

REMEMBERING THE PAST, CULTIVATING A CHARACTER: MEMORY AND THE ARAMAIC PSEUDO-DANIEL TEXTS (4Q243-244; 4Q245)

Andrew B. Perrin / Aramaic DSS Symposium, University of Copenhagen / August 14-15, 2017

Introduction

The texts collected under the Pseudo-Daniel rubric are an intriguing item in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls as they bridge two predominant foci observed for the broader Aramaic corpus. On the one hand, the texts are associated with life in the exilic diaspora by way of attribution to a “Daniel” and mention of political figures and eras associated with prevailing empires of the recent past. On the other hand, aspects of the fragmentary content are anchored in the antediluvian and ancestral ages with nods to the flood, tower of Babel, exodus, references to patriarchs, and an apparent interest in priestly genealogies. This paper will revisit the composition(s) represented in 4Q243-245 and explore the ways in which it (they) contributes to our understanding of two interrelated issues. First, how can a reading informed by insights from memory studies advance our understanding of the situation of the Pseudo-Daniel materials at an apparent nexus of the two predominant narrative settings of the Aramaic corpus? Second, how did this new narrative and thematic backdrop at once enhance the emerging persona of Daniel as a literary character as well as enable the creator of these writings to redeploy this redrawn Daniel to speak into a broader set of topics? In these ways, the paper will draw upon and challenge aspects of some current conceptual categorizations of the Aramaic corpus as well as underscore how the Danielic writings within it provide a fresh space for redescribing the rapid evolution of the Daniel traditions in the centuries leading up to the Common Era.

The Prospects of Memory for Exploring Scribal Imaginations in the Qumran Collection

The exploration of memory as a tool for accounting for the formation of historiographies found in the textual and traditional heritage of ancient Judaism and Christianity is bound to the

ongoing and diffuse enterprises in the cognitive sciences and sociology centered on the relation between events past and their subsequent representations created through individual, social, and collective memory. Following on what remains an essential primer on the history of academic research on memory, Olick and Robbins commented that “memory is not an unchanging vessel for carrying the past into the present; memory is a process, not a thing, and it works differently at different points in time.”¹ In some sense, memories deal in currency inherited but their current expressions are accessed and created in view of the ever-passing moment of present events, individuals, and experiences that slowly but surely accrue into the past. In addition to not being static, memory is also orientational and axial insofar as it serves the purposes of identity formation and maintenance in light of both a multi-dimensional past and a present context that is equally dynamic and faceted. Representations of the past—whether individual or collective, penned or performed—are at once formed within and formed for collectives. In view of these observations, I find the concise explanation of what constitutes social memory proposed by Schwartz to be a helpful departure point: “Memory is a fundamental property of the mind, an indispensable component of culture, and an essential aspect of tradition. Although individuals alone possess the capacity to remember the past, they never do so singly; they do so with and against others situated in different groups and through the knowledge and symbols that predecessors and contemporaries transmit to them.”²

Schwartz further overserved that “[m]edia are memory’s vehicles.” If media are the vehicles of memory, then the Qumran library is a veritable parking lot. Deploying terminology of

¹ Jeffrey K. Olick and Joyce Robbins, “Social Memory Studies: From ‘Collective Memory’ to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices,” *Annual Review of Sociology* 24 (1998): 105-40, here 122.

² Barry Schwartz, “Where There’s Smoke, There’s Fire: Memory and History,” in *Memory and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity: A Conversation with Barry Schwartz*, ed. Tom Thatcher, SemeiaSt 78 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014), 7-37, here 9.

a “textual community” coined by Brian Stock, Jan Assmann (arguably the pioneer of memory as an evaluative tool for Israelite traditions) once briefly characterized the Qumran library and community in such terms. He suggested that, like the Nag Hammadi codices, the Judaean Desert finds “give us an insight into the vestiges of the libraries that were used as a foundation by such textual communities. Despite their fragmentary condition they enable us to infer that, unlike modern libraries, they did not aim at the greatest possible variety and completeness. Instead, they confined themselves to the literature that the community deemed authoritative.”³ Although, here I would perhaps exchange the final word with “significant” for the sake of nuance. Stock’s earlier articulation of this idea underscored the role of what we might call the *tradent* in the formation of textual communities. He writes, “What was essential to a textual community was not a written version of a text, although that was sometimes present, but an individual, who, having mastered it, then utilized it for reforming a group’s thought and action.”⁴

Naturally, this understanding lends itself to the several important studies on the underlying historiography of Qumran origins, not least as it pertains to the elusive figure of the “Teacher of Righteousness.” Yet transposing this concept to the Qumran community should also force us to redirect our focus from texts as objects to the creative activity of the scribe in the presentation of memory that is eventually instantiated in the developing written tradition. In doing this, we then move to consider the potential motivations for scribal intervention and the ways scribes participated in engaging and extending a text. In this domain, the literatures among the Qumran collection that have been described as having a degree of relation to a core authoritative tradition come into purview. Here, of course, I am referring to the thorny theoretical

³ Jan Assmann, *Religion and Cultural Memory: Ten Studies*, trans. Rodney Livingstone (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006), 73.

⁴ Brian Stock, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), 90.

and terminological issues that converge on texts under rubrics such as “rewritten bible/scripture,” “parabiblical/scriptural,” and “paratextual.”

To date, the single attempt to bridge the gap between so-called rewritten texts with insights from memory studies is that of George Brooke.⁵ In a recent essay, Brooke made some key observations that relate to our understanding of scribal memory in the cultivation and creation of traditions. Drawing together two overarching insights, he writes:

[A]n individual mind, what it remembers, how it articulates and rearticulates what it remembers, how it functions, needs to be considered as part of the process of the transmission (and development) of authoritative traditions... They [instances of scribal intervention] might also indicate how an author considers his standing within a particular historical perspective and attempt to manipulate an audience towards a similar standing. The motivations for adjusting the received traditions in the rewriting process are ideological in one way or another.⁶

As noted by Brooke, considering memories embedded in texts is not concerned with recovering or reconstructing the historical past *as it really happened*. Rather, “we are concerned to notice how a community’s memory works to handle the traditions it receives in recognizable ways by providing implicit commentary as cultural memories are changed and adjusted.”⁷ The case studies Brooke undertakes to illustrate these phenomena in rewritten texts are notably those in a close and discernible degree of relation to Pentateuchal tradition (i.e., Jubilees, Reworked Pentateuch, Genesis Apocryphon, Temple Scroll, selections from Josephus’ *Antiquities*).

To inch closer to the topic of the present study, Brooke’s model for exploring the intersection of memory and the process of rewriting could be beneficially applied to Josephus’ rendition of the Daniel saga in *Antiquities* 10.188-12.322. As is commonly recognized, the

⁵ George J. Brooke, “Memory, Cultural Memory and Rewriting Scripture,” in *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years*, 119-36.

⁶ Brooke, “Memory, Cultural Memory and Rewriting Scripture,” 122.

⁷ Brooke, “Memory, Cultural Memory and Rewriting Scripture,” 128.

representation of Daniel in *Antiquities* is selective and strategic, with Josephus navigating through his antecedent tradition all the while negotiating his present context with respect to his Roman patrons and ancestral ties. The result is that the Daniel we meet in the pages of Josephus is to be understood as the same character from the book of his namesake, albeit a Daniel remodeled through memory with reference to a base text.

However, unlike Josephus' activity of remembering through rewriting anchored in a textualized authoritative tradition, the Danielic texts among the Qumran Aramaic do not seem to be crafted with an antecedent lingering in the background. Rather, they are oriented around a figure: Daniel.

In view of this theoretical background, I will briefly introduce the texts of *Pseudo-Daniel* before turning my attention to a selection of narrative and thematic features within that entail memories of the ancestral past now clustered around this new figure. Ultimately I hope demonstrate that, while the *Pseudo-Daniel* materials are attached to a figure in the recent exilic past, it is by virtue of his association with events and individuals of the patriarchal and monarchic eras that enabled the formation and cultivation of a more dynamic Daniel than the character with whom we are already familiar in the pages of the Hebrew Bible.

A Synopsis of the Pseudo-Daniel Materials in the Qumran Collection

The materials collected under the title *Pseudo-Daniel* relate to fragments of three known Aramaic manuscripts recovered from Qumran cave four. 4QPseudo Daniel^{a-b} (4Q243-4Q244), which benefit from some modest textual overlap confirming they are copies of the same work, and 4QPseudo Daniel^c (4Q245). As suggested by Collins and Flint in, collectively the manuscripts seen to have been penned in an Herodian hands of the late first century BCE.⁸ Compositionally, the historical allusions and references to named figures such as to the Hasmonean "Simon" (4Q245 1i:10) and Hellenistic name "Balakros," aid

⁸ For descriptions of the hands of each manuscript's physical and palaeographical profiles, see DJD 22:97, 122, 154.

in establishing a *terminus post quem* of the original work. In view of these items, Collins and Flint concluded “[t]he most likely time of composition is somewhere between the beginning of the second century BCE and the coming of Pompey.”⁹

Since 4Q245 is highly fragmentary and does not benefit from overlap with surviving content of the pair 4Q243-4Q244 it cannot be determined whether or not this is a third copy of the same ancient work. One potentially instructive similarity suggesting a degree of relation is the fragmentary references to the priestly forefathers in 4Q243 28 and 4Q245 1i.¹⁰ Beyond this, we find six references to Daniel across fragments of all three manuscripts.¹¹ In this way, their association with the figure Daniel locates them in a common tradition regardless of their textual status.

While the question of the relation of the materials in 4Q243-4Q244 with those of 4Q245 is indeed challenging, as is the issue of the orientation of these Qumran texts to other exemplars of the Danielic tradition, since my concern in the present study works towards a model of accounting for the robust tradition oriented around a common *figure* (i.e., Daniel), I will draw on these fragments as a group to ascertain what portrait of Daniel results from the broader contribution of these new materials in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls. I will now turn my attention to the memories included in these materials, which, I hope, will add further detail to the scope and type of content included in the texts.

Retrospective References and Prospective Genealogies: Patriarchs, Priests, and Kings

At the outset of the book of Daniel our character is attached to the memory of the destruction of Jerusalem, the plundering of her temple, and the tragedy of exile undertaken by the Babylonian king Nebuchadnezzar (Dan 1:1-2). While Daniel acknowledges the “God of my

⁹ DJD 22:137.

¹⁰ As noted by Collins and Flint, “If the text is correctly read so that it refers to Qahat, Phineas, and his son Abishua, this fragment provides possible evidence for a relationship between 4Q243 and 4Q245” (DJD 22:116).

¹¹ 4Q243 1:1; 2:1; 5:1; 6:3; 4Q244 4:2; and 4Q245 1i:3

ancestors (אלה אבהתי)” in his prayer (Dan 2:23), the Aramaic unit has little explicit recourse to ancestral traditions or personages. In the biblical book, Daniel is cast as an Israelite yet his identity is largely cultivated in the space of the memory of the exilic era looking forward. *Pseudo-Daniel*, however, draws upon a deeper and more diverse range of ancestral actors imbedded in Israel’s story remembered. The effect is that, while Daniel is a latecomer to the tradition, he is positioned against the backdrop of both its earliest foundational characters as well as individuals and institutions that would emerge in Israelite history proper.

References to Antediluvian Figures and the Remembering Generations in Genealogies

In the fortuitous yet frustrating surviving text of 4Q243 9:1 we read simply the words “to Enoch (לחנוך).” A second anchor on the other side of the deluge is found in 4Q244 8:3, which names “Noah (נוח)” in a context seemingly describing the post-flood age (see below). By importing named figures from the antediluvian and patriarchal past into the Aramaic text, the Daniel we meet in *Pseudo-Daniel* is not vaguely associated with “our ancestors.” On the contrary, naming Enoch, Noah, and perhaps others, anchors this budding Second Temple tradition in the ancestral past and associates this relatively new exilic character of Daniel with memories of essential figures from the foundational narratives of Genesis. The *Pseudo-Daniel* materials’ most ambitious maneuvers to memorialize ancestral figures, however, pertains to the way genealogical content is created and gathered under with the leading figure of Daniel.

Genealogies are an essential medium for selecting, ordering, and posturing a chronology of generations past in view of present individual or communal institutions and identity. Their strategic formulation and presentation is where history (in the broadest sense of antecedent events and individuals) becomes heritage, that is, the curated memory of a group. As vehicles of

memory, genealogies relate to both identity and authority. More than listing figures from the past, the genealogy in *Pseudo-Daniel* focuses on figureheads associated with two iconic institutions in Israelite memory: the priesthood and monarchy.

Merging Memories of Priestly Origins with *Ex Eventu* Views of Second Temple Priesthoods

The most extensive view of genealogical material is found in 4Q245 1i. While there is little in the way of narrative context, for a memory informed reading, this fragment of seems to trace the priestly genealogy through generations beginning with its earliest representatives to contemporary expressions.

4Q245 1 i:5 commences with a likely reference to “Levji” followed immediately by the extant name “Qahat.” The memory of these figures, of course, were the subject of extensive scribal creativity in the *Aramaic Levi Document* and *Testament of Qahat* (4Q542) at Qumran. Unfortunately, the text crumbles after the mention of Qahat. Given the context, it would be reasonable to posit “Amram” followed thereafter, who likewise enjoyed an existence in Second Temple memory at Qumran in the *Visions of Amram* (4Q543-547). It is perhaps significant that this trilogy of texts exhibit an emphatic interest in tracing the trajectory of the priestly line. *Pseudo-Daniel* extends to include future generations of Israel’s priesthoods beyond those remembered from Genesis. These include: “Bukki” and “Uzzi” (remembered by the Chronicler for their Aaronide lineage, 1 Chr 6:3-5), “Zadok” and “Abiathar” (the frontrunners of two priestly lines in the early monarchic period, 1 Sam 22:20-23; 2 Sam 15:24-37; 1 Kgs 2:26-27), the High Priest “Hilkiah” (memorialized for rediscovering the law, 2 Kgs 22:2-23:7).

Lines 9-10, however, creates a bridge of memories of the priestly forefathers from the distant past to the more recent memory (or as we will see, *ex eventu* projections) of the priesthood in the Second Temple period. The name “Onias” in line 9 is clearly associated with

the Oniad dynasty, which plugs the genealogy of *Pseudo-Daniel* into a tradition associated with Jerusalem's Second Temple in the Hellenistic period, perhaps tangentially with the cultic site of the community at Heliopolis if Onias IV is in view, and with a dynasty of priestly prominence in the critical years of transition from Ptolemaic to Seleucid rule in the region. The final two priestly figures plausibly found in the text in line 10 ("Jonathan" and "Simon"), introducing the priestly leadership of the Hasmoneans.

Given the exilic narrative setting of *Pseudo-Daniel*, the priestly section of the genealogy is both retrospective and prospective. While the memory of all the priestly generations presented in the list is past tense from the perspective of the reader, from the narrative vantage point of Daniel the generations following Hilkiah project into the narrative future. That is, the genealogy blends a memorial catalogue of past priests with an *ex eventu* prospectus of names associated with cultic institutions and priestly lines yet to come in the Hellenistic period. This merging of memories and their strategic projection in the narrative, therefore, adds to Daniel characterization as it positions him as an authority for prognosticating the direction of the priesthood from past, present, and future. This aspect of Daniel's characterization is otherwise unknown elsewhere in the Danielic tradition. While the "biblical" Daniel critiques the pollution of the altar in a priestly domain (Dan 9:27; 11:31; 12:11), this is qualitatively different from the concentrated and detailed memories of the priestly tradition in *Pseudo-Daniel*.

Remembering Monarchic Origins as Separate from Priestly Lines and Leadership

As the fragment narrows, the genealogy transitions into a list of names associated with the monarchy (lines 11-12). The names "David" and "Solomon" must be taken as at or near a clear reset in the genealogy, here looking to the origins of the united monarchy. The partially extant reading of "Ahaziah" and largely reconstructed reading of "Joash" seem reasonable in

light of their paired naming in the list of kings in 1 Chr 3:11. It seems that the writer of *Pseudo-Daniel* here is interested in establishing memories of an institution through the monuments of its founding figures. As was the case with the priestly list, our Daniel is associated with yet another institution—that of the monarchic age and tradition. While Daniel has an extensive resume in the service of foreign kings elsewhere, *Pseudo-Daniel's* memory of iconic kings of Israel's own history draws him more closely to this monarchic past and another set of founding figures.

Since the list of priests is clearly set apart from that of the kings, this structural mechanism of the genealogy presents a memory of these institutions as jointly part of Israelite heritage yet distinct in their origins and expression. The separation of offices in the memory and *ex eventu* presentation of the genealogy likely served a rhetorical prescriptive purpose in the author's own past or present in the mid-Second Temple period, when the delineation or dual occupation of these positions was contentious. Without a fuller knowledge of the composition structure and setting of 4Q245 in particular the exact target of this critique cannot be determined. However, this framework would conceivably have implications for both community identity and authority structures of religious-political institutions in the second century BCE.

Collapsing Events of the Ancestral Past with the Imperial Present

As demonstrated above, the Daniel we meet in *Pseudo-Daniel* is associated with both Israel's priestly and monarchic past. Combing the fragments of 4Q243 and 4Q244 reveals that he is likewise linked with memories of foundational episodes from the Hebrew scriptures, largely recollections instantiated in Genesis and eras/individuals from more recent experiences under ancient Near Eastern and Mediterranean empires. The text also seems to coordinate these memories with eschatological expectation. However, given my interest in the work's creation and coordination of memories, I will save treatment of *Pseudo-Daniel* forward-looking outlook

another time. Here I will explore but an illustrative selection of recent memories of ages of empires and recollections of events from Israel's internal and more distant past.

Hints at Babylonian, Assyrian, and Hellenistic Imperial Figures and Phases

Given the plausible narrative setting of Pseudo-Daniel in an exilic context, it is perhaps not surprising to find references to “Nebuchadnezzar” (4Q243 23:2) and “Balshazzar” (4Q243 2:2). Due to a close philological parallel in *Damascus Document* 1:6, 4Q243 13:3 is arguably the most intriguing of these nods to Babylonian rulers, which reads “to give them into the hand of Neb[uchadnezzar (למנתן אנון ביד נבֿכדנצר)” The view of imperial history in *Pseudo-Daniel*, however, extends in both directions from this narrative present.

On the one hand, we find some reference to “Before the nobles of the king and the Assyrians (קודם רברבני מלכא ואשריא)” in 4Q244 1-3:1. On the other hand, 4Q243 21:2 includes reference to one “Balakros (בלכרוס).” As Collins highlighted, at least three of Alexander the Great's officers went by this name. It is possible that additional figures associated with the Hellenistic or Roman empires were named in 4Q243 19:1-2, yet these cannot be identified with any degree of certainty.¹² In view of these few references, Garcia-Martinez concluded that “despite the fact that the personages in question must retain their anonymity and remain wrapped in mystery, the mere circumstance of their mention by name is quite interesting, and differentiates our texts from other mss. of Qumran, in which allusions of an actual historical character are extremely rare.”¹³

¹² Collins, “*Pseudo-Daniel Revisited*,” 129. See also the discussion in Garcia-Martinez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 144-45.

¹³ Garcia-Martinez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 145.

I would add that this quality in *Pseudo-Daniel* also sets the Aramaic work apart from the biblical book, since the later veils its critiques of empires and pagan kings in symbolic dream-visions and ciphers. In the present text, the character of Daniel is painted with a similar brush as his canonical counterpart, insofar as they both reflect on the imperial past and through *ex eventu* project movements in the future. Yet the detail work is different as there is an apparent proclivity for explicit references in *Pseudo-Daniel*. While we cannot be sure of the exact narrative setting of the work—if included a revelatory episode or writing of some description—these mentions of named figures associated with ancient empires are undoubtedly associated with Daniel. These mentions enhance his portrayal as an endowed sage with intimate knowledge of specific political movements and figures, some of which are of a different sort than known in the biblical Daniel.

***Pseudo-Daniel's* Recollection of Genesis Traditions: The Flood, Babel, and Exodus**

The final components of *Pseudo-Daniel* memorial of Israel's past to consider pertains to the many notable nods to events and episodes culled from the primeval history or themes of the exodus traditions. The earliest discernable reference to an event is that of the deluge, settling of the ark, and founding of a city in 4Q244 8. While this event is understandably linked to Genesis, the limited words that follow indicate *Pseudo-Daniel's* memory of the flood is cast in terms closer to broader Second Temple traditions related to this event, as indicated by the reference “Lubar (לובר),” a post-flood location known also in *Genesis Apocryphon* (1Q20 12:13), *Book of Giants* (6Q8 26:1), and Jub. 5:28; 7:1, 17.

The fragmentary remains of 4Q243 10:2-3 seem to reference the Babel tradition (Gen 11:1-9). This is suggested by the phrases “o]n the tower, and he sent (ע]ל מגדלא ושלח)” and “to]inspect a building (ל]בְקֶרֶה בְּבִנְיָן).” The partial phrase “the tower, [whose] heig[ht (מגדלא (

מה]ר[” at 4Q244 9:2 may also relate to this scene. Kugel suggested that the 4Q243 10:2 may be read in light of the phrasing “let us go down” in Gen 10:7, perhaps suggesting that the interpretation in *Pseudo-Daniel* implied God remained in heaven while dispatching heavenly emissaries to investigate the tower.¹⁴

The Exodus as Heard through the Memory of Genesis

Apart from a brief mention to the exodus in the phrase “Egypt, by the hand of (מצרין)” (ביד) (4Q243 11ii:2), 4Q243 12 includes the fullest memory of the exodus. This text reads:

1. fo]ur hundred [years,] and from (שנין אר[בַּע מאה ומן)
2.]their [...] and they will come out of (סְהוּן ויתון מן גוא)
3.] their crossing the Jordan, the [xth] jubilee¹⁵ (מעברהון ירדנא יובל[א])
4.]and their children [(ובניהון)
5.]...[(דיתו)

This fragment not only closely relates the exodus with the wilderness wanderings, it sets these recollections in a chronological framework. The reference to 400 years seems to represent the prediction of Egyptian bondage presented to Abraham in Gen 15:13, not 430 years as related by Exod 12:40-41 (cf. the 400 year figure in Philo, Josephus, and Jubilees). If the

¹⁴ Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible*, 242. Cf. Jub. 10:22-23; *Conf.* 168, 171, 174; Tg. Ps.-J. Gen 11:7; *Civ.* 16.5. In translation Cook rendered and reconstruct in view of such an understanding: “agai]nst the tower and He sent [angels” (Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 343).

¹⁵ Collins and Flint rendered this line as “their crossing the rive[r] Jordan” (DJD 22:105). Garcia-Martinez previously concluded that given the nearby reference to the “Jordan (ירדנא),” this term should be understood as the “river Jordan” (*Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 141-42). At the time, he indicated the meaning “jubilee” was unknown in ancient Jewish Aramaic literature. However, it is now evident that the term occurs in 1Q20 6:10 with this meaning. Furthermore, while there is indeed precedent in Hebrew literature for the terms יְבֵל (“watercourse”) (e.g., Is 30:25; 44:4; Job 20:28), יוֹבֵל (“canal” or “stream”) (e.g., Jer 17:8; 1QH 8:7, 10), or אֶבְל (“canal”) (e.g., Dan 8:2, nowhere is the Jordan river described in such geographical terms. *HALOT* lists the present instance of the term in *Pseudo-Daniel* as meaning “water-course” or “canal” on recommendation of Milik. However, this understanding should now be corrected to the understanding “jubilee year” as suggested here and listed appropriately by Cook (*Dictionary of Qumran Aramaic*, 101). See also his translation of the passage along these lines in Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 343.

association with Gen 15:13 is correct, this may suggest the presence of Abraham in roster of ancestral mentions. Either way, the figure 400 suggests that the memory of the exodus was set in the domain of an ancestral tradition anchored in Genesis.

Conclusions

This study was a highly selective consideration of aspects of the complex and challenging fragments of *Pseudo-Daniel*. Nonetheless, the discussion above resulted in some outcomes for how we might revisit the dynamic portrayals of Daniel in ancient Jewish tradition as well as re-evaluate how we account for the contours of the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls corpus.

Remembering as a Creative Process for Character Development and Tradition Formation

To use the analogy of scenes, characters, and storyboards, it seems safe to say that in Aramaic *Pseudo-Daniel*—or any other representatives of the Danielic tradition in ancient Judaism—we are dealing with the same actor known from the biblical book, yet are seeing him in a different performance setting where his character is drawn differently. The contributors to this rapidly developing tradition in the centuries leading up to the Common Era seem to have cast Daniel in several scenes and stories and, therefore, cultivated a dynamic persona for the figure that worked itself out differently in different narrative settings with their own rhetorical or theological dynamics. As a character, Daniel is bigger than any one text or performance.

In the case of the *Pseudo-Daniel* texts, it was demonstrated that at least part of this characterization was enabled or enhanced by an ambitious scribal attempt to foreground Daniel against a backdrop of curated memories of individuals, episodes, and eras from Israel's past. In many instances, the presentation of these memories either alluded to or explicitly named ancestral figures (e.g., Noah and Enoch), individuals foundational to the origins of the monarchy (e.g., David and Solomon) and historic priesthoods (e.g., Levi, Zadok, Abiathar), as well as

reference to episodes essential to Israel's collective memory (e.g., the flood, exodus, and exiles). While our Daniel in *Pseudo-Daniel* remains a figure plausibly set in the Babylonian period, these memories of the past elevated his profile as a reliable conduit for delivering both retrospective views of Israelite experience and prospective (or even prescriptive) outlooks for Jewish identity in the scribe and audience's contemporary world. Unlike discourses attached to founding figures which marshal new material to individuals already established in the antecedent tradition (here I am thinking of the insightful work of Hindy Najman), in *Pseudo-Daniel* we find traditions associated with foundational figures are thrown ahead to bolster a more recently drawn persona with greater authority and insight.

Since there is no evidence that *Pseudo-Daniel* as a composition assumes or requires a reference point in "biblical" Daniel, it is also important to recall that what seems to be at the core of the tradition at this stage is a persona not a particular text within the tradition. While the book of Daniel was no doubt suddenly popular in and beyond Qumran shortly after its composition in the mid-second century BCE, I would argue that the status of the book is in many ways indebted to the stature of the character within it. This stature was achieved in part by his elevated profile developed *across* the tradition, which was first initiated in Aramaic scribal settings.

Implications for the Contours and Categorization of the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls

As is widely recognized in scholarship, regardless of how we categorize the compositions among the Qumran Aramaic texts, these writings are oriented around either the antediluvian/patriarchal past or exilic age. On literary grounds, this also accounts for *Pseudo-Daniel*, which seems to cast Daniel yet again in the Babylonian court. However, in terms of the content of the materials associated with the persona of Daniel in this exilic context, the majority of eras, episodes, and individuals included in the fragmentary remains were memories from the

ancestral and national pasts. It was demonstrated above that *Pseudo-Daniel*'s recollections effectively straddled both the predominant settings of the Aramaic texts. While the work was set in the recent exilic past, a good amount of its content and concerns were anchored in the more antiquated ancestral past, not least Genesis. Furthermore, the work dabbled in the territory and times between these ages in a way that is not well-represented in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls. The genealogical traditions described above perhaps best illustrate this conclusion. This vehicle of memory included references to founding figures and lines initiated in Genesis, acknowledgment and mention of the heads of multiple priestly families that emerged in the monarchic period, and eventually named High Priests that extended into the Second Temple period though *ex eventu* projections. The added dynamic of the mention of royal figures—not least David and Solomon—established a space for the essential institution of the kingdom of Israel in the history and memory of *Pseudo-Daniel*. While *Pseudo-Daniel*'s narrative is related in retrospect from the eastern diaspora, the coverage of its memories of the past were not limited to the poles of Israelite history; rather, they included trajectories that originate in the ancestral past and made explicit mention to items at the heart of Israelite history in between.

As Hendel noted at the outset of his study on Abraham traditions in the Hebrew Bible, the Palestinian Targums refer to their Hebrew scriptural antecedents as “the Book of Memories.”¹⁶ While we now have at our disposal a larger library of ancient Judaism Aramaic scribal heritage among the Dead Sea Scrolls, it seems that in many ways writings within the collection, such as *Pseudo-Daniel*, likewise live up to that descriptor for their scribal creativity in curating memories of Israel's past for contemporary Jewish audiences in the Second Temple period.

¹⁶ Hendel, *Remembering Abraham*, ix.