited in Weißer, \textit{Studien zum mittelalterlichen Krankheitslunar}, 359–360. I have maintained his punctuation and spelling, but have not included the \textit{sigillum} he uses to indicate that an abbreviated portion of the text has been here spelled with full orthography.
In both cases the name of Adam appears in conjunction with the name of Daniel, so it is not strictly true that these lunations are associated with Adam alone. The fact that both lunations appear in tandem in the same manuscript codex strongly suggests that their attributions to Adam were the anomaly, a result more probably of a deliberate effort on the part of their copyist-redactor for his own unknown purposes rather than the mindless forces of chance that miraculously spared the only two extant representatives of a widespread tradition that associated Adam with lunations.

But this explanation does not answer the question as to why these lunations were associated with Adam, nor does it address the connexion between Adam and Daniel. On the surface, these introductions tell us nothing explicitly beyond the ultimate provenance of the lunar knowledge in the texts to which they are prefixed. Perhaps, though, what we have underpinning these two introductions is a form of the legend of the Cave of Treasures, to which we have alluded several times already. After their expulsion from the Garden of Eden—so the legend goes—Adam and Eve settled in a cave on a sacred mount. This cave served as both a dwelling and a place of worship, and in it Adam secured the gold, myrrh, and frankincense which he had taken out of Paradise. After Adam’s death, this cave became his tomb, and with his body were sealed these three items from paradise.

The legend of Adam and the cave is found in many sources, including a text called the Cave of Treasures, which survives in Syriac, Arabic and Karshuni, Ethiopic, Georgian, and other versions. In other versions of the legend, however, the treasures that Adam took with him from Paradise were not the only items sealed with his tomb in the Cave. In the Testament of Adam 3.6, for example, it is claimed that Adam’s last testament was sealed in the Cave, and in some other texts, notably a version of the Malḥamat Dāniyāl (see §5, infra), there is a reference to secret astronomical and meteorological lore that was also deposited in the Cave.

This last is the important point. The figure of Adam was from early on associated with special, secret knowledge, his having of course been one of two humans to eat from the Tree of Knowledge

---

146 The literature on these sources is fairly extensive. The standard work is A.S.-M. Ri, Commentaire de la Caverne des trésors: étude sur l’histoire du texte et ses sources (CSCO 581, Subsidia 103; Turnhout, 2000); for more sources (including editions) see DiTommaso, Bibliography of the Pseudepigrapha, 211–217.
of Good and Evil (Gen 3:6). Josephus remarks that Adam predicted “a destruction of the universe, in one case by violent fire and in another by a mighty deluge of water.” In fact, Adam’s foretelling the future was a common picture in the Aggadah, and there his predictions are noted to have been directed to future generations rather than to his contemporaries, thereby according them for all intents and purposes the status of revelatory literature. Häfí Khalífa’s Arabic *Lexicon* mentions that Adam inscribed clay tablets on which were inscribed scientific knowledge, and within some of the diverse material of the Hermetic corpus there is the tradition that these tablets, which were deposited in the Cave of Treasures, were later discovered by Hermes. The *Malḥamat Dâniyâl* ties all these loose ends together: Adam deposits the tablets containing this hidden and esoteric scientific knowledge in the Cave of Treasures, which many generations later are recovered by Daniel. This sequence of events is echoed in al-Bîrûnî’s *Alâthâr Albâ˚iya* ‘an-il Kûrûn Alkhâliya, which connects the knowledge of the great chronological cycles of the cosmos to Daniel’s wisdom.

Even more explicit is the connexion between Adam and Daniel established by an Arabic text preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, codex arab. 4605 (circa 1642–1643) which the Baron de Slane calls the *Livre de la Majesté divine, transmis à la postérité par le prophète Daniel*. He proceeds to describe the text as:

... une traité de cosmogonie. On lit dans la préface que cette révélation, écrite sur une toile de soie blanche, avait été envoyée par Dieu.

---


151 al-Bîrûnî, *Alâthâr Albâ˚iya* ‘an-il Kûrûn Alkhâliya [trans. = E. Sachau. *The Chronology of Ancient Nations. An English Version of the Arabic Text of the Athâr-ul-Bâkiya of AlKhâni*, or “Vestiges of the Past,” Collected and Reduced to Writing by the Author in A.H. 390–1, A.D. 1000. London, 1879. 300]: “It [the Great Cycle] occurs in the following verses of Khâlid b. Yazîd b. Mu˚awiya b. Abî-Sufyân, who was the first philosopher in Islam; people say even that the source of his wisdom was that learning which Daniel had derived from the *Treasure-Cave*, the same one which Adam the father of mankind had deposited his knowledge.”

152 The text is described in W. MacGuckin (Baron de Slane), *Catalogue des manuscrits arabes de la Bibliothèque Nationale* (Paris, 1883–1895), 3.731.
à Adam. Un nommé ‘Abdallah ibn Salâm, ayant déterré ce trésor, en communiqua le contenu au calife ‘Othmân.

Of course the introductions to the Ashmolean lunations preserve nothing of this sequence explicitly, and the legend of the Cave of the Treasures was perhaps unknown in the West. It is not too much to suppose, however, that the copyist/redactor of these two lunations might have drawn on this widespread tradition connecting Adam, Daniel, and secret knowledge when he crafted the introductions or, at the very least, given that throughout late antiquity and the mediaeval period both Daniel and Adam were associated with mantic wisdom and scientific knowledge, made the connexion between the two biblical figures independently.

Third, as I have previously remarked, in approximately one quarter of the extant manuscripts a lunation immediately precedes, follows, or is in some other way intimately related to a copy of the *Somniale Danielis*. Most commonly the *Somniale* immediately precedes or follows the lunation (or lunations, since there are instances where lunations appear in groups of two or more). To be sure, both the *Somniale* and the *Lunationes* appear in manuscript codices alongside other prognostica, including the *Dies Aegyptiaci*, but the frequency of these cases is quite low compared to the number of instances where the *Somniale* is preceded or followed by a lunation rather than another prognosticon. Put another way, the frequency of cases where a lunation and the *Somniale* enjoy this close proximity suggests that there is a special connexion between the two texts other than merely that they were considered scientific or astronomical works.

---

153 This percentage is only an approximation, given that I was not able to examine all the manuscripts by autopsy and that we cannot be certain that we have identified the full corpus of extant manuscripts of either the *Somniale* or the *Lunationes*. See the list of manuscripts for both the *Somniale* and the *Lunationes* in the Inventory in Chapter Six, which also identifies the instances where the two texts enjoy this special relationship and when either one or both are explicitly attributed to Daniel.

154 Again, see the Inventory in Chapter Six for numerous examples of this.

155 This close relationship in manuscript between lunation and *Somniale* is not exactly the same as the one in which either of these texts appears as part of a larger work of a like nature or is bound together in the same manuscript codex with analogous texts. For example, as with the *Somniale*, lunations frequently appear i) as part of an extended collection of works (in the same hand) devoted to scientific, astronomical, or astrological matters or ii) bound in manuscript codices (of various hands) containing various treatises on these subjects. In such cases one may conclude that lunations were understood to be part of the corpus of the scientific literature of the time, *i.e.*, their appearance in so many scientific or astronomical
What is more, the lunations that are paired with the *Somniiale* are frequently anonymous. This intimates that in such cases the copyist knew that these two texts enjoyed some sort of relationship. Because there is no real connexion between the substance of dream-texts and moon-texts (indeed, there are host of other astronomical and astrological texts that formally are far more similar to a lunation), one cannot help but conclude that the element that united both texts in the imagination of the copyist was the figure of Daniel, even though in these cases the lunation was left anonymous.

In certain instances this close physical relationship between the two texts in manuscript is exhibited even more plainly. To cite one example, Vatican codex Pal. lat. 235, whose texts date from the eighth to the eleventh centuries, contains one of the oldest Latin copies of the *Somniiale* (unfortunately incomplete) preserved in any language. In the upper two thirds of fol. 39 verso three lunations are preserved, *a, b, and c*, which run in parallel columns down the page. For some reason, the text of the third lunation in column *c* does not extend as far down the page as does the first two in their columns. The text of the *Somniiale*, however, begins in column *c* immediately following the end of the third lunation. When the text reaches the point in the page where the columns containing the first two lunations end, it moves to extend across the full width of the lower third of the page. The text then continues across full width of the following page (fol. 40 recto) when it abruptly breaks off approximately half-way down. The text of the *Somniiale* thus begins immediately in column *c* following the third lunation before moving to extend across the page at the point where the other two lunations terminate, a clear indication that it and the trio of lunations that precede it are meant to be associated together.

The *fourth* and perhaps most significant reason why the *Lunationes* ought to be considered part of the Daniel apocrypha is that in the instances where it and the *Somniiale Danielis* appear together in manuscript they often share the Prologue.\(^{156}\) No other text besides the *Lunationes* shares the Prologue with the *Somniiale*. The most telling

---

\(^{156}\) On the Prologue, see §2, *supra*. 

---
aspect of this phenomenon is that the order of the three elements—Prologue, *Somniale*, and *Lunationes*—varies among the manuscripts. In some cases the *Lunationes* precedes both the Prologue and the *Somniale*; in other cases the Prologue precedes the *Somniale*, which is then followed by the *Lunationes*; in still other cases the *Lunationes* immediately follows the Prologue, separating it from the *Somniale*.\(^{157}\) It must be reiterated that the Prologue was originally a part of the *Somniale* alone—we know this by virtue of the nature of its content and by the fact that it never appears prefixed to a lunation without the *Somniale*.\(^{158}\) It follows, then, that the insertion of the lunation at various points in the formula Prologue + *Somniale* (and particularly between the two elements) is a deliberate act, and one that can only be explained by assuming that those who did so operated under the assumption that there was an intimate linkage between the texts.\(^{159}\) Again, because there is no common substantive element between the two, we are forced to conclude that the figure of Daniel (and the way in which his special ability with dreams was understood) provided the necessary link.

*Fifth*, the name of Daniel explicitly appears in the titles of or *incipits* to certain lunations\(^{160}\) independent from the aforementioned connexion with the *Somniale* that is implied by virtue of the shared

---

\(^{157}\) *Lunationes* + Prologue + *Somniale*: Cambridge, CCC cod. 466 [olim MS Misc. L], pp. 131 (*incipit*), 228–231 (on this Prologue, see note 96, *supra*, and the text to which the note refers); Prologue + *Somniale* + *Lunationes*: Città del Vaticano, BAV Pal. lat. 1321, fols. 160va–163ra–b; Prologue + *Lunationes* + *Somniale*: Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 1030, fols. 131ra–132vb. For more examples of each type, see the Inventory in Chapter Six; for a more detailed examination of the types in the Vatican holdings, see DiTommaso, “Mediaeval Manuscripts.”

\(^{158}\) The only exception might be the relatively copy preserved in the Wagstaff *Miscellany* at the Beinecke Library at Yale University (see note 163, *infra*), a fact that confused the compiler of the manuscript catalogue in which the *Miscellany* is listed into thinking the text was actually a copy of the *Somniale* rather than the *Lunationes*. But even in this unique case the Prologue is radically abbreviated.

\(^{159}\) Note, *e.g.*, the very old (eleventh century) copy preserved in London, BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A. iii, fols. 30v–33v (the foliation of this codex is particularly problematic; see the note on the matter where the codex is first cited in the section on the *Somniale Daniæli* in the Inventory of Chapter Six). The codex appears to preserve a *Somniale* followed by a lunation, with the lunation terminating with the closing sentence “Finiunt somnia Daniæli prophetae” ([in Old English: “endia swefnu danielis [þæs] wiþgan” [the text is in both Latin and Old English]], thereby plainly indicating that the two texts are intimately related.

\(^{160}\) It must be noted, however, that the bulk of the titles of the lunations are very simple and concentrate only on their particular function (“De etate lune,” “Prognostica ad mortem et ad vitam,” *etc.*)
Prologue. There is among the various copies of lunations the notation that “Incipit lunaris sancti Daniheli”\textsuperscript{161} or that “Incipit lunarium sancti Danihel de nativitate infantium.”\textsuperscript{162} One also encounters the abbreviated prologue “Dies Nebugodonosor Regis omnis populus tradebat ei sompnia que videbat ut solueret Daniel propheta,”\textsuperscript{163} and the title or description “Consideratio aetatum lunae in Nativitibus; convenit quoad potissimam partem cum Lunari Danielis Prophetae.”\textsuperscript{164}

In conclusion, not every lunation ever copied and eventually bound into codex was understood to have been written by Daniel. The fact that lunations are often anonymous and that only a minority of them appear in manuscript with a Somniale indicates that in some cases the text was merely one of a number of anonymous and quasi-autonomous astronomical prognostica that were frequently bound together in a codex. That being said, there are five reasons which together suggest that the Lunationes collectively belongs among the corpus of the Daniel apocrypha. Whether the Lunationes was ever independently attributed to Daniel before it became associated with the Somniale is unknown.\textsuperscript{165} Whatever the case, its attribution to Daniel and its association with the Somniale occurred quite early, and the manuscript evidence demonstrates that the link between the two texts was not the content of both texts but rather the figure of Daniel.

But proving that Daniel was associated with the Lunationes to the point where the text ought to be considered part of the Daniel apocrypha does not get around to explaining why Daniel would be associated with astronomical prognostica in the first place. It has already been noted that there is no formal relationship between the Lunationes and the Somniale and that their connexion in manuscript is based on a common attribution to Daniel the wise. To be sure, the underlying

\textsuperscript{161} St. Gallen, SB cod. 751, p. 376.
\textsuperscript{162} London, BL cod. Harley 3017, fol. 58v.
\textsuperscript{163} New Haven, Yale University Beinecke cod. 163 (Wagstaff Miscellany), fol. 28v. See notes 96 and 158, supra.
\textsuperscript{164} London, BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii, fol. 41r–v. With respect to the copy preserved at Manchester, Chetham’s Library cod. 11380 [olim Mun. A.4.91], fol. 125v, N.R. Ker, Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries. III: Lampeter-Oxford (Oxford, 1983), 370, identifies the work as “Prognostications from the age of the moon and from dreams ‘secundum Danielem’.” The quotation marks framing the phrase “secundum Danielem” suggest that Ker is quoting the manuscript itself, although I cannot be certain of this as I have not examined it by autopsy.
\textsuperscript{165} The manuscripts where the Lunationes and Somniale appear with the Prologue are earlier than those that simply preserve a copy of the Lunationes that is attributed to Daniel.
equation for the association of the _Lunationes_ and the figure of Daniel was probably much the same as it was in the case of the _Somniale_. The _Lunationes_ was a scientific text and in the post-biblical mind Daniel was the greatest scientist of the biblical tradition. But the post-biblical rationale that connected lunar prognostica specifically with the figure of Daniel needs to be more fully articulated.

We have already observed that the author/redactor of MT Daniel took some care to delineate among the various groups of wise men of Babylon. For the purposes of this chapter it is irrelevant whether this careful classification of the wise men is historical, in the sense that it accurately reflects the court setting of sixth-century Babylon, or, more probably, was a romantic, somewhat idealised vision of court life. In this classification there appears several times the category of “diviners” (אמש, at 2:27, 4:4, 5:7, and 5:11). The word derives from the Hebrew root יָשָׁה, “to cut” and, more specifically, “to partition,” which then led its gaining additional and related meanings, such as (in the Aramaic) “to determine fate.” The term does not appear in the New Testament, which only contains one reference to fortune-telling (Acts 16:16–19), and here the context is clearly oracular rather than strictly divinatory.}

---


167 See also the text to which notes 72–74, supra, refer.

168 The verb employed at 16:16 is μαντεύω, which tends to appear in the context of fortune-telling and, more specifically, in an oracular sense (see the sources cited in W. Bauer, _A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature_ [second English ed. of fifth German ed.; trans. and ed. F.W. Gingrich and F.W. Danker, based on the first English ed. trans. and ed. W.F. Arndt and F.W. Gingrich; Chicago/London, 1957], 491). The oracular tenor of the verb as it is used at Acts 16:16 is reinforced by the note that the slave-girl with these powers is described as having a spirit of a python (πνεῦμα πυθώνος). In the entry “πυθώνος” (728–729), the editors of the _Greek-English Lexicon_ suggest the ultimate referent of the word was the snake or dragon that guarded the Delphic oracle. This suggestion only indirectly associates the word “python” with the fortune-telling action of the slave-girl; accordingly they note that the word later “came to designate a spirit of divination.” In my opinion, this is too general a use of the term “divination,” which was clearly distinguished from other types of fortune-telling both in Book of Daniel (with the emphasis on the categorisation of the Babylonian wise men) and, by implication, in the many separate prognostica of late antiquity and the mediaeval period (and in systematic classifications such as Macrobius’). Moreover, while the ultimate referent of the word “Python” in its fortune-telling sense was indeed the guardian
In the Book of Daniel, the Babylonian wise men function as a foil against which Daniel’s knowledge and skill are cast into sharp focus. But because the categories of these wise men are communicated substantively and never in a comparative sense, the implication is that Daniel is the master of all the specialties of the groups of Babylonian wise men, not just one or two of them. Daniel is as much a diviner as he is a dream-interpreter. Admittedly, there is no empirical proof to support this; the biblical Daniel does not formally operate in a divinatory sense, as he does as an interpreter of dreams. At the same time, however, the existence of the *Lunationes* suggests that in the post-biblical era the understanding of Daniel as an expert diviner was in effect. Kernel of this understanding may be found in the implication that Daniel was proficient and knowledgeable is all the specialties of the wise men. This implication was further buttressed by the widespread belief throughout the classical world that the Babylonians invented the calendar, perfected the regular keeping of time, and were the greatest astronomers and astrologers of the ancients.\(^\text{169}\)

Another place where this kernel of understanding may be sought is in the dreams and visions of Daniel 2, 4, and 5, in which, as we saw, the forecasting of personal fortune plays a prominent role, even when the interpretation of the dream or vision has corporatist overtones. This aspect is particularly pronounced in the tale of Nebuchadnezzar’s madness in Daniel 4, which essentially revolves around the idea of the Wheel of Fortune, a popular topos in late mediaeval and renaissance literature and art. Over a space of seven years Nebuchadnezzar moves from king to wild beast and then back again to king, the cycle complete. The forecast of this double reversal of fortune, which is presented in the form of Daniel’s interpretation of the king’s odd dream, is functionally the equivalent of a personal fortune-telling, albeit clothed in the axiomatic hermeneutic that God is in control.

---

\(^{\text{169}}\) Many examples exist of Babylonian lunaria and other prognostica; see those cited in M. Jastrow, Jr., *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria* (Handbooks on the History of Religions 2; Boston, 1898), 352–406, *passim.*
of the processes of his history and that kingdoms wax or wane at his command.

However, the question still remains as to why Daniel’s name came to be associated with the moon in general and with the *Lunationes* specifically. Collins correctly remarks that the figure of Daniel demonstrates scant interest in the motion of the stars, a topic that in the Second Temple period was largely the province of other biblical heroes, paramount among whom was Enoch. Certainly the old lunar calendar of Second Temple Judaism had nothing to do with a post-biblical lunar text such as *Lunationes*, and there does not appear to be a connexion between the practice of dream interpretation and the moon. One might argue that Daniel’s preoccupation with time (past time: the *ex eventu* periodisation of history; future time: the calculation of the end) prepared the way for a prognosticon such as the *Lunationes* that centered on the divisions among the days of the month. Perhaps, too, the fact that dreams are a phenomenon of the night might explain an association with the moon, which of course rules the night sky just as the sun rules the day.

At the same time, it is probable that such points of contact between the figure of Daniel and the phenomenon divination merely paved the way for a process of association that actually occurred in manuscript, at the level of the copyist/editor rather than the author. The close correspondence of the *Lunationes* in manuscript with the *Somniale* has already been mentioned. Although a detailed investigation of all the cases where the two prognostica appear together in manuscript is still required, a preliminary survey of the evidence strongly suggests that the specific key to the process of association between them is the simple dream lunation. For example, in the six cases where a Vatican manuscript preserves a copy of the *Somniale* and one or more copies of the *Lunationes*, the lunation that immediately precedes or succeeds the *Somniale* is of the simple dream-interpretation type. In fact, five of the six cases contain a dream lunation immediately preceding the *Somniale*, while only one has the lunation following the *Somniale*. Furthermore, in three of these cases

---

170 Collins, *Daniel*, 139.
171 Again, such an investigation would require an examination by autopsy of all the manuscript evidence.
172 Pal. lat. 235, Pal. lat. 1030, Reg. lat. 567, Reg. lat. 1420, and Vat. lat. 6297.
173 Pal. lat. 1321.
the lunation is actually inserted between the *Somniale* and its Prologue.\(^{174}\)

This evidence implies that through the medium of the simple dream lunation the *Lunationes* came to be associated in manuscript with the *Somniale Danielis* and so also with the figure of Daniel the Prophet. The process was no doubt facilitated by the aforementioned points of contact, but the critical element was the correspondence of the subject matter, *i.e.*, dream interpretation. Once this association was established, either the other types of lunations began to be included under Daniel’s name or, more probably, simple dream lunations under the name of Daniel gradually acquired other functions and/or grew into complex lunations, all of which is now reflected in the state of the manuscript evidence.

**Excursus I: The Figure of Daniel in Complex Lunations and the Zodiacal Lunaries**

Two other lunar prognostica deserve our attention, if only in passing. The structure of some complex lunations include both divinatory and non-divinatory elements and frequently the latter consists of a notation about persons and events from the Bible: the specific day of the month on which a patriarch or prophet was born, when the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah met their fate, *etc.* These notations appear for each of the thirty moons that constitute a complete lunation.

Such complex lunations generally begin with the observation that “Luna prima factus est Adam . . . ,”\(^{175}\) “Luna prima. Adam natus fuit,”\(^{176}\) “Primo die lunae Adam ad lucem peruenit . . . ,”\(^{177}\) “Luna prima Adam fuit creatu s . . . ,”\(^{178}\) and the like. One would expect Daniel to be mentioned somewhere in the series, but this is not the case, since the thirty moons usually cover the figures and events from Adam to Moses or, less frequently, from Adam to Samuel or David.\(^{179}\) How this particular chronological window

---

\(^{174}\) Pal. lat. 1030, Reg. lat. 1420, and Vat. lat. 6297. For more information on the Vatican lunations, see DiTommaso, “Mediaeval Manuscripts.”


\(^{176}\) Firenze, BML cod. Ashburnham 204 [olim 136], fols. 25r–26r.

\(^{177}\) Paris, BNF cod. lat. 3660, fols. 53r–57r.


\(^{179}\) This chronological range also extends to the vernacular lunations of this type.
came to be established is impossible to determine, although it is clear that Daniel and the Babylonian exile fall outside it. Oddly enough, however, King Nebuchadnezzar appears in one lunation (London, BL cod. Sloane 2641, fol. 62r–64v: “Luna IXa. natus est Nabugodenosor.”).

The second type of text where the figure of Daniel appears briefly is the zodiacal lunary, a genre upon which some scholarship has been devoted. As their name suggests, zodiacal lunaries are prognostica which depend on the observation of the zodiac as well as the moon. There are several types of zodiacal lunaries: i) those that are structured around the twelve signs of the zodiac and the position or state of the moon relative to each sign (e.g., “Luna commorante in signo Arietis . . .”), ii) as above, but with an added line or two explaining the correspondence between the sign of each zodiac and a biblical figure, usually a patriarch, prophet, or apostle; and iii) those that are centered around the zodiacal signs and the moon’s place within them, but structured in three divisions of four zodiacal signs each (e.g., “Aries Cancer Libra Capricornus. In his signis tropicis Luna cum crit . . .”).

In the zodiacal lunaries the figure of Daniel appears sporadically and almost always in the context of those texts that include this additional line about a biblical figure (type ii). The one common element among such brief references is the association of Daniel with Leo, the sign of the zodiac representing the lion. In the Bibliothèque Nationale de France codex n.a. lat. 299, fol. 23 recto to 24 verso, we find the following: “Signum Leonis signum est Danielis prophete, qui in lacum leonis fuit. de Luna cum fuerit in Leone.” And again, in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France codex n.a. lat. 456, fol. 163 verso to 168 recto: “Luna XI et XII. Signum Leonis, pro eo quod Daniel Propheta in lacum leonum missus fuit . . . signum Leonis Sancti Daniel prophete signum est . . .”. In both cases the link between

---

181 Cf. Berlin, SBPK cod. lat. 8° 93, fols. 56r–57r (from which the quotation was drawn); Cambridge, CCC cod. 37, fol. 51r–v; Herten, Bibliothek des Grafen Nesselrode-Reichenstein, cod. 192, fols. 89va–90va; Paris, BNF cod. lat. 16208, fol. 25r; Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Urb. lat. 1398, fols. 23r–31r. Such texts are common throughout ancient and mediaeval Europe and the Near and Middle East—see, e.g., the Syriac Book of Medicines, fol. 212v: incip.: “And if the year be born in the sign of the Ram, the rain will cut the early seed . . .”; expl.: “And if the year be born in the sign of the Fishes, do not sow seed too early, and the crops will prosper on the mountains, and the early seed will prosper” (E.A.W. Budge, *Syrian Anatomy, Pathology and Therapeutics, or “The Book of Medicines”. The Syriac Text, Edited from a Rare Manuscript, with an English Translation, etc.* (London, 1913), 2.522–523).
182 Paris, BNF cod. n.a. lat. 299, fols. 23r–24v; Paris, BNF cod. n.a. lat. 456, fols. 163v–168r.
183 Cf. Fabriensis cod X, fols. 18r–v; St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek cod. 878, pp. 240–241 (from which the quotation was drawn); Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek cod. hist. fol. 415, fols. 18v–82r; Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 834, fol. 42v. See Hübner, *Zodiacus Christianus*, 196–197, for difficulties in reading Laurentianus 45,23, fol. 65r at the point at which Daniel’s name appears.
184 Quotations *apud* Svenberg, *Lunaria et zodiologia latina*, 63–64 and 83.
the figure of Daniel and the zodiacal sign of Leo is made on the basis of the episode of Daniel in the Lions’ Den (Dan 6). The association of Daniel with Leo is reflected in the work of W. Hübner, who has made an exhaustive study of all such associations between the patriarchs, prophets, and apostles and the zodiac, the motion of the planets, and other astrological data.185

Because there is no attribution to Daniel I do not categorise these zodiacal lunaries as part of the Daniel prognostica, and since they preserve only a minute amount of information about the prophet (a phrase or sentence at most) and the vector by which this information is communicated is not third-person narrative, these lunations are not Daniel legenda, either. In actuality, the only thing that can be said about this information is that it is vaguely annalistic. A modern analogy would be the 365-day calendar on which one finds specific days recorded with the notations for “Easter,” “Victoria Day,” “Christmas Day,” and so on. While one expects to see calendars with the third Monday in May highlighted “Victoria Day,” one does not expect to see any further information about Queen Victoria other than perhaps the dates of her long reign.

4. Praedictiones Danielis

In contrast to the Somniale Danielis and the Lunationes Danielis, which while not particularly well-known to scholars of apocryphal literature have been nevertheless the subject of some sustained academic interest on the part of mediaevalists, the existence of the Praedictiones Danielis is almost completely unknown beyond the limited compass of the study of Greek astrological texts. Indeed, even the name of the text is artificial. The manuscript catalogues, which preserve the bulk of the scant evidence associated with this text, tend to employ terms such as “Danielis prophetae apocalypse”186 or “Apocalypsis Danielis.”187 The use of the term “apocalypse” is in part reflective of the fact that a few of the manuscript copies of the text preserve titles that call to mind the titles of several of the apocryphal Daniel

185 See Hübner, Zodiacus Christianus, 62: “Von Daniel beim Löwen und Jona bei den Fischen war bereits die Rede, weil diese beiden Parallelen schon früher belegt sind.” See also Tabelle 13 (at 66) and especially the comprehensive Tabelle 14 (at 72–73). Note, however, the anomaly at Tabelle 8 (at 46), where Daniel appears under sign of Capricorn.
The Praedictiones, however, is patently not an apocalypse. It is an anthological prognosticon, that is, it consists of a series of loosely related forecasts derived from the observation of various phenomena. With this in mind, the functional title of Praedictiones Danielis seems more apropos for this text than the more established but plainly inappropriate “Apocalypse Danielis.”

The form and content of the Praedictiones vary widely among the copies, with the differences among the texts centering on the quantity and nature of their forecasts. In its longest examples, the text consists of a series of twenty-five prognostica whose referents are primarily astronomical and meteorological phenomena—the movement and phases of the sun and the moon, the observation of lightning and seismic activity, and so on. In none of its various versions does the Praedictiones appear to contain a section that deals explicitly with the interpretation of dreams. This is markedly different from what we find with both the Somniale and the Lunationes.

The Praedictiones survives in at least thirteen Greek manuscript copies, although there is a high probability that more examples of the text have yet to be identified. Although there is a distinct possibility that it is preserved in oriental copies (see below), the Praedictiones does not appear to be extant in manuscript copies which are composed either in Latin or in the vernacular languages of mediaeval Western Europe. In this characteristic the Praedictiones again radically differs from both the Somniale and the Lunationes.

The Praedictiones Danielis is never intimately connected in manuscript to the Somniale and its Prologue in the way that many copies of the Lunationes are. The text generally stands alone, although in some codices devoted specifically to astronomical or astrological prognostica it is bound along with a copy of the Lunationes. In one

---

188 Cf. the ἤρασις προφήτου Δανιήλ of the copy listed in the preceding note.
189 Actually, “Prognostica Danielis” would have been a more accurate title, but this would likely cause confusion with the general subject of this Chapter.
191 Athínai, Bibl. Publ. cod. 1350 and Milano, BA cod. E.11 sup. It is unclear whether London, BL cod. Royal 16.C.ii preserves a copy of the Lunationes plus additional but unconnected prognostica (i.e., not a copy of the Praedictiones), or whether all the prognostica (including the lunation) is meant to function as the first section of a full-blown copy of the Praedictiones Danielis.
case, it is bound with a copy of the apocalypse *The Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel.*

The attribution of the *Praedictiones* varies with the copy consulted. In some cases it is associated with Daniel, in other cases it is ascribed to figures such as Orpheus or, in light of its claim to be an apocalypse, to Leo the Wise. Occasionally prefixed to the text are various prologues. Some of these are quite brief, others are longer and more detailed, but they are completely unlike the Prologue that is associated with the *Sommiae* and, through it, the *Lunationes.* Perhaps the most important of these prologues appears at Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France codex gr. 2316, fols. 380 verso to 381 recto:

This is an important statement, because it explains the post-biblical rationale for associating the *Praedictiones* with the biblical figure of

194 Cambridge, UL cod. Ll.4.12, fols. 89r–99r.
Daniel. It does this by clarifying the relationship between the author, Daniel, and the present form of the text. In a nutshell, we are told that the text originated from the pen of Daniel, was translated into Greek at the time of Ptolemy Philadelphos (284–246 BCE), was later transmitted into Arabic, and finally translated back into the Greek by Alexios of Byzantium. The reference to Ptolemy Philadelphos is significant in that, according to tradition, it was in Egypt during this time and at the king’s request that seventy-two elders of Israel translated the Hebrew Bible into Greek. What the prologue attempts to do, therefore, is to connect the Praedictiones Danielis with the Book of Daniel by means of a common transmission history involving the legendary history of the LXX, the argument being that if the Book of Daniel is genuine (as it is surely was), then so too was the Praedictiones.

Despite its obviously fictional elements, this transmission history might nevertheless provide a clue to the real origins of the text. It is possible that the Greek text which presumably stands behind these relatively late extant manuscript copies of the Praedictiones Danielis is also the Vorlage of the oriental prognosticon known as Malḥamat Dāniyāl. It must be stressed that any evaluation of this suggestion will require the identification of the full range of the available manuscript evidence, a study of the versions of both the Praedictiones and the Malḥamat, and a detailed analytical comparison of the two texts. It is presently unclear, for example, whether the Praedictiones and the Malḥamat—if indeed they are related—are copies of the same text or versions of related texts, or whether both texts in their present form represent later recensions of an original Greek (or Syriac or Arabic) Vorlage. At the same time, several items suggest that there might be some fundamental connexion between the Praedictiones and the Malḥamat. First, the information in the prologue of Bibliothèque Nationale de France codex gr. 2316 provides an explicit connexion with the general Arabic prognostic tradition. Second, both texts are anthological treatises, in contrast to the Somniale Danielis and Lunationes Danielis, which focus on one sort of forecasting. Third, both the Praedictiones and the Malḥamat are extant in manuscript copies whose varieties differ in their length and contents. Fourth, no variety of either text seems to contain a section on the interpretation of dreams.

197 See the Letter of Aristeas.
198 See §5, infra.
Finally, both texts are specifically concerned with the meaning of astronomical and meteorological phenomena.

5. Daniel Prognostica from the East

As I remarked in the introduction to this chapter, in the West the name of Daniel came to be associated with two types of prognostica. The Somniale Danielis and the Lunationes Danielis were products of the culture of mediaeval Europe and were seemingly unknown in the East beyond those geographic boundaries defined by the presence of the Latin- and Greek-speaking peoples. To be sure, the phenomena of dream interpretation and lunar prognostication were as widespread throughout the East as they were in the West. J.C. Lamoreaux demonstrates that dream manuals were quite common throughout the Arabic Muslim world, while lunar and other astronomical and astrological prognostica seemingly enjoyed a wide circulation in points south and east of Byzantium. At the same time, the Somniale and the Lunationes are extant in but a handful of Hebrew and Armenian copies of a very late date. In addition, there is only


201 There is one Hebrew copy of the Somniale at Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Vat. heb. 285, and perhaps another at London, BL cod. Harley 5686 (see M. Stein-schneider, “Das Traumbuch Daniels,” 196). In addition, Vat. heb. 285 contains a copy of the Lunationes. For a description of the Vatican copies and of the problems associated with their foliation, see DiTommaso, “Medieval Manuscripts.” It is further possible that a Hebrew copy of both the Somniale and the Lunationes exist in the Munchen libraries—Dream manual: (cod. 418) “אברית ופי אלבנת היל מאראל”; lunations: (cod. 289, fol. 139) תומיקס קtep קוסטמו קסרו . . . , Collectaneen . . . und Nativitäten nach den Monaten . . . und Bauernregeln über die Jahre . . . .” (reported by M. Stein-schneider, Die hebraischen Handschriften der K. Hof- und Staatsbibliothek in Muenchen (Munchen, 1895), 235, 151).

202 I know of two copies of the Somniale Daniélis in Armenian: i) Paris, BNF cod. armen. 307, fols. 91v–102v, on which see F. Macler, Catalogue des manuscrits arméniens et géorgiens (Paris, 1908), 159: “Explication des songes par le prophète Daniel”; note that Macler describes the text following (fols. 103r–114v) as “Autre traité sur le même sujet”; ii) Oxford, Bod. cod. armen. f.10, fols. 112–132, on which see S. Baronian and F.C. Conybeare, Catalogi codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae. Pars XIV:
one Coptic copy of the Somniale of which I am aware,\(^{203}\) while the Lunationes is preserved in perhaps a few Syriac copies.\(^{204}\) Apparently neither text survives in Aramaic, Arabic, Ethiopic, Georgian, Slavonic, or Turkish.\(^{205}\) The fact that the Hebrew and Armenian copies are

\(^{203}\) Oxford, Bod. cod. Maresch. 31 (cod. Copt. 2); see J. Uri, Bibliothecae Bodleianae codicum manuscriptorum orientalium, videlicet hebraicorum, chaldaicorum, syriacorum, aethiopico-rum, arabicorum, persicorum, turcicorum, copticorumque (Oxford, 1787), 318: “Somnium danielis Prophetae, cum Arabica interpretatione.”

\(^{204}\) There is a Vatican text listed in an old manuscript catalogue that might be a Syriac lunation. See J.S. Assemanus, Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae codicrum manuscriptorum catalogus. I.III: Complectens reliquos codices chaldaicos sive syriacos (Roma, 1759), 503 re no. 217: “Astrologia & Lunarium, Syriace fol. 92 [to 94].” I have not been able to verify whether this is a lunation proper (the index to the catalogue lists it as attributed to Daniel) or, more generally, a lunary. In the Syriac Book of Medicines, there are several lunations, although none are attributed to Daniel: (fol. 218r) \(\textit{incip.}\): “Every one who is attacked by sickness on the first day of the month recovereth on the second day . . .; \(\textit{expl.}\): “If he be attacked on the thirtieth day of the month, he will live.”; (fols. 218r–v) \(\textit{incip.}\): “First day of the moon. If he is breathing a little, the son of a day, he will live; and if he is altogether sick, he will not die . . .”; \(\textit{expl.}\): “Thirtieth day of the moon. Whether he eateth, or whether he eateth not, he will most assuredly die”; (fol. 226r) \(\textit{incip.}\): “First day of the moon. The whole day is propitious for going on a journey . . .”; \(\textit{expl.}\): “Thirtieth day of the moon. The whole day”; (fols. 226r–v) \(\textit{incip.}\): “Observe on what day the first day of the month beginneth. First day. Propitious for everything . . .”; \(\textit{expl.}\): “Thirtieth day. Good for everything”; (fols. 227r–229v) \(\textit{incip.}\): “First day of the moon. This day is good for business of all kinds . . . and the dream which a man seeth on this day will be fulfilled in two days’ time . . .” \(\textit{expl.}\): “Thirtieth day of the moon. This day is good for everything . . . And dreams dreamed on this day are bad. Keep thyself from them” (E.A.W. Budge, Syrian Anatomy, Pathology and Therapeutics, or “The Book of Medicines”. The Syriac Text, Edited from a Rare Manuscript, with an English Translation, etc. (London, 1913), 2.536–538, 556–558, 560–565).

\(^{205}\) The possibility is high that this statement is erroneous in its minor details, given the number of languages cited, the number of manuscripts preserved in each language, and the fact that the manuscript catalogues for these languages are not as well known as the catalogues for Greek and Latin manuscripts. But even if, for example, there is an Arabic copy of the Somniale Danielis or a Syriac copy of the Lunationes Danielis buried in a library somewhere, this would not change the fact that there are over 150 western manuscripts of the former and over 250 of the latter, and one or two or twelve eastern copies will not alter the conclusion that these
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of such a late date implies that these exemplars are late translations of the Somniale and the Lunationes from Western manuscripts rather than the only survivors of a long-standing tradition in Hebrew and Armenian.

Instead of the Somniale or the Lunationes, though, there was a remarkable and variegated assortment of divinatory texts attributed to Daniel which circulated primarily throughout the mediaeval Near and Middle East—particularly in Syriac Christian and Arabic Muslim circles—and which appears never to have spread farther west than the Bosporus. The scholarship on these Eastern Daniel prognostica is comparatively meagre, and it cannot be stressed strongly enough that the information presented in this section is meant as a preliminary survey designed to supplement the list of texts that F. Sezgin presents in the seventh volume of his comprehensive Geschichte des arabischen Schrifttums.207 Almost every fundamental question about these eastern Daniel prognostica remains at best only partially answered, including issues pertaining to their identification and the range of the extant manuscript evidence, the state of their relationship to each other, and their origins and transmission history.208 Our knowledge of many of these texts frequently relies on little more than a brief citation in a manuscript catalogue, and it is more than probable that what we consider to be separate texts by virtue of their seemingly distinct titles are in several cases actually versions or even copies of the same text.209

The most important and possibly the oldest of these eastern Daniel prognostica frequently appears under the title Malhamat Dāniyāl, that is, the Forecasts of Daniel or the Predictions of Daniel,210 which I have

---

206 No date is indicated in the catalogue for the Coptic Somniale.
208 This warning is repeated in the sections on these texts in the Inventory of Chapter Six.
209 Cf. the trenchant comments of Lamoreaux: “Whether by way of physiognomy, geomancy, palmistry, dream interpretation, or any of a dozen other methods, mediaeval Muslims evinced a lively interest in the arts of divination. The manuscript collection of the Muslim world are replete with hundreds of thousands of texts on these subjects. Despite their ubiquity, few have had the good fortune to attract the attention of researchers” (Muslim Dream Interpretation, 1).
210 On the term malāhim, see T. Fahd, La divination arabe: études religieuses, sociologiques et folkloriques sur le milieu natif de l’Islam (Leiden, 1966), 224; and S.A. Arjomand,
previously suggested might be related to or a later copy/version of the anthological Greek prognosticon *Praedictiones Danielis*. The *Malḥamat* is also known by the generic *Kitāb Dāniyāl* (*The Book of Daniel*) and as with the *Praedictiones* is sometimes associated with other biblical and historical figures besides Daniel.\(^{211}\) From what can be gleaned from the scattered and diverse sources, the *Malḥamat Dāniyāl* is extant in Arabic, Persian, and Syriac (Karshuni) copies that stem from both the Christian and the Islamic traditions.

The *Malḥamat Dāniyāl* is essentially an anthology of prognostica. Its forecasts tend to focus not only on astronomical phenomena, but also calendrical, meteorological, climactic, agricultural, and/or astrological ones. Unlike the *Somnilae Danielis* and the *Lunationes Danielis*, which almost always involve a personal rather than a corporate perspective (namely, events will occur to an individual rather than to a community or state), the prognostications in the *Malḥamat Dāniyāl* sometimes include those with a corporate aspect. Oddly for a prognosticon, a number of the versions of the text contain the sort of eschatological speculation and historical-political statements about dynasties and kings that one normally associates more with the biblical and apocryphal Daniel dreams and visions.\(^{212}\) This combination of divinatory prediction and eschatological expectation is seemingly unknown in western prognostica such as the *Somnilae* or the *Lunationes*.

In his magisterial study of divination in the Arabic tradition, T. Fahd argues that there are three recensions of the *Malḥamat*.\(^{213}\) The first recension contains what in western manuscript codices might be called a compendium of calendrical *compti* and sundry meteorological forecasts, the contents of which are worth listing:

---

\(^{211}\) See the history of *malḥama* literature in Fahd, 225–227. He observes that “ce genre de *malḥama* atteignit son apogée dans un écrit qui fit fortune à l’époque ottomane et dont il existe de nombreux témoins manuscrits et commentaires” (226).


\(^{213}\) Fahd, *La divination arabe*, 408–409.
Un corpus de ces signes et de leurs significations divinatoires nous est parvenu sous le nom de Malhama, attribuée au prophète Daniel, où des prédications sont tirées du premier janvier du calendrier chrétien, selon le jour de la semaine auquel il tombe, à commencer par le samedi [in this manuscript, fols.:] (58v–60r), des éclipses de soleil, selon les mois du calendrier chrétien, à commencer par avril (60r–60v), des éclipses de la lune, selon la même ordre (60v–61v), des éclairs (5v) [sic], du tonnerre (61v–63r), de l’apparation des halos autour du soleil (63r–63v) et autour de la lune (63v–64r), de l’arc-en-ciel (64r–64v), de l’apparition d’un signe dans le ciel (64v–65v), des tremblements de terre (65v).

The second recension is a fuller version of the first, with the addition of prognostica such as the Mansions of the Moon, forecasts relating to the observation of comets, and so on. The third recension, Fahd claims, is the longest one of all, and includes an introduction that expands the attribution of the prognosticatory material to a diverse assortment of biblical and ancient and contemporary historical figures traditionally associated with scientific endeavour.

Whether one can divide a rather open-ended text such as the Malḥamat Dāniyāl in this rigorous tripartite fashion is uncertain, especially in the light of the reality that an overall grasp of the manuscript evidence is not yet available. Sezgin, for example, argues that this evidence indicates that there are more than a dozen separate (and by implication unrelated) texts that only sometimes appear under the name Malḥamat. On the other hand, Sezgin’s classification appears
to run counter to the research of scholars such as M. Ullmann\(^{218}\) and J. den Heijer,\(^ {219}\) who list under the title of the *Malḥamat* many of the manuscripts that Sezgin seemingly considers to be copies of these other texts.

Certainly examples exist of shorter manuscript copies of the *Malḥamat* or *Malḥamat*-like texts that preserve different prologues and that do not appear to conform to one of Fahd’s three categories. There is a brief Arabic text located in the Library of the Coptic Patriarchate in Cairo (codex Theol. 260) in which one will find a *Vision of Daniel the Prophet*,\(^ {220}\) which despite its apocalyptic-sounding title appears to be nothing more than an abbreviated copy of the *Malḥamat* of clearly Egyptian provenance.\(^ {221}\) At the other end of the spectrum is a very long print edition of the text edited by A. Fodor.\(^ {222}\) Here the *Malḥamat* begins by describing how God taught Adam the science of forecasting the future, whereupon Adam transcribed his knowledge on tablets of baked clay—for nothing else would survive the Deluge that was to come—and deposited them in a cave that would open but one day each year. This of course is a version of the legend of the Cave of Treasures, and one on which we already have commented in the context of the two Ashmolean copies of the *Lunationes* associated with Adam and Daniel. Centuries after the Deluge, Daniel, having heard of this remarkable Cave and the special information stored therein, gathered forty pupils and set off from Jerusalem to the Cave to be there on the one day in the year that it opened.\(^ {223}\) Daniel and his band entered the Cave on the prescribed day and there they copied the information from the tablets of Adam (pp. 3–4). After this lengthy introduction the text continues with a description of the sort of knowledge that Daniel discovered, beginning with some general zodiacal data (pp. 4–6). This is followed by prognos-


\(^{219}\) den Heijer, “*Malḥamat Dāniyāl*.”


\(^{221}\) An Egyptian provenance for the text seems indicated by its sustained concern with the level of the Nile’s flooding and by continual reference to Egyptian place names.


\(^{223}\) On the tradition that Daniel left for the Cave from Jerusalem (and thus did so before he came to serve in the Babylonian court), see Chapter Two.
tica based on: the day of the week on which falls the Second Kanun, from Saturday to Friday (pp. 6–15); the sign of the zodiac (and the astronomical body associated with each sign) in which the new year begins (pp. 15–29); the month in which the Sun (pp. 29–33) and the Moon is eclipsed (pp. 33–38); the month in which a halo appears around the Moon (pp. 39–40) or the position of the new moon in each month (pp. 40–42); and the month in which earthquakes (pp. 42–44), lightning (pp. 44–45), rainbows (pp. 46–49), thunder (pp. 49–59), thunderbolts (pp. 59–64), comets and other celestial signs (pp. 64–71), and gale winds and sundry storms (pp. 71–75) occur. Towards the end of the text we find prognostica concerning the severity of winter and the occurrence of rain (pp. 76–78), prognostica based on the sign of the zodiac (pp. 78–80) or the month (pp. 80–84) in which the Moon is eclipsed, prognostica concerning the cold and fog (pp. 84–86), the day of the week upon which one falls ill (pp. 86–87) and comets (p. 88), and prognostica based on the day of the week on which falls the beginning of the month of Muharram, from Saturday to Friday (pp. 88–91), and on the day of the week on which falls the Festival of the Cross, from Saturday to Friday (pp. 91–93).

Clearly the order of the prognostica in the *Malḥamat* as they are presented in the lists of Fahd and Fodor are dissimilar. Although there are enough similarities among the various manuscript copies of the text to consider them part of the *Malḥamat* corpus, the differences in the sequence of their prognostic elements intimate a more complicated transmission history. What is more, the transmission-relationship among the discrete versions or recensions of the text need not be strictly linear. Rather, the evidence could instead suggest a more radial development, in that there was a common stock of *computi* and astronomical and meteorological phenomena from which various authors at different times drew to fashion the disparate copies of the *Malḥamat*. In this, perhaps, the transmission history of the *Malḥamat Dāniyāl* might echo that of the Byzantine apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles attributed to Daniel.

At the same time, and regardless of the exact nature of its transmission history, the *Malḥamat* never appears to contain either a dream manual or a lunation proper among its diverse contents. Notably, it shares this quality with the aforementioned Greek *Praedictiones Danielis*.

The issue of the number of copies and the problem with the versions or recensions in which the *Malḥamat Dāniyāl* is preserved are
only two of the many questions that surround this text. Its date and provenance also remain a mystery. Fodor argues that the Malḥamat originated in Syrian Christian circles in Ṭūr ʿAbdīn around the second half of the eleventh century (developing from the Assyrian-Babylonian Iqqur İpuš and the astrological portions of the Syriac Book of Medicines) and then moved into the Shiʿite communities of southern Iraq. Fodor bases his argument on this connexion between Adam, Daniel, and the Cave of Treasures and the Hermetic literature, and on the Malḥamat’s agricultural and horticultural data, linguistic features, confessional aspects, and historical allusions.

This theory of origins has been rightly questioned by G. Vajda, who demonstrates that Fodor’s linguistic evidence does not permit such specific conclusions, and by den Heijer, who among other things notes that the full extent of the manuscript evidence first needs to be consulted in order to determine whether this information about the Cave of Treasures appears in older copies of the text. Also open to question is the assumption that a solitary community was responsible for the creation of a compendium of astronomical and meteorological forecasts such as the Malḥamat when so many of the component elements of the text appear in widely diverse formats elsewhere (in both the East and the West) and well before the period indicated by Fodor. In addition, the agricultural and horticultural data cited by Fodor are far too general to imply a specific location and, besides, one cannot exclude the possibility that these elements in such a text are the product of accretion rather than creation. As for the historical allusions in the text that Fodor cites, they consist of largely unspecific references to kings and conflicts between the Arab Muslims and the Byzantines, and so are of a kind that per-

224 On the Book of Medicines, see note 204, supra.
225 Fodor, “Malḥamat Dāniyāl,” 90–96. But if the copy in the Coptic Patriarchate in Cairo is a version of the Malḥamat Dāniyāl, the conclusion is that this text (or at least certain versions of it) also spread into Egypt.
226 On the connexion between Daniel and Hermes, note the Kitāb Hīrnis, a “compendium of astrological lore usually bearing a title relating to the first treatise, which deals with the heliacal risings of Sirius and which is attributed to Hermes, but consisting mainly of sections attributed to Daniel” (D. King, A Survey of the Scientific Manuscripts in the Egyptian National Library (American Research Center in Cairo, Catalogs 5; Winona Lake, 1983), 27). King lists five MSS, at least one of these Christian, and notes that there are more.
227 G. Vajda, “Quelques observations sur la Malḥamat Dāniyāl,” Arabica 23 (1976), 85–87. For more on the Malḥamat, see note 284 infra.
mits identification with a variety of historical circumstances. That the Arabic is a translation from the Syriac is a distinct possibility, however, since in some Arabic copies the prognostica based on the months of the year are arranged according to the Syriac months.\footnote{229} Like all prognostica, the \textit{Malḥamat Dāniyāl} transcended religious boundaries easily. Den Heijer aptly describes it as a “popular astrological/meteorological divinatory text, and as such . . . not restricted to any particular confession.”\footnote{230} The manuscript evidence bears this out, with both Christian and Islamic variations of the text. The obvious question is whether this state of affairs sheds some light on the ultimate origin and subsequent development of the text. As for the eschatological elements which are preserved in some copies of the text, the major issue here is whether there might be a connexion between these elements and the eschatological data contained in the apocryphal Syriac and Arabic Daniel apocalypses. With respect to both queries, however, we are stymied by a woefully incomplete understanding of the evidence, and no conclusions can be offered at this time.

Yet, even if the text originated in the Syriac Christian tradition, the process of its incorporation into Muslim scientific circles might have run parallel with or otherwise might have been somehow related to the development of Muslim interest in \textit{fitan}, that is, civil disorders and wars, a topic explored in some detail in Chapter Three, Excursus II. S.A. Arjomand’s thoughts on this possibility are illuminating and worth quoting extensively:

With the civil wars of 656–661 and 680–692, the term \textit{fitan} was soon to become synonymous with \textit{malāḥim}—apocalyptic woes and tribulations on which a book is attributed to Daniel. I suggest that this tradition anachronistically renders \textit{malāḥim} as \textit{fitan}, but its referent is most probably the apocalyptic battles of the kings of the South and the North, and especially the battles of the end of time against the earthly kings in which the archangels Gabriel and Daniel will lead the army of angels against earthly kings (Dan. 10:13–12:1). The use of the term \textit{malāḥama} for the woes and tribulations of the end of time is striking. Its derivation from the Hebrew cognate, \textit{milhāmā} (‘war’), has not been explored; nor has the possible influence of the apocalyptic ‘War Rules’ in the Dead Sea Scrolls. . . . But if my reading of this tradition on the content of the book of Daniel is correct, the original derivation of the

\footnote{229} Thorndike, \textit{History}, 2.294, citing Alger codd. 1517 and 1518.\footnote{230} Den Heijer, “\textit{Malḥamat Dāniyāl},” 223.
Malāḥīm may be from the Danielic expression of the battles of the end of time. Others doubtless thought that the book also contained the eternal wisdom that the father of humanity, Adam, had hidden in the Treasure-Cave mentioned in the Syriac texts soon to be translated into Arabic . . . 231

Arjomand raises several issues, a few of which fall outside the compass of our investigation. 232 It could be, however, that on the basis of its eschatological elements—the “woes and tribulations at the end of time,” as Arjomand puts it—the Malḥamat Dāniyāl was part of a general blossoming of Islamic interest in apocalyptic ideas, another example of which was witnessed in the production of the Arab Muslim apocalypses. Whether this blossoming was precipitated by the discovery of Daniel’s tomb and the contents therein, by first contact and then war with the Byzantines 233 (and perhaps even by cross-pollination from the many Byzantine Greek Daniel apocalypses that also appeared at this time), or, as Arjomand suggests, by internecine strife in Muslim world, the underlying assumption is that the Malḥamat dates more from the eighth or ninth centuries than it does from the tenth or eleventh ones (pace Fodor). 234 Significantly, the Kitāb al-malāḥīm of Ibn al-Munāḍī, in which is embedded the Arabic Apocalypse of Daniel on the Events after al-Mu'tamid, 235 is dated to the first decades of the tenth century. If the story preserved in the text about the apocalypse’s being an older text is to be believed, we have another connexion among Daniel and eighth- or ninth-century malḥama literature.

At the same time, the Malḥamat Dāniyāl, as I suggested in the previous section, might represent the vernacular reflexes of the aforementioned Greek prognosticon, the Praedictiones Danielis, which were produced for and circulated around the mediaeval Muslim world. Much more work is required on the study of these two classes of texts, however, before any firm conclusions may be drawn.

Despite the many unanswered questions surrounding the origins, development, and characteristics of the Malḥamat Dāniyāl, it is the

---

231 Arjomand, “Islamic Apocalypticism in the Classical Period,” 244.
232 For example, the suggestion of a connexion between malḥama literature and the War Scroll (found in several manuscripts and copies among the Dead Sea Scrolls) is particularly tenuous.
234 For a discussion of all these hypotheses, see Chapter Three, Excursus II: “The Figure of Daniel and the Arabic Muslim Daniel Apocalypses.”
235 See Chapter Three, §2.18.
one text of its type to which some sustained academic research has been devoted. Indeed, the only common characteristic of the other Daniel prognostica from the East is that relatively very little is known about them.

There is a collection of geomantic texts that exist in Persian, Arabic, Syriac, Armenian, and Turkish manuscript copies and that have some connexion to the figure of Daniel the Prophet. The science of geomancy is one where divination is effected by means of figures and lines or geographic features. In the Arabic tradition this science is called *raml*, a term also seen in transcription spelled as *reml*, *remel*, or *rumul* (with and without diverse diacritica). The full extent of these Daniel geomantic prognostica is unknown, as is their history, development, and characteristics beyond what one finds included in manuscript catalogues, and to the best of my knowledge they have not been the subject of sustained academic enquiry.

Brief as these catalogue descriptions are, however, they do help illuminate the nature of this elusive text. For example, there is in British Library codex Add. 9702, fols. 1–45, a Turkish “book of Remel ascribed to Daniel, with the heading . . . The figures used in that mode of divination consist of sixteen combinations of dots and lines.” One manuscript in the possession of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal is described as “Ṣḥajari-i-pur Thamara. Another treatise on divination by *raml*, based on the apocryphic [sic] book of

---


237 There are several manuscript codices, for example, in the Vatican Library devoted to astronomical and astrological texts which contain tables of chance, usually revolving around the various combinations of throws of the dice (with six, eight, or even ten pips), each throw indicating a different forecast. On the subject in general, see A.C. Merriam, “Divination by Dice-Throwing,” *American Antiquarian and Oriental Journal* 7 (1885), 184; and W.L. Brackman, *Fortune-Telling by the Casting of Dice* (Scripta 4; Bruxelles, 1981).

238 On the manuscripts, see the Inventory of Chapter Six and note 284 infra.

239 Fahd, *La divination arabe*, 196–204, discusses geomancies—and refers to some of the authors cited by the descriptions in the manuscript catalogues—but does not mention Daniel in this context. See also the quotation by B. d’Herbelot at note 249, infra.

Daniel, while another is identified as a “treatise on raml, based on the book of Daniel. The author calls himself merely Surkhāb.”

I have uncovered references to possibly three additional copies in the Vatican manuscript holdings: codex Vat. arab. 1106, fols. 93 verso to 98 recto, a text which is entitled “k.[itāb] Al-Qur’a ar-ramliyya di Dānīyāl (Daniele)”, codex Barb. pers. 533, fols. 2 to 70, described as a “Recueil de données astrologiques, suivi d’une série de prognostications (Kitāb ar-raml), le tout attribué à Daniel le prophète . . . en garğūnī”, and codex Vat. pers. 107, fols. 2 to 70, identified as “Kitāb-i ramal-i Dānīyāl, trattato o raccolta di trattati di geomanzia, in turco, senza nome d’autore.”

These descriptions suggest several preliminary conclusions about the Daniel geomantica. First, some copies appear to be anthological. Second, they are not always attributed to Daniel and, indeed, as with several of the copies of the Malḥamat Dānīyāl, a few of these geomantic texts are found under the name of a collection of authors. Some of these authors are ancient, others are more contemporary, still others might not even be pseudonymous, as we find with this “Surkhāb,” a name that is frequently associated with other geomantic texts. The situation here is analogous perhaps to what we encountered with the Venerable Bede and the strange attribution to him of the text De minutione sanguinis.

The implication is that there was a storehouse of geomantic traditions which were often drawn upon for incorporation into discrete texts. Some of these texts were longer, some were shorter. Some were attributed to the figure of Daniel, others were merely based on Daniel’s knowledge, as if the prophet stood at the head of a long line of scientific tradition whose culmination in the field of geomancy were these texts. While it would be seriously unwarranted to include

242 Ibid., no. 1518.1, 709: Calcutta, Asiatic Society MS J.9, fols. 1v–34v.
244 A. van Lantschoot, Inventaire des manuscrits syriaques des fonds Vatican (490–631) Barberini oriental et Neofiti (S&T 243; Città del Vaticano, 1965) 57–58.
245 E. Rossi, Elenco dei manoscritti Persiani della Biblioteca Vaticano (S&T 136; Città del Vaticano, 1948).
246 Cf. the analogous situation with the eleventh-century dream manual of Dinawarī, which used extensively the traditions ascribed to Daniel (Lamoreaux, Muslim Dream Interpretation, 62).
all the Eastern geomancies under the general rubric of Daniel apocrypha, the presence of geomancies under Daniel’s name or somehow based on his knowledge cannot be ignored, either. For both the Malhamat Dāniyāl and these Daniel geomantica, the key element is the figure of Daniel and how this figure was understood in the post-biblical period.

Perhaps related to the Daniel geomantica is a text called the Qur’at Dāniyāl. According to Fahd, “dans la Qur’at Dāniyāl, ce sont les nombres, formulés en deux phrases, qui servent à la qu’ra; elles sont disposées de la manière suivant [here appears a table of two columns of words]. Une explication détermine la signification de ces formules, explication reprise en vers introduits par qâla r-rāgīz.”

Another eastern prognosticon associated with Daniel is a dream-text called variously Kitāb al-usūl li-Dāniyāl al-ḥakīm (The Book of Principles of Daniel the Sage) or Uṣul al-ta’bir li-Dāniyāl (The Principles of Interpretation [of Dreams] of Daniel). A few scholars mention this work in passing, others cite a manuscript or two. I have never encountered an edition or a translation of this text, and the one truly noteworthy item about it that I have been able to uncover is that Fahd discusses the text in the light of the Greek copies of the Somniale Danielis published by E. de Stoop and F. Drexel. It is uncertain whether Fahd means to imply that this Kitāb al-usūl is an Arabic copy of the Somniale or whether he was simply indicating that the Arabic text is of the same type (e.g., a dream manual) as these Greek manuscript copies. Whatever the case, the Kitāb al-usūl li-Dāniyāl al-ḥakīm does not exist in any great numbers; Fahd cites one copy in Berlin,

---

247 Unlike the Lunationes Danielis, where we could identify a specific type of lunar prognostica and definitely assign it to the Daniel apocrypha.
248 Fahd, La divination arabe, 218.
250 Fahd, La divination arabe, 335. On the Greek texts of the Somniale, see note 27, supra.
251 There is a text preserved at Istanbul, Bağdati Vehbi Kütüphanesi 2234, fols. 16r–20v, whose title Sezgin records as K. Dāniyāl al-ḥakīm (Geschichte, 7.315, re his no. 7). Whether this is the same text, I do not know.
and there is perhaps an additional copy in Paris. Thus even if the text is indeed an Arabic copy of the *Somniale*, it stands more with the handful of Hebrew manuscript copies as an interesting anomaly rather than as evidence for the widespread transmission of the *Somniale* to the East. Notably, the *Somniale* is not mentioned except in passing in Lamoreaux’s study of early Muslim dream interpretation.

A similarly mysterious text associated with Daniel is the *Kitāb al-Jafar*, that is, the *Book of Numerology*. In his book *Les Prairies d’Or*, Masudi mentions a certain Daniel, who lived during the time between Noah and Abraham, to whom may be attributed the various scientific writings, the eschatological predictions, and foretellings of the fortunes of kingdoms, and to whom is ascribed this “*Kitab el-Djefr*” [*sic*]. Why all these writings were ascribed to an “elder Daniel” rather than to the familiar one who operated at the Babylonian court is unclear, since all are of the sort one traditionally finds associated with Daniel the Prophet. A more trustworthy analysis is offered by Arjomand, who writes: “Numerology is an ancient technique for the calculation of the predetermined future. Its reception in Islam as the science of *Jafir* was quite early, that science being attributed to Daniel and also to the sixth Shi‘ite Imam, Ja‘far b. Muhammad, presumably on account of the red leather bag known as the *jafir*,” and again: “It is interesting to note that Ibn Abī Tāhir’s treatise in political astrology is followed, in the same manuscript, by the Book of Jafir, ‘extracted from the Books of Daniel and Solomon, son of David’.” Regarding the text cited by Arjomand, London, British

---


253 Lamoreaux, *Muslim Dream Interpretation*. Note, esp., his Appendix, “Early Muslim Dream Manuals” (175–181), which does not refer to the *Somniale*.


255 Arjomand, “Islamic Apocalypticism,” 265.

Library cod. Or. 426 [Add. 7473], the British Museum catalogue of Oriental manuscripts provides the title “Operis Astrologici pars secunda” and translates its Arabic prologue into Latin:


One will note that several astrological elements familiar to western astronomical/astrological codices appear in this prologue and that the text appears either to be anthological or to have drawn eclectically from various sources. But nothing more can be said about this text.

M.H. Goshen-Gottstein lists an eighteenth or nineteenth-century Syriac manuscript in the Harvard Library, MS Syr 161. He describes the text as a “book of magic, diagnosis and prognosis of illnesses, attributed to the Prophet Daniel and to Ezra the Scribe.” It is uncertain whether a Syriac version of the Lunationes is part of this treatise.

There is a brief Persian text on divination and astrology which is preserved in the Bodleian Library and which is said to be “extracted from the book of the prophet Daniel.” Whether this is an excerpt from the Malhamat Dāniyāl or any of the other known Daniel prognostica or represents something new, I do not know.

Several types of Daniel prognostica exist in the Turkish tradition in addition to the geomantica.

---

257 Arjomand cites fol. 63r; the Catalogue fol. 64.
258 Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum orientalium. Pars secunda, codices arabicos amplectens (London, 1846), 206.
259 Goshen-Gottstein, M.H., Syriac Manuscripts in the Harvard College Library: A Catalogue (HSS 23; Missoula, 1979), 104. The text was first described by J.T. Clemons, “A Checklist of Syriac Manuscripts in the United States and Canada,” OCP 32 (1966), 224–251 at 236 [re MS 37], but no mention is made of Daniel.
261 On all the texts listed in this paragraph, see the Inventory of Chapter Six, re the Excursus, “Sundry Turkish Daniel Apocrypha.” Several other Ottoman texts
fols. 13–19 contains a medical treatise “in tabulated form showing the omens to be drawn from throbblings in various parts of the body . . . [it] gives, in five columns, the import assigned to the throbblings by Ja’fer Şādik, the prophet Daniel [etc.] . . .”262 One wonders whether western medical lunations played a role in the connexion made here between Daniel and physiological forecasting. Fols. 355 verso to 356 recto of the codex turc supp. 245 in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France preserve a text described as a “traité de prédictions d’après le prophète Daniel, en turc, disposé sous la forme de tableaux.”263 Finally, two Turkish texts associated with Daniel and mantic functions appear in the manuscript catalogues to the old Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin.264

6. General Observations

Despite the fact that there were scores of different divinatory texts which circulated throughout ancient and mediaeval Europe and the Near and Middle East, the figure of Daniel the Prophet came to be associated with only a few specific types. In the West, these were the Somniale Danielis and the Lunationes Danielis.265 Both texts were probably composed originally in Greek in late antiquity and in the context of biblical and classical ideas of the interpretation of dreams, visions, and astronomical and astrological phenomena. Both are preserved in a great number of manuscript copies—over 150 extant copies of the Somniale and over 250 of the Lunationes—and were extraordinarily popular in Western and Northern Europe from at least

---

262 C. Rieu, Catalogue of the Turkish Manuscripts in the British Museum (London, 1888), 134.
265 There is at least one copy of the Mansions of the Moon that is attributed to Daniel: Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal cod. 2872, fols. 394r–397r (Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France. Paris: Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal (Paris, 1885–1889), 3.136). To the best of my knowledge, this is the only copy of this text (which exists in many hundreds of copies) that is attributed to Daniel, and thus we must characterise the attribution as idiosyncratic rather than paradigmatic.
the ninth or tenth century to well into the age of print. Although there are exceptions, in most cases these two texts were bound in manuscript codices that wholly or in part were devoted to astronomical and astrological observation and prognostica, with medical lunations sometimes included in medical codices. In a significant minority of instances the two texts appear side-by-side in manuscript and share the same Prologue. Despite their disparate contents, the element that linked them in the mind of the copyists is the figure of Daniel; more specifically, Daniel the interpreter of dreams.

In the East the situation was slightly different. Although the same broad restrictions seem to have applied to the sort of texts with which Daniel could be associated, the corpus of prognostica was comparatively larger and the range somewhat broader. In both the West and the East one encounters manuscript codices devoted to scientific topics, but whereas in the former the general tendency was for individual texts to be titled and attributed separately, in the East it seems that there was a greater trend towards anthological treatises. With respect to the Daniel prognostica specifically, the *Somniale* and *Lunationes* are discrete texts: one deals with dreams and their interpretations from A to Z, the other with the thirty days of the month, and very rarely is there another type of divination text prefixed or appended to either text. While they might share a Prologue and so attribution to Daniel, the *Somniale* and *Lunationes* are unquestionably separate from the *Mansions of the Moon*, the *Supputatio Esdrae*, and rest of the prognostica, even when they all these texts appear alongside each other in the same codex. In contrast, the East was home to collective treatises such as the *Malhamat Dāniyāl* and the various Daniel geomantica, where under the name of Daniel were collected a whole range of divinatory elements, the sequence and inclusion of which could vary depending on the manuscript copy consulted. We should also include in this category the *Praedictiones Danielis*, which, as we have seen, is not preserved in manuscript copies composed in the languages of Western Europe.

One difference, therefore, between the western and the eastern Daniel prognostica is a developmental one that is related to the issues

266 And, in some cases, beyond. One finds lunations and weather prognostica in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century almanacs and other literature of that sort.

267 Notably, neither appears in manuscript alongside a copy of the Book of Daniel, as we sometimes find with a few of the apocryphal Daniel apocalypses.
of form and function. In the West the function of a prognosticon was more rigidly subordinate to its form. In form all lunations are alike; in function they are radically different. There are lunations that deal with medical issues, matters of personal fortune, or with questions pertaining to whether dreams will come true or whether fugitives will be apprehended. But the form of the lunation is precisely the same in all such cases and, moreover, the attribution to Daniel is no more prevalent for one type of lunation than it is for any of the others. The same is true for the Somniale, whose form remained the same no matter how many of the individual dreams were added, subtracted, or reworked. In the eastern Daniel prognostica, however, form tended to be sacrificed more to function by virtue of this inclination to anthological treatises. If an author of a Malḥamat wanted to include forecasts revolving around the meaning of comets or to subtract predictions based on the interpretation of rainbows, he simply added them to his text, all the while maintaining the attribution to Daniel.

In both the West and East, however, and whether Daniel’s name was associated with the Somniale, the Lunationes, or an anthological treatise on divination, the implication was that Daniel stood near the head of a long line of scientific tradition. Daniel could interpret dreams and visions and had ten times the skill of the other types of Babylonian wise men—this the Bible said. But if in the Book of Daniel he is the wise man without peer, we must also recognise that in the court tales of Daniel 1–6 he gains his special knowledge from God, as a result of his resolute courage and steadfast piety in the face of mortal oppression. He is granted knowledge of the hidden mysteries by virtue of his enduring faith.

In the prognostica, however, just as in the apocryphal Daniel apocalypses, much of the overt expressions of this basic connexion between faith and knowledge is lost. But whereas in the apocryphal apocalypses the loss of the link between faith and knowledge was not replaced by anything else, there is in these Daniel prognostica an additional sense of Daniel as a scientist, however crudely that term

---

268 Or sometimes Daniel was understood to have collated the science and wisdom of the philosophers and wise men antecedent to him; cf. an Armenian copy of a Daniel geomanticon, which according to its description in the catalogue begins: “[The] wisdom of ancient philosophers, expounded by Daniel the Prophet, how to know good and evil, and beware of the latter” (Baronian and Conybeare, Catalogue of the Armenian Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, cols. 236–237).
was understood a thousand years ago. We encounter this understanding in the ways that the Daniel prognostica were plainly understood to be scientific texts. They were frequently grouped in manuscript with other texts pertaining to the study of and forecasts from astronomical, astrological, meteorological, and other phenomena, and were also bound in codices of like material. The prologues to these texts, where they exist, communicate less the biblical connexion between faith and knowledge and more the simple fact that Daniel was fundamentally knowledgeable. In certain prologues, particularly in such collective treatises such as the Malhamat Dāniyāl, the Daniel geomantica, and even the Turkish treatise on the “throbbings” of the body, the figure of Daniel is grouped with other biblical, mythological, and historical figures to whom others have attributed great knowledge.

Prognostica are by nature scientific texts. Their contents imply patient observation and careful calculation and the information they contain is assumed for the most part to be universal. All these elements are hallmarks of the scientific method and from these simple procedures were born modern science and medicine. S.W. Hawking remarks that “the whole history of science has been the gradual realization that events do not happen in an arbitrary manner, but that they reflect a certain underlying order, which may or may not be divinely inspired.” The prognostica thus represent an important intermediate stage in the worldview that postulates that all knowledge ultimately comes from God. The figure of Daniel in the prognostica operates not simply as a wise man whose abilities are God-given, but also as an empirical scientist. This is not to suggest that the view of Daniel as scientist was no longer governed by this postulate that knowledge derives from God. Rather, there is an additional element of wisdom that fundamentally if only implicitly underpins these prognostica, a biblical wisdom that is anthropocentric as well as empirical, repeatable, and universal. Daniel has figured things out for himself, so to speak. He does this using his God-given talents, to be sure, but also with the benefit of his own reason and common sense. What is more, the results of his observations are codified in texts such as the Somniale and Lunationes and are ready to be employed by subsequent generations of scientists and physicians—this, after all, is the function of such prognostica. In the cases of the anthological

---

269 S.W. Hawking, A Brief History of Time. From the Big Bang to Black Holes (New York, 1988), 122.
treatises attributed to several wise men of the past, Daniel’s observations are simply an important part of a larger compendium of similar scientific observations. Indeed, texts such as the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal’s MS 1506, whose contents represent a seeming florilegium of scientific observations drawn from the researches of past wise men, clearly imply this as well. The underlying hermeneutic is diachronic, not synchronic: it relies on a view of knowledge characterised not by what the historian of mediaeval technology L. White, Jr. once called the “flat contemporary view of phenomena” common to engineers or to social scientists, but rather by an implicit belief of science as both process and progress. The figure of Daniel as it is both expressed and implied in the prognostica is understood to be part of this dynamic.

I do not mean to draw too sharp a line between Daniel the wise man in the biblical tradition and Daniel the scientist in the postbiblical one. Again, one must assume that the conception that God is the ultimate origin of Daniel’s special knowledge exists in the postbiblical prognostica, despite the lack of the sort of overt connexion one finds in the Book of Daniel. At the same time, too, the biblical figure of Daniel is no mere cipher, the mindless voice of God to the Babylonians, the Medes, and the Persians, and from there to generations of later kings and kingdoms. Ten times as clever as his Babylonian counterparts, Daniel employs both his intelligence and ability to reveal mysteries to resolve situations. This is seen most clearly in the apocryphal story of Susanna, where the angel of the Lord or God himself provides the impetus for Daniel to act on behalf of the accused, but the manner in which Daniel acts as a detective is a model of common sense and judicious wisdom. Moreover, I cannot fully agree with R. Gnuse that “the art of [dream] interpretation is connected only with Joseph and Daniel where special effort goes into attributing the power of interpretation to God, so that Joseph and Daniel appear as prophets not oneirocritics.” True, Daniel is not a paradigmatic oneirocritic in the Hebrew Bible, but he is chief of a group of wise men whom the Book of Daniel takes

---

pains to explain were specialists in various fields of scientific endeavour, including the science of dream interpretation. And it is a science; otherwise we must attribute the powers of these Babylonian wise men to divine fiat, and this would undermine the connexion between faith and special knowledge that stands at the heart of the court tales of Daniel 1–6.273

For all this, though, little of Daniel’s actions in the Bible call to mind the figure that stands behind the prognostica, and unless one approaches it with an overarching purpose,274 the information revealed in the dreams and visions of the book of Daniel cannot be used in a scientific or anthological sense. Daniel reveals dreams in the Bible, but he functions more as a court magus than as a scientist, dispensing one-time dream interpretations to kings on their royal command rather than compiling a corpus of divinatory knowledge for posterity. Therefore, even though the implication is there in the Book of

273 For this reason I cannot agree with R.G. Wooden, who argues that, in distinction from the Babylonian wise men who indirectly divined messages sent by the gods, Daniel is presented as one who receives revelations directly from God (“The Witness of Daniel in the Court of the Kings,” “You Will Be My Witnesses.” A Festschrift in Honor of the Reverend Dr. Allison A. Trites on the Occasion of His Retirement (edd. R.G. Wooden, et al.; Macon, GA, 2003), 30–52 (cf. note 82, supra, and the text to which this note refers). There is no reason to draw such a sharp line between Daniel and the Babylonian wise men. Daniel can be a wise man, skilled in all the divinatory arts and even be ten times better at it than his Babylonian counterparts, and yet still receive divine revelation. Daniel 4, which Wooden does not address in any detail, is a good example where Daniel essentially functions as an straight-forward interpreter of dreams. Indeed, Wooden himself admits that the Book of Daniel stresses that Daniel was a member of the guild of Babylonian wise men, and the distinctions he highlights between Daniel and the Babylonians (Daniel is a Jew, he is the recipient of divine favour, and he alone receives divine revelations in Daniel 2) do not really speak to his central argument of this sharp dichotomy. The figure of Daniel as the recipient of divine revelation of course cannot be ignored, and Wooden is quite right to remind us of its import. But the transformation from wise man to seer of apocalyptic visions was a process, and the Book of Daniel records several of its stages. My point is that the final redaction of the Book never fully harmonised what essentially was a changing understanding of the nature and role of Daniel, and it seems to me that any effort to maximise the revelatory aspects of Daniel the Wise of Daniel 1–6 is too informed by the portrait of Daniel the Seer of Daniel 7–12. I will have more to say on this topic in a future study. Also, to keep things in perspective, we should recall the topic of this chapter is the Daniel prognostica, and it is quite clear that its authors (and many copyists) obviously considered him to be a functioning classic dream interpreter of the highest skill.

274 E.g., a Christian Praeparatio wherein passages from the Hebrew Bible thought be foretelling the advent of Jesus Christ would be collected and which would include the Son of Man portions of the Book of Daniel.
Daniel that the Prophet has scientific credentials, the fruits of these credentials is not science. In sum, therefore, the understanding of Daniel as a scientist is not biblical, but it is post-biblical, and thus represents a critical extrapolation of his character and abilities beyond the information contained in the biblical record.

Daniel was not an expert in all types of knowledge, however, and here the limitations of this extrapolation from the biblical record are met. There is nothing in the Book of Daniel to indicate that he was a court astrologer or that he received oracular visions as did the Sibyl. He is a scientist, but his field of scientific enquiry is somewhat delimited by his description in the Book of Daniel, which itself is circumscribed by the comparison with the wise men of Babylon (and, implicitly, by the various groups of these wise men). Daniel’s knowledge and proficiency were restricted to specific fields of study. That this was true in every case is impossible to say, but a general statement to this effect can be made. Such a statement is based, in a positive sense, on the reconstruction of the post-biblical rationale in the cases of the Somniale, the Lunationes, and the Malkamat, and also, in a negative sense, by the distinct lack of certain types of late antique and mediaeval texts associated with him. There are no oracular Daniel texts, nor are there magical or demonological ones. Daniel’s name never appears at the head of mathematical or musical treatises—of which there are many in both the Western and Eastern manuscript tradition—nor is it ever associated with such activities as animal husbandry, wine-making, alchemy, or sorcery.

The characteristics that made prognostica part of the science of the day also ensured their ready transmission across confessional and schismatic boundaries. The Somniale and the Lunationes likely originated in areas under the general influence of the Eastern Christianity, but quickly found a home among the lands of Western Christendom. Many of the Daniel prognostica from the East are preserved in both Christian and Islamic copies, which should come as no surprise given the ease with which science transcended linguistic and cultural differences in the Middle Ages.²⁷⁵ Unlike the apocryphal Daniel legends and apocalypses, where sometimes one can find evidence of

²⁷⁵ An excellent example of this phenomenon is the pagan Greek scientific texts of antiquity, many of which were preserved in Muslim manuscripts, and which over the long twilight of the mediaeval period were re-introduced from these manuscripts to Western Christendom.
the religious attitudes of the community which produced them, the Daniel prognostica tend not to preserve such information.

Along with their ability to cross confessional boundaries was the prognostica’s capacity to endure. The Hebrew Bible frowned upon divination (Deut 18:14–15, Isa 44:25; Jer 14:14, 27:9–10, etc.) and the only reference to fortune-telling in the New Testament (Acts 16:16–19) is whole-heartedly derogatory. At the same time, and running parallel to this “official” stance, the practice of divination, augury, and the use of magic thoroughly permeated the ancient and mediæval worlds. Among many other elements, there are Jewish incantation bowls from Hellenistic Egypt, manuscript illuminations of Christian priests practicing divination, and a slew of widely diverse magic and prognostic texts in many languages. The precise relationship between the “official” stance and this mass of texts and customs is beyond the scope of this chapter, but whatever it might be, the Daniel prognostica form a part of a scientific tradition that existed alongside, and probably to some degree within, the strictures of the biblical tradition.

In a recent, important essay, R.M. Liuzza argues that because prognostica were suited to the rhythms of monastic life, they flourished even in an era where fortune-telling and divination were normally condemned. In this context prognostic texts served many functions: as much-needed medical reference works, as manuals for calculating the age of the moon (a facet of clerical training), as vectors between celestial observation and ecclesiastical observance, or, more generally, as a way in which churchmen could relate to the members of their flocks on an everyday level. For Liuzza, the fact that prognostica were produced and used regularly in church circles suggests

---

276 E.g., some of the Byzantine Greek Daniel apocalyptica preserve indications of their iconophile or iconoclastic tendencies.

277 So Susan L’Engle of the Vatican Film Library informs me in a personal conversation.

278 But note the conclusion to the recent essay by I. Moreira, “Dreams and Divination in early Medieval Canonical and Narrative Sources: The Question of Clerical Control,” Catholic Historical Review 84 (2003), 621–642 at 642: “[The] picture provided by the prescriptive sources points to a clergy relatively uninterested in regulating non-clerical dream interpreters…” Moreira, who does not discuss the Somniale, also notes that the clergy did not have the de facto means to assert control had they wanted to, nor was there a normative “Christian culture” of dreaming [the term is hers] against which non-clerical modes of dream interpretation could be qualified and, if necessary, proscribed.

279 Liuzza, “Anglo-Saxon Prognostics in Context” (note 107, supra).
their central rather than peripheral place within mediaeval culture and social systems.\textsuperscript{280}

The popularity of the Daniel prognostica endured for a long time, perhaps over ten or eleven centuries in the west, and even longer in the east. They were the last of the three great types of Daniel apocrypha to emerge in the post-biblical period\textsuperscript{281} and they were the last to depart. The \textit{Somniale} was a popular text in incunabula, as was to a lesser extent the \textit{Lunationes}, and in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries one could still find surviving examples of both genres in the printed farmer’s almanacs and the related quasi-folklorish and often mawkish compendia of the “Secret Lore of the Ancients” type.\textsuperscript{282} In the east, Fodor reports that printed copies of the \textit{Malhamat} were being sold by street book-vendors well into the third quarter of the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{283}

The doom of these Daniel prognostica was the result of the same broad and complex changes in attitudes about the nature and dynamics of underlying causes that also spelled the end for the production of the apocryphal Daniel apocalypses. Simply put, prognostica have no part to play in the modern world outside their popular, uncritical applications. More specifically, their demise was precipitated by the redefinition of the concept of agency and the examination of the formal differences between correlation and causal relationships that gradually took place during the Renaissance, the Enlightenment, and the scientific revolution. It slowly came to be understood that humans and human behaviour could no longer be thought of in terms of the relatively simplistic causal formulations based on the observation of terrestrial and celestial phenomena. As a result, the study of humankind largely moved from what was considered science to what would become later known as the social sciences or the humanities. A few disciplines proved to be exceptions to the rule, managing to

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{280} \textit{Ibid.}, 196: the proliferation of prognostica “must be considered as a consequence, though no doubt an unintended one, of the tenth-century monastic reform—not at its margins but in its midst.” Although Liuzza’s focus is on Anglo-Saxon England, it is borne out by the MS evidence as valid for Western Europe in general.
  \item \textsuperscript{281} Although, of course, prognostica as a genre are extremely ancient.
  \item \textsuperscript{282} E.g., Godfridus, \textit{The Book of Knowledge of Things Unknown} (1530?, 1588, and later published with \textit{The Husbandman’s Practice} (1673, 1676, 1688, 1743)); N. Powell, \textit{The New Universal Fortune-Teller; or, Complete Book of Fate} (London, 1730?); and W. Lilly, \textit{The Book of Knowledge of the Wisdom of the Ancients Written by Erra Pater} (Glasgow, 1780). See also Förster, “Beiträge VIII,” 26–30.
  \item \textsuperscript{283} Fodor, “Malhamat Daniyal,” 86.
\end{itemize}
keep the study of certain aspects of humanity a science. Medicine is one such discipline, the study of the mind is another. But in both cases these disciplines had to re-examine their foundations, and what could not be justified in the light of the new scientific rigour was discarded. Medical prognoses were no longer offered on the basis on which day of the month it happened to be, but rather on a more nuanced comprehension of physiological functions, germ theory, and now gene theory. In psychiatry, dreams no longer foretold an individual’s future but instead revealed his or her past. This fundamental re-examination of foundations also occurred with meteorology and the agricultural sciences; here again the comparatively simplistic formulations of the prognostica were incrementally but steadily replaced by approaches more grounded in modern science and technology.

In the end, the Daniel prognostica simply were no longer relevant. Their primary function—communicating knowledge of the future in a coherent manner—had become a casualty of the gradual transformation of the mediaeval world into the modern one. At the same time, however, their existence and popularity testify not only to the influence they once held but also to the way in which the biblical figure of Daniel sparked the imagination of dozens of generations of humanity across Europe and the Near and Middle East.\textsuperscript{284}

\textsuperscript{284} At the eleventh hour I encountered the transcription and translation of “A Judeo-Arabic Version of the Predictive Book Malḥamat Dāniyāl” in Y. Tobi, \textit{The Jews of Yemen} (ÉJM 21; Leiden/Boston, 1999), 242–254. He cites two copies at Jerusalem, Hebrew University Ben-Zvi Institute cod. 3203, fols. 2r–4r and 26r–30v. The text, on which he comments briefly (citing only Fodor and Vajda) is an abbreviated version of the \textit{Malḥamat}, containing a forecast based on the day of the week on which Second Kānūn Falls and a brontologion. He does not mention the \textit{Praedictiones} but notes (on p. 244) a copy of the \textit{Kitāb al-Raml}, the geomantic text attributed to Daniel.
Despite appearing at a relatively late stage in the biblical tradition, the figure of Daniel—wise man, model of faithfulness, interpreter of dreams, and seer of visions—proved remarkably popular. One of the few truly post-exilic characters, the figure of Daniel had by the first decades of the second century BCE become associated with a wide variety of court tales and revelatory visions, not all of which were included in the circa 164 BCE redaction of the final form of the MT book that bears his name. Moreover, within a few short generations, the material in MT Daniel was accorded the same authoritative status that had been granted to the books of great Israelite prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel.

The figure of Daniel also enjoyed what arguably was the greatest post-biblical afterlife of any biblical figure. The Greek witnesses to the Book of Daniel represented the first such manifestation, although many of the Additional stories and the variant versions of the court tales themselves likely antedated the final redaction of the MT text—it is merely because they are extant only in the Greek witnesses that we tend to consider them to be post-MT creations. What is more, LXX Daniel itself came to be considered authoritative and a fundamental part of Greek Bibles, and it was in this venue that the biblical story of Daniel enjoyed its greatest and most far-reaching influence.

MT and LXX Daniel very much fixed the basic contours of the story of Daniel, the character of the figure of Daniel, and the shape of all subsequent literature devoted to or associated with the figure.1

1 One example of the manner in which the Book of Daniel affected all subsequent apocrypha is witnessed in the continuity of the ways in which the Book of Daniel exhibits three distinct modes by which the knowledge of the future is revealed through the figure of Daniel: dream interpretation (Daniel 2 and 4), waking-vision interpretation (Daniel 5), and the apocalyptic revelation of dreams and visions (Daniel 7–12), the last type mediated by an angelic figure and communicated in the first person. There is no sense that the distinction among the modes reflected current Jewish, Greek, or Near Eastern attitudes regarding the revelation of the future, nor
But the relationship between the biblical text and the post-biblical apocrypha was not simply one of source and stream. The focus of this study was the identification and investigation of the apocryphal Daniel literature and its relationship with the Book of Daniel, and not the process by which the Book of Daniel came to be considered authoritative and/or canonical. Nevertheless, the relative lateness of the final redaction of MT Daniel, the *realia* of the material evidence, and the observations recorded in the three previous chapters suggest that the relationship between biblical character and the post-biblical literature devoted to or ascribed to it was, in the case of Daniel, highly atypical. Our first encounter with most other biblical characters is in the Hebrew Bible; their past history and the earliest stages of their stories are almost always lost to us. In effect, the Hebrew Bible represents the starting-point for figures such as Adam and Abraham and Moses and David. When J.H. Charlesworth perceptively writes that “biblical exegesis was the crucible in which the Pseudepigrapha took shape,” this is largely true. The figure of Daniel, however, is somewhat the exception to the rule.

---


3 This is true even if these figures are developed and expanded in later biblical Books, such as we find with the kings of Israel in Judah in Chronicles.

Although the biblical version of the story of Daniel was the font for all sorts of expansions, reworkings and amplifications of the story in the post-biblical legenda, the story of Daniel plainly antedates the biblical version. In other words, the biblical story of Daniel was merely one stage, albeit the most important one, in an ongoing process of the recitation of this story, one which began perhaps in the earliest tales ascribed to the figure of Danel and/or Beltshazzar and which continued through late antiquity and well into the medieval period. The root of the post-biblical Daniel legenda was the exegesis of Daniel 1–6 and the Greek Additions. This was a result of the authority granted to the biblical version of the Daniel story, a version which effectively overwrote or overwhelmed all previous expressions of the story. But we should not forget that the exegetical motivations behind the legenda were not new, but rather to a large extent were identical to those which stood behind the formation of MT Daniel and the creation of the Greek witnesses to the Book of Daniel. The concern with Daniel’s early and later years and the need to establish the relative and absolute chronologies of the story are as much a part of the redaction of MT Daniel and the Greek witnesses as they are the formation of the post-biblical Daniel legenda.

Charlesworth’s dictum is less appropriate in the case of the apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha. The revelatory visions of Daniel 7–12 had their roots in the figure of Daniel the wise and in the dream of the great statue of Daniel 2. These visions represented one of the earliest uses of a biblical figure to communicate an apocalyptic historiography, and through it to impart a reassuring message about a community’s place in history and its future deliverance, even as the community faced great peril. The reasons why such historical visions should have been ascribed to Daniel apply as much to visions of MT Daniel 7–12 as they do to the two dozen apocryphal Daniel apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles. At the same time, however, it is not the case that exegesis of the visions of Daniel 7–12 were the crucible out of which formed these apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles, even if in form and outlook the revelatory visions of the biblical Daniel greatly shaped the apocryphal ones. The Daniel apocalyptica are independent creations, each one designed to address the historical circumstances and present-day needs of a specific community at a specific point in history. They cannot be considered to be exege-
ses of Daniel 7–12, nor should it be concluded that the reasons behind their composition are exegetical in nature.

The same is true for the Daniel prognostica, which although not having any direct generic antecedent in the biblical tradition, clearly took their inspiration from the figure of Daniel the dream interpreter, whose ultimate antecedents surely predate MT Daniel. Yet, despite this clear connexion with the figure of Daniel as it articulated in the Hebrew Bible, the prognostica cannot be considered to stand in a formal exegetical relationship with the Book of Daniel.

Perhaps the most surprising result of this study is the character of the evidence of the apocryphal Daniel literature. On the one hand, this literature is of three types only—legenda, apocalyptic apocrypha, and prognostica. This is itself is quite astonishing, given the many dozens of forms and genres in which post-biblical apocrypha could and did take shape. The tripartite nature of the evidence and the fact that it was generically limited in such a drastic fashion demonstrates, as I have noted repeatedly, the tremendous effect of the influence of the biblical Book on the format of all subsequent Daniel apocrypha. On the other hand, and although it was rigidly restricted to these three types, the apocryphal Daniel literature exists in more numbers than any other corpus of apocryphal literature with the exception of that devoted to Adam. What is more, the Daniel apocrypha enjoyed a great popularity and had the rare ability to transcend easily the boundaries of language, culture, and confession. Particularly remarkable are the quantity and provenance of the apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha and the Daniel prognostica, the details of which have been presented in Chapters Three and Four respectively, which were evidently quite popular throughout late antique and mediaeval Jewish, Christian, and Muslim circles.

In addition to this general observation, our survey of the full corpus of the apocryphal Daniel literature revealed some interesting patterns:

1. The concern with retelling the story of Daniel—whose concrete manifestations are primarily witnessed in the Daniel legenda—does not seem to have played as an important part in Muslim contexts as it did in Jewish and Christian ones. The figure of Daniel is unmentioned in the Qurān; perhaps the two data are related.

2. The apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha, while extant in Jewish, Christian, and Islamic traditions, was far more an Eastern Mediterranean phenomenon that a Western Mediterranean one. At one end
of the extreme is the Byzantine apocalyptic tradition, which, depending on how one defines the category, accounts for approximately three-fifths of the text discussed in Chapter Three. At the other end is the fact that no apocryphal Daniel apocalypse is a product of Western Europe of the late Roman Empire or the Middle Ages, nor is any such apocalypse preserved in Latin or any of the western vernacular languages.

3. The Daniel prognostic literature, which while as a class was extremely popular throughout Eastern and Western Europe of late antiquity and the mediaeval era, was nevertheless also split along geographic lines. In the West were the two great Daniel prognostica, the *Sommiale Danielis* and the *Lunationes Danielis*; in the East were the anthological prognostica attributed to Daniel, including the *Malḥamat Dāniyāl* and an amorphous collection of geomantic texts.

4. The legenda are the oldest form of Daniel literature. Their origin may be traced back to the proto-MT court tales involving Daniel the wise and the contemporary but extra-biblical court tales preserved in fragmentary form among the Dead Sea Scrolls. In addition, the autonomous Greek Additions (Susanna, Bel and the Dragon) are themselves third-person narratives.

5. There are no post-Hellenistic ancient Daniel apocalypses extant, although the form is of course ancient (MT Daniel 7–12), and older still is the use of the figure of Daniel to communicate an apocalyptic historiography (MT Daniel 2). The Dead Sea text 4Q243/244 most certainly contains an apocalyptic review of history, but I have argued in another essay that this text predates the final redaction of

---

5 The total only increases if we add the Jewish Daniel apocalypses, which were clearly composed in the same Byzantine milieu and which probably emerged out of the same text-traditions.

6 The reasons for this are complex. B. McGinn identifies three reasons for the fact that Eastern Christianity, rather than Western Christianity, was the primary source of new apocalyptic speculation in the late antique and mediaeval periods: i) Eastern theologians were far less influenced by the Augustinian reaction against apocalyptic eschatology; ii) although the Roman Empire in the West was long gone, Byzantium still functioned as the imperial restraining force of 2 Thess 2:6, which meant that the historical setting of some of the traditional apocalyptic scenarios still had a present meaning for Eastern Christians; and iii) the advance of the Arab Muslims was a historical event that demanded an apocalyptic interpretation (*Antichrist, Two Thousand Years of the Human Fascination with Evil* (San Francisco, 1994), 88). On the interpretation of the conflict between Byzantium and Islam in the framework of “apocalyptic historiography,” see G. Podskalsky, *Byzantinische Reichseschatologie. Die Periodisierung der Weltgeschichte in den vier Großreichen* (Daniel 2 und 7) und dem tausendjährigen Friedensreiche (Apok. 20) (München, 1972).
MT Daniel and thus also at least a few of its apocalyptic visions in chapters 7–12. Despite claims to the contrary, then, the earliest post-biblical, first-person apocalyptic texts identified in Chapter Three probably date from the late fourth century ce.

6. The Daniel prognostica are products of the early mediaeval period, or perhaps, in the case of the Somniale Danielis, the late antique one. Their ultimate point of origin was probably the early Byzantine Empire, although new forms of old texts and new texts developed later on in other areas. Based on the manuscript evidence, the Daniel prognostica flourished in both the West and East during the ninth to fifteenth centuries, their zenith in the West being the High Middle Ages.

7. Apocalyptic literature associated attributed to Daniel was, as I noted, the product of either the late Persian and Hellenistic worlds or late antiquity and the Middle Ages. The chronological distribution of the apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha does not match that of apocalyptic literature in general, since other Jewish and Christian apocalypses were composed in the period between the second century BCE and the fourth century CE. One explanation may be the firmly national focus of all Daniel apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles—it is in times of national, state distress (the Antiochene crisis, the Arab invasions) that the figure of Daniel is summoned to serve as an ex eventu prophet to reassure, console, and promise. In addition, many of the Roman-era apocalypses are of the “otherworldly journey” type, which tended to be associated with the figures of Adam, Enoch, and Isaiah. But this is all quite speculative.

8. As is the case with the visions of Daniel 7–12, the focus of the apocalyptic Daniel apocrypha is the state and its place with respect to past history, present exigencies, and future expectations. As such, it commonly functioned, if indirectly so, as nationalist propaganda, although set firmly within the larger rationale that God controlled the sweeping processes of history. The Daniel apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles were unconcerned with otherworldly journeys or with visions of heaven, paradise, or hell. There was no meaningful

---

7 See L. DiTommaso, “4QPseudo-Daniel α–β (4Q243–4Q244) and the Book of Daniel,” *DSD* [forthcoming].
8 The story of Daniel was told and retold more or less continually in post-biblical times (recall that it was also communicated by patristic-era commentaries and works of art), while the Daniel prognostica are not a product of pre-Christian times.
discussion in this material on the causal connexion between present-day behaviour and future-time fortune.

9. The Daniel apocrypha were rarely employed to communicate specific or sectarian theologies. Although Byzantine Christian apocalypses, for example, typically reflected the concerns of Byzantine Christians, issues of heresy, iconoclasm, and schismatic theologies are not a feature of the Daniel apocrypha, nor were any of these texts used for proselytising purposes. Indeed, several Byzantine apocalyptic oracles attributed to Daniel appear to have been composed by those unconcerned with the issue of icons.

10. The place in society of the apocryphal Daniel literature is difficult to calculate, although a general claim could be made for their overall central role. The story of Daniel was evidently popular enough to retell time and again, to write commentaries upon, and to serve as a subject for countless manuscript illuminations and other works of art. The model of steadfast faith in the face of oppression and peril, the figure of Daniel the wise spoke and continues to speak to many persons. As for the apocalyptic apocrypha, their numbers and Bishop Liudprand's statement about the importance of the visions of Daniel and the Sibylline Books to the Byzantine court directly speak to their central role within some segments of society. Indirectly, their historiographic function must have ensured a ready audience at most levels of society. The prognostica were clearly popular across the board; used in both priestly and lay circles, they were an integral part of the science of the time. While certainly not part of the higher classical and theological literature of the period, they nevertheless performed many valuable everyday roles. Not everybody could read apocalypses or prognostica or, for that matter, could afford them, but by their very nature—and as opposed to long classical texts or involved theological treatises—their contents could have been disseminated relatively easily by word of mouth. The same is true for the story of Daniel, which by virtue of its attractive protagonist and engaging episodes probably ensured its continual popularity as a vehicle for didactic, hortatory, and entertainment purposes.

Much work remains to be done regarding the apocryphal Daniel literature. Many of the texts—particularly the Byzantine-era apocalyptic writings and the prognostica from the East—require further primary manuscript research and/or the production of critical editions. In the area of the Daniel legenda, the lines of transmission among the various ancient and mediaeval Jewish, Christian, and
Islamic expressions of the various themes and topoi require further study. An investigation of the relationship among the Byzantine-era apocalyptic Daniel material that incorporates the results of such studies is a desideratum. This is also true for a broader overview of the history of Byzantine apocalyptic that accounts for the complete corpus of texts (Danielic or otherwise) and for a re-examination of the role and import of apocalyptic in Byzantine culture and society. Likewise, certain topics concerning the Daniel prognostica demand attention, including an in-depth study of the Praedictiones Danielis and a full preliminary survey of the eastern anthological prognostica.

That being said, it is hoped that the analytic and bibliographic aspects of the present study have provided some of groundwork for such future endeavours. If anything, the apocryphal Daniel literature is a rich and exciting area of study that will no doubt foster many more generations of scholarly research.

---

9 On the subject of cross-confessional lines of contact, see the questions raised by the study of the Cairo Genizah palimpsests in S.C. Reif, A Jewish Archive from Old Cairo: The History of Cambridge University's Genizah Collection (Richmond, Surrey, 2000), 105–106.
CHAPTER SIX

THE APOCRYPHAL DANIEL LITERATURE:
INVENTORY AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

The purpose of this Inventory and Bibliography is to provide scholars with a comprehensive account of the Daniel apocrypha and their manuscript evidence and to present the complete range of the primary and secondary literature devoted to these texts.

The problems associated with the identification and evaluation of the Daniel apocrypha have been detailed in the first four chapters. In many cases the information contained in this Inventory represents a significant leap in our knowledge of the full extent of certain types of texts (e.g., the Daniel apocalyptica) or of the manuscript evidence (e.g., the apocalyptica again, and also the Daniel prognostica, especially the \textit{Somniale Danielis} and the \textit{Lunationes Danielis}). The Inventory thus represents a new and more complete understanding of the apocryphal Daniel literature, correcting and greatly expanding on the scholarship of past generations while adding much more in the way of information about new texts, sources, and manuscripts.

At the same time, the Inventory cannot be the last word on the topic. Much work remains to be done, particularly with respect to the relationship among the many Daniel apocalyptica (particularly the Greek exemplars) and among the Eastern Daniel prognostica, a good number of which still must be edited from manuscript. There is also the task of identifying the discrete traditions associated with the story of Daniel and tracing the trajectories of their transmission in the legenda, commentaries, and works of fine art. It is hoped, therefore, that the Inventory, together with the analysis of the data in the previous chapters of this study, will serve both as a checklist for scholars and as a springboard for future research.

The Daniel apocrypha are arranged in the Inventory below according to the language in which they are preserved rather than by genre, content, date, provenance, or confession. No attempt is made to distinguish among the legenda, apocalyptica, and prognostica, although all three types of literature are comprehensively included. Each text is identified, named, and described. The manuscript evi-
dence for each is listed, including, where possible, the title of each manuscript, its *incipit* and *explicit*, and the catalogue and other references to it. I do not assign a distinctive *siglum* to each manuscript copy, since in so many cases the full picture of the manuscript tradition for a text remains unresolved. Sometimes a brief description of the text is provided; in other cases the reader is pointed to another chapter and section where this information is presented. Each text is also accompanied by the bibliography of the editions, translations, and secondary studies.

As I noted in the Introduction, variant or obsolete orthography is not highlighted. Since spelling is rarely consistent in mediaeval manuscripts, a proportion of the non-English text might appear misspelled. Manuscript dates, which in brackets follow shelf numbers and foliation, are reproduced from catalogues or secondary sources. Roman numerals refer to centuries, Arabic ones to specific dates and both may be assumed to refer to the Common Era unless otherwise indicated.
I. The Prayer of Nabonidus

Manuscript:

- 4Q242 (4QPrayer of Nabonidus ar) [i BCE]

incip: ... [Texts and Translations: See infra]

Note. 4Q242 consists of four fragments of text.

Description of the Text:

The Prayer of Nabonidus perhaps preserves what its DJD editor, J.J. Collins, calls “an older or more conservative form of the tradition behind Daniel 4,” perhaps even the “missing link” between the story of the Babylonian king Nabonidus’ ten-year sojourn to Teima in Arabia and the legend of the madness of King Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel 4 (“4QPrayer of Nabonidus ar” (infra), 86–87). For more on this text, see Chapter Three, Excursus III: “Dead Sea 4Q ‘Pseudo-Daniel’.”

1. Texts and Translations


Text and translation.


Transliteration, translation, and commentary.


Text and translation, the official edition.


Text and translation.


2. Auxiliary Studies


3. Secondary Studies


   See also A.S. van der Woude, *JSJ* 16 (1985), 302–303 at 303.


---

II. and III. Pseudo-Danielar

Manuscripts:
- 4Q243 (4QPseudo-Daniela) [i]
  incip.: wanting
  Texts and Translations: See infra
- 4Q244 (4QPseudo-Danielb) [i]
  incip.: wanting
  Texts and Translations: See infra
- 4Q245 (4QPseudo-Danielc) [i]
  incip.: wanting
  Texts and Translations: See infra

Most commentators have assumed that 4Q243, 4Q244 (these two documents overlap at 4Q243 13 and 4Q244 12), and 4Q245 are copies of one document, although
this matter is still open to question. J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint, the editors of the fragments in the DJD edition, first present the fragments of 4Q243 and 4Q244 separately, and then provide a running text preserved by the sum total of fragments from 4Q243–244. The four fragments of 4Q245 are in the DJD edition presented as a separate text.

Description of the Texts:
The text represented by the fragments in the copies 4Q243 and 4Q244 is a third-person review of history from primaeval times to the Hellenistic era, all of which appears to be set, à la Daniel 1–6, in the context of the Babylonian court. For more on this text, including the question of its generic relationship to the Book of Daniel, see Chapter Three, Excursus III: “Dead Sea 4Q ‘Pseudo-Daniel’” and DiTommaso, “4Q Pseudo-Daniel-a–c” (infra).

1. Texts and Translations


Text and translation.


Text and translation.


Text and translation.


Text and translation.


Text and translation.


Translation and commentary.


2. Auxiliary Studies


3. Secondary Studies


Brief overview.
DiTommaso, L. “4QPseudo-Daniel\textsuperscript{a–b} (4Q243–4Q244) and the Book of Daniel.” *DSD* [forthcoming].


Including the transcription of several fragments.


**IV. The “Son of God” Text**

*Manuscripts:*  
- 4Q246 (4QApcryphe de Daniel ar) [i BCE]  
  *incipit:* wanting  
  *Texts and Translations:* See infra

*Description of the Text:*  
Much scholarship has been devoted to the reading and implications of this text. See also Chapter Three, Excursus III: “Dead Sea 4Q ‘Pseudo-Daniel’.”

1. *Texts, Translations, and Commentaries*


Text and translation.


Text, translation, and commentary.


Text, translation, and commentary.


Text, translation, and commentary.


Text and translation.


Translation and study.


Text, translation, and commentary.


With translation.

Transcription, translation, and notes on col. I.


Unreconstructed and reconstructed text and translation, with study.

2. Auxiliary Studies


3. Secondary Studies


Collins, J.J. “The ‘Son of God’ Text from Qumran.” From Jesus to

See the reply of Collins, BBR 7 (1997), supra.


V. Aramaic-Hebrew Daniel-Poem

See below, under “Daniel Apocrypha Preserved Primarily in Hebrew.”
A. Greek Daniel Apocrypha in Antiquity and the Early Mediaeval Period

I., II., and III. The Greek Additions to the MT Book of Daniel

The Greek Additions are among the oldest of all expressions of the story of Daniel and, with the exception of MT Daniel, the most studied. I have omitted the roster of extant manuscripts of the Additions, since this is a subject that has already had much time and effort devoted to it in the context of the studies on the texts of the ancient Greek versions of the Bible in general and the Book of Daniel in particular. It is well-known that OG Daniel (with the Greek Additions) was at a very early date considered unsatisfactory and so was replaced by the translation commonly attributed to Theodotion.

1. Selected Primary and Secondary Sources on All the Greek Additions to Daniel

Selected Sources on the Textual History of the Ancient Greek Versions of the Book of Daniel and the Greek Additions to Daniel (not including ancient translations made therefrom):


Giessen, A. *Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel 5–12, zusammen mit Susanna, Bel et

——. “Daniel VI dans le Septante.” Κατὰ τοῦς ὁ’ Ἡλληνιστικὰ: Selon les Septante [FS M. Harl].


I. The Prayer of Azariah and The Song of the Three Young Men

Manuscripts:
On the manuscript tradition of the Greek additions to Daniel, see the note under “The Greek Additions to the MT Book of Daniel.”

Description of the Text: See Chapter Two, §1.

1. Texts, Translations, and Commentaries

Including only the discrete texts, translations, and commentaries, and not those that are part of Greek Bibles (see supra) or the commentaries on the Book of Daniel.


2. Secondary Sources


II. Bel and the Serpent

*Manuscripts:*

On the manuscript tradition of the Greek additions to Daniel, see the note under “The Greek Additions to the MT Book of Daniel.”

*Description of the Text: See Chapter Two, §1.*

1. *Texts, Translations, and Commentaries*

Including only the discrete texts, translations, and commentaries, and not those that are part of Greek Bibles (*see supra*) or the commentaries on the Book of Daniel.


2. *Secondary Sources*


III. Susanna

*Manuscripts:*

On the manuscript tradition of the Greek additions to Daniel, see the note under “The Greek Additions to the MT Book of Daniel.”

*Description of the Text: See Chapter Two, §1.*

1. *Texts, Translations, and Commentaries*

Including only the discrete texts, translations, and commentaries, and not those that are part of Greek Bibles (*see supra*) or the commentaries on the Book of Daniel.
On the figure of Susanna in late mediaeval literature, see the relevant sections, *infra*. On Susanna and mediaeval illustration, see Chapter Two, note 152.


Scholz, A. *Commentar über das Buch “Esther” mit seinem Zusätzen und über “Susanna.”* Würzburg/Wien, 1892.

2. Secondary Sources


Excursus: Josephus’ Portrait of Daniel

In his Antiquities of the Jews (10.186–281, 11.337), Flavius Josephus devotes much effort to the story of Daniel. His retelling is important in that it provides a record of a first-century Jewish attempt to address the perceived gaps in and difficulties with the biblical life of Daniel. Secondary Sources on Josephus’ retelling of the story of Daniel (but not including material on this topic in commentaries on Daniel):


IV. The Vita Danielis in the Lives of the Prophets [Greek, Latin, Syriac, Ethiopic, Hebrew, Arabic, and Armenian]

Manuscripts:
The manuscript evidence for the Vita Danielis is particularly rich and diverse. Because of this, and also because of the fact that the Vita never appears independently, but, in its present form at least, must be considered an integral part of the larger work known as the Lives of the Prophets, no attempt is made here to detail the full range of the manuscript evidence (although key manuscript copies will be noted) or to provide full reference to those auxiliary studies that identify and catalogue it. Manuscript lists and catalogues that refer to unedited texts are included, however.

Description of the Text:
The Lives of the Prophets (Vitae prophetarum) was probably in its original form a Jewish text of the late Second Temple period, although it appears that different Vitae were composed and/or redacted later. The Lives of the Prophets is preserved in many languages and in different versions. In their fullest form, they detail, as states the Codex Marchalianus, “the names of the prophets and from whence they come, and where they died, and how and where they are buried.” The order of the Vitae in the Lives of the Prophets varies.
The final form of the Life of Daniel, or the Vita Danielis, as it is termed here, dates from the Byzantine era and concentrates mostly on the episode of Nebuchadnezzar’s madness (Daniel 4). It ends with a note about the death and burial of Daniel, which is followed by another note concerning a prediction by Daniel regarding the mountain of the north, the mountain of the south, and the end-time. For more on this text, see Chapter Two.

1. Texts and Textual Issues

In the editions or translations of the Lives of the Prophets cited infra, specific pagination cites refers to the pages where the Vita Danielis is presented. Editions, translations, or studies that present or discuss vitae other than the Vita Danielis are not included. Excellent summaries of the range of the textual evidence for the Lives of the Prophets may be found in Schermann, Propheten- und Apostellegenden, 2–43; idem, Prophetarum vitae fabulosae, ix–xxxiii; Denis, Introduction aux pseudépigraphes d’Ancien Testament, 85–90; and Satran, Biblical Prophets, 9–16 (infra).


a. Greek

The Greek manuscripts of the Lives of the Prophets may be classified into six recensions:

i. Epiphanius Prior [Ep¹]: Paris, BNF cod. gr. 1115 [1276], which is the longer one of the two recensions that is attributed to Epiphanius of Cyprus.

ii. Epiphanius Alter [Ep²]: This recension is preserved in many MSS (some of which are unpublished), and is the shorter one of the two recensions that is attributed to Epiphanius of Cyprus.
iii. Dorotheus [Dor]: Wien, ÖNB cod. theol. gr. 40 [olim 77] [xiii], which is attributed to Dorotheus of Tyre, and is represents the version of the Lives that was incorporated into the Chronicon paschale.

iv. Recensio anonyma [An]: Codex Marchalianus (BAV cod. Vat. gr. 2125 [traditional siglum = “Q”], pp. 11–24 [vi, but fols. 1–12 perhaps vii/viii]) and other MSS, some of which are unpublished. Paris, BNF cod. Coislin 224 [x], is a member of this family of MSS, and it is defective in the Vita Danielis.

v. An abbreviated recension preserved in the writing of Theophylact and in the scholia to Theodoret of Cyr.

vi. A recension found in the menologia and synaxaria of the Greek Orthodox tradition.


Reproduces text apud Schermann, Prophetarum vitae fabulosae (infra).


Re excerpts preserved in an eleventh-century menologion.


Synoptic presentation of the versions of the Lives from MSS Q and E¹, with variants from 3 Syriac MSS.

Petavius. Epiphaniæ opera. 1622.

Text, Paris, BNF cod. gr. 1115. Details unknown.


Critical text of all the important Greek recensions, with extensive apparatus noting variants from these.


Text, Paris, BNF cod. gr. 1115.


Zehner, J. *Divi Epiphanii (ut vulgò nominatur) Liber de vitis prophetarum graece.* Schlesinger, 1612.

Introduction, Greek text (Paris, BNF cod. gr. 1115; a corrected version of the text edited by Torinus (*supra*)), Latin translation, and extensive annotations.

b. Latin

Latin forms of the *Lives of the Prophets* exist in portions of Isidore of Seville’s *De ortu et obitu patrum* and Peter Comestor’s *Historia scholastica*. On Comestor’s work and the Hebrew version of the *Vita Danielis*, see infra. Dolbeau (“Deux opuscules,” *infra*) suggests that two forms of the Latin *Lives* precede and influence Isidore’s account of the *Lives*, which would thus date them to as early as the sixth century.


Text, Isidore of Seville’s *De ortu et obitu patrum* (83.129–156) and Peter Comestor’s *Historia scholastica* (198.1053–1722).


c. Syriac

The Syriac exemplars of the *Lives of the Prophets* are multiiform and, as Satran (*Biblical Prophets*, 10) notes, the full range of the evidence has yet to be assessed:
i. The Ambrosian Codex of the Syro-Hexapla, which preserves the *vitae* of the first nine Minor Prophets (but not the *Vita Danielis*).

ii. London, BL codd. Add. 12178, Add. 14536, and Add. 17193, which are attributed to Epiphanius.

iii. A recension represented by Berlin, cod. Sachau 131, fols. 68r–78r, New York, Union Theological Seminary MS syr. 16, fols. 1–23 (verso only) [six], Birmingham, Mingana cod. 567, fols. 1v–19r (so Ebied, “Some Syriac Manuscripts,” *infra*), and Leeds, MS syr. 4, fols. 194vff. [1890].

iv. A recension represented by a MS from the Monastery of St. Catherine [x], which preserves concise *vitae* of the prophets.

v. The *vitae* preserved in Michael the Syrian’s *Chronicle*.

vi. The *vitae* preserved in chapter 32 of Solomon of Basrah’s *Book of the Bee*.


Translation (69–73) and text (74–79).


Details unknown.


Text (1.63–101) and translation (94.38–63).


Notes unpublished Leeds MS syr. 4.


New York, Union Theological Seminary MS syr. 16. See also M. Goshen-Gottstein, *Syriac Manuscripts in the Harvard College Library* (HSS 23; Missoula, 1979), 125.


The first edition includes an eclectic edition of the *vitae* of the four Major Prophets on the basis of the 3 BL Add. codd. attributed to Epiphanius; the second edition contains a complete text.


Synoptic presentation of Greek MSS Q and E', with variants from the 3 BL Add. codd. attributed to Epiphanius.


Discussion of the MS evidence.


Latin translation of St. Catherine cod.


MS evidence.

See also W. Wright, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum Acquired Since the Year 1838* (London, 1870): Add. 14614, fols. 80–127: “2. The Lives of the Prophets, ascribed to Epiphanius . . . Fol. 27 a. See Epiphani Opera, ed. 1622, t. ii., p. 235; Migne, Patrol. Gr., t. xiii., col. 393. The names occur in the following order: Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel (imperf.), Hosea (imperf.), Amos . . . [at] fol. 35 b we have the subscription . . . Then follows a short section on the prophets whose prophecies were not written down, fol. 35 b; and an extract from Severus on the deaths of Jeremiah and Daniel, fol. 36 a” (No. DCCLXXI, p. 743).

d. *Ethiopic*

The *Lives of the Prophets* exists in several forms. In 1893 J. Bachmann published a version of the *Vita* of Jeremiah (*Aethiopische Lesestücke. Inedita Aethiopica für den Gebrauch*
in Universitäts-Vorlesungen (Leipzig, 1893), 10–13). Since that time, however, more manuscript evidence has been uncovered on the Lives as a whole.


e. Hebrew

The Lives of the Prophets is not preserved in Hebrew as an independent text. Abbreviated versions in Hebrew of the Vita of Isaiah and Ezekiel, however, are to be found in Paris, BNF cod. heb. 326, fols. 157v–158r. More importantly, a mediaeval Hebrew version of the Vita Danielis exists embedded in an Bodleian manuscript codex of the Chronicle of Jerahmeel (Oxford, Bod. cod. 2797, 76r–76v). As Satran (*Biblical Prophets*, 16, note 34) observes, “The [Bodleian] version of Yerahmeel is clearly a Hebrew translation of a Latin form of the text virtually identical with that found in the Historia Scholastica of Peter Comestor.” On Comestor and the Latin version of the Vita Danielis, see supra.

f. Arabic

The Arabic version of the Lives of the Prophets, which exhibits affinities with the Greek recensio anonyma and the Syriac recensions, is preserved in Milano, BA cod. X.201 sup., fols. 61–69 [x/xi].


Notes that the Greek and Syriac vitae serve as sources of the Arabic *Misbaḥ az-zuḥna wa-ʿīdāḥ al-ḥidma*, the encyclopaedia of Abū l-Barakāt ibn Kabar.


Text [transcription and photographs] and translation.

g. Armenian

As with the Greek and Syriac evidence, the Armenian textual witnesses the Lives of the Prophets are multiform: biblical manuscripts, the Collection of Homilies, the Menologium, and work related to but distinct from the Lives of the Prophets, the Names, Works, and Deaths of the Holy Prophets (on the last, see “Daniel Apocrypha Preserved in Armenian,” §III). The *Vita Danielis* does not appear in the Armenian version of the Lives of the Prophets, although for the sake of completeness the editions are listed below.


Eclectic text of the Lives of the Prophets fashioned from a variety of biblical MSS.


2. Translations (of the Vita Danielis only)


3. Secondary Studies (of the Vita Danielis only)


The Vita Danielis is also discussed briefly in other places throughout this work.

V. Praedictiones Danielis

Manuscripts:

The manuscript evidence for this text remains unclear and the list below is extremely provisional. For an initial description and analysis of this text, see Chapter Four, §4. It is my preliminary conclusion that this text is related to or, in one of its forms, represents the Greek Vorlage of the Middle Eastern propheticum, the Malhamat Daniyel. It must be stressed, however, that this conclusion awaits evaluation by means of a detailed study of the relevant texts, and for this reason the Praedictiones and the Malhamat are listed as discrete texts.
– Athenai, Ethnikē Bibliothēkē tēs Hellados cod. 1350, fols. 25v–28r [xvii]  
inscr.: 'Ενδέχεται περίερχεται όρασίας τινάς τοῦ προφήτου Δανιήλ ὃς ἀπεκάλυψεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς  
Bruxelles, 1924. 28, 153–155 [partial text].

– Berlin, SBPK cod. gr. 170 [olim Phillipps 1574], fols. 137v–184r  
incip.: Πίναξ σὺν θεῷ ἑγγὺς τοῦ βιβλίου . . .  

– Berlin, SBPK cod. gr. 173 [olim Phillipps 1577], fols. 69r–72v  
Reference: Boll (supra), 51–52, 173 [partial text (fol. 71v)]: “Εκ τῶν ἀποκαλύφσεων τοῦ προφήτου Δανιήλ.”

– Cambridge, UL cod. Ll.4.12, fols. 89r–99r [xv]  
inscr.: Περὶ καταρχῶν ἐκ τῶν Δωδεκατρόπου Ὄρφεος κατὰ Ζωδίων  
Note. This text appears to be attributed to Orpheus, not Daniel.

Reference: Weinstock, Catalogus IX.II (supra), 124–125.  
Note. It is unclear whether this cod. preserves a copy of the Lunationes Danielis (see infra) plus additional but unconnected prognostica (i.e., not a copy of the Praedictiones), or whether all the prognostica (including the lunation) is meant to function as the first section of a full-blown copy of the Praedictiones Danielis.

– Milano, BA cod. D.137 sup., fols. 3r–12r [xvi]  

– Milano, BA cod. E.11 sup.  

incept.: Πίναξ σὺν θεῷ τῆς βίβλου . . .  

– Paris, BNF cod. gr. 2316, fols. 380v–418r  
incept.: Πίναξ σὺν θεῷ τῆς βίβλου . . .  
Note. On the long prologue to this text, see Chapter Four, §4.

– Paris, BNF cod. gr. 2494, fols. 204r–229r  
Reference: Boudreaux (supra), 71.

– Paris, BNF cod. supp. gr. 1148, fols. 30r–36r  
VII [= Boll (supra)], p. 173, d’après le Berolin. 173—Le texte du présent ms. est assez différent de celui que donne Cat. codd. astr. gr., VIII [= Boudreaux (supra)], pp. 172,29—177,26, d’après Paris gr. 2316."

Sankt Petersbourg, cod. Academicus Musaei Palaeographici, fols. 8v–40v [1684/1685]

Sankt Petersbourg, cod. Bibl. Publicae 575, fols. 46r–64v [xvii]

Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. gr. 363, fols. 146r–164v [xv]
incip.: <Π>ιναξίν θεός τισδε τίς βιβλού . . .

V bis. Somniale Danielis and Lunationes Danielis

See below, under “Daniel Apocrypha Preserved Primarily in Latin.” Both these texts were probably composed originally in Greek in late antiquity or in the early mediaeval period, although the earliest manuscripts, which are in Latin, are from the ninth century. For a description and analysis of these texts, see Chapter Four, §§2–3.

B. Greek Daniel Apocalyptica of the Byzantine Period

Preliminary Note:

Much work is still required on the topic of the Greek apocalyptica attributed to Daniel, a category which also includes texts which were composed originally in Greek but survive only in another language. Of course, the outstanding work of nineteenth century scholars such as V.M. Istrin, E. Klostermann, and A.A. Vassiliev and twentieth-century scholars such as P. Alexander, K. Berger, H. Schmoldt, L. Pertusi, and V. Tupkova-Zaimova and A. Miltenova cannot be underestimated. At the same time, far too many questions persist, even at the fundamental level of the identification of text and manuscript.

Some texts have received more attention than others; the Diegesis Danielis and the Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel surely may be cited here. But these are the exceptions rather than the rule, and the situation is compounded by recent discoveries (or re-discoveries, in some cases) of manuscripts of apocalypses attributed to Daniel. One need only consult the lists of the manuscripts for each text in the sections below to find examples of copies not included in previous studies. Similarly, the Excursus, “Notes on and Manuscripts of Unidentified Greek Daniel Apocalypses” (infra), lists many Daniel apocalyptica unnoticed outside their appearance in catalogue. In addition, there are many examples where variant copies of any given text contain material which in the roster below also appears in manuscript copies recorded for different texts. Accordingly, because the textual situation for most of these texts has yet to be completely resolved, I have decided against assigning distinctive sigla to the manuscripts.
It should not be forgotten, too, that there is a wealth of unedited Byzantine oracles, prophecies, and "world-chronicles," some but not all of which are attributed to Methodius. Given that a number of the known Byzantine Daniel apocalypses contain material lifted from the various versions of the Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius or have some of their manuscript copies attributed to Methodius (or to other figures besides Daniel), any serious study of the full corpus of the Byzantine apocalyptic tradition must at one point examine these unedited texts. Further compounding the problem is the fact that discrete oracles tended to be used and reused (sometimes verbatim, sometimes not) in various venues, including, for example, in copies of the Oracles of Leo the Wise. The relationship between the origins and transmission history of the discrete oracles and the apocalyptic texts in which they appear must be isolated and evaluated.

It is hoped that the information in the following sections, coupled with the presentation and analysis of all the Daniel apocalypses and apocalyptic oracles in Chapter Three, will clarify the situation somewhat. Although it is beyond the scope of the present work, what is ultimately required is a complete and critical examination by autopsy of all the manuscripts of all the relevant apocalyptic texts. From there one should be better able to move beyond the basic requirement of the correct identification of the texts, and towards a more complete understanding of the extant Daniel apocalyptic and the textual and literary relationships among them and between them and the wider Byzantine apocalyptic tradition.

VI. The Vision of Daniel on the Island of Cyprus

Manuscripts:
- Oxford, Bod. cod. Barocci 145 [SC 145], fols. 31–32 [xv/xvi]
  Text: Istrin 184 (infra).
  Note: Bousset, “Beiträge,” (infra) identifies this text as a copy of The Last Vision of the Prophet Vision of Daniel.
- Oxford, Bod. cod. Barocci 145 [SC 145], fol. 85 [xv/xvi]
  Text and Translation: Vereecken and Hadermann-Misguich (infra).
  Note: This text is embedded in a copy of the Oracles of Leo the Wise.
- Oxford, Bod. cod. Barocci 170, fol. 10r
  inscr.: Οὗτοι σοι ταῦμαν καὶ κεκαυμένη Κύπρος . . .
  Text and Translation: Vereecken and Hadermann-Misguich (infra).
  Reference: Rigo (supra), 32.
  Note: This text is embedded in a copy of the Oracles of Leo the Wise.
- Palermo, Biblioteca nazionale cod. I.E.8, fol. 9v [xvi]
  inscr.: Χρησμός δοξίηλ μονοχού περὶ τῆς ἐπτελόσου . . .
  Note: From the information contained in Lattanzi’s catalogue, this text—which Mioni (infra, note re BM cod. gr. VII.3) identifies as a copy of an oracle concerning the island of Cyprus—appears to follow rather than be embedded in a copy of the Oracles of Leo the Wise.
  Note: I have not had occasion to examine this manuscript by autopsy. The title of this text, however, suggests that it might be a copy of the Vision of
Daniel on the Future of the Seven-Hilled City (infra), and it is only due to Mioni’s assertion that I include it here.

- Paris, BNF cod. gr. 947, fol. 275r
  Reference: Mioni (infra, note re BM cod. gr. IV.38).
  Note: Not specifically listed in F. Halkin, Manuscrits grecs de Paris. Inventaire hagiographique (SubH 44; Bruxelles, 1968), 93, who, though, cites fols. 276v–280v: “Ioannes, apocalypsis a. Chrysostomo.”

- Venezia, BM cod. gr. IV.38 [olim Nanianus 260], fols. 18v–19r [xvi]
  incep.: ὧν οἱ πλημμελήματαν κεκαυμένη Κύπρε τάλαινα

- Venezia, BM cod. gr. VII.3, fol. 8v [xx/xxvi]
  insep.: Περὶ τῆς νῆσου Κύπρου τοῦ αὐτοῦ Δανιήλ.
  incep.: Αἱ αἱ σοι, πλημμελήματον κεκαυμένη καὶ βεβορβορωμένη ζωφώδης
  [Rigo:] κεκαυμένη κύπρος τάλαινα
  expl.: θεοῦ γὰρ μηνίν ἐχρυσεῖν οὐ δυνήσῃ.
  Text: Klostermann (infra).

- Venezia, BM cod. gr. VII.22 [olim Nanianus 244], fols 131r–133v [1590]
  incep.: Οὔτω καὶ Κύπρῳ τοιῇ . . .
  Text and Translation: Vereecken and Hadermann-Misguich (infra).
  Reference: Rigo (supra), 60.
  Note: This text is embedded in a copy of the Oracles of Leo the Wise.

- Private, cod. Bute, fol. 9r [1575–1577]
  incep.: ὧν οἱ τῆς μνήμης καὶ κεκαυμένη Κύπρος . . .
  Text and Translation: Vereecken and Hadermann-Misguich (infra).
  Note: This text is embedded in a copy of the Oracles of Leo the Wise.

  Note: The relationship among various oracles attributed in some texts to Daniel (or Daniel and others) and in other texts to Leo the Wise has yet to be completely resolved. It is certainly possible that the Vision of Daniel on the Island of Cyprus is extant embedded in other manuscript copies of the Oracles of Leo the Wise, on which see Vereecken and Hadermann-Misguich (infra), 51 note 66.

Description of the Text: See Chapter Three, §2.1.

1. Texts and Translations

Istrin, V.M. “Откровение Мефодия Патарского и апокрифических видений Даниила в византийской и славянорусской литературе. В. Тексты. II. Видения Даниила.” COIDRMosa 184 (1898.1). Moskva, 1898. 135–162 at 140–142.


2. **Auxiliary Studies**


3. **Secondary Studies**


VII. The Vision of Daniel on the Blond Race

Manuscripts:
- Mount Athos, Monastery of Koutloumousion cod. 220 [Lambros no. 3293], fols. 201v–208r [xv/xvii]
  Reference: Lambros, S.P. Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos. Cambridge, 1895–1900. 1.301: ὁ χριστιανὸς Φροδήμων ἡμῶν μεταμορφώσεται σήμερα ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ ...
  Text: Schmoldt (infra), 315 note 343.
- Mount Athos, Monastery of Vatopedion cod. 754, fol. 182 [xvii]
  Reference: Istrin 182 (infra), 321; Schmoldt (infra), 315 note 344.
- München, BSB cod. gr. 154, fol. 343v
  inscr.: "Ἐτέρω χρησιμῶς Θεοφιλόπουλος πρεσβυτέρου 'Ρωμαίου ...
  incip.: Ἀναστήσεται σχίσμα εν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ ...
  Text: Istrin 182 (infra).
  Reference: Schmoldt (infra), 242 [but he does not identify the MS].
- Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Ottob. gr. 260, fol. 12r [xvi]
  Reference: Istrin 182 (infra), 319.

Description of the Text: See Chapter Three, §2.2.

1. Texts and Translations


2. Secondary Studies


VIII. The Visions of Daniel and Other Holy Men

Manuscripts:
- Oxford, Bod. cod. Barocci 145 [SC 145], fols. 70r–79r [xv/xvi]
  inscr.: Εκ τῶν ὀράσεων τοῦ ἀγίου προφήτου Δανιήλ καὶ ἐκ διαφόρων ἄγιων ἀνδρῶν
  incip.: Ἀναστήσεται μεταμόρφωσιν ἐξ ὁσφύος κόσμως ...
  Text: Istrin 182 (infra) [partial]; Pertusi (infra) [critical edition]; Vereecken and Hadermann-Misguich (infra) [in apparatus].
  Note: Istrin 182 (infra) lists a copy at fols. 43–52, but this is contraindicated by the presence of a copy of the Vision of Daniel on the Future of the Seven-Hilled
City at fols. 47v–50r and (apud Vereecken and Hadermann-Misguich (infra)) the presence of the first of three copies of the Oracles of Leo the Wise at fols. 50r–58r.

- Oxford, Bod. cod. Laudianus gr. 27 [olim 722], fols. 25v–46v [Vereecken and Hadermann-Misguich: fols. 28r–49v] [xv/xvi]
  inscr.: Παρεκβολάων σὺν Θεῷ ἀγίῳ ἐκ τῶν ὑψάσεων τοῦ ἁγίου προφήτου Δανιήλ καὶ ἐκ διαφόρων ἁγίων ἀνδρῶν ὃν ὁ βασιλεὺς φιλοσοφότατος Λέων συνήξε ἐκτισε † ζωοδολητικό † καὶ ἔξιστόρησεν.
  *incip.:* Εἰς τόνδε τὸν ιεροφόρητον τὸν ἐν ὧν τεταπλεύρῳ ἐστότα μαρμάρῳ . . .
  *Text:* Pertusi (infra) [critical edition]; Vereecken and Hadermann-Misguich (infra) [in apparatus].

- Oxford, Bod. cod. Laudianus gr. 27 [olim 722], fols. 60r–65v [Vereecken and Hadermann-Misguich: fols. 63v–68v] [xv/xvi]
  *Text:* Pertusi (infra) [critical edition]; Vereecken and Hadermann-Misguich (infra) [in apparatus].
  *Note:* This copy is incomplete.

*Note:* The relationship among various oracles attributed in some texts to Daniel (or Daniel and others) and in other texts to Leo the Wise has yet to be completely resolved.

*Description of the Text:* See Chapter Three, §2.6.

1. **Texts and Translations**

Istrin, V.M. “Откровение Мефодия Патарского и апокрифическая вида́ния Даниила в византийской и славяно-русской литературе.” A. Изслѣдованіе. II. Вида́ния Даниила.” COIDRMoskva 182 (1897.3).


2. **Secondary Studies**


**IX. The Oracle of the Prophet Daniel on Byzantium**

*Manuscripts:*
- Wien, ÖNB cod. suppl. gr. 172, fols. 38v–39r [xvi],
  *inscr.:* Χρησμός Δανιήλ τοῦ προφήτου περὶ τῆς Βυζαντίδος, καὶ σημείωσαι πρὸ τοῦ κτισθῆναι ὕπο Κωνσταντίνου μᾶλλον εἰκεῖν καὶ τοῦ Βυζα

*Translation:* Pertusi (*infra*) [partial].


*Description of the Text:* See Chapter Three, §2.7.

1. *Secondary Studies*


**X. The Proclamation of the Prophet Daniel**

*Manuscripts:*
- Venezia, BM cod. gr. IV.38 [olim Nanianus 260], fols. 34r–35v [xvi],
  *inscr.:* Κήρυξ αὐτοῦ προφήτου Δανιήλ καὶ ὥρασις περὶ τῶν χρησμῶν μέλλοντος καιροῦ τῶν ἐπὶ αἰώνον
  *incip.:* Ἐγὼ κλίνω γράφω τὰ μέλλοντα γενέσθαι. Πολλά τραγία εἰς τό Σαλονίκη . . .

*Text:* Lambros (*infra*).


*Description of the Text:* See Chapter Three, §2.8.
1. Texts


XI. The Vision of Daniel on the Future of the Seven-Hilled City

Manuscripts:

- Dresden, Öffentliche Bibliothek cod. Da 53, fol. 6

- Oxford, Bod. cod. Barocci 145 [SC 145], fols. 47v–50r [xv/xvi]
  inscr.: Δανιήλ μοναχοῦ περί τῆς ἐπιταλάφου καὶ περί τῶν νῆσσων τί ἔστι τὸ μέλλον αὐτῶν
  incip.: οὐάι σοι, πόλις ἐπιτάλαφος, μέλλει σοι καὶ τὰ ὀραία τείχη πεσεῖν . . .
  Text: Istrin 184 (infra); Schmoldt (infra) [critical edition].

- Oxford, Bod. cod. Barocci 145 [SC 145], fols. 94v–96r [xv/xvi]
  inscr.: Δανιήλ μοναχοῦ περί τῆς ἐπιταλάφου καὶ περί τῶν νῆσσων τί ἔστι τὸ μέλλον αὐτῶν
  incip.: οὐάι σοι, ἐπιτάλαφος, μέλλει σοι καὶ τὰ ὀραία τείχη πεσεῖν
  Reference: Coxe (supra), col. 248.

- Oxford, Bod. cod. Laudianus gr. 27 [olim 722], fols. 68v–71v [xv/xvi]
  inscr.: Δανιήλ μοναχοῦ περί τῆς ἐπιταλάφου καὶ περί τῶν νῆσσων τί ἔστι τὸ μέλλον αὐτῶν
  incip.: οὐάι σοι, πόλις ἐπιτάλαφος, μέλλει σοι καὶ τὰ ὀραία τείχη πεσεῖν . . .
  Reference: Coxe (supra), col. 509.

- Paris, BNF cod. supp. gr. 82, fols. 9v–12v [1617]
  Note: Halkin notes that this text is the same as the one preserved at fols. 55v–57v, infra, and that it is ‘ex codice Vaticano’; but which Vatican codex is a mystery still to be solved.

- Paris, BNF cod. supp. gr. 82, fols. 53v–57v [1617]
  Reference: Halkin, Manuscrits grecs (supra), 282.

- Venezia, BM cod. gr. VII.3, fol. 8v [xv/xvi]
  inscr.: Χρησμὸς Δανιήλ. α’ περί τῆς ἐπιταλάφου καὶ περί τῆς νῆσου Κρήτης καὶ ἔτερων καὶ τί ἔστι τὸ μέλλον αὐτῶν
  incip.: οὐίσι σοι, οὐίσι σοι, πόλις ἐπιτάλαφος, μέλλει σοι καὶ τὰ ὀραία τείχη πεσοῦνται
  expl.: προσελεύσεται ὑπά σωθῆς καὶ τὰ ἔξης.
  Text: Klostermann, Analecta (infra); Schmoldt (infra) [critical edition].
– Venezia, BM cod. gr. VII.22 [olim Nanianus 244], fol. 87r–v [1590]
  inscr.: 'Ὁ χρησμός τῆς ἐπτάλοφου
  incip.: οὐάι σοι πάλις ἐπτάλοφη . . .

and probably (see the discussion in Chapter Three, §2.9):
– Mount Athos, Monastery of Iveron cod. 181 [Lambros no. 4301], fols. 60r–63r [xvi]
  inscr.: Δανιήλ μοναχός περὶ τῆς ἐπτάλοφου καὶ περὶ τῶν νῆσον τί ἐστι τὸ μέλλον αὐτῶν
  incip.: οὐάι σοι πάλις ἐπτάλοφη . . .
– Mount Athos, Monastery of Xiropotamos cod. 248 [Lambros no. 2581], fols. 530r–532v [xvii]
  inscr.: Δανιήλ μοναχός περὶ τῆς ἐπτάλοφου καὶ περὶ τῶν νῆσον τί ἐστι τὸ μέλλον αὐτῶν
  incip.: οὐάι σοι πάλις ἐπτάλοφη . . .
  expl.: . . . καὶ εἰς ἑτέρους τόπους γεννήσεται οδύνη πολλή καὶ στέναζως καὶ οὐαὶ τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ.
Reference: Lambros (supra), 1.218.

and possibly (see the discussion in Greek VI, supra):
– Palermo, Biblioteca nazionale cod. I.E.8, fol. 9v [xvi]

Description of the Text: See Chapter Three, §2.9.

1. Texts and Translations
Istrin, V.M. “Откровение Мефодия Патарского и апокрифическая вида Бния Даниила въ византийской и славянорусской литературѣ. В. Тексты. II. Вида Бния Даниила.” COIDRMoskva 184 (1898.1). Moskva, 1898. 135–162 at 143–144.
Klostermann, E. Analecta zur Septuaginta, Hexapla und Patristik. Leipzig, 1895. 121.

2. Auxiliary Studies

3. Secondary Studies


**XII. Diegesis Danielis**

*Manuscripts:*

- Montpellier, Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Médecine cod. 405, fols. 105r–115 [xv/xvi]
  
  *inscription*: Δήησειν περὶ τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ Ἀντιχρίστου τὸ πῶς μέλλει γενέσθαι καὶ περὶ τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος
  
  *incipit*: Κατὰ τὴν θεολεκτίν φωνὴ τοῦ εὐαγγέλιου
  
  *Text*: Berger (*infra*), 12–23 [synthetic edition, with translation and commentary, based on the Bodleian and Montpellier MSS].
  
  *Translation*: Zervos (*infra*) [based on the Bodleian and Montpellier MSS]; Macler (*infra*) [partial].
  

  
  *inscription*: Τοῦ ἐν ἀγίους
  
  *incipit*: Κατὰ τὴν θεολεκτίν φωνὴ τῆς λέγουσαν
  
  *Text*: Istrin 184 (*infra*); Berger (*infra*), 12–23 [synthetic edition, with translation and commentary, based on the Bodleian and Montpellier MSS].
  
  *Translation*: Zervos (*infra*) [based on the Bodleian and Montpellier MSS].
  

*Note*: Both Berger and Zervos identify the text preserved at Venezia, BM cod. gr. VII.22, fols. 14–16, as a copy of the *Diegesis*. But see §2.11, *infra*.

*Description of the Text*: See Chapter Three, §2.10.
1. Texts and Translations


This is the standard edition, with critical text and apparatus, translation, and commentary. Berger argues that the review of history was composed shortly after Charlemagne’s coronation (800 CE) but that the eschatological section may go back to as early as the third century CE. See the review of this book by M.E. Stone, *JBL* 98 (1979), 609–610.

Istrin, V.M. “Откровение Мефодия Патарского и апокрифическая видения Даниила в византийской и славянорусской литературе. В. Тексты. II. Видения Даниила.” *COIDRMoskva* 184 (1898.1). Moskva, 1898. 135–162 at 145–150.

The quality of this edition has been criticiised by later scholarship.


With detailed introductory sections and textual apparatus. Chapter and verse numbers differ from those of Berger. Zervos argues (*pace* Berger) that the historical review may be dated to a time shortly after the coronation of Charlemagne, but that certain elements of the apocalyptic section “could fit into the apocalyptic environment that produced such works as the Sibylline oracles, 2 Baruch, 4 Ezra, and the Revelation of John.” (757) See the review of this translation by S.P. Brock, *JJS* 35 (1984), 200–209 at 207.

2. Auxiliary Studies


Notes publication of Istrin (*supra*) and lists MS evidence and contents.


Haelewyck understands some of the texts cited by Kozak, *JbPT* 18 (see the Greek *Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel*, §2.X) to be a Slavonic version of the *Diegesis*.


3. **Specific Studies**


Argues (contra Berger) that the review of history does not extend past Theodosius III (pace Bousset) and thus the work could not have been composed later than 716–717 CE.


On the description of the Antichrist in this text.

DANIEL APOCRYPHAA PRESERVED PRIMARILY IN GREEK


XIII. The Vision and Revelation of the Prophet Daniel

Manuscripts:

Greek
- Venezia, BM cod. gr. VII.22 [olim Nanianus 244], fols. 14–16 [1590]
inser.: Δανιὴλ ὤρασις πρώτη, ὤρασις καὶ ἀποκάλυψις Δανιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου
incip.: καὶ κλίνει ὁ θεός ὁ παντοκράτορ τὸν θυμὸν αὐτοῦ
Text: Berger (infra).

Slavonic
- Moskva (?), Graf Tolstoy Library I.56, fols. 150–154
inser.: Видвние и укровение Даниила пророка
incip.: Въ лъто трети Киру . . . Персомъ . . .
Text: Istrin 184 (infra).
Translation: Folco (infra).

Description of the Text: See Chapter Three, §2.11.

1. Texts and Translations


Istrin, V.M. “Откровение Мефодия Патарского и апокрифическая видвния Даниила въ византийской и славяно-русской литературѣ. В. Тексты. II. Видвния Даниила.” COIDRMoskva 184 (1898.1). Moskva, 1898. 135–162 at 159–162.
2. Secondary Studies

Pertusi, L. Fine di Bisanzio e fine del mondo. Significato e ruolo storico delle profezie sulla caduta di Costantinopoli in Oriente e in Occidente. Istituto storico Italiano per medio evo n.s. 3; Roma, 1988. 50, 80–95 passim, 111–127 passim.

XIV. The Word of Daniel on the End of the World

Manuscripts:
- Athínai, Ethnikē Bibliothēkē tēs Hellados cod. 2187, fols. 228v–233r [xv]
  Note: Although Halkin, Catalogue, believes this copy and the following copy in the same MS (i.e., fols. 236v–238r) to be copies of the same text, this supposition is not related by Politēs. See Chapter Three, note 220.
- Athínai, Bibliothēkos tēs Hellados cod. 2187, fols. 236r–238r [xv]
  incep.: Εν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ἐλθόντες οἱ ἀπόστολοι
  Text and Commentary: Maisano (infra) [critical edition].
  Reference: Politēs, Katalogos (supra), 217; Halkin, Catalogue (supra), 122–123.
  Note: Halkin, BHGN (infra), no. 1871, identifies this MS as a copy of the Discourses of John Chrysostom Concerning the Vision of Daniel
- Andros Hagia MS 9, fols. 117v–132v [xvi]
  Text and Commentary: Maisano (infra) [critical edition].
- Cambridge, TC cod. O.8.33 [olim C.26], fols. 71v–81v [xvi]
  Text and Commentary: Maisano (infra) [critical edition].
  incep.: Εν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ἐλθόντες οἱ ἀπόστολοι τοῦ κυρίου λέγοντες, εἰπὲ ἡμῖν πότε ταῦτα ἐσται κ. τ. τὸ σημεῖον τῆς σῆς παρουσίας κ. τ. συντελεῖας τ. αἰῶνον τούτου. λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ήκουσετε τοῦ προφήτη Δανιὴλ λέγοντος ἐβάρεσκα τόν παλαιὸν τῶν ἡμερῶν
  Reference: James, M.R. The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge. Cambridge, 1900. 1.430: “After a few lines Christ quotes a vision of Daniel which continues to the end. Much of it is occupied by a contest between an Abbot Stephanus μεσοκλίτεσ and a wicked king.”
  Note: Halkin, BHG (infra), no. 1871a, identifies this MS as a copy of the Discourses of John Chrysostom Concerning the Vision of Daniel
- Jerusalem, Patriarchikē Bibliothēkē cod. Sabaitikos gr. 128 [xvii]
  Text and Commentary: Maisano (infra) [critical edition].
  Note: Halkin, BHGN (infra), no. 1871, identifies this MS as a copy of the Discourses of John Chrysostom Concerning the Vision of Daniel.
  Note: L. Pertusi, Fine di Bisanzio e fine del mondo. Significato e ruolo storico delle profezie sulla caduta di Costantinopoli in Oriente e in Occidente (Istituto storico Italiano per medio evo n.s. 3; Roma, 1988) 39 note 130, but in the context of the Vision of Daniel on the Future of the Seven-Hilled City. “Pure di origine cretese l’altra versione della Visio Leonis che si legge nei codd. Athen. gr. 2187, s. XV, e Sabait. gr. 128, s. XV–XVIII, ed. Maisano, pp. 117–125.”
Description of the Text: See Chapter Three, §2.12.

1. Texts and Translations


2. Auxiliary Studies


3. Secondary Studies


XV. Discourses of John Chrysostom Concerning the Vision of Daniel

Manuscripts:
- Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Barb. gr. 284 [olim gr. III.3], fols. 130v–141v [1497]
  *inser.*: Τού ἐν ἀγίῳ πατρός ἡμῶν Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου λόγος ἐκ τὴν ὀράσειν τοῦ Δανιήλ
  *incip.*: "Ἔκουσεν, ὑπακοήν, μετὰ ἀκριβίας, πάς οἱ τέσσαρες βασιλεῖς μετ’ ἄλληλων συνήθησαν. Αἴθωμες, Μακεδόνες, Ἐλληνες καὶ Ρωμαίοι..."
  *Text*: Vassiliev (*infra*) [likely an eclectic edition with Ottob. gr. 418]; Schmoldt (*infra*) [with translation].
  *Reference*: Vassiliev (*infra*), xxiv.
- Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Ottob. gr. 418, fol. 301 [xv/xvi]
  *Text*: Vassiliev (*infra*) [likely an eclectic edition with Barb. gr. 284]; Schmoldt (*infra*) [with translation].
  *Reference*: Vassiliev (*infra*), xxiv.

and very probably (see the discussion in Chapter Three, §2.15):
- Athínai, Ethnikè Bibliothèkè tês Hellados cod. 2605 [olim Serrensis II 25], fols. 257v–258v [xiv/xv]
  *incip.*: Τέτοκε δὲ Βοσσάντια τρεῖς υἱοῖς, τὸν πρῶτον ὡνόμασε κατὰ τὴν προσηγορίαν τοῦ πατρός Ἐρμύλαου, τὸν δὲ δεύτερον Ερβάνον
- Venezia, BM cod. gr. XI.25 [olim Nanianus 300], fols. 160r–165v

Description of the Text: See Chapter Three, §2.15.

1. Texts and Translations


On proposed emendations to Vassiliev’s text, see N.G. Politis, “Διορθωτικά τινα εἰς τὰ *Anecdota graeco-byzantina* τοῦ Vassiliev,” *IV* 4 (1897), 94–99 at 97.
2. Auxiliary Studies


3. Secondary Studies

XVI. The Vision of Daniel on the Last Times and the End of the World

Manuscripts:
- Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Barb. gr. 284 [olim gr. III.3], fols. 141v–152v [1497]
  
  inscr.: "Ωρασίς τοῦ Δανιήλ περὶ τοῦ ἐσχάτου καιροῦ καὶ περὶ τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος"

  incip.: Καὶ ἦσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, ἀναστήσεται μειράκιον ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσαμηλ καὶ ἢξελεύσεται ἐπὶ τὰς χώρας . . .

  Text: Vassiliev (infra) [but citing fols. 142ff.]; Schmoldt (infra).

Reference: Vassiliev (infra), xxiv; Haelewyck (infra).

Note: Vassiliev (infra), xxv, and Haelewyck (infra) assert that the Vision of Daniel on the Last Times and the End of the World is preserved in Wien, ÖNB cod. phil. gr. 58 [olim 211], fols. 44–50. But see Chapter Three, notes 299 and 300.

Description of the Text: See Chapter Three, §2.16.

1. Texts and Translations


On the emendations to Vassiliev’s text, see N.G. Politis, “Διορθωτικά τινα εἰς τὰ Anecdota graeco-byzantina τοῦ Vassiliev,” IV 4 (1897), 94–99 at 97.

2. Auxiliary Studies


3. Secondary Studies

Daniel Apocrypha Preserved Primarily in Greek 365


XVII. The Vision of Daniel on the Island of Crete

Manuscripts:

– Crete, Brontisi Monastery

  Reference: Bées, N.A. “Katalogos tôn cheiropigraphōn kōdikōn tēs en Aroaneia monēs tôn Hagión Theodōrīn.” Επετηρίς Φιλολ. Συλλ. Παρανάσου 9 (1906). 56–57; Morgan (infra), 293: “there are two prophecies . . . One prophecy is ascribed to Daniel the monk . . .”

– Venezia, BM cod. gr. VII.22 [olim Nanianus 244], fol. 59r [1590]

  Reference: Mioni, E. Bibliothecae Divi Marci Venetiarum codices graeci manuscripti. II: Codices qui in sextam, septimam atque octavam classem includuntur continens. Roma, 1960. 36: “Methodius Patarensis [ps.—], De regnis gentium et alia vaticinia, i.e. Orakelweltchronik . . . de Danielis vaticinio in Cretam insulam”; Morgan (infra) [he does not distinguish between the two BM cod. gr. VII.22 copies]: “both these prophecies are combined and ascribed to the prophet Daniel.”

– Venezia, BM cod. gr. VII.22 [olim Nanianus 244], fols. 84r–86r [1590]

  Inscr.: Ἐτέρα ὄρασι τοῦ προφήτου Δανιήλ περὶ τῆς νήσου κράτης

  Incipit: Οδοὶ οὐδέ οὐκ αἱ κράτης πολυορκομένης [Rigo: πολυορκομένη]

  Reference: Mioni (infra), 36–37: “Methodius atarensis [ps.—], De regnis gentium et alia vaticinia, i.e. Orakelweltchronik . . . de Danielis visionibus in insulam Cretam”; Morgan (infra) [he does not distinguish between the two BM cod. gr. VII.22 copies]: “both these prophecies are combined and ascribed to the prophet Daniel”; Rigo, A. Oracula Leonis. Tre manoscritti greco-veneziani
degli oracoli attribuiti all’imperatore bizantino Leone il Saggio (Bodl. Baroc. 190, Marc. gr. VII.22, Marc. gr. VII.3). Venezia, 1988. 50–52.  

Note: Rigo also records a preliminary *incipit*: Πόλλοι φόνοι ἐν τῇ νῆσῳ κράτης.

- Venezia, BM cod. gr. XI.19, fol. 338 *bis* [xvi]
  
  **Text:** Morgan (*infra*).
  
  **Reference:** Laourdas (*infra*).

**Description of the Text:** See Chapter Three, §2.20.

1. **Secondary Studies**


**XVIII. The Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel**

**Manuscripts:**

**Greek**

  
  **inscr.**: ἡ ἐσχάτη ὀράσις τοῦ προφήτου Δανιήλ
  
  
  **Note:** Halkin, *BHG* (*infra*), no. 1874c, correctly identifies this text this as a copy of the *Last Vision* but incorrectly identifies it with the text published by Istrin (*infra*), 140–142 (i.e., *The Vision of Daniel on the Island of Cyprus*).

- London, BL cod. Harley 5632, fols. 494r–496v [1574]
  

- London, BL cod. Harley 5734, fols. 42–45 [xvi]
  
  **Text:** Istrin, no. 184 (*infra*) [variants in apparatus, but listing fols. 42–46].
  
  **Reference:** Istrin, no. 182 (*infra*); Bousset, “Beiträge” (*infra*); Schmoldt (*infra*), 115–116.

- Mount Athos, Monastery of Iveron cod. 207 [Lambros no. 4327], fols. 191v–197r [xvi]
  
  **inscr.**: ἡ ἐσχάτη ὀράσις τοῦ προφήτου Δανιήλ
  
  **incip.**: Τάδε λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ. Οὐαί σοι, γῆ, . . .
  

- Mount Athos, Monastery of Koutloumousion cod. 217 [Lambros no. 3290], fols. 181r–183v [xviii]
  
  **Text:** Istrin, no. 184 (*infra*); Kampers (*infra*), 147 [partial text *apud* Istrin].
  
- Oxford, Bod. cod. Barocci 145 [SC 145], fols. 61v–63v [xv/xvi]
  inscr.: ὁράσεις τοῦ προφήτου Δανιήλ ἀπὸ τῆς πετεκαδέκατῆς ήμέρας τῆς αἰγυμακοσίας ἐως τῆς Χριστιανοῦ καταβάσεως ἐως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος
  incep.: καὶ η ἡ νήσος Κρήτης τῆς ῥάχην αὐτῆς
  Note: Halkin, Novum auctarium BHG (infra), no. 1874c, correctly identifies this text this as a copy of the Last Vision but incorrectly identifies it with the text published by Istrin (infra), 140–142 (i.e., The Vision of Daniel on the Island of Cyprus).

- Oxford, Bod. cod. Barocci 145 [SC 145], fols. 96v–97v [xv/xvi]
  inscr.: ὁράσεις τοῦ προφήτου Δανιήλ ἀπὸ τῆς πετεκαδέκατῆς ήμέρας τῆς αἰγυμακοσίας ἐως τῆς Χριστιανοῦ καταβάσεως, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Χριστιανοῦ καταβάσεως ἐως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος
  incep.: Τάδε λέγει κύριος, οὐκαί σοι γῇ ὑπόταν τῶν ἁγγέλων
  Reference: Coxe (supra), col. 248.
  Note: Halkin, BHG (infra), no. 1874c, correctly identifies this text this as a copy of the Last Vision but incorrectly identifies it with the text published by Istrin (infra), 140–142 (i.e., The Vision of Daniel on the Island of Cyprus).


- Paris, BNF cod. gr. 947, fols. 199v–201r [1574]
  inscr.: ἐσχάτη ὁράσεις τοῦ Δανιήλ
  Text: Tischendorf (infra) [eclectic text with BNF cod. gr. 2180 and BM cod. gr. II.125]; Klostermann, Analecta (infra) [eclectic text with BNF cod. gr. 2180 and BM codd. gr. II.125 and gr. VII.38].
  Note: Vassiliev (infra), xxiv, and Stegmüller (infra) identify this text as a copy of the Vision of Daniel On the Last Times and the End of the World.

- Paris, BNF cod. gr. 2180, fol. 104r–v [xv]
  inscr.: ἐκ τῶν ἐσχάτων ὀράσεων τοῦ προφήτου Δανιήλ
  Text: Tischendorf (infra) [eclectic text with BNF cod. gr. 947 and BM cod. gr. II.125]; Klostermann, Analecta (infra) [eclectic text with BNF cod. gr. 947 and BM codd. gr. II.125 and gr. VII.38].
  Reference: Istrin, no. 182 (infra); Bousset, “Beiträge” (infra); Halkin, Manuscrits grecs (supra), 232: “Visiones Danielis”; Schmoldt (infra), 115–116.
  Note: Vassiliev (infra), xxiv, and Stegmüller (infra) identify this text as a copy of the Vision of Daniel On the Last Times and the End of the World.

- Paris, BNF cod. supp. gr. 467, fols. 223r–225r [xvi]
  Reference: Halkin, Manuscrits grecs (supra), 290: “Visio Danielis mon.”

- Patmos, Monastery of St. John cod. 529, fols. 13–21 [early xix]
  Text: Istrin, no. 182 (infra), 285–287 [partial, parallel with Beograd Narodna Biblioteka Srbiye cod. 651 (infra)]; Istrin, no. 184 (infra) [as variants in apparatus].
  Reference: Bousset, “Beiträge” (infra); Schmoldt (infra), 115–116.

- Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Ottob. gr. 415, fols. 123–125 [xiv/xv]
  inscr.: ἡ ἐσχάτη ὁράσεις τοῦ προφήτου Δανιήλ

- Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Ottob. gr. 418, fols. 298v–300v [xv/xvi]
  Text: Vassiliev (infra) [likely an eclectic text with ONB cod. phil. gr. 162].
  Reference: Bousset, “Beiträge” (infra); Stegmüller (infra); Schmoldt (infra), 115–116.
- Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. gr. 363, fols. 47–49 [xv]
  inscr.: Η ἐσχάτη ὀρασὶς τοῦ προφήτου Δανιήλ
  incip.: Τάδε λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ ... 

- Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Vat. gr. 695, fols. 261 ff. [xiv/xv]
  inscr.: ὀρασὶς τοῦ προφήτου Δανιήλ ἀπὸ τῆς πετεκαϊδεκάτης

- Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Vat. gr. 1700, fols. 100–105 [1332/1333]
  inscr.: Η ἐσχάτη ὀρασὶς τοῦ προφήτου Δανιήλ

- Venezia, BM cod. gr. II.125 [olim Nanianus 181], fols. 6r–10r [xv]
  incip.: ἀποκάλυψις τοῦ προφήτου Δανιήλ περὶ τῆς συντελείας τοῦ κόσμου

- Venezia, BM cod. gr. III.12 [olim Nanianus 236], fols. 484r–487v [xv]
  incip.: Τάδε λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ.
  expl.: καὶ ἀποδόσει ἐκάστῳ ὁ κύριος κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν
  Reference: Klostermann, Analecta (infra) [eclectic text with BNF codd. gr. 947 and 2180 and BM cod. gr. VII.38].

- Venezia, BM cod. gr. VII.38 [olim Nanianus 154], fols. 350v–352r [xvi/xv]
  inscr.: ἡ ἐσχάτη ὀρασὶς τοῦ προφήτου Δανιήλ καὶ περὶ τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως καὶ περὶ τοῦ εἰρηνικοῦ βασιλέας καὶ περὶ τῆς συντελείας
  incip.: Τάδε λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ. Ουάι σοι, γῆ ... 
  expl.: ἀπὸ ἁνέμου στροβίλου ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ
  Text: Klostermann, Analecta (infra) [eclectic text with BNF codd. gr. 947 and 2180 and BM cod. gr. II.125].

- Wien, ÖNB cod. hist. gr. 110, fols. 1r–3v [xvi]
  inscr.: Η ἐσχάτη ὀρασὶς τοῦ Δανιήλ

- Wien, ÖNB cod. iur. gr. 6, fols. 201v–202v [xv]
  inscr.: ή τελευταία όρασις τού μεγάλου προφήτου Δανιήλ, ήτις διά τού ἐν ἀγίων πατρός ἡμῶν Μεθοδίου Πατάρων εφανερώθη ἡμῖν
  Text: Klostermann, “Zur Apokalypse Daniels” (infra) [listing textual variations from the edition in his Analecta (infra)]


- Wien, ÖNB cod. phil. gr. 162, fols. 163v–167v [xv]
  Text: Vassiliev (infra)
  Note: On the foliation of this copy, see Chapter Three note 411.

- Wien, ÖNB cod. suppl. gr. 172, fols. 19v–24r [xvi]
  inscr.: Η ἐσχάτη Ὄρασις τού προφήτου Δανιήλ, ήτις διά τοῦ ἐν ἀγίων ἡμῶν Μεθοδίου ἐπισκόπου Πατάρων εφανερώθη ἡμῖν
  BHG 1873.”

- Wien, ÖNB cod. suppl. gr. 1601, fols. 133r–135r [xvii]
  Note: Istrin, no. 182 (infra) and Bousset, “Beiträge,” (infra) assert that the Vision of Daniel on the Last Times and the End of the World is preserved in Wien, ÖNB cod. phil. gr. 58 [olim 211], fols. 44–50. But see Chapter Three, notes 299, 300, and 417.

Slavonic

- Beograd, Narodna Biblioteka Srbije cod. 312, fols. 68r–73v [xvi/xvii]
  inscr.: пророка Данила последње зрели
  Text: Makushev (infra); Istrin, no. 182 (infra), 284–285 [portions of Slavonic text paralleling Greek text].
  Reference: Kozak (infra); Bonwetsch (infra), 916; Stojanović, L. Каталог Народне библиотеке у Његраду. IV. Рукописи и старе штампане књиге. Beograd, 1903. 309–312 at 310–311; Tupkova-Zaimova/Miltenova, Palaeobulgarica (infra), 41; Tupkova-Zaimova/Miltenova, Историко-апокалиптичната книжина във Византия (infra), 209.

- Beograd, Narodna Biblioteka Srbije cod. 313, fols. 78r–83r [xvii]
  Reference: Stojanovic (supra), 312–315 at 314; Tupkova-Zaimova/Miltenova, Palaeobulgarica (infra), 41; Tupkova-Zaimova/Miltenova, Историко-апокалиптичната книжина във Византия (infra), 209.

- Beograd, Narodna Biblioteka Srbije cod. 651, fols. 249v–251r [xiii]
  Text: Sreckovic (infra); Istrin, no. 182 (infra), 285–287 [partial, parallel with Patmos, Monastery of St. John cod. 529]; Tupkova-Zaimova/Miltenova, Историко-апокалиптичната книжина във Византия (infra) [with translation and commentary].
  Reference: Stojanovic, 290–294 at 293.
Note: This is a partial text, only part of what in the Greek is a longer composition.

Lvov, Narodna Biblioteka cod. A.C. Petrushevich, fols. 203–204 [xvi]
inscr.: Послѣднее видѣніе стого пророка Даниила
Text: Franko (infra).
Reference: Tupkova-Zaimova/Miltenova, Palaeobulgarica (infra), 41; Tupkova-Zaimova/Miltenova, Историко-апокалиптическата книжина въ Византия (infra), 210.

Moskva, Chudov Monastery cod. 62, fols. 721–725 [xvi]
Text: Speranski (infra), 58–64; Istrin, no. 182 (infra), 280–283 [portions of Slavonic text paralleling Greek text].
Reference: Kozak (infra); Bonwetsch (infra), 916–917; Stegmüller (infra); Tupkova-Zaimova/Miltenova, Историко-апокалиптическата книжина въ Византия (infra), 210.

Moskva, Gosudarstvenny istoricheski muzei cod. Khludov 241, fols. 132v–134v [c. 1451]

Moskva, Rossiskaya Gosudarstvennaya biblioteka [slim Gosudarstvennaya biblioteka im. Lenina] cod. Undolskii 1, fol. 422a [xy]
Text: Speranski (infra), 95–98; Istrin, no. 182 (infra), 277–280 [portions of Slavonic text paralleling Greek text].
Reference: Kozak (infra): “eine Besondere Redaktion” [re cod. Chudov Monastery cod. 62, supra]; Bonwetsch (infra), 917; Stegmüller (infra); Tupkova-Zaimova/Miltenova, Palaeobulgarica (infra), 41; Tupkova-Zaimova/Miltenova, Историко-апокалиптическата книжина въ Византия (infra), 210.

Mount Athos, Monastery of Panteleimon cod. 97, fol. 18r [xiv]
Reference: Tupkova-Zaimova/Miltenova, Palaeobulgarica (infra), 41; Tupkova-Zaimova/Miltenova, Историко-апокалиптическата книжина въ Византия (infra), 209.

Praha, Národního Musea cod. IX.A.44, fols. 258r–v [xiv]
inscr.: Слово къ пророка Даніїла

Sankt Petersburg, Biblioteka Akademii Nauk cod. 13.3.19, fols. 220v–224v [1448]
Text: Íatsimirski (infra), 133–136; Tupkova-Zaimova/Miltenova, Palaeobulgarica (infra), 41; Tupkova-Zaimova/Miltenova, Историко-апокалиптическата книжина въ Византия (infra), 214–218 [with translation and commentary].

Sreznevskii MS [xvii]
Text: Sreznevskii (infra).
Reference: Kozak (infra); Bonwetsch (infra), 917; Stegmüller (infra).
Note: The identification and details of the Slavonic MS copies of this text remain quite preliminary and it is quite possible that further copies exist but have yet to be identified. What is more, some manuscript copies appear to preserve only discrete portions of the text, although whether such copies could be called “incomplete” (i.e., suggesting a fixed text against which these copies could be measured) is very uncertain given the pericope-like nature of the parts of this and other apocalyptic texts attributed to Daniel.

Description of the Text: See Chapter Three, §2.23.
1. *Texts and Translations*


Іатсимирскій, І.А. Из истории славянской письменности в Молдавии и Валахии XV–XVII вв. Памятники древней письменности и искусства 162. Санкт Петербург, 1906.

Istrin, V.M. “Откровение Мефодия Патарского и апокрифических видений Даниила въ византийской и славянорусской литературѣ. В. Тексты. II. Видѣнія Даниила.” *COIDR Moskva* 184 (1898.1). Moskva, 1898. 135–162 at 135–139.


Essentially a translation of Klostermann’s edition, *infra*.


Speranskiй, M. “Бібліографіческіе матеріалы А.Н. Прпвымъ.” *COIDR Moskva* (1889.3).


2. Auxiliary Studies


Notes the publication of Tischendorf, Apocalypses apocryphae, Klostermann, Analecta zur LXX and “Zur Apokalypse Daniels,” (supra), and Kalemkiar, “Die siebente Visions Daniels” (see the Armenian Seventh Vision of Daniel, supra).


3. Secondary Studies


Discussed in conjunction with the Armenian *Seventh Vision of Daniel*, which Weinel understands to be a version of the same work.


Discussed in conjunction with the Armenian *Seventh Vision of Daniel*.

**Excursus: Notes on and Manuscripts of Unidentified Greek Daniel Apocalypses**

The following comments and notes are included for the sake of completeness, on the theory that partial information is better than no information at all. Of course, an examination by autopsy of these MS will no doubt further add to our understanding of the texts of the Daniel apocalyptic and their MS evidence.

i. *Oxford, Bod. cod. Barocci 148*


But the *Summary Catalogue* does not confirm this information. Rather, I think it possible that this is a mistaken reference to Oxford, Bod. cod. Barocci 145 [SC 145], a codex which preserves several apocryphal Daniel apocalypses; see Chapter Three, note 407. It is also possible that Migne was referring to the portion of the Greek Book of Daniel preserved in Oxford, Bod. cod. Barocci 148, fols. 1–30, to which F. Halkin, *Bibliotheca hagiographica graeca* (SubH 8a; Bruxelles, 1957), 2.313, lists under the heading “Visio(nes) Danielis” at no. 1870y.

ii. *Paris, BNF cod. gr. 1295*

In his editions and literary analysis of the Greek recensions of the *Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius* and the texts of the apocryphal Daniel apocalypses (“Откровение Методия Патарского и апокрифических видений Даниила в византийской и славяно-русской литературе.” В. Тексты. II. Виды Даниила,” *COIDRMoskva* 184 (1898.1) (Moskva, 1898), 135–162 at 151–155), V.M. Istrin includes a text that A. Vasiliev calls “the last Greek version” of a Greek *Vision of Daniel* (The Russian Attack on Constantinople in 860 (Mediaeval Academy of America Publication 46; Cambridge, MA, 1946), 161). Note that Istrin includes in the apparatus to the edition variants from what appears to be a second copy at Patmos cod. 548.

The question of whether Vasiliev and other authorities are correct in postulating a single Greek *Vision of Daniel* of which all the extant Daniel apocalypses are either versions or copies is addressed in Chapter Three, §3. The issue pertinent here is whether this text, as Vasiliev suggests (and as Istrin implies), is a *Daniel* apocalypse. Although the text contains several *topoi* and themes common to other Daniel apocalypses, the text is not attributed to Daniel, nor does it appear to be an unattributed copy of an extant Daniel apocalypse. See, further, W. Bouset, “Beiträge zur Geschichte der Eschatologie,” *ZKG* 20 (1900), 103–131, 261–290 at 289. Note that F. Halkin lists the text under “Apocalypsis Methodii” (*Bibliotheca hagiographica graeca* (SubH 8a; Bruxelles, 1957), No. 2036e, 3.10; *Novum auctarium bibliothecae hagiographicae graecae* (SubH 65; Bruxelles, 1984), No. 2036e, 220).
iii. Jerusalem, Patriarchiké Bibliothékē cod. S. Sepulcri 121, fols. 13r–33r

In the first volume of his catalogue of Greek MS codices, A. Papadopoulos-Kerameós lists a text by the title “Ὀράσεις καὶ ἀποκάλυψις Δανιήλ τοῦ προφήτου” (‘Ierosolymitikí Bibliothékē I (Sankt-Petersburg, 1891), 201–202 at 202). From what I can gather, the text begins “‘Ετώς τρίτου τοῦ Κύρου,” to which Papadopoulos-Kerameós adds “Προτέτακτοι ὀκτάστης χρησμοῖς, οὗ ἡ ἄρχη ‘ἐν ἔτει τρίτῳ βασιλεύοντος’.” I know nothing more on this text.


In the second volume of his catalogue of Greek MS codices, A. Papadopoulos-Kerameós lists a text by the title “Ὠράσις Δανιήλ τοῦ προφήτου” (‘Ierosolymitikí Bibliothékē II (Sankt-Petersburg, 1894), 651–653 at 653). But nothing more is said of this text or its contents.

v. Jerusalem, Patriarchiké Bibliothékē (?) cod. 244, fols. 218–225

In the fourth volume of his catalogue of Greek MS codices, A. Papadopoulos-Kerameós lists a text by the title “Ὠράσις Δανιήλ τοῦ προφήτου” (‘Ierosolymitikí Bibliothékē IV (Sankt-Petersburg, 1899), 207–210 at 210). Most interestingly, the text begins: “‘Ὠράσις πρώτη τοῦ προφήτου Δανιήλ. Καὶ Ἰν ἀνήρ οἰκών ἐν Βαβυλώνι.’”

vi. London, BL cod. Harley 5734, fols. 57r–60r [xvi]


vii. Mount Athos, Monastery of Dionysos cod. 159 [xix] [Lambros no. 3693]


viii. Mount Athos, Monastery of Dionysos cod. 167 [xx] [Lambros no. 3701]

Listed, most intriguingly, by S.P. Lambros as “Δανιήλ ὀράσεις α’—β” (Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos (Cambridge, 1895–1900), 1.353). Foliation, incipit, and details unknown. There is a text in the University Library of Messina that is described by its cataloguer as “ὁράσις Δανιήλ τοῦ προφήτου... ὀράσις πρώτη περὶ Σουσάννης—Fol. 98v: ὀράσις γ’. Περὶ τοῦ δράκοντος,” which presumably is the LXX Book of Daniel (see H. Delehaye, Catalogus codicum hagiographorum graecorum Monasterii S. Salvatoris, nunc Bibliothecae Universitatis Messanensis (AnBoll 23 reprint; Bruxelles, 1904), 60). The description of the second MS might shed light on the nature of the contents of the first.

ix. Mount Athos, Monastery of Iveron cod. 686 [xxvii] [Lambros no. 4806]

x. Mount Athos, Monastery of Iveron cod. 751 [xvii] [Lambros no. 4871]

Listed by S.P. Lambros as “Περὶ τῶν ὀράσεων τοῦ Δανιὴλ” (Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos (Cambridge, 1895–1900), 2.220). Foliation, incipit, and details unknown, although the text would appear to be quite short (fifty-seven separate tracts are included between fols. 31r and 49r).

My search of the index of Lambros’ catalogue reveals no less than nine texts that are almost certainly apocryphal Daniel apocalypses. To put this figure into perspective, only two of these apocalypses had been listed in the previous research: Koutloumousiou Monastery cod. 217 [Lambros no. 3290] (the Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel) and Koutloumousiou Monastery cod. 220 [Lambros no. 3293] (the Vision of Daniel on the Blond Race). As for cod. Vatopedi 754 (the Vision of Daniel on the Blond Race), I have not been able to associate the reference to this copy with the information contained in Lambros’ catalogue. On the basis of the catalogue title and incipit, I have tentatively identified Iberon Monastery cod. 207 [Lambros no. 4327] as a copy of the Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel, and Iberon Monastery cod. 181 [Lambros no. 4301] and Xiropotamos Monastery cod. 248 [Lambros no. 2581] as copies of the Vision of Daniel on the Future of the Seven-Hilled City.

xi. Wien, ÖNB cod. suppl. gr. 89, fols. 14v–15v/Wien, ÖNB cod. suppl. gr. 172, fols. 31r–33r:

F. Halkin lists these two MSS as a separate apocalypse (No. 1875b) in his Novum auctarium bibliothecae hagiographicae graecae (SubH 65; Bruxelles, 1984), 214. The information in Hunger and Hannick’s catalogue seems to confirm this: i) Wien, ÖNB cod. suppl. gr. 89: “(14’–15’) <METHODIOS> VON PATARA* (?), Weissagung über die Türken und den Fall von Konstantinopel (Χρησιμος ο πορων εοικε του Πετρου... Inc. Γενος δε του Χρησιμου κτισε άνω και κατω πλησιον της επαλαρου και ουκ οι επαλώσε... Vgl. Cod. Suppl. gr. 172, f. 31’...”; Wien, ÖNB cod. suppl. gr. 172: “(31r–33r) LASKARIS, Erklärung des vorangehenden Orakels (Ερημηνεια του Λασκαριου Κοδ.). Inc. Γενος του Χρησιμου κτισε άνω και κατω πλησιον της επαλαρου...” (Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der österreichischen Nationalbibliothek. Teil 4: Supplementum graecum (Museon (neue Folge) 4.4. Wien, 1994), 150, 293). I have not read the text of this apocalypse, nor does it appear to be attributed to Daniel. At the same time, Halkin’s assertion that it belongs with the visions of Daniel cannot be ignored. More work is required here.

Excursus: Sundry Greek Daniel Apocrypha

i. Daniel in the Menologia and Synaxaria

A menologion is a liturgical book which is arranged by the months of the ecclesiastical year of the Eastern Church and in which are contained the lives of saints and other figures. The term synaxarion is frequently used interchangeably, although it more properly refers to a specific type of collection of brief accounts of saints or feasts. The figure of Daniel is commonly associated with 17 December, the Sunday preceding Christmas. See F. Halkin, “Un inédit de Nicétas le Paphlagonien: l’éloge du prophète Daniel BGH 488b,” KΑΘΗΓΗΤΡΙΑ. Essays Presented to Joan Hussey for Her 80th Birthday (ed. J. Chrysostomides; Camberley, 1988), 287–302, re Paris, BNF cod. gr. 1180, fols. 124r–132r.

ii. Wien, ÖNB cod. phil. gr. 220, fols. 198r–203v

See H. Hunger, Katalog der griechischen Handschriften des Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek. Teil 1: Codices historici. Codices philosophici et philologici (Museon (neue Folge) 4.1); Wien,
iii. Mount Athos, Monastery of Iveron cod. 383 [xvii] [Lambros no. 4503]

There are two texts of note here. The first is listed by S.P. Lambros as “Περὶ τοῦ προφήτου Ἱερεμίου καὶ τοῦ προφήτου Δανιήλ,” the second (which immediately follows) as “Ετέραν φοράν τοῦ Δανιήλ τοῦ προφήτου” (Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos (Cambridge, 1895–1900), 2.118). Specific foliation, incipit, and additional details unknown.

iv. Mount Athos, Monastery of Iveron cod. 604 [xviii] [Lambros no. 4724]

Listed, interestingly, by S.P. Lambros as “Προνοοστικά περὶ Ἀντιχρίστου καὶ τῆς βασιλείας τῶν Μοαμεθανῶν, ἐρμηνευτικὰ τῆς Ἀποκάλυψις καὶ τῶν τεσσάρων βασιλείων τοῦ Δανιήλ καὶ κατὰ τῆς αἱρέσεως τῶν Λατίνων (Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts on Mount Athos (Cambridge, 1895–1900), 2.183). Specific foliation, incipit, and additional details unknown.

Excursus: Daniel Legenda Preserved in the Palaea historica

The first introduction to the Palaea historica from the perspective of someone interested in biblical apocrypha was provided by M.R. James, who writes that this text is “a history of the Old Testament from Adam to Daniel. The Slavonic Version of this is one of the most important monuments of Slavonic literature . . . The lives of the Judges are full of extraordinary blunders . . . The kings after David are almost wholly omitted. Then follow the stories of Bir (i.e. Tobit) and Daniel. The whole book is a kind of Greek Historia scholastica, but is much more full of legendary matter than that compilation” (Apocrypha Anecdota II (T&S 5.1; Cambridge, 1897 [rep. Nendeln, 1967]), 156–157). Despite James’ statement, however, the material on Daniel is actually limited to a retelling of the episode of Lions’ Den (Daniel 6).

The Greek text of the Palaea was printed by A. Vassiliev in his Anecdota graeco-byzantina (Moskva, 1893), 188–292, but Vassiliev mentions (lxxvii) that a Slavonic version was edited by A. Poporus in 1881. The Palaea historica must be distinguished from the Palaea interpretata, which is preserved only in the Slavonic. The essential survey study of the Greek Palaea historica (with an invaluable overview of its contents) remains that of D. Flusser, “Palaea historica. An Unknown Source of Biblical Legends,” Studies in Aggadah and Folk-Literature (Scripta Hierosolymitana 22; edd. J. Heinemann and D. Noy; Jerusalem, 1971), 48–79.
I. The Vita Danielis in the Lives of the Prophets

See above, under “Daniel Apocrypha Preserved Primarily in Greek.”

II. Somniale Danielis

Manuscripts:
The following list of manuscripts in which the Somniale Danielis is preserved is still probably incomplete. That being said, it represents the fullest list compiled to date, especially with respect to the Latin manuscripts. Some of the manuscripts were first identified in a series of seminal articles written by M. Förster in the early decades of the twentieth century, others were listed by later scholars such as L. Thorndike, L.T. Martin, J. Grub, A. Epe, M.E. Wittmer-Butsch, or M. de Wit. Several dozen manuscript copies of the Somniale, however, are highlighted here for the first time outside of their initial citation in a catalogue or other source.

Because of the large number of manuscripts, no attempt has been made to provide the title or the incipit or explicit for each; on these, see the incomplete but still valuable list in Thorndike and P. Kibre’s Catalogue of Incipits (infra). In addition, because the textual situation must now be considered unresolved on account of the addition of so many hitherto unnoticed copies, I have decided against assigning distinctive sigla to the manuscripts. On the various Prologues to the Somniale Danielis, see Chapter Four, §2.

Abbreviations Employed in the List of the Manuscripts:

Epe:

Förster, “Beiträge III.3”:

Förster, “Beiträge III.4”:

Förster, “Beiträge IV.5”:

Förster, “Beiträge V.6”:

Förster, “Beiträge V.7”:

Förster, “Beiträge IX.19”:
Martin:

Thornìde:

Thornìde/Kibre:

de Wit:

Wittmer-Butsch:

{[*]} MS siglum [e.g., Martin {A}]

Greek
- Berlin, DSB cod. Phillipps 1479, fols. 4v–10v (314 dreams, incomplete) [xv]
  Text: de Stoop (infra).
  - Paris, BNF cod. gr. 2511, fols. 27r–36v [xiv]
    Text: Drexel, “Das anonyme Traumbuch” (infra), 290.
    Note: This dream-book, although anonymous, is very similar in content to Vatican cod. Pal. gr. 319 (infra).
  - Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. gr. 319, fols. 31r–48r [xv]
    Note: For a synthetic translation of and brief commentary on all three of these Greek MSS, see Oberhelman (infra), 79–124.

Latin
- Berlin, SBPK cod. theol. 4° 10, fols. 63r–64r [xv]
- Berlin, SBPK cod. lat. 4° 70, fols. 226ra–229rb [xiv]
  Reference: Rose (supra), 1219: “Dies ist das Somniale Danielis propheta im cod. Ox. Digb. 81 (Macray’s Cat. p. 87)”; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin, 60; de Wit.
Bern, Stadtbibliothek Bongarsiana (Burgerbibliothek) cod. 556, fols. 129v–133v

Boston, Public Library, cod. G.401.12, fols. 88r–90r [1448]

Bruxelles, Bibliothèque royale des Ducs de Bourgogne cod. 2367, 71r–80v [xv]
Reference: Catalogue des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Royale des Ducs de Bourgogne. 3 vols. Bruxelles, 1842. 1.48, 2.162; Thorndike/Kibre, col. 671; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin, 60; de Wit.

Budapest, Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum cod. 59, fols. 40r–43v [xiii/xiv]
Reference: Bartoniek, E. Codices manu scripti latini. I: Codices latini medii aevi. Budapest, 1940. 51–52; Thorndike/Kibre, col. 124; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin, 61; de Wit.

Budapest, Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum cod. 405, fols. 119v–122v [xiv]
Reference: Bartoniek, Codices manu scripti (supra), 367; Thorndike/Kibre, col. 671; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin, 61.

Cambridge, CCC cod. 301, pp. 198–202 [xiv]
Reference: Wittmer-Butsch; Martin, 61; Epe {GD}; de Wit.

Cambridge, CCC cod. 466 [olim MS Misc. L], pp. 131 (incipit), 228–231 [xiv]

Cambridge, CCC cod. 481, pp. 404–418 [xiii/xiv]
Reference: James, Descriptive Catalogue... CCC (supra), No. 481; Thorndike/Kibre, col. 141; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin, 61; Epe {GA} [but citing pp. 405–419]; de Wit.

Cambridge, PC cod. 103, fols. 75r–77v (144 dreams) [x]
Text: Förster, “Beiträge V.7.”
Reference: Förster, “Beiträge III.4,” 32; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin {C} de Wit.
Note: In his list of the MS books at the former library of S. Edmund at Bury, M.R. James identifies a codex (his no. 207) containing a copy of the “Sompniarum Danielis” which is now part of the holdings at Pembroke College, Cambridge. But James dates this codex to the xii/xiii centuries. See M.R. James, On the Abbey of S. Edmund at Bury. I. The Library. II. The Church (Cambridge Antiquarian Society, Octavo Publications 28; Cambridge, 1895), 77.

Cambridge, Peterhouse MS 222, fols. 1r–8v [xiv]
Reference: Steinschneider (infra), 200; Epe {GE}; de Wit.

Cambridge, TC cod. O.1.57 [olim C.1] fols. 119r–124r (324 dreams) [xv]
Reference: James, M.R. The Western Manuscripts in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge, Cambridge, 1900. 1.57; Thorndike/Kibre, cols. 621, 735; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin {Y}; Epe {EY}; de Wit.

Cambridge, TC cod. O.8.21 [olim C.15.46] [xv–xvi]
Reference: James, Western Manuscripts... TC (supra), 1.409; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin, 61; de Wit.

Cambridge, UL cod. Gg.i.1, fols. 394v–397r (215 dreams) [xiv]
Text: Förster, “Beiträge V.7.”
Reference: A Catalogue of the Manuscripts Preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge. Cambridge, 1858. 3.5 [but citing fols. 394v–397v]; Förster, “Beiträge III.4,” 32; Thorndike/Kibre, col. 141; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin {G}; de Wit.
Cambridge, UL cod. li.vi.17, fols. 112r–117v [xv]
Reference: A Catalogue ... University of Cambridge (supra), 3.516; Thorndike/Kibre, col. 141; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin, 61; Epe {GV}; de Wit.

Donauessingen, Hofbibliothek cod. 793 [xvi]
Reference: de Wit.

Erfurt, WBS cod. Amplonian 4° 21, fols. 136r–139v [xiv]
Reference: Schum, W. Beschreibendes Verzeichnis der Amplomanischen Handschriften-Sammlung zu Erfurt. Berlin, 1887. 303; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin, 61; de Wit.

Erfurt, WBS cod. Amplonian 4° 186, fols. 125v–127v [xiv]
Reference: Schum (supra), 445; Thorndike/Kibre, col. 7; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin, 61; Epe {GG}; de Wit.

Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek cod. 90, fols. 110r–118r (494 dreams) [xv]
Reference: Wittmer-Butsch; Martin {F}; de Wit.

Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek cod. 673, fols. 85r–86v [xv]
Reference: Wittmer-Butsch; Martin {Ee}; de Wit.

Firenze, BML cod. Ashburnham 1724 [olim 1648], fols. 110r–118r (315 dreams) [xv]
Reference: Wittmer-Butsch; Martin {F}; de Wit.

Kassel, Landesbibliothek cod. 2° iurid. 25, fols. 176r–177v [xiv]

Kassel, Landesbibliothek cod. 4° iurid. 36 [xiv]
Reference: de Wit.

Note: The status of this text is unclear (so de Wit, in private correspondence).

Kassel, Landesbibliothek cod. 4° iurid. 37, fols. 159r–163v [xiv]
Reference: Kremer, Handschriften (supra), 138ff.; Wittmer-Butsch; de Wit.

Krakow, Biblioteka Jagiellońska, cod. 813, fols. 124r–v [1364/1368]

Leicester, Old Town Hall Library, cod. 4, pp. 33–34 [xiii–xiv]

Leiden, Universiteitsbibliothek cod. Vossiani Lat. O.52, fols. 101r–109v [xvii]

Leipzig, U-B cod. 936, fols. 152v–153v [xv]

London, BL cod. Add. 15236, fols. 161v–168v (235 dreams) [late xiii/early xiv]
Chapter Six


Note. The Index of Manuscripts in the British Library (supra) notes “Liber somniòrum Daniels, Prophetæ, f. 161b.”; “Rules for the interpretation of dreams, Fr., f. 169”; “‘Tractatus de futurorum prescienciis,’ f. 169b.” I am uncertain as to the nature of this French text.

– London, BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii, fols. 27v–31v (249 dreams) [xi]
Text: de Gray Birch (infra), 481–483 [partial, but citing fol. 25v]; Förster, “Beiträge IV.5” [edition of all the dreams at fols. 27v–32v]; Epe {AA}, 109–169; Fischer, Medieval Dreambook (infra).
Note. On the foliation problems that plague Cotton Tiberius A.iii, see note in the section on the MS in the Latin section of the Lunationes Danielis, infra.

Note. This text is composed in both Latin and Old English.

– London, BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii, fols. 31v–32r (21 dreams) [xi]
Text: Förster, “Beiträge IV.5” [edition of all the dreams at fols. 27v–32v]; Epe {AB}, 172–177.
Note. On the foliation of Cotton Tiberius A.iii, see note at fols. 27v–31v, supra.
Note. This text is not attributed to Daniel, but falls under the compass of fols. 27v–31v, which is.

– London, BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii, fol. 32r–v (32 dreams) [xi]
Text: Förster, “Beiträge IV.5” [edition of all the dreams at fols. 27v–32v]; Epe {EA}, 180–189.
Note. On the foliation of Cotton Tiberius A.iii, see note at fols. 27v–31v, supra.
Note. This text is composed in both Latin and Old English.
Note. This text is not attributed to Daniel, but falls under the compass of fols. 27v–31v, which is.

– London, BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii, fols. 38r–39v (97 dreams) [xi]
Text: Epe {EB}, 192–211.
Note. On the foliation of Cotton Tiberius A.iii, see note at fols. 27v–31v, supra.
Note. This text is composed in both Latin and Old English.
Note. This text is not attributed to Daniel, but is edited by Epe in his edition of the Somniale Danielis.

– London, BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii, fol. 42r–v (26 dreams) [xi]
Note. On the foliation of Cotton Tiberius A.iii, see note at fols. 27v–31v, supra.
Note. This text is composed in both Latin and Old English.
Note. This text is not attributed to Daniel, but is edited by Epe in his edition of the Somniale Danielis.

– London, BL cod. Cotton Titus D.xxvi, fols. 11v–16r (151 dreams) [c. 1040] inscr.: Alphabetum somniale excerptum ex Danielis libro [on which, de Gray Birch notes: “This heading is in a sixteenth or seventeenth century hand”]

Reference: Liber Vitae: Register and Martyrology of New Minster and Hyde Abbey. London, 1892. 258; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin {J}; Epe {A}; de Wit.


Reference: James, Western Manuscripts . . . TC (supra), 1.373: “Entered in the Manuscript Catalogue as (K.4. No. 374) . . . Somniarum Danieli. Quod uidet et disposuit in babilonia in diebus nabugodon/os/or rex quando uidit somnum ut ei a principibus ciuitatis uir inquirendus ut somnia quod uiderat eis tradere. Tunc daniel prophete hec somnia scripsit et eis (eis) ad agendum tradidit dicens ego sum daniel propheta unus de filiabus israel qui captiui ducti fuerunt de Iherusalem ciuitate sancta hec omnia a deo facta sunt nichil tamen per memed ipsum addit uel sustulit sed etiam a domino accepi quicunque legerint danielem intelligunt. [Somniale begins:] Aues in somnibus contra se pugnari uidere iracundiam signifcat etc.’ Ends: ‘Zizanus seminare etc’”; Thorndike/Kibre, col. 1256; de Wit.

- London, BL cod. Egerton 847 [olim Cambridge, TC cod. O.8.16], fols. 21v–26v (314 dreams) [xvi]


Note: A fragmentary Somniale, covering the letters A to C.

- London, BL cod. Harley 3017, fol. 1ra–1vb (76 dreams, but not arranged alphabetically) [ix]


- London, BL cod. Royal 12.C.xii, fols. 81v–86v (217 dreams) [xiii/xiv]

Reference: Warner and Gilson (infra), 2.28: “Lunationes et Somnia, a pair of treatises on prognostication which appear together in a variety of shapes, both in Latin and in other languages”; Index of Manuscripts in the British Library (infra), 3.203; Thorndike/Kibre, col. 125; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin {Q}; de Wit.


- London, BL cod. Sloane 475, fols. 217v–218r (29 dreams) [xi/xii]

Reference: Förster, “Beiträge III.4,” 32; Thorndike/Kibre, col. 170; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin {S}; Epe {AS}; Liuzza (infra), 227; de Wit.
- London, BL cod. Sloane 1009
  Reference: Bühler (infra), 270.

- London, BL cod. Sloane 2561, fol. 55 [xvii]

- London, BL cod. Sloane 3281, fols. 39r–47r (300 dreams) [late xiii/early xiv]
  Reference: Scott (infra), 203 [but listing both Latin and French at fols. 35–46]; Index of Manuscripts in the British Library (infra), 3.203; Thorndike/Kibre, cols. 125, 986; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin {K}; Epe {GK}; de Wit.

- London, BL cod. Sloane 3542, fols. 41v–44v (55 + 87 dreams) [xvi]
  Reference: Scott (infra), 203 [but listing fol. 43]; Index of Manuscripts in the British Library (infra), 3.203; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin {Gg}; de Wit.

- London, Royal College of Physicians cod. 229, fols. 123v–133r [xv]

- London, Royal Society of Antiquaries cod. 306, fols. 64r–71v [xv]
  Reference: Ker, vol. I (infra), 310; Epe {GT}; de Wit.

- London, Wellcome Medical Library cod. 508, fols. 61v–63v (158 dreams) [middle xv]
  Reference: Wittmer-Butsch; Martin {Cc}; de Wit.

- London, Wellcome Medical Library cod. 517, fols. 112r–114v (184 dreams) [late xv]

- Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional cod. 10063, fols. 25v–26ra [xiii]
  Reference: Thorndike/Kibre, col. 170 [but citing fols. 24v–25ra]; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin, 61; de Wit.

  Note: See section on the MSS of the Lunaria Danielis, infra.

- Manchester, Chetham’s Library cod. 11380 [olim Mun. A.4.91], fol. 35r–v [xiii/xiv]
  Reference: Ker, Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries. III (infra), 369; Epe {AC}; de Wit.

  Note: It is unclear whether this text is actually attributed to Daniel.

- Melk, Benediktinerstift cod. 728, fols. 57va–58vb [xv/xvi]

- Milano, BA cod. T.81 sup., pp. 147–151 (145 dreams) [xiv]
  Reference: Thorndike/Kibre, col. 492; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin {A}; de Wit.

- Modena, Biblioteca Estense cod. lat. 697, fols. 24v–27r [xv]

  Note: From the description of the incipit, it appears that a lunary precedes the Somniale.

- München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 666, fol. 377r

- München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 5005, fols. 106r–119r [1473/1480]

- München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 5032, fols. 176r–182r [1513]
  Reference: Catalogus clm I.II (infra), 264.
- München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 5125, fols. 242r–244r (211 dreams) [xiv]
  *Reference:* Catalogus clm III (infra), 263; Förster, “Beiträge III.4,” 32; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin {M}; de Wit.

- München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 7520, fols. 68r–70v [xiv]

- München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 7746 [xv]
  *Reference:* Onnerfors, “Über die alphabetischen Traumbücher” (infra); de Wit.

- München, UB cod. 4° 649, fols. 186r–190va [xiv]

- Oxford, All Souls College cod. 81, fols. 166r–172r (355 dreams) [xiv]

- Oxford, All Souls College cod. 81, fols. 205r–211v [xv]
  *Reference:* Watson (infra), 169; Wittmer-Butsch; de Wit.

- Oxford, All Souls College cod. 81, fols. 232r–238v (716 dreams) [xv]
  *Text:* Martin, 173–212.
  *Reference:* Thorndike/Kibre, col. 113 [but citing fols. 232–240]; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin {O}; Epe {O}; de Wit.

- Oxford, Bod. cod. Bodley 177 [SC 2072], fol. 64v (69 dreams) [late xiv]
  *Reference:* Wittmer-Butsch; Martin {Hh}; de Wit.

- Oxford, Bod. cod. Bodley 581 [SC 2191], fols. 6r–8v (389 dreams) [xv]
  *Reference:* Wittmer-Butsch; Martin {Aa}; Epe {HA} [but citing fols. 7r–8v]; de Wit.

*Note:* According to the *Summary Catalogue*, 2.1.252, the preface to this *Somniale* begins “Philosophantes antiques siue Iudeos.”

  *Text:* Förster, “Beiträge V.7” [but citing fols. 98r–99r]

*Note:* Two copies of the *Somniale*?

- Oxford, Bod. cod. Digby 86 [SC 1687], fols. 34v–40r (514 dreams) [xiii]
  *Text:* Förster, “Beiträge III.3,” 303 [partially quoted in footnotes]; Fischer, *Medieval Dreambook* (infra); Tschann and Parkes (infra) [facsimile edition].
  *Reference:* Macray (infra), col. 91; Stengel, E. *Codices manu scriptum Digby 86 in Bibliotheca Bodleiana.* Halle, 1871; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin {N} [but citing fols. 34v–48r]; Epe {DN}; de Wit.
- Oxford, Bod. cod. Lyell 35, fols. 19r–23v+5r+25v (272 dreams) [xv]
- Oxford, Bod. cod. Selden Supra 74, fol. 14ra [SC 3462] [xiii]
  Reference: Wittmer-Butsch; Martin, 61; Epe {AO}; de Wit.
  Note: It is unclear as to the extent of this text; according to the Summary Catalogue, 2.1.643 at fol. 14: “After a few concluding sentences of a Latin treatise on omens from dreams, comes...”
- Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal cod. 873, fols. 181r–194v [xv]
- Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine cod. lat. 3599, fols. 69va–d [xiii–xiv]
  Reference: Molinier, A. Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Mazarine. Paris, 1890. 3.139; Thorndike/Kibre, cols. 170, 492 [but citing fol. 69va–c]; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin, 61; de Wit.
- Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine cod. lat. 3642, fol. 118r [xiii] [Wittmer-Butsch: script. incertus]
  Reference: Molinier (supra), 3.152; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin, 61; de Wit.
  Note: The brevity of this text and the fact that its incipit is recorded in the catalogue as “Oves circa se videre pugnantes” (rather than one from the usual range of incipits) suggests that this MS is incomplete.
- Paris, BNF cod. a.f. lat. 1007, nr. 4
  Reference: de Wit.
- Paris, BNF cod. lat. 1845, fols. 1r–2r [x]
  Reference: Wittmer-Butsch; Martin, 61; de Wit.
  Note: There is some confusion as to the shelf number of this MS. See BNF cod. lat. 18415, infra. Note that P. Lauer, Bibliothèque Nationale. Catalogue général des manuscrits, tome II (nos. 1439–2692) (Paris, 1940), 194–195, notes that codd. 1842–1849 (sic: 1847, but this an error) preserve 8 copies of Hieronymus’ Commentary on Matthew, with no mention of a Somniale at 1845.
- Paris, BNF cod. lat. 7349, fols. 45v–48r [xv]
  Text: Förster, “Beiträge V.7.”
- Paris, BNF cod. lat. 14068, fols. 40r–45v [xv]
  Note: It is unclear, however, whether the text cited is actually attributed to Daniel.
- Paris, BNF cod. lat. 15173, fols. 205–206
  Note: The text of this Somniale Danielis no longer survives. This MS was originally part of the collection of the Abbey of St.-Victor (cod. F F F 8). Although much of the cod. is now preserved as Paris, BNF cod. lat 15173, certain portions of it, including the Somniale, have been lost. See V. Gerzvon Buren, et al., Le catalogue de la bibliothèque de l’abbaye de Saint-Victor de Paris de Claude de Grandrue 1514 (Paris, 1983), 326 and 543.
- Paris, BNF cod. lat. 18415, fols. 1r–2r [xii]
  Reference: There is some confusion as to the shelf number of this MS. Grub (infra), lii, records a MS with the shelf number “lat. 18415,” citing L. Delisle, Inventaire des manuscrits latins de Notre Dame et d’autres fonds conservés à la Bibliothèque Nationale sous les nos. 16719–18613 du fonds latin (Paris, 1871), 97. “18415a” is also recorded by Berriot (infra), 50. “18415” is similar to “1845” [as de Wit also notes [private correspondence]], and all the more since the foliation for both MSS is recorded as fols. 1r–2r, and so one might conclude there is only one MS, viz. BNF lat. 18415. But the difference in dates suggests otherwise, as does the fact that “1845” is cited by other authorities, even though a Somniale is not included in Lauer’s Catalogue (infra). Unfortunately, I have not had the opportunity to examine either MS. My feeling is that there is Somniale at cod. 18415, but probably not one at cod. 1845.

- Praha, Archivium Capituli Metropolotani cod. 503, fol. 72r
  Reference: Thorndike/Kibre, cols. 124, 728; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin, 61; de Wit.

- Praha, Českém Krumlově, cod. A 17, fols. 58v–61r [1477]

- Roma, Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio Emanuele cod. 1511 [xiv]
  Text: Semeraro (infra).
  Reference: de Wit.

- Salamanca, Biblioteca Universitaria cod. 2262, fols. 276–277 (incomplete) [xv]

- St. Gallen, SB cod. 304, pp. 5–31 [xv]
  Reference: Scherrer, G. Verzeichniss der Handschriften der Stiftsbibliothek von St. Gallen. Halle, 1875. 110; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin, 61; de Wit.

- St. Gallen, SB cod. 1050, pp. 78–85 [xiv/xv]
  Reference: Scherrer (supra), 394; Förster, “Beiträge III.4,” 32; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin, 61; de Wit.

- Stockholm, Kungliga Biblioteket MS D4, fols. 207v–211r (364 dreams)
  Text and Translation: Gejrot (infra).
  Reference: de Wit.

- Toledo, Librería del Cabildo cod. 378, fols. 5r–30v
  Note: The text is titled “Vera Somniorum Interpraetatio [sic] ex Daniele et Iosepho.”

  Reference: Wittmer-Butsch; de Wit.

- Uppsala, Kon. Universitetsbiblioteket cod. C.664, pp. 101–111 (312 dreams) [ix]
  Text and Commentary: Grub (infra).

- Uppsala, Kon. Universitetsbiblioteket cod. C.679, fols. 64r–66v [1458]
  Reference: Andersson-Schmitt (supra), 260.

- Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 235, fols. 39vc–40r (54 dreams) [x–xi]
  Reference: Wittmer-Butsch; Martin {V}; de Wit; DiTommaso, “Mediaeval Manuscripts” (infra).
– Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 1030, fols. 131rb–132vb  

– Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 1321, fols. 160va–163ra  

– Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 1880 (409 dreams) [1459]  

– Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 1880 (409 dreams) [1459]  
Reference: Wittmer-Butsch; Martin {Z}; de Wit; DiTommaso, “Mediaeval Manuscripts” (*infra*).

– Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Reg. lat. 567, fols. 34r–37r [xii]  
Reference: Wittmer-Butsch; Martin, 62; de Wit; DiTommaso, “Mediaeval Manuscripts” (*infra*).

– Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Reg. lat. 1420, fols. 33v–38r (188 dreams) [xv]  
Reference: Wittmer-Butsch; Martin {X}; Epe {GR}; de Wit; DiTommaso, “Mediaeval Manuscripts” (*infra*).

– Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Reg. lat. 1420, fols. 33v–38r (188 dreams) [xv]  
Reference: Wittmer-Butsch; Martin {X}; Epe {GR}; de Wit; DiTommaso, “Mediaeval Manuscripts” (*infra*).

– Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Vat. lat. 6297, fols. 152ra–156va (437 dreams) [xiv]  
Reference: Wittmer-Butsch; Martin {L}; de Wit; DiTommaso, “Mediaeval Manuscripts” (*infra*).

– Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Vat. lat. 6297, fols. 152ra–156va (437 dreams) [xiv]  
Reference: Wittmer-Butsch; Martin {L}; de Wit; DiTommaso, “Mediaeval Manuscripts” (*infra*).

– Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Vat. lat. 12107, fols. 39r–45v (437 dreams) [xviii]  
Reference: DiTommaso, “Mediaeval Manuscripts” (*infra*).

– Vendôme, cod. 245, fol. 210 [xv]  
Reference: Thorndike/Kibre, col. 839; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin, 62; de Wit.

– Venezia, BM cod. lat. VIII.33, fols. 8–11 [xv]  

Note: Valentinelli observes that “De scripto vide Fabricum in codice pseudoepigrapho vet. testam., t. I, p. 1130.”

– Venezia, BM cod. lat. VIII.33, fols. 118ra–124vb [xv]  
Reference: Valentinelli (*supra*), No. XI.106. 283; Thorndike/Kibre, col. 143.

– Venezia, BM cod. lat. XII.248 [xvi]  
Reference: de Wit.

– Venezia, BM cod. lat. Z.478 [xiv]  
Reference: de Wit.

– Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare cod. LXII, fols. 218rb–219vb [early xi]  

– Wien, ÖNB cod. lat. 271 [olim Rec. 2133], fols. 76v–77v (158 dreams) [x]  


– Wien, ÖNB cod. lat. 545 [olim Rec. 528], fols. 119v–122v [xiv]  
Reference: *Tabulae codiciorum in Bibliotheca Palatina* (*supra*), 1.92; de Wit.
DANIEL APOCRYPHA PRESERVED PRIMARILY IN LATIN

- Wien, ÖNB cod. lat. 1878 [olim Theol. 550], fol. 162r [xii] [Wittmer-Butsch: xi]
  Reference: Tabulae codicum . . . in Bibliotheca Palatina (supra), 1.297; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin, 62; Epe {AV}; de Wit.
  Note: It is unclear whether this text is actually attributed to Daniel, despite references by Wittmer-Butsch and Martin. The Tabulae codicum notes merely that this is an “Oneirocricon secundum ordinem alphabeticus usque in litteram J.,” but the on-line manuscript catalogue of the Hill Monastic Manuscript Library does provide the familiar Somniale Danielis incipit, “Auem in somnis qui viderit . . .”

- Wien, ÖNB cod. lat. 2245 [olim Univ. 633], fols. 69v–75r [xii]
  Reference: Tabulae codicum . . . in Bibliotheca Palatina (supra), 2.42; Thorndike, 678 note 1; Thorndike/Kibre, col. 492; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin, 62; de Wit.

- Wien, ÖNB cod. lat. 2723, fols 124v–130r [x]
  Reference: Wittmer-Butsch; Martin, 62; Epe {AW}; de Wit.
  Note: The list of contents of cod. 2723 [olim Rec. 2325] in the Tabulae codicum does not include reference to a Somniale Danielis.

- Wien, ÖNB cod. lat. 5154 [olim Univ. 377], fols. 25v–29r [xiv]
  Reference: Tabulae codicum . . . in Bibliotheca Palatina (supra), 3.42; Thorndike/Kibre, col. 113; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin, 62; de Wit.

- Wien, ÖNB cod. lat. 5239 [olim Philos. 418], fols. 114r–127r [xiv/xv]
  Reference: Tabulae codicum . . . in Bibliotheca Palatina (supra), 3.71; Thorndike/Kibre, col. 120; Wittmer-Butsch; Martin, 62; de Wit.

- Wien, ÖNB cod. lat. 14303, fol. 64v [xii/xiii]
  Reference: Wittmer-Butsch; Martin, 62; de Wit.

- Wolfenbüttel, Herzoglichen Bibliothek cod. 2715, fols. 84r–86v [1431]
  Reference: von Heinemann, O. Die Handschriften der Herzoglichen Bibliothek zu Wolfenbüttel. 2: Die Augusteischen Handschriften. III. Wolfenbüttel, 1898. 384; de Wit [citing cod. 75.3].

- Zürich, Zentralbibliothek cod. C. 101/467, fols. 158v–161r [xv]

- Private [xiv]
  Text: Cron (infra) [with translation]; Fischer, Medieval Dreambook (infra).
  Reference: Fischer, Medieval Dreambook (infra), 14: “Unique copy . . . privately published in 100 copies by its owner [Cron] . . . in Latin with a modern English translation”; Wittmer-Butsch; de Wit.

- Private (Prof. Aug. Conrady of Leipzig) [xv]
  Reference: de Wit.

Old English

- London, BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii, fols. 27v–31v (249 dreams) [xi]
  Text: Cockayne (infra), 198–215 [with translation]; Förster, “Beiträge IV.5” [edition of all the dreams at fols. 27v–32v]; Epe {AA}, 109–169; Fischer, Medieval Dreambook (infra).
Note: On the foliation problems that plague Cotton Tiberius A.iii, see note in the section on the MS in the Latin section of the *Lunationes Danielis*, infra.

Note: This text is composed in both Latin and Old English.

- London, BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii, fols. 31v–32r (21 dreams) [xi]  
  **Text**: Förster, “Beiträge IV.5” [edition of all the dreams at fols. 27v–32v]; Epe {AB}, 172–177.  

Note: On the foliation of Cotton Tiberius A.iii, see note in the Latin section (supra) at fols. 27v–31v.

Note: This text is composed in both Latin and Old English.

Note: This text is not attributed to Daniel, but falls under the compass of fols. 27v–31v, which is.

- London, BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii, fol. 32r–v (32 dreams) [xi]  
  **Text**: Förster, “Beiträge IV.5” [edition of all the dreams at fols. 27v–32v]; Epe {EA}, 180–189.  

Note: On the foliation of Cotton Tiberius A.iii, see note in the Latin section (supra) at fols. 27v–31v.

Note: This text is composed in both Latin and Old English.

Note: This text is not attributed to Daniel, but falls under the compass of fols. 27v–31v, which is.

- London, BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii, fols. 38r–39v (97 dreams) [xi]  
  **Text**: Epe {EB}, 192–211.  

Note: On the foliation of Cotton Tiberius A.iii, see note in the Latin section (supra) at fols. 27v–31v.

Note: This text is composed in both Latin and Old English.

Note: This text is not attributed to Daniel, but is edited by Epe in his edition of the *Sonniale Daniellis*.

- Oxford, Bod. cod. Hatton 115 [olim Junius 23] [SC 5135], fols. 150v–152v [c. 1120]  
  **Text**: Cockayne (infra), 168–176 [with translation]; Förster, “Beiträge IX.19,” 270–293.  
  **Translation**: Griffith (infra), 224–226 [apud Cockayne].  
  **Reference**: Frank/Cameron (supra), B23.3.6.8; Liuzza (supra), 228.

Note: Liuzza (supra), 227, notes that “prognostic material is in two quires (fols. 148–55) added in the twelfth century and not part of original MS.”

Middle English

- Cambridge, TC cod. O.9.37 [olim G.20], fols. 26–32 [xv]  
  **inscr.**: Here beginneth þe Interpretacioun of Danyell þe prophete to hym schewed in Baboloyne by þe holy gooste of mannes dremes in slepyng...  
  Reference: Catalogue of the Harleian Manuscripts in the British Museum (4 vols.; London, 1808), 1.590: “An English Poem upon the Interpretation of Dreams, pretended to have been found by David a Prophete of grete pris, in a Cyte of Babylonye.”
  Note: On this MS and its attribution to David, see Chapter Four note 47.

- London, BL cod. Lansdowne 388, fol. 372v (35 dreams) [xiv]
  Text: Bühler ([infra]), 266–268; Fischer, *Medieval Dreambook* ([infra]).

- London, BL cod. Royal 12.E.xvi, fols. 1r–2v [c. 1500]
  Text: Förster, “Beiträge V.7”; Bühler ([infra]), 271–273 [the portion of the text overlooked in Förster]; Fischer, *Medieval Dreambook* ([infra]).
  Reference: Warner and Gilson ([supra]), 2.55: “...a translation of the dictionary of dreams contained in the work called Somnia Daniel, De lunationibus et somnis, or by other titles...the Latin form in [cod. Royal] 13 D.I...nearly corresponds with the present translation”; Index of Manuscripts in the British Library ([infra]), 3.203; Wittmer-Butsch.

- London, BL cod. Sloane 1609, fols. 29v–32r [xiv]
  Text: Förster, “Beiträge V.7”; Fischer, *Medieval Dreambook* ([infra]).
  Reference: Scott ([supra]), 203; Index of Manuscripts in the British Library ([infra]), 3.203; Wittmer-Butsch.

- York, Minster cod. XVI.E.32, fols. 123v–125r

Middle Welsh

- Aberystwyth, Llyfrgell Genedlaethol Cymru cod. Llanstephan 27, fols. 153v–156v (186 dreams) [c. 1400]
  Text: Förster, “Kymrische Traumbuch” ([infra]).
  Reference: Wittmer-Butsch.

Middle Irish

- Dublin, Trinity College cod. H.3.17, fols. 650 (bis) + 651 + 649 (194 dreams) [middle xiv]
  Text: Best ([infra]).
  Reference: McNamara, M. *The Apocrypha in the Irish Church*. Dublin, 1975. 32 [where Best is referred to as R. Flower]; Wittmer-Butsch.

Old Icelandic

- København, UB cod. Arnamagnaeus 764, fol. 33v (80 dreams) [c. 1500]
  Reference: Wittmer-Butsch.

German

- Berlin, SBPK cod. germ. 8° 101, fols. 87v–97v (87 dreams) [1441]
  Text: Graffunder ([infra]; Fischer, *Medieval Dreambook* ([infra]).
  Reference: Wittmer-Butsch ([infra]; Speckenbach ([infra]), 136–137.
Note: There is in the same cod. at fols. 172v–176r another oneirokritikon, but this does not seem to be attributed to Daniel; see Speckenbach (infra), 134.

- Berlin, SBPK cod. germ. 2º 103, fols 59r–65r [xvi]
  Reference: Speckenbach (infra), 133.
- Coburg, Landesbibliothek cod. 5, fols. 112ra–116ra (185 dreams) [xv]
  Reference: Speckenbach (infra), 135.
Note: This MS is the same as Heidelberg, UB cod. Pal. germ. 575 (infra).
- Heidelberg, UB cod. Pal. germ. 575, fols. 36r–38r (73 dreams) [xv]
  Reference: Speckenbach (infra), 131–132.
- Heidelberg, UB cod. Pal. germ. 832, fols. 110vb–116ra (185 dreams) [c. 1491]
  Reference: Speckenbach (infra), 135.
Note: This MS is the same as Coburg, Landesbibliothek cod. 5 (supra).
- London, Wellcome Medical Library cod. 588, fols. 42v–46v (84 dreams) [c. 1500]
  Reference: Speckenbach (infra), 137.
- München, BSB cod. germ. mon. 270, fols. 215v–216r (11 dreams, incomplete) [c. 1460]
  Reference: Speckenbach (infra), 134–135.
- München, BSB cod. germ. mon. 597, fols. 245ra–246ra (87 dreams, incomplete) [c. 1485]
  Reference: Speckenbach (infra), 137.
- München, UB cod. 8º 179, fols. 142v–148v [1434, 1501]
- Nürnberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum cod. 6284, fols. 5r–v (24 dreams, incomplete) [xv]
  Text: Fischer, “Fragment” (infra).
  Reference: Speckenbach (infra), 131.
- Nürnberg, Germanisches Nationalmuseum cod. 6285, fols. 1r–6v (291 dreams) [xv]
  Text: Fischer, “Handschrift” (infra).
  Reference: Speckenbach (infra), 132.
- Wien, Mechitaristenkongregation cod. 345 (115), fols. 110r–128v [xvii/xviii]
  Reference: On-line manuscript catalogue of the Hill Monastic Manuscript Library.
- Private, Petroneller ‘Circa-instans’-MS, fols. 145v–152r (270 dreams) [xv]
  Text: Palmer (infra).
  Reference: Speckenbach (infra), 132–133.

French

- Berlin, SBPK cod. lat. 4º 70, fols. 233r–281v [xiv]
  Reference: Fabricius (infra), 1132; Rose (supra), 1220.
  Note: According to Rose, the incipit of this text is “Ci commence lexpositionn des sonnges solom ceo qu Daniel le prophete le fist et en escription per Astronomie le mist de assureur tute gent de sonnge warie lentendement ci peut homme lire apertement.” Note also Fabricius’ comments on a French MS preserved in the royal library in Berlin and that opens with almost (but not exactly) the same three-dozen words. But this text is not a classic Somniale—rather, it appears to be a French version of Leo Tuscus’ Latin translation of the popular Dream-book of the Achmet ben Sirin, now here attributed to Daniel.
- Bruxelles, Bibliothèque Royale cod. 10574–85, fols. 115va–116ra (43 dreams) [xiv]
  Text: Suchier (infra), 153–156; Fischer, Medieval Dreambook (infra).
  Reference: Wittmer-Butsch (infra).
Italian
- Firenze, Biblioteca Riccardiana cod. 859 [xv]
- Firenze, Biblioteca Riccardiana cod. 1258 [xv]

Western Manuscripts Incorrectly Attributed
- München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 26639, fols. 42r–v [xvi]
  Reference: Martin, 61.
  Note: This text is a copy of the Lunationes Danielis—see the list of MSS in that section, infra.
- New Haven, Yale University Beineke cod. 163 (Wagstaff Miscellany), fol. 28v [xiv/xv]
  Note: This text is a copy of the Lunationes Danielis—see the list of MSS in that section, infra.
- Wien, ÖNB cod. 2185 [olim Rec. 3010], fols. 197r–198v [xiv]
  Reference: Tabulae codicum . . . in Bibliotheca Palatina (supra), 2,24; Thorndike/Kibre, col. 400.
  Note: It is unlikely that this text is actually attributed to Daniel or even if it is a Somniale. There is no mention of Daniel in the Tabulae codicum and the incipit is unfamiliar (“Demonibus non tam scientia quam potestas data est . . .”). It is perhaps the case that Thorndike/Kibre are in error here.

The Somniale Danielis in the Eastern Tradition
It is extremely difficult to assess the extent to which the Somniale is extant in Hebrew, Syriac, Armenian, Coptic, and Arabic manuscripts. What can be said is that there are perhaps a few copies of the Somniale in Hebrew, at least two in
Armenian, and one in Coptic. For the shelf numbers of these manuscripts (certain and possible) and their references, see Chapter 4, notes 201 (Hebrew), 202 (Armenian), 203 (Coptic), 204 (Syriac), 205, and 252 (Arabic). On the Hebrew Somniale at Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Vat. heb. 285, see DiTommaso, “Mediaeval Manuscripts” (infra). [Hoffmeister’s article (infra) could prove valuable, but this book went to press before I could examine it.]

Incunabula:

In the Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke, the editions of the Somniale are divided into four recensions: A (“Sammlung von 431 Traumdeutungen, alphabetisch (nach Buchstaben, innerhalb dieser jedoch beliebig) geordnet”); B (“beginnend mit Orakeln für einzelnen Tage des Monats; darauf Sammlung von 444 Traumdeutungen (alphabetisch geordnet wie die A), z.T. identisch mit den unter A behandelten”); C (“In einer grösseren Einleitung wird die Traumdeutung auf Grund von Bibel und Patristik verteidigt. Die Sammlung umfasst 419 Deutungen”); and D, the last titled the Somnion Danielis et Joseph (“Zunächst Vorhersage über die Wahrheit von Träumen für jeden Tage des Monats; sodann Sammlung von 191 Traumdeutungen”); plus a French translation E (“verkürzt und anscheinend aus verschiedenen Rezensionen zusammengestellt, in nicht durchsichtiger Anordnung”).

Abbreviations Employed in the Lists of the Incunabula:


Recension A

Latin

Reference: GKW 7904; Hélin 7; Klebs 319.3.

Reference: GKW 7905; Hélin 8; Klebs 319.2.

Reference: GKW 7906; Klebs 319.4.

Reference: GKW 7907; Klebs 319.9.

Reference: GKW 7908; Hain *5924, 5925; Hélin 2; Klebs 319.5.

Reference: GKW 7909; Hain *5923; Hélin 1; Klebs 319.6.

Reference: GKW 7910; Hélin 20; Klebs 319.15.

Reference: Cop ii 1874; GKW 7911; Hélin 13; Klebs 319.16.
  Reference: GKW 7912; Hain *5927; Hélin 28; Klebs 319.25.
  Reference: GKW 7913; Hain *5926; Hélin 14; Klebs 319.28.
- Danielis somniorum expositoris veredici. Augsburg: Johann Schaur, 1497. 4°.
  Text: Hélin, 46–47 [title and colophon only], apud Paris, BNF, réserve A 17953.
  Reference: GKW 7914; Hain *5928; Hélin 25; Klebs 319.33.

German
  Reference: GKW 7915; Hain *5929; Hélin 29; Klebs 319.21; Speckenbach (infra), 139–140.
- Inhalt dis buchlin dis auszlegung der treiim Danielis. Augsburg: Johann Schönsperger, c. 1495/1500. 4°.
  Text: Fischer, Medieval Dreambook (infra).
  Reference: GKW 7916; Hélin 30; Klebs 319.32; Speckenbach (infra), 140–141.
  Note: See also Augsburg, SuStB, 9 an 4° cod. 180; for a photo-reproduction of this title page, see Speckenbach (infra), plate 17.
- Dis biechlin halt yn die auszlegung der treim Danielis. Strassburg: [Matthias Hupfuff], 1500. 4°.
  Reference: GKW 7917; Hélin 31; Klebs 319.38; Speckenbach (infra), 141.
  Note: There exist many other copies of the Somniale Danielis in German but which were published in the sixteenth rather than the fifteenth century; see Speckenbach (infra) for details.

Italian
  Reference: Cop ii 1878; GKW 7918; Hélin 35; Klebs 319.30.

Recension B

Latin
  Text: Fischer, Medieval Dreambook (infra).
  Reference: Cop ii 1873; GKW 7919; Hélin 5; Klebs 319.1.
  Reference: Cop ii 1876; GKW 7920; Hélin 9; Klebs 319.7.
  Note: Cop ii 1876 lists the publisher as “Steph. Plannck,” which would suggest GKW 7925 (infra), but the incipit matches GKW 7920.
  Text: Hélin, 45 [first page (Lunaria) only], apud Washington, SGL.
  Reference: GKW 7921; Hélin 4; Klebs 319.8.
  Text: Hélin, 6–29 [Lunaria 9–12], apud Paris, BNF, réserve V 1351; Fischer, Medieval Dreambook (infra).
  Reference: GKW 7922; Hélin 10; Klebs 319.11.
  Reference: Cop ii 1875; GKW 7923; Hélin 6; Klebs 319.12.
  Text: Hélin, 41–42 [second page (Lunaria) and last page only], apud Bibliothèque Ste.-Geneviève OE. xvs. 759.
Recension C

Latin

  Reference: GKW 7936; Hélin 15; Klebs 319.25.

- Somnia Danielis. [Wien: Johann Winterberg, c. 1500 (?)]. 4°.
  Text: Fischer, Medieval Dreambook (infra).
  Reference: GKW 7937; Hain *5934; Klebs 319.39.

Recension D

Latin

  Reference: GKW 7938; Hain 5935; Hélin 3; Klebs 319.10.
Italian

- *Li significati de tutti li di lunari.* Bologna: Bazalerius de Bazaleriis e Angelus Rugerius, 1487. 4°.
  
  Reference: GKW 7939; Hélin 34; Klebs 319.17.

  
  
  Note: Hélin, 99: “Une quatrième édition italienne, que nous n’avons pu retrouver, est indiquée par Kristeller.”

French Translation E.

  
  
  Reference: GKW 7941; Hélin 32; Klebs 319.35.

  
  Text: Hélin, 39–40 [title page and last page only], apud Chantilly, Musée Condé IV, D. 82.
  
  Reference: Hélin 33; Klebs 319.36.
  
  Note: In the Inventaire de la Bibliothèque du roi Charles VI fait au Louvre en 1423 (Paris, 1867), we find two entries: No. 118: “Ung [sic] livre de l’Exposition des Songes selon Daniel… en françois” and No. 308: “Les Songes Daniel, en prose, en francois; de lettre formée à deux coulombes.” Whether these are incunabula are unknown.

Description of the Text: See Chapter Four, §2.

1. Texts, Partial Texts, Textual Issues, and Translations


This text was mentioned earlier (and a few lines of it was translated) by E. O’Curry, On the Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish (1873 [reprinted Dublin, 1996]), 2.223–224.


the History of Science in This Country before the Norman Conquest. Rerum
Britannicarum medii aevi scriptores. London, 1866. 3.198–214. [reprinted 1965]
DiTommaso, L. “Greek, Latin, and Hebrew Manuscripts of the
Somniale Danielis and Lunationes Danielis in the Vatican Library.”
Epe, A. Wissensliteratur im angelsächsischen England: Das Fachschrifttum der
vergessenen artes mechanicae und artes magicae. Mit besonderer Berück-
sichtigung des Somniale Danielis: Edition der (lateinisch-)altenglischen
Fabricius, J.A. “CCXXIV. Conjectorius Danielis, sive somniorum
interpretatio sub Prophetae illius nomine jactata.” Codex pseude-
A complex but very valuable entry on the state of the evidence at the start
of the eighteenth century; see Migne, infra, for a summary and partial repro-
duction of Fabricius, 1131–1134. It contains i) a note from one “Jo.
Sarisberiensis” (i.e., John of Salisbury, aka. John Davenant) on the plethora
of Daniel Dream-books; ii) the note that “Onirocritica Danielis damnari in
decreto Gratiani”; iii) references to MSS of the Oneirocritica Danielis in the cat-
alogue of F. Sylburgius and that of G. Hickes (vol. II, p. 38, which actually
is an incorrect reference—see H. Wanley, infra); iv) a reproduction of a Daniel
dream-text in Old French that “exstat in Bibliothecae Regia Berolinensi” (but
which is probably a dream-text from Leo Tuscus; see list of MSS, infra); v)
a note from an unidentified Sgambatus on the “Onerocritica Danielis, anti-
qua impostura”; vi) a poem in Old German from the Paraeneticorum veterum of
M. Goldast (i.e., “König Tyro”; on which, see infra, under “Daniel Apocrypha
Preserved Primarily in Old German”); and vii) various notes to other schol-
ars, including a note on the Daniel dream-books in the Arabic tradition as
recorded in the Bibliothèque orientale of B. d’Herbelot (see “Daniel Apocrypha
Preserved in Arabic,” infra).
Fischer, S.R. The Complete Medieval Dreambook. A Multilingual, Alphabetical
———. “Ein deutsches ‘Somnia Danielis’-Fragment aus dem späten
Mittelalter.” Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Literatur 111
———. “Eine mittelalterliche Somnia Danielis-Handschrift in deutscher
Sprache. Zur Hs. 6285 des Germanischen Nationalmuseums,
Facsimiles of specific incunabula (5–64): I = H 10; II = H 32; III = H 33 (title and colophon only); IV = H 11 (penultimate and ultimate pages only); V = H 12 (second page only); VI = H 24 (title/first page only); VII = H 4 (title/first page only); VIII = H 25 (title and colophon only); IX = H 21; X = H 35 (title only).


Parallel and eclectic edition (with apparatus) of the texts of what Martin refers to as the “a” and “b” recensions of the Latin version of the *Somniale* (at 95–168), with “Appendix I: The Version of the *Somniale* found in British Museum Harley 3017 [ninth century]” (at 169–172) and “Appendix II: The Fullest Version of the *Somniale*, found in All Souls College, Oxford, MS. 81 (ff. 232r–238v)” (at 173–212).


Summarizes much of Fabricius (*supra*), 1131–1134. Includes reference to a MS in “la bibliothèque d’Uffenbach” [i.e., J. Majus, *Bibliotheca Uffenbachiana manuscripta* (Halle, 1720)], a MS which I have not been able to identify, and to an Italian book, “un opuscle de quatre feuillets intitulé: Sogni di Daniel, profeta” [likely = *Esogni di Daniel Profeta* (*see Recension A in the section on “Incunabula,” *supra*)].


de Wit, M. “Codices legere bonum significat. De *Somniale Danielis* (een middeleeuws droomboek) in handschriften en maatschappij


2. Secondary Studies on the Somniale and on Mediaeval Dream Manuals (Selected)


Diepgen, P. *Traum und Traumdeutung als medizinisch-naturwissenschaftliches Problem im Mittelalter.* Berlin, 1912.


Excursus: *Cy commence le livre des exposicions et signifiacions des songes*

There is a long dream manual with the *incipit*, “Cy commence le livre des exposicions et signifiacions des songes par Daniel et autres exposez” [so BNF cod. fr. 1317]. This text is not alphabetic like the *Somniale*; rather, and more in keeping with other dream manuals, the arrangement is thematic. Beginning with dreams concerning the resurrection and ending with those pertaining to various animals, this text is ten times the length of the longest *Somniale*. As its title suggests, this text was likely a compendium of available knowledge on dreams on all these subjects, and for which several versions of the *Somniale* were probable sources. See Chapter Four, §2.

The critical edition of this text is provided by F. Berriot, *Exposicions et signifiacions des songes et Les songes Daniel (manuscrits français de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris et de la Staatsbibliothek de Berlin, XIVe, XVe et XVIe siècles)* (*Travaux d’Humanisme et Renaissance* 234; Genève, 1989), 55–298. In addition to two early editions of the text, Berriot employs four manuscripts, one of which is in Latin (Carpentras, MS lat. 337), and the others in French (Berlin, SBPK cod. fr. 4° 968; Paris, BNF cod. fr. 1317; and Paris, BNF cod. fr. 24432).

**III. Lunationes Danielis**

*Manuscripts*

The following list of over 250 Greek, Latin, and western vernacular manuscript copies of this text represents the most complete one of its kind and is meant to correct and supercede the (still valuable) list of 127 copies presented in Weißer. At the same time, it is recognized that errors of fact or omission are always inevitable. Moreover, since the process of cataloguing the manuscript treasures of the great libraries is an ongoing process, new references to lunations continue to come to light (e.g., some of the Latin lunations from München, which appear in the newest catalogues).

Only lunations proper are included: a scheme of thirty days (not the twenty-eight “mansions of the moon”), in which the determination of a future state of the success of a future action or event is the focus of the text for each day. Lunations that also contain non-prognosticatory information (such as the birth-days of bibli cal figures) are included if the thrust of the text is fundamentally prognostic (e.g., the Middle English *Storia Lune*). Omitted, however, are zodiacal lunaries (twelve-month or thirty-day schemata), texts that focus on the phases of the moon or its movement in the sky, and completely non-prognostic schemata of thirty days. For more on the definitions of the various lunar prognostica, see Chapter Four, §3.

The manuscript tradition is extremely complicated, for three reasons: i) the confusing nature of the types and sub-types of the extant lunations, some of which are attributed to Daniel but many of which are anonymous; ii) the fact that lunations as a genre are found scattered throughout many languages; and iii) the sheer number of manuscripts, a substantial minority of which (over 100) are listed here for
the first time outside their appearance in catalogue. Accordingly, and with the certainty that still more copies of the Lunationes remain to be identified, I have decided against assigning distinctive sigla to the manuscripts.

Abbreviations Employed in the List of the Manuscripts:

Beccaria:

Frank/Cameron:

Förster, “Beiträge III.4”:

Förster, “Beiträge VIII”:

Förster, “Sammellunare”:

Förster, “Traumlunare”:

Liuzza:

Means:

Svenberg 1:

Svenberg 2:

Taavitsainen:

Thorndike:

Thorndike/Kibre:

Wanley:

Weißer:
Zinner:
Zinner, E. Verzeichnis der astronomischen Handschriften des deutschen Kulturgebietes. München, 1925.

(*) siglum [e.g., Svenberg 2 {G}; Weißer {At,G}]

Greek

- Athínai, Ethnikê Bibliothèkê tês Hellados cod. 1265, fols. 5r–6v [xvi]
  Text: Delatte (infra), 5, 72–74: "Lunarium" [edited in parallel columns with Bibliothecae Societatis historicæ cod. 115].
  Reference: Weißer {At,G}.

- Athínai, Ethnikê Bibliothèkê tês Hellados cod. 1275, fols. 22r–25v [xix]
  Text: Delatte (infra), 23, 121–126: "Davidis et Salomonis Lunarium."
  Reference: Weißer {At,G}.

- Athínai, Ethnikê Bibliothèkê tês Hellados cod. 1275, fols. 44v–45v [xix]
  Text: Delatte (infra), 24, 136–137: "Menologia aegrotatantium."
  Reference: Weißer {At,G}.

- Athínai, Ethnikê Bibliothèkê tês Hellados cod. 1350, fols. 79v–83v [xvii]
  Text: Delatte (infra), 29, 196–200: "Lunarium."
  Reference: Weißer {At,G}.

- Athínai, Bibliothecae Societatis historicæ cod. 115, fols. 1r–2r [xviii]
  Text: Delatte (infra), 40, 243–247: "Lunarium."
  Reference: Weißer {At,G}.

- London, BL cod. Royal 16.C.ii, fols. 1r–7v (Luna VIII–XXX only) [xv]

- Madrid, Escorial MS 1.R.14, fols. 153r–160v [xv]
  Text: Zuretti, Pars I (infra), 134–144.
  Reference: Weißer {EsG}.

- Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional cod. 4616, fols. 88r–88v [xv]
  Text: Zuretti, Pars II (infra), 150–151.
  Reference: Weißer {Md,G}.

- Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional cod. 4616, fols. 92r–95r [xv]
  Text: Zuretti, Pars II (infra), 157–162.
  Reference: Weißer {Md,G}.

- Milano, BA cod. E.16 sup., fols. 39v–46v [xiii]
  Text: Martini and Bassi, Catalogus codicum astrolagorum (infra), 32–39.

- Milano, BA cod. E.16 sup., fol. 47r [xiii]
  Reference: Craig (infra), xxxix; Martini and Bassi, Catalogus codicum graecorum (supra), no. 273, 303; Weißer {Ml,G}.

- Napoli, Biblioteca nazionale cod. II.C.3, fols. 396r–398r [xiii]
  Text: Bassi, et al. (infra), 142–143.
  Reference: Craig (infra), xxxviii; Weißer {NaG}.

- Paris, BNF cod. gr. 1884, fol. 150v (Luna I–VIII only) [1503]
  Reference: Weißer {Pa,G}.
Latin

- Aberystwyth, Llyfrgell Genedlaethol Cymru cod. Peniarth 26, pp. 15–19 [xv]
  incip.: Luna prima Adam creatus est. Pueros ad doctrinam mittere bonum est. Hec dies utiles est in omnibus rebus. Puer natus illustris et vitalis erit. In lecto qui inciderit, diu languebit et difficile euadit. In somnis quidquid videris, in gaudium conuertetur. Psalmus: Beatus vir [Ps. 31:2]. Quibus necesse est sanguinem minuere, ante horam tercium [expedit (?)].
  Note: This text is substantively the same as Erfurt, WBS cod. Amplonian 4° 330 [Weißer {EfL}] (infra).

- Basel, Universitätsbibliothek MS B VII 4, fol. 140va–b [xiii]
  inscr.: Somniale quod reuelatum est esdre siue ex daniele inuentum
  incip.: Luna prima. quicquid sompniaueris ad gaudium conviertur...
  expl.: Luna 30. infra triduum fiet sompniuim tuum sine periculo. sed tamen interdum caute cauendum.
  Note: On the attribution of this text, see Chapter Four, note 47.

- Basel, Universitätsbibliothek MS D I 10, fols. 32v–3v [xiv]
  inscr.: Incipit tractaus de confideracione omnium lunarum
  incip.: Luna prima hec dies omnibus egranitibus utilis est. In lectum qui ceciderit, diu languebit et longam infirmitatem pacientur. Et in somniis quecumque viderit, in gaudium vertentur, et si videris vinci, vinces inimicos tuos. Et infans si natus fuerit, bonus et utilis erit. Quibus necesse est minuere sanguinem, ante horam tercium minuet.
  Reference: Thorndike/Kibre.

- Berlin, DSB cod. Phillipps 1790, fol. 40r (Luna I–III only) [ix]
  incip.: Luna I leviter aegrotat et quotquot in somnis viderit in gudio revertitur
  expl.: Luna iii: Qui aegrotat, non euadit. Et qui somniet: sicut superius nihil dubius.

- Berlin, DSB cod. Phillipps 1790, fol. 40r [ix]
  incip.: Luna I qui fuerit in ea natus vitalis erit ... 
  expl.: (Luna XXX) affatur sessione per verba suum.

- Berlin, DSB cod. Phillipps 1790, fols. 40v–41v [ix]
  inscr.: Incipit lunaris liber i
  incip.: Luna prima: Qui decubuerit, si tercia die se alleuauerit, sanus erit; si autem grauior fuerit, cum graui periculo euadit.
  Note: This text is substantively the same as Erfurt, WBS cod. Amplonian 2° 276 [Weißer {EfL}], Frenze, BML cod. Strozzi 70, fol. 100rv [Weißer {FlL}], London, BL cod. Sloane 475, fols. 81r–82r [Weißer {LoL}], Prague, Národního Musea cod. XIV.A.12 [Weißer {PrL}], and St. Gallen, SB cod. 44 [Weißer {SgL}] (infra).
  Reference: Beccaria, 201; Schipke (supra), 305.

- Berlin, DSB cod. Phillipps 1790, fol. 41v [ix]
  inscr.: Incipit de infirmis per lunam liber i
  incip.: Luna prima: Leuiter egrotabit. Luna ii: Cito surgit ...
expl.: Luna xxx: Contrariis rebus cesser.

_text_ Wééber {Bl1L}, 174–175 [synthetic text of 3 MSS].

_note_ This text is substantively the same as Karlsruhe, Bad. Landesbibliothek MS Aug. CLXXIII [Wééber {Ka1L}] and Paris, BNF cod. lat. 11218 [Wééber {Pa1L}] (infra).

_reference_ Beccaria, 201; Schipke (supra), 305.

- Berlin, DSB cod. Philippus 1790 (?), 1780 (?), fols. 42r–42v, 70r

_inscriptio_ Incipit somnialis visalis

_inceptio_ Luna I quicquid videris in gaudio convertetur . . .

_reference_ Beccaria, 204: “Lunare dei sogni”

- Berlin, SBPK cod. lat. 2° 186, fols. 157v–158r [xiv]

_inceptio_ Nota ji dier i lune: Omnibus rebus est visibilis. Si qui dier egrotauerit, longe perseuerabit. Et somnium tunc nocte apparens erit sibi lecticia mundana. Infans, si nascitur, per multum tempus viuit.

_text_ Wééber {Bl1L}, 164–167.

_note_ This lunation extends to 31 days.

- Berlin, SBPK cod. lat. 4° 70 [Electoralis 968], fols. 229vb–232rb [xiv]


_text_ Svenberg 1 {b}, 25–83, 103–128 [commentary].

_reference_ Zinner No. 8067; Thorndike/Kibre; Wééber {Bl1L}.

- Berlin, SBPK cod. lat. 8° 44, fol. 2vb [xiv]

_inceptio_ Si quis luna prima in aliqua infirmitate grauatus fuerit, cito ab hac luce migrabit

_text_ Wééber {Bl1L}, 162–163.

- Berlin, SBPK cod. lat. 8° 93, fols. 54r–56r [xiii]


_text_ Svenberg 1 {B}, 25–83 [as apparatus to Svenberg 1 {L2}], 103–128 [commentary]; Wééber {Bl1L}, 380–392 [synthetic text of 4 MSS]

_note_ This text is substantively the same as Bernkastel-Kues, Universitätsbibliothek MS 203 [Wééber {Ku1L}] (supra), London, BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.III [Wééber {Lo1L}], and Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 235 [Wééber {Vp1L}] (infra).

- Bern, Burgerbibliothek MS 441, fols. 15r–16r (Luna I–XVI, XXX only) [ix]

_inscriptio_ De diuersis causis probato per lunam

_inceptio_ Luna prima hec dies ad omnia agendo utilis est. In lecto qui inciderit, duit languescet et longam infirmitatem patitur. Infans, si natus fuerit, uitalis erit.

_text_ Wééber {Be1L}, 160–162.

_reference_ Thorndike/Kibre.
- Bernkastel-Kues, St. Nicolaus Hospital MS 203, fols. 86vb–88rb [xiii]
  incip.: Luna i omnibus rebus agendis utilis est. Puer natus uitalis est. Quidquit somnpo uideris, in gaudium convurteretur, et si uideris te uinci, omnes tamen inimicos tuos uines. Qui recumbit, diu languebit.
  Reference: Marx, J. Verzeichnis der handschriften-Sammlung des Hospitals zu Cues bei Bernkastel a./Mosel. Trier, 1905. 188–189: "Beg. Luna prima omnibus rebus agendis utilis est. Schl. Quia tempus carum erit."
  Note: This text is substantively the same as Berlin, SBPK cod. lat. 8° 93 [Weißer {Bl2L}], London, BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii [Weißer {Lo2L}], and Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 235 [Weißer {Vp2L}] (infra).

- Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár cod. lat. 59, fols. 43v–44r [xiii/xiv]
  incip.: Luna prima. Quicunque somniaverit...

- Cambridge, CCC cod. 422
  Text: Henel (infra), 334–335.

- Cambridge, CCC cod. 466 [olim MS Misc. L], pp. 131 (incipit), 228–231 [xiv]
  Note: Lunation + Somniale.

- Cambridge, CCC cod. 481, pp. 418–419 (?) [xiii–xiv]
  Note: Only the Somniale is mentioned in James, Descriptive Catalogue . . . CCC (supra).
  The precise foliation of the texts is unknown.

- Cambridge, PC cod. 103, fols. 77v–79v [xii]
  incip: Luna prima: Hec est utilis omnibus augmentis. Qui ceciderit in lectum, diu languescat infirmitatem paciuet. Et sompniun quicquid uiderit, in gaudium convurteret. Et si infans natus fuerit, vitalis erit.
  Reference: Thorndike/Kibre.
Note: This text is substantively the same as London, BL cod. Harley 978 [Weißer {Lo16L}] and Milano, BA cod. T 81 sup [Weißer {Mi1L}] (infra).

- Cambridge, CCG cod. 391 [olim TC cod. K.10.11], pp. 718–720 [xi]
  Text: Förster, “Traumlunare,” 67–74 [collation only].


Note: Unlike other cases of MSS containing Latin text + Old English text/gloss, the Old English in this text is not a translation of the Latin.

- Cambridge, TC cod. O.7.23, fols. 68v–70r [xv]
  incip.: Luna prima omnibus agendis utilis. In lecto quis inciderit, diu languet. In sumipsis quicquid viderit, vertetur in gaudium.
  Text: Weißer {Ca1L}, 200–205 [synthetic text of 2 MSS].
  Note: This text is substantively the same as København, UB cod. Arnamagnaeus 194, fols. 49v–50v [Weißer {Ko1L}] (infra).

- Cambridge, TC cod. O.7.23, fol. 70v [xv]
  incip.: Luna prima tota die bona luna secunda . . .
  Reference: Thorndike/Kibre: “Regula ad sanguinem minuendum.”

Note: This text appears to be substantively the same as Herten, cod. med. Hertensis 192; London, BL. cod. Cotton Titus D.xxvi, fol. 7v; London, BL cod. Cotton Titus D.x D. xxvii, fol. 2r; London, BL cod. Harley 3271; London, BL cod. Sloane 3283; München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 4636; München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 10172; St. Gallen, SB, cod. 751, p. 428b; Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 485, fol. 15v; Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 1449, fol. 9r; and Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Vat. lat. 687 (infra); and the text published by Migne, PL 105, cols. 961–962.

- Cardiff, Public Library cod. 3.242 + 5.99, p. 56 [xiv/xv]

- Einsiedeln, cod. [?] 321, p. 21 [x]
  incip.: Luna prima quicquid videris in gaudium convertitur . . .
  Reference: Meier, G. Cat. cod. mss qui in bibl. monas. Einsidlensis. 1899; Thorndike/Kibre: “Dream Book.”

- Erfurt, WBS cod. Amplonian 2° 276, fol. 70ra [xiv/xv]
  incip.: Luna prima: Si quis jā die acubuerit, et 3ā die alleuauerit, sanus erit; si grauior fuerit, cum grauiori periculo euadit.
  Text: Weißer {Ef1L}, 365–373 [synthetic text of 6 MSS].
  Note: This text is substantively the same as Berlin, DB cod. Phill. 1790, fols. 40v–41v [Weißer {Bl1L}], (supra), Firenze, BML cod. Strozzi 70, fol. 100rv [Weißer {Fl1L}], London, BL cod. Sloane 475, fols. 81r–82r [Weißer {Lo16L}], Prague, Národního Musea cod. XIV.A.12 [Weißer {PrL}], and St. Gallen, SB cod. 44 [Weißer {Sg1L}] (infra).

- Erfurt, WBS cod. Amplonian 2° 276, fols. 70ra–70va [xiv/xv]
  incip.: Luna prima. In omnibus agendis rebus est utilis. Puer natus illustris erit et uitalis, signum habebit in ore uel supercilio, hic asutus est et litteratus et sapiens erit, in aqua periclitabitur, sed si tamen euaserit, ad perfectam etatem perueniet. Puella habebit signum ut puer, litterata, casta, bona, speciosa, uiiris placens, in posteriori etate abhorabitur. In lectum qui
inciderit, diu languescet et longam infirmitatem pacietur et difficile euadet. 
In somnis quidquid uiderit, in gaudium conuertetur. Beatus vir, cui non 
inputabit dominus peccatum, nec est in spiritu eius dolus [Ps. 31:2]. Qui 
vult sanguinem minuere, mane minuat.


- Erfurt, WBS cod. Amplonian 4° 330, fols. 23v–24v (Luna I–XXVI only) [xiv] 
  incipit: Luna prima Adam creatus est. Pueros ad doctrinam mittere bonum. Hec 
dies vitlis est in omnibus rebus. Puer natus illustris et vitalis erit. Jn lecto 
qui inciderit, diu languebit et difficile euadit. Jn somnis quidquid videris, 
in gaudium conuertetur. Psalmus: Beatus vir [Ps. 1:1]. Quibus necesse est 
sanguinem minuere, ante horam tercium expleat.


Reference: Zinner No. 8061; Thorndike/Kibre.

Note: This text is substantively the same as Aberystwyth, National Library of 
Wales, Peniarth MS 26 [Weißer {AbL}] (supra).

- Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek cod. 674, fols. 17r–18r [c. 1300]


Reference: Weißer {ErL}.

Note: Luna I–XII of this text is substantively the same as Città del Vaticano, 
BAV cod. lat. 3101 [Weißer {Va1L}]; Luna XIII–XXX of this text is 
substantively the same as London, BL, cod. Cotton Titus D.xxvii [Weißer 
{Lo1L}].

- Firenze, BML cod. Ashburnham 130, fols. 25–26 [xiii/xiv]
  incipit: Luna prima Adam factus est (natus fuit) illa die propter . . .

Reference: Thorndike/Kibre: “Giovannino di Graziano, mentioned in the 
Ashburnham MS at Florence . . . was perhaps its owner rather than author.
The text is anonymous in the MS at Venice” [i.e., Venezia, BM cod. 
VIII.33 (infra)].

Note: Despite the similarity in foliation, this text does not seem to be the same 
as Firenze, BML cod. Ashburnham 204 (infra).

- Firenze, BML cod. Ashburnham 204 [olim 136], fols. 25r–26r [c. 1300]
  incipit: Luna prima. Adam natus fuit. dies bonus est ad omnia opera bona: sci-
licet uendere, emere, iter facere, seminare, nauigare, sanguinare, puerum 
ad doctrinam mittere bonum est. qui egrotat, sanabitur. qui nascitur, uuiet. 
qui perdidderit: inuenietur.

expl.: Luna XXX. dies bonus. conuenit ad omnia que operatur in ea. sanguinem non minus bestiarum in corpore. sompnium non nocebit. qui fugit, inuenitur. qui egrotat, sanabitur. qui nascitur, erit potens et princeps.

Text: Svenberg 1 {F}, 24–82, 103–128 [commentary].

Note: Despite the similarity in foliation, this text does not seem to be the same 
as Firenze, BML cod. Ashburnham 130 (supra).

- Firenze, BML cod. Strozzi 70, fol. 100rv [ix]
  incipit: Luna prima: Si decubuerit eger, si se die terca alleuauerit, sanus erit; 
si grauior fuerit infirmitas, cum graui periculo euadit.

incipit: Luna prima si decubuerit eger . . .


Reference: Hauréau, B. Initia. Operum scriptorum latinorum medii potissimum aevi ex 

Note: This text is substantively the same as Berlin, DSB cod. Phill. 1790, fols. 
40v–41v [Weißer {Bl,L}], Erfurt, WBS cod. Amplonian 2° 276 [Weißer
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{EfL} [supra], London, BL cod. Sloane 475, fols. 81r–82r [Weißer {LoL}], Prague, Národní Musea cod. XIV.A.12 [Weißer {PrL}], and St. Gallen, SB cod. 44 [Weißer {SgL}] [infra].

– Gent, Universiteitsbibliotheek MS 5 (416), fols. 157v–158v (Luna I–XXVII only) [c. 1400]

\textit{Inscr.}: Prenostica merlini

\textit{Incep.}: Lunaque prima qui decubuerit, si 3\textsuperscript{a} alleuiaatur, sanus erit. Qui natus fuerit, vitalis erit et astutus.

\textit{Text}: Weißer {GeL}, 226–228.

– Göteborg, MS X (Luna I–XXIII only) [x/xi]

\textit{Incep.}: Luna I. Haec dies agentibus omnibus utilis est in lecto qui inciderit, diu lan\textsuperscript{g}escit et longa patitur, et somnia quicquid uideris, <in gaudium conuertetur. et si uideris> te uinici, tamen uinces omnes inimicos tuos, et infans si fuerit natus, vitalis erit....

\textit{Expl.}: Luna XXIII. rixa habebit et contenti<es sine uilla detractione. somp<nium... >


\textit{Reference}: Weißer {GoL}.

\textit{Note}: This MS is the substantively the same as St. Gallen, SB 756 [Svenberg 1 {s}] and Wien, ÖNB cod. lat. 2532 [Svenberg 1 {W}] [infra].

– Hamburg, Staatsbibliothek cod. Hans. IV.15, fols 131–149


\textit{Note}: It is unclear whether this is a lunation; the catalogue merely noted “lunationes.”

– Herten, Bibliothek des Grafen Nesselrode-Reichenstein [Schloßbibliothek], cod. med. Hertensis 192, fols. 87vb–88rb [xi]:

\textit{text}: Sudhoff [infra].

\textit{Incep.}: Luna I tota die bona est...

\textit{Expl.}: Luna XXX non est bona.

\textit{Reference}: Beccaria, 213: “Lunare del salasso... (ed. Sudhoff... 303 e 304)”; Weiner, 56–57 [but cites foliation as 89v–90v]

\textit{Note}: This text appears to be substantively the same as Cambridge, TC cod. O.7.23, fol. 70v (supra); London, BL cod. Cotton Titus D.xxvi, fol. 7v; London, BL cod. Cotton Titus D.xxvii, fol. 2r; London, BL cod. Harley 3271; London, BL cod. Sloane 3285; München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 4636; München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 10172; St. Gallen, SB, cod. 751, p. 428b; Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 485, fol. 15v; Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 1449, fol. 9r; and Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Vat. lat. 687 [infra]; and the text published by Migne, \textit{PL} 105, cols. 961–962.

– Hildesheim, Dombibliothek MS 749, fol. 116va [xii]:

\textit{Incep.}: Luna I. Tota die bona est...

\textit{Expl.}:... XXX. Non est bona.


\textit{Incep.}: Luna prima: Leuiter egrotabit. Luna ii: iterum...

\textit{Expl.}: Luna xxx: Contrariis rebus cesser.

\textit{Text}: Weißer {KaL}, 174–175 [synthetic text of 3 MSS].
Note: This text is substantively the same as Berlin, DSB cod. Phill. 1790, fol. 41v [Weiβer {Bl1L}] (supra) and Paris, BNF cod. lat. 11218 [Weiβer {Pa4L}] (infra).


- Kobenhavn, Det kongelige Bibliotek cod. 1653, fol. 76v (Luna I–XXII only)
  inscr. [description?]: Incipit lunaris cursus
  incip.: Luna I, ora prima . . .
  expl.: Luna XXII cito confirmat.

Reference: Beccaria, 121: “ed. Laux, 432” [but see St. Gallen SB 751 (infra)].

Note: On the title, incipit, and explicit of this lunation, see the note to St. Gallen SB 751, fols. 175–176 (infra).

- Kobenhavn, UB cod. Arnamagnaenus 194, fols. 49r–49v [1387]


Reference: Craig (infra), xxxix; Weiβer {Ko1L}.

- Kobenhavn, UB cod. Arnamagnaenus 194, fols. 49v–50v [1387]
  incip.: Luna prima in omnibus agendis utilis. In luctu quis ceciderit, diu languescit.
  In sumpnus quidquid viderit, vertetur in gaudium

Text: Kålund, Cod. MBR. AM. 194 (infra), 85; Weiβer {Ko1L}, 200–205 [synthetic text of 2 MSS].

Reference: Craig (infra), xxxix.

Note: This text is substantively the same as Cambridge, TC cod. O.7.23, fols. 60v–70r [Weiβer {Ca1L}] (supra).

  incip.: Luna prima factus est Adam. Quicquid feceris, bonum est. Et somnum quod videris, prope videbis, et in bonum et in gaudium reuertitur. Et infans, si fuerit natus, vitalis erit et diues. Et infirmus, si in lecto ceciderit, diu languebit et longam infirmitatem pacietur.

Text: Weiβer {Lo13L}, 288–293.

Reference: Thorndike/Kibre.

  inscr. [description?]: Consideratio aetatum Lunae (sive Lunares) in aegris
  incip.: Lun. I. qui inciderit, diu fugit...| | se he afeallð earfodlice he ætwint . . .
  expl.: Lun. XXX. Eger laborabit & surget. || Seco he swimcð ġ arisð.


Reference: Wanley, 233–234; Craig (infra), xxxix; Liuzzi, 215: “medical lunarium.”


Note: This text is composed in both Latin and Old English (on which, see infra).

  inscr.: de observatione lune & quae cauenda sint
  incip.: Luna prima. omnibus rebus agendis utilis est. puer natus erit illustratus, astutus, sapiens, litteratus, in aqua perclitatur, si euaserit, longeus erit.
puella nata interemerta, casta, benigna, speciosa, uiris placens, aeque discernens in postera aetate erit. in lecto longe recumbens. signum habet in ore uel in supercilio, qui recumbit, longe languescit. quicquid somniauerit, in gaudium convertetur, quia neque malum, raro bonum significat, et sanguinem minere tota die luna bona est.

expl.: Luna XXXma. puer natus felicissimus benignus, puella felix, mansueta. eger laborat, sed uiet. somnia infra triduum reulabuntur. interdum caudum est. non est bona luna sanguinem minuere.


Reference: Wanley, 194; Liuzza, 216: “General lunarium.”

Note: The Latin of this text is substantively the same as Bernkastel-Kues, Universitätsbibliothek MS 203 [Weißer {KuL}], Berlin, SBPK cod. lat. 8° 93 [Weißer {BlL}] (supra), and Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 235 [Weißer {VpL}] (infra).

Note: This text is composed in both Latin and Old English (on which, see infra).

Note: The foliation of BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii and the description of its contents is fraught with difficulties. Generally speaking, the foliation cited in the older studies (Wanley, Cockayne (infra), and especially the detailed list of the contents of the MS in H. Logeman, The Rule of S. Benet. Latin and Anglo-Saxon. Intralinear Version (EETS 90; London, 1888), xix ff.) are two folios “behind” the foliation cited in twentieth-century scholarship, although there are many minor disagreements even here—note the foliation of the copies of the Somniale Danielis (supra) as expressed by A. Epe, who examined the MS by autopsy. For this MS—re both the Somniale and the Lunationes, and re both the Latin and the Old English copies of each—I employ the foliation as it is articulated in Ker, Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts (supra), 240–245, and in Liuzza. But see also M. Förster, “Beiträge zur mittelalterlichen Volkskunde III. 4. Inhaltsangabe des volks qualidade Sammelkodex Tiberius A.III,” ASSZ 121 (1908), 30–46.

– London, BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii, fols. 35v–36r [xi]

inscr.: [description?]: Somniorum eventus juxta aetates Lunae

incip.: swa hwæt swa ðu gesihst on blisse bið || Luna prima quicquid uideris in gaudium erit . . .

expl.: binnan þrim dagum gewyr þ swefen ð in butan frecendnysse || Luna XXX.


Note: This text is composed in both Latin and Old English (on which, see infra).

Note: On the foliation of this and all the lunations in BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii, see the note following the Latin lunation at fols. 30v–33v, supra.

– London, BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii, fol. 36v [xi]

incip.: Luna I. se þe acenned sið liðlic he bið . . . || Luna I. qui natus fuerit.

expl.: Luna XXX. caepa seala he smeað. || Luna XXX. Nagotia multa tratabit.


Reference: Wanley, 194 [but citing fol. 34v]: “Incipit Lunares Sc Danielis de Nativitate. Tit. D. 26”; Craig (infra), xl; Ker, Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts (supra), 242; Liuzza, 217: “Birth lunarium.”

Note: This text is composed in both Latin and Old English (on which, see infra).

Note: On the foliation of this and all the lunations in BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii, see the note following the Latin lunation at fols. 30v–33v, supra.
London, BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii, fols. 36v–37r [xi]
inscr.: Luna I. se þe æfealleð earfoðlice he ætwint . . . || Luna I. qui incident,
difficile evadet. . .
expl.: Luna XXX. secæ swincð þer. || Luna XXX. eger laborabit & surget.

Text [Latin]: Förster, “Beiträge VIII,” 32–34; Weißer {Lo9L/E}, 273–277 [synth-
etic text of 9 MSS].

Reference: Wanley, 194: “Incipit Lunares in aegris. TITUS. D. 26”; Craig {infra},
xxxix; Ker, Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts (supra), 242; Liuzza, 217:
“Medical lunarium.”

Note: The Latin text is substantively the same as London, BL cod. Cotton
Caligula A.xv [Weißer {Lo20L/E}] (supra), London, BL cod. Cotton Tiberius
A.iii, fol. 5v [Weißer {Lo3L}]; London, BL cod. Cotton Titus D.xxvi
[Weißer {Lo2L}], London, BL cod. Harley 3017, fol. 58v [Weißer {LoTL}],
Oxford, St. John’s College MS 17 [Weißer {OxL}], Paris, BNF cod. lat.
39vb [Weißer {VpL}], and Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 485
[Weißer {VpL}] (infra).

Note: This text is composed in both Latin and Old English (on which, see infra).

Note: On the foliation of this and all the lunations in BL cod. Cotton Tiberius
A.iii, see the note following the Latin lunation at fols. 30v–33v, supra.

London, BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii, fol. 65r [xi]


Reference: Ker, Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts (supra), 245 (see note infra);
Liuzza, 218: “Bloodletting lunarium.”

London, BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii, fol. 65v [xi]


Reference: Craig {infra}, xi; Ker, Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts (supra), 245
(see note infra); Liuzza, 218: “Birth lunarium.”

London, BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii, fol. 65v (Luna I–VII only) [xi]

Note: Ker, Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts (supra), 245, reports that at fol.
65r–v there are “four sets of prognostics, the first giving lucky and unlucky
days of the moon, the second headed De natiuitate infantum, the third headed
Incipit lunaris sancti danielis de natiuitate infantum.” Liuzza, 218, identifies the
second text as a “birth prognostic by day of the week,” i.e., not a lunation.

of 9 MSS].

Reference: Craig {infra}, xxxix; Ker, Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts (supra), 245;
Liuzza, 218: “Medical lunarium.”

Note: The extant part of this text is substantively the same as London, BL cod.
[Weißer {Lo2L}], London, BL cod. Harley 3017, fol. 58v [Weißer {LoTL}],
Oxford, St. John’s College MS 17 [Weißer {OxL}], Paris, BNF cod. lat.
[Weißer {VpL}] (infra).

Note: On the foliation of this and all the lunations in BL cod. Cotton Tiberius
A.iii, see the note following the Latin lunation at fols. 30v–33v, supra.

London, BL cod. Cotton Titus D.xxvi, fol. 6r–v [c. 1040]
inscr.: De flebotomatione uel de minuendo sanguine

incip: Luna prima. Tota die bonum est. Luna. ii . . .

Text: de Gray Birch {infra}, 477 [partial]; Günzel, B. Ælfwine’s Prayerbook (London,
Woodbridge, 1993. 146.
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Note: This text appears to be substantively the same as Cambridge, TC cod. O.7.23, fol. 70v; Herten, cod. med. Hertensis 192 (supra); London, BL cod. Cotton Titus D.xxvi, fol. 2r; London, BL cod. Harley 3271; London, BL cod. Sloane 3285; München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 4636; München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 10172; St. Gallen, SB, cod. 751, p. 428b; Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 485, fol. 15v; Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 1449, fol. 9r; and Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Vat. lat. 687 (infra); and the text published by Migne, PL 105, cols. 961–962.

Note: BL codd. Cotton Titus D.xxvi and D.xxvii were originally one book.

- London, BL cod. Cotton Titus D.xxvi, fols. 7v–8r [c. 1040]
  inscr.: Incipit lunares sancti Daniælis de natiuitate
  incep: Luna i. qui natus fuerit, vitalis erit . . .

- London, BL cod. Cotton Titus D.xxvi, fols. 8r–9r [c. 1040]
  inscr.: Incipit lunares de aegrís
  incep: Luna i. Qui inciderit, difficile evadit . . .
  Reference: Index of Manuscripts in the British Library (infra), 3.507; Liuzza, 220: “Medical lunarium.”


  inscr.: Incipit lunares de somnis
  incep: Luna i. Quicquid uideri, ad gaudium pertinet. Luna. ii. et. iii....
  Text: de Gray Birch (infra), 479 [partial]; Günzel (supra), 149–150.

- London, BL cod. Cotton Titus D.xxvii, fol. 2r [c. 1040]
  inscr.: Ad sanguinem minuendam
  incep: Luna i. tota die bona est . . .
  Text: de Gray Birch (infra), 496 [partial], with note: “resembling the article ‘de flebotomatone vel de minuendo sanguine’ in the MS. Titus D.xxvi . . . already cited” [see BL Cotton Titus D.xxvi, fol. 7v (supra)]; Günzel (supra), 89.

Note: This text appears to be substantively the same as Cambridge, TC cod. O.7.23, fol. 70v; Herten, cod. med. Hertensis 192; London, BL cod. Cotton Titus D.xxvi, fol. 7v (supra); London, BL cod. Harley 3271; London, BL cod. Sloane 3285; München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 4636; München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 10172; St. Gallen, SB, cod. 751, p. 428b; Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 485, fol. 15v; Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 1449, fol. 9r; and Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Vat. lat. 687 (infra); and the text published by Migne, PL 105, cols. 961–962.

  inscr.: Argumentum Lunare ad Requirendum Quomodo Luna Qualiter Observitur
incip.: Luna I hec dies ad omnia agenda utilis est. In lecto qui inciderit, diu languesce et longa infirmate patietur, et quidquid uideris, in gaudium conueretur. Et si uideris te uinci, tu tamen uinces omnes inimicos tuos. Infans si fuerit natus, uitalis erit.


Text: Svenberg {L1}, 25–83, 103–128 [commentary]; Günzel (supra), 117–120.


incip.: Luna prima. Adam creatus est. Omnibus rebus incipientibus utilis est. Puer natus illustratus erit et uitalis; signum uero habebit in ore aut in supercilio; astutus erit et sapiens et litteratus, si ad hoc applicatus fuerit, sed in aqua perclitabitur et, si inde euaserit, ad perfectam etatem ueniet. Puella nata habebit signum quod et puer et erit casta, benigna, speciosa, uiris placens et equalis discens et in posteriori etate meliorabitur. In lecto qui inciderit, diu languebit et longam infirmatem pacietur et difficile euadit. In somnis uero quicquid uideris, in gaudium conueretur, nec inde dubites, quia neque bonum neque malum tibi erit. Beatus vir, qui non abiit [Ps 1:1]. Quibus nescesse est sanguinem minuere, ante horam terciam debet expleri.


Note: This text is substantively the same as London, BL cod. Sloane 2641 [Weißer {Lo0-L}] (infra). But see also note at London, BL cod. Sloane 122 and again at Sloane 282 (infra).

– London, BL cod. Egerton 821, fols. 8v–12r [xii]


Text: Weißer {Lo0-L}, 244–252.

– London, BL cod. Egerton 821, fols. 32r–32v [xii]


– London, BL cod. Egerton 847, fols. 20r–21v [xv]

inscr.: Incipit parus tractatus de lunacionibus


Reference: Craig (infra), xl.


expl.: . . . somnia vana erunt.

Reference: Catalogue of Additions to the Manuscripts in the British Museum in the Years 1900–1905, 393: “From the days of the lunar month: a table like that called Lunationes, which usually accompanies the so-called Somnia Danielis (Cotton MS. Tib. A. iii. f. 32b, Sloane Ms. 2030, f. 134, etc., but there is a great variety in the texts). Beg. . . .”; Craig (infra), xl; Index of Manuscripts in the British Library (supra), 3.203.
London, BL cod. Harley 978, fols. 16r–18r [xiv–xv]

*incipit:* Luna prima: Hec est utilis omnibus augmentis. Qui ceciderit in lectum, diu languescet. Et somnium quicquid uiderit, in gaudium convetur. Et si infans natus fuerit, vitalis erit.

*Text:* WeiBer {Lo12L}, 307–314 [synthetic text of 3 MSS].


*Note:* This text is substantially the same as Cambridge, PC cod. 103 [WeiBer {Ca2L}] (supra) and Milano, BA cod. T 81 sup [WeiBer {MiL1} (infra)].


London, BL cod. Harley 3017, fol. 58v [xi]

*incipit:* Incipit euisdem lunarium de egris

*Text:* WeiBer {Lo9L}, 273–277 [synthetic text of 9 MSS].

*Reference:* Liuzza, 223: “Medical lunarium.”


London, BL cod. Harley 3017, fols. 58v–59r [xi]

*incipit:* Incipit Lunaris sancti Danihel de nativitate infantium

*Text:* WeiBer {Lo9L}, 273–277 [synthetic text of 9 MSS].


London, BL cod. Harley 3271, fol. 102v

*incipit:* De sanguine minuere

*Text:* Liuzza, 224: “Bloodletting lunarium.”

*Note:* This text, if it exists (it is not listed as part of this cod. in the Catalogue ... Harleian Manuscripts (supra)), appears to be substantially the same as Cambridge, TC cod. O.7.23, fol. 70v; Herten, cod. med. Hertensis 192 (supra); London, BL cod. Cotton Titus D.xxvi, fol. 7v; London, BL cod. Cotton Titus D.xxvii, fol. 2r; London, BL cod. Sloane 3285; München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 4636; München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 10172; St. Gallen,
SB, cod. 751, p. 428b; Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 485, fol. 15v; Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 1449, fol. 9r; and Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Vat. lat. 687 (infra); and the text published by Migne, PL 105, cols. 961–962.


Reference: Thorndike/Kibre.

Note: Although Weißer edits this lunation separately, it is clear that this text is substantively the same as London, BL cod. Cotton Vespasian E.X, fols. 119r–122v \{Weißer \{Lo1L\}\} (supra), London, BL cod. Sloane 2641 [Weißer \{Lo1L\}] (infra) and London, BL cod. Sloane 282 (infra).

- London, BL cod. Sloane 282, fols. 82v–85v [xiv]

incipit: Luna prima Adam fuit creatus. Omnis rebus incipiendis utilis est: pueros ad scolas mittere. Puer natus illustratus erit et naturale signum habebit in supercilio; hastatus erit, litteratus et sapiens, si ad hoc applicatus fuerit, in aqua periclibitur et si euaserit, ad perfectam etatem peruenerit. Puella nata signum sicut et puer, casta erit et benigna, speciosa, viris bene placita, equalis, sapiens, in posteriour etate meliorabitur. In lecto qui inciderit, diu languebit et longa inflamabit et difficile viuet. In somnis vero quicquid videris, in gaudium vertetur; non dubites neque bonum neque malum erit tibi. Versus: Beatus vir, qui non abijt in consilio impiorum [Ps 1:1]. Qui vult sanguinem minuire, ante horam terciam minuat.

Text: Weißer \{Lo1L\}, 277–286.
Reference: Craig (infra), xl; Thorndike/Kibre.

Note: Although Weißer edits this lunation separately, it is clear that this text is substantively the same as London, BL cod. Cotton Vespasian E.X, fols. 119r–122v \{Weißer \{Lo1L\}\}, London, BL cod. Sloane 122 (supra), London, BL cod. Sloane 2641 [Weißer \{Lo1L\}] (infra); note also Craig (infra), xl, that this lunation and the one at BL cod. Cotton Vespasian E.X, fol. 114 [sic] “agree with each other.” See also the Middle English copy at London, BL cod. Royal 12.E.xvi, fols. 51v–53v (infra).


Reference: Taavitsainen \{S5\}.
Note: This lunation is written in Latin (to Luna IV) and then in English.

- London, BL cod. Sloane 475, fol. 37r (Luna I–XXVIII only) [xi/xii]

incipi: Quibus lunationibus bonum est sanguinem

expl: Luna XXVIII similiter. Explicit liber II.
Reference: Beccaria, 256; Thorndike/Kibre [but citing fols. 39r–40r]; Liuzza, 226: “Bloodletting lunarium . . . Indications for most days are different from those commonly found in Anglo-Saxon lunaria.”

- London, BL cod. Sloane 475, fols. 81r–82r [xi/xii]

incipit: Luna prima: Qui decubuerit, si tercio die alleuauerit, sanus erit; si uero quarto die gravius fuerit, cum grandi periculo euadit.

Text: Weißer \{Lo10L\}, 365–373 [synthetic text of 6 MSS].

Note: This text is substantially the same as Berlin, DSB cod. Phill. 1790, fols. 40v–41v [Weißer {Bl.1}]; Erfurt, WBS cod. Amplonian 2° 276 [Weißer {El.1}]; Firenze, BML cod. Strozzi 70, fol. 100rv [Weißer {Fl.1}] (supra), Prague, Národní Museum cod. XIV.A.12 [Weißer {Pr.1}], and St. Gallen, SB cod. 44 [Weißer {Sg.1}] (infra).

- London, BL cod. Sloane 475, fols. 211r–216v [xi/xii]
  incip.: <Luna I. h.> aec dies utilis est omnibus rebus agendis. puer natus erit illustris, astutis, sapiens, litteratus. et in aqua periclabit. et si euaserit, in posteriori etate melior erit. puella nata litterata, casta, benigna, speciosa, uiris placens. in lecto qui inciderit, diu languescit et longe infirmate patietur. in somnis quicquid uideris, in gaudium conuertetur. nihil dubium sis, quia neque <bonum neque> malum est.
  expl.: Luna XXX. puer natus erit fìlicissimus et benignus. puella nata erit felix, benigna, quieta, mansuetu. et qui in lecto ceciderit, perueniet quasi mortuus, sed ad uiam ueretur. et somnium infra triduum reuelabitur. intersum tamen causa [Svenberg 2: cautae (!)] agendum est.
  Text: Svenberg 1 {Lo.1} 25–83, 103–128 [commentary].
  Reference: Craig (infra), xl; Beccaria, 257: “Lunare di malattia”; Weißer {Lo.1}; Liuzza, 226: “General lunarium.”

- London, BL cod. Sloane 783b, fol. 220r (Luna I–XVIII only) [xv]
  incip.: Luna prima dies bona est, omnia ad faciendum utile. Ilia die Adam plas- matus est. Hac die omnia agenda utile. In lectum qui inciderit, diu iacebit et longa infirmate pacietur. Sopnum quicquid erit, in gaudium conuertetur. Quis uir qui non abiit, etc. [Ps 1:1]. Infans natus utile erit et non diues.
  Reference: Craig (infra), xxxix [re a “blood-letting” lunation] and again at xl [re a “general” lunation]; Thorndike/Kibre.

  incip.: Luna prima factus est Adam. omnibus rebus agendis utile est. puer natus erit illustris et uitalis. signum habebit in ore aut in supercilio. astutus erit et sapiens et litteratus, si ad hoc applicatus fuerit. sed in aqua periclabit. et si tamen euaserit, ad perfectam etatem non ueniet. puella nata habebit signum quod et puer. et erit casta, benigna, speciosa, uiris placens et uerit. in posteriori etate meliorabitur. in lecto qui inciderit, diu languebit et longam infirmatem pacietur et difficile uadet. in somnis quicquid uideris, in gaudium ueretur, quia neque bonum neque malum ueriuent. Quibus autem necesse est sanguinem minuere, ante horam † debet explere.
n.b.: Luna IXa, natus est Nabugodenosor. Omnibus rebus faciendis utile est . . .
expl.: Luna XXXa, natus est Samuel propheta. Ad omnia utilis est. infans natus felicissimus, benignus. necgia multa sectabitur. puella felix, mansueta erit.
eger perueniet quasi in mortem, et ad uiam converterit. somnia infradrus dies eueneint, et hoc sine periculo. et ideo non est curandum de illis.


Reference: Thondike/Kibre.

Note: This text is substantially the same as London, BL cod. Cotton Vespasian E.x [Weiβer {Lo,L}] (supra). But see also note at London, BL cod. Sloane 122 and again at Sloane 282 (supra).

– London, BL cod. Sloane 3285, fol. 87r [xv]

incip.: Luna prima tota die bona luna secunda . . .

Reference: Thondike/Kibre: “Regula ad sanguinem minuendum.”

Note: This text appears to be substantively the same as Cambridge, TC cod. O.7.23, fol. 70v; Herten, cod. med. Hertensis 192; London, BL cod. Cotton Titus D.xxvi, fol. 7v; London, BL cod. Cotton Titus D.xxvii, fol. 2r; London, BL cod. Harley 3271 (supra); München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 4636; München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 10172; St. Gallen, SB, cod. 751, p. 428b; Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 485, fol. 15v; Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 1449, fol. 9r; and Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Var. lat. 687 (infra); and the text published by Migne, PL 105, cols. 961–962.

– London, Royal College of Physicians cod. 358, fols. 49r–50r [xv]


– Lucca, Biblioteca Governativa cod. 296, fol. 109r

incip.: [description?]: Incipit lunas de somnium

expl.: Luna I quicquid somnum tuus videris in gaudium convertetur . . .

Reference: Beccaria, 298; Thondike/Kibre.

– Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional cod. 10063, fol. 25ra [xiii]

incip.: Luna prima quicquid per somnium (in somniis) videris . . .

Reference: Thondike/Kibre.

– Manchester, Chetham’s Library cod. 11380 [olim Mun. A.4.91], fols. 8r–v [xiii/xiv]


– Manchester, Chetham’s Library cod. 11380 [olim Mun. A.4.91], fols. 35v–36v [xiii/xiv]


– Manchester, Chetham’s Library cod. 11380 [olim Mun. A.4.91], fol. 125v [xiii/xiv]

Reference: Ker, Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries III (supra), 370: “Prognostications from the age of the moon and from dreams ‘secundum Danielem’.”

– Melk, Benediktinerstift cod. 728, fols. 90r–91v [xiv/xv]

incip.: Luna prima: Haec dies utilis est emere omnibus rebus agendis . . .

expl.: Luna XXXa . . . laborat sed vivet.

- Milano, BA cod. T.81 sup., pp. 153–156 [xiv]

Text: Weißer {Mi1,L}, 307–314 [synthetic text of 3 MSS].

Reference: Thorndike/Kibre.

Note: This text is substantively the same as Cambridge, PC cod. 103 [Weiße {Ca2,L}] and London, BL cod. Harley 978 [Weiße {Lo14,L}] (supra).

- Modena, Biblioteca Estense cod. lat. 697, fols. 24v [xv]

incip.: Incipit Somniale Daniethis prophete. Luna prima quicquid sopniarent [sic] . . .


Note: From the description of the incipit, it appears that a lunation precedes the text of the Somniale. This phenomenon is not uncommon; see DiTommaso, “Mediaeval Manuscripts,” (infra).

- Modena, Biblioteca Estense cod. lat. 697, fols. 24v–27r [xv]

incip.: Luna prima factus est adam dies bonus in omnibus vendere . . .
expl.: . . . dies bona in omnibus. [alphabet follows]
Reference: McGurk (supra), 50.

- München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 317, fols. 123va–124v [xv]


Reference: Catalogus codicum latinarum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis. Tomi I, Pars I: Codices num. 1–2329 complectens. München, 1892. 170; Thorndike/Kibre; Beccaria, 420 [?]: “Luna prima qui decuberit si tertia die se adlevaverit . . .”

- München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 4622, fol. 4v [xii/xiii]

incip.: Luna I. mane. luna II. medio die . . .
expl.: luna XXX. noli uti.

Note: This text is substantively the same as München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 27305 (infra).

- München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 4636, fol. 108v [xii/xiii]

incip.: Luna I. tota die bona est . . .
Reference: Glauche, G. Katalog der lateinischen Handschriften (supra), 261.
Note: This text appears to be substantively the same as Cambridge, TC cod. O.7.23, fol. 70v; Herten, cod. med. Hertensis 192; London, BL cod. Cotton Titus D.xxvi, fol. 7v; London, BL cod. Cotton Titus D.xxvii, fol. 2r; London, BL cod. Harley 3271; London, BL cod. Sloane 3285 (supra); München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 10172; St. Gallen, SB, cod. 751, p. 428b; Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 485, fol. 15v; Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 1449, fol. 9r; and Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Vat. lat. 687 (infra); and the text published by Migne, PL 105, cols. 961–962.

- München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 6382, fol. 42r [xi]
  incep.: Luna prima quicquid uideres in gaudium convertitur . . .

- München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 10172, fol. 10rv [xi]
  incep.: Luna I. tota die bonum est...
  expl.: luna. XXX. similiter.

Note. This text appears to be substantively the same as Cambridge, TC cod. O.7.23, fol. 70v; Herten, cod. med. Hertensis 192; London, BL cod. Cotton Titus D.xxvi, fol. 7v; London, BL cod. Cotton Titus D.xxvii, fol. 2r; London, BL cod. Harley 3271; London, BL cod. Sloane 3283; München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 4636 (supra); St. Gallen, SB, cod. 751, p. 428b; Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 485, fol. 15v; Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 1449, fol. 9r; and Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Vat. lat. 687 (infra); and the text published by Migne, PL 105, cols. 961–962.

- München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 14111, fols. 412ra–413va [xv]
  incep.: Luna prima omnibus rebus agendis vitilis est . . .

- München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 14506, fols. 2r [xii]

- München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 14706, fols. 34r–35r [xv]


- München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 16521, fols. 6r–7r [1462]
  incr.: De etate lune

Reference: Catalogus codicum latinorum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis. Tomi II, Pars III: Codices num. 15121–21313 complectens. München, 1878. 73; Thorndike/Kibre [but citing fol. 6r only].

- München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 26639, fols. 42ra–vb [xvi]
  incipit: Luna prima quicquid vides non dubites bonum est . . .


Note: Both the Catalogus and Thorndike/Kibre imply that this is a copy of the Somniale Danielis, but the incipit makes it clear that it is not.

- München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 27305, p. 33 [x/xi]
  inscr.: Isti sunt dies lunares qua luna debeas uti medicina
  incipit: Luna I. mane. Luna II. medio die . . .
  expl.: luna. XXX. noli vti.


Note: This text is substantively the same as München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 4622 (supra).

- München, UB 4° cod. 649, fol. 185v [1472/1478]
  incipit: Luna prima quid quotiens videbis non dubitabis . . .


- München, UB cod. 4° 808, fols. 173v–174r [1456/1457]
  inscr.: Pronostica ad mortem et ad vitam. Pronostica ad mortem et ad vitam per dies mensis a physicis experta
  incipit: Quis prima die mensis in i[n]finitatem decicit, sequens tercia diei timenda est: qua si transiit, usque ad xxx dies euadit.


Note: This text is substantively the same as Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 1234 [Weiβer {Vp, L}] (infra).

- München, UB cod. 8° 339, fols. 118v–119r [xv]
  Text: Weiβer {Mü, L}, 343.

- New Haven, Yale University Beinecke cod. 163 (Wagstaff Miscellany), fol. 28v [xiv/xv]
  incipit: Dies Nebugodonosor Regis omnis populus tradebat ei somnna que videbat ut solueret Daniel propheta
  expl.: luna XXXv. infra tres dies videns quod somnmiasti. Explicitum lune distinctionum.


- Oxford, All Souls College cod. 332, fol. 3 [xii]
  Reference: Ker, Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries III (supra), 591: “f. 3 (begins imperfectly) quadam debilitate. Luna in xi . . . predicere finem.”

Note: It is unclear whether this text is a lunation.

- Oxford, Bod. cod. Ashmole 342, fol. 23v–25v
  incipit: Luna prima omnibus agentibus est . . .

Oxford, Bod. cod. Ashmole 361, fols. 156v–158v [xiv]

_inscr._: Iste sunt lunaciones quas Adam primus homo disposuit secundam veram experientiam quam etiam suis filiis tradidit et quam maxime Abel et ceteris de posteritate ad quos etiam concordavit Daniel prophet a et ceteris...

_Reference_: Black _supra_ col. 280; Thorndike, 682 note 1.

Oxford, Bod. cod. Ashmole 361, fols. 159r–159v [xiv]

_inscr._: <M>odo agitur de numero lune ad videndum que sit bona uel que mala et vsum istarum lunacionum inuenerunt Adam et Daniel propheta, quibus dedit sensum deus et pulcritudinem et fortitudinem huius mundi. Et ideo omnes homines qui nascentur: omni debet peccatum ipsius Ade et mulieris peccatum Euue, sicut quod masculus quando nascitur, dicit ‘o a’, et femila dicit ‘o e’. Primum dixit, quod vidit Adam, quando fuit factus, quia primo creatus uidit lunam, et ideo uocata est ‘lunam’ primam, et deus dedit lune potestatem super res inferiores creatas. Et Adam scuit tectum suum posse, et inst<it>uit lunam uocari primam, postquam conjuncta est soli facta reuolucione, dum jucipit nouiter apparere, et ideo propter creacionem suam dixit:

_incep_: quando omnia sunt bona ad faciendum luna prima, et ut incipiantur. Et homo qui nascitur luna prima, debet esse diuturne uite et debet bene finere. Idem dixit de muliere, que tunc nascitur. Qui decidit in inferiorem lunam, debet habere pro<l>ongam in<fi>rmitym, sed debet perfecte curari. Et debet habere signum in pede. Et qui illa hora somniam somniun; debet in gaudium ueri<fi>cari et erit bonum atque dilectum. Si incipiat ibidem pluere, non debet durare ultra tres dies. Et quando tempore illo fit flebothemia, debet fieri ante terciam uel ante.

_Text_: Weißer _Ox L_, 359–362.

_Reference_: Black _supra_, col. 280; Thorndike, 682 note 1.

Oxford, Bod. cod. Bodley 579, fol. 56r [ix]

_incep._: Luna prima bona est. Luna secunda bona est.

_Reference_: Liuzza, 227: “Lunarium, presumably for bloodletting though not so labelled.”

Oxford, Bod. cod. Junius 43 [SC 5155]

_inscr._: Somniorum eventus iuxta aetates Lunae

_incep._: swa hwæt swa ãu gesihst on blisse bi æ || Luna prima quicquid uideris in gaudiam erit...

_exp.:_...swefen ðin butan freccnednsse ||...Somnium tuum sine periculo. Amen.

_Reference_: Wanley, 88, who notes that this text “ex Cottoniae Bibliothecae volumine, quod inscribuit, TIBERIUS. A.3.”

_Note_: This text appears to be composed in both Latin and Old English _infra_ and a copy of some of the lunations in the BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii (on which, see _infra_); according to the _Summary Catalogue_, 2.2.974, the text was copied by hand and appears in a printed book (København, 1631).

Oxford, Bod. cod. Junius 44 [SC 5156]

_inscr._: De observatione Lunae, & quae cauenda

_incep._: Mona se forma on eallum ðingum dondum nyðic ys... || Luna prima omnibus rebus agendis utilis est...


_Note_: This text appears to be composed in both Latin and Old English (on which, see _infra_). According to the _Summary Catalogue_, 2.2.974, “De observatione lunae et quae cavenda” copied by Junius from Cott. MS Tib. A.iii,
fol. 32°, in the British Museum (fol. 2), followed by brief extracts from the same (artt. iii, vii, viii, x, xi, xii, xv, xviii, and xxii) with parallels from no. 5135, at that time in the Hatton Library."

- Oxford, Bod. cod. Junius 44 [SC 5156]
  inscr.: Luna I. se þe æfealleð. earfoðlice he ætwint . . . || Luna I. qui incidet, difficile evadet. . . .
  Note: This text appears to be composed in both Latin and Old English (on which, see infra); see note following previous entry.

- Oxford, Bod. cod. Lyell 36, fols. 51–57 [xv]
  incipit: Luna prima omnibus rebus agendis utilis est. Puer natus illustris erit et vitalis . . .

- Oxford, St. John’s College MS 17, fol. 4r [1110]
  incipit: Luna. i. tota die bona est. Luna. ii. . . .

- Oxford, St. John’s College MS 17, fol. 4r [1110]
  incipit: Luna. i. Qui natus fuerit uitalis erit. Luna. ii. . . .

- Oxford, St. John’s College MS 17, fol. 4r [1110]
  incipit: Luna. i. quicquid uideris ad gaudium pertinet. Luna. ii . . .
  Text: Weißer {OxL}, 273–277 [synthetic text of 9 MSS].

- Oxford, St. John’s College MS 17, fol. 4r [1110]
  incipit: Luna. i. quicquid uideris ad gaudium pertinet. Luna. ii . . .

- Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal cod. 873, fols. 212r–213r [xv]
  incipit: Luna prima quicquid videris ad gaudium veniet . . .

- Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal cod. 2872, fol. 400r [xiv]
  Note: It is unclear whether this text is a lunation, although the attribution to Daniel and the fact that it appears immediately after a series of lunaries and immediately before a “table des nativités pour trouver la planete et le signe de chascun” strongly suggests it.
- Paris, BNF cod. lat. 2113, fol. 256r–v [x/xi]
  *inscr.*: Incipit de infirmis
  *incip.*: Luna I, non longa infirmitas sed cito sanatur. Luna II, multum languitur, sed sanabitur ...
  *Text*: Wickersheimer (infra), 53–54; Weißer {Pa4L}, 419–420 [synthetic text of 3 MSS].
  *Note*: This text is substantively the same as Paris, BNF cod. lat. 2825 [Weißer {Pa5L}] and Zürich, Zentralbibliothek cod. Car. C. 176 [Weißer {Zü4L}] (infra).

- Paris, BNF cod. lat. 2113, fols. 256v–257v [x/xi]
  *Reference*: Weißer, 56: “Sammelunar.”
  *Note*: Not specifically noted in Lauer (infra).

- Paris, BNF cod. lat. 2825, fols. 125v–126r [x]
  *inscr.*: Luna I, longa infirmitio. Luna II, cito surgit ...
  *Text*: Wickersheimer (infra), 57; Weißer {Pa4L}, 419–420 [synthetic text of 3 MSS].
  *Note*: This text is substantively the same as Paris, BNF cod. lat. 2113, fols. 256v–257v [Weißer {Pa4L}] (supra) and Zürich, Zentralbibliothek cod. Car. C. 176 [Weißer {Zü4L}] (infra).

- Paris, BNF cod. lat. 3660, fols. 55r–57r [xvi]
  *incip.*: Primo die lunae Adam ad lucem peruenit, in quo quidem die bonum est emere et uendere, plantare, seminare, nauigare etc. et is qui tali die aufugerit, suo tempore reuertetur, qui uero eo in die ortum habuerit, longae uitae erit. qui autem in die illo infirmatur, cito sanatur, et somnia in eo erunt uera.
  *expl.*: 30 dies fortunatus erit. qui nascetur, bonae uitae erit. qui autem infirmabitur, cito morietur.
  *Text*: Svenberg 1 {p}, 100–102, 139 [commentary].
  *Reference*: Weißer {Pa4L}.

- Paris, BNF cod. lat. 4147, fol. 112
  *incip.*: Luna prima factus est Adam ...
  *Reference*: Hauréau (supra); Thorndike/Kibre.

- Paris, BNF cod. lat. 6882, fol. 18v [ix/x]
  *inscr.*: Lunaris de egrotantibus quomodo tempore egrotant.
  *incip.*: Luna I qui in ceciderit difficiles evadit ...
  *expl.*: Luna XXX laborat, set surgit.
  *Text*: Wickersheimer (infra), 74; Weißer {Pa4L}, 273–277 [synthetic text of 9 MSS].
  *Reference*: Beccaria, 149; 470 (index); Thorndike/Kibre.
- Paris, BNF cod. lat. 7349, fols. 31v–32v [ix]
- Paris, BNF cod. lat. 7453, fols. 18r–19v
- Paris, BNF cod. lat. 11218, fol. 101r [ix]
  inscr.: Incipit disposizione de lunas.
  incep.: Luna prima: Leuiter egrotabit. Luna ii: iterum . . .
  expl.: Luna xxx: Contrariis rebus rebus cesser.
  Text: Wickersheimer (infra), 110; Weißer {Pa1L}, 174–175 [synthetic text of 3 MSS].
  Reference: Beccaria, 165.
  Note: This text is substantively the same as Berlin, DSB cod. Phill. 1790, fol. 41v [Weißer {Bl1L}] and Karlsruhe, Bad. Landesbibliothek MS Aug. CLXXIII [Weißer {Ka1L}] (supra).
- Paris, BNF cod. n.a. lat. 356, fols. 1v–(14) [xii]
  incep.: Luna prima hec dies omnibus egrantibus utilis est . . .
  Reference: Thorndike/Kibre.
- Paris, BNF cod. n.a. lat. 1616, fols. 10v–12r [ix]
  incep.: Luna prima. [qui incenditur in ipsa, sanabitur. et] bona est in omnibus: dare et accipere et nubere et nauigare in mare et uendere et emere. et omnis quicumque fugerit in ipsa aut seruus aut liber, non poterit, sed capietur. aut qui incendit in tedio, sanabitur. et qui natus fuerit, uitalis erit. Luna II . . .
  expl.: Luna XXX. bona est ambulare in piscatone . . . periculo mortis habebit.
  Text: Svenberg 1 {P}, 84–87, 128–131 [commentary]; Svenberg 2, 23–29; Wickersheimer (infra), 140–141 [partial].
  Reference: Thorndike, 676; Thorndike/Kibre; Weißer {Pa1L}.
- Praha, Národního Musea cod. XIV.A.12, fols. 383ra–383rb [xv]
  inscr.: Prognosticon lune de infrimbus
  incep.: Luna prima: Si decubuerit in ipsa, sanabatur. et] bona est in omnibus:
  si grauior fuerit in infrimis expl.: Luna XXX. bona est ambulare in piscatone . . . periculo mortis habebit.
  Text: Weißer {Pr1L}, 365–373 [synthetic text of 6 MSS].
  Note: This text is substantively the same as Berlin, DSB cod. Phill. 1790, fols. 40v–41v [Weißer {Bl1L}], Erfurt, WBS cod. Amplonian 2o 276 [Weißer {Ef1L}], Firenze, BML cod. Strozzi 70, fol. 100rv [Weißer {Fl1L}], London, BL cod. Sloane 475, fols. 81r–82r [Weißer {Lo18L} (supra), and St. Gallen, SB cod. 44 [Weißer {Sg1L}] (infra).
  - St. Gallen, SB cod. 44, pp. 226–228 [ix]
  inscr.: Incipit lune requisitione in infrimis
  incep.: Luna prima: Qui decubuerit, si die tercia alleuauerit, sanus erit; si autem grauior fuerit, cum graui periculo euadit.
  Text: Weißer {Sg1L}, 365–373 [synthetic text of 6 MSS].
  Note: This text is substantively the same as Berlin, DSB cod. Phill. 1790, fols. 40v–41v [Weißer {Bl1L}], Erfurt, WBS cod. Amplonian 2o 276 [Weißer {Ef1L}], Firenze, BML cod. Strozzi 70, fol. 100rv [Weißer {Fl1L}], London, BL cod. Sloane 475, fols. 81r–82r [Weißer {Lo18L} (supra), and Prague, Národního Musea cod. XIV.A.12 [Weißer {Pr1L}] (supra).
  - St. Gallen, SB cod. 304, pp. 32–37 [1436]
  incep.: Luna prima: Omnibus rebus agendis utile est. Sagvinem mimuere mane
  ante horam terciarum debet explere. Jn lectum qui incidit, diu langwescit
  et longam infirmitatem pacietur. Jnfanst, si natus fuerit, vitalis erit. Jn somn-
  nis quidquid videris, non dubius sis, quia bonum est neque malum: jn
gaudium commutabitur, et si te videris vinc, tum tu vinces omnes jni-
micos tuos, secundum tradicionem. Psalmi versus: Beautus vir, qui non abiit in consilio impiorum [Ps 1:1], etc.


- St. Gallen, SB cod. 751, pp. 175–176 (Luna I–XXIX only) [ix/x]
  
  *inscr.*: In qualis luna debet homo sanguinem
  
  *incipit*: Luna prima et secunda bona est.
  
  *explit*: Luna XXIX ab hora III usque ad septima bona est.
  
  Text: Laux {infra}, 432.
  
  
  *Note*: It is quite clear that the lunation in Laux, 432, is this St. Gallen text.
  
  But Beccaria, 379, provides an *incipit* and *explicit* that is different from that in Laux’s edition. Yet for the lunation preserved in København, Det kgl. Bibliotek cod. 1653 (supra), Beccaria lists an *incipit* and an *explicit* that is identical to what is found in Laux, and what is more cites Laux as the editor of the text. All this suggests that Beccaria mistakenly assigned the incorrect *incipits* and *explicits* to each text. Both Beccaria and Laux observe that the St. Gallen lunation is incomplete.

- St. Gallen, SB cod. 751, p. 376 [ix/x]
  
  *inscr.*: Incipit lunaris sancti Daniheli.
  
  *incipit*: Luna prima puer natus erit studiosus vitalis . . .
  
  *explit*: (Luna XXX) omnia bona sunt.
  

- St. Gallen, SB cod. 751, p. 428b [ix/x]
  
  *inscr.* [description?): Incipit de lun. c. servat [?]
  
  *incipit*: Luna I tota die bonum est . . .
  
  *explit*: Luna XXX non est bona.
  
  
  *Note*: This text appears to be substantially the same as Cambridge, TC cod. O.7.23, fol. 70v; Herten, cod. med. Hertensis 192; London, BL cod. Cotton Titus D.xxvi, fol. 7v; London, BL cod. Cotton Titus D.xxvii, fol. 2r; London, BL cod. Harley 3271; London, BL cod. Sloane 3283; München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 4636; München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 10172 (supra); Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 485, fol. 15v; Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 1449, fol. 9r; and Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Vat. lat. 687 (infra); and the text published by Migne, *PL* 105, cols. 961–962.

- St. Gallen, SB cod. 751, p. 428c–429 [ix/x]
  
  
  *Note*: This MS is the substantively the same as Göteborg, MS X {supra} and Wien, ÖNB cod. lat. 2532 {Svenberg 1 [W]} (infra).

- Uppsala, Kon. Universitetsbibliotek cod. C.664, p. 23 (Luna XXVII-XXX only) [ix]
  
  *incipit*: Luna XXVII. Usque as mortem egrotat . . .
Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 235, fol. 39va [xi]

\begin{flushleft}
\textit{expl.} (Luna XXX) et contrariis rebus a medicis curabitur. Explicit lune requisitio.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 235, fol. 39vb [xi]

\begin{flushleft}
\textit{inscr.} De egrotantibus
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textit{incip.} Luna i qui ceciderit difficilae euadit. L ii . . .
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textit{Text.} Weiβer \{Vp.L\}, 273–277 [synthetic text of 9 MSS].
\textit{Reference.} DiTommaso, “Mediaeval Manuscripts” (infra).
\textit{Reference.} Stevenson (supra), 57; Thorndike, 680 note 1; DiTommaso, “Mediaeval Manuscripts” (infra).
\textit{Note.} This text is substantively the same as Bernkastel-Kues, Universitätsbibliothek MS 203 [Weiβer \{Ku.L\}], Berlin, SBPK cod. lat. 8° 93 [Weiβer \{Bl.2L\}], and London, BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii [Weiβer \{Lo.0L\}] (infra).
\textit{Reference.} Stevenson (supra), 156 [but listing it as a copy of the \textit{Dies Aegypiaci}]; Wallis, “Medicine in Medieval Calendar Manuscripts” (supra), 105–143 at 115–117 [but citing fol. 13r]; DiTommaso, “Mediaeval Manuscripts” (infra).
\textit{Reference.} Stevenson (supra), 156; Thorndike/Kibre: “Ad sanguinem minuendum”; DiTommaso, “Mediaeval Manuscripts” (infra).
Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 1030, fol. 131ra–b
**incipit.** Luna prima qui quid in somno videbis fiet bonum. Luna ii...  
**Reference.** DiTommaso, “Mediaeval Manuscripts” (*infra*).

Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 1080, fol. 196rv
**incipit.** Luna prima... qui ceciderit lectum longam in infirmitatem habebit  

Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 1234, fols. 105rb–105va [xv]
**incipit.** Si quis prima die cuiuslibet mensis in infirmitate ceciderit sequens 3cia...  
**Text.** Weißer {Vp}, 344–347 [synthetic text of 2 MSS].  
**Reference.** Schuba, *Die medizinischen HSS* (*supra*), 252; DiTommaso, “Mediaeval Manuscripts” (*infra*).  
**Note.** This text is substantively the same as München, UB cod. 4° 808 [Weißer {Mü,L}] (*supra*).

Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 1321, fol. 163ra–b
**incipit.** Luna prima nichil dubites quidquid videris...  

Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Pal. lat. 1449, fol. 9r
**incipit.** Luna I bona est. secunda non est bona...  

Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Reg. lat. 567, fol. 30v–31r
**incipit.** [Luna prima s]omaueris (?) quicquid videris ad gaudium ueniet. L ii & iii...  
**Reference.** DiTommaso, “Mediaeval Manuscripts” (*infra*).

Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Reg. lat. 567, fols. 37v–41v
**incipit.** [L prima] hec dies utilis est omnibus...  
**Reference.** DiTommaso, “Mediaeval Manuscripts” (*infra*).

Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Reg. lat. 846, fol. 114vb–c
**Reference.** Beccaria, 319: “a c. 114vb si scourge l’impostazione di un lunario, quasi interamente cancellato”; DiTommaso, “Mediaeval Manuscripts” (*infra*).

Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Reg. lat. 1420, fol. 32v–33r
**incipit.** Luna prima quidquid videbis bonum est. Luna 2...  
**Reference.** DiTommaso, “Mediaeval Manuscripts” (*infra*).

Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Urb. lat. 1439, fols. 146v–147v
**inscr.** De natiuitate... dies Lune  
**incipit.** Luna prima qui natus erit...  

Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Vat. lat. 642, fol. 91r
**incipit.** Luna i qui quidquid in somnis uideris siue bonum siue malum non est dubium in gaudio convuertetur  
**Reference.** DiTommaso, “Mediaeval Manuscripts” (*infra*).

Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Vat. lat. 642, fol. 91r
**incipit.** Luna i infans si natus fuerit uitalis erit. In ii...  
**Reference.** DiTommaso, “Mediaeval Manuscripts” (*infra*).
Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Vat. lat. 642, fols. 91v–94r

_Incerto:_ Luna i mari pleno uade ad regem & pete ab eo quod uis hora tercia & dabitur tibi . . .

_Text:_ Förster, “Beiträge VIII,” (infra), 38–42; Svenberg 1 {V 3}, 88–95, 131–136 [commentary]; Svenberg 2, 30–41.

_Reference:_ Craig (infra), xxxvii; Vattasso, M. Codices Vaticani latinii. Tomus I: Codices 1–678. Roma, 1902. 493; Thorndike/Kibre; Weißer {Va3L}; DiTommaso, “Mediaeval Manuscripts” (infra).

Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Vat. lat. 1548, fols. 75v–76r

_Incerto:_ De diuiniatione infirmitatum & sompniorum

_Text:_ Svenberg 2 {O}, 42–43 [but citing fol. 75v only].


– Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Vat. lat. 6297, fol. 157ra–b

_Incerto:_ Luna prima minuere sanguinem tota die bonum est. Luna 2 . . .

_Reference:_ DiTommaso, “Mediaeval Manuscripts” (infra).

– Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. Vat. lat. 6297, fols. 164r–165r

_Incerto:_ Luna prima natus est Adam. dies bona in omnibus vendere . . .

_Reference:_ DiTommaso, “Mediaeval Manuscripts” (infra).

– Venezia, BM cod. lat. VII.33 [olim lat. 106], fols. 7vb–8vb [xv]

_Incerto:_ Luna prima. Adam factus est illa propter iussa opera. bonum est uendere, in uia ambulare, testamentum facere. et qui incipit languere, sanatur. Puer si natus fuerit, signum habebit in collo. puella similiter. et uiam <longam> non habebit, sed cum langore amittit animam. et qui egro-
tauerit, longam infirmitatem facet et in dubium est. et sompniuim tuum
certum est. quidquid uiderit, in gaudium conuertit aut dubium est, quia
non uincit te. et qui aliquid perdidet aut fugerit, infra paucos dies inu-
enerit illud.

expl.: Luna 30a. infans qui natus fuerit, prope morietur. et sompniuim quod
uideris, infra tres dies fiet.

Text: Svenberg 1 {m}, 96–99, 137–139 [commentary].

Reference: Thorndike/Kibre; Weißer {VeL}.

– Wien, ÖNB cod. lat. 545 [likely, but 575 ?], fols. 122v–124v [xiv]

incip.: Luna prima si infans natus fuerit . . .

Note: Under this incipit Thorndike/Kibre list Wien cod. 575, fols. 122v–124v
[xiv]. But the Tabulae codicum manu scriptorum praeter graecos et orientales in
Bibliotheca Palatina Vindobonensi asservatorum (Wien, 1864–1870) records that
cod. 575 ends at fol. 121. What is interesting is that the Tabulae also
records that at cod. 545, fols. 122v–124v [xiv] there is the following text:
“De lunationibus cujsuslibet mensis. Incip.: ‘Luna prima si infans . . .’ et
expl.: ‘reuelabitur sine periculo’.” Could Thorndike/Kibre have mistaken
cod. 575 for cod. 545? Note also that a copy of the Somniale Danielis is
preserved at cod. lat. 545.

– Wien, ÖNB cod. lat. 2245, fols. 60r–64v [xii]

Text: Wilhelm (infra), 217–222.

Reference: Weißer {WiSiL}.

– Wien, ÖNB cod. lat. 5307 [olim Nov. 392], fols. 55r–59r [xii]

incip.: Luna prima hec dies omnibus egrantibus utilis est . . .

Text: Svenberg 1 {W}, 24–82 [as apparatus to Svenberg 1 {S} and {s}],
103–128 [commentary].

Reference: Tabulae codicum manu scriptorum (supra): “Notitiae astrologicae de phasi-
bus lunae. Incip.: ‘Luna. 1. Hec dies omnibus aegrotantibus utilis est . . .’
Expl.: ‘Puer natus negotia multa sectabit’.”; Hauréau (supra); Thorndike/Kibre;
Weißer {Wi,L}.

Note: This MS is the substantively the same as Göteborg, MS X [Svenberg 1
{G}] and St. Gallen, SB 756 [Svenberg 1 {s}] (supra).

– Wien, ÖNB cod. lat. 545 [likely, but 575 ?], fols. 66v–67r [xv]


Reference: Tabulae codicum manu scriptorum (supra): not listed specifically, but fols.
60r–316r listed as “Therapeutica universalis in systema digesta”; Thorndike/
Kibre [but listing cod. 5305].

– Zürich, Zentralbibliothek cod. C. 101, fol. 24r [xv]

Reference: Weißer, 58: “Tagwähllunar.”

– Zürich, Zentralbibliothek cod. Car. C. 176, fol. 238r [x/xi]

Reference: Mohlberg, L.C. Katalog der Handschriften der Zentralbibliothek Zürich. I:
Mittelalterliche Handschriften, Zürich, 1932. 536 [index, q.v., “Daniel”]: “lumar-
ium sancti D. de nativitate infantium”; Weißer, 58: “Geburtslunar.”

– Zürich, Zentralbibliothek cod. Car. C. 176, fol. 238v [x/xi]

insert.: Incipit de egris qui decumbit per singulas lunae, utrum morituri sint an
comauescere queant

incip.: Luna i: infirmatur diu. Luna ii: cito surgit . . .


Note: This text is substantively the same as Paris, BNF cod. lat. 2113, fols.
256v–257v [Weißer {Pa,L}] and Paris, BNF cod. lat. 2825 [Weißer {Pa,L}]
(supra).
Old English

- Cambridge, CCC cod. 391 [plim TC cod. K.10.II], p. 716 [xi]

  Reference: Craig (infra), xxxix; Ker, Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts (supra), 114: “prognostics of illness by the age of the moon, beg. ‘Se þe onre [sic] nihte monan weorðan untrum’ and ending ‘arise þis is eallum gemæne iungum . . .”

- Cambridge, CCC cod. 391 [plim TC cod. K.10.II], pp. 720, 721 [xi]
  Reference: Ker, Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts (supra), 114: “prognostics by the age of the moon, preceded on pp. 718–20 by a Latin version. OE begins ‘þonne se mone bið anre nihte eald swa hwæt swa þe gesihst. Pr. Förster 1925–6, 79”; Frank/Cameron B.23.3.1.5; Liuzza, 214.

- Cambridge, CCC cod. 391 [plim TC cod. K.10.II], pp. 720, 721 [xi]

- Cambridge, CCC cod. 391 [plim TC cod. K.10.II], pp. 720, 721 [xi]

- London, BL cod. Arundel 60, fols. 1r–v [xi]
  Text: Henel (infra), 334–335.
  Reference: Gneuss, H. Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts. A List of Manuscripts and Manuscripts Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100. MRTS 241. Tempe, 2000. 38; Frank/Cameron B.23.2.2; Liuzza, 214.

  inscr. [description?]: Consideratio aetatum Lunae (sive Lunares) in aegris
  incip.: Lun. I. qui inciderit, diēfīcē euadet . . . | | se þe afeallō earfoðlice he ætwint . . .
  expl.: Lun. XXX. Eger laborabit & surget. | | Seoc he swincd . . .
  Text [Old English]: Cockayne (infra), 150 [with translation] [but citing fols. 121v–122r]; Förster, “Beiträge VIII,” 32–34.
  Reference: Wanley, 233–234; Ker, Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts (supra), 174; Weißer {Lo20L/E}; Frank/Cameron B.23.3.2.1; Liuzza, 215.

Note. This text is composed in both Latin (on which, see supra) and Old English.

  incip.: On anre nihte eald Monan. swa hwæt swa þe mæteð þet cymðo to gefean . . .
Daniel Apocrypha preserved primarily in Latin


Reference: Wanley, 234; Craig (infra), xxxix [but citing fol. 127v]; Ker, Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts (supra), 175; Liuzza, 216.

  incep: Gif man bīd akenned on anre nihta eoldne Monan. Se bið lang līfes veli... expl: Gif he bið on XXX. oðde on XXX, nihta ealdne monan akenned. se bið god and freondli... Text: Cockayne (infra),156–159 [with translation] [but citing fol. 128r]; Förster, “Beiträge VIII,” 21–26.

Reference: Wanley, 234; Craig (infra), xl; Ker, Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts (supra), 175; Frank/Cameron B.23.3.2.3; Liuzza, 216.

  incep: de observatione lune & quae cauenda sint
  incep: Mona se forma on eallum pingum dondum nytlíc ys. cild acenned bið mæne, glaw, wis, gesteoffered, on pætere gelyrfed gif he ætwint, lang life he bið, mæden acenned ungewemmed clæne. milde, werum gelengege, rihtlice toscedenne. on æftereardan ylde heo bið on bedde lange liegende. tacen heo hefð on mœde. oðde on [ofer] brunan. se þæt lange he hand-lað, swa þæt swa hine sweofnað on blisse hit bið gewyrfed. for þi ne yfel selden god hit getacnað. ðæt blod lætan oðde panian ealne dæg. mona god yð... expl: Mona se þrītt[i]goda] cild acenned gesæligust. milde, mæden gesælig. geþ-wære. seoc swin[c]d ac he leofa swefnu binon þrīm dagum beow øwignene hwilan to warnienne. nyf na god mona blod lætan. endiðað sweofnu danielis [hes] witigan.

Reference: Wanley, 194; Ker, Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts (supra), 242; Weiβer {Lo2L/E}; Index of Manuscripts in the British Library (supra), 3.203; Frank/Cameron C16.2; Liuzza, 216: “General lunarium.”

Note: This text is composed in both Latin (on which, see supra) and Old English.

Note: On the foliation of this and all the Latin and Old English copies of the lunations in BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii, see the note following the Latin lunation at fols. 30v–33v, supra.

- London, BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii, fol. 36v [xi]
  incep: Luna I. se þæt acenned sīð liflic he bið... expl: binnan þrīm dagum gewyrþ swefen dīn butan frecendnysse || Luna XXX. infa triduum fīs, somniï tuum sine periculo. amen.
  Reference: Wanley, 194 [citing fol. 33v]: “Incipit Lunaris de somnis, TITUS. D.26”; Craig (infra), xxxix [but citing only fol. 35v]; Ker, Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts (supra), 242; Frank/Cameron C16.3; Liuzza, 216–217: “Dream lunarium.”

Note: This text is composed in both Latin (on which, see supra) and Old English.

Note: On the foliation of this and all the lunations in BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii, see the note following the Latin lunation at fols. 30v–33v, supra.

- London, BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii, fol. 36v [xi]
  incep: Luna I. se þæt acenned sīð liflic he bið...

Reference: Wanley, 194 [but citing fol. 34v]: “Incipit Lunares Scī Danielis de Nativitate. Tit. D. 26”; Craig [infra], xl; Ker, Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts [supra], 242; Frank/Cameron C16.5; Liuzza, 217: “Birth lunarium.”

Note: This text is composed in both Latin (on which, see supra) and Old English. Note: On the foliation of this and all the lunations in BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii, see the note following the Latin lunation at fols. 30v–33v, supra.


inscr. [description?]: Consideratio aetatum Lunae in agris

incip.: Luna I. seoc swincōri. || Luna XXX. eger laborabit & surget.

Text [Old English]: Cockayne [infra], 150–151 [with translation] [but citing fols. 34v–35r]; Förster, “Beiträge VIII,” 32–34.

Reference: Wanley, 194: “Incipit Lunares in aegris. TITUS. D. 26”; Craig [ infra], xxxix; Ker, Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts [supra], 242; Weißer {Lo19L/E}; Frank/Cameron B23.3.3.1; Liuzza, 217: “Medical lunarium.”

Note: This text is composed in both Latin (on which, see supra) and Old English. Note: On the foliation of this and all the lunations in BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii, see the note following the Latin lunation at fols. 30v–33v, supra.


inscr. [description?]: Somniorum eventus juxta aetates Lunae

incip.: On anre nihta ealdne monan swa hwæt swa þe mæte þet cymð to gefæan ... 

expl.: On XXX. nihta ær twegra nihta fyrste þæt swefen agæ butan frecnum þingum.

Text: Cockayne [infra], 154–157 [with translation] [but citing fols. 35v–36r]; Förster, “Traumlunare” [infra], 79–86.

Reference: Wanley, 194; Ker, Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts [supra], 242; Frank/Cameron B23.3.3.3; Liuzza, 217: “Dream lunarium.”

Note: This text is followed by “somniorum diversitas,” running from fols. 38r–39v. Note: On the foliation of this and all the lunations in BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii, see the note following the Latin lunation at fols. 30v–33v, supra.

– London, BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii., fols. 39v–40r (Luna I–III only) [xi]

incip.: On anre nihta ealdne monan. Far þu to cinge ... 


Reference: Craig [infra], xxxix [but citing 39v–40v]; Ker, Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts [supra], 243: “Ends at the third moon...”; Frank/Cameron B23.3.3.3; Liuzza, 217: “General lunarium.”


incip.: On anre nihta ealdne monan se þe hine adl gestande þæt fremd þe he gewyrpð þæt að ahriseþ.

Text: Cockayne [infra], 182–183 [with translation] [but citing fol. 38r]; Förster, “Beiträge VIII,” 34–36.

Reference: Craig [infra], xxxix; Ker, Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts [supra], 243; Weißer {Lo19L/E}; Frank/Cameron B23.3.3.4; Liuzza, 217: “Medical lunarium.”

Note: On the foliation of this and all the lunations in BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii, see the note following the Latin lunation at fols. 30v–33v, supra.


inscr. [description?]: Consideratio aetatum lunae in Nativitatibus; convenit quoad potissimum partem cum Lunari Danielis Prophetarum
incipit: Gif man biþ acenned on ane nihtne ealdne monan. Se long lifes ċ welig bió...

expl.: Gif he bið. XXIX. nihta. oððe. XXX. se bið god. and freondliþe.


Reference: Wanley, 194–195; Craig (infra), xl [but citing fol. 41r only]; Ker, Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts (supra), 243; Frank/Cameron B23.3.3.5; Liuzzi, 218: “Birth lunarium.”

Note: On the foliation of this and all the lunations in BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii, see the note following the Latin lunation at fols. 30v–33v, supra.

— Oxford, Bod. cod. Hatton 115 [olim Junius 23] [SC 5135], fol. 148r [c. 1120]

incipit: Xære æresten nyhte þonne niwe monan. þæt mon þonne in sweoﬁne gesiþp. þæt cynded to gefan...

expl.: þonne heo biþ IX. X. fulle XXX. nihta eald. þæt bið æfre buton freæcesse.


Reference: Ker, Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts (supra), 402; Frank/Cameron B23.3.6.1; Liuzzi, 227–228: “Dream lunarium.”

Note: Liuzzi, 227, notes that “prognostic material is in two quires (fols. 148–55) added in the twelfth century and not part of original MS.”

— Oxford, Bod. cod. Hatton 115 [olim Junius 23] [SC 5135], fol. 148v (Luna I–XIV only) [c. 1120]

incipit: Se biþ acenned on annihtne monan. se bið lange lifes. ċ wel eði...

expl.: Gif man biþ acenned on X.XII. nihta ealdne mone. se bið ælices godes pýþ


Reference: Craig (infra), xxxix; Ker, Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts (supra), 402; Frank/Cameron B23.3.6.2; Liuzzi, 228: “Birth lunarium.”

— Oxford, Bod. cod. Hatton 115 [olim Junius 23] [SC 5135], fols. 152v–153v (Luna I–XVII only) [c. 1120]

incipit: On annihtne monan fer to cýninge. ċ bidde þes þu wille. ge þæt gíþeð
gang in to him on þa þrídda tid þes deges. oðð þonne þu wýþe þæt sǣ si ful...

expl.: On XVII. nihte mone gýf þu wylle hus tímbran. ber þæt tímbre.


Reference: Craig (infra), xxxix; Ker, Catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts (supra), 402; Frank/Cameron B23.3.6.9; Liuzzi, 228: “General lunarium.”

— Oxford, Bod. cod. Junius 43 [SC 5155]

inscr. [description?]: Somniorum eventus iuxta aetates Lunae

incipit: swa hwæt swa ðu gesihst on blisse bið | | Luna prima quicquid uideris
in gaudium erit...

expl.: . . . swefen ðæm butan frecendnysse | | . . . Somnium tuum sine periculo.

Amen.

Reference: Wanley, 88, who notes that this text “ex Cottoniae Bibliothecae volumine, quod inscribatur, TIBERIUS. A.3.”

Note: This text appears to be composed in both Latin (on which, see supra) and Old English and a copy of some of the lunations in the BL cod. Cotton Tiberius A.iii (on which, see infra); according to the Summary Catalogue, 2.2.974, the text was copied by hand and appears in a printed book (København, 1631).

— Oxford, Bod. cod. Junius 44 [SC 5156]

inscr. [description?]: De observatione Lunae, & quae cauenda
incip.: Mona se forma on eallum dīngum dondum nýtlíc Ļs . . . Luna prima omnibus rebus agendis utilis est . . .


Note: This text appears to be composed in both Latin (on which, see supra) and Old English; according to the Summary Catalogue, 2.2.974, “De observatione lunae et quae cavenda’ copied by Junius from Cott. MS Tib. A.iii, fol. 32$, in the British museum (fol. 2), followed by brief extracts from the same (artt. iii, vii, viii, x, xi, xii, xv, xviii, and xxii) with parallels from no. 5135, at that time in the Hatton Library.”

- Oxford, Bod. cod. Junius 44 [SC 5156]
  inscr. [description?]: Consideratio aetatum Lunae in aegris
  incep.: Luna I. se þe afealleð, earfoðlice he ætwint . . . Luna I. qui inciderit, difficile evadet . . .

Note: This text appears to be composed in both Latin (on which, see supra) and Old English; see note following previous entry.

Middle English
- Bethesda, National Library of Medicine MS 49, fol. 96r–106v
- Cambridge, Gonville and Caius College cod. 457/395, fol. 68r–74r [xv]
  Reference: Taavitsainen {Cai3}.
- Cambridge, Magdalene College cod. Pepys 1236, fol. 114v–120v [c. 1465–1475]
  Reference: Taavitsainen {P}.
  Note: This text is a “Storia Lune” rather than a lunation proper.
- Cambridge, St. John’s College cod. L.10, pp. 3–32 [c. 1421]
  Reference: Taavitsainen {J}.
  Note: This text is a “Storia Lune” rather than a lunation proper.
- Cambridge, TC cod. O.1.13, fols. 20v–21r [xv/xvii]
  Reference: Taavitsainen {T1}.
- Cambridge, TC cod. O.1.13, fols. 34v–36r [xv/xvii]
  Reference: Taavitsainen {T1}.
  Reference: Taavitsainen {T5}.
- Cambridge, TC cod. R.14.15, fols. 18v–20r
  Reference: Taavitsainen {T6}.
- Cambridge, TC cod. R.14.15, fols. 20r–22r
  Reference: Taavitsainen {T6}.
- Huntington, Huntington Library cod. HM 64 [olim Phillipps 6883], fol. 83v–95r [xv]
- London, BL cod. Egerton 827, fols. 10r–13v [xv]
  Reference: Taavitsainen {E1}.
- London, BL cod. Harley 1735, fols. 1r–13v [c. 1446]
  Reference: Taavitsainen {H3}.
  Text: Means, 112–147.
  Reference: Taavitsainen {H5}.
  Note: This text is a “Storia Lune” rather than a lunation proper.
- London, BL cod. Harley 3725, fols. 66r–81r [xv]
  Reference: Taavitsainen {H7}.
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- London, BL cod. Royal 12.E.xvi, fols. 51v–53v (Luna I–X only) [c. 1500]
  Reference: Warner and Gilson (supra), 2.55: “A metrical English version of the tract on lucky and unlucky days of the month...It seems to be derived from a text resembling Sloane MS. 282, f. 82b, and that of the printed Interpretationes sue Somnia...Imperfect, breaking off in the 10th day”; Taavitsainen {R3}.

- London, BL cod. Royal 17.A.iii, fols. 91r–95v [xiv]
  Reference: Warner and Gilson (supra), 2.215: “Prose translation of part of the tract known as the Lunationes et somnia or Somnia Daniel...The dreams are not included”; Index of Manuscripts in the British Library (supra), 3.203: “Daniel, the Prophet. Lunationes, attrib. to, late 14th cent. Lat.”; Taavitsainen {R4}.

  Reference: Warner and Gilson (supra), 2.242; Taavitsainen {R5}.

- London, BL cod. Sloane 213, fols. 113r–115r [c. 1400]
  Reference: Craig (infra), xl; Taavitsainen {S4}.

  Reference: Taavitsainen {S5}.
  Note: This lunation is written in Latin (to Luna IV) and then in English.

- London, BL cod. Sloane 297, fol. 112r [c. 1450]
  Reference: Taavitsainen {S5}.

- London, BL cod. Sloane 635, fols. 1v–9v [xv]
  Reference: Taavitsainen {S8}.

- London, BL cod. Sloane 963, fol. 73r [xv]
  Reference: Taavitsainen {S10}.

  Reference: Taavitsainen {S12}.

- London, BL cod. Sloane 1315, fols. 49r–64v [xv]
  Reference: Taavitsainen {S15}.

- London, Wellcome Medical Library cod. 411, fols. 4r–9r [xvi]
  Reference: Taavitsainen {W2}.

- Manchester, JRUL cod. Eng. 404, fols. 34v–35v [xv]
  Reference: Ker, Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries III (supra), 424: “On the dies mali and days not to let blood.”
  Note: It is uncertain whether this text is actually a lunation.

- Oxford, Bod. cod. Ashmole 189 [SC 6777 and 6778], fols. 64r–67r (Luna XV–XXX only) [c. 1500]
  Reference: Taavitsainen {A4}.

- Oxford, Bod. cod. Ashmole 189 [SC 6777 and 6778], fols. 85v–86r [c. 1500]
  Reference: Black, W.H. A Descriptive, Analytical, and Critical Catalogue of the Manuscripts Bequeathed unto the University of Oxford by Elias Ashmole, Esq., M.D., F.R.S., Windsor Herald. Also of Some Additional MSS. Contributed by Kingsley, Lhuyd, Borlase, and Others. Oxford, 1845. Col. 151 [but citing fol. 84v]; Craig (infra), xli [but citing fol. 84v]; Taavitsainen {A4}.
  Note: Fragmentary text.

- Oxford, Bod. cod. Ashmole 189 [SC 6777 and 6778], fols. 212r–215v, 218r–v [c. 1500]
  Reference: Black (supra), col. 153 [but citing fols. 213v–215v]; Craig (infra), xl [but citing fols. 213ff]; Taavitsainen {A4}.

- Oxford, Bod. cod. Ashmole 346 [SC 6693], fol. 16v
  Reference: Black (supra), col. 253; Taavitsainen {A10}; who, however, quotes SC 6694, which according to the Summary Catalogue = cod. Ashmole 345.

- Oxford, Bod. cod. Ashmole 391, fols. 3v–5r [c. 1500]
  inscr.: Danyel his dremys.
Reference: Black (supra), col. 296; Taavitsainen {A13}; Weißer {Ox,L}, 359–362.
- Oxford, Bod. cod. Ashmole 1444 [SC 7712], pp. 79–84 [c. 1475–1500]
Reference: Black (supra), col. 1205; Taavitsainen {A18}.
- Oxford, Bod. cod. Ashmole 1481 [SC 7722], fol. 25r
Reference: Black (supra), col. 1321 [but citing fol. 25r–v]; Taavitsainen {A10}.
Text: Means, 88–94.
Reference: Taavitsainen {B2}.
- Oxford, Bod. cod. Bodley 591 [SC 2363], fols. 38v–38v [c. 1440–1480]
Reference: Taavitsainen {B2}.
- Oxford, Bod. cod. Digby 67 [SC 1668], fols. 30v–31r
Reference: Taavitsainen {Db1}.
Reference: Macray, W.D. Catalogi codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae. Pars
nona: codices a viro clarissimo Kenelm Digby, Eq. Aur., anno 1634 donatos, com-
pletens. Oxford, 1883. Col. 98; Taavitsainen {Db2}.
- Oxford, Bod. cod. Digby 88 [SC 1689], fols. 64r–75v [xv]
Reference: Macray (supra), col. 98; Craig (infra), xli; Taavitsainen {Db2}.
- Oxford, Bod. cod. Douce 84 [SC 21638], fols. 46r–53r [xv]
Text: Taavitsainen “Storia Lune” (infra).
Reference: Taavitsainen {D1}.
Note: This text is a “Storia Lune” rather than a lunation proper.
- Oxford, Bod. cod. Douce 381 [SC 21956] (Luna I–XVIII only), fols. 6r–12r [xv]
Reference: Taavitsainen {D2}.
Note: It is the Summary Catalogue that notes that the lunation covers only the
first eighteen days of the month.
Note: This text is a “Storia Lune” rather than a lunation proper.
- Princeton, University Library Garrett MS 141, fols. 79r–83v [1448/1449]
Text: Craig (infra), 148–156; Means, 95–104.
Reference: Taavitsainen {G}; Weißer {PtE}.
Note: A date of 1448/9 for this MS seems out of step when we observe that
the lunation begins with the phrase, “As Haly wyttynessyth, the gret
astrolegere...” But Edmund Halley was born in 1656 and died in 1742.
- Warminster, Longleat Library MS 176, fols. 31v–41r
Reference: Taavitsainen {Lo}.
- Warminster, Longleat Library MS 333, fols. 58r–66r
Note: This list of Middle English lunations is almost certainly incomplete. In
her list of Middle English Medical texts, L.E. Voigts estimates that there
are approximately 300 copies of prognosticatory medical texts and 175
copies of “moon-texts,” although she does not identify lunations specifically;
cf. “Multitudes of Middle English Medical Manuscripts, or the Englishing
of Science and Medicine,” Manuscript Sources of Medieval Medicine. A Book of

Middle Welsh
[c. 1400]
II.2.461.
Aberystwyth, Llyfrgell Genedlaethol Cymru cod. Llanstephan 88 [c. 1476]
Reference: Evans, Report (supra), II.2.561

Aberystwyth, Llyfrgell Genedlaethol Cymru cod. Porkington 10, fols. 1r–2r
Text: Kurvinen (infra), 38–41.
Reference: Taavitsainen {Lo}.

Bangor, University Library (cod. ?) [c. 1688]

Unknown, Cwrtmawr-MS 6 [c. 1692]

German and Dutch
Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek cod. L.III 38, fols. 68r–70r (Luna I–XX only) [1463]
Text: Müller (infra), Weißer {BaD}, 325–330 [synthetic text of 3 MSS].
Note: This text is substantively the same as München, BSB clm 17188 [Weißer {Mü3D}] and München, BSB clm 26713 [Weißer {Mü 4D}] (infra).

Berlin, SBPK cod. germ. 8° 121, fols. 159r–166r [xiv]

Berlin, SBPK cod. germ. 8° 477, fols. 163v–166r [1424]

Brugge [private] [xix]
Text: Braekman (infra), 172–178.
Reference: Weißer {BgD}.

Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár cod. germ. 5, fols. 159r–160r [xvi]
Note: This text is substantively the same as Zürich, Zentralbibliothek cod. C. 102 b [Weißer {Zü 3D}] (infra).

Budapest, Országos Széchényi Könyvtár cod. germ. 56, fols. 34r–37r [1518]
Text: Weißer {Bu 2D}, 191–196.

Edinburgh, Royal Observatory cod. Cr.4.6, fols. 115r–121r [xv]
Reference: Ker, N.R., Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries II (supra), 575: “Lunar prognostications: (a) ff. 115–16. Hie nach sagt es wie man wissen vnd erkenne sol in einem yeden monat vnd besonder nach dem newen schön wetter oder regen. So wartt in welicher stunde ein newer mon...; (b) ff. 116v–121 Hienach sagt ez den vnderschayde eins yecklichen newen mons was in den xxx tagen an yecklichem tage zu thun ist...”

Edinburgh, University Library MS 329 (DC 5.90), fols. 203r–204v [c. 1463]
Reference: Ker, Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries II (supra), 619: “Mainly prognostics: (a) ff. 203–203v Wer an dem Ersten tag des monds so er new ist sich wurt der sich lang... See Follan [i.e., J. Follan, “Manuscripts of Ortolf von Bayerlant” Fachliteratur des Mittelalters, 1968], 34–36.”

Gent, Universiteitsbibliotheek MS 697, fols. 73–83 [xv]
Reference: Weißer {Ge1D}.

Gotha, Landesbibliothek cod. chart 2°, fols. 76r–79v [c. 1400]
Text: Norrbom (infra), 162–166.
Reference: Weißer {GoD}.

Hamburg, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek cod. germ. 1, fols. 62r–63v (Luna I–XV only) [xv]

Heidelberg, UB cod. Pal. germ. 575, fols. 28r–34v [xv]
Text: Telle (infra), 199–200 [partial]; Müller (infra), 246–256.
Reference: Weißer {HdD}.
- Heidelberg, UB cod. Pal. germ. 644, fols. 9r–10r [xv]
  Text: Telle (infra), 195–196.
  Reference: Weißer {Hd,D}.
- Heidelberg, UB cod. Pal. germ. 796, fols. 57v–59v [xvi]
- Karlsruhe, Bad. Landesbibliothek cod. St. George 73, fols. 170r–171v [xiv]
  Text: Telle (infra), 197–198.
  Reference: Weißer {Ka,D}.
- København, Det kongelige Bibliotek cod. 1664, fols. 25v–28r [xv]
- København, Det kongelige Bibliotek cod. Thott. 675, fols. 79r–84v [xv]
  Text: Norrbom (infra), 162–166.
  Reference: Weißer {Ko,D}.
- München, BSB cod. germ. mon. 725, fols. 107v–111v [xv]
  Text: Telle (infra), 199–200 [partial]; Weißer {Mü,D}, 393–401 [synthetic text of 3 MSS].
  Note: This text is substantively the same as Wien, ÖNB cod. 2817 [Weißer {Wi3D}] and Wien, ÖNB cod. 2967 [Weißer {Wi4D}] (infra).
- München, BSB cod. germ. mon. 5250/26 [c. 1200]
  Reference: Weißer {Mü,D}.
- München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 849, fols. 155–156 [xv]
  Reference: Catalogus codicum latinorum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis. Tomi I, Pars I (supra), 202: “Der manen boec (liber lunae), in fine mutulis.”
  Note: It is unclear what type of “manen boec” is precisely meant.
- München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 17188, fols. 108ra–109va (Luna I–XX only) [xiv]
  Note: The preserved portion of this text is substantively the same as Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek cod. L.III 38 [Weißer {BaD}] (infra) and München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 26713 [Weißer {Mü,D}] (infra).
- München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 26713, fols. 312v–314r [xv]
  Note: This text is substantively the same as Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek cod. L.III 38 [Weißer {BaD}] and München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 17188 [Weißer {Mü,D}] (infra).
- München, BSB cod. lat. mon. 6284, fols. 1r–5r [xv]
- Oudenaarde, Stadsarchief MS 5556/13, fols. 184v–187v [xv]
  Reference: Weißer {OuD}.
- Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek 16° MS 1355, fols. 93r–94v [c. 1400]
  Text: Gallée (infra), 138–139; Lindgren (infra), 79–80.
  Reference: Weißer {Ut,D}.
- Wien, ÖNB cod. 2817 (Med. 92), fols. 3r–5v [xiv]
  Text: Weißer {Wi,D}, 393–401 [synthetic text of 3 MSS].
  Note: This text is substantively the same as München, BSB cgm 725 [Weißer {Mü,D}] (infra) and Wien, ÖNB cod. 2967 [Weißer {Wi,D}] (infra).
- Wien, ÖNB cod. germ. 2967 (Med. 136), fols. 51v–54v [xv]
  Text: Weißer {Wi,D}, 393–401 [synthetic text of 3 MSS].
  Note: This text is substantively the same as München, BSB cgm 725 [Weißer {Mü,D}] and Wien, ÖNB cod. 2817 [Weißer {Wi,D}] (infra).
- Zürich, Zentralbibliothek cod. C. 102 b, fols. 60v–82r [xv]
Note: This text is substantively the same as Budapest, Universitätsbibliothek cod. germ. 5 [Weißer {Bu,1D}] (supra).

- Zürich, Zentralbibliothek cod. C. 102 b, fols. 96v–103r [xv]
  Note: This text is substantively the same as Zürich [private] “Schüpfeimer Codex,” [Weißer {Zü,1D}] (infra).

- Zürich [private] “Schüpfeimer Codex,” fols. 15r–21r [xv]
  Text: Wäckerlin-Swiagenin (infra), 30–33; Weißer {Zü,1D}, 406–414 [synthetic text of 2 MSS].
  Note: This text is substantively the same as Zürich, Zentralbibliothek cod. C. 102 b, fols. 96v–103r [Weißer {Zü,1D}] (infra).

Note: I follow Weißer in grouping the German and Dutch MSS together. Förster, “Sammellunare,” 150–151, mentions six Middle Dutch MSS, although he names only one: Oudenaarde, Stadsarchief MS 5556/13 (supra). Of the other five, he simply cites J. Clarisse, Sterre- en natuurkundig onderwijs, gemeenlijk genoemd Natuurkunde van het geheel-al (Leiden, 1847) [non vidi].

Scandinavian
- København, UB cod. Arnamagnaenus 45, fols. 93v–95v [xv]
  Text: Klemming (infra), 162–166.
  Reference: Weißer {Ko5N}.

- København, UB cod. Arnamagnaenus 245 [xviii]

- København, UB cod. Arnamagnaenus 434 [xviii]
  incip.: Lunnaa ein-naett er gott hvertvetna . . .
  Note: Förster, “Sammellunare,” 150–151, also notes “ein Beda presti, sem var á Englandi 1708 zugeschriebenes nisl. Sammellunare ist zu lesen in einem modernen Volksbuch Gömlu-Marínar leyndomsfulla galdvæda spáspilabók (Reykjavik 1905, S. 23–29), of which he includes a brief passage. On Bede and the Lunationes Danielis, see Chapter Four, §3.

French
- Berlin, DSB cod. Phillipps 4156, fol. 180r [xiii]: See New Haven, Yale cod. 395

- Berlin, DSB cod. Phillipps 4156, fol. 182r [xiii]: See New Haven, Yale cod. 395

- London, BL cod. Royal 12.C.xii, fols. 77r–81r (Luna X–XXX only) [xiii/xiv]
  Reference: Warner and Gilson (supra), 2.28: “Lunationes et Somnia, a pair of treatises on prognostication which appear together in a variety of shapes, both in Latin and in other languages . . . In the present MS. the days of the month are treated of in French verse, but the dreams in Latin prose, viz.:—(a) Lunationes, imperf. by loss of leaves at beg. The first complete day beg. ‘La disme lune est profitable.’”

  Note: This cod. has been missing since 7 June 1879.

- Modena, Biblioteca Estense cod. Stranieri 32 (XII, C.7), fols. 25r–26v [xiv]
  incip.: luna est profitable a toz fors . . .
Text: Camus (infra), 207–211; Förster, “Sammellunare,” 154 [partial].
Reference: Weißer {MoF}.

- New Haven, Yale University Beinecke cod. 395, fols. 180r–181r
- New Haven, Yale University Beinecke cod. 395, fols. 182r–183r
- Oxford, Bod. cod. Ashmole 342, fol. 25v


- Oxford, Bod. cod. Digby 86 [SC 1687], fols. 41r–45v [xiii]
Text: Tschan and Parkes (infra) [facsimile edition].

- Paris, BNF cod. fr. 2043, pp. 105ff. [xiii/xiv]
Text: Méon (infra), 364–393.

- Worchester Cathedral, Chapter Library cod. 4° 61 [xiii]
incip: A prime lune fud Adam furme, Adam de ki nus fumes ne. . . .
Text: Chaytor (infra), 212–222; Förster, “Sammellunare,” 151–152 [partial].
Reference: Weißer {Wo,F}.

Provençal

- Paris, BNF cod. fr. 7693, fol. 151 [xiv/xv]
incip: La luna prima es bona a far totas causas. . . .
Reference: Weißer {Pa,0,F}.

The Somniale Danielis in Other Traditions

It is extremely difficult to assess the extent to which the Lunationes is extent in Hebrew, Armenian, and Syriac manuscripts. What can be said is that there are perhaps one copy of the Lunationes in Hebrew and one more in Armenian. For the shelf numbers of these manuscript copies (certain and possible) and their references, see Chapter 4, notes 201 (Hebrew), 202 (Armenian), 204 (Syriac), and 205.


Incunabula:
See the list of incunabula in the section on the Somniale Danielis, supra.

Description of the Text: See Chapter Four, §3.

1. Texts, Partial Texts, Textual Issues, and Translations


The text is titled “Calendarium” [Bartsch’s title?] and contains a fairly long introduction. Note corrections by H. Suchier, Denkmäler provenzalischer Literatur und Sprache (Halle, 1883), 122.


Norrbom, S. *Das Gothaer mittelniederdeutsche Arzneibuch und seine Sippe*. Hamburg, 1921.


Weißer (infra) identifies as “Handschriftenstudie” [non vidi].


2. Secondary Studies (Selected)

  Contains a discussion of these prognostica in their literary and social contexts (181–211), followed by a handlist of MSS (211–230). The discussion represents the most important evaluation of this genre of literature since Förster’s studies.

**IV. Ludus Danielis and Historia de Daniel representanda**

Surviving in several manuscript versions but with its music extant only at London, BL cod. Egerton 2615, fol. 95, the *Ludus Danielis* (i.e., the *Play of Daniel*) is a mediæval liturgical drama of the type commonly called a “miracle play” or “mystery play.” The title “Officium circumcisionis et Danielis Ludus” appears in the manuscript, which for a time was lost to scholarship and was only re-discovered by E.K. Chambers (*infra*, 1.284) in the nineteenth century. The *Ludus* was likely composed circa 1230 for performance on New Year’s Day at Beauvais Cathedral. The *Historia de Daniel representanda* of Hilary survives in a unique manuscript copy in Paris BNF cod. lat. 11331. It, too, is considered to be a product of early twelfth-century French literary expression.

The *Ludus* and Hilary’s *Daniel* are clearly related to each other in content and sequence of action. Both plays involve a dramatic retelling of the events from the Book of Daniel: Belshazzar’s Feast and the episode of the Writing on the Wall (Daniel 5) and Daniel in the Lions’ Den (Daniel 6). Numerous minor variations from and expansions of the biblical record are salted throughout the plays, and it is clear that in some places the episode of the lions’ den has been conflated with the later but parallel episode of Daniel, Bel, and the Serpent from the Greek Additions. At the end of both plays there is a brief prophecy relating to the coming of the Messiah which bears some resemblance to the prophecies in the *Ordo prophetarum* (ed. and trans.: J.Q. Adams, “*Ordo prophetarum* from Laon Cathedral,” *Chief Pre-Shakespearean Dramas: A Selection of Plays Illustrating the History of the English Drama from Its Origin Down to Shakespeare* (Boston, 1924), 41–48; F. Collins, Jr., “The Procession of the Prophets (*Ordo Prophetarum*) from Limoges,” *Medieval Church Music-Dramas: A Repertory of Complete Plays* (Charlottesville, 1976), 165–188).

A curious footnote: J.P.A. van der Vin cites Bertrand de la Broquière’s account of a visit to the Hagia Sophia during Byzantine times, where he saw a performance of a mystery play about the Three Youths and the Fiery Furnace (Daniel 3). See J.P.A. van der Vin, *Travellers to Greece and Constantinople. Ancient Monuments and Old
Traditions in Medieval Travellers’ Tales (Istanbul, 1980), 260, 445–446. One wonders whether this was the ultimate source of the Old Russian liturgical drama involving the three youths and the fiery furnace; on this text, see M. Swoboda, “The Furnace Play and the Development of Liturgical Drama in Russia,” Russian Review 61 (2002), 220–234.

1. Texts and Translations

Including some scores.


Ed. Ludus.


Ed. Ludus with printed music.


Fuller, J.B. Hilarii Versus et Ludi. New York, 1929.


Ed. Hilary’s Daniel.


Young, K. The Drama of the Medieval Church. Vol. II. Oxford, 1933.

Ed. Ludus and Hilary’s Daniel.

2. Selected Secondary Studies (not including reviews of performances)


Despite its age, this thesis remains valuable.


Abstract of a paper presented on “the relationship between the famous Daniel play from Beauvais and the liturgical cursus for the octave of Christmas which makes up the remainder of Egerton 2515.”


Excursus: Sundry Latin Daniel Apocrypha

i. “Daniel liberatus” and “Daniel tragoedia”—Bibliothèque Mazarine cod. lat. 3915 [xvii] and 3920 [xvii]

Bibliothèque Mazarine cod. lat. 3915 is described in catalogue as an autograph copy of a collection of dramatic poems and tragedies. On pp. 347–350 there is listed a curious but incomplete text that is described as “Daniel liberatus seu Darius penitens, drama heroicum.” The information provided in the catalogue suggests that the subject of the play was the story of Daniel in the Lion’s Den (Daniel 6), although it is quite possible that this play is something completely different. Bibliothèque Mazarine cod. lat. 3920 is described in catalogue as “‘Daniel, tragoedia.’ En vers
iambiques. Page 127. ‘Daniel, tragédie pour la distribution des prix au séminaire des chanoines réguliers de Saint-Vincent à Senlis, représentée le . . . 1662,’ with the added observation that it contains “Intermèdes allégoriques, en français.” It is impossible to say from the brief description whether this text deals with Daniel the Prophet or some other Daniel. At the same time, the former is not an impossibility, given the other mediaeval Daniel- and Susanna-plays. This book might have been part of an earlier library: the catalogue gives the reference “Bibliothecae Recollectorum Parisiensium, ms. CXXVIII.” See A. Molinier, Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Mazarine (Paris, 1890), 3.238, 240.

ii. Mediaeval Italian Susanna Poems

Fourteenth-century Italy produced some poetry associated with the figure of Susanna, including De sancta Susanna, Tractatus metricus de Susanna, and Rithmi Susanna. On this material, see J.H. Mozley, “Susannah and the Elders: Three Medieval Poems,” Studi medievali 3 (1930), 27–52. On the figure of Susanna in the Italian art of this period, see now B. Bohn, “Rape and the Gendered Gaze: Susanna and the Elders in Early Modern Bologna,” Biblical Interpretation 9 (2001), 259–286, and, in manuscript illuminations, Chapter Two, note 152.

iii. Huntington, Huntington Library cod. HM 83

In the Huntington Library there exists a curious, late fifteenth-century text (1486/88) labeled by the catalogue as “Cosmography; Astrological Medicine” (see C.W. Dutschke, Guide to Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the Huntington Library (Huntington, 1989), 1.141–142). Further descriptions indicate a connexion with Daniel, but it is unclear whether the MS preserves an apocryphal prophetic text actually attributed to Daniel embedded in this anthology/pastiche of apocalyptic/prophetic passages.

The manuscript begins with “Nota tres fuerunt babilonie, Una super flumen chobar ubi regnabat Nabuchodonosor in qua fuit turris baliel . . .” [n.b. the river, which appears in a prophetic context associated with Ezekiel at Ezek 1:1, 3; 10:15, 20, 22; 43:3, and also with Daniel in the apocryphal Hebrew apocalypse The Vision of Daniel by the River Kebar (on which see Chapter 3, §2)]. Next is “prophetic material with maps and lists . . . [maps] based on the prophecies of the Apocalypse and Daniel,” which is followed by diverse material, including several prophecies involving the Antichrist or Gog, and expositions or summaries (?) of the kingdoms and beasts of Daniel 2 and 7.

iv. Cambridge, UL cod. II.vi.17, fols 37v–38r


v. Daniel Prophete Urgellensis

vi. *Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal cod. 2872, fols. 394r–397r*

There is a copy of the so-called *Mansions of the Moon* that is attributed to Daniel: *Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal cod. 2872, fols. 394r–397r*. See the *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France. Paris: Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal* (Paris, 1885–1889), 3.136. To the best of my knowledge, this is the only copy of this text—which exists in many dozens if not hundreds of copies—that is so attributed.
I. The Vita Danielis in the Lives of the Prophets

See above, under “Daniel Apocrypha Preserved Primarily in Greek.”

II. The Vision of the Young Daniel

Texts and Translations


Auxiliary Studies


3. Secondary Studies


Brief, unsupported statement dating the text to the fourth century.


Brief, survey-style overview.


Very brief notice.


Accepts Schmoldt’s argument that the work is composed of two texts (chs. 1–2, 6 and chs. 3–5, 7–8) and argues that the Jewish work(s) on which it is based “perfectly concur with the apocalyptic writings of the first centuries.” (160)


III. The Revelation of Daniel the Prophet in the Land of Persia and Elam

Manuscript:
– Cambridge, MA, Harvard University cod. syr. 42, fols. 117r–122v [olim SMH 30] [vii]

Text, Translation, and Commentary: Slabczyk (infra); Henze (infra).


Description of the Text: See Chapter Three, §2.5.
1. **Texts and Translations**


   Text, translation, and commentary.


   *Editio princeps*. Text and (Esperanto) translation. Despite the title, there is no formal commentary. English summary.

**IV. Malhamat Dâniyâl**

See below, under “Daniel Apocrypha Preserved Primarily in Arabic.”

**V. Daniel Geomantic Texts**


**Excursus: Sundry Syriac Daniel Apocrypha**

i. *Mingana MS Syr 22, J, fols. 136–141r*

   In the Mingana MS Syr 22, J (fols. 136–141r), we find the following note: “The story of the child whose father and mother wished to offer as sacrifice in the time of the prophet Daniel.” Nothing more is said, though, and it is unclear whether this text is known elsewhere. See A. Mingana, *Catalogue of the Mingana Collection of Manuscripts Now in the Possession of the Trustees of the Woodbrooke Settlement, Selly Oak, Birmingham. Vol. I: Syriac and Garshuni Manuscripts* (Cambridge, 1933), col. 65.

ii. *London, BL cod. Or. 2313—The “Testimonies of the Prophets”*

   See G. Margoliouth, *Descriptive List of Syriac and Karshuni Mss. in the British Museum Acquired since 1873* (London, 1899), 8, who notes title of the text: “The Testimonies of the Prophets (Jeremiah, Daniel, Ezekiel, &c.).”


   Two texts identified by R.P. Smith, *Catalogi codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae. Pars sexta: Codices syriacos, carshunicos, mendaicos complectens* (Oxford, 1864), cols. 598–600 at 599–600: “13. Varia, sc. Locutio Danielis prophetae; ratio qua dignoscatur, utrum vera sit de alicujus morte fama...fol. 165,” and “14. Danielis sapientia prognostica.” These texts do not seem to be copies of the Malhamat Dâniyâl, as we find at Smith no. 161 (= Bod. Or. 8, see infra). For one thing, we perhaps would expect Smith to have mentioned this fact; secondly, the texts seem much too short when compared to Bod. Or. 8 or indeed most of the other copies of the Malhamat Dâniyâl. Their identification will require an examination by autopsy of the manuscript itself.
iv. *Cambridge, MA, Harvard University cod. syr. 161 [xviii/xix]*

M.H. Goshen-Gottstein describes this text as a “book of magic, diagnosis and prognosis of illnesses, attributed to the Prophet Daniel and to Ezra the Scribe” (*Syriac Manuscripts in the Harvard College Library: A Catalogue* (HSS 23; Missoula, 1979), 104). The text was first described by J.T. Clemons, “A Checklist of Syriac Manuscripts in the United States and Canada,” *OCP* 32 (1966), 224–251 at 236 [re MS 37], but he makes no mention of Daniel. I do not know whether a Syriac version of the *Lunationes* is part of this treatise.
To the best of my knowledge, no Daniel apocryphon exists in Ethiopic outside of the Ethiopic copy of the *Vita* of Daniel in the *Vitae Prophetarum*. According to W. Wright, however, London BL cod. Or. 496, fol. 139v contains “a short history of the prophet” Daniel that immediately follows the Book of Daniel in this Ethiopic manuscript codex, which has collected in it various books from the Hebrew Bible and the Apostolic Epistles. Whether this is an Ethiopic version of the standard sort of prologues to the biblical books that one sees in Western Bibles, I do not know; the fact that Daniel is the only book in this manuscript to have such a brief history appended would suggest that this history is an unusual composition. See his *Catalogue of the Ethiopic Manuscripts in the British Museum Acquired since the Year 1847* (London, 1877), 18 (where he incorrectly lists the folio as “193 b”; the manuscript has only 173 folio pages and the book following Daniel [*i.e.*, Hosea, in this codex] begins on fol. 140r).


**I. The Vita Danielis in the Lives of the Prophets**

See above, under “Daniel Apocrypha Preserved Primarily in Greek.”
I. Somniale Danielis

See above, under “Daniel Apocrypha Preserved Primarily in Latin.”

II. The Fourteenth Vision of Daniel [Coptic and Arabic]

Manuscripts:

Bohairic Coptic
- London, BL cod. Or. 1314, fols. 240r–251v [1374]
  Note: The BL MS codex contains Coptic and Arabic text in parallel columns.
- Manchester, JRUL cod. 419 [xvii]
- Paris, BNF ? [olim Saint-Germain-des-près MS 21]

Arabic
- London, BL cod. Or. 1314, fols. 240r–251v [1374]
  Text and Translation: Becker (infra).
  Note: The BL MS codex contains Coptic and Arabic text in parallel columns.

Description of the Text: See Chapter Three, §2.21.

1. Texts and Translations


Text.


Text and translation, with notes and a detailed study of the text and its historical contexts. Becker suggests that the historical allusions in the text date it to the end of the ‘Umayyad period.

Text and translation. Macler argues that the text alludes to the fall of the Fatimid dynasty.


Translation and commentary of entire text, divided into 88 verses. Meinardus suggests that an original version dealing with the fall of the ‘Umayyad dynasty was likely updated in the middle of the twelfth century so as to include the events concerning the fall of the Fatimid dynasty.


Translation and new commentary, verses 23–77. In this essay Meinardus argues (pace Macler, but contra his earlier commentary) that the text was entirely composed at the end of the Fatimid period.

Schulte, A. *Die koptische Übersetzung der vier grossen Propheten*. Münster i. W., 1892. 84–90.

Translation.


Including translation, indicating (what Suermann understands to be) the original and the redacted text.


Coptic text with parallel Latin translation.


Coptic text.

2. Auxiliary Studies


3. Secondary Studies


Brief, survey-style overview.


Discussed in terms of points of contact with the *Apocalypse of Shenute II* and the *Apocalypse of Samuel of Qalamān*. Includes partial translation (verses 24–59 and again 54–60) from the Coptic.


Excursus: *Sundry Coptic Daniel Apocrypha*

i. *London, BL cod. Or. 1325, fols. 196v–256v*


The precise nature of this text is unknown to me, as is what is meant by the reference to “Daniel’s Vision.” It may be one (or all) of the visions included in the biblical Book of Daniel, it may be the Coptic Fourteenth Vision of Daniel (§1, supra), or it may be something else altogether.
I. The Vita Danielis in the Lives of the Prophets

See above, under “Daniel Apocrypha Preserved Primarily in Greek.”

II. Somniale Danielis

See above, under “Daniel Apocrypha Preserved Primarily in Latin.”

III. Aramaic-Hebrew Daniel-Poem

Manuscripts:
- Cambridge, UL T-S H12.8
- Cambridge, UL T-S H12.9
  Reference: Klein (supra), 37.

Description of the Text:
According to Klein (supra), this text may be termed an “Aramaic poem with Hebrew refrain based on Book of Daniel, אֶלָּא יְהוָ֖ה יָדֵ֑א יָ֑דַע מִי יָ֖דֵע הַדָּֽעַת הָ֑יְתָה, with T-S H12.9 “with variants and much more preserved.” No edition or scholarship is seemingly associated with this text.

IV. Vision of Daniel by the River Kebar

Manuscript:
- New York, Jewish Theological Seminary, Schechter Genizah fol. 5r–v
  inscr.: זַיִּשׁ יָדִיאוּל הָנִּמָּל
  incip.: אֶלָּא יְהוָ֖ה יָדֵ֑א יָ֑דַע מִי יָ֖דֵע הַדָּֽעַת הָ֑יְתָה
  Text: Ginzberg (infra); Ibn-Shmuel (infra); Bonfil, "זַיִּשׁ יָדִיאוּל" (infra) [partial text].
  Translation: Sharf, "זַיִּשׁ יָדִיאוּל" (infra); Buchanan (infra).

This text is preserved in a unique manuscript sheet (recto and verso). We possess the title and the beginning of the text, and the catchword on the verso corresponds to the first word on the verso. It is unclear, however, if the text continued on other (no longer extant) sheets.

Description of the Text: See Chapter Three, §2.17.

1. Texts and Translations

Bonfil, R. "זַיִּשׁ יָדִיאוּל הָנִּמָּל", Zion 44 (1979) [I.F. Baer Memorial Volume], 111–147.
Includes photographs of the folio (recto and verso), with text (verso only, lines 5–24) [and reconstructed Greek text]. English summary of article xv–xvi. Bonfil
argues that the text was composed by a Jewish leader during the crisis of empire that followed the death of Leo III (912 CE), who supported the political claims of Leo’s widow, Zoë, and her son, Constantinos Porphyrogenetos.


Translation, with brief afterword.


Editio princeps, without translation.


Text on pp. 249–252.


Translation of portions of the text, scattered throughout this article.


Translation included. This translation was reprinted as “The Vision of Daniel,” Byzantine Jewry from Justinian to the Fourth Crusade (London, 1971), 201–204.


Translation of portions of the text, with commentary.

2. Auxiliary Studies


3. Secondary Studies


Brief, survey-style overview.


Survey-style overview.


V. *Nevu’ot Daniel*

*Manuscripts:*

– Sankt Petersburg, details unknown.


This text is presently being edited for publication by M. Ben-Sasson.

*Description of the Text: See Chapter Three, §2.22.*

VI. *The Daniel-Tales in the Book of Yosippon*

*Description of the Text:*

Much has been said but little is known for certain about the Hebrew *Yosippon*—its date, provenance, purpose, and the character of the original text are still matters for debate. Some scholars have dated it early as the fourth century, others as late as the eleventh. What is known is that it exists in two versions, the so-called “Mantua” edition and the longer and more elaborate “Constantinople” edition, each named after the place where its editio princeps was published. In addition, portions of the Yosippon were incorporated in the eleventh-century Hebrew narrative known as the *Chronicle of Jerahmeel*, which itself was copied and augmented in 1325 by Eleazar ben Asher ha-Levi.

The Daniel material in *Yosippon* is paralleled in *Jerahmeel*, although *Jerahmeel* adds material not included in *Yosippon*, including a Hebrew translation of Daniel; J. Reiner
(see infra) notes that the Yosippon used by Jerahmeel exhibits characteristics of both editions. On some of this material, see Chapter Two.

1. **Texts and Translations**


2. **Secondary Studies**


**VII. Malḥamat Dāniyāl**

See below, under “Daniel Apocrypha Preserved Primarily in Arabic.”

**Excursus: The Additional Greek Material in the Post-Biblical Jewish Tradition**

Selected Sources:


I. Malḥamat Dāniyāl

See below, under “Daniel Apocrypha Preserved Primarily in Arabic.”

II. The History of Daniel (Qissa-yi Dāniyāl)

Manuscripts:
- Paris, BNF cod. héb. 128 [ancienonds 45], fols 72vff.
  
  inscr.: אָמָת דָּנִיֵּל
  
  incep.: יִסְרָאֵל יִתְנַה הֲמָלֵךְ רַבִּי חֵגי
  
  Text: Zotenberg, “Geschichte Daniels” (infra); Ibn-Shmuel (infra); Eisenstein (infra).
  
  Translation: Jellinek [and Wunsche] (infra); Buchanan (infra); Asmussen and Dadkhah (infra).
  

The text is composed in Persian but written in Hebrew characters.

Description of the Text: See Chapter Three, §2.14.

1. Texts and Translations


Translation.


Translation, with brief afterword.


Translation (into Persian script) and translation, of portions of the apocalyptic section, fols. 83v–88 v.

Eisenstein, J.D. אֶזְרַת מִדְרַשׁ. A Library of Two Hundred Minor Midrashim. New York, 1918. 1.97–103


Text at 209–228.

Jellinek, A. “Erzählung Daniel’s.” Bet ha-Midrasch. Sammlung kleiner Midraschim und vermischter Abhandlungen aus
Brief introduction (xxxvi–xxxvii) and translation.

German translation of Jellinek’s Hebrew translation, with brief afterword (78–80).

Text and translation.

2. Auxiliary Studies


Notes publication of “une Histoire de Daniel” in Cahen [Cahn] (see Munk, infra).


3. Secondary Studies


Brief, survey-style overview.

Brief but interesting note. Surveys literature on the text, questions J. Darmesteter’s (“L’apocalypse persane de Daniel,” supra) identification of historical figures and
events in the last section of the text, and suggests that the date of composition might be the tenth century CE rather than the thirteenth.


Buttenwieser withdrew his name from the article as it appears in the Jewish Encyclopaedia and then published a slightly revised version of it in book form.

Brief description of the contents of the text. Buttenwieser concludes, pace W. Bousset, that the text was written in the first half of the ninth century.


Survey-style overview.


Survey-style overview. Concludes that the text is Jewish, that its historical part is not earlier than the eleventh century, and that the apocalyptic section cannot be dated any earlier, either.


Brief note describing text.


Brief note describing text as being a legendary life of Daniel in Persian.


See the extended review of this book and comments on the text by C. Salemann, Literatur-Blatt für orientalische Philologie 2 (1884–1885), 74–86 at 75.


Very brief notice.


Brief notice. Asserts that this text “contains similar materials” as the Armenian *Seventh Vision of Daniel*.

### III. The Book of Daniel (Dāniyāl-nāma)

**Manuscripts:**

- Jerusalem, Hebrew University MS H2680 [1913]
  

- London, BL cod. Or. 4743, fols. 2r–65r [1816]
  


The BL copy contains the complete text; the Hebrew University text is incomplete and preserves the first 234 distichs only. The text is in poetry rather than prose and is composed in Persian but written in Hebrew characters. The original date of the composition of the text is given (Seleucid 1918 (= 1607 CE)), along with the date of its redaction (1704/5 CE), and it also contains a superscription that preserves the name of its author, one Kh(w)āja Bukhārāi.

**Description of the Text:** See Chapter Three, §2.24.

1. **Texts and Translations**


Transliteration and translation of portions of the text. Haelewtyck, *Clavis*, 265, incorrectly cites this as an edition of the *History of Daniel* (*supra*).


Text.

2. Auxiliary Studies


3. Secondary Studies


Brief, survey-style overview.


Very brief note. Suggests that the text might ultimately go back to a Bukharian poet, Benjamin ben Mishal, also known as Amina.


Includes very partial translation.


Study of linguistic features, phonology, morphology, and lexicology.


Details unknown. So noted by Netzer himself.


Excursus: Daniel Geomantic Texts in the Persian, Arabic, Syriac, Armenian, and Turkish Traditions

In his Descriptive Catalogue of Persian Manuscripts (infra), Ivanow subdivides the section on divination manuscripts into several parts, including: i) those that concern the interpretation of dreams; ii) those that concern divination by fāl and istikhāra; and iii) those that concern divination by means of raml (also: reml, renel, or rumul), i.e., the science of geomancy, or divination by means of figures and lines or geographic features. For a preliminary overview of these texts and of their place with respect to the rest of the Daniel prognostica, see Chapter Four, §5.

Note that the following list of texts does not claim to be exhaustive:

- Cairo or Città del Vaticano (?), [Sbath MS 560] [xvii]

- Cairo or Città del Vaticano (?), [Sbath MS 560] [1658]

- Calcutta, Asiatic Society MS J.9, fols. 1v–34v [1114 A.H.]


- Calcutta, Asiatic Society MS J.9, fols. 35v–44v [1114 A.H.]
  Reference: Ivanow (supra), No. 1518.2. 709: “Kanzu’l-ghayb. Another short treatise on raml, also based on the book of Daniel (and several other authorities). The author calls himself Sa’du’d-Dīn Mas’ūd b. Ahmad Nishāpu’rī.”

- Calcutta, Asiatic Society MS J.16 [x A.H.]
  Reference: Ivanow (supra), No. 1517. 709: “Šahari-i-pur Thamara. Another treatise on divination by raml, based on the apocryphic [sic] book of Daniel. The copy is incomplete at the beginning, and probably only on account of this defect that author’s name and exact date of composition are not found.”
Daniel Apocrypha Preserved in Persian

Selected Sources on Daniel Geomantic Texts:


Excursus: Sundry Persian Daniel Apocrypha

i. The Daniel Story in the Sogdian Tradition

MS C22 of the Turfan collection in the Berlin Staatsbibliothek preserves, among other things, a fragmentary story of Daniel. N. Sims-Williams (infra) observes that “it was presumably translated from Syriac, but the original has not been identified,” and “is not a retelling of the text of the Bible but a free retelling of the biblical narrative.” Three episodes are partially preserved, the first based on Daniel’s refusal to eat impure food (Dan 1), the second on the interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream of Dan 2, and the third perhaps a conflationary tale of Bel and the Serpent, possibly set in the time of Belshazzar.

Selected sources on Daniel-Tales in the Sogdian Tradition:


ii. India Office MSS 129 and 596

See H. Ethé, Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts in the Library of the India Office (Oxford, 1903), vol. 1, cols. 52–53, re MS 129: “A curious work on general history, intermixed with theological and esoteric discussions...After this introductory part the real work begins, a compendium of general history in fifteen makâlas...Makâlah IV: From Munûçîhr to Alexander the Great (...Solomon, Daniel), on fol. 102a' and 1, cols. 241–242, re MS 596: “Ta’rîkh-i-Anbiyā...Another very detailed work on the prophets and holy men before the Islâm...29. ...on fol. 159b, in five bâbs.” Note also C. Stewart, A Descriptive Catalogue of the Oriental Library of the Late Tippoo Sultan of Mysore (Cambridge, 1809), 21: “This book also contains an Account of the Creation of the World, and a History of all the Prophets preceding Mohammed.”

iii. Oxford, Bod. cod. Whinfield 8, fols. 215r–216r

“Further notes on divination and astrology, said to be ‘extracted from the book of the prophet Daniel.’” See A.F.L. Beeston, Catalogue of the Persian, Turkish, Hindustani and Pushtu Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library. Part II: Additional Persian Manuscripts (Oxford, 1954), 82–84 at 84. Is this a copy or version of the Malḥamat Dāniyāl?
I. The Vita Danielis in the Lives of the Prophets

See above, under “Daniel Apocrypha Preserved Primarily in Greek.”

II. The Fourteenth Vision of Daniel [Coptic and Arabic]

See above, under “Daniel Apocrypha Preserved in Coptic.” The Fourteenth Vision of Daniel is preserved in Arabic in one MS: London, BL cod. Or. 1314.

III. The Apocalypse of Daniel on the Events after al-Muʿtamid

Manuscript:
- details unknown
  Translation: Cook (infra).

Description of the Text: See Chapter Three, §2.18.

1. Texts and Translations


IV. The Vision of Daniel as Related to Ezra, His Pupil

Manuscript:
- Paris, BNF cod. arab. 150, fols. 14r–20r [1606]
  Text and Translation: Macler (infra); Gottheil (infra) [partial text only: fols. 14r–v + 19v–20r]


Description of the Text: See Chapter Three, §2.19.

1. Texts and Translations


Gottheil identifies the text as a copy of the Syriac Ezra-Apocalypse first published by F. Baethgen (ZAW 6 (1886), 199–210).


Text and translation, with an introductory section.
2. Auxiliary Studies


3. Secondary Studies


Brief, survey-style overview.


Survey-style overview.


Survey-style overview.


V. Malḥamat Dāniyāl

Manuscripts:

The full range of the manuscripts and the versions in which this text is preserved is unknown, and as such the following list must only be considered a very preliminary attempt at gathering the available manuscripts in one place. I have collated the data found in the few studies which discuss this enigmatic text with the information uncovered from an examination by autopsy of manuscript catalogues. Included are only those texts explicitly attributed, in whole or in part, to Daniel; as with the *Lunationes Danielis*, though, not every *Malḥamat* is actually attributed to Daniel.

It is my preliminary conclusion that this text is either related to or is an oriental version of the Greek *Praedictiones Danielis*, although it must be stressed that this conclusion awaits evaluation by means of a detailed study of the relevant texts.
Syriac

- Birmingham, Mingana MS Syriac 191, fols. 43–62
  Reference: Mingana, A. Catalogue of the Mingana Collection of Manuscripts Now in the Possession of the Trustees of the Woodbrooke Settlement, Selly Oak, Birmingham. Vol. I: Syriac and Garshuni Manuscripts. Cambridge, 1933. Cols. 420–421: “A special treatise on the solar months of the year, by Daniel the philosopher (1).” note 1: “This treatise is found in Islamic Arabic where it is known as [Malḥamad Daniel]. See the Arabic Catalogue of the Berlin manuscripts by Ahlwardt, vol. v, pp. 304–307 (Nos. 5912 and 5915).” Note also that rest of this MS (A, fols. 1–42, and C, fols. 63–69, are prognosticatory texts, the former explicitly concerned with the moon.

- Birmingham, Mingana MS Syriac 311, fols. 75r–99 [c. 1750]
  Reference: Mingana, Catalogue I (supra), cols. 590–591: “The treatise on Horoscope, called Malḥamah, attributed to Daniel the Philosopher. . . . The expression ‘peace be with him’ suggests that this ‘Daniel the Philosopher’ is the prophet Daniel. The treatise is divided into twelve fasls, corresponding with the twelve months of the year, beginning with October and ending with September. About three leaves are missing at the end, which contained part of August and all September.”

- Birmingham, Mingana MS Syriac 436, fols. 2v–29r
  Reference: Mingana, Catalogue I (supra), cols. 770–771: “A treatise on the Syrian months and the events that take place in them, entitled the ‘Prognostications of Daniel the Prophet.’ . . . Each month has a special section called a faṣl.”

- Cairo, Egyptian National Library MS TJF 12, fols. 1v–4r

- London, BL cod. Or. 2084, fol. 1 [1756]

- London, BL cod. Or. 4434 [xix]
  Text: Furlani, ZDMG 75 (infra).
  Reference: Margoliouth (supra), 42: “Or. 4434. Tracts on a fanciful collection of diseases according to the numerical value of names . . . forecasts of various kinds, dreams and their interpretation, and some remedial preparations . . . sixteenth century”; den Heijer (infra), 230.

- Oxford, Bod. cod. Syr. 115

Chapter Six

- Wien, ÖNB cod. Or. 1552, fols. 108r–124v
  Note: Details uncertain.

Arabic
- Alger, Bibliothèque Publique cod. arab. 1517
- Alger, Bibliothèque Publique cod. arab. 1518
- Ankara, MS Is. Saib Sincer I, 312
  Reference: Fahd (infra), 409 note 4.
- Berlin, SBPK cod. arab. 5912 [olim Spr. 1936, fols. 1r–63r]
- Berlin, SBPK cod. arab. 5913 [olim Mq. 657]
  Reference: Ahlwardt (supra), 305; Ullmann (infra), 293 note 4.
- Berlin, SBPK cod. arab. 5914 [olim Mf. 39,6, fols. 85r–96r + Mo. 197,2, fols. 4r–30v]
- Berlin, SBPK cod. arab. 5915 [olim Mo. 198 + Mq. 466,1, fol. 1v + Mq. 466,3, fol. 12v + Spr 1936, fols. 67r–73r]
  Reference: Ahlwardt (supra), 305.
  Note: In many places the text here is paralleled by cod. arab. 5912.
- Birmingham, Mingana MS Christian Arabic Additional 204, fols. 2v–29r [c. 950]
- Birmingham, Mingana MS Christian Arabic Additional 135, fol. 1b
  Reference: Mingana, Catalogue III (supra), No. 259. 56: “The beginning of the astrological work attributed to the prophet Daniel, and generally known under the title of [Malhamat Daniel]. It is here called Book of Thunder . . . . The work differs from that found in many other MSS. of my collection, such as Mingana Arab (Isl.) 323 and Mingana Syriac 191 and 311. The text of the present MS. is much shorter, and its phraseology is totally different . . . . The months are those of the Syrian calendar . . . .”
- Birmingham, Mingana MS Arabic (Islamic) 891 I [xviii]
Birmingham and Preserved at the Selly Oak Colleges Library, Vol. IV: Islamic Arabic Manuscripts. Birmingham, 1963. Nos. 1911 and 1912. 355: No. 1911 [MS 891 I]: “Malamat Dâniyâl, a work on astrology, ostensibly based on ancient Greek writers. It is similar to Berlin 5912 but is not as complete as that work”; Sezgin (infra), 315 re his no. 5; Ullmann (infra), 293 note 4.

- Birmingham, Mingana MS Arabic (Islamic) 323 [xix]
  Reference: Gottschalk, Catalogue IV (supra), No. 1912 (MS 323): “The same work [as No. 1911, supra”]; Sezgin (infra), 315 re his no. 5; Ullmann (infra), 293 note 4.

- Cairo, Coptic Patriarchate Library cod. Theol. 260, fol. 183v (old pagination)

- Cairo, Dâr, miqât 132
  Reference: Sezgin (infra), 315 re his no. 5.

- Cairo, Egyptian National Library MS K 3862, fols. 1v–10r

- Cairo, Egyptian National Library MS S 4467, fols. 59r–74v
  Reference: King (infra), 27.

- Cairo or Città del Vaticano (?), [Sbath MS 71], fols. 1r–39r [1683]
  Sezgin (infra), 316 re his no. 12: “K. Al-Falak”; Ullmann (infra), 293 note 4.

- Cairo or Città del Vaticano (?), [Sbath MS 771] [1697]
  Reference: Sbath, Bibliothèque (supra), No. 771, 2.61: “C’est un livre d’astrologie attribué au prophète Daniel”;
  Sezgin (infra), 315 re his no. 5; Ullmann (infra), 293 note 4.

- Cairo or Città del Vaticano (?), [Sbath MS 1050] [xvi]
  Reference: Sbath, Bibliothèque (supra), No. 1050, 2.158: “Livre astrologique attribué à Daniel le prophète... incomplet (V. ms. 771)”; Ullmann (infra), 293 note 4 [but identifying the MS as 1051].

- Cairo or Città del Vaticano (?), [Sbath MS 1085] [xviii]
  Reference: Sbath, Bibliothèque (supra), No. 1085, 2.164: “Livre astronomico-astrologique attribué à Daniel le prophète”; Ullmann (infra), 293 note 4.

- Calcutta, Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, MS 1506
  Reference: Ulama M. Hidayat Hosain, S., Maheuz-ul Haq, M., and Ishaque, M. Catalogue of the Arabic Manuscripts in the Collection of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal. Calcutta, 1949. No. 1506, 2.195–196: “1506. Kitâb al-Mulhama. A treatise expounding the astrological judgment relating to the twelve months. The name of the author is not mentioned. In the preface it is mentioned that the material for the present work was taken from the sayings of Dâniyâl, the Prophet, Idrâs bin Luqmân and Hurmus the Philosopher.”

- Cambridge, Oriental MS 1258

- Dimashq, Zahirîya Library MS 3585
  Reference: Sezgin (infra), 315 re his no. 5; Ullmann (infra), 293 note 4.

- Dimashq, Zahirîya Library MS 5039
– Dimashq, Zāhirīya Library MS 5600
  Reference: Sezgin (infra), 315 re his no. 5; Ullmann (infra), 293 note 4.
– Dimashq, Zāhirīya Library MS 6263
– Dimashq, Zāhirīya Library MS 6271
  Reference: Ullmann (infra), 293 note 4.
– Dimashq, Zāhirīya Library MS 6860, fols. 1v–65v
  Reference: Sezgin (infra), 316 re his no. 11: “K. Dāniyāl . . .”; Ullmann (infra), 293 note 4.
– Dimashq, Zāhirīya Library MS 7845, pp. 294–295
  Reference: Sezgin (infra), 315 re his no. 5; Ullmann (infra), 293 note 4.
– Durham, University Library cod. Or./Arab. 10, pp. 1–70 [1893]
  Reference: On-line manuscript catalogue of the Durham University Library.
– Gotha, Herzoglichen Bibliothek cod. 1464
  Reference: Pertsch, W. Die orientalischen Handschriften der Herzoglichen Bibliothek zu Gotha. III: Die arabischen Handschriften III. Gotha, 1881. 96–97; Ullmann (infra), 293 note 4, Sezgin (infra), 317 as an unassigned text.
– Gotha, Herzoglichen Bibliothek cod. 1465
  Reference: Pertsch, Die orientalischen Handschriften (supra), 97; Ullmann (infra), 293 note 4, Sezgin (infra), 317 as an unassigned text.
– Istanbul, Atıf Mustafa Efendi Kütüphanesi MS 1164, fols. 15r–93r
  Reference: Fahd (infra), 408–409.
– Istanbul, Atıf Mustafa Efendi Kütüphanesi MS 1722
  Reference: Ullmann (infra), 293 note 4.
– Istanbul, Aya Sofya 2684, fols. 106r–117v
  Reference: Fahd (infra), 409: “Divination météorologique selon Daniel”; Ullmann (infra), 293 note 4; Sezgin (infra), 317 as an unassigned text.
– Istanbul, Bağdatlı Vehbi Kütüphanesi 2234, fols. 1–6r
  Reference: Fahd (infra), 408–409; Sezgin (infra), 315 re his no. 6 [but citing fols. 1v–7r].
  Reference: Sezgin (infra), 315 re his no. 5.
  Reference: Fahd (infra), 409 note 4.
– Istanbul, Nuruosmaniyi Kişiliyesi MS 2796
  Reference: Fahd (infra), 409 note 4; Sezgin (infra), 316 re his no. 10: “K. Dāniyāl”; Ullmann (infra), 293 note 4.
  Reference: Fahd (infra), 409 note 4; Sezgin (infra), 315 re his no. 5.
– Istanbul, Velüddin Efendi MS 2281,3
  Reference: Ullmann (infra), 293 note 4.
– Istanbul, Velüddin Efendi MS 2294, fols. 58v–65v
  Reference: Fahd (infra), 408–409; Sezgin (infra), 316 re his no. 8 [but citing fols. 58v–87v].
– Konya, Kitaplığı Yusuf Ağa [Yusufağa] MS 5006, pp. 1–64
  Reference: Fahd (infra), 409 note 4.
  Note: Is this the same MS as what Sezgin lists as Konya 6462 (infra)?
– Konya, Kitaplığı Yusuf Ağa [Yusufağa] MS 6462, pp. 1–64
  Reference: Sezgin (infra), 316 re his no. 11.
  Note: Is this the same MS as what Fahd lists as Konya 5006 (supra)?
– Leeds, University of Leeds Department of Semitic Languages and Literatures MS or. 72 [xix]

– Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek cod. Or. 11.066 [1263 AH]


– Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek cod. Or. 12.050 [xix]


– London, BL cod. Or. 5907 [1080 AH]


Note: There appear to be several texts associated with Daniel in this MS. See Sezgin (infra), 314 re his no. 2 [on fols. 1v–44r] (“Ein Buch über Malhama in 22 Kapiteln, übersetzt aus dem syrischen . . .”), 315 re his no. 4 [on fols. 53r–73v], and 316 re his no. 16 [on fols. 44r–48r]. See also the list of the titles of the individual texts preserved in this MS in G. Furlani, “Eine Sammlung astrologischer Abhandlungen in arabischer Sprache,” ZA 33 (1921), 157–168; see also A. Mengozzi, Trattato di Sen e altri testi astrologici (Testi del Vicino Oriente antico 7.1; Brescia, 1998), 83–86.
acquisitions (1884–1924). Paris, 1925. 9: “Traité d’astrologie et de présages attribué au prophète Daniel”; Vajda (supra), 445; Sezgin (infra), 317 as an unassigned text.

- Sharfa [Charfet], Maronite Monastery MS 18/1

- Tunis, Bibliothèque Nationale MS 08910/3, fols. 67v–75v
  Reference: Sezgin (infra), 316 re his no. 9.

- Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. arab. 416, fols. 220v–227r

- Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. arab. 955, fols. 94v–107v

- Città del Vaticano, BAV cod. arab. 955, fols. 108v–126r
  Reference: Levi della Vida (supra), 2.76; Ullmann (infra), 293 note 4; Sezgin (infra), 317 as an unassigned text.

Note: Fahd (infra), 409 note 4, cites “Lâleli 1584” [cf. Sezgin (infra), 317 as an unassigned text].

Note: Sezgin (infra), 315 re his no. 5, cites “Hekimoğlu 572/2 (ff. 292–345),” and 316 re his no. 11, cites “Konya, Yusufa 6462/1 (S. 1–64).”

Note: Ullmann (infra), 293 note 4, lists another Arabic text: “Ya‘qûb Şarkîs nr. 122.”

Note: Vajda (supra) also lists BNF copies of the Malhama(t) which are unattributed or are attributed to others: codd. arab. 809, fols. 21r–22r [cf. de Slane (supra), 1.174: “Un feuillet d’un traité cabalistique”]; 2675, fols. 53v–57v [cf. de Slane (supra), 2.482: “Traité de divination”]; 2736 [cf. de Slane (supra), 2.494: “... livre de prédictions...”]; 4580, fols. 131r–138v [cf. de Slane (supra), 3.725: “Notes, figures et tableaux se rapportant à l’astrologie et à la divination”]; 4606, fols. 79r–80r and 81v–83r [not explicitly mentioned in de Slane (supra), 3.731–732; n.b. that it should be noted that this cod. 4606 cannot be confused with cod. arab. 4605 (on which see the Excursus on “Sundry Arabic Daniel Apocrypha,” no. iii, infra), which according to de Slane is only 35 fols. in length]; 5674, fols. 202r–205r; 6110, fols. 130r–134r; and 6400, fols. 49r–56r.
Persian

- London, BL cod. Or. 1104 [xviii]
- Paris, BNF cod. pers. 2406


Note: Y. ‘Abd al-Mas‘ūd notes that one should refer to Graf for reference to “an analogical Weather calendar [to Cairo Coptic Museum MS 3808 (on which see supra)], attributed to Daniel the Prophet” (“A Fragmentary Farmer’s Almanac,” Les cahiers coptes 10 (1956), 5–9 at 5), while S.P. Brock remarks that Graf “mentions a related type of text attributed to Daniel” (review of J.H. Charlesworth, The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, volume 1, JJS 35 (1984), 200–209 at 204).

Hebrew

The extent to which the Malḥamat Dāniyāl is preserved in Hebrew is very unclear. Portions of Steinschneider’s two notes (infra) seem to apply to the Malḥamat (note the reference to BNF cod. arab. 2633), while other portions appear to allude to Hebrew copies of the Somniale Daniælis or the Lunationes Daniælis (on which, Chapter Four, note 201).


Note: Y. ‘Abd al-Mas‘ūd notes that one should refer to Graf for reference to “an analogical Weather calendar [to Cairo Coptic Museum MS 3808 (on which see supra)], attributed to Daniel the Prophet” (“A Fragmentary Farmer’s Almanac,” Les cahiers coptes 10 (1956), 5–9 at 5), while S.P. Brock remarks that Graf “mentions a related type of text attributed to Daniel” (review of J.H. Charlesworth, The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, volume 1, JJS 35 (1984), 200–209 at 204).
Printed Texts:

Fodor, “Malhamat Daniyal” (infra), 86, mentions that as late as 1973 one could still find among the traditional booksellers in Shi’ite Iraq recently published printed copies of the *Malhamat Dāniyāl* (indeed, his translation of the text is taken from one such edition). Whether or not this text still circulates there today is uncertain.

Description of the Text: See Chapter Four, §5.

1. Texts and Translations


Text and translation, along with Coptic *kalandalogion* (Cairo, Coptic Museum MS 3808), he provides little comment on our text, but notes that “it recalls in a certain degree to an Arabic text in a work by Abū Mašar, the great Astrologer, *The Stars from which Omens of Men and Women Are Taken*, etc.” (7).


Translation and photographs of a modern printed Arabic version of the *Malhamat Dāniyāl*.


2. Auxiliary Studies


3. **Secondary Studies**


“With the civil wars of 656–661 and 680–692, the term *fitan* was soon to become synonymous with *malhīm*—apocalyptic woes and tribulations on which a book is attributed to Daniel. I suspect that this tradition anachronistically renders *malhīm* as *fitan*, but its referent is most probably the apocalyptic battles of the kings of the South and the North, and especially the battles of the end of time against the earthly kings in which the archangels Gabriel and Daniel will lead the army of angels against earthly kings (Dan. 10:13–12:1). The use of the term *malhāma* for the woes and tribulations of the end of time is striking. Its derivation from the Hebrew cognate, *milhāmâ* (‘war’), has not been explored; nor has the possible influence of the apocalyptic *War Rules* in the Dead Sea Scrolls. . . . But if my reading of this tradition on the content of the book of Daniel is correct, the original derivation of the *malhīm* may be from the Daniēlic expression of the battles of the end of time. Others doubtless thought that the book also contained the eternal wisdom that the father of humanity, Adam, had hidden in the Treasure-Cave mentioned in the Syriac texts soon to be translated into Arabic (al-Bīrūnī. 1879 [= *The Chronology of Ancient Nations* (trans./ed. C.E. Sachau, London)], 300).”


VI. The Book of Principles of Daniel the Sage (Kitāb al-ṭābil li-Dāniyāl al-ḥakīm) or The Principles of Interpretation [of Dreams] of Daniel (Usul al-Ta’bir li-Dāniyāl)

Manuscripts:
The tradition and extent of this text (or texts) is very unclear. See also the Excursus: “Sundry Turkish Daniel Apocrypha” (infra), at no. ii.

Description of the Text: See Chapter Four, §5.


Paris, 1697. 283.


“The Arabs attribute to Daniel the invention of geomancy (“ʿilm al-raml”) and the authorship of the “Usul al-Ta’bir” (“The Principles of Interpreting Dreams”).”

VII. Kitāb al-Jafar

Manuscripts
– London, BL cod. Or. 426 [Add. 7473], fol. 63r
Reference: Catalogus codicum manusciptorum orientalium. Pars secunda, codices arabicos amplectens. London, 1846. 206 [but citing fol. 64r]; Arjomand (infra), 278, note 37.

Description of the Text: See Chapter Four, §5.

265: “Numerology is an ancient technique for the calculation of the prede-
termined future. Its reception in Islam as the science of *Jafr* was quite early,
that science being attributed to Daniel and also to the sixth Shi’ite Imam,
Ja’far b. Muhammad, presumably on account of the red leather bag known
as the *jafr*.” 278, note 37: “It is interesting to note that Ibn Abî Tâhir’s trea-
tise in political astrology is followed, in the same manuscript, by the Book of
*Jafr*, ‘extracted from the Books of Daniel and Solomon, son of David’.”

period between Noah and Abraham, and was the father of the aforemen-
tioned sciences; and Daniel the younger, who, according to a tradition, was
the maternal uncle of Cyrus, whose mother was a Jewess. The Arabs attribute
to him the book “Kitab al-Jafar” and many predictions relative to the Persian
kings.”

**VIII. Qur’at Dâniyâl**

*Manuscripts*

See the references at Fahd (*infra*), 218.

*Description of the Text*: See Chapter Four, §5.

**Fahd, T. La divination arabe: études religieuses, sociologiques et folkloriques sur le milieu natif de l’Islam. Leiden, 1966. 218.**

**IX. Daniel Geomantic Texts**

See Excursus, “Daniel Geomantic Texts in the Persian, Arabic, Syriac, Armenian,
and Turkish Traditions,” above, under “Daniel Apocrypha Preserved Primarily in
Persian.”

**Excursus: Sundry Arabic Daniel Apocrypha**

i. *Cairo, Coptic Patriarchate Library cod. 776, fols. 99r–117r*

   See G. Graf, *Catalogue de manuscrits arabes chrétiens conservés au Caire* (S&T 63; Città
del Vaticano, 1934), 173, re MS Graf No. 457: “Récit sur Daniel, sans titre…
   Incipit: …الฯ …”

ii. *Kitâb Hirûs*

   In his survey of scientific MSS in the Egyptian National Museum, D. King notes
   the existence of a “compendium of astrological lore usually bearing a title relating
to the first treatise, which deals with the heliacal risings of Sirius and which is attributed to Hermes, but consisting mainly of sections attributed to Daniel” (A Survey of the Scientific Manuscripts in the Egyptian National Library (American Research Center in Cairo, Catalogs 5; Winona Lake, 1983), 27). He lists five MSS, at least one of which is Christian, and notes that there are more copies extant. In addition, King warns that the Library has an especially rich collection of hermetic material and that much of what he records in his present compilation will have to be modified in the light of further research. For more on the connexion between Hermes and Daniel, see Chapter Four.

iii. Paris, BNF cod. arab. 4605

The Baron de Slane describes the title of this text as “Livre de la Majesté divine, transmis à la postérité par le prophète Daniel” (Catalogue des manuscrits arabes de la Bibliothèque Nationale (Paris, 1883–1895), 3.731). For more on the importance of this text, see Chapter Four, note 152, and the text to which it refers.

iv. München, BSB cod. arab. 148 (no. 894), fols. 15r–26r


v. St. Athanasius of Alexandria and the Visions of Daniel

There are at least two Arabic texts preserved among the manuscripts at the Library of the Monastery of Saint Catherine at Mount Sinai that mention the vision or prophecies of Daniel in connexion with St. Athanasius of Alexandria. Both texts are mentioned in the standard catalogues: A.S. Atiya, The Arabic Manuscripts of Mount Sinai, A Hand-List of Arabic Manuscripts and Scrolls Microfilmed at the Library of the Monastery of Mount Sinai (Baltimore, 1955), and M. Kamil, Catalogue of All Manuscripts in the Monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai (Wiesbaden, 1970). Kamil cod. 495 [Atiya 448]: “Codex contains 50 miscellaneous articles which may be divided into the following categories: 1—Stories of Lives of Prophets and Saints . . . St. Athanasius of Alexandria and his vision of the Prophet Daniel . . .” Kamil cod. 548 [Atiya 539]: “Codex containing thirty-five tracts with an extensive selection of stories from the lives and acts of the Apostles and Evangelists and other contemporary Saints and their writings and testimonies . . . an account of the life of Melchisedek by St. Athanasius Patriarch of Alexandria, and three prophecies by Daniel, Elias [leg. Enoch?] and Elijah.”

vi. Chiekho and Graf Catalogues

Note that the catalogues of L. Cheikho (Catalogue des manuscrits des auteurs arabes chrétiens depuis l’Islam. (Beyrouth, 1924)) and G. Graf (Catalogue de manuscrits arabes chrétiens conservés au Caire (S&T 63; Città del Vaticano, 1934)) each preserve several references to texts with the name of Daniel attached beyond those which are recorded in the lists supra. Cf., e.g., Graf No. 457 at 173, re Cairo, Coptic Patriarchate Library cod. 776, fols. 99r–117r [script. saec. xvi–xviii]: “Récit sur Daniel, sans titre . . . Incipit: . . .لِ، . . .”
Daniel Apocrypha Preserved in Turkish

I. Daniel Geomantic Texts


Excursus: Sundry Turkish Daniel Apocrypha


See C. Rieu, Catalogue of the Turkish Manuscripts in the British Museum (London, 1888), 134: “A treatise in tabulated form showing the omens to be drawn from throbbings in various parts of the body. . . . It gives, in five columns, the import assigned to the throbbings by Ja’ler Sâdîk, the prophet Daniel . . .”

ii. Berlin, SBPK cod. Diez A. 4°. 47, fols. 31r–39v and cod. orient. 4°. 145

In his catalogue of the Turkish MSS of the Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin, W. Pertsch identifies two interesting MSS. The first, cod. Diez A. 4°. 47, fols. 31r–39v, he describes as “eine Abhandlung mit der Ueberschrift . . . Der Prophet Daniel spielt bei der Punctierkunst der Orientalen überhaupt eine Rolle; vgl. die folgende Handschrift [i.e., cod. orient. 4°.145], Gotha Nr. 8,3 und Wien Nr. 1814,9 . . .”


iii. Paris, BNF cod. turc supp. 245, fols. 355v–356r

chapter six

DANIEL APOCRYPHA PRESERVED IN OLD
AND MIDDLE ENGLISH

I. Somniale Danielis

See above, under “Daniel Apocrypha Preserved Primarily in Latin.”

II. The Junius Daniel

Manuscript:
  \textit{inser.}: [wanting]
  \textit{incip.}: Gefrægn ic Hebreos/eadge lifgean/in Hierusalem
  Text and Translation: many—see §1, \textit{infra}.

Description of the Text:
Junius 11, a codex once thought to be the product of Caedmon but now understood to be the work of a tenth-century compiler, contains four Old English poems: Genesis, Exodus, Daniel, and Christ and Satan. Daniel is a paraphrastic reworking of the episodes from the Vulgate Daniel chapters 1–5, although opinions differ as to whether the poem is complete in its present form.

Modern scholarship (but note the contrary and influential view of R.T. Farrell) has tended to accept the view that Daniel is composed of two documents: Daniel A and Daniel B, the latter a later interpolation consisting of verses 279–361 of Daniel and containing the Song of Azarias (verses 279–332, and which is not precisely the same work as the Exeter Azarias (on which, see \textit{infra}) plus some narrative material preceding the Song of the Three Children.

For a full bibliography of sources on Junius 11 written prior to the mid-1970s, see J.L. Greene, “A Critical Bibliography of the Manuscript Junius 11 in the Bodleian Library, Oxford” (Diss: University of Texas at Austin, 1976).

1. Texts, Textual Issues, and Translations

With few exceptions, not including partial texts or translations presented in anthologies.


A 1:1 facsimile of the MS.

Translation, Daniel 1–45, 224–448a.


Junius, F. Caedmonis Monachi paraphrasis poetica Genesios ac praecipuarum Sacrae paginae historiarum, abhine annos M.LXX. Amsterdam, 1655.
Editio princeps.


No. 334. 406–408.
Brief but important description of contents and characteristics of the MS, arguing that in its present form Daniel is incomplete.

Text, with notes.


Text, with literal translation.

Wülker, R.P. *Grundriss zur Geschichte der angelsächsischen Litteratur mit einer Übersicht der angelsächsischen Sprachwissenschaft.* Leipzig, 1885.

2. Secondary Studies

Including only those text-, historical-, or literary-critical studies that discuss *Daniel* itself or the place of Daniel in the Junius MS (rather than any of its other poems individually).


Examines Hrothgar’s conversion in *Beowulf* in the light of the forms of other Old English conversion accounts, especially Nebuchadnezzar’s public confession of God’s power in the Old English *Daniel.*


Textual notes.


Dethloff, R. “Darstellung der Syntax im angelsächsischen Gedichte *Daniel.*” Diss: Rostock, 1907.


Discussion of the intended illustrations to Daniel in the Junius MS.


Contra Farrell’s view as to the completeness of the ending of Daniel and concentrating on the pages and quires of the Junius MS. Concludes that Daniel is missing about forty-eight lines.


A complex and complete study on the biblical text and traditions that stand behind Daniel. Its importance cannot be overestimated.


Textual and metrical notes.
—. “Zur Rhythmik des germanischen Alliterationsverses. III.”

Textual and metrical notes.

“Thus the repetitions in Daniel, 245–429, are not without method and the twice-told tale not without purpose. Critics who see only a somewhat haphazard redundancy of details need instead to recognize two complete recountings of the miracle of the fiery furnace, told from two radically different points of view. It was in order to contrast these viewpoints, the visions of the carnal and spiritual men, that the poet chose to repeat his account of the central event of the first half of the Old English Daniel.” (363–364)


Arguments that Daniel 279–408 is an interpolation.


Arguments that Daniel A is older than Beowulf.


III. The Exeter Azariah

Manuscripts:
– The Exeter Book, fols. 53r–55v [x]
– London, BL cod. Add. 9067 [a copy of The Exeter Book]

Description of the Text:
The Exeter Book preserves a collections of poems, including a work commonly known as Azarias. This work is not the same as the section in the Junius Daniel (supra), verses 279–429, that contain the Song of Azarias and other material, including the so-called Daniel B (verses 279–332), which is often considered to be an interpolation. But the Exeter Azarias is not completely independent, either. Rather, as R.T Farrell (Daniel and Azariah, 41) remarks, “Though no definite statement can be made on the nature of the relation between Dan. 279–429 and Azarias, it is reasonable to suppose that they have been influenced by a common tradition, and that the Song of Azarias [in Daniel] in particular is an indication of this, since there are only occasional differences marking the two off from one another in their versions of this passage.”
1. Texts and Translations

   A 1:1 facsimile of the MS.
   With detailed introduction.
   Text and translation.

2. Secondary Studies

   Textual notes.

Excursus: The Feast of Belshazzar in the Middle English Poem Cleanness

One of four works attributed to the Gawain-Poet, Cleanness (or Purity) is a late-fourteenth-century alliterative poem composed in the dialect of the West Midlands. As its title suggests, the focus of the poem is the freedom from vices that defile the soul, communicated by a retelling of several biblical tales, including (vv. 1333–1804) the story of the Feast of Belshazzar from Daniel 5.
Selected Sources on *Cleanness:*

Bibliography to 1977:


**Excursus: Sundry Old and Middle English Daniel Apocrypha**

i. *The Pistil of Swete Susan*

A poem composed in alliterative verse, *The Pistil of Swete Susan* is sometimes attributed to Huchown of the Awle Ryale. It dates from the mid- to late-fourteenth century and was composed in the North or Northwest Midlands. Also known as simply *Susannah,* the *Pistil* basically follows the story of Susannah, although in some places (e.g., the description of the garden), the author has inserted his own material or material derived from other sources. For the text of the *Pistil,* see A. Miskimin, *Susannah: An Alliterative Poem of the Fourteenth Century* (New Haven, 1969); n.b. also the study by J.-A. George, “Repentance and Retribution: The Use of the Book of Daniel in Old and Middle English Texts,” *BJRL* 77 (1995), 177–192.


iii. *Oxford, Balliol College cod. 354, fol. 89v*

H.O. Coxe, *Catalogus codicum MSS. qui in collegiis aulisque Oxoniensibus hodie adservantur. Pars I* (Oxford, 1852): “The tale of Nabegodonosor, howe he dremid of the gret tree... Beg. ‘Ther was a kyng of myche myght.’”
I. Somniale Danielis

See above, under “Daniel Apocrypha Preserved Primarily in Latin.”

II. The Mors Danielis in the Deaths of the Chief Prophets

Manuscripts:
- Dublin, Royal Irish Academy, MS 23 P16 (the Leabhar Breac), p. 181b
- Oxford, Bod. cod. Rawlinson B.502 [SC 11849], p. 75a

Description of the Text:
This short text, a better name for which might be The Deaths and Burials of the Chief Prophets, provides brief descriptions surrounding the circumstances of the death and burial of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel.

1. Texts and Translations

I. Somniale Danielis

See above, under “Daniel Apocrypha Preserved Primarily in Latin.”

Excursus: Rauðúlf’s þáttr

Rauðúlf’s þáttr, or the Tale of Rauðúlf—the name means “Red-Wolf”—is preserved in various versions and among nine manuscripts. The central figures in the tale are Rauðúlf (who is also known simply as Rauð) and his sons, all of whom have the ability to foretell the weather, interpret dreams, and the like. Different versions of the tale highlight the prognostic powers of either Rauðúlf or his sons.

The figures of Rauðúlf and his sons clearly owe a debt to the character of the wise man who is skilled in foretelling the future on the basis of past or present action (dreams, weather, etc.), and in particular the Daniel-type of wise man (and, to a lesser degree, the Ezra-type) that appears throughout so many of the other ancient and mediaeval texts and in so many languages.

The link with the figure of Daniel is made even more explicit in the second half of Rauðúlf’s þáttr, which tells how Rauðúlf describes the dream of the King Olaf. Olaf’s dream is based on King Nebuchadnezzar’s dream of the great statue at Daniel 2, but adapts the basic imagery to fit a Christian theology and a Scandinavian historical context. King Olaf dreams of a great green cross that stands upon the earth and upon which there is a figure. The head of the figure (which is surrounded by an aureole and from which flow golden locks down to the breast) is made of red gold; the neck of the figure is made of copper; its breast of refined silver; its girdle of iron; its belly of electrum; its groin unre fined silver; its thighs of flesh; and its lower legs and feet of wood. Each portion of the body, Rauðúlf tells Olaf, represents a kingdom, from Olaf himself, who is the head of red gold, through his successors.

Selected sources on Rauðúlf’s þáttr:
I. Somniale Danielis

See above, under “Daniel Apocrypha Preserved Primarily in Latin.”

Excursus: “König Tyro von Schotten und Fridebrand sin Sun”

The poem “König Tyro von Schotten und Fridebrand sin Sun” (“King Tyro of Scotland and Fridebrand His Son”) is preserved in fols. 8r to 9v of Heidelberg’s Universitätsbibliothek cod. Pal. germ. 848 [script. saec. xiii-xiv], a stunningly beautifully collection of illuminated thirteenth-century poems composed in the Minnesang tradition. The codex is known officially as the Große Heidelberger Liederhandschrift but is often referred to simply as the Manesse Manuscript. It was most likely compiled in Zürich in the first quarter of the fourteenth century. The first four stanzas function as the introduction to the poem and concern Daniel the Prophet [fol. 8r (title and miniature), 8va (text)].

Selected Sources on “König Tyro” (including texts of the Codex Manesse but only those studies that discuss the text of the poem or its illustration rather than the Codex as a whole, the literature on which is quite extensive):


Excursus: *The Figure of Susanna in the Medieval German Tradition*

As was true in other languages, the figure of Susanna was a popular one in medieval and renaissance German literature. For example, there are several Susanna plays of the fifteenth to the seventeenth centuries, including a Viennese *Fastnachtspiel*, Paul Rehbun’s *Susanna*, and the Nuremberg-Magdeburg *Susanna*. In addition, the Susanna tale appears in the fragments of MS B of the early twelfth-century *Central Franconian Rhyming Bible* that were found at Hall, Tyrol (and that were subsequently again lost).

Selected Sources on the Figure of Susanna in the Medieval German Tradition:

- von Kraus, C. *Mittelhochdeutsches Übungsbuch*. Heidelberg, 1926. 1–27, 273–274. [editions of the *Central Franconian Rhyming Bible* after Kraus’ work are all based on it]

Excursus: *Die drei Jünglinge im Feueroen*

Found in the *Vorau Manuscript* (Vorau, Stiftsbibliothek cod. 276, fols. 99va–100va), *Die drei Jünglinge im Feueroen* retells the story of the three youths and the fiery furnace of Daniel 3.

Selected Sources on *Die drei Jünglinge im Feueroen*:

I. Somniale Danielis

See above, under “Daniel Apocrypha Preserved Primarily in Latin.”

Excursus: Sundry French Daniel Apocrypha

i. Moses ben Abraham, Chronique de la Bible [iii]

Cod. 131 A 3 of the Rijksmuseum Meermanno-Westreenianum/Museum van het Boek at ’s-Gravenhage contains the Chronique de la Bible of a certain Moses ben Abraham. From the description of the codex in the catalogue, we observe that the text “begint bij de stamboom van Noach en eindigt abrupt bij een ontmoeeting tussen koning Herodes en Archelaus van Cappadocië (ca. 10 v. Chr.).” The author, however, seems to pay special attention to Daniel and his visions; indeed, although the manuscript is only sporadically illuminated, the visions of Daniel are richly illustrated.

I have not seen this manuscript, which does not appear to exist elsewhere, nor am I aware whether it has been edited. From the description in the catalogue, it seems that the text is less a commentary and much more a free reworking of the Biblical narrative perhaps akin in spirit to the Sogdian Daniel fragments (see supra, “Daniel Apocrypha Preserved in Persian”). For more information on the Chronique de la Bible, consult the catalogue: Schatten van de Koninklijke Bibliotheek: Acht eeuwen verluchte handschriften. Tentoonstelling in het Rijksmuseum Meermanno-Westreenianum/Museum van het Boek, 17 December 1980 – 15 Maart 1981 (’s-Gravenhage, 1980), 66–67 (n.b. 66, where there is a photograph of fol. 26r, showing the four beasts and the four winds of Dan. 7:1–9).

ii. French “Visions de Daniel”

There is a reference to a manuscript in the Bibliothèque royale des Ducs de Bourgogne to a text called the “Visions de Daniel” (cod. 11016). According to the catalogue, the text is in French and is composed in both prose and verse: “Les vers sur les visions de ce Prophète commencent: Danieauls I sains homme / Trouva ceste lechons.” It does not appear to be a French version of the Somniale Danielis. See the Catalogue des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Royale des Ducs de Bourgogne (3 vols.; Bruxelles, 1842), 1.221 and 2.162.

Note: On the French dream manual, Cy commence le livre des exposicions et significacions des songes, see the Excursus of the same name following the Somniale Danielis in the section on “Daniel Apocrypha Primarily Preserved in Latin,” above.
On the Armenian version of the Book of Daniel—beyond those many studies that discuss the Armenian version of the Hebrew Bible in general and in addition to the information presented in the standard editions and commentaries—see S.P. Cowe, *The Armenian Version of Daniel* (Atlanta, 1993).

I. *The Vita Danielis in the Lives of the Prophets*

See above, under “Daniel Apocrypha Preserved Primarily in Greek.”

II. Somniale Danielis

See above, under “Daniel Apocrypha Preserved Primarily in Latin.”

III. *The Seventh Vision of Daniel*

*Manuscripts:*

- London, Lambeth Archiepiscopal Library cod. armen. 1209 [xii]
  *Text and Translation:* Kalemkiar (*infra*).
  *Translation:* Macler (*infra*) [from Kalemkiar].
- Venezia, S. Lazzaro cod. 935 [1341]
- Venezia, S. Lazzaro cod. 1635 [xv]
  *Translation:* Issaverdens (*infra*) [employing variants from S. Lazzaro cod. 935 (*supra*)].

*Note:* According to Issaverdens, 235–236, this MS is a copy of the one in the Lambeth Library.

- Wien, Mechitaristenkongregation cod. armen. 14 [1375]
  *Text and Translation:* Kalemkiar (*infra*).
  *Translation:* Macler (*infra*) [from Kalemkiar].
- Wien, Mechitaristenkongregation cod. armen. 39 [1337]
  *Text and Translation:* Kalemkiar (*infra*).
  *Translation:* Macler (*infra*) [from Kalemkiar].

*Description of the Text:* See Chapter Three, §2.3.

1. *Texts and Translations*


Translation.
Text. Noted by M.R. James, Apocrypha Anecdotæ II (T&S 5.1; Cambridge, 1897), 165. [rep. Nendeln, 1967]

Text (edited from three MSS) and translation.

Translation, apud Kalemkiar, “Die siebente Visions Daniels.”

2. Auxiliary Studies

Note on the existence of the Armenian MS Bible that contains the Seventh Vision.


3. Secondary Studies


Survey-style overview. No mention that this text, which “[goes] back to a lost Greek original,” is preserved in any other version but Armenian.


Brief but curious note asserting that the “Seventh Vision” exists in “versions in Greek, Coptic, Armenian and other tongues” (70). James, of course, was intimately familiar with most of the libraries and manuscripts of his age, and thus his statement cannot be dismissed without reason. Does the mention of a Coptic version mean that James had in mind the Coptic (and Arabic) “Fourteenth Vision of Daniel”? See also the assertion of M.E. Stone, *infra.*


In comparison with the Greek *Last Vision of Daniel.*


Brief notice. Notes, *pace* M.R. James (*supra*), that “texts are known in Armenian, Greek, Coptic, and Slavonic. The Greek and Armenian forms differ from one another in many respects, but their common source is quite apparent. The Slavonic represents the same text form as the Greek. A Persian work called the *History of Daniel* also contains similar materials…”

“This apocalypse is clearly allied with the Greek and Hebrew medieval Daniel apocalypses” (618).


Discussed in conjunction with the Greek Last Vision of Daniel, which Weinel understands to be a version of the same work.


Notes appearance of a “Seventh Vision of Daniel” in the c. 1290 CE list of apocryphal books of Mechithar of Airivank (115–116), and briefly discusses the Vision, along with a few other Daniel texts (118–121).

IV. The Mors Danielis in the Names, Works, and Deaths of the Holy Prophets

Manuscripts:
- Erevan MS Mat. 562, fols. 28v–30r [< 1711]
  Text and Translation: Stone (infra).
- Paris, BNF cod. armen. 198 [olim ancien fonds armen. 98], pp. 41–44 [xviii]
  Text and Translation: Stone (infra).

1. Texts and Translations


V. The Vita of the Three Children

1. Texts and Translations

2. Secondary Studies


VI. Daniel Geomantic Texts


Excursus: Sundry Armenian Daniel Apocrypha


F.C. Conybeare describes this text as “The vision of Nabogodonosor, and Daniel’s interpretation thereof. Daniel’s death.” (*A Catalogue of Armenian Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London, 1913), 221). This text does not appear to be a copy of the *Somniale Danielis*. Is it another copy (or a different version) of the *Mors Danielis* in the *Names, Works, and Deaths of the Holy Prophets*?

ii. Paris, BNF cod. armen. 194 [olim suppl. armen. 39], fols. 45v–47v [xvii]

F. Macler describes this text as an “Extrait de Daniel sur le banquet de Balthasar” (*Catalogue des manuscrits arméniens et géorgiens* (Paris, 1908), 109). Given that Macler was quite familiar with the apocryphal Daniel apocalypses known in his day, including the Armenian *Seventh Vision of Daniel*, we must assume, then, that this Armenian text is either a copy of a portion of the Armenian version of Daniel 5 or a reworking (in whatever form) of that chapter.

iii. Portion of Daniel the Prophet

DANIEL APOCRYPHA PRESERVED PRIMARILY
IN THE SLAVONIC LANGUAGES

The full extent of the corpus of biblical apocrypha preserved or composed in the Slavonic languages is still unknown, and much work remains to be done, even at the most fundamental level of the identification of text and manuscript. To be sure, much was done, particularly by the great pre-Revolutionary Russian scholars, but this work is relatively unknown today.

This situation is changing, however. The rekindling of the spirit of the academy following the fall of the Soviet Union and the lifting of the Iron Curtain has precipitated much new scholarship, and Western scholars are rediscovering the breadth and depth of the old Russian and Eastern European collections of manuscripts. Note now the new collection of essays: Old Testament Apocrypha in the Slavonic Tradition: Continuity and Diversity (Edd. L. DiTommaso and C. Böttich; JSPSup; London/New York) [forthcoming].

All the same, it cannot be stressed strongly enough that the section below on the Daniel apocrypha preserved in the Slavonic languages very much represents a preliminary effort at cataloguing these texts. See also my comments in the introductory paragraphs to the list of the Greek apocalyptic texts attributed to Daniel, supra.

I. The Vision of the Prophet Daniel on the Emperors

Manuscripts:
  Text: Srečkovic (infra); Istrin 182 (infra), 260–263 [partial text, in parallel with part of the text from the Athos cod.;] Kaîmakamova (infra); Angelov (infra), 65–86; Tupkova-Zaimova/Miltenova, Историко-апокалипсичната книжина във Византия (infra), 118–124 [with translation and commentary].
  Translation: Pertusi (infra) [based on both MSS].
  Reference: Stojanović, L. Каталог Народне библиотеке у Београду. IV. Рукописи и старе штампане књиге. Beograd, 1903. 290–294 at 293; Bonwetsch (infra), 916; Tupkova-Zaimova/Miltenova, Palaeobulgarica (infra), 40.
  Note: This MS, a copy of the Ѕборник Попа Драголија, is now lost. I have reproduced the foliation as it is listed by Stojanović; others record it differently.
- Beograd, SANU cod. 56, fols. 185r–188r, 189r–v [xv–xviii]
  Text: Tupkova-Zaimova/Miltenova, Историко-апокалипсичната книжина във Византия (infra), 118–124 [variants in apparatus].
- Mount Athos, Monastery of Hilandarian 24, fols. 68ra–69vb [xii–xiii]
  Text: Istrin 184 (infra), 156–158; Lavrov (infra) [with variants from the lost Beograd MS].
  Translation: Alexander (infra) [with variants from the lost Beograd MS]; Pertusi (infra) [based on both MSS].
Daniel Apocrypha preserved in the Slavonic languages.

Sofia, Tsentura za slavjano-vizantijski prouchvaniia ‘Ivan Duichev’ cod. 17, fols. 15r–19r, 109r–110v [xviii]  
Text: Tupkova-Zaimova/Miltenova, Историко-апокалиптичната книжина във Византия (infra), 118–124 [variants in apparatus].  
Reference: Tupkova-Zaimova/Miltenova, Palaeobulgarica (infra), 40; Tupkova-Zaimova/Miltenova, Историко-апокалиптичната книжина във Византия (infra), 110.

Sofia, Narodna biblioteka “SS. Kiril i Metodi” cod. 309, fols. 154r–155v, 90r–v [xvi]  
Reference: Tupkova-Zaimova/Miltenova, Palaeobulgarica (infra), 40; Tupkova-Zaimova/Miltenova, Историко-апокалиптичната книжина във Византия (infra), 110.  
Note: This text is incomplete.  
Note: See also the note on the Interpretation of Daniel in the Excursus on “Sundry Slavonic Daniel Apocrypha,” infra.

Description of the Text: See Chapter Three, §2.13.

1. Texts, Textual Issues, and Translations

Alexander, P.J. “Appendix: English Translation of Slavonic Daniel.”  
Apud, for the most part, the text of P.A. Lavrov, SORYSAStP 67.3, infra.


Istrin, V.M. “Откровение Мефодия Патарского и апокрифическая видБния Даниил във византийской и славянорусской литературь. В. Тексты. II. ВидБния Даниил.” COIDRMoskva 184 (1898.1). Moskva, 1898. 135–162 at 156–158.


2. **Auxiliary Studies**


3. **Secondary Studies**


69–70. [rep., with introduction by D. Frankfurter. AART&T 24. Atlanta, 1999]]


Argues that the Greek original of the Slavonic \textit{Vision of Daniel} was composed by the future patriarch Methodius in the spring of 829.

\textbf{II. The Vision and Revelation of the Prophet Daniel}

See above, under “Daniel Apocrypha Preserved Primarily in Greek.”

\textbf{III. The Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel}

See above, under “Daniel Apocrypha Preserved Primarily in Greek.”

\textbf{Excursus: Sundry Slavonic Daniel Apocrypha}

\textit{i. The “Interpretation of Daniel”}

Many of the manuscripts which preserve the Slavonic \textit{Vision of the Prophet Daniel on the Emperors (supra)} also contain a composition titled the \textit{Interpretation of Daniel}. Among other places, this text appears embedded in P.S. Srecković’s edition of the


ii. Slavonic Legenda Concerning the Three Youths and the Fiery Furnace

In the first volume of his monumental Апокріфи і легенди Українських Рукомисів (Lvov, 1896), I. Franko lists three texts related to the story of the three youths: “Страсть св. трьох отрокь Ананій, Ананій, Азарія, Мисаила и Данила пророказ (307–312), “Память св. трех отрок и св. пророка Даниила [sic]” (312–315), and “Св. отрок Ананій, Азарій, Мисаила” (315–319).

iii. Daniel Apocrypha in the Palaea interpretata

F.J. Thomson observes that many apocrypha are extant in full or extensively quoted in the Slavonic Palaea interpretata, including the “Apocalypsis Danielis (BHG 1873–1874d)” (“The Nature and Reception of Christian Byzantine Culture in Russia in the Tenth to the Thirteenth Centuries and Its Implications for Russian Culture,” Slavica Gandensia 5 (1978), 107–139 at 108). I have not yet had occasion to examine the Palaea interpretata—which is to be distinguished from the Palaea historica—in any detail. In the first volume, however, of his monumental Апокріфи і легенди з Українських Рукомисів (Lvov, 1896), I. Franko lists several texts that are drawn from the Palaea, including one titled “Провидіння пророка Даниила о Навходоносоре” (319–320).
INDEXES

References in the footnotes to the ancient and mediaeval sources, manuscripts, modern authorities, and subjects are only cited when there is no explicit corresponding reference in the text to which the note refers.

1. Ancient and Mediaeval Sources

**HEBREW BIBLE (MT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genesis</th>
<th>Jeremiah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:1–4</td>
<td>14:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:3, 6–7</td>
<td>25:11–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31:10–13, 24</td>
<td>27:9–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–41</td>
<td>29:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29:21–23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41:1–15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:11</td>
<td>52:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:17</td>
<td>50 note 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:2</td>
<td>70 note 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39 note 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:11</td>
<td>1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:17</td>
<td>163; 449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33:2</td>
<td>1:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>163; 449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
<td>2:9–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:14–15</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>163; 449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua</td>
<td>10:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:1</td>
<td>163; 449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Samuel</td>
<td>10:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:6</td>
<td>163; 449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kings</td>
<td>14:14, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:5–15</td>
<td>50 note 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:20</td>
<td>43:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kings</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:6</td>
<td>3:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:8</td>
<td>245 note 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:11–13</td>
<td>119 note 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25:25–26</td>
<td>Proverbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:7</td>
<td>1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:11</td>
<td>13–14; 39–50; 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39:7</td>
<td>note 105; 83;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44:25</td>
<td>114; 170; 215;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44:28–45:7</td>
<td>248 notes 68–69;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45:1</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>218 note 539;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:7</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:11</td>
<td>245 note 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39:7</td>
<td>1–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44:25</td>
<td>2; 9 note 32;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44:28–45:7</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13–14; 39–50;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>note 103; 83;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>114; 170; 215;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>248 notes 68–69;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3:12 43 note 13

1:21

57; 61; 69; 76;

3:13–18 43

213 note 517

3:19–23 43

2–6

57; 62; 68 note

3:23–24 7

105; 80–81; 110;

3:24–25 43

208; 251 note 82

3:25 46 note 20

2

27; 41–42; 45

3:26–27 43

note 18; 63;

3:28–30 43

63–66; 67 note

3:31–6:29 10 note 33

102; 69–70; 74;

3:31–33 43

162 note 310;

3:31 251 note 33

208; 214 note

4:–6

4

523; 219; 223;

4 8; 39 note 2;

229; 245; 249;

43–45; 51; 53;

252; 253; 275;

67 note 102;

303 note 273;

80 note 148;

308 note 1; 310;

214 note 523;

312; 449; 470;

215 note 528;

495

245 note 54;

2:1

41; 69–70

247 note 62;

2:2–6

41

249; 251–252;

2:2

249

275; 303 note

2:4b

211 note 510

273; 308 note 1;

2:7–9

41

339

2:10–12

41

4:1–2 43–44

2:10

249

4:3–4 44

2:13–15

41

4:4 249; 274
INDEXES

4:5  40 note 4  6:26–28  48
4:6  40 note 4; 46  note 20; 251  7–12
4:7–14  44
4:15  40 note 4; 44
4:16  40 note 4; 44
4:17–22a  44
4:17–18  44 note 18
4:22b–24  44
4:25–27  45
4:27  44 note 18
4:28–30  45
4:31–33  45
4:34  45
5–9  69
5  45–47; 53; 7–8
66–67; 69; 86; 7
245 note 54;
246 note 57;
250; 252–253;
255; 256; 275;
308 note 1; 446;
492; 503
5:1  45  7:1  210
5:2–4  45  7:2–9  210
5:5–6  45  7:10  210
5:7–9  45–46  7:11–12  210
5:7  250; 274  7:13–14  210
5:8  250  7:14–15  210
5:10–12a  46  7:17–18  210–211
5:11  251; 274  7:18  216 note 529
5:12b–16  46  7:19–24  211
5:17  46  7:21  211 note 508
5:18–23  46  7:25–27  211
5:21  250  7:25  211 note 508;
5:24  46  216 note 529
5:25–28  46  216 note 529
5:29–31  47  7:27  88 note 5; 211;
6  47–48; 53; 64;
69; 71–74; 80; 6–10  107 note 67
86; 212; 213  8
note 519; 247
note 62; 255;
377; 446; 448
6:1  47; 73
6:2–4  47
6:5–6  47  8:1–2  39 note 1; 211
6:7–10  47  8:1  211 note 509
6:11–14  47  8:2  76 note 134
6:15–16  47  8:3–7  211
6:17–18  47  8:5  112
6:19–21  47  8:8–12  211
INDEXES

8:8 112; 162 note 10:10–13 213
     310 10:10 163
8:13–14 211 10:13 216 note 529
8:15–17 211 10:14 214
8:18–19 211–212 10:15 214
8:20–25 212 10:16–11:2a 214
8:21 112 10:20 214 note 524
8:25 216 note 529 11–12 10 note 33
8:26–27 212 11 107 note 67; 214
8:26 87; 257 note 11:1 72 note 118; 214
     100 note 524
9 39 note 1; 45 11:2b–20 214
     note 18; 55 note 11:2b 214 note 524
     53; 58 note 66; 11:21–31 214
     72; 199 note 11:32–39 214
     462; 200 note 11:32 216 note 530
     469; 208; 11:40–45 45 note 18; 214
     212–213; 216 12 62; 214–215; 223
     note 529; 218; 12:1 214; 216 note
     223; 255 529
9:1–2 212 12:2–3 214–215
9:1 39 note 1; 72 12:3 216 note 530
9:3–19 212 12:4 87; 215; 257
9:20–22 212 12:5–7 215
9:23–24 212 12:7 216 note 529
9:25–27 212–213 12:8–10 215; 216 note
10–12 39 note 1; 78; 530
     199 note 462; 12:11–13 215
     213–215; 223 12:11–12 3 note 7
     note 556; 255 12:13 213
10–11 223
10 213–214 Ezra
     10:1 3 note 6; 57 1:1–3 80 note 147
     note 59; 69; 76; 1:1–4 213 note 518
     102; 213 4:5–6 72 note 121
10:1–5 180 5:13–15 213 note 518
10:2–3 213 6:3–5 213 note 518
10:2 213 note 520
10:4 213 2 Chronicles
10:5–11:2a 214 note 524 36:8 58 note 65
10:5–11:2a 214 note 524 36:22–23 80 note 147; 213
10:5–9 213 note 518

Septuagint (OG and $\theta^\prime$)

Deuteronomy
32:20 132; 143
Ezekiel
25:16–17 97
1 Esdras
2:1–7 80 note 147

2 Esdras q.v. 4 Ezra

Baruch
1:3 152 note 266

Tobit
8:5 6 note 20
### INDEXES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daniel</th>
<th>Bel and the Dragon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 note 4; 50; 59 note 69; 62–63; 69–71; 81–82; 85; 274; 308–309</td>
<td>48–49; 52; 61; 72; 210 note 331–334; 335; 470</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1:20 | 249 note 70 Prayer of Azariah | 52; 53; 79; 331–334; |
| 3:1 | 70 | 331–334; |

| 4 | 80 note 148; 247 note 62; 249 note 73; 251–252 | Song of the Three 6 note 20; 52; 79; 331–334; |
| 4–6 | 49 | 334–335 |
| 4:1 | 70 note 113 Susanna | 4 note 12; |
| 5:30–31 | 72–73 | 48–49; 52; |
| 5:7 | 250 note 74 | 59–64; 86; 210 |
| 5:8 | 250 notes 75 and 77 | note 503; 302; 331–334; |
| 5:21 | 250 note 78 | 335–338 |
| 9:1 | 72 |
| 10:1 | 76; 213 note 517 | 1 Maccabees 2:59–60 | 4 note 13; 6 note 20 |

| Additions (collectively) | 6–7; 14; 32; 34; 48–49; 64; 81; 110; 114; 310; 312; 331–334 | 4 Maccabees 84 |

#### OTHER VERSIONS OR TRANSLATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daniel</th>
<th>Syro-Hexaplaric</th>
<th>62</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopic</td>
<td>Vulgate</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Latin</td>
<td>59 note 69</td>
<td>455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papyrus 967</td>
<td>63 note 84; 69; 70 note 110</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peshitta</td>
<td>121–122; 451</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ANCIENT NEAR EASTERN TEXTS

**Iqqur Ïpuï**
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### CLASSICAL TEXTS

**Cicero**

*De re publica* 244–246

*Somnium Scipionem* *q.v.* *De re publica* 246–247

**Macrobius, Commentary**

*On the Somnium Scipionem*

**Herodotus**

*Histories* 79 note 146

**Virgil**

*Georgics* 264

**Hesiod**

*Works and Days* 264
### Ancient Jewish Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Notes/Sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apocalypse of Abraham</strong></td>
<td>219 notes 543–544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apocalypse of Moses</strong></td>
<td>219 note 543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aristaeas, Letter of</strong></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Baruch</strong></td>
<td>27 note 81; 77; note 135; 119; 140; 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Baruch</strong></td>
<td>77 note 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dead Sea Scrolls</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesis Apocryphon</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Scroll</td>
<td>106 note 66; 292 note 232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hodayot</strong></td>
<td>54 note 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4Q116</strong></td>
<td>3 note 9; 10; note 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4Q174</strong></td>
<td>1 note 1; 87; note 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4Q242–246 (4QPseudo-Daniel, collectively)</strong></td>
<td>27; 28; 30; 206–209; 7–8; 49; 51; 52; 53; 80 note 134; 81 note 150; 206–318–322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4Q242</strong></td>
<td>7–8; 49; 51; 52; 53; 80 note 134; 81 note 150; 206–318–322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4Q243/244</strong></td>
<td>7–8; 46 note 20; 52; 81 note 150; 206–208; 312; 322–325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4Q245</strong></td>
<td>7, 8–9; 208–209; 322–325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4Q246</strong></td>
<td>8; 209; 325–330; 8 note 26; 4 note 12; 7 note 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temple Scroll</strong></td>
<td>54 note 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Enoch</strong></td>
<td>27 note 81; 50; note 30; 106; 107 note 67; 119 note 117; 217 note 537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Ezra</strong></td>
<td>27 note 81; 74–75; 106; 107 note 67; 119–120; 140; 177; 213 note 516; 220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questions of Ezra</strong></td>
<td>54 note 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Josephus Antiquities</strong></td>
<td>1 note 1; 9–10; 40; 51; 53 note 42; 58; 61; 64–65; 72–73; 76; 83 note 154; 84–85; 269; 338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jubilees</strong></td>
<td>50 note 30; 51; 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Letter of Aristeas</strong></td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psalms of Solomon</strong></td>
<td>54 note 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pseudo-Philo, LAB</strong></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sibylline Oracles (original Jewish oracles)</strong></td>
<td>140; 219 note 55; 544</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Testament

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Notes/Sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matthew</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:20–24</td>
<td>245 note 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:13–15</td>
<td>245 note 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:15</td>
<td>1 note 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24:15–16</td>
<td>87 note 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10</td>
<td>245 note 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:16–19</td>
<td>274; 305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:1</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:1–12</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Late Antique and Early Mediaeval Authors and Texts

For pre-modern commentaries, *scholia*, and *postilla* on the Book of Daniel, *q.v.* under the authors’ names in Index 4, *infra*, “Subject Index.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
<th>Index/Note</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acta Pauli</td>
<td>85 note 159</td>
<td>Le livre des expositions</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Andrew Salos Apocalypse”</td>
<td></td>
<td>et significacions des</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>songes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apocalypse of Adam (NHC)</td>
<td>219 notes</td>
<td>Historia de Daniel</td>
<td>65; 79; 446–448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Hebrew)</td>
<td>543–544</td>
<td>representanda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apocalypse of Elijah</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Interpretation of Daniel</td>
<td>507–508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Apocalypse of Enoch”</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>Kutāb al-Fitan</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apocalypse of Shenute II</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>Kutāb al-malāḥim</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azariah (Old English)</td>
<td>79; 486; 491–492</td>
<td>König Tyro von Schotten und</td>
<td>21; 496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pridebrand sin Sun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book of the Bee</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>Leonis Constantinopolitani</td>
<td>144–145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>de fine mundi homilia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book of Medicines</td>
<td>278 note 181;</td>
<td>Life of St. Andrew the Fool</td>
<td>132 note 179;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>284 note 204;</td>
<td></td>
<td>170; 192; 228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cave of Treasures</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>Life of St. Euthymius</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ and Satan</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>Ludus Danielis</td>
<td>52; 54 note 48;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66; 79; 446–448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronicles of Jerahmeel</td>
<td>46 note 19; 58;</td>
<td>Malalas, John</td>
<td>21; 53; 73; 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63; 77; 85; 344;</td>
<td>Chronography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>461–462</td>
<td>Mansions of the Moon</td>
<td>257; 287; 298; note 265; 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanness</td>
<td>492–493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel (Old English)</td>
<td>53; 59; 65; 486–491</td>
<td>Mors Danielis (Armenian)</td>
<td>53; 502; 503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Die drei Jünglinge im Feuerofen</td>
<td>79; 497</td>
<td>Mors Danielis (Irish)</td>
<td>53; 59; 76–77; 494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dies Aegyptiaci</td>
<td>258; 263 note 124;270</td>
<td>Oracles of Leo the Wise</td>
<td>95; 97–98; 145 note 222; 203; 348–349; 352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exodus (Old English)</td>
<td>486</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEXES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ordo prophetarum</th>
<th>79</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palaea historica</td>
<td>53; 377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palaea interpretata</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passion of Daniel and the Three Children</td>
<td>78–79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pistil of Sweeete Susan</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portion of Daniel the Prophet</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Povest’o Car’grade</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prophecy of Constantine the Great</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qur’ān</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revelations/Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodius (translation/recension non-specific)</td>
<td>28; 98 note 32; 108; 116–119; 125; 133 note 183; 134; 136; 142; 149–150; 161; 203; 205; 223; 224–230 passim; 348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rauðhilfs þáttr</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sefer ha-Yashar</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sefer Yosippon</td>
<td>58 note 61; 461–462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibylline Oracles (including collections attributed to the various Sibyls)</td>
<td>219–220 note 544; 314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sogdian Daniel fragment</td>
<td>53; 498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storia Lune</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supputatio Esdrae</td>
<td>232; 260 note 111; 263 note 124; 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syriac Alexander Legend</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylonian Talmud b. Sanhedrin</td>
<td>79; 119 note 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testament of Adam</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testaments of the XII Patriarchs</td>
<td>220 note 545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatise of Shem</td>
<td>236 note 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitae of the Three Children</td>
<td>78; 502–503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitae prophetarum (including the Vita Danielis)</td>
<td>9; 12; 40 note 4; 53; 59; 65; 76; 79; 87; 339–345; 451; 455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Žbornik Popa Dragolia</td>
<td>146–147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Daniel Apocalypses and Apocalyptic Oracles

These texts are listed in the order in which they are discussed in Chapter Three (identified by section and sub-section).

(Greek) Apocalypse (or Vision) of Daniel (as a generic term) | Daniel Apocalypses and Apocalyptic Oracles | The Vision of Daniel on the Blond Race (§2.2) 96; 99–100; 126; 205; 351 |
| The Vision of Daniel on the Island of Cyprus (§2.1) 95 note 28; 96; 97–99; 100; 127 and 127 note 151; 128 note 153; 129; 178; 189 note 417; 205; 226; 348–350 |
| The Seventh Vision of Daniel (§2.3) 6 note 18; 92 note 22; 93 note 24; 96; 99; 100–108; 116; 137 note 194; 142; 155 note 274; 200; 204 notes 481–482; 205; 207 |
INDEXES

note 491; 225–228 passim; 230; 499–502; 503

The Vision of the Young Daniel (§2.4)
10 note 33; 24; 28; 93 notes 23–24; 96; 108; 108–113; 121–123; 177; 204 note 481; 22 note 553; 226; 451–452

The Revelation of Daniel the Prophet in the Land of Persia and Elam (§2.5)
28; 29; 34; 39 note 1; 53; 66; 73; 77–78; 80; 83; 95 note 28; 96; 110–113; 113–123; 141 note 207; 150 note 251; 152; 177; 184; 204 note 481; 218 note 540; 222 note 553; 452–453

The Visions of Daniel and Other Holy Men (§2.6) 96; 123–125; 191 note 435; 224 note 558; 351–353

The Oracle of the Prophet Daniel on Byzantium (§2.7) 96; 125–126; 201 note 471; 206; 353

The Proclamation of the Prophet Daniel (§2.8) 96; 126; 200 note 467; 353–354

The Vision of Daniel on the Seven-Hilled City (§2.9) 95 note 28; 96; 97; 124; 125; 126–130; 144 note 220; 192; 351–352; 354–356

Diegesis Danielis (§2.10) 24; 93 note 24; 95 note 28; 96; 105; 118 note 107; 120 note 121; 130 note 165; 130–141; 141–144; 145; 151; 154 note 272; 166 note 324; 167; 223; 226; 243; 347; 356–359

The Vision and Revelation of Daniel (§2.11) 96; 102; 131; 133 note 183; 134 note 184; 135; 140; 141–144; 145 note 226; 151; 166 note 324; 204 note 482; 359–360

The Word of Daniel on the End of the World (§2.12) 96; 139; 144–145; 155 note 276; 360–361

The Vision of the Prophet Daniel on the Emperors (§2.13) 92 note 22; 96; 118 note 107; 125 note 139; 141; 145–151; 157; 161 note 306; 189; 191 note 435; 204 note 482; 226; 230; 504–507; 508

Qissa-yi Daniyà (§2.14) 39 note 1; 52; 58; 66–67; 73; 78; 83; 96; 113; 119; 151–154; 218 note 540; 227; 228; 463–466; 501

Discourses of John Chrysostom Concerning the Vision of Daniel (§2.15) 96; 118 note 107; 144 note 217; 149; 155–158; 159; 161–162; 225–228 passim; 360; 362–363

The Vision of Daniel On the Last Times and the End of the World (§2.16) 96; 125 note 139; 142; 149 note 250; 155; 158–162; 187 note 410; 187–188 note 412; 191 note 435; 225–228 passim; 364–365

The Vision of Daniel by the River Kebar (§2.17) 88 note 5; 93 note 23; 96; 162–170; 218 note 539; 228; 449; 459–461

The Apocalypse of Daniel on the Events after al-Mu’tamid (§2.18) 34; 89 note 11; 96; 171–174; 204 note 481; 292; 471

The Vision of Daniel as Related to Ezra, His Pupil (§2.19) 96; 102; 173; 174–177; 185; 204 note 481; 229; 471–472

The Vision of Daniel on the Island of Crete (§2.20) 95 note 28; 97; 129; 178–179; 365–366

The Fourteenth Vision of Daniel (§2.21) 88 note 5; 90 note 11; 97; 177; 179–184; 204 note 481; 227; 456–458

Nevu’ot Daniel (§2.22) 87 note 2; 93 note 23; 97; 154; 184–185; 200; 461

The Last Vision of the Prophet Daniel (§2.23) 91 note 14; 97; 98 note 34; 108; 125 note 139; 141 note 212; 147–148; 155; 159–160; 178;
INDEXES

186–192; 200; 201; 225–228 \textit{passim}; 230; 243; 281; 347; 366–374; 502 \textit{Dāniyāl-nāma} (§2.24) 97; 114; 193; 201 note 471; 466–468

Daniel Prognostica

\textit{Daniel geomantica} (collectively) 293–295; 468–469

\textit{Kitāb al-Jafar} 296–297; 482–483

\textit{Kitāb al-üşūl li-Dāniyāl al-ḥakīm} 295–296; 482

\textit{Lunationes Danielis} 14 note 43; 18; 19; 32–33; 87–88; 114 note 96; 174; 232–233; 254; 258; 259–279; 280; 283–285; 286; 295 note 247; 297; 298–307 \textit{passim}; 312; 347; 472; 479

\textit{Malḥamat Dāniyāl} 18; 173; 174; 208; 233; 236 note 15; 268–269; 282–283; 285–293; 294; 298–307 \textit{passim}; 312; 453; 472–481

\textit{Praedictiones Danielis} 18; 92 note 20; 114 note 96; 174; 205 note 483; 233; 254; 279–283; 315; 345–347

\textit{Praedictiones Danielis} as possibly \textit{Malḥamat Dāniyāl} 282–283; 286; 289; 292; 307 note 284; 472

\textit{Quʾat Dāniyāl} 295; 483

Somniale Danielis 12; 14 note 43; 18; 19; 32–33; 34; 87–88; 114 note 96; 174; 188 note 412; 232–233; 236–259; 260 note 111; 259–277 \textit{passim}; 280; 283–285; 286; 295–296; 298–307 \textit{passim}; 312; 313; 347; 449; 479; 498

Modern Texts

\textit{The Book of Mormon} 15 note 45
\textit{Science and Health} 15 note 45

\textit{The Divine Principle} 15 note 45
\textit{Testament of Alexander} 15 note 45; 149 note 248

2. Manuscripts Cited

For the list of abbreviations of major libraries, museums, and other manuscript repositories, see the section in the Introduction on “Abbreviations,” xvii–xx at xviii.

Aberystwyth
Llyfrgell Genedlaethol Cymru
cod. Llanstephan 27 391; 438
cod. Llanstephan 38 439
cod. Peniarth 26 277 note 178; 405
cod. Porkington 10 439

Alger
Bibliothèque Publique
cod. arab. 1517 291 note 229; 474
cod. arab. 1518 291 note 229; 474

Andros Hagia
MS 9 360

Ankara
MS Is. Saib
Sincer I, 312 474
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEXES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athínai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliothecae Societatis Historicae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnikē Bibliothēkē tēs Hellados</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 1265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 1275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 2187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 2605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bamberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staatsbibliothek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. L.III 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(cod. ?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitätsbibliothek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS B VII 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS D I 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beograd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narodna Biblioteka Srbije</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Phillipps 1479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Phillipps 1574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Phillipps 1790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Phillipps 4156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBPK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. arab. 4289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. arab. 5912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. arab. 5913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. arab. 5914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. arab. 5915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Diez A. 4°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. fr. 4° 968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. germ. 2° 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. germ. 8° 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. germ. 8° 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. germ. 8° 477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. gr. 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. lat. 2° 186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. lat. 4° 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. lat. 8° 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. lat. 8° 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. orient. 4° 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. theol. 4° 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turfän MS C22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgerbibliothek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS 441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beograd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stadtbibliothek Bongarsiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernkastel-Kues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Nicolaus Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS 203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethesda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Library of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Phillipps 1479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Phillipps 1574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Phillipps 1790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Phillipps 4156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selly Oak (Mingana) Arabic (Islamic) Add. 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>891 I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Arab. Add. 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Arab. Syriac 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syriac 191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syriac 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syriac 436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syriac 567</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Boston

Public Library cod. G.401.12 | 380 |

Brugge [private] | 439 |

Bruxelles

Bibliothèque Royale cod. 10574–85 | 392 |
Bibliothèque royale des Ducs de Bourgogne cod. 2367 | 380 |
cod. 11016 | 498 |

Budapest

Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum cod. 59 | 380 |
cod. 405 | 380 |
Országos Széchényi Könyvtár cod. germ. 5 | 439 |
cod. germ. 56 | 439 |
cod. lat. 59 | 407 |
cod. lat. 405 | 407 |

Caen

Bibliothèque Municipale MS 589 | 393 |

Cairo

Coptic Patriarchate Library cod. 776 | 483; 484 |
cod. Theol. 260 | 288; 290 |
note 225 |

Dār māqāt 132 | 475 |

Egyptian National Library MS K 3862 | 475 |
MS S 4467 | 475 |
MS TJF 12 | 473 |
Sbath MSS q.v. Città del Vaticano cod. Oriental | 1258 | 475 |
T-S H12.8 | 459 |
T-S H12.9 | 459 |

Calcutta

Asiatic Society MS J.9 | 294 note 242; 468 |
MS J.16 | 294 note 241; 468 |

Cardiff

Public Library cod. 3.242 + 5.99 | 408 |

Cambridge

CCC cod. 37 | 278 note 181 |
cod. 301 | 380 |
cod. 391 | 407; 432 |
cod. 422 | 407; 432 |
cod. 466 | 255; 272 |
note 157; 380; 407 |
cod. 481 | 380; 407 |

Gonville and Caius College cod. 457/395 | 436 |

Magdelene College cod. Pepys 1236 | 436 |
PC cod. 103 | 380; 408 |

Peterhouse MS 222 | 380 |
St. John’s College cod. L.10 | 436 |

TC cod. O.1.13 | 408; 436 |
cod. O.1.57 | 380 |
cod. O.7.23 | 266 |
cod. O.8.21 | 380 |
cod. O.8.33 | 144–145; 360 |

UL cod. Gg.i.1 | 380 |
cod. Li.vi.17 | 381; 449 |
cod. Li.4.12 | 281 note 194; 346 |

Cambridge, MA Harvard University cod. syr. 42 | 113; 452 |
cod. syr. 161 | 297; 454 |
Carpentras
MS lat. 337 402

Coburg
Landesbibliothek
cod. 5 392

Crete
Brontisi Monastery
cod. (?) 178; 365

Dimashq
Zāhirīya Library
MS 3585 475
MS 5039 475
MS 5600 476
MS 6263 476
MS 6271 476
MS 6860 476
MS 7845 476

Donaueschingen
Hofbibliothek
cod. 793 381

Dresden
Öffentliche Bibliothek
cod. Da 53 128; 354

Dublin
Royal Irish Academy
MS 23 P16 494
Trinity College
cod. H.3.17 391

Durham
University Library
cod. Or./Arab. 10 476

Edinburgh
Royal Observatory
cod. Cr.4.6 439
University Library
MS 329 439

Einsiedeln
cod. 321 408

Erevan
MS Mat. 562 502

Erfurt
WBS
cod. Amplonian
2° 276 408–409

cod. Amplonian
4° 21 381

cod. Amplonian
4° 186 381

cod. Amplonian
4° 330 277 note 178; 409

Erlangen
Universitätsbibliothek
cod. 90 381
cod. 673 381
cod. 674 409

Firenze
BML

cod. Ashburnham
130 267 note 143; 409

cod. Ashburnham
204 267 note 143;
277 note 176;
409

cod. Ashburnham
1724 381

cod. Strozzi 70 264 note 129;
409–410

Biblioteca Riccardiana
cod. 859 381; 393
cod. 1258 393

Gent
Universiteitsbibliotheek
MS 5 (416) 265 note 134;
410

MS 697 439

Göteborg
MS X 410

Gotha
Herzoglichen Bibliothek
cod. 1464 476
cod. 1465 476

Landesbibliothek
cod. chart 2° 439

Gottweig
Stiftsbibliothek
cod. 429 (207) 381

Hamburg
Staatsbibliothek
cod. Hans. IV.15 410
Jerusalem
Hebrew University
Ben-Zvi Institute
3203 307 note 284
MS H2680 193; 466

Patriarchikē Bibliothēkē

cod. Sabaitikos

gr. 128 126 note 146;
gr. 144 note 220;
gr. 155 note 276;
366

cod. Sabaitikos

gr. 697 375
cod. S. Sepulcri

121 375
cod. 244 375

Herton
Bibliothek des Grafen
Nesselrode-Reichenstein

cod. med.

Hertensis 192 278 note 181;
410

Hildesheim
Dombibliothek

MS 749 410

Huntington
Huntington Library

cod. HM 64 436
cod. HM 83 439

Istanbul
Atif Mustafa Efendi Küütüphanesi

MS 1164 476
MS 1722 476

Aya Sofya

MS 2684 476

Bağdatlı Vehbi Küütüphanesi

MS 2234 295 note 251;
476

Hekim Oğlu [Hekimoğlu] Ali Pasha

MS 572 476
MS 574 476

Nuruosmaniye Külliyesi

MS 2796 476

Suleymaniye bib. šehit Ali

MS 2002 476

Veliüddin Efendi

MS 2291 476
MS 2294 476

København
Det kongelige Bibliotek

cod. 1653 411
cod. 1664 440
cod. Thott. 675 440

UB

cod. Arnamagnaen

45 411
cod. Arnamagnaen

194 441
cod. Arnamagnaen

245 441
cod. Arnamagnaen

434 441
cod. Arnamagnaen

764 391

Konya
Kitaplıgı Yûsuf Ağa [Yusufağa]

MS 5006 476
MS 6462 476
Krakow
Biblioteka Jagiellońska

cod. 813 381

Leeds
MS syr. 4 342
University of Leeds, Department of Semitic Languages
MS or. 72 476–477

Leicester
Old Town Hall Library

cod. 4 381

Leiden
Universiteitsbibliotheek

cod. Or. 11.066 477

cod. Or. 12.050 477

cod. Vossiani
lat. O.52 381

cod. Vossiani
chy. Q.33 261 note 113

Leipzig
U-B

cod. 936 381

London
BL

cod. Add. 7473 296–297; 482

cod. Add. 9067 491

cod. Add. 9702 293; 468

cod. Add. 12178 342

cod. Add. 14536 342

cod. Add. 14614 343

cod. Add. 15236 267 note 143;
277 note 175;
381–382; 411

cod. Add. 17193 342

cod. Add. 18715 108; 451

cod. Add. 25881 188 note 418;
190 note 431;
366

cod. Arundel 60 432

cod. Cotton
Caligula A.xv 411; 432–433

cod. Cotton
Tiberius A.iii 239; 262 note
122; 273 note
164; 382;
389; 411–413;
433–435

cod. Cotton Titus
D.xxvi 234 note 94;
258 note 107;
382–383;
413–414

cod. Cotton Titus
D.xxvii 258 note 107;
414–415

cod. Cotton Vesp.
D.xiv 493

cod. Cotton Vesp.
E.x 415

cod. Egerton 82 383

cod. Egerton 708 503

cod. Egerton 821 262 note 112;
277 note 175;
415

cod. Egerton 827 436

cod. Egerton 847 383; 415

cod. Egerton 2615 446

cod. Egerton 2852 415

cod. Harley 978 416

cod. Harley 1735 436

cod. Harley 2253 243 note 47;
391

cod. Harley 2320 436

cod. Harley 2558 383; 416

cod. Harley 3017 232 note 6;
237 note 19;
239; 273 note
162; 383; 416

cod. Harley 3271 416–417

cod. Harley 3725 436

cod. Harley 5632 366

cod. Harley 5686 283 note 201

cod. Harley 5734 188; 366; 375

cod. Lansdowne 388 391

cod. Or. 426 q.v. cod. Add.
7473

cod. Or. 496 12 note 38;
455

cod. Or. 1314 179–180; 183
note 395; 456

cod. Or. 1325 458

cod. Or. 2084 473

cod. Or. 2313 453

cod. Or. 2624 284 note 202

cod. Or. 4434 473

cod. Or. 4743 193; 466

cod. Or. 5907 477

cod. Or. 11044 479
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cod. Royal 8.E.x</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Royal 12.C.xii</td>
<td>383, 441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Royal 12.E.xvi</td>
<td>391, 437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Royal 13.D.i</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Royal 16.C.ii</td>
<td>262 note 119; 348, 404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Royal 16.E.viii</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Royal 17.A.iii</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Royal 17.C.xv</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Sloane 122</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Sloane 213</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Sloane 282</td>
<td>267 note 143; 277 note 178; 417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Sloane 297</td>
<td>417; 437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Sloane 475</td>
<td>383; 417–418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Sloane 635</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Sloane 783b</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Sloane 963</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Sloane 989</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Sloane 1009</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Sloane 1315</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Sloane 1609</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Sloane 2030</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Sloane 2561</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Sloane 2641</td>
<td>267 note 143; 277 note 175; 278; 418–419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Sloane 3281</td>
<td>384; 393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Sloane 3285</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Sloane 3542</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS 129</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS 596</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambeth Archiepiscopal Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. arm. 1209</td>
<td>101 note 50; 499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal College of Physicians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 229</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 358</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Society of Antiquaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 306</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellcome Medical Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 411</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 508</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 517</td>
<td>384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 588</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucca</td>
<td>Biblioteca Governativa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 296</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lvov</td>
<td>Narodna Biblioteka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. A.C.</td>
<td>Petrushevich 370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>Biblioteca Nacional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 4616</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 10063</td>
<td>384; 404; 419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escorial</td>
<td>MS I.R.14  404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>Chetham’s Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 11380</td>
<td>273 note 164; 384; 419–420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 419</td>
<td>179; 456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Eng. 404</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melk</td>
<td>Benediktinerstift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 728</td>
<td>241 note 41; 384; 419–420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milano</td>
<td>BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. D.137 sup.</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. E.11 sup</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. E.16 sup</td>
<td>280 note 191; 404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Stranieri 32</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modena</td>
<td>Biblioteca Estense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. lat. 697</td>
<td>267 note 143; 277 note 175; 384; 420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montpellier</td>
<td>Bibliothèque de la Faculté</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Stranieri 32</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moskva</td>
<td>Chudov Monastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 62</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

passim
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indexes</th>
<th>525</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gos. istoricheskii muzeii</td>
<td>cod. gr. 154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Khudov 241</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossiiskii Gos. biblioteka</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“MS 43”</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Undolski 1</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graf Tolstoy (?)</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 4622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.56</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Athos</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 4636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monastery of Dionysos</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 5005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 159</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 5032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 167</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 5125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monastery of Hilandarion</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 6382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 24</td>
<td>232 note 6;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141 note 209;</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 146; 148; 504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monastery of Iviron</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 7520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 181</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 7746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 207</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 7806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 383</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 604</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 10172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 686</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 14111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 751</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 14506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monastery of Koutloumousion</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 14706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 217</td>
<td>277 note 175;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 220</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188; 366; 376</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 15613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100; 351; 376</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monastery of Pantaleimon</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 16521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 97</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 17188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190; 370</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 18921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monastery of Vatopedion</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 25005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 754</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 26593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100; 351</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 26713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monastery of Xiropotamos</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 27305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 248</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128; 355; 376</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 25005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Sinai</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 26639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monastery of Saint Catherine</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 26713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 495</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 27305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 548</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>München</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSB</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. arab. 148</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 26639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. germ. mon. 270</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 26713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. germ. mon. 597</td>
<td>cod. lat. mon. 27305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. germ. mon. 725</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. germ. mon. 5250/26</td>
<td>cod. 4° 649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 4° 808</td>
<td>385; 422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEXES

cod. 8° 179 392
cod. 8° 339 277 note 175; 422

Napoli
Biblioteca nazionale
cod. II.C.3 404

New Haven
Yale University, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library
cod. 163 255 note 96; 272 note 158; 273 note 163; 393; 422
cod. 395 267 note 143; 422; 441

cod. Barocci 145 98–99 and note 34; 123–124; 127–128; 178 note 369; 188–189 note 417; 191 note 434; 348; 351–352; 354; 367; 374
cod. Barocci 148 187 note 407; 374

cod. Barocci 170 98
cod. Bodley 177 385
cod. Bodley 579 423
cod. Bodley 581 385
cod. Bodley 591 438
cod. Bodley 2797 344
cod. Canonicius gr. 19 130–141 passim; 356

cod. Copt. 2 284 note 203
cod. Digby 67 438
cod. Digby 81 385
cod. Digby 86 385; 442
cod. Digby 88 438
cod. Douce 84 438
cod. Douce 381 438
cod. Hatton 115 390; 435
cod. Heb. 2642 162 note 310
cod. Holkham gr. 26 376
cod. Hunt 456 477
cod. Hyde 32 477
cod. Junius 11 486
cod. Junius 43 423; 435

cod. Laudianus gr. 27 123–124; 128; 352; 354

cod. Lyell 35 386
cod. Lyell 36 424
cod. Marsh 513 477
cod. Or. 436 477
cod. Rawlinson B.502 494
cod. Selden superius 15 453

Nürnberg
Germanisches Nationalmuseum
cod. 6284 392; 440
cod. 6285 392

Oudenaarde
Stadsarchief
MS 5556/13 440

Oxford
All Souls College
cod. 81 237 note 17; 239; 385
cod. 332 422
Balliol College
cod. 354 493
Bod.
cod. armen. e.12 469
cod. armen. f.10 283–284 note 202
cod. Ashmole 189 437
cod. Ashmole 342 422; 442
cod. Ashmole 346 437
cod. Ashmole 361 267–268; 270; 423
cod. Ashmole 391 437–438
cod. Ashmole 1444 438
cod. Ashmole 1481 438
cod. Auct. T.V.8 346
cod. Barocci 148 187 note 407; 374

cod. Barocci 170 98
cod. Bodley 177 385
cod. Bodley 579 423
cod. Bodley 581 385
cod. Bodley 591 438
cod. Bodley 2797 344
cod. Canonicius gr. 19 130–141 passim; 356

cod. Copt. 2 284 note 203
cod. Digby 67 438
cod. Digby 81 385
cod. Digby 86 385; 442
cod. Digby 88 438
cod. Douce 84 438
cod. Douce 381 438
cod. Hatton 115 390; 435
cod. Heb. 2642 162 note 310
cod. Holkham gr. 26 376
cod. Hunt 456 477
cod. Hyde 32 477
cod. Junius 11 486
cod. Junius 43 423; 435

cod. Laudianus gr. 27 123–124; 128; 352; 354

cod. Lyell 35 386
cod. Lyell 36 424
cod. Marsh 513 477
cod. Or. 436 477
cod. Rawlinson B.502 494
cod. Selden superius 15 453
INDEXES

cod. Selden Supra
74  386

cod. Whinfield 8  297; 470

cod. Syr. 115  473

cod. Syr. 116  473

cod. Syr. 118  q.v. cod. Selden superius 15

St. John’s College
MS 17  424

Palermo
Biblioteca nazionale
cod. I.E.8  98; 348–349; 355

cod. lat. 3599  386

cod. lat. 3642  386

cod. lat. 3915  448

cod. lat. 3920  448

Paris
Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal
cod. 873  386; 424

cod. 2872  298 note 265; 424; 450

Bibliothèque Mazarine
cod. lat. 3599  386

cod. lat. 3642  386

cod. lat. 3915  448

cod. lat. 3920  448

BNF
cod. a.f. lat. 1007  386
“cod. arab. 107”  175–176

cod. arab. 150  175–176; 471

cod. arab. 2524  477

cod. arab. 2593  477

cod. arab. 2633  477; 479

cod. arab. 4605  269; 484

cod. arab. 4716  477–478

cod. armen. 194  503

cod. armen. 198  502

cod. armen. 307  283 note 202

cod. fr. 1317  259 note 107; 402

cod. fr. 1553  393

cod. fr. 2043  442

cod. fr. 6793  442

cod. fr. 12786  393

cod. fr. 24432  402

cod. gr. 947  98; 159–160; 186–187; 187 note 412; 348; 367

cod. gr. 1115  339

cod. gr. 1295  374

cod. gr. 1884  404

cod. gr. 2180  159–160; 187 note 412; 348; 367

cod. gr. 2316  281–282; 346

cod. gr. 2494  346

cod. gr. 2511  237 note 19; 379

cod. hèb. 128  151; 463

cod. hèb. 326  344

cod. lat. 1845  386

cod. lat. 2113  425

cod. lat. 2825  425

cod. lat. 3660  267 note 143; 277 note 177; 425

cod. lat. 4147  267 note 143; 277 note 175; 425

cod. lat. 6882  425

cod. lat. 7349  386; 426

cod. lat. 7453  426

cod. lat. 11218  264 note 129; 426

cod. lat. 11331  446

cod. lat. 14068  386

cod. lat. 15173  386

cod. lat. 16208  242 note 43

cod. lat. 18415  387

cod. n.a. lat. 299  278 note 182

cod. n.a. lat. 356  426

cod. n.a. lat. 456  278 note 182

cod. n.a. lat. 1616  264 note 129; 426

cod. pers. 2406  479

cod. suppl. gr. 82  128; 354

cod. suppl. gr. 467  367

cod. suppl. gr. 1148  346–347

cod. turc suppl.  245  298; 485

fonds Coislin 224  340

Saint-Germain-des-près
MS 21  179; 456

Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève

cod. fr. 2255  393

Patmos
Monastery of St. John
cod. 529  188; 369

cod. 548  374

Praha
Archivium Capituli Metropolitani
cod. 503  387
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Codex Reference</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Českém Krumlově</td>
<td>cod. A 17 387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Národního Musea</td>
<td>cod. IX.A.44 190; 370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. XIV.A.12 426</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>University Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrett MS 141 265 note 136;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>cod. Cron 389</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. Bute 98; 137 note 193; 349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petronellier 'Circa-instans'</td>
<td>392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. A. Conrady of Leipzig 389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qumran</td>
<td>4Q116 3 note 9; 10 note 33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q174 1 note 1; 87 note 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q242 318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q243/244 322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q245 322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q246 322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q548 8 note 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q551 4 note 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q552/553 7 note 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emanuele cod. 1511 387</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Gallen</td>
<td>SB cod. 44 264 note 129;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 304 387; 426–427</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 751 264 note 129; 273 note 161; 427</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 756 427</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 878 278 note 183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 1050 387</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salamanca</td>
<td>Biblioteca Universitaria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod. 2262 387</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sankt Petersburg</td>
<td>Academicus Musaei Paleographici</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cod.? 347</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblioteka Akademicka Nauk cod. 13.3.19 370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bib. Publicae cod. 575 279 note 187; 347</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown 461</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qumran</td>
<td>4Q116 3 note 9; 10 note 33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q174 1 note 1; 87 note 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q242 318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q243/244 322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q245 322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q246 322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q548 8 note 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q551 4 note 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q552/553 7 note 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma</td>
<td>Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emanuele cod. 1511 387</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofia</td>
<td>“SS. Kiril i Metodić”</td>
<td>cod. 309 505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narodna biblioteka Tsentūra za slavînovo-vizantîski prouchvaniîa ‘Ivan Duîchev’ cod. 17 505</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockholm</td>
<td>Kungliga Biblioteket MS D4 387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuttgart</td>
<td>Württembergische Landesbibliothek cod. hist. 2° 415 278 note 183</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunís</td>
<td>Bibliothèque Nationale MS 08910/3 478</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Cod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uppsala</td>
<td>Universitetsbibliotek</td>
<td>B.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utrecht</td>
<td>16° MS 1355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utrecht</td>
<td>16° MS 1355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Città del Vaticano</td>
<td>BAV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Barb.</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Barb. gr. 284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Barb. pers. 533</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Ottob. gr. 260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Ottob. gr. 415</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Ottob. gr. 418</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Pal. gr. 319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Pal. gr. 363</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Pal. lat. 235</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Pal. lat. 485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Pal. lat. 834</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Pal. lat. 1030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Pal. lat. 1080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Pal. lat. 1234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Pal. lat. 1321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Pal. lat. 1449</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Pal. lat. 1880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Reg. lat. 567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Reg. lat. 846</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Reg. lat. 1420</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Urb. lat. 1398</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Urb. lat. 1439</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Vat. arab. 416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Vat. arab. 955</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Vat. arab. 1106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Vat. ar. 1665</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Vat. hebr. 285</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Vat. gr. 695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Vat. lat. 1700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Vat. lat. 1865</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Vat. lat. 2125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Vat. lat. 642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Vat. lat. 687</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Vat. lat. 1548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Vat. lat. 3101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Vat. lat. 6297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Vat. lat. 12107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Vat. pers. 107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Vat. syr. 217 (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Vat. lat. 276 note 172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Vat. lat. 277 note 174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Vat. lat. 388</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Vat. lat. 430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Vat. lat. 888</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Vat. lat. 1085</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Vat. lat. 1245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Vat. lat. 1321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Vat. lat. 1449</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Vat. lat. 1880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Reg. lat. 567</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Reg. lat. 1080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Reg. lat. 1321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Reg. lat. 1449</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Reg. lat. 1880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Reg. lat. 245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indexes**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Cod.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Venezia</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. gr. II.101</td>
<td>361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. gr. II.125</td>
<td>159-160; 186-187; 190-191; 368</td>
<td>note 412; (M. 92); (M. 136)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. gr. III.12</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>cod. hist. gr. 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. gr. IV.38</td>
<td>97; 126; 349; 353</td>
<td>cod. hist. prof. 576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. gr. VII.3</td>
<td>97, 127-128; 349; 354</td>
<td>cod. iur. gr. 6 91 note 14; 188; 190-191 note 432; 369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. gr. VII.22</td>
<td>98; 128; 131; 141-142; 178; 349; 354; 356; 359; 363-364</td>
<td>cod. lat. 271 254 note 65; 388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. gr. VII.38</td>
<td>159; 187; 190 note 432; 368</td>
<td>cod. lat. 2723 389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. gr. XI.19</td>
<td>178; 364</td>
<td>cod. lat. 2723 389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. gr. XI.25</td>
<td>156; 362</td>
<td>cod. lat. 2532 431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. Ital. XI.124</td>
<td>124 note 137</td>
<td>cod. lat. 2723 389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. lat. VIII.33</td>
<td>267 note 143; 277 note 175; 388; 430-431</td>
<td>cod. lat. 5154 389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. lat. XII.248</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>cod. lat. 5154 389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. lat. Z.478</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>cod. lat. 5239 389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Lazzaro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. 935</td>
<td>102 note 52; 499</td>
<td>cod. phil. gr. 58 160; 187 note 410; 188 note 417; 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. 1635</td>
<td>102 note 52; 499</td>
<td>cod. phil. gr. 162 187; 369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vercelli</td>
<td>Biblioteca Capitolare</td>
<td>388</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. LXII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vorau</td>
<td>Stiftsbibliothek</td>
<td>497</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. 276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warchester Cathedral Chapter Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. 4° 61</td>
<td>442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warminster</td>
<td>Longleat Library</td>
<td>438</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MS 176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MS 333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wien</td>
<td>Mechitaristenkongregation</td>
<td>392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. 345</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. arm. 14</td>
<td>101 note 50; 499</td>
<td>cod. XVII.32 391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. arm. 14</td>
<td>101 note 50; 499</td>
<td>cod. XVII.32 391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. arm. 14</td>
<td>101 note 50; 499</td>
<td>cod. XVII.32 391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. arm. 14</td>
<td>101 note 50; 499</td>
<td>cod. XVII.32 391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. arm. 14</td>
<td>101 note 50; 499</td>
<td>cod. XVII.32 391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. arm. 14</td>
<td>101 note 50; 499</td>
<td>cod. XVII.32 391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. arm. 14</td>
<td>101 note 50; 499</td>
<td>cod. XVII.32 391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. arm. 14</td>
<td>101 note 50; 499</td>
<td>cod. XVII.32 391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. arm. 14</td>
<td>101 note 50; 499</td>
<td>cod. XVII.32 391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cod. arm. 14</td>
<td>101 note 50; 499</td>
<td>cod. XVII.32 391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- BM: Biblioteca Marciana, Venice
- ÖNB: Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna
- S. Lazzaro: S. Lazzaro Library, Venice
- Vercelli: Biblioteca Capitolare, Vercelli
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Science, Prognostica as 231–236; 258; 298–307
Scipio 240–241; 244–246
Scythians 99
Second Coming 103; 115; 157
Septuagint, as translation 282
“Seven-Hilled City” 125; 132; 142; 148; 157; 165–166; 169–170
Seth 36
Shloah, Pool of 77–78
Sicily 150; 157
Singara, Mount 116
Smyrna 102
Solomon 37–38; 220; 232; 240; 242; 243; 246–247; 265; 296; 470
throne of 66–67; 73; 77
Solomon of Basrah 342
Solon 138
Son of God 209
Son of Man/“One Like a Human Being” 55 note 53; 109; 181; 210; 211; 303 note 274
Sufyānī 171–172
Surkẖāh 294
Susa (Shushan/Shushtar) 58; 76–77; 78; 174; 211
Susanna, figure of 12; 50 note 35; 53; 60–64
in art 81 note 152; 449
legenda 82 note 152
mediaeval poetry on 449
Syracuse 150
Syria 107; 116; 191
Tatars 191
Temple, 153
Terminology and Classification of Texts 32–33; 51–54; 198; 244–245; 279–280; q.v. also Apocalypse, and prognostica; Apocalypse, as genre;
Theodoret of Cyr 340
“Theodosius” 103
Theodosius I 102 note 57
Theodosius II 102; 103
Theodosius III 136–137
“Theophilos of Rome” 99
Thessalonica 191–192
Three Young Men, figures of 40; 42–43; 48 note 23, 65–66; 78; 248–249
in art 79
legenda 82 note 152
Tiberias 65; 78
Tigris, River 78; 172; 180; 213
Tikhonravov, N. 90
Tischendorf, K. von 90
Translatio imperii q.v. History, periodisation of
Tullius Cicero, M. q.v. Cicero, M. Tullius
Tār ‘Abdūn 290
Turks 182
“Tyrannis” 148
Tyre 165; 166
Umar 174
Umayyads 154; 181–183
Ulai, Canal 78; 211
Upper Beth-Horon 59
Vesuvius, Mount 115 note 100
Visigoths 100
Visions 87–230 passim
Wise Men of Babylon 248–254; 274–275; 300; 302; 303 note 273; 274
Woes, eschatological 103; 109; 114–115; 120; 142; 145 note 225; 165; 172; 291–292
Zedekiah (king) 58
Zedekiah (prophet) 63
Zerubbabel 77; 154; 185
Zodiac 278–279
Zoë 89 note 11