

TEMPLE
UNIV.
LIBRARY
PALEY

The Scrolls and the Scriptures

Qumran Fifty Years After

Edited by
Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans

Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha
Supplement Series 26

Roehampton Institute London Papers, 3



BM
487
S356x
1997

4Q246 provides no support for the thesis that the Danielic man-like figure was understood as an individual being, messiah or angel, in the period prior to Jesus.

THE THRONE-THEOPHANY OF THE BOOK OF GIANTS:
SOME NEW LIGHT ON THE BACKGROUND OF DANIEL 7

Loren T. Stuckenbruck

1. *Introduction*

Ever since 1971 the scholarly world has generally known about the existence of the *Book of Giants* among the fragments of Qumran.¹ At that time, it was Josef T. Milik who, having been assigned the publications of the fragments corresponding to parts of *1 Enoch* from Cave 4, had identified a set of Enochic fragments from Cave 4 not found in any extant part of *1 Enoch*. The basis of his identification of these materials with the *Book of Giants* rested ultimately on two further criteria: (1) the fragments in question contain details which were uniquely shared with fragments from the Manichaean *Book of Giants* published during the 1940s by W.B. Henning² and (2) the fragments

1. J.T. Milik, 'Turfan et Qumran: Livre des géants juif et manichéen', in G. Jeremias, H.-W. Kuhn, and H. Stegemann (eds.), *Tradition und Glaube: Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), pp. 117-27; and 'Problèmes de la littérature hénochique à la lumière des fragments araméens des Qumran', *HTR* 64 (1971), pp. 333-78 (esp. pp. 366-72). See also Milik's *The Book of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments from Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), esp. pp. 4, 6-7, 57-58, 230, 236-38, and 298-339.

2. See W.B. Henning, 'The Book of Giants', *BSOAS* 11 (1943-46), pp. 52-74 (a publication of readings and translations of fragmentary materials in Middle Persian, Parthian, Uygur, Sogdian, and Coptic). A significant later publication of a Manichaean fragment, and too late for Milik to take into account, is by W. Sundermann, *Mittelpersische und partische kosmogonische und Parabeltexte der Manichäer* (Berliner Turfantexte, 4; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1973), pp. 76-78 (MS 'M 5900'), and *idem*, 'Ein weiteres Fragment aus Manis Gigantenbuch', in *Orientalia J. Duchesne-Guillemin emerito oblata* (Acta Iranica, 23 [and Second Series, 9]; Leiden: Brill, 1984), pp. 491-505 (frag. 'L'). For the most thorough recent treatment of the Manichaean sources for the *Book of Giants*, see J.C. Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions* (Monographs of the Hebrew Union College, 14; Cincinnati: Hebrew University College Press, 1992).

show a specific interest in the offspring of the 'sons of God' and the 'daughters of humankind' whose birth as giants (LXX, γίγαντες; in the Hebrew, called נפיליִם and נברִיִם) is narrated in Gen. 6.1-4. Unlike the *I Enoch* materials and like the Manichaean sources, these fragments give specific names to the giants: for instance, Mahaway, 'Ohyah, Hahyah, Aḥiram, Ḥobabish, and Gilgamesh.³

In 1976, as part of his publication of the Aramaic fragments from extant parts of *I Enoch*, Milik decided to publish the *Book of Giants* fragments from one manuscript with photographs (4Q203), while offering some readings (without photographs) from other as yet unknown manuscripts and re-identifying some previously published materials with the work.⁴ As a result of his studies and the subsequent ones of other scholars, it seems clear that the *Book of Giants* at Qumran is represented by seven manuscripts at the very least (4Q203; 4Q530, 531, 532; 1Q23; 2Q26; and 6Q8),⁵ with the very real possibility that three more should be included (4Q206 frags. 2-3; 4Q556; and 1Q24).⁶ This attestation, whether the manuscripts derive from one

In addition Milik observed that portions of the *Book of Giants* seem to correspond to the so-called *Midrash of Shemḥazai and 'Aza'el*, for which he provides a collation of four mediaeval Hebrew MSS in *The Books of Enoch*, pp. 321-39.

3. Mahaway (1Q23 frag. 27, l. 2; 4Q203 frag. 2, l. 4; 4Q530 col. ii, l. 20; col. iii, ll. 6-7; 6Q8 frag. 1, ll. 2, 4); 'Ohyah (1Q23 frag. 29, l. 1; 4Q203 frag. 4, l. 3; frag. 7A, l. 5; 4Q530 col. ii, ll. 1, 15; frag. 12, l. 2; 4Q531 frag. 17, l. 9; 6Q8 frag. 1, ll. 2, 4); Hahyah (4Q530 col. ii, ll. 7-12 is probably his dream-vision; 4Q203 frag. 4, l. 3; frag. 7A, l. 5); Aḥiram (4Q531 frag. 4, l. 1); Ḥobabish (4Q203 frag. 3, l. 3); and Gilgamesh (4Q530 col. ii, l. 2; 4Q531 frag. 17, l. 12). See also the incomplete name]אדס in 4Q203 frag. 3, l. 3.

4. So in *The Books of Enoch*.

5. See especially F. García Martínez, 'The Book of Giants' in *idem, Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (STDJ, 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992), pp. 97-115 and, further, Chapter 2 in my forthcoming volume on *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Text, Translation, and Commentary* (TSAJ, 63; Tübingen: Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1997).

6. Far less plausible are the proposals to assign the following manuscripts to the *Book of Giants*: 4Q533 (so initially Jean Starcky; see E. Tov with S.J. Pfann [eds.], *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche: Companion Volume* [Leiden: Brill, 1993], p. 47); 4Q534 (J.A. Fitzmyer, 'Qumran Aramaic in the New Testament', in *idem, A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* [SBLMS, 25; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1979], p. 101); 1Q19 and 6Q14 (K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984], pp. 229 n. 1, 268); 4Q535-536 (K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer: Ergänzungsband* [Göttingen:

or more groups, may reflect a relative popularity of the *Book of Giants* during the Second Temple period.

While there is no question that Milik has made a real contribution by calling attention to the existence of a new work among the Qumran caves, his work was far from exhaustive. For instance, a number of fragments from manuscripts 4Q530, 4Q531, and 4Q532, some of these significant, were not included in his discussion. This is understandable due to the fact that these materials had been assigned to Jean Starcky for publication. Even more frustrating in his monograph on the *Books of Enoch*, however, was Milik's inexact allusions to *Book of Giants* manuscripts, which has resulted in contradictory interpretations by subsequent scholars concerning the nature of his references.⁷

2. Consequences of Interpreting an Unpublished Text: The Case of 4Q530 col. ii, ll. 17-19

Perhaps one of the best examples of a significant text which Milik did not choose to discuss comes from 4Q530 col. ii, ll. 17-19. This part of the *Book of Giants* contains the dream-visions of two giants, the brothers Hahyah and 'Ohyah. In the narrative of the work, the meaning of their ominous visions is not readily understood by the giants, who resort to sending one of their own (the giant Mahaway) to Enoch

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994], pp. 125-26); and 4Q537 (Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, p. 110).

7. See especially his statement in *The Books of Enoch*, p. 309: 'Up to the present I have located six copies of the Book of Giants among the manuscripts of Qumrân: the four manuscripts cited above (1Q23, 6Q8, 4QEnGiants^{b,c}), a third manuscript from the Starcky collection, and 4QEnGiants^a published below. There are also five other manuscripts too poorly represented to allow a sufficiently certain identification of the fragments: En^e 2-3 (above, pp. 236-38), 1Q24 (DJD, 1, p. 99 and pl. IX), 2Q26 (DJD, 3, pp. 90-91 and pl. XVII; see below, pp. 334-35), and two groups of small fragments entrusted to the Starcky edition.' Milik's vague references here to a 'third manuscript' and 'two groups of fragments' from the lot assigned to Starcky have been capable of incompatible interpretations. The 'third manuscript' is 4QEnGiants^e in Fitzmyer (*The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study* [SBLRBS, 20; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990]), pp. 52-53), while it is taken as a reference to 4QEnGiants^a by Beyer (*Die aramäischen Texte*, pp. 259-60) and García Martínez ('The Book of Giants', pp. 104-105 and *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated*, p. 505. In Milik's 'two groups of fragments' these authors have seen '4QEnGiants^{d,f}' (Fitzmyer), '4QEnGiants^{f,g}' (Beyer), and '4QGiants^e ar?' and '4QEnGiants^e' (García Martínez).

for an interpretation (col. ii, l. 21 to col. iii l. 11). Through Enoch the giants' worst fears are confirmed: the dreams of Hahyah and 'Ohyah herald God's imminent judgment of the giants for the atrocities they have committed on earth during the ante-diluvian period. As a whole the *Book of Giants* thus emphasizes that the giants will not be able to escape the consequences of their activities.⁸ The lines in question belong to 'Ohyah's dream, the second of these visions.

Having cited most of the rest of the column (ll. 3-12, 14-16, 20-23), Milik was content with merely summarizing the content of ll. 17-19, which according to him are a description of divine judgment 's'inspiré de Dan 7,9-10'.⁹ It was apparent from this statement alone that the text, to the extent that it is legible, would be of particular significance, since the early interpretation of Daniel 7's vision of the Ancient of Days and of one like a son of man has been a matter of interest for students of both the Hebrew Scriptures and the New Testament alike. Nevertheless, Milik's allusive comment provided all one could know about the text until its photographic evidence was made available in 1991 through Robert Eisenman and James Robinson's *Facsimile*

8. If there is a polemical edge to the *Book of Giants*, then, it may be found within the context of conflicting views among early Jewish works concerning the fate of the ante-diluvian giants in relation to the great flood. The view represented in the *Book of Giants*, the *Book of Watchers* (cf. *1 En.* 10 and 15-16), and other early Jewish documents (so CD col. ii, ll. 17-21; *Sir.* 16.17a; and *Wis.* 14.6-7) contrasts with the motif of the giants' survival of the flood preserved in Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* 9.17.1-9 and 9.18.2. These passages cited a work *On the Jews of Assyria* by the first century BCE Alexander 'Polyhistor', who in turn has preserved traditions attributed, respectively, to a 'Eupolemus' and to 'anonymous' (ἀδέσποτοι) authors. For all their differences, these fragments—often referred to together as 'Pseudo-Eupolemus'—share a common perspective in that they (1) link Abraham and the γίγαντες to the transmission of Babylonian astrological science; (2) associate the building of a tower with a giant (passage 2) or giants (passage 1); and (3) relate an escape by giants from some form of destruction. In 9.17.1-9 the giants are said to have been 'saved from the deluge' (οἱ διασωθέντοι ἐκ τοῦ κατακλύσμου) and in 9.18.2 one of them, Belos, escapes death and lived in Babylon. The motif of the giants' escape may have been read out of LXX Gen. 10.9 (Nimrod = γίγας) and Num. 13.33 (נפילים = Anakim) and is picked up in rabbinic stories which identify the kings Sihon and Og as giants surviving the flood (*b. Zeb.* 113b and *b. Nid.* 61a; cf. *Targ. Ps.-J.* to Deut. 2.2 and 3.11). The *Book of Giants* denies such survival to the evil giants.

9. 'Turfan et Qumran', p. 122. See also *The Books of Enoch*, p. 305.

*Edition*¹⁰ and in 1992 in Emanuel Tov's *Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche*.¹¹ Finally, on the basis of these photographic editions, Klaus Beyer then published his readings of these lines in the *Ergänzungsband* to his *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* in 1994.¹²

In the meantime, however, Milik's description of the unpublished text betrayed a tradition-historical judgment about the background of the *Book of Giants* text: that is, it implied that the text from the *Book of Giants* is dependent on Daniel 7. Of course, without access to the photographs themselves, there was no way of knowing in the meantime what is actually to be read in the text. In the absence of evidence, Beyer (in 1984)¹³ and Reeves¹⁴ were thus wise to mention the mere similarity between ll. 17-19 and the throne-theophany in Dan. 7.9-10.

The tradition-historical implication of Milik's comments, however, was more influential on Florentino García Martínez's discussion of the *Book of Giants*,¹⁵ more particularly on the matter of dating the composition. García Martínez was rightly calling into question Milik's dating of the *Book of Giants* to sometime between 128 BCE (his date for the composition of *Jubilees*) and 100 BCE (for him the latest possible date for the composition of the Damascus Document), especially since (1) the dates themselves are debatable;¹⁶ (2) it is precarious to assume that *Jubilees* would have cited the *Book of Giants* had it been in existence; and (3) it is doubtful that the Damascus Document actually cites the *Book of Giants*.¹⁷ In his alternative proposal, García Martínez proposed a way forward by focusing on the significance of the relationship between the unpublished text in 4Q530 col. ii, ll. 17-19 and the text of Dan. 7.9-10. He reasoned that if Milik's claim of literary dependence on the Danielic text could be substantiated, then

10. R. Eisenman and J. Robinson, *A Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (2 vols.; Washington, DC: Biblical Archeology Society, 1991).

11. See bibliography in n. 6 above.

12. Bibliography in n. 6 above.

13. *Aramäischen Texte*, p. 264 n. 1.

14. *Jewish Lore*, p. 92.

15. 'The Book of Giants', p. 104.

16. See Reeves's excellent critique in *Jewish Lore*, pp. 53-54.

17. So correctly García Martínez, 'The Book of Giants', p. 115. The passage in question is CD col. ii, ll. 18-19 which describes the sons of the Watchers as those 'whose height was as the height of cedars'. However, this description, according to García Martínez, is better understood as a 'poetic extension' of a previous phrase ('his height like the height of cedars') which itself is taken from Amos 2.9.

the composition of the *Book of Giants* is to be assigned to an 'upper limit by the middle of the 2nd century BC'.¹⁸ Despite García Martínez's *proviso* that a literary dependence on Daniel would need to be confirmed, the validity of his proposal for a date was nevertheless based on the correctness of Milik's passing tradition-historical judgment.

3. Comparison between 4Q530 col. ii, ll. 16-19 and Daniel 7.9-10

It is now becoming clear that Milik's claim of a literary dependence on Daniel 7 in 'Ohyah's dream-vision is untenable. This is borne out by a comparative analysis of the two Aramaic texts. After providing a reading of the Aramaic text for 4Q530 col. ii, ll. 16b-19 below, its translation is compared with a translation of Dan. 7.9-10 (correspondences between the texts in vocabulary and/or sense are given in *italics*):

| | |
|---|----|
| הא שלשלטן שמיא לארעה נחת | 16 |
| וכרסון יחיטו וקרישא רנא יתב מאה מ[אין לה משמשין אלף אלפי לה | 17 |
| [פלאחין כ[לן ק[דמודי הוא קאמין וארון ספרין פתיחו ודין אמיר ודין | 18 |
| רבא בכחב כ[תיב וברשם רשים]. לכל חיא ובסרא ועל | 19 |

| | <i>Book of Giants</i> | <i>Daniel 7.9-10</i> |
|-------|--|--|
| (16b) | Be]hold, the ruler of the heavens descended to the earth, and <i>thrones</i> <i>were erected (yhytw)</i> | (9) (a) I was looking until (b) <i>thrones</i> <i>were set up (rmyw)</i> |
| (17a) | and the Great Holy One <i>sat d[own.</i> | (c) and an Ancient of Days <i>sat down</i> |
| (17b) | | (d) His clothing (was) like snow-white. (e) and the hair of his head (was) like white wool. (f) His throne (was) flames of fire; (g) its wheels (were) a burning fire. |

18. García Martínez, 'The Book of Giants', p. 115. García Martínez determined his *terminus ante quem*, the 'end of the 2nd century BC', on the basis of Milik's claim that the manuscript 4QEnoch^c relies on an earlier manuscript from the second century BCE in which the Enochic writings were already being collected.

| | <i>Book of Giants</i> | <i>Daniel 7.9-10</i> |
|-----------|--|--|
| | | (10) (a) a river of fire flowed (b) and went forth from before it. |
| (17c) | A hundred hu]ndreds (were) <i>serv[ing him;</i> | |
| (17d-18a) | <i>a thousand thousands</i> [(were) <i>worshiping?</i>] him. | (c) <i>A thousand thousands</i> <i>served him,</i> |
| (18b) | [A]ll <i>stood [be]fore him.</i> | (d) and a myriad myriads <i>stood before him.</i> |
| (18c-d) | And behold [<i>books]s were opened,</i> and judgment was spoken; | (e) The court sat down, (f) and <i>books were opened.</i> |
| (18e-19a) | and the judgment of [the Great One] (was) [wr]itten [in a book] and (was) sealed in an inscription... [| |
| (19b) |]for every living being and (all) flesh and upon [| |

Based on this comparison, the two passages may be said to correspond in the following four ways: First, the conjunctions excepted, the passages have at least eight vocabulary items in common: כרסה (throne), יתב (sit down), שמש (serve), אלף (thousand), ספר¹⁹ (book), קדם (before), and קום (arise, stand). Secondly, it is significant to note that of these eight terms seven appear in an identical grammatical form: כרסון (abs. pl.), יתב (*qal* 3rd masc. sing. pf.), ספרין (abs. pl.), פתיחו (*qal* pass. 3rd com. pl.), קדמודי (prep. with 3rd masc. pl. suff.), יקומו (*qal* 3rd masc. pl. impf.), אלף (abs. sing.), and אלפי/ם (abs. pl.). Under this category one might also wish to include the *qal* passive third person plural perfect forms for רמיו and יחיטו in the respective parallel texts of Daniel and *Book of Giants*. Thirdly, the sequence of the phraseology in both is remarkably similar. The *Book of Giants* has five successive phrases (so 17a, 17b, 17c-d, 18b, and 18c) which correspond exactly to the order of the parallel phrases in Daniel 7 (cf. vv. 9b, 9c, 10c, 10d, and 10f). Fourthly, the five parallel phrases preserve a

19. In view of the context and the similarity with Dan. 7.10, ספרין is the most probable restoration in 4Q530 col. ii, l. 18c.

common sequence for their parts (17a = 7.9b; 17b = 7.9c; 17c = 7.10c [substantive + verb]; 18b = 7.10d; and 18c = 7.10-11).

These similarities demonstrate sufficiently that a tradition-historical dependence between the texts is likely. Without further analysis, however, one is not in a position to consider the nature of this source-critical relationship. If there is a literary connection of some sort, then several explanations for this are possible: (a) the *Book of Giants* has adapted the Daniel text (as suggested by Milik's comment); (b) Daniel has adapted and extended the text in the *Book of Giants*; (c) both the *Book of Giants* and Daniel draw upon a prior independent tradition. Under (c) two further possibilities may be considered: Daniel preserves a prototype of the tradition used in the *Book of Giants*²⁰ or the *Book of Giants* preserves a prototype of the tradition used in Daniel. Whereas alternatives (a) and (b) may be closely bound up with the dating of both compositions in relation to each other, (c) envisions the possibility of dependence on a more faithfully preserved form of a tradition underlying one or the other passage.

In order to evaluate the viability of these options, it is necessary to consider the main differences between the passages. First, whereas in the *Book of Giants* the subject of the theophany is designated 'the Great Holy One', Dan. 7.9 (and vv. 13, 22) refers to an 'Ancient of Days'. Secondly, the *Book of Giants* text describes the theophany as an advent—or better, 'descent' (יָרַד)—to the earth. In the Daniel text, there is no attempt to locate the theophany, though its interest in the details of the divine throne (see *1 En.* 14.18-22) suggests that the vision is concerned with the execution of judgment in a heavenly court. Thirdly, 'Ohyah's vision uses three verbs to describe the worship activity before the divine throne ('serving', ['worshiping'], and 'standing'), while Daniel makes use of two verbs ('serving' and 'standing'). Fourthly, while the *Book of Giants* text only describes 'the Great and Holy One' as taking a seat, Daniel attributes 'sitting' to both the 'Ancient of Days' (v. 9c) and the heavenly court (v. 10e). Fifthly, and perhaps significantly, the texts differ in their respective numbers of worshippers: while the *Book of Giants* refers to 'hundreds' and 'thousands' (17c-d), Daniel has 'thousands' and 'myriads' (7.10c-d). Finally, and sixthly, if the literary contexts of the visions are taken into

20. That is, the *Book of Giants* is not directly inspired by the text of Daniel but by a proto-Daniel tradition.

account, the *Book of Giants* vision, unlike Daniel, makes no reference to a 'son of man' figure.

4. Evaluation and Conclusion

As a whole, the differences listed here suggest that the giant's vision in the *Book of Giants* is structurally and theologically less complicated than its counterpart in Daniel. Except for the motif of a theophanic advent, the only clear instance in which the vision of 'Ohyah is longer than that of Daniel occurs near the end: the judgment, which has been pronounced, is both written and sealed (19a). Within the context of the *Book of Giants* the solemnity and finality of the court decision functions as a guarantee that the giants, despite their false hopes, will be destroyed because of the evil deeds they have perpetrated.²¹ Thus this part of the vision, which correlates so well with the larger narrative context of the *Book of Giants*, may reflect the way the author(s) appropriated the theophanic tradition. In other respects, however, it seems that it is Daniel—and not the *Book of Giants*—which preserves the more well-developed of the two visions. It seems more likely that the Daniel vision has added speculative details concerning the seated figure, his throne, and the 'son of man' figure than to suppose that the form in the *Book of Giants* represents a redactor's removal of them. In the case of Daniel, a number of scholars have explained the presence of these details on the basis of an author's use of the merkabah vision in Ezekiel 1.²² Furthermore, if one is allowed to suppose that details of such traditions tend to inflate rather than undergo a scaling down, then it is probable that the 'hundreds' and 'thousands' of worshippers in the giant's vision would have been transformed into

21. See n. 8. above.

22. This point has been emphasized, most notably, by C. Rowland, *The Influence of the First Chapter of Ezekiel on Judaism and Early Christianity* (doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge, 1975); *idem*, *The Open Heaven* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), pp. 95-113 (see esp. p. 98); J. Lust, 'Daniel 7,13 and the Septuagint', *ETL* 54 (1978), pp. 62-69 (esp. pp. 67-68); D. Halperin, *Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision* (TSAJ, 16; Tübingen: Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1988), pp. 74-78; and L.T. Stuckenbruck, "'One like a Son of Man as the Ancient of Days" in the Old Greek Recension of Daniel 7,13: Scribal Error or Theological Translation?', *ZNW* 86 (1995), pp. 274-75. In addition, details from Dan. 7.9d, f-g and 10a-b, which are not in the *Book of Giants*, may have been derived from the tradition in *1 En.* 14.19-20, 22.

'thousands' and 'myriads' in Daniel rather than the other way around.

This line of reasoning suggests that Milik's comment that the *Book of Giants* text 's'inspiré de Dan 7,9-10' is misleading. Neither is one, on the other hand, to suppose that the *Book of Giants* must therefore have antedated Daniel 7.²³ The comparative analysis offered here does, however, make it likely that the *Book of Giants* preserves a theophanic tradition in a form which has been expanded in Daniel. If this thesis is correct, then the recently available text from 4Q530 col. ii brings contemporary scholarship closer than ever to identifying the kinds of traditions which the author(s) of Daniel 7 had to hand when recording the theophany involving an 'Ancient of Days' and one 'like a son of man'.²⁴

23. For a full argumentation concerning the question of dating the *Book of Giants*, see Chapter 1 of my forthcoming book, *The Book of Giants from Qumran*.

24. It is important, then, to distinguish between the religio- and traditio-historical backgrounds for Daniel 7. In emphasizing the importance of the former, J.J. Collins, in his commentary on *Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1993), pp. 280-94, has tried to underscore the literary unity of the chapter, not least by associating the visions of the 'Ancient of Days' in vv. 9-10, the beast in vv. 11-12, and the one 'like a son of man' in vv. 13-14. It is instructive here to review Collins's thesis briefly. In rejecting possible backgrounds in Babylonian and Iranian mythologies, Collins appeals to a Canaanite myth as attested among the Ras Shamra materials at Ugarit since they depict Ba'al, 'a rider of the clouds', as subordinate to 'El who is perhaps described as 'father of years'. Ba'al, in turn, slays the beast 'Lôtân' and 'Yamm' (= the sea). If Canaanite mythology is to be understood as having played a formative role in the structure and characters in Daniel's vision, this insight is now to be weighed against the tradition-historical considerations brought to bear on the text through the theophany in the *Book of Giants*. I do not think it necessary to discount a mythological background in favour of the question of sources. However, the vision in 4Q530 col. ii, ll. 16-20 demonstrates that the theophanic vision of the kind found in Dan. 7.9-10 may have circulated independently before it was adapted and integrated into a more complicated vision of larger proportions. It would not be misleading if we suppose that traditions such as the *Book of Giants* theophany, *1 Enoch* 14 and Ezekiel 1 provided the author(s) of Daniel 7 with some of the raw materials for the vision. If this hypothesis is accepted, then it is possible to reconsider the significance of Canaanite mythology for Daniel: provisionally, it would seem to have formed part of a mythological *Vorverständnis* and/or an organizing principle through which independent traditions, whether the author(s) were conscious of this background or not, were welded together to create a new composition. The *Book of Giants* tradition, therefore, may well open up the need for a further exploration of the background for Daniel 7.

THE BOOK OF THE TWELVE, AQIBA'S MESSIANIC INTERPRETATIONS,
AND THE REFUGE CAVES OF THE SECOND JEWISH WAR

Brook W.R. Pearson

1. *Introduction: Studying the Bar Kokhba Revolution*

Beyond a few LXX fragments and some unidentifiable Greek fragments found at Qumran,¹ those interested in Greek documents from the Dead Sea region are, for the most part, limited to those from the era of the Bar Kokhba revolution (132-35 CE). For biblical scholarship, this introduces the further difficulty that the Bar Kokhba revolution, beyond the potential significance of the messianic pretensions of its leader, is not viewed as relevant to New Testament studies.²

In fact, before the dramatic finds in the 1950s and early 1960s³ of several caves and their contents which had been occupied by refugees from the Bar Kokhba revolution, this period was a very dimly-lit area of study indeed. Bar Kokhba was, and in many ways, despite the new evidence, still is a semi-legendary figure. He is not dissimilar to the figure of King Arthur in the history of England—we know he existed

1. See E. Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr)* (DJD, 8; The Seiyâl Collection, 1; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p. 25, for a list of most of the Greek scrolls or fragments found at Qumran. Also see C.P. Thiede, *The Earliest Gospel Fragment? The Qumran Fragment 7Q5 and its Significance for New Testament Studies* (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1992), and the response to that in G.N. Stanton, *Gospel Truth? New Light on Jesus and the Gospels* (London: HarperCollins, 1995).

2. Notable exceptions to this include R.A. Horsley, 'Popular Messianic Movements around the Time of Jesus', *CBQ* 46 (1984), pp. 491-94; and, more recently, C.A. Evans, *Jesus and his Contemporaries: Comparative Studies* (AGJU, 25; Leiden: Brill, 1995), pp. 183-211.

3. Perhaps the furthest ranging survey of the contributions that these finds made to the study of the second revolt can be found in J.A. Fitzmyer, 'The Bar Cochba Period', in his *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (SBL SBS, 5; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1974), pp. 305-54.