The Book of Daniel in Light of the Ancient Near Eastern Literary and Material Finds: an Archaeological Perspective

Patrick Mazani
Andrews University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations

Part of the Biblical Studies Commons, History of Art, Architecture, and Archaeology Commons, and the Near Eastern Languages and Societies Commons

Recommended Citation

https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations/93

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Research at Digital Commons @ Andrews University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Andrews University. For more information, please contact repository@andrews.edu.
Thank you for your interest in the Andrews University Digital Library of Dissertations and Theses.

Please honor the copyright of this document by not duplicating or distributing additional copies in any form without the author’s express written permission. Thanks for your cooperation.
THE BOOK OF DANIEL IN LIGHT OF THE ANCIENT NEAR EASTERN LITERARY AND MATERIAL FINDS: AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

A Dissertation for the degree of Ph.D.
Andrews University
Patrick Mazani
2008
THE BOOK OF DANIEL IN LIGHT OF THE ANCIENT NEAR EASTERN LITERARY AND MATERIAL FINDS: AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

A Dissertation

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy

by

Paula M. Manu

December 2000

Volume 2
Andrews University

Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary

THE BOOK OF DANIEL IN LIGHT OF THE ANCIENT NEAR EASTERN LITERARY AND MATERIAL FINDS:
AN ARCHAEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

A Dissertation

Presented in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Patrick Mazani

December 2008

Volume 2
TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES .................................................. viii

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .......................................... ix

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION .................................................. 1

Archaeology and the Book of Daniel ............................ 1
Problem ................................................................ 12
Purpose .................................................................. 12
Justification .......................................................... 12
Delimitations ......................................................... 13
Methodology ......................................................... 13

II. ANCIENT PEOPLE AND PLACES IN DANIEL ............... 15

Introduction .......................................................... 15
Historical Geography ............................................... 16
  The Euphrates River .............................................. 17
  The Tigris River (Dan 10:4) .................................... 18
  Ulai River (Dan 8:2) ............................................. 20
  The Great Sea (Dan 7:2) ......................................... 23
  The Plain of Dura (Dan 3:1) .................................... 26
Ancient People and Places in Daniel ......................... 29
  The Chaldeans (Dan 1:4) ....................................... 29
  The City of Babylon (Dan 4:30) ......................... 32
  Shinar (Dan 1:2) .................................................. 37
  Jerusalem (Dan 1:1-2) ........................................... 38
  Judah and Israel (Dan 1:3-4, 6) ......................... 40
  Ammon (Dan 11:41) ............................................. 42
  Moab (Dan 11:41) ................................................ 45
  Edom (Dan 11:41) ............................................... 46
  Egypt (Dan 9:15; 11:8) ........................................ 48
  Ethiopia (Dan 11:43) .......................................... 53
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Libya/Lybia (Dan 11:43)</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece (Dan 8:21; 10:20; 11:2)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittim (Dan 11:30)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elam (Dan 8:2)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šusan/Susa (Dan 8:2)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uphaz (Dan 10:5)</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Medes and Persians (Dan 5:28)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III. NEBUCHADNEZZAR AND GEOPOLITICAL FRAMEWORKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebuchadn/rezzar (Dan 1-4)</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebuchadnezzar My Servant (Dan 1:2)</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Royal Title (Dan 1-4)</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Administration (Dan 1:1-2)</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Officials Catalogue (Dan 1-5)</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Wise Men (Dan 1-5)</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Distinctions (Dan 1-6)</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eunuchs (Dan 1:3)</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation (Dan 2:9)</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylonian Imperial Administration on Judah (Dan 1:1-2)</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hezekiah, King of Judah</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoiakim, King of Judah (Dan 1:1)</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehoiachin, King of Judah</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zedekiah, King of Judah</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gedaliah, the Governor</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah, the Prophet (Dan 9:2)</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel, the Prophet</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judah under Babylonian Attack (Dan 1:1)</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem under Siege (Dan 1:1)</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temples (Dan 1:2)</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple Looting (Dan 1:2)</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Finds in Jerusalem (Dan 9:25)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deportations (Dan 1:1-3)</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Babylonian Gap (Dan 9:2)</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylonian Curricula (Dan 1:3, 4)</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietary Practices (Dan 1:5, 8)</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine (Dan 1:8)</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation of Dreams (Dan 2-4; 7-12)</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebuchadnezzar’s Dreams (Dan 2; 4)</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebuchadnezzar’s Gigantic Image (Dan 3)</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Fiery Furnace (Dan 3)</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical Instruments (Dan 3:5)</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Four-Kingdom Schema (Dan 2)</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebuchadnezzar’s Tree (Dan 4)</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel’s Dreams/Visions (Dan 7-12)</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Blowing Winds of Daniel (Dan 2:35; 7:2)</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Four Marine Animals and Geopolitical Representations</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Representations (Dan 7)</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Court Scene (Dan 7:9, 10)</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Judgment (Dan 7:22)</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Son of Man (Dan 7:13)</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Seventy Years of Captivity (Dan 9:2)</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Seventy Weeks of Dan 9:24-27: A Mathematical Computation</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Flood in Daniel 9:26</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Praying Daniel (Dan 9)</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fasting and Mourning Rites (Dan 9:3)</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel’s God (Dan 1:2)</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hymn to God (Dan 2:20-23)</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IV. THE SUCCESSION OF POLITICAL EMPIRES LEADING TO THE TIME OF THE END**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Identity of Belshazzar (Dan 5)</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Feast of Belshazzar and the Fall of Babylon (Dan 5)</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akitu Festival (Dan 5)</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylonian Gods (Dan 5:4)</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The King’s Wives and Concubines (Dan 5:2, 3, 23)</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Queen Mother (Dan 5:10)</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decipherment of the Inscription in the Hall (Dan 5:7)</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darius the Mede (Dan 5:31)</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lions’ Den (Dan 6)</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killing the Families of the Guilty (Dan 6:24)</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrus II, the Persian (Dan 10:1)</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Prince of Persia (Dan 10:13, 20)</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Kings of Daniel 11</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median and Persian Kings (vv. 1-2)</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Kings (vv. 3-19)</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Time of the End (Dan 8:17, 19; 11:40; 12:4, 9, 13)</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ones Sleeping in the Dust (Dan 12:2)</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seals (Dan 12:4, 9)</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Righteous (Dan 9:7, 14, 16, 18)</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. THE BOOK OF DANIEL AND ANCIENT LITERATURE RELATING TO DANIEL ........................................... 360

The Composition of Daniel ........................................... 360
Datable Events in Daniel ........................................... 363
Dating Problem ........................................... 364
Multilingualism in Daniel ........................................... 371
The Hebrew of Daniel (Dan 1:1-2:4a; 8-12) ........................................... 373
The Aramaic of Daniel (Dan 2:4b-7) ........................................... 375
Greek Translation of Daniel ........................................... 379
Sources for the Study of Daniel ........................................... 385
Daniel Outside the Book of Daniel ........................................... 393
  In the Hebrew Bible: Noah, Daniel, and Job ........................................... 393
  New Testament Times ........................................... 405
Daniel and the ANE Literature ........................................... 407
  The Legend of Aqhat ........................................... 407
  The Story of Ahikar/Ahiqar ........................................... 409
  Daniel and Related Ugaritic Literature ........................................... 411
  Daniel and Related Akkadian Literature ........................................... 412
The Text of Daniel at Qumran ........................................... 413
Nonbiblical Texts Associated with Daniel ........................................... 419
Prayer of Nabonidus ........................................... 421
4Q242(4QPrNab) Text ........................................... 423
Apocryphal Additions to the Text of Daniel ........................................... 427
Daniel in the Pseudepigrapha ........................................... 430
Daniel as an Apocalypse ........................................... 434
The Maccabean Hypothesis Approach ........................................... 442
  Historical Arguments ........................................... 443
  Linguistic Arguments ........................................... 444
  Literary Arguments ........................................... 447
  Theological Arguments ........................................... 448
  Exegetical Arguments ........................................... 450
Antiochus IV Epiphanes Omission ........................................... 450
The Interpretation Strains on Daniel ........................................... 462
Conclusion ........................................... 467

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS ........................................... 469

Summary ........................................... 469
Conclusions ........................................... 475
Suggestions for Further Study ........................................... 477
Appendix

A. MONTHS OF THE YEAR ......................................................... 478
B. ARCHAEOLOGICAL TIMETABLE ............................................. 479

BIBLIOGRAPHY ........................................................................ 480

Digitized by the Center for Adventist Research
CHAPTER V

THE BOOK OF DANIEL AND ANCIENT LITERATURE RELATING TO DANIEL

The Composition of Daniel

Studies on the writing of the book of Daniel have stimulated an ongoing debate that is centered mainly on authorship and the relationship between chaps. 1-6 and chaps. 7-12.\(^1\) Porphyry (ca. A.D. 232/4-304) questioned the historicity of Daniel and the authenticity of the book that bears his name.\(^2\) He suggested that the book of Daniel was written by an individual who was in Judea during the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.\(^3\) Further, he argued that Daniel never predicted the future but was simply narrating authentic history up to the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.\(^4\) In light of this, the writer of the book of Daniel has been “considered a ‘palimpsestic author’, who used the texts

---


\(^3\) Archer, trans., *Jerome’s Commentary on Daniel*, 15.

\(^4\) Ibid.
transmitted to him in order to apply them to the situation of his own generation.” On the other hand, the literary genre differences between the two sections of the book of Daniel have led some scholars to suggest multi-authorship. However, the debate over the issues concerning the composition of Daniel continues to baffle progress towards understanding that book as a literary unit.

Fortunately, there are many archaeological discoveries and extrabiblical data which can shed light on to some of the problems encountered in understanding the composition of the book of Daniel. As already shown in this work, the geographical places, historical persons, and enigmatic words and phrases in the text of Daniel can be understood better in light of related archaeological finds.

According to the internal evidence the setting of the book of Daniel is mainly the Neo-Babylonian to Medo-Persian court (late seventh to sixth century B.C.). The events described stretch from the siege of Jerusalem in the third year of Jehoiakim king of Judah (605 B.C.) to the third year of Cyrus the Persian king ruling in Babylonia (537/6 B.C.). Other contemporary historical figures featured in the book who interacted with the author

---


include Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon (605-562 B.C.), the coregent king Belshazzar (550-539 B.C.), Darius the Mede (539 B.C.), Cyrus (559-530 B.C.), and Jeremiah (627-580 B.C.).

The book is attributed to Daniel, who appeared as a Jewish exile of noble birth (Dan 1:3, 6) but with no genealogical record. Chapter 4:1-27, 34-37 appears as Nebuchadnezzar’s first-person testimony but vv. 28-33 could be the author’s editorial comment. The first six chapters of the book are Neo-Babylonian and Persian court stories. The text reveals that the author must have been very well acquainted with the contemporaneous court system and its operations. The last six chapters describe in the first-person singular the personal dreams, experiences, and apocalyptic visions of the writer, which seem to build upon the first six chapters of the book.

Wayne Sibley Towner argued that the “radically divergent content of the two halves of the book” of Daniel, which were written in two languages, is a reflection of a work by “several authors.” Nonetheless, a comparative analysis by Zdravko Stefanovic attempts to show the thematic relationships between the two main sections of Daniel. Stefanovic, however, concluded that the historical (chaps. 1-6) and the prophetic (chaps 7-12) pericopes present an outlook of a unified work of a single author rather than a

---

8Towner, Daniel, 5.
9Ibid.
fragmented collection of writings from different sources. Further, he pointed out that the historical and prophetic segments of Daniel point to an early date of their composition, as well as the early type of Aramaic used.

Opinions nevertheless differ on the authorship of Daniel. Suggestions on authorship include the Right Teacher of the Qumran community, an anonymous story writer, a second-century B.C. author, multiple authorship, and Daniel, a Jew in Babylonian exile. Despite the various ideas on authorship, the coherent nature of the text, its thematic consistency and ingenuity, backed up by archaeological finds, lead to the logical conclusion that the book of Daniel seems to reflect a single author.

**Datable Events in Daniel**

Some events in the book of Daniel can be chronologically ascertained and

---


dated. Most of these historical incidents are attested in several contemporary ancient Near Eastern sources discovered by archaeologists, and they can provide useful data for addressing the dating problem. The text of Daniel reveals that the author was cognizant of the prevailing situation in the Neo-Babylonian as well as the Medo-Persian court and provides information unique to himself. The datable events shown in table 8 are contemporaneous with the author and are useful in dating the book of Daniel.

**Dating Problem**

Scholars have inconclusively assigned the writing of the book of Daniel to different periods of time. The irreconcilable opinions on the dating of Daniel have become more complex because the same evidence on the dating of Daniel have been used either to support the earlier or later dates for the composition of the text.

---


17 The main views on the dating of Daniel are the traditional perspective which considers a sixth-century date for Daniel and the popular position which assigns the writing to about 165 B.C.
### TABLE 8

**DATED EVENTS IN DANIEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>EVENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>605 BC</td>
<td>Third year of the reign of Jehoiakim king of Judah/Nebuchadnezzar besieged Jerusalem (Dan 1:1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel and his friends, along with other Jewish captives and temple vessels, were taken to Babylon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604 BC</td>
<td>Appointment of students for the king's school (Dan 1:3-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603 BC</td>
<td>Nebuchadnezzar's dream in his second year of reign (Dan 2:1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel recovered and interpreted the king's dream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602 BC</td>
<td>End of the three years of training set by the king (Dan 1:18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel and friends entered the king's service (Dan 1:19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602-536 BC</td>
<td>Daniel's service in the Neo-Babylonian and Medo-Persian courts (Dan 1:21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>593 BC</td>
<td>King Nebuchadnezzar assembles all people on the Plain of Dura to worship the golden image he had set up (Dan 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three instruments with Greek names are identified in the orchestra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego are rescued from the fiery furnace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550/49 BC</td>
<td>First year of Belshazzar (Dan 7:1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel's dream of four marine beasts from the Mediterranean Sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548/7 BC</td>
<td>Third year of king Belshazzar (Dan 8:1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel's vision of the ram and the goat by the Ulai River/Canal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539 BC</td>
<td>Banquet and death of Belshazzar (Dan 5:1-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cyrus king of Persia takes Babylon (Dan 1:21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Darius the Mede receives the Babylonian kingdom (Dan 5:31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539-530 BC</td>
<td>The reign of Cyrus king of Persia (Dan 6:28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>539/8 BC</td>
<td>Darius the Mede's first year of reign under Cyrus king of Persia (Dan 9:1; 11:1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel's prayer in the first year of Darius the Mede (Dan 9:1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Angel visitor relating events of the first year of Darius the Mede (Dan 11:1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536 BC</td>
<td>Third year of Cyrus king of Persia (Dan 10:1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel's vision while he was by the Tigris River</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are some who advocate a pre-Maccabean era for the writing of the whole book, while others prefer the Maccabean date (165 B.C.). Some suggest that parts of Dan 1-6 are pre-Maccabean while the rest of the book may be Maccabean. A study of the debate on Daniel’s dating classified the arguments into the historical, the literary or linguistic, the theological, and the exegetical categories. This analysis indicates that the use of archaeology in the understanding of the dating of Daniel has been underutilized.

Daniel has been considered a historical fiction, pseudepigraphical work that presents *vaticinium ex eventu* (prophecy after the event), composed around 165 B.C.


20 Gerhard F. Hasel discusses various positions on the dating by different writers; see his “The Book of Daniel and Matters of Language: Evidences Relating to Names, Words, and the Aramaic Language,” 211-225. For example, P. R. Davies, “Daniel Chapter Two,” *JTS* 27 (1976): 392-401, took chapter 2 to have been written in the sixth century B.C. but he thought that Dan 1-6 was written in the diaspora only to be finally redacted in the Maccabean period. Idem, “Eschatology in the Book of Daniel,” *JSOT* 17 (1980): 33-53. A. Lacocque proposed the composition of Dan 9 to have been between 587-538 B.C.; see his “The Liturgical Prayer in Daniel 9,” 119-142.

encourage Jews who were undergoing persecution by Antiochus IV Epiphanes.\(^{22}\) However, a close analysis of the themes and concerns of the book of Daniel seems to show that the book was not written as a prophylactic document for people under the “fearful ordeal of persecution.”\(^{23}\)

In the Hebrew Bible, Daniel is placed among \(K\) \(t\)û\(b\)î\(m\) “the Writings” and not among \(N\)\(b\)î\(‘\)î\(m\) “the Prophets,” and this has been seen to indicate that the book is not prophecy but an apocalypse and that it was written later than all the prophets.\(^{24}\) Nevertheless, the placing of Daniel in the Writings section of the Hebrew Bible or the \(T\)a\(N\)a\(K\) (\(T\)ô\(r\)â\(h\), \(N\)\(b\)î\(‘\)î\(m\), \(K\)\(t\)û\(b\)î\(m\))\(^{25}\) has nothing to do with the dating of the book because along with Daniel in the same section are also other earlier texts such as Job, Davidic Psalms, and Solomonic writings.\(^{26}\) In the LXX Daniel is placed among the prophets. At Qumran, the Florilegium (4QFlor [4Q174]) indicates Daniel as a prophet and the author of the book bearing his name.\(^{27}\) Josephus strongly indicated that in the first century A.D.

\(^{22}\) Archer, trans., Jerome’s Commentary on Daniel, 15; and Collins, Daniel, 25.

\(^{23}\) Porteous, Daniel, 21.


\(^{27}\) DJD, 5:54-55.
Daniel belonged to the prophets in the second division of the Hebrew Bible canon.²⁸

The hymn in honor of the ancestors by Jesus Son of Sirach (Ecclesiasticus or Sirach 44-50) identifies some of the famous men in the Israelite history but does not mention Daniel in any way, and this has been used by some as evidence for the late date for the book of Daniel. However, the names mentioned by Sirach do not appear in their chronological order, nor do they present a comprehensive list. Some important key players in the writing of Israelite history such as Jehoshaphat, Ezra, and Mordecai, just to name a few, are missing and there is no renowned woman acknowledged in the whole text. In fact, during the first century A.D. Daniel was already considered a prophet (Matt 24:15; Luke 21:20; Mark 13:14).²⁹

Several features of the book have been cited as historical inaccuracies. These include some internal dating data (Dan 1:1; 2:1; 7:1; 8:1; 9:1), the Chaldeans as wise men (1:4; 2:2, 10-14), Nebuchadnezzar’s building projects (4:30) and mental derangement (4:25, 28-33; 5:21), the mention of Darius the Mede (6:28; 9:1; 11:1), and the identity of Belshazzar as king (5:1, 9; 7:1; 8:1) or as the son of Nebuchadnezzar (5:2, 11, 18).

Discussing these issues in light of the archaeological evidence shows that they are not “in

²⁸Josephus, Against Apion, 1.8; idem, Antiquities, 10.11.7; and also Archer, A Survey of the Old Testament, 424.

conflict with other historical witnesses," but rather, they indicate that the author of Daniel had unique information known only to himself and must have lived during the time period he wrote about.

The study of the Hebrew and Aramaic of Daniel along with some Greek and Persian loan-words has been implemented to determine whether the book belongs to an earlier origin or to the Maccabean date. In light of this, several experts in the Aramaic language have concluded that the Qumran Job Targum (11QtgJob) is dated to the second century B.C., the second half of the third century B.C., or the first half of the second century B.C. and that its Aramaic is evidently centuries later than that of Daniel and Ezra. This being the case, then the Aramaic of the book of Daniel would evidently point us to a much earlier date than the suggested 165 B.C. Moreover, Daniel’s Aramaic

---

30 Collins, Daniel, 30.


33 B. Jongeling et al., Aramaic Texts from Qumran (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 6; and Michael Sokoloff, The Targum to Job from Qumran Cave XI (Ramat-Gan [Israel]: Bar-Ilan University, 1974), 25.


and syntax have been attested as belonging to the sixth century B.C. and of Babylonian provenance.36

Prior to the adopting of the Seleucid system in 311 B.C., the ancient Mesopotamians had no fixed method for dating, but they had several ways to determine dates based on the reigning years of their rulers or the important events that took place.37 The book of Daniel used the Mesopotamian method of dating (Dan 1:1, 21; 2:1; 7:1; 8:1; 9:1; 10:1). The datable events in Daniel38 can be precisely ascertained when correlated with the contemporary Babylonian and Persian king lists and other relevant chronological conventions.39

On the other hand, some studies conclude that Dan 1-6 stories originated around seventh to sixth centuries B.C. during the time of the Babylonian exile, and that Dan 7-12


38See table 8 above.

39The Assyrian limmu-lists offer valuable astronomical data from 747-631 B.C. and coincide with Ptolemy’s Canon, which has the list of kings and their length of reign from Nabonassar, 747 B.C., through Cleopatra VII’s reign in 30 B.C. These lists, along with the Neo-Babylonian and Persian dated economic texts and receipts, can be utilized to determine the datable material in the book of Daniel. See Nemet-Nejat, Daily Life in Ancient Mesopotamia, 10; and Leo Depuydt, “‘More Valuable Than All Gold’: Ptolemy’s Royal Canon and Babylonian Chronology,” JCS 47 (1995): 97-117.
apocalypses were written to complete the book of Daniel around 165 B.C.\textsuperscript{40}

Nevertheless, more and more archaeological evidence seems to show that the book of Daniel is a unified whole that must have been composed earlier than popular suggestions.

Daniel seems to have been written in the sixth century B.C. since it contains more stories from that time than from the Hellenistic or Roman periods. If it was written in the second century B.C. as thought by some, then it should have had more of the Greek language, style, or literary motifs. One of the main concerns of the Danielic author was on how the Jerusalem temple was looted and destroyed (Dan 1:2; 5:2, 3, 23; 9:17). If the book was written after the returning exiles had finished reconstructing the temple in 516/515 B.C.,\textsuperscript{41} it is most likely that the author was going to highlight this event.

However, an examination of the archaeological evidence in relation to Daniel may show that the popular dating of the book might have been misplaced by several centuries.

**Multilingualism in Daniel**

The book of Daniel is multilingual.\textsuperscript{42} Chapters 1-2:4a and 8-12 are predominantly Hebrew whereas 2:4b-7 are Aramaic. In the Hebrew and Aramaic passages are some Akkadian, Greek, and Old Persian words which serve to show the author’s linguistic skills and administrative experience with national and international affairs while he was

\textsuperscript{40}Bandstra, *Reading the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*, 477-478; and Talmon, “Daniel,” 343-344.


\textsuperscript{42}Daniel is usually classified as bilingual in the sense that the text is composed of two main languages, Hebrew and Aramaic, but there are several words in the text that were borrowed from other languages.
in the Babylonian and Medo-Persian courts.\textsuperscript{43} The foreign words have been used to date the book of Daniel, but the same evidence has also been used differently to advocate for either the sixth-century or second-century B.C. dates.\textsuperscript{44}

Archaeology shows that multilingual documents are not unique in the ancient Near Eastern first millennium B.C. To name a few, the life-size Statue of Hadad-yith’i, the ruler of Guzana in the mid-ninth century B.C. in northern Syria, was found with bilingual Akkadian-Aramaic inscriptions where the first half of the two versions was very close, but the second half had wide-ranging differences.\textsuperscript{45} Bilingual texts include some from Asia Minor in Lydian and Aramaic,\textsuperscript{46} in Greek and Aramaic,\textsuperscript{47} and the Tell

\textsuperscript{43} Word studies have been made by several scholars on the foreign words in the text of Daniel; see S. R. Driver, \textit{An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament} (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1910), 501-508; Wiseman et al., \textit{Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel} (1965); and Boutflower, \textit{In and Around the Book of Daniel}, 241-267.

\textsuperscript{44} Already noted above in Musical Instruments (Dan 3:5).


\textsuperscript{46} Donner and Röllig, \textit{Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften}, 2:305-309, no. 260.

\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., 2:309-310, no. 262; and Greenfield, “Aramaic Studies and the Bible,” 128. The excavations at Tel Dan (Arabic Tel el Qadi) uncovered a bilingual Greek and Aramaic dedicatory inscription which read: “To the God who is in Dan, Zoilos made a vow.” See Avraham Biran, “Dan,” \textit{ABD} (1992), 2:16-17; also idem, “What Is Biblical Archaeology?” 3.
A trilingual inscription in Aramaic, Greek, and Lycian was found in the Sanctuary of Leto at Xanthos in 1973. Elam outside the Bible appears first in 1667 A.D. when Samuel Flower discovered some cuneiform inscriptions at Persepolis. These were deciphered in 1778 by Carsten Niebuhr, who indicated that the signs were trilingual, "Old Persian, the Babylonian dialect of Akkadian and Elamite." The Rosetta Stone records a decree made by some Egyptian priests in 196 B.C. conferring honors on Ptolemy V Epiphanes. It was written in classical Egyptian hieroglyphics, demotic, and classical Greek. Multilingualism in Daniel reflects a literary technique that was in common use in the ancient Near East in different time periods.

The Hebrew of Daniel (Dan 1:1-2:4a; 8-12)

Daniel 1:1-2:4a and 8-12 are the Hebrew parts of the book. Some scrolls recovered by archaeologists at Qumran confirm the Hebrew and Aramaic parts of the text of Daniel just as they appear in the MT. 1QDan (Dan 1:10-17; 2:2-6) shows the transition from Hebrew to Aramaic at 2:2b while both 4QDan and 4QDan preserve the


50 Potts, The Archaeology of Elam, 5.

51 Ibid.

shift from Aramaic back to Hebrew at Dan 8:1. The hypothesis that the Hebrew of the Danielic text was a translation from the Aramaic original document has been discarded for lack of supportive linguistic evidence. Aramaic shares not only the script with Hebrew but also the vocabulary. As sister languages, Aramaic and Hebrew have close affinities that when objectively analyzed may help determine the date of the composition of Daniel.

Daniel uses some contemporary exilic phrases that were also commonly employed by Ezekiel, such as מְאֹד מֶלֶךְ (Dan 8:17; Ezek 2:1), יָשָׁר יִשְׂרָאֵל (Dan 8:17; 11:35, 40; 12:4; Ezek 21:25, 29), יָשָׁר יִשְׂרָאֵל “Beautiful” (Dan 8:9; 11:41; Ezek 20:6, 15), יִשָּׁר יִשְׂרָאֵל “burnished bronze” (Dan 10:6; Ezek 1:7), יִשָּׁר יִשְׂרָאֵל “clothed in white linen” (Dan 12:6, 7; Ezek 9:3, 11; 10:2, 6, 7). Montgomery, who followed Franz Delitzsch, acknowledged Daniel’s literary use of Ezekiel but nevertheless dated Daniel along with Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther, to have been written shortly before the beginning of the Greek period. W. F. Martin analyzed the words in Daniel that are used to support


a late date for the book and concluded that there was nothing extraordinary in the Hebrew of Daniel that would deny a sixth-century B.C. date.\textsuperscript{58} Thus, there is no evidence to show that any words in Daniel classified as second century B.C. or later were not already in use in the sixth century B.C. or earlier.

**The Aramaic of Daniel (Dan 2:4b-7)**

The book of Daniel records that Aramaic was the language the Chaldeans spoke to King Nebuchadnezzar in the court (Dan 2:4b, attested in 1QDan\textsuperscript{a}).\textsuperscript{59} Why the writer switched from Hebrew to Aramaic at this point in the text is not very clear.\textsuperscript{60} The text also continues in Aramaic even after the speech of the Chaldeans is ended.\textsuperscript{61} At the beginning of chap. 8 the author switches back from Aramaic to Hebrew (attested in 4QDan\textsuperscript{a} and

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{59} \textit{DJD}, 1:150-151; and John C. Trevor, “Completion of the Publication of Some Fragments from Qumran Cave 1,” \textit{Revue de Qumran} 19 (1965): 323-344.
  \item \textsuperscript{60} There has been a deliberate attempt to explain the bilingualism in Daniel and Ezra through different approaches. H. L. Ginsberg employed the diachronical approach but he fails to settle the question on why the authors used Hebrew, switched to Aramaic, and then went back to Hebrew. See his “The Composition of the Book of Daniel,” \textit{VT} 4 (1954): 246-275. Bill T. Arnold realized the inadequacies of the diachronic method and supplemented it with the synchronic approach as he analyzed bilingualism in Ezra and Daniel, in “The Use of Aramaic in the Hebrew Bible: Another Look at Bilingualism in Ezra and Daniel,” \textit{JNSL} 22 (1996): 1-16.
  \item \textsuperscript{61} See how Daniel C. Snell wrestles with the problem of the continuation of Aramaic in the text even after the speech of the Chaldeans, in “Why Is There Aramaic in the Bible?” \textit{JSOT} 18 (1980): 32-51.
\end{itemize}
4QDan\(^b\)\(^{62}\) and continues in Hebrew to the end of the book.\(^{63}\) The book of Ezra has a literary format similar to that of Daniel, for Ezra 4:8-6:18; 7:12-26 is Aramaic while the rest of the document is Hebrew.

Textual analysts had long identified the two distinct sections of the book of Daniel, namely, the historical court stories (chaps. 1-6) and the prophetic/apocalyptic part (chaps. 7-12), but the Hebrew and Aramaic portions of the book do not follow these two literary conventions. Some have suggested that the author of Daniel introduced Aramaic to strive for authenticity in reporting the speech of foreigners, but this explanation, too, does not account for why the author continued in Aramaic when the foreigners had stopped speaking.\(^{64}\) However, it has been noted that the author of Daniel was bilingual and used Aramaic as a rhetorical device to show his literary views.\(^{65}\)

Gerhard F. Hasel\(^{66}\) traced the old debate with regard to the Aramaic of Daniel and


\(^{63}\)Four different approaches have been suggested by scholarship to explain the bilingual problems in Ezra and Daniel, but these have not been adequate to address the whole issue. See Collins, Daniel, 12, 13.


identified Samuel R. Driver\(^67\) as the one who sparked this ongoing debate in 1897. Driver pointed out that

the verdict of the language of Daniel is thus clear. The *Persian* words presuppose the period after the Persian empire had been well established: the Greek words *demand*, the Hebrew *supports*, and the Aramaic permits, a date *after the conquest of Palestine by Alexander the Great* (B.C. 332). The Aramaic is also that which was spoken *in or near Palestine*. With our present knowledge, this is as much as the language authorizes us to affirm; though *συμφωνία*, as the name of an instrument . . . would seem to point to a date somewhat advanced in the Greek period.\(^68\)

Driver’s conclusion led more scholars to the comparative study of the Aramaic of Daniel in light of new literary evidence that was being recovered. However, the ongoing discussion on the subject soon showed that Driver’s conclusion was limited to the evidence he had during his time. Despite the increasing new evidence concerning the date and use of the Aramaic language, scholars reached various conclusions on the nature and date of the Aramaic of Daniel. Driver, affirmed by R. D. Wilson\(^69\) and H. H. Rowley,\(^70\) maintained that the Aramaic of Daniel was after 331 B.C. or much later. Joseph Fitzmyer suggested that the Aramaic of Daniel should be dated at 200 B.C. but it “should not be pressed too rigidly.”\(^71\) On the other hand, Montgomery thought that Daniel’s Aramaic was


\(^68\)Ibid., 508.


from about 400 B.C. whereas Kitchen, Kutscher, Coxon, and Young\(^{72}\) point further back to the sixth century B.C. for the authorship.

The scholarly contention with the book of Daniel shifted a greater concern with the type of Aramaic Daniel has and its relation to the dating and authenticity of the entire document. Further, despite several recovered Aramaic documents, there is no clear-cut outline on the developmental phases the Aramaic language has gone through, or ways to determine "scribal updating" with regard to the transmission of the Aramaic of Daniel.\(^{73}\) Also, not much is known on phonological and orthographical differences that may have existed during the writing or transmission of the text of Daniel.\(^{74}\) Whether the geography of Daniel's Aramaic dialect is of eastern or western origin may not have a major impact in solving the problems of the dating. The study of the word order in the Aramaic of Daniel has not yielded any positive impact on the dating of the document either.\(^{75}\)

The temptation to take the Aramaic portion of the book of Daniel (2:4b-7:28) as an independent book is crippled by the fact that the literary unit of the entire book outweighs any suggestion otherwise. The book of Daniel is not "a composite but an


\(^{73}\)Stefanovic, The Aramaic of Daniel, 14, 15.

\(^{74}\)Ibid., 15.

intentionally constructed book,” which has a literary and a theological thrust throughout the entire text.

The study by Stefanovic where he correlated the literary, grammatical, and syntactical constructions of some Old Aramaic texts (900-700 B.C.) in comparison with the Aramaic of Daniel (a work grossly misunderstood by Collins) has shown the book of Daniel to have closer linguistic affinity to the Old Aramaic and Official Aramaic (700-300 B.C.) than the Middle Aramaic (300-200 B.C.), the Late Aramaic (200 B.C.-700 A.D.), and the Modern Aramaic (700 A.D. to the present). The use of the Aramaic language as a device to advocate for the late date of the book of Daniel has ostensibly failed to offer substantive evidence. On the other hand, overwhelming evidence shows that the Aramaic of Daniel is more closely related to the Official Aramaic and Old Aramaic than to any other periods of that language’s development.

Greek Translation of Daniel

The history of the translation of the Hebrew scriptures into Greek remains unclear and debatable. What makes it a complex issue is that the extant information that purports

---


77 Collins, Daniel, 16, n. 156.


to describe how the Greek translation came into existence is the apocryphal *Letter of Aristeas* or *Pseudo-Aristeas*\(^1\) written in Alexandria a century or more after the translation had been made.\(^2\) Whether or not the *Letter of Aristeas* is a reliable historical source on the Greek translation is the issue.\(^3\) The *Letter of Aristeas* has been charged with historical inaccuracies, questionable background, and unreliable dating.\(^4\) Although other writers from Alexandria, Aristobulus and Philo, are not consistent with the *Letter of Aristeas*, they repeat its story\(^5\) and this may in fact give Aristeas some credibility.

Interestingly, Josephus paraphrased the *Letter of Aristeas* and pointed out that it

---


\(^3\)Arie van der Kooij traces the four different hypotheses for the translation of the Pentateuch or Torah into Greek; see his “The Septuagint of the Pentateuch and Ptolemaic Rule,” in *The Pentateuch as Torah*, ed. Gary N. Knoppers and Bernard M. Levinson (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 295-299.


\(^5\)Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 12-13; see also Philo of Alexandria’s *Philo: De vita Mosis*, 2.26-44.
was circulating in Palestine in the first century A.D. Aristeas purports to write to a certain Philocrates whom he informed of the process of the translation of the Jewish Law into Greek during the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285-247 B.C.) in Alexandria. A certain Demetrius of Phaleron, who was the royal librarian, proposed and was commissioned to translate into Greek the books of the Laws of the Jews. Ptolemy II Philadelphus sent a letter to the high priest in Jerusalem asking for translators. The Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible was the work of the 70 or 72 Jewish translators, hence the designation “Septuagint” and its shorthand siglum is LXX. Scholars are unsure of the date of the LXX, but based on the Letter of Aristeas and the six fragments from a work by Demetrius the Chronographer, it could be suggested to have been in the fourth to third century B.C.

The translations must have started with the Jewish Law or the Pentateuch and

86Josephus, The Antiquities of the Jews, 12.2.1.11-118; and idem, Against Apion 2.45-47.

87T. J. Meadowcroft has compared the Aramaic narratives of Dan 2-7 of the MT and the LXX and concluded that the LXX is a literal translation of the Aramaic text in Aramaic Daniel and Aramaic Greek: A Literary Comparison (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995). Where there are significant differences between the MT and the LXX, Meadowcroft attributed this to the fact that the Greek translators tended to follow the Vorlage, an older text than the LXX. He rearranges the chapters to follow this order: 4, 5, 6, 3, 2, and 7.

subsequently spread to cover the whole corpus of the Hebrew Scriptures. Ever since the Hebrew Scriptures were first translated into Greek, other revisions or translations into Greek such as Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus and others, continued to surface for use by either the Jews in the diaspora or the Jewish proselytes.

The text of the book of Daniel appears in two different Greek translations/versions known as the Old Greek Daniel (OG-Dan or OG) and Theodotion Daniel (Th-Dan or θ). Both these translations have the twelve chapters that are found in the Masoretic Text (MT), but in addition they include some apocryphal/pseudepigraphal writings, namely, Bel and the Dragon, the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Hebrews, and Susanna. Although both the OG-Dan and Th-Dan tend to follow closely or diverge from

---


92 The other Greek versions include the Quinta (ē), Sexta (Ç) and the Septima (ζ) which were identified in Origen’s research; see Eusebius, trans. Philip Schaff and Henry Wace (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 1:262-264. Another ancient Greek translation is the Graecus Venetus, a fourteenth-fifteenth-century A.D. single manuscript preserved in St. Mark’s Library in Venice which contained the Pentateuch, the books of Ruth, Proverbs, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, and Daniel; see Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 52-56. Other early translations or versions rather include the Old Latin, Vulgate, Coptic, Gothic, Amernian, Georgian, Slavonic, Ethiopic, and Arabic; see Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, 246-268.

93 These works are discussed below. These writings are commonly called the Additions and also appear in other ancient manuscripts including the Syriac Peshitta and the Latin Vulgate.
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the Masoretic Text (MT), there are also some significant similarities and differences between them. These two translations differ in the style of presentation, detail in the stories, points of emphasis, grammar, and vocabulary. Different renditions in the translations have been noticed between the OG-Dan and Ø versions of Daniel, which have become known as the double translations. The double translation phenomena is more noticeable in chaps. 4-6 despite the fact that both versions might or might not have been drawing from the same Vorlage.


McLay gives several examples of the double translations by comparing the MT, Ø, and OG, e.g., Dan 4:29:

MT Dan 4:32/29 הָעַרְגָּרָר לָעַרְגֶּרָר וּמַעָּמָמָּו

Ø Dan 4:29 χόρτον ὡς βοῦν ψωμιοῦτοι σὺ

OG Dan 4:29 χόρτον ὡς βοῦν σὺ ψωμιοῦτοι καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς χλόης τῆς γῆς ἐσταί
Irenaeus related that Theodotion was a Jewish proselyte from Ephesus who translated the Hebrew Scriptures into the Greek version commonly known today as Theodotion (Θ). He revised the Old Greek version in light of the standard Hebrew text and he literally transliterated the Hebrew nouns into Greek. His translation of the book of Daniel was rated far better than the OG. Except for the second-century Papyrus 967 of the Chester Beatty 1931 collection, and the eleventh-century MS 88, which are good witnesses to the OG, all other extant MSS on the book of Daniel relied on Theodotion’s translation. The Syriac text of Daniel also includes the apocryphal additions that were in the Greek translations. The are several extant versions of the Syriac Daniel. These include the Peshitta, which seems to be in accordance with other ancient texts.


100 Ibid., 41.

101 Ibid.

the Syro-Hexapla, and the Revised Peshitta of Jacob of Edessa. The Syriac text reflects the Old Greek text to a large extent.

The witnesses to Daniel other than the Masoretic Text (MT) include the Old Greek (OG), the extant copies of Daniel in the Dead Sea Scrolls corpus, which do not show major disagreements with the MT, and the New Testament (Matt 24:15; Mark 13:14; Luke 21:20). In conclusion, the apocrypha or the Greek additions to Daniel and all the pseudepigrapha ascribed to Daniel cannot be safely taken as witnesses to the book of Daniel, although some of this literature presents unique material in relation to Daniel. See discussion on apocrypha and pseudepigrapha below.

Sources for the Study of Daniel

Besides the Hebrew Bible, the data for the reconstruction of the history of the Neo-Babylonian Empire are extracted from various ancient Near Eastern extant sources, which include mostly the Assyrian, Babylonian, and Medo-Persian archaeological and


Textual artifacts are very essential for the study of Daniel and they can be further categorized as the royal correspondence and monumental inscriptions.

Textual artifacts refer to the extant documents that were written in a formal script, language, and setting intended by their writer(s) to retain or communicate specific information. See Zimansky, “Archaeology and Texts in the Ancient Near East,” 309-326. Other relevant works pertinent to this discussion include: Jean Bottero, Mesopotamia: Writing, Reasoning, and the Gods, trans. Zainab Bahrani and Marc Van de Mieroop (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); and Dever, What Did the Biblical Writers Know and When Did they Know It? 11-17.


The royal correspondence ranges from letters, seal inscriptions, building inscriptions, and votive inscriptions usually the king was responsible for; see W. W. Hallo, “The Royal Inscriptions of Ur: A Typology,” HUCA 33 (1962): 1-43. The Assyrian empire had more voluminous texts than the Babylonian. There are also letters to the Assyrian kings from individuals, temple administrators, and Assyrian authorities in Babylonia recovered in the archives at Kuyunjik and Nimrud, and these are dated from the eighth to seventh centuries B.C. See Clay, Neo-Babylonian Letters from Erech (1919); S. Parpola, ed., Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars (1993); and Oates and Oates, Nimrud: An Assyrian Imperial City Revealed, 195-225.

Examples of such monuments include wall reliefs and some inscribed asuminētu șa galālu “stelas of polished stones” set up by Nabonidus (556-539 B.C.) in Sippar, Larsa, Agade, and Sippar-Anunitum. These were to commemorate the restoration of their main temples or war victories. Beaulieu, The Reign of Nabonidus, 27-29. For the other texts see Clay, Neo-Babylonian Letters from Erech, 13-26, and the autographed texts, plates 1-200.
The architecture recovered from various parts of the ancient Near East remains impressive. Excavations have also unearthed some building inscriptions which offer relevant historical data.

These can help in outlining historical events; see the Chronicles in Wiseman, Chronicles of the Chaldaean Kings, 1-96, also Plates I-XXI; and Grayson, Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles, 8-192.

These compilations include the Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, and Egyptian king lists. More information can be gleaned from the chronicles as well as other documents and inscriptions.

Such documents were normally commissioned by the king and can be useful for chronological purposes and also for deciphering information on the king’s sociopolitical and socioreligious obligations. However, caution in using these annals must be exercised because of their propagandistic orientation.

An example for the Neo-Babylonian period is the story of Nabonidus’s mother, Adad-guppi, on two stelae found in Harran in 1906 and 1956 respectively. See Gadd, “The Harran Inscription of Nabonidus,” 35-92; and ANET, 560-562. Adad-guppi narrates how she was devoted from her childhood to the gods Sin, Shamash, Ishtar, and Adad. She believed that these gods were in heaven. She further indicates that all her possessions were given by the gods.

These are considered as “prose composition consisting in the main of a number of ‘predictions’ of past events.” Grayson, Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts, 6. Texts which belong to this category include: (a) Marduk Prophecy, in Longman III, Fictional Akkadian Autobiography, 131-142; COS, 1:480-481; Block, The Gods of the Nations, 123-124; and Arnold and Beyer, Readings from the Ancient Near East, 215-217; (b) Sulgi Prophecy, in R. Borger, “Gott Marduk und Gott-König Sulgi als Propheten,” Bibliotheca Orientalia 28 (1971): 3-24; and Longman, Fictional Akkadian Autobiography, 142-146; (c) Uruk Prophecy, in H. Hunger and S. A. Kaufman, “A New Akkadian Prophecy Text,” JAOS 95 (1975): 371-375; Arnold and Beyer, Readings from the Ancient Near East, 217; and (d) Dynasty Prophecy which is in the British Museum (BM 34903); Longman, Fictional Akkadian Autobiography, 149-152; and biblical prophecy; for the Neo-Babylonian period see biblical books: Ezekiel, Jeremiah, Daniel, etc.

Such as Atra-hasis, Šumma Eliš, Eridu, and Gilgameš, see ANET, 104-106, 44-54, 72-97; 104-106; 503-507, 512-513, 640-642; COS, 1:450-453, 458-460, 513-515, 550-552; and Arnold and Beyer, Readings from the Ancient Near East, 13-15, 21-50, 66-
and pseudo-Danielic writings.\textsuperscript{121} Moreover, there are many myths from the ancient Near East that have shown some parallels and syntactical issues with the text of Daniel.\textsuperscript{122} Even though it has been established that the ancient myths and Daniel share some literary motifs and parallels, it has not been convincingly established that Daniel had any literary dependence or borrowing from any of them.\textsuperscript{123}

The Babylonian Chronicles are valuable for the reconstruction of the Neo-

70.

\textsuperscript{118}These may include letters by the king or his officials or other citizens. They can be useful historical documents which offer additional information on what was taking place during that time. L. B. Shiff has dealt more with private communication in “The Nur-Sin Archive: Private Entrepreneurship in Babylon” (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1987).

\textsuperscript{119}These offer valuable dating information. Usually the name of the reigning king, the date, and the place are included in a legally binding document.

\textsuperscript{120}Some of these appear as deeds of sale, contracts, and receipts. These texts may be useful for asserting chronology, economic transactions, and also for identifying the parties which were involved. See Ellen Whitley Moore, \textit{Neo-Babylonian Business and Administrative Documents}, 2-396; and idem, \textit{Neo-Babylonian Documents in the University of Michigan Collection} (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1939), 3-71, and plates 1-75.

\textsuperscript{121}A large volume of pseudo-Danielic writings has been published but many such works continue to surface. These will be addressed later.


\textsuperscript{123}See the discussion on Daniel and the ANE Literature.
Babylonian history and cover the years 626-623, 616-608, 608-605, and 605-594 B.C. but unfortunately they preserve nothing about Nebuchadnezzar’s reign after 594 B.C. The chronicles leave out critical details in recording the events; for example, BM 21946 mentioned Nebuchadnezzar’s invasion of Jerusalem on 15/16 March, 598/597 B.C., but does not give more information to highlight that historical event.

Medo-Persia, especially under the Achaemenid administration (sixth to fifth centuries B.C.), offers some valuable archaeological and literary artifacts that have also contributed to the understanding of the world of Daniel. However, in addition to these indigenous sources there are some foreign ancient texts that offer information which is not found elsewhere in the study of Neo-Babylonia. These secondary sources include the Arabic, Aramaic, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin sources and these highlight the history.

124Kuhrt, ANE, 2:541, 592-593. For the texts of the chronicles see ANET, 265-317; Wiseman, Chronicles of Chaldaean Kings (1956); and Grayson, Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles (2000).

125Wiseman, Chronicles of the Chaldean Kings, 32-35, 73, reverse, lines 11-13; and Grayson, Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles (2000), 102, reverse, lines 11-13.

126The examples of some of these finds are discussed above under The Medes and Persians.

culture, religion, economy, political administration, and military achievements of Neo-Babylonia, but they should be used with caution.

It can be noticed that in these sources there are some striking similarities or irreconcilable differences with Daniel in the descriptions of some of the events. On the other hand, Berossus cited a complaint about the misinformation on the history of Babylon circulated by some Greek authors. Interestingly, W. G. Lambert remarked that there are no fully comparable extant Greek texts that antedate Daniel. It remains plausible to note that the Danielic material is more comparable to the Neo-Babylonian and Medo-Persian or earlier archaeological material than that of the later time periods. There is overwhelming evidence that some Babylonian materials in Aramaic were spread throughout the Hellenistic world.

While the Greek classical historians fairly highlight the world of Daniel, it must be noted that these writers fail to provide some critical information from that time that now remains unique to Daniel. It has already been pointed out that Herodotus, Ctesias, Strabo, Pliny, Diodorus, and others missed the concept that Nebuchadnezzar built Babylon to its grandeur in the sixth century B.C. The Greek writers do not, however,  

European Thought,” 1:67-80.

128 Burstein, The Babyloniaca of Berossus, 28. See also Josephus, Against Apion, 1.20.142-144; and Grabbe, “Of Mice and Dead Men,” 120-125.

129 Lambert, The Background of Jewish Apocalyptic, 15.

130 Ibid.

explicitly present Medo-Persia as a unified kingdom after 539 B.C. as indicated in Daniel’s text (Dan 5:28; 6:8, 12, 15; 8:20). The Greeks understood the succession of empires in the ANE as Assyrian, Median, Persian, and then Greece. In fact, for the Greeks, Babylon plays no significant geopolitical role and is even taken as an Assyrian colon by Ctesias. Further, these classical writers also do not mention anything about Nebuchadnezzar’s lycanthropy (Dan 4) and dreams (Dan 2, 4), Darius the Mede as king in Babylon (Dan 5:31; 6); and Belshazzar’s inscription (Dan 5). Daniel says that Belshazzar was killed on the night of the fall of Babylon (5:30). However, Xenophon does not provide the name but reports that the Persians killed the king the night they took Babylon. In conclusion, therefore, Daniel can be understood as an earlier tradition that contains information which was lost to later writers.

It must be appreciated that there are many informative extrabiblical sources available for highlighting the study of Daniel, but some of these sources have caused more difficulties in understanding the content and the chronology of the book. Some of the data from such sources cannot be corroborated with the cuneiform sources. Besides, some of the original classical texts have survived only in fragments or quotations by other scholars.

---


133 Ibid. See also table 9. However, some important items mentioned by the classical Greek writers which are not in Daniel include the Hanging Gardens of Babylon and lists of Neo-Babylonian kings and their years of reign.

successive writers. Some documents in relation to Daniel have not been published; still many more such continue to surface to date, sometimes from diverse and dubious backgrounds. The interest in the study of Daniel intensifies.

Some later ancient literary works relevant to Daniel were composed by historians, scholars, geographers, and travelers from the classical Greek times to the 1895-1917 organized archaeological work at Babylon by the German Orient Society under the direction of Robert Koldewey. More information on Nebuchadnezzar or the Chaldeans is known from the collection of later antiquity literary sources. The Neo-Babylonian literature does not provide the historians with enough data on the political developments of the ANE region. However, the available sources have their own limitations in

135 Megasthenes' work is lost except for a fragment of his writing, which appears as a quotation in Eusebius who got it from Abydenus who also quoted Megasthenes: “Abydenus, in his history of the Assyrians, has preserved the following fragment of Megasthenes, who says: That Nabuchodrosorus (Nebuchadnezzar), having become more powerful than Hercules, invaded Lybia and Iberia (Spain), and when he had rendered them tributary, he extended his conquests over the inhabitants of the shores upon the right of the sea... he expired, and was succeeded by his son Evilmaruchus (Evil Merodach), who was slain by his kinsman, Neriglisares (Neriglissor), and Neriglisares left a son, Labassoarascus (Labarosoarchod), and when he also had suffered death by violence, they made Nabonnidochus king, being no relation to the royal race.” See Cory, Ancient Fragments of the Phoenician, Chaldean, Egyptian, Tyraian, Carthaginian, Indian, Persian and Other Writers, 71-72; Sack, Images of Nebuchadnezzar, 31-32; and idem, Neriglissar–King of Babylon, 4-5.


presenting the data, because their authors seem to have had diverse personal interests rather than the writing of history objectively. Therefore, some of the sources should be used with caution. See table 9.

**Daniel Outside the Book of Daniel**

In the Hebrew Bible: Noah, Daniel, and Job

Ezekiel’s prophetic writings are dated 593-571/568 B.C. during the Babylonian captivity. He must have first mentioned Daniel (Ezek 14:14, 20) in 592 B.C. However, Ezek 14:14, 20 appears to offer chronological inconsistency: “Noah, Daniel and Job,” that is, Daniel is placed before the primeval Job. In view of this, then, the criteria used to assemble these three men together has been questioned.

The other problem is that the biblical text seems to indicate that these three men would not be able to save their sons and daughters (v. 16). Noah had no daughters, whereas Daniel had no children at all. According to the biblical text, Job was a righteous man (Job 1:22; 2:10; 42:8), but he could not save his own seven sons and three daughters from the destroying wind (1:18, 19). After his ordeal where he lost his property and children (1:13-2:10), he later had other children (42:13-15). However, the context of Ezek 14 shows that the author cited the three men in order to make an illustrative hypothetical point (cf. Jer 15:1).

---


139 Boutflower, *In and Around the Book of Daniel*, xvii.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>RELEVANCE TO DANIEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Xenophanes of Colophon</td>
<td>ca. 550-500 BC</td>
<td>Illustrated the expansion of the Persian Empire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hecataeus of Miletus</td>
<td>ca. 500 BC</td>
<td>Had extensive travels in the Persian Empire including Mesopotamia. His two works, <em>Periegesis</em> and <em>Genealogiai</em>, are now lost. Herodotus refers to his genealogical record. Herodotus, 2.143.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dionysius of Miletus &amp; Charon of Lampascus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wrote Persian history and customs, but now lost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellanicus of Lesbos</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wrote <em>Persica</em>, in two books, covering the history of Assyria, Media, and the rise of Persia. Presents the Chaldeans as older people than the Persians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herodotus</td>
<td>Mid 5th century BC</td>
<td>Compiled accounts of his journeys and an extensive excursus on Babylonian history. Described layout of Babylon. His <em>Histories</em> published between 430-425 BC is the earliest surviving Greek account on the history of ANE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ctesias</td>
<td>ca. 5th century BC</td>
<td>Compiled history of Assyria and Persia, <em>Persica</em>, in 23 books through the help of Diodorus Siculus. He lived at the Persian court. He tried to discredit Herodotus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenophon</td>
<td>ca. 427-355 BC</td>
<td>Compiled accounts on cities, history, legends, and stories. Traveled with Greek mercenaries through Asia Minor and upper Tigris and Euphrates rivers. He wrote <em>Anabasis</em> and pro-Cyrus legends in <em>Cyropaedia</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinon of Colophon</td>
<td>4th century BC</td>
<td>Wrote a commentary on Ctesias’s <em>Persica</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>RELEVANCE TO DANIEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megasthenes from Ionia</td>
<td>Time of Seleucus I Nicator 312-280 BC</td>
<td>Wrote <em>History of India</em> but only a fragment is preserved. He discussed the 6th-century B.C. Neo-Babylonian list of kings but had more on Nebuchadnezzar. His work was cited by Abydenus and also Eusebius. Josephus, <em>Against Apion</em>, 1.20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesudo-Democritus of Abdera</td>
<td>3rd century BC</td>
<td>Presented an account of Babylonian history, traditions, and culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berossus, a Babylonian Priest</td>
<td>3rd century BC</td>
<td>Used ancient resources to compose the <em>Babylonica</em> which is now lost, but Josephus and Eusebius both preserved the fragmentary work. He wrote in Greek. Berossus’s chronology corresponds with Cuneiform documents. He dedicated his work to Antiochus Seleucus I (281-260 BC). His list of Neo-Babylonian kings agrees with cuneiform sources but is the only source informing us that Neriglissar was Amel-Marduk’s brother-in-law. See Burstein, <em>The Babylonica of Berossus</em> (1978).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philo of Byzantium</td>
<td>250 BC</td>
<td>Described in detail the Hanging Gardens of Babylon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qumran Manuscripts</td>
<td>200 BC-AD 70</td>
<td>The Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS). The text of the canonical Daniel was among the discoveries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Polyhistor from Miletus or Caria</td>
<td>Born 105 BC</td>
<td>Preserved fragments of Eupolemus’s work, some of which were also preserved by Eusebius, e.g., the dynastic list of the Neo-Babylonian kings. Wacholder, <em>Eupolemus: A Study of Judeo-Greek Literature</em>, 44-52.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diodorus Siculus, Pompeius Trogus, &amp; Nicolaus of Damascus</td>
<td>1st century BC-AD</td>
<td>Compiled general international history from creation to their day.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>RELEVANCE TO DANIEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td>ca. 64 BC-AD 19</td>
<td>Wrote the Geography, which was more than just accounts on travel. His encyclopedic work covers the historical geography of the inhabited countries from the beginning of the Christian era. The Geography of Strabo, 8 vols. (1917-1933).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flavius Josephus</td>
<td>Born AD 37</td>
<td>Wrote an autobiography The Life of Flavius Josephus, and in addition, The Antiquities of the Jews, The War of the Jews, and Flavius Josephus Against Apion. His writings covered Nebuchadnezzar and the fall of Jerusalem (cf. 2 Kgs 25:27-30; Jer 52: 31, 32) and give some information on Jewish and Neo-Babylonian history which is not attested elsewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliny the Elder</td>
<td>1st century AD</td>
<td>Visited and described Babylon’s walls, indicated that the Euphrates flowed through Babylon and that it was diverged by the Persians. He said that the temples were still standing and that the population was 600,000. Pliny the Elder, Natural History (1961), 2:429-433.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintus C. Rufus</td>
<td>1st century AD</td>
<td>Visited Babylon and wrote that the Hanging Gardens were still visible. Quintus Curtis Rufus, History of Alexander, 5.1.35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucian of Samosata</td>
<td>2nd century AD</td>
<td>Suggested that Homer’s birthplace was Babylon in The True Story. Cyrus son of Cambyses is said to have transferred the kingdom of the Medes to the Persians and also to have subdued the Assyrians and Babylonians. Lucian, 8 vols. (1959-1967), 2:415.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudius Ptolemy</td>
<td>2nd century AD</td>
<td>Authored Ptolemy Canon which listed the Neo-Babylonian kings and the duration of their reign but his work omits Labashi-Mardurk (556 BC). He seemed to have depended on Polyhistor who was also dependent on earlier historians. He gave some geographic descriptions of Mesopotamia. Ronald H. Sack, Amel-Marduk 562-560 B.C., 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin</td>
<td>2nd century AD</td>
<td>Wrote Dialogue with Trypho, where he quoted Dan 7:9-27 and referred to Christ as the Son of Man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistle of Barnabas</td>
<td>ca. AD 130</td>
<td>Wrote on Dan 7 and pointed out that the fourth beast was Rome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>RELEVANCE TO DANIEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trypho</td>
<td>Mid 2nd century AD</td>
<td>Held views that Dan 7 pointed to the time after Antiochus IV Epiphanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Martyr</td>
<td>Mid 2nd century AD</td>
<td>Was convinced that the little horn would appear well after Antiochus IV Epiphanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irenaeus</td>
<td>AD 130-200</td>
<td>Wrote <em>Against Heresies</em> where he dealt with Daniel’s major prophecies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abyssenus</td>
<td>2nd/3rd century AD</td>
<td>He wrote about the Assyrians and incorporated information on Neo-Babylonian period by earlier writers but his book has not survived. In his writings he included fragments of Alexander Polyhistor and Megasthenes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippolytus</td>
<td>AD 140-235</td>
<td>Wrote a commentary on Daniel in Greek in ca. AD 202. He identified the little horn of Dan 8 with Antiochus IV Epiphanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clement of Alexandria</td>
<td>ca. AD 150-220</td>
<td>Attempted to set up the chronology of ancient Israel from Dan 9:24-27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertullian</td>
<td>AD 160-240</td>
<td>His <em>An Answer to the Jews</em> dealt with Dan 9 and he pointed to Jesus as the Messiah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius Africanus</td>
<td>AD 160-240</td>
<td>Worked on the chronology of the figures mentioned in Daniel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origen</td>
<td>AD 185-254</td>
<td>Commented on Daniel in Greek and which was translated into Latin, but the work is extant only in fragments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprian of Carthage</td>
<td>AD 200-258</td>
<td>Wrote much on Antiochus IV Epiphanes but without relating his work to Daniel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenophon of Antioch</td>
<td>3rd century AD</td>
<td>Wrote the novel, <em>Babylonian Matters</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soterichos</td>
<td>3rd century AD</td>
<td>Produced the novel, <em>The Experiences of Panthea, The Babylonian Girl</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porphyry</td>
<td>ca. AD 232/4-304</td>
<td>Wrote <em>Against the Christians</em> 15 vols. In vol. 12 he alleged that the book of Daniel was written by an unknown person during the time of Antiochus IV. He took the prophetic passages to be <em>vaticinia ex eventu</em> (prophecies after the event).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>RELEVANCE TO DANIEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lactantius</td>
<td>AD 250-330</td>
<td>Wrote on the prophecies of Daniel and about the Antichrist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eusebius of Pamphilius Bishop of Caesaria</td>
<td>AD 260-339</td>
<td>Was a prolific writer. Among his works <em>Church History</em> and the <em>Chronicle</em> have been very influential. The <em>Chronicle</em> has thousands of ancient dates, also useful chronology and the history of the ancient Near East, the Assyrians, the Babylonians, the Egyptians, the Greeks, the Romans and the biblical text. The <em>Onomasticon</em> gives a list of over 600 biblical geographical places. His <em>History of the Chaldeans, Assyrians, and Persians</em> offers useful information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephraem Syrus</td>
<td>AD 308-373</td>
<td>Commentator on Daniel in Syriac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem</td>
<td>AD 315-386</td>
<td>Wrote about history as found in Daniel and that the Messiah was fulfilled in Christ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eusebius Sophonius Hieronymus (known as Jerome)</td>
<td>AD 340-420</td>
<td>Wrote on 6th-century BC Mesopotamian and Jewish history. Produced OT commentaries including <em>Isaiah</em> and <em>Daniel</em> with some unique insights, e.g., he mentioned in <em>Daniel</em> that Belshazzar was the son of Labashi-Marduk. In <em>Isaiah</em>, he pointed out that when Amel-Marduk wanted to get on to the throne after the death of Nebuchadnezzar, the state officials refused him to be crowned because they thought that Nebuchadnezzar might return. His works did not survive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Chrysostom</td>
<td>AD 347-407</td>
<td>Wrote a Greek commentary on Daniel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polychronius</td>
<td>AD 374-430</td>
<td>His commentary on Daniel in Greek survives in fragments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodoret</td>
<td>AD 393-457</td>
<td>Wrote a commentary on Daniel in Greek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>RELEVANCE TO DANIEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Venerable Bede</td>
<td>672-735 AD</td>
<td>Consulted available sources including the biblical text in his writings. Dealt with the Neo-Babylonian monarchy and commented on Jehoiachin king of Judah. Quoted often from Jerome's commentary on Daniel and also from Josephus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous clerical</td>
<td>7th century AD</td>
<td>The <em>Chronicon Paschale</em> named and discussed the Chaldean kings in the light of the biblical text. Narrated historical events from Adam to AD 629.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgius Syncellus</td>
<td>Late 8th/9th century AD</td>
<td>Wrote the <em>Chronographia</em> which traces events from Adam to Diocletian. He had king lists and discussed Nabopolassar through Nabonidus. Years for each king seem not reliable and he omitted Labashi-Marduk from his work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibn Hawqal</td>
<td>10th century AD</td>
<td>Visited the site of Babylon and described it as a small village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin of Tudela</td>
<td>1160 &amp; 1173</td>
<td>Was from Spain and traveled to Asia and China to see if Jews were adhering to the Bible. For him Babylon was only important in its relation to the Jews. Benjamin of Tudela, <em>The Itinerary of Tudela, Critical Text, Translation and Commentary</em>, trans. Marcus Nathan Adler (New York: Feldheim, 1964).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic source, al-Qazwini</td>
<td>13th century AD</td>
<td>Confirmed that Babil was the site of ancient Babylon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johann Schlitberger</td>
<td>1396-1427</td>
<td>Was from Bavaria but became a Turkish prisoner of war. He visited Babylon, measured the walls, and recorded the city plans. His data accord with that of Herodotus. He mistakenly took the ruins of Birs Nimrud (ancient Borsippa, south of Babylon) to be the Tower of Babel, an error found earlier in the Talmud, Sanhedrin 109a, Genesis Rabbah 38:11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annius?</td>
<td>15th century AD</td>
<td>In 1498 <em>Antiquitatum Variarum Volumina</em> was published in Venice. It had a list of Neo-Babylonian kings and unparalleled years of reigning. Thus: Nabugodonosor, annis 45; Amilinus Evilmerodach, annis 30; Filius hujus primus Ragassar, annis 3; Secundus Lab-Assardoch, annis 6; Tertius Baltassar, annis 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>RELEVANCE TO DANIEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Rauwolff</td>
<td>1574</td>
<td>The itinerary and notes of Rauwolff, a German doctor, indicated that he visited the site of Babylon and other eastern countries including Syria, Palestine, Armenia, Chaldea, and Mesopotamia. John Ray, <em>A Collection of Curious Travels and Voyages in Two Tomes</em>, vol. 1 (1693).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Shirley</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>Visited the site of Babylon and published his travel accounts in London in 1613. He attempted to write how Babylon looked like in the time of Nebuchadnezzar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pietro Della Valle</td>
<td>1614-1646</td>
<td>Traveled in Mesopotamia, Persia, and India between 1614 and 1626. Visited Babylon in November 1616 and is said to have been the first person to give an accurate record of Babylon. He collected several cylinder seals. He discussed the multicolored glazed bricks. Pietro Della Valle, <em>Viaggi di Pietro Della Valle</em> (Brighton: Gancia, 1843).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Browne</td>
<td>1658</td>
<td>Published the <em>Garden of Cyrus</em> where he discussed the Hanging Gardens of Nebuchadnezzor in Babylon and also the physical features of Babylon. His work is in line with some classical writers, Josephus, and the biblical text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athanasius Kircher</td>
<td>1666, 1679</td>
<td>A historian from Europe who traveled to Egypt and Mesopotamia. He wrote <em>Obelisci aegyptiaci nuper inter Isaei Romani rudera effosi interpretio hieroglyphica</em> (&quot;The hieroglyphic interpretation of recently excavated Egyptian Obelisks among the buried Isaei of Rome&quot;) (1666), and <em>Turis Babel</em> (1679).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>RELEVANCE TO DANIEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engelbert Kämpfer</td>
<td>1686</td>
<td>Visited ruin sites in Iran. Kämpfer discovered that the Babylonian inscription was different from Old Persian and he gave the name <em>cuneatae</em> &quot;cuneiform.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johann Bernhard</td>
<td>1721, 1725</td>
<td>An Austrian baroque architect whose work, Fischer von Erlach’s <em>Entwurf einer historischen Architectur</em>, had drawings of the city plan of ancient Babylon as recollected from classical writers. J. A. Delsenbach later produced copper engravings of Babylon and the ziggurat of Marduk from this work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredrick Handel</td>
<td>27 March 1745</td>
<td><em>Belshazzar</em>, orchestral music performed in King’s theater, Haymarket, London. The text was written by Charles Jennens who drew words from Daniel, Jeremiah, Isaiah, Herodotus, and Xenophon. The theme was on God’s punishment of the proud.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voltaire</td>
<td>1747</td>
<td>Authored Zadig, which deals with oriental tales with the setting in Babylon where the youth learn Chaldean science. This work shares much in common with the book of Daniel. Wrote <em>Semiramis</em>, 1748, and the novel <em>La Princesse de Babylone</em>, 1768.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denis Diderot</td>
<td>1751</td>
<td>Published <em>Encyclopedie: ou, Dictionnaire raisonne des sciences, des arts et des metiers</em>, which has relevant entries on several topics on Babylon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbé de Beauchamp</td>
<td>1780, 1790</td>
<td>He was a papal vicar who was commissioned to go to Babylon in 1780 and 1790 and reported on the surrounding people who were looting baked bricks and artifacts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>RELEVANCE TO DANIEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Byron</td>
<td>1815, 1821</td>
<td>His <em>Hebrew Melodies</em>, 1815, had several poems including “Vision of Belshazzar” and he also wrote the novel, <em>Sardanapalus</em>, 1821.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Martin</td>
<td>19th century</td>
<td>Paintings: <em>Belshazzar’s Feast</em> (1820), <em>Fall of Nineveh</em> (1829) and mezzotints <em>Belshazzar’s Feast</em> (1826) and <em>Fall of Babylon</em> (1831).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugène Delacroix</td>
<td>1826-1827</td>
<td>Painted <em>Death of Sardanapalus</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. M. W. Turner</td>
<td>1833-1836</td>
<td>Watercolored landscape illustrations of the Bible, with an accurate depiction of the ruins of Babylon though he himself had never been in the Near East.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>RELEVANCE TO DANIEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Fresnel &amp; J. Oppert</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>Acquired many inscriptions, believed that the Hanging Gardens were in the hill of Amran ibn Ali, and tried to identify the Tower of Babel. Oppert drew a detailed map of Babylon in 1853 from trigonometric calculations. This expedition lost all objects while being transported in the Euphrates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. C. Rawlinson &amp; George Smith</td>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Brief excavations in Babylon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustave Courbet</td>
<td>1854-1855</td>
<td>Depicted Assyrians in his paintings, <em>Atelier the Painter</em> (1854-1855); <em>The Meeting</em> (1855) and the lithograph <em>Portrait of Jean Journet</em> which had Sargon II as seen in the Khorsabad reliefs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. S. Buckingham</td>
<td>1855</td>
<td>He thought he found in Babylon the Hanging Gardens described by Greek writers. James Silk Buckingham, <em>Autobiography of James Silk Buckingham, Including His Voyages, Travels, Adventures, etc.</em> (London: Longman, 1855).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hormuzd Rassam</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Rassam promised to pay for significant finds. He got many clay tablets and the clay cylinder concerning Babylon being captured by Cyrus. Rassam's incentives increased the vandalism by the local people. Hormuzd Rassam, <em>Asshur and the Land of Nimrod</em> (New York: Eston &amp; Mains, 1897).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The righteousness implied by Ezekiel can be understood more in light of archaeology. On an inscription from Zinçirli dated about 730 B.C., Barrakab, the son of Panamu, king of Sam’al and the servant of Tiglath-pileser III, boasted, “because of the righteousness of my father and my own righteousness, I was seated by my Lord Rakabel and my Lord Tiglath-pileser upon the throne of my father.” While it may be true that Barrakab was appointed king on account of both his father’s and his own merit, Ezekiel’s point, however, is that in terms of salvation by YHWH, no one’s righteousness will be able to save one’s own children other than oneself (cf. Ezek 18).

---

141 ANET, 655.

142 Spiegel, “Noah, Danel, and Job,” 202, correctly points out that “the righteous alone will escape, at best, and there is not anyone, alive or dead, whose prayer could stave off disaster,” but still he confuses the Daniel of the biblical account and Danel of the Legend of Aqhat (discussed below). Another literary construction similar to Ezek 14:14, 20 is Jer 15:1, where Yahweh would not only reject Jeremiah’s but also the patriarchal intercession of Moses and Samuel on behalf of the unrepentant Judah.
The spelling לְדַנֵּל in Ezekiel has the nun followed by the short vowel “hireq,” making the reading Danel possible. Some have attempted to avoid the rigor of exegesis by simply taking Ezek 14:14, 20 to refer to a Ugaritic Danel, who might not have been the biblical Daniel. The different spellings of Daniel’s name are not an issue here, for several names in the biblical text appear with spelling discrepancies, including that of the King of Babylon. In Ugaritic literature, there are no stories about Noah, Daniel, and Job like those found in the biblical text. The writer of Ezek 14:14, 20 was likely referring to biblical characters. Moreover, in Ezek 28:2-6, the writer seems to chide the prince of Tyre for regarding himself to be wiser than Daniel. This message must have been delivered in 587 B.C. Nevertheless, to associate Daniel in Ezek 28:2-6 with Danel in the Ugaritic story of Aqhat is to stretch the evidence too far. There seems to be no connection between the fragments of Aqhat and the biblical text.

New Testament Times

Reference is made to Daniel as a prophet in Matt 24:15 and Mark 13:14, just as

143 See below on The Legend of Aqhat.
144 See discussion in chap. 3 on Nebuchadnezzar (Dan 1-4).
145 John Day argues that Ugaritic Daniel and Daniel of Ezekiel were the same person because they were both righteous, and non-Israelites; see his “The Daniel of Ugarit and Ezekiel and the Hero of the Book of Daniel,” VT 30 (1980): 174-184.
146 Boutflower, In and Around the Book of Daniel, xviii.
147 See The Legend of Aqhat.
he was esteemed at Qumran (4Q174 Florilegium, col. 2, lines 1-3). Of interest is the citation of the recurrent expression “the abomination that causes desolation” from Dan 9:27; 11:31; 12:11, an incident that was still to be anticipated by the first century A.D. Collins quoted 1 Macc 1:54 as the earliest passage interpreting the phrase in Daniel. He concluded that “the abomination that causes desolation” referred to “the disruption of the Jewish cult by Antiochus Epiphanes” which involved the placing of a structure on the great altar of sacrifice. Nevertheless, the futuristic thrust of Matt 24:15 and Mark 13:14 eliminates the association of “the abomination that causes desolate” with the second-century B.C. Antiochus IV Epiphanes. The historical event implied by Matt 24:15, 16; Luke 21:20; and Mark 13:14 is understood to have taken place in A.D. 70 when the Romans destroyed the Jerusalem Temple.

The New Testament makes several allusions to the book of Daniel. G. K. Beale argued that Rev 1:19 is also a possible eschatological expression by allusion to Dan 2:28-29, 45. The book of Daniel was taken as authoritative scripture by New Testament times.

---


149 Collins, *Daniel*, 357.

150 Ibid.

151 Ibid.


Daniel and the ANE Literature

The Legend of Aqhat

In 1929 archaeologists recovered some clay tablets with cuneiform script at ancient Ugarit (Tell Ras Shamra on the Mediterranean coast in Syria) which proved to be ancient Canaanite records, religious literature and Hurrian administrative records, epics, letters, myths, and rituals. The religious texts from this archive have been of great interest to biblical scholars for a variety of reasons, including the appearance of the name Dani’ilu (Daniel/Danel) in the text of Aqhat. Some parallels have been drawn between the biblical Daniel and king Dani’ilu in the legend of Aqhat (Aqhatu). It is apparent that in spelling Dani’ilu differs from the biblical Daniel despite suggestions that the former was similar to the Daniel in Ezek 14:14, 20 and 28:3. The Aqhat text relates the


story of how Dani’ilu appealed from the gods to have a son, Aqhat, who later on became more prominent than his father. The central theme of the legend is “what a son means to the father.” However, Dani’ilu contrasts with Daniel with regard to the following:

1. He is regarded as a *rapa ‘u* “healer or savior” of the people.

2. He sought for a son from gods (polytheistic).

3. He gave gods food, drink and sacrifices.

4. He became satiated with wine.

5. He had a wife Danatay, a son Aqhat, and a daughter Pûğatu.

6. He possessed a bow and arrow which he handed over to his son.

7. He was a judge on social issues.

8. He learned of his son’s death.

9. He cursed the environs of his son’s murder.

10. He cast spells.

11. He could have been a king.

There is no biblical Daniel who is associated with the person of the Aqhat myth. There are no substantive correlations between the stories of Dani’ilu and Daniel that may warrant any literary interdependence or borrowing. The two stories, however, belong to


the ancient Near Eastern setting and share a few common motifs, like putting on sackcloth, grieving, and mourning. Ezekiel 14:14-20 states that the righteous father will not be able to save his child on account of his personal goodness, and the Aqhat story is exactly the opposite: The father’s intervention saves his son from death. Job did not save his own children; according to the biblical text, he ended up having another set of ten children (Job 42:12-15).

The Story of Ahikar/Ahiqar

The book of Ahikar/Ahiqar contains the story and proverbs of a sage who served as a scribe and counselor to the Assyrian kings Senacherib (704-681 B.C.) and his son Esarhaddon (680-669 B.C.). From the island of Elephantine on the Nile River in Egypt (near modern Aswan), some papyri fragments were found containing the story of Ahiqar, which are dated ca. 500 B.C. There are other smaller fragments with Demotic translations of the story of Ahiqar, which are dated to the first century A.D. The story,

---


probably of Assyrian origin, was popular in the ancient Near East\textsuperscript{161} and has diverse variations\textsuperscript{162} not limited to Arabic, Aramaic, Armenian, Ethiopic, Greek (associated with Aesop),\textsuperscript{163} Old Turkish, Slavonic, and Syriac.

The polytheistic nature of the writings of Ahiqar makes the whole work stand in contrast to the monotheistic thrust in the book of Daniel. Ahiqar kills an innocent man to save the life of a reputable officer who had been condemned to die, and later that same officer saved Ahiqar’s life by murdering an innocent eunuch. In contrast, Daniel pleads and saves the lives of men condemned to death for failing to execute the king’s orders (Dan 2:24). On the whole, there is no clear intertextual dependence or borrowing between the story of Ahiqar and the story of the biblical Daniel. However, the two works do not underestimate the value a trained thinker had for the king in times of political

\textsuperscript{161}Vanderkam cites several ancient sources that have the name Ahikar or its equivalent. \textit{ABD} (1992), 1:114.

\textsuperscript{162}Wills, \textit{The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King}, 44.

emergencies.  Although the two stories belong to the ancient Near Eastern milieu, they show no close affinities for anyone to assume the association of the two characters as one.

Daniel and Related Ugaritic Literature

The formula "from generation to generation," appearing in (Aramaic) Dan 3:33, (Eng) Dan 4:3, and (Aramaic) 4:31, (Eng) 4:34 is well attested in both Ugaritic and Hebrew. 165 Line 10 of the Ba’al and ‘Anat Cycle text has tgh.mlk. ‘lmk.drkt. dt drdrk, 166 and drkt “rule, authority” 167 has been equivalently translated as ṭmsl (Ps 145:13) and šl šl (Dan 3:33/4:3 and 4:31/4:34). 168 Also the word-pairs “reach/come” (Dan 7:13) are found in the Ba’al epic. 169

A striking similarity has been noted between Prince Ba’al as “a rider of clouds” and the son of man in Dan 7:13. 170 The archaeological discovery of texts at Ras Shamra (Ugarit) revolutionarized biblical studies. Scholars have identified the Ugaritic language


165 Stan Rummel, ed., Ras Shamra Parallels (Rome: Pontificum Institutum Biblicum, 1981), 218. For other Ugaritic/Hebrew phrases regarding endless ages, see above on The Court Scene (Dan 7:9, 10).


167 Segert, A Basic Grammar of the Ugaritic Language, 184.

168 Rummel, ed., Ras Shamra Parallels, 218.


170 ANET, 129-142
as “a Canaanite dialect older than Hebrew, Phoenician, and the other known Canaanite dialects but sharing with them many common traits of morphology, vocabulary, and syntax.” It can be noted, therefore, that the similarities in the use of certain words or phrases was a common phenomena in the ancient Near East Semitic languages. In view of this, it has been acknowledged that the Aramaic and Hebrew of Daniel share certain words and phrases along with other local ancient languages.

Daniel and Related Akkadian Literature

Daniel had multiple visions described in the first person in chaps. 7-12 of the book bearing his name. Unlike the Daniel portrayed earlier in chaps. 1-6, who had insight in all visions and dreams” (Dan 1:17), the last half of the book portrays one who anxiously sought for help from celestial beings to interpret his puzzling visions and dreams (7:15, 16; 8:15, 16; 9:21, 22; 10:14; 12:8). A recurrent motif with the visions in this section is Daniel’s repeated confusion and the lack of understanding of them (7:28; 8:27; 12:8). Despite expressing eagerness to understand what was being explained by the angelic being, Daniel was commanded “but you, shut up/keep closed the vision for (it is) for many days” (8:26). Similar commands also appear in 12:4:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{וַאֲהֵם רֵאָאֵל סֵתָמ הָרְבָּרוֹמָה} & \text{ וּשְׁמִים} \text{ סֵפִּים} \text{ וּרְשׁוֹת} \text{ כְּי לְיַמֵּי רְבִימָם} \text{ נִאָהֵם \text{ כְּי לְיַמֵּי רְבִימָם.}}
\end{align*}
\]

“but you Daniel, shut up/keep closed the words and seal the book until the time of the


\[172\] Ibid., 551.
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“Go! Daniel, for the words (are) shut up/kept closed and sealed until the time of the end.”

Some archaeological materials seem to offer light into what the author of Daniel meant by shutting a document. Shalom M. Paul pointed out that the keeping in secret and sealing of literary works expressed in Daniel could also be understood in light of Akkadian scribal technical practices in Mesopotamia.\(^\text{173}\) Paul indicated that the term *kakkū sakku* derived from Akkadian verbs *kanāku* “to seal” and *sakāku* “to be clogged, stopped up [said of the ears]” appears in several Akkadian texts, for example:

\[
\text{...} \text{kakku sakku šu libitu šu} \text{...}\]

It is hidden and obscure. It is a brick,” and

\[
\text{hitāku mihilti abni ša lām abūbi ša kakkū sakku ballū}\]

“I [Ashurbanipal, king of Assyria] have examined the inscriptions on stone (dating) from before the Flood that were sealed, obscure, and confused.”\(^\text{174}\) Thus, the sealing of a document was a preventive measure to protect it from use before its intended time or audience.

**The Text of Daniel at Qumran**

Archaeology has recovered about eight scrolls of the canonical book of Daniel at Qumran and seven scrolls out of the eight originally contained the entire book. The two scrolls that were retrieved from Cave 1 are 1QDan\(^a\) and 1QDan\(^b\). From Cave 4 came six scrolls, 4QDan\(^a-e\), and 4Q174. Cave 6 had 6QDan(6Q7) only.\(^\text{175}\) The text on the scrolls


\(^\text{174}\) Ibid., 116-117.

\(^\text{175}\) Sources for the texts include: David L. Washburn, *A Catalogue of Biblical Passages in the DSS* (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003), 136-139; *DJD*, 1:150-152; 3a:114-116
follows mostly the Masoretic Text, but may differ in spellings of certain words. In the eight scrolls each chapter of the book of Daniel is represented except for chap. 12.

From the *Florilegium* "anthology" (4Q174) are fragments that cite Dan 12:10 and indicate that it was written in the book of Daniel. The texts of Daniel recovered at Qumran do not have the so-called Greek Additions to the book of Daniel. About thirteen fragments retrieved from Cave 11 at Qumran contain the text commonly known as the Heavenly Prince Melchizedek (11Q13), which may have some references to the book of Daniel. Such references may serve to show that by Qumran times the book of Daniel was viewed as authoritative scripture. In addition, the references may also indicate that the book of Daniel was written much earlier than what popular opinions suggest. Table 10 compiles the fragments of the Danielic text found at Qumran.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daniel</th>
<th>Scroll</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:19-33</td>
<td>4QDan* (4Q112)</td>
<td>Ulrich, <em>BASOR</em> 268 (1987): 17-37; <em>DJD</em>, 16:244-246; <em>Of Scribes and Scrolls</em>, 29-42.</td>
<td>Probably column 4 of the original manuscript, with all four margins preserved. Parts of the surface have flaked. The text has numerous variants from the ancient MSS including the MT, Syriac OT, Arabic OT, LXX, and Theodotion translations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:33-46</td>
<td>4QDan* (4Q112)</td>
<td>Ulrich, <em>BASOR</em> 268 (1987): 17-37; <em>DJD</em>, 16:246-248.</td>
<td>Top and bottom margins of column 2 of the main fragment have been preserved. Many variants with mainly the MT can be noted and this could allow several reading options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Scroll</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:23-25</td>
<td>4QDan⁴ (4Q115)</td>
<td>Pfann, RQ (1996): 37-71; DJD, 16:281-282</td>
<td>Top and right margins of the fragment are extant on this MT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:27-30</td>
<td>1QDan b (1Q72)</td>
<td>DJD, 1:151-152.</td>
<td>Has 6 variations from mainly the MT, v. 27 <em>לותך</em> for <em>לטך</em>, v. 29 <em>אומד שיבתי</em> for <em>אומד יבשותי</em> and v. 31 <em>קוה</em> for <em>קוהה</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:12-16</td>
<td>4QDan⁴ (4Q115)</td>
<td>Pfann, RQ (1996): 37-71; DJD, 16:283-284.</td>
<td>Too fragmentary but the text has MT characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:10-16</td>
<td>4QDan b (4Q113)</td>
<td>Ulrich, BASOR 274 (1989): 3-26; DJD, 16:255-258.</td>
<td>Notable on this fragmentary text is one variant from MT in v. 16 <em>תובלו תוכלל</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:12-14</td>
<td>4QDan⁵ (4Q112)</td>
<td>Ulrich, BASOR 268 (1987): 17-37; DJD, 16:250-251.</td>
<td>Variants from MT in v. 12 <em>נובע נודעה</em> for <em>נובע נודעה</em> and <em>חתות חלות</em> for <em>חתות חלות</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:13-14</td>
<td>4QDan⁵ (4Q112)</td>
<td>Ulrich, BASOR 268 (1987): 17-37.</td>
<td>No variants from MT can be noticed on this very fragmented text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:16-19</td>
<td>4QDan⁵ (4Q112)</td>
<td>Ulrich, BASOR 268 (1987): 17-37; DJD, 16:251.</td>
<td>Top and right margins and a stitched edge are extant. Two words in v. 18, <em>עליא מלמדתא</em> are written without word division. Two variants from the MT in v. 17 are <em>משרדה וNSBundleך</em> for <em>משרדה וNSBundleך</em> and <em>לכבודך</em> for <em>לכבודך</em>. Fragment looks contracted and split.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:19-22</td>
<td>4QDan b (4Q113)</td>
<td>Ulrich, BASOR 274 (1989): 3-26; DJD, 16:259.</td>
<td>Fragment could have top margin of a column. For v. 22 only 2 tips of <em>lamed</em> are preserved. A single variant from MT and the Syriac OT is in v. 19 <em>?מרמא מ瀏覽器</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Scroll</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:8-13</td>
<td>4QDan⁶ (4Q113)</td>
<td>Ulrich, <em>BASOR</em> 274 (1989): 3-26; <em>DJD</em>, 16:259-260.</td>
<td>Bottom and left margins are extant. The hole between lines 16 and 17 might have been there before the writing. V. 10 is without word division unlike in the MT, probably because of some morphological and etymological reasons. Variants from MT v. 11 קְרִינִים for בְּעָלָיוֹ; v. 13 אֶפֶר for אָמֶר.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:27-7:4</td>
<td>4QDan⁶ (4Q113)</td>
<td>Ulrich, <em>BASOR</em> 274 (1989): 3-26; <em>DJD</em>, 16:263-264.</td>
<td>The 3 fragments here preserve the bottom margin of the column. There are clues for reconstruction of the text. Variants from the MT include 6:27 תִּירָה for מִשְׁפְּרָה and v. 28 מִי for מְי.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:15-23</td>
<td>4QDan⁶ (4Q115)</td>
<td><em>DJD</em>, 16:284-285.</td>
<td>Left and bottom margins extant. MT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:25-8:5</td>
<td>4QDan⁶ (4Q112)</td>
<td>Ulrich, <em>BASOR</em> 268 (1987): 17-37; <em>DJD</em>, 16:252-253.</td>
<td>Fragment retains the bottom and stitched left margin. Text shows two words in 8:1 crossed out by the scribe because they were an error. Several variants with other ancient MSS as noted in Ulrich, <em>BASOR</em> 268 (1987): 33-34; and <em>DJD</em>, 16:253.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:26-28</td>
<td>4QDan⁶ (4Q113)</td>
<td>Ulrich, <em>BASOR</em> 274 (1989): 3-26; <em>DJD</em>, 16:265-266.</td>
<td>Too fragmentary. No variants can be noted from other ancient MSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:1-8</td>
<td>4QDan⁶ (4Q113)</td>
<td>Ulrich, <em>BASOR</em> 274 (1989): 3-26; <em>DJD</em>, 16:266-267.</td>
<td>V.7 has a suprascript waw to act as a mater lectionis inserted by the scribe. Two variants from MT and BHS in v. 3 קרִינִים for קרִינִים and v. 4 קרִינִים for קרִינִים.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Scroll</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:13-16</td>
<td>4QDan b (4Q113)</td>
<td>Ulrich, BASOR 274 (1989): 3-26; DJD, 16:267.</td>
<td>Top and right margin are extant. No textual variations can be noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:16-17?</td>
<td>6QDan (6Q7)</td>
<td>DJD, 3:116.</td>
<td>Too fragmented but there are a few noticeable letters. Written on papyrus, can also be identified with the siglum: pap6QDan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:20-21?</td>
<td>6QDan (6Q7)</td>
<td>DJD, 3:114.</td>
<td>Too fragmented but there are a few noticeable letters. Written on papyrus, can also be identified with the siglum: pap6QDan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:12-14</td>
<td>4QDan e (4Q116)</td>
<td>DJD, 16:288.</td>
<td>Fragmented, could be Daniel's prayer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15-17</td>
<td>4QDan e (4Q116)</td>
<td>DJD, 16:289.</td>
<td>Right margin of the fragment text preserved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:5-13</td>
<td>4QDan e (4Q114)</td>
<td>Ulrich, BASOR 274 (1989): 3-26; DJD, 16:272-273.</td>
<td>Thin leather manuscript written on the hair side. Early semicursive was used. Top right and left margins preserved. Variants with MT and other ancient MSS are palaeographical, morphological, and also orthographical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:8-16</td>
<td>6QDan (6Q7)</td>
<td>DJD, 3:114-115.</td>
<td>Fragmentary but easy for reconstruction. Mainly MT. No variants from 4QDan c. Written on papyrus; can be identified with the siglum: pap6QDan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:16-20</td>
<td>4QDan e (4Q112)</td>
<td>Ulrich, BASOR 268 (1987): 17-37; DJD, 16:253.</td>
<td>Bottom and left margins extant. V. 19 has 3 variants from MT and other ancient MSS: אמא for אמא (similar to Arabic OT, Syriac OT, Theodotion and LXX) for אמא; and תוע for תוע.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:13-16</td>
<td>4QDan e (4Q112)</td>
<td>Ulrich, BASOR 268 (1987): 17-37; DJD, 16:253-254.</td>
<td>Bottom margin of the column is extant. Text similar to 4QDan e but v. 15 differs from MT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nonbiblical Qumran Texts Associated with Daniel

About nine of the non-biblical documents written in Aramaic that archaeologists discovered in Qumran Cave 4 (hence the designation 4Q before the number of each text found there) have been associated with the canonical book of Daniel (Table 11). Closer examination shows that only four of these writings are somewhat related to the text of the biblical Daniel. The texts related to Daniel will be discussed below.


Table 10—Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daniel</th>
<th>Scroll</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:25-29</td>
<td>4QDan² (4Q114)</td>
<td>Ulrich, BASOR 274 (1989): 3-26; DJD, 16:276-277.</td>
<td>The right stitched and bottom margins of the column preserved. MT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:32</td>
<td>4QFlor (4Q174)</td>
<td>DJD, 5:54-55.</td>
<td>יִנְּשׁ וֹרִיי מָלָאך יְהוֹעֵז seems to be part of a parablepsis. MT reads: יִנְּשָׁדֵי מָלָאך יְהוֹעֵז.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:33-38</td>
<td>6QDan (6Q7)</td>
<td>DJD, 3:115-116.</td>
<td>Very fragmentary with only parts of words preserved. Written on papyrus, hence the siglum: pap6qDan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:10</td>
<td>4QFlor (4Q174)</td>
<td>DJD, 5:54-55.</td>
<td>Daniel identified as a prophet and the author of the book which is partly quoted on this fragment of the Florilegium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANUSCRIPT</td>
<td>NUMBER</td>
<td>DATE COPIED</td>
<td>RELATION TO CANONICAL DANIEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PrNab ar</td>
<td>4Q242</td>
<td>72-50 BC</td>
<td>No mention of the name Daniel. The relationship is based on vague thematic associations between this document and parts of the canonical Daniel which are difficult to determine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psDan* ar</td>
<td>4Q243</td>
<td>early 1\textsuperscript{st} century AD</td>
<td>Classified as pseudo-Daniel. Has the Babylonian court setting and mentions the names of Daniel, Belshazzar, and the Chaldeans. Has the combination of past historical survey (unlike canonical Daniel) and future predictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psDan* ar</td>
<td>4Q244</td>
<td>early 1\textsuperscript{st} century AD</td>
<td>Shares comments with 4Q243 above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psDan* ar</td>
<td>4Q245</td>
<td>early 1\textsuperscript{st} century AD</td>
<td>Has the name Daniel. Has no relationship with 4Q243 and 4Q244 and no basis to associate it with canonical Daniel. Has a list of priests and kings not found in canonical Daniel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apocalypse ar</td>
<td>4Q246</td>
<td>last 3\textsuperscript{rd} of 1\textsuperscript{st} century BC</td>
<td>No name of Daniel mentioned in this document. Certain themes that have New Testament language can somewhat be related to the canonical Daniel. <strong>DJD</strong>, 22:165-184. This text has allusions to the biblical Daniel. Collins, <em>Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls</em>, 17-18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>papApocalypse ar</td>
<td>4Q489</td>
<td>ca. AD 50</td>
<td>This text has 8 small fragments extant. On the basis of 2 words from 2 fragments, a possible relationship with the canonical Daniel: frag 1.1 וְהָיוּתָהוּ “and its appearance” as in Dan 4:8 and frag 1.2 והיתו “and you saw” as in Dan 2:41; the two words also appear in other texts different from Daniel, e.g., the first, 1 Enoch 14:18 and the second, 1 Enoch 25:3; 46:4; 52:4. <strong>DJD</strong> 7:10-11 and plate II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DanSuz? ar</td>
<td>4Q551</td>
<td>late 1\textsuperscript{st} century BC</td>
<td>Story of Suzanna taken as Dan 13 in the Apocrypha. Relationship with canonical Daniel is doubtful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Kingdoms ar</td>
<td>4Q552</td>
<td>ca. early 1\textsuperscript{st} century AD</td>
<td>Contains the 4-kingdom theme but not similar to canonical Daniel. The kingdoms are seen as trees and their chronology differs from that of Daniel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Kingdoms ar</td>
<td>4Q553</td>
<td>ca. early 1\textsuperscript{st} century AD</td>
<td>Shares the same comments with 4Q552 above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Prayer of Nabonidus

From Qumran Cave 4 archaeologists found several Aramaic fragments of a text and their reconstruction, translation, annotation, interpretation, and association with Dan 4 has attracted much scholarship. Although the extant text 4Q242 or 4QPrNab\(^{178}\) is commonly known as the Prayer of Nabonidus, it does not contain any prayer at all unlike what those who reconstructed it would like anyone to believe.

Among many other leather fragments discovered in Cave 4 at Qumran there were three manuscripts, 4Q243 (40 fragments),\(^{179}\) 4Q244 (14 fragments),\(^{180}\) and 4Q245 (4
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4Q245, also known as 4Qps Dan c, has nothing to warrant its relationship with either 4Q243 and 4Q244 or the biblical book of Daniel. However, 4Q242 (4QPrNab), 4Q243, 4Q244, and 4Q245 all properly belong to the pseudepigraphal literary genre of the time.

Due to the fragmentary nature of these manuscripts, their reconstruction has been debatable, and it depends largely on where one places the fragments. As will be seen below, it is apparent that each redactor was influenced by the biblical story (Dan 4) in its reconstruction.

4Q242 (4QPrNab) Text

Translation

1. The words of the prayer which Nabonidus, king of Babylon, the great king, prayed when he was stricken
2. with an evil disease by the decree of God in Teman. [I Nabonidus] was stricken with [an evil disease]
3. for seven years, and from [that] (time) I was like [unto a beast and I prayed to the Most High]
4. and, as for my sin, he forgave it (or: my sin he forgave). A diviner— who was a Jew [of the Exiles—came to me and said:
5. ‘Recount and record (these things) in order to give honour and great[ness] to the name of the God Most High.’ And thus I wrote: I]
6. was stricken with an evil disease in Teman [by the decree of the Most High God, and, as for me,]
7. seven years I was praying [to] gods of silver and gold, [bronze, iron,]
8. wood, stone (and) clay, because [I was of the opinion] that they [were gods]

187Ibid., 137-150.

188Frank Moore Cross mentioned about “the proper placement of the fragments” in “Fragments of the Prayer of Nabonisus,” 260, but whatever placement one might come up with, it shows that there is a deliberate and conscious effort to relate this text to the biblical story in Dan 4.
From the above reconstructed text, there are a few close similarities between the Prayer of Nabonidus and the Dan 4 story, but most of these disappear when one removes all the amendments. The first-person common singular pronoun אָנֹהֵי does not appear anywhere in the fragments. The words in line 3 אָנֹהֵי לָחוֹז עֵלֶיהָ כֹּהֶם עֵלֶיהָ אני “I was like unto a beast and I prayed to the Most High” are all supplied except for the first א on the first word. In fact, comparing Nabonidus to a beast is “not actually attested in the extant fragments,” 189 and has been observed as “paleographically impossible.” 190 There is nothing in the surviving fragments that suggests the mention of a beast. 191 On the same lacuna of the fragments Vanderkam suggested אלהא טלוי אנופור אנופור ראמס לאי “God set his face on me, he healed me,” 192 a totally different reading altogether.

Jongeling, Labuschagne, and van der Woude combined Cross and Vanderkam’s reconstructions to have עוֹלֶיהָ שָׁויָן אלהא כֹּהֶם אלהא עֵלֶיהָ טַלָוי “I came to be like the animals, but I prayed to God Most High.” 193 The space on the fragments does not allow this elongated reconstruction either.

There is no mention of the God of the Hebrews in the Prayer of Nabonidus. The redactor, who was obviously aware of the biblical story of Daniel, filled the lacunae with

189 Collins, Daniel, 218.
190 Martínez, Qumran and Apocalyptic, 123.
191 DJD, 22:90.
192 Ibid., 22:88, 89.
193 Jongeling, Labuschagne, and van der Woude, Aramaic Texts from Qumran, 126-127.
the name אֶלְוָא. The reconstruction of אֶלְוָא in line 2 might have been calculated to meet the redactor’s objective. In lines 3 and 5 the letters אֶלְוָא are added to a single surviving letter א to read “God.” The plural אֶלְוָא in line 7 is questionable. אֶלְוָא in line 8 is the only clear evidence of the pantheon, which has survived from the fragments. In line 7 the fragments have “silver” and “gold,” then some missing words, which are followed by the words “wood, stone and clay.” Where there are some missing words the redactor inserted נָהָשׁ מֶרְוָא “bronze, iron.”

In his reconstruction above, Cross also supplied the word אֶלְוָא “gods” before this list so that it would match with Dan 5:4, 23, “gods of silver and gold, bronze, iron, wood and stone.” This clearly establishes the fact that the redactors deliberately worked out the Prayer of Nabonidus in light of the biblical text to try to discredit the authenticity and early date for the composition of the book of Daniel. In Dan 4 Nebuchadnezzar suffered from mental derangement, possibly “lycanthropy,” which caused him to behave like an animal. Contrary to this, Nabonidus had a skin disease which irritated him. The Verse Account of Nabonidus (BM 38299) is a very fragmentary text from which a


196 Smith, Babylonian Historical Texts, 27-97; and ANET, 312-314.
suggestion was made that \textit{a-gu-ùg šarru} “the king is mad”\textsuperscript{197} referred to the madness of Nabonidus. However, it has been clearly shown that \textit{a-gu-ù} means “angry” or “wrath.”\textsuperscript{198}

The times for Nebuchadnezzar and Nabonidus’s afflictions are significant. Nebuchadnezzar suffered for \textit{šabtûn šarrûn} “seven times” (Dan 4:23, 32) while Nabonidus claims to have been afflicted for \textit{šabtûn šabtûn} “seven years” (line 3). The Danielic time reckoning is more difficult to conceptualize than that of the Prayer of Nabonidus, and this strongly suggests that Daniel could be a much earlier tradition. \textit{šabtûn šabtûn} of Daniel is part of an ancient prophetic language which calls for interpretation.

In light of the above discussion, Dan 4 and the Prayer of Nabonidus could be the same event but each with different details. With this suggestion the questions that remain to be answered are on the dating and authorship. Which one of the two is an earlier tradition? How the prayer was not canonized and yet featured at Qumran is a puzzle. It can also be suggested that one of these stories comes directly from the event and the other from the source of the event.\textsuperscript{199} In light of this idea, the debate among scholars then centers on which of the two is more authentic and of an earlier date. Both pieces of literature have valuable data for biblical studies. In my opinion the suggestion that makes

\textsuperscript{197}Smith, Babylonian Historical Texts, 85, col. IV, line 5; and ANET, 314, col. iv.

\textsuperscript{198}Smith, Babylonian Historical Texts, 89, col. IV, line 5; and Martin McNamara, “Nabonidus and the Book of Daniel,” Irish Theological Quarterly 37 (1970): 141. \textit{a-gu-ù} is used in reference to the violent current of water, that is, “a surging flow of raging water,” “an angry surge of water,” or “furious waves of water”; see CAD, A 1, 157-158.

sense is that Dan 4 and 4QPrNab are two different events with data that complement each other.

The problem with 4QPrNab is its reconstruction, which is done in light of the biblical text of Daniel. Nevertheless, 4QPrNab seems to draw its inspiration from several passages in the book of Daniel, and such works were common in the later phase of the development of the Danielic writings. The dissimilarities in content and literary structure between these two accounts point to the fact that they have less in common than what scholars accredit to them.

As Collins has admitted that although the Prayer of Nabonidus along with Bel and the Dragon has some significant parallels with Dan 1-6, there is basically no clear evidence on the supposed literary influence between any of these works.200

**Apocryphal Additions to the Text of Daniel**

The Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Children,201 the History of Susanna,202 and Bel and the Dragon203 are the three documents found in the LXX which


have been taken as Greek Additions to the canonical book of Daniel. Martin MacDonald has opined:

It is likely that the additions to Daniel (Songs of the Three Children, Susanna, and Bel and the Dragon), the extended portions of Esdras that were added to Ezra, and the epistle of Jeremiah (sometimes included as the last chapter of 1 Baruch) were added by Jews in the first century B.C.E. or before and were a part of a popular Jewish collection of sacred writings before the church separated from Judaism. However, these Additions were rejected by the Christian Church, and the Protestants termed them apocrypha. On the other hand, the Roman Catholic Church accepted these documents at their council of Trent in 1546 and named them “deutero-canonical texts.” These texts appear in the official Roman Catholic Church adaptation of the Holy Bible, the Douay Version.

The Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Children (67 verses) are composed mainly of the Prayer of Azariah and the Hymn of the Three Young Men, which could sequentially be inserted immediately after the canonical Dan 3:23. This text was probably written during the Maccabean era and the original language remains


The Apocrypha: Greek and English,” in The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English, 137-139; Moore, Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah: The Additions, 117-149; and The Cambridge Annotated Study Apocrypha, 126-127.
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Ibid., 2:18, 19.
unknown. According to Dan 3, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego were thrown into a furnace of fire for having defied Nebuchadnezzar’s order to worship the golden image in the Plain of Dura. So the sixty-seven verses of this text are supposed to have been the prayer and the hymn the three young men offered to their God who miraculously delivered them from being destroyed by the fire. The canonical text points out that Nebuchadnezzar finally declared to all the people not to despise the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego or they would face destruction.

Carey A. Moore argued that the Prayer of Azariah was an independent document produced and circulated after 163 B.C. and had nothing to do with the canonical Dan 3. Further, Moore insisted on why the Prayer was inappropriate for the context of the canonical Dan 3:

(1) the clumsy and repetitious character of the prayer’s own introduction to itself in vv. 24-25 of the older LXX;
(2) its use in v. 24 of the heroes’ Hebrew names, whereas in the fiery furnace account of the MT their Aramaic names are always used (13 times);
(3) the obvious inappropriateness of much of the prayer for its context; and
(4) the logical and chronological misplacement of the prayer when compared to the narrative (3:46-51).

Whether the story of Susanna is placed before the beginning or at the end of the canonical text (as in θ, Old Latin, Coptic, Ethiopic, or Arabic versions), it is still considered as “strangely out of place.” Susanna is a heroine, who was condemned to be

---


210 Ibid.

211 Ibid., 2:21.
killed for having committed adultery but was rescued by a young Daniel. The three stories in Bel and the Dragon have been characterized as lacking religious value although they stress monotheism and ridicule paganism in view of Jewish religion.\textsuperscript{212} Despite the status of the Prayer of Azariah, Susanna, and Bel and the Dragon with regard to the canon, these so-called Additions to Daniel have not been helpful in the understanding or dating of the book of Daniel.

**Daniel in the Pseudepigrapha**

Several writings that the Roman Catholic Church considers to be holy and inspired by God are known as the “Additions” to the canonical book of Daniel. These writings are designated as deuterocanonical, from the Greek δεύτερος “second” and κανών “(a cane), ‘a measure’ or ‘a rule.”\textsuperscript{213} No deuterocanonical literature was considered in the corpus of scripture known as the biblical canon.\textsuperscript{214} Both Protestant Christians and Jews reject the deuterocanonical writings as uninspired and reckon them

\begin{itemize}
  \item[Ibid., 2:26.]
  \item[213]The New Analytical Greek Lexicon (1990), s.v. “δεύτερος,” and “κανών.”
  \item[214]The debate over the issues with regard to the canon of the Old Testament or the New Testament is not over yet. For the Old Testament canon James A. Sanders gave an overview and bibliography on the discussion in “Canon,” in ABD (1992), 1:837-852. The long-standing conviction that the Hebrew Bible or the Old Testament (39 books) was finally canonized at the Council of Jamnia around A.D. 90 while the New Testament (27 books) was fixed in Alexandria around A.D. 367 has been challenged. The Jews (with the exception of those who proselytize to Christianity) do not recognize the New Testament as part of their scripture.
\end{itemize}
as apocrypha,\textsuperscript{215} ἀπόκρυφος “hidden away,” or “concealed.”\textsuperscript{216} Over the years the deuterocanonical writings have come to be viewed either as extrabiblical, nonbiblical, parabiblical, intrabiblical, postbiblical, noncanonical, extracanonical, nonstandard, apocryphal, or pseudepigraphal (ψευδός “falsehood” and γραφή “a writing,”\textsuperscript{217} that is, false writings). Pseudepigraphal documents are falsely attributed to an ancient famous author and they may have valuable information but are also tinted with error and misconceptions. Charlesworth, who has done extensive editing of the literature dealing with the pseudepigraphal writings, defines the pseudepigrapha as

those writings 1) that, with the exception of Ahiqar, are Jewish or Christian; 2) that are often attributed to ideal figures in Israel’s past; 3) that customarily claim to contain God’s word or message; 4) that frequently build upon ideas and narratives present in the Old Testament; 5) and that almost always were composed either during the period 200 B.C. to 200 A.D. or, though late, apparently preserve, albeit in an edited form, Jewish traditions that date from that period.\textsuperscript{218}

The collection of the pseudepigraphical writings is voluminous,\textsuperscript{219} and there has been a

\textsuperscript{215}Apocryphal writings are the 13 Additions that are not in the 	extit{Biblia Hebraica} or the Old Testament but are found in the Greek and Slavonic codices of the Old Testament, viz., Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus, and Codex Alexandrinus. See James H. Charlesworth, “Apocrypha,” 	extit{ABD} (1992), 1:292-294; and Collins, 	extit{Daniel: With an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature}, 28-29.

\textsuperscript{216}The New Analytical Greek Lexicon (1990), s.v. “ἀπόκρυφος.”

\textsuperscript{217}Ibid., s.v. “ψευδός,” and “γραφή.”

\textsuperscript{218}Charlesworth, ed. 	extit{The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments}, 1:xxv.

\textsuperscript{219}DiTommaso, 	extit{A Bibliography of Pseudepigrapha Research 1850-1999} (2001), gives a comprehensive bibliography on the pseudepigrapha and related literature, but ever since the completion of this valuable work, more such literature is continuously surfacing. Pages 307-335 of his volume have entries on Daniel pseudepigrapha.
deliberate effort by some scholars to show the relationship between these and the biblical text. Charlesworth argued for the pseudepigrapha to be broadly understood as to include all Jewish, Israelite, or Christian writings claiming to be the word of God and having been written from about 250 B.C. to A.D. 200 or later.

Lorenzo DiTommaso further contended that "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." It should be noted that it is on the basis of that "drift" from the biblical text that responsible exegesis is always suspicious of the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical writings. DiTommaso nevertheless acknowledged that the bulk of the Danielic material "is of a late enough date to assume the unambiguous precedence and thus the authority of its scriptural referent." In view of this observation, it sounds reasonable to conclude that since the pseudepigrapha as well as the apocrypha are considered to lack the authoritative aura of the biblical canon, it is always safe to observe the distinction.

One of the well-distinguished literary genres in the pseudepigrapha is the


223 Ibid., 51.
apocalypses, ἀποκάλυψις "a disclosure," "a revelation," "a manifestation," or "an appearance." Certain documents or their portions, such pseudepigraphical literature as 1 and 2 Enoch, 2 and 3 Baruch, 4 Ezra, Testament of Levi 2-5, Jubilees, Apocalypse of Zephania, the Testament of Abraham, and also the canonical book of Daniel are classified as the apocalyptic genre. Not much is known about the apocryphal fallen angel Dan’el/Danyul mentioned in 1 Enoch 6:7 and 69:2 respectively. On the other hand, Jub 4:20 mentions a Dan’el who was the maternal grandfather of one called Methuselah.

The apocalyptic pseudepigraphy are usually attributed to renowned ancient figures. Several reasons have been suggested as to why such writings are pseudonymous. Perhaps these writings have demonstrated that they are based on mere speculation on the life of the renowned ancient writers. Collins summarized the scholarly views by pointing out that some writers chose to be pseudonymous in disguise to avoid consequential retribution from authorities. It is therefore most likely that since prophecy declined or lost its popularity (Zech 13:2-6) after the Medo-Persian period (539-331 B.C.), this may have prompted many writers to come up with some pseudonymous oracles. Lastly, some writers may have employed pseudonymity as an attempt to attain

224 *The New Analytical Greek Lexicon* (1990), s.v. "ἀποκάλυψις."


prestige for their work. It is also possible that the pseudonymous writers were in a bid to have their work included in the canon if it had the name of an ancient, well-regarded person. They may have had a hidden agenda to endorse or perpetuate through the authority of some historical person. Whatever reasons given for pseudonymity, the volume of such literature attributed to Daniel is overwhelming and has caused intractable problems in the understanding of the biblical book.

**Daniel as an Apocalypse**

The two Greek words ἀπό “from” and καλύπτω “to cover,” “hide,” or “veil” when coined become ἀποκάλυπτω, which literally means to “uncover,” “disclose,” “unveil,” “make bare” or “undo a package.” The macrogenre of the literature that is characterized by visions, dreams, symbolism, prophecy, historical outlines, human agent interacting with divine beings, eschatological cosmic events of destruction, and the transcendence of God has come to be known as the apocalypses. This has been loosely defined by J. J. Collins and others as the genre of revelatory literature 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 envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world.

---


Such a generic definition still lacks some vital characteristics embedded in many of the apocalypses,\(^{231}\) for example, pseudonymity, paraenetic discourses, and mythical imagery, to name a few.\(^{232}\) Apocalypses are a macrogenre that can be delimited into subgenres with distinct themes, features, and content, which vary with each literary work.

The book of Daniel has been considered as one of the earliest works in the apocalyptic genre,\(^{233}\) but as already observed above, chaps. 1-6 evince a different subgenre which works as preparatory background for chaps. 7-12. The suggestion that the apocalyptic literature flourished from 250 B.C. to A.D. 250\(^{234}\) fails to acknowledge such earlier biblical books as Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah, which already showed some of the characteristics of this genre back from the eighth to the sixth century B.C.\(^{235}\) It is clear that earlier apocalyptic literature can be identified from the prophetic and wisdom


\(^{233}\)Collins, *Daniel*, 58. If the book of Daniel can be ascertained to have been written in the sixth century B.C., then it assumes the title of being the earliest full-blown apocalyptic literature. Stuart Lasine considered Daniel’s literary genre to have some social functions; see his “Solomon, Daniel and the Detective Story: The Social Functions of a Literary Genre,” *Hebrew Annual Review* 11 (1987): 247-266.


\(^{235}\)Paul D. Hanson points out that some biblical prophetic books have prophetic eschatology “study of end-time events” and that apocalyptic eschatology was an outgrowth from this biblical prophetic eschatology. However, he emphasized the fact that “prophetic eschatology and apocalyptic eschatology are best viewed as two sides of a continuum” which thrives best in social and political conditions. See his “Apocalypses and Apocalypticism: Introductory Overview,” in *ABD* (1992), 1:280-282.
traditions of ancient Israel and also the mythologies of the ancient Near East.

What was רוחי "shut up" משמרא "and sealed" in the book of Daniel (chap. 12:4, 9) until the time of the end has been ἀπεκαλυφθεὶς "revealed" or "disclosed" in the book of Revelation (chap. 1:1) where there is the first attested use of the word ἀποκαλυφτικός to refer to a kind of writing. The LXX used ἀπεκαλυφθείς “was revealed” (Dan 2:19, 30; 10:1) regarding some mysterious historical developments that were to be known before they took place. The two books, Daniel and Revelation, have much in common and can be studied one in light of the other. Some of the imagery in Revelation has its precedents in Daniel and other parts of the Hebrew Bible. In fact, Collins lists the Revelation, the Ethiopic Book of Enoch, 2 Apocalypse of Baruch, and 4 Ezra as a few examples of historical apocalyptic writings that are clearly dependent on Daniel. Matthew 24, Mark 13, and Luke 24 are the New Testament apocalypses that give some reference to Daniel.

Some themes in Daniel have parallels in other apocalypses, but it is difficult to detect direct dependence on each other. There are some parallels to Daniel in the book of Enoch with regard to the eschatological era and the end-time judgment of the righteous and the wicked (chaps. 1-5), the Messiah, the son of man, reckoning of time by the sun, and the fate of the wicked (chaps. 72-82), dream visions (chaps. 83-90) and the blessedness of the righteous in contrast with the miserable end of the wicked people


237 Ibid., 72-73.

238 Collins, Daniel, 58, 59.
Generally, there are two types of apocalypses, historical and otherworldly, as exemplified by the books of Daniel and 1 Enoch respectively. The historical apocalypses have to do with the revelation of future developments that are fixed and may not change. Daniel’s apocalyptic writing is not communicating a conditional future (although he wished to, chap. 4:27), but what is revealed in his book is already certain and it would take place (chap. 2:45). In Daniel there are no otherworldly journeys taken by the writer while in company of divine beings. In fact, the supernatural beings come to the furnace (3:25), lions’ pit (6:22), and to explain visions to Daniel (8:15; 9:21, 23; 10:5; 12:5).

The apocalyptic messages in Daniel come through dreams and visions. Mysterious symbols are used that escape all logic for making sense. In the first half of his book, Daniel had skill in all visions and dreams and in any matter of wisdom and understanding (1:17, 20), but in the last half, he is in desperate search for understanding, and only supernatural beings attended to give him understanding.

The origin of the apocalypses has been a divisive matter among scholars. Different persuasions accredit the apocalypses as an outgrowth of either Old Testament

---


241 Works which cover otherworldly journeys include Apocalypse of Abraham; Apocalypse of Zephaniah; 1-2 Enoch; 3 Baruch and Testament of Levi 2-5; see Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 1.
wisdom or prophecy. On the other hand, the history of religions takes the apocalypses as a foreign element, possibly originating from Persian or Iranian and ancient Near Eastern myths. If the prophetic oracles that were in the biblical canon became the source material for some of the apocalypses, then it must be noted that the writers of the apocalypses may or may not have had different purposes and points of interest from those who preceded them. Some may have intended to supplement information unavailable from the ancient writers, but such works are characterized mostly by the author’s speculation and therefore raise suspicion.

The main characteristics of the apocalypses include first, the tendency to predict events that may have already happened, what is commonly known as the vaticinia ex eventu; second, prophecies; and third, the eschatological predictions, the foretelling of future signs of the end. Collins classified as ex eventu prophecies Gen 15:13-16; Dan 7, 8, 9, 10, 11; along with the following pseudepigraphical writings: Apocalypse of Abraham; Animal Apocalypse; Apocalypse of Weeks; Jub 23:11-26; 2 Baruch 35-47; 53-77; and 4 Ezra 11-12. The ex eventu prophecies, for example, the Persian writings such


244 Collins, Daniel: With an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature, 11-14.
as Bahman Yasht and the Bundahishn, periodized history into various time periods to show that history was fixed and would happen as scheduled.\textsuperscript{245} In such prophecies, Collins argued, the reader might be able to situate one’s generation at the end of the chronological succession.\textsuperscript{246} Collins’s suggestion that the reader placed one’s generation at the end of the chronological sequence is not the case of Daniel. Daniel 2 situated the Neo-Babylonian generation at the beginning of the chronological history, and all the subsequent time-line events point to the end-time long after the Neo-Babylonian empire had vanished into history (Dan 8:17; 10:14; 12:4, 9,13).

Grayson describes some Akkadian prophecies as \textit{vaticinia ex eventu}, that is, prose compositions that have past events but are presented by their authors “as a genuine attempt to forecast future events.”\textsuperscript{247} In light of this, scholars have noted a striking similarity in genre, style, and content between Dan 11 and some Akkadian prophecies.\textsuperscript{248}


\textsuperscript{246}Collins, \textit{Daniel: With an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature}, 11.


\textsuperscript{248}Several Akkadian texts that fall in this category include: the Late Assyrian tablet from Assur dated 614 B.C. which reads: “A prince will arise and will exercise kingship for 13 years. There will be an attack of Elam on Babylonia and the booty of Babylonia will be carried off. The shrines of the great gods will be ruined and Babylonia will be defeated. There will be chaos, upset and trouble in the land, and the upper classes will lose power. Some other, unknown person will arise, will seize power as if king, and will kill off the nobility.” A. K. Grayson and W. G. Lambert, “Akkadian Prophecies,”
The Akkadian vaticinia ex eventu writings are meant either to justify the author’s claims or just to gain credibility from the readership. More examples of such works include the Dynastic prophecy,249 Text A,250 Uruk Text,251 Marduk, and Shulgi Prophetic Speeches.252


Another text was found at Warka, Babylonian Uruk (biblical Erech), and it reads: “After him a king will arise and will not judge the judgement of the land, will not give decisions for the land, but he will rule the four world regions and at his name the regions will tremble. After him a king will arise from Uruk and will judge the judgement of the land, will give decisions for the land. He will confirm the rites of Anu in Uruk.” Ibid., rev., lines 9-12.

The Late Babylonian tablet now housed in the British Museum says: “A rebel prince will arise[ . . .] the dynasty of Harran [. . .] for 17 years [he will exercise kingship] and will prevail over the land. The festival of Esagil (?) [. . .] the wall in Babylonia. A king of Elam will rise up, the sceptre [. . .] he will remove him from his throne [. . .] he will seize the throne.” Grayson, Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts (1975), 33, lines 11-24; and Lambert, The Background of Jewish Apocalyptic, 12.

249 Grayson, Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts, 24-37. The Dynasty prophecy text is preserved on a fragment tablet BM 40623 (BM 34903 could be its other piece) which relates the rise and fall of the nations. It refers to the fall of Assyria, the rise and fall of Babylon, the rise and the fall of Persia, and possibly the rise of the Greeks.

250 ANET, 451-452, 606-607; Grayson and Lambert, “Akkadian Prophecies,” 12-16; Robert D. Biggs, “More Babylonian ‘Prophecies,’” Iraq 29 (1967): 117-132. Text A relates of a chain of anonymous kings who are introduced by the formulaic statement: “A prince shall arise and rule for x years. . . .” Each incumbent king is either good or bad but there is no regular pattern on all. The last part of the prophecy is lost and this makes it difficult to discover both its definite historical framework and the intention of the author. See also W. W. Hallo, “Akkadian Apocalypses,” IEJ 16 (1966): 235-236; and Helmer Ringgren, “Akkadian Apocalypses,” in Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East, 379-380.

251 Hunger and Kaufman, “A New Akkadian Prophecy Text,” 371-375. Both Hunger and Kaufman concur that all these prophecies are dissimilar in both literary format and function (375).

all of which are thought to have some affinities or parallels to the Hebrew apocalypses. However, a close analysis of the Akkadian prophecies in form, content, and function shows that they lack transcendental eschatology, which is the most dominant characteristic of the apocalypses.\textsuperscript{253} These prophecies belong to a different genre than the apocalypses, although their historical outlines have some parallels with Dan 2, 7, 8, and 11.\textsuperscript{254} Grayson concluded that this literature was valuable only for comparative purposes with the apocalypses.\textsuperscript{255} Further, the Babylonian prophecies have no clear-cut purpose for their composition, predictions that lead to a grand climax of history, and an international thrust; they have no affinity with the Hebrew apocalypses.\textsuperscript{256}

Scholarship acknowledges the fact that Dan 1-6 claims to be of the Neo-Babylonian and Medo-Persian provenance.\textsuperscript{257} The debate is still unsettled on whether or not all these stories circulated from a single authorship.\textsuperscript{258} More and more literary evidence and devices show that the unity of the first six chapters is to be viewed as a

\textsuperscript{253}Roy Gane, “Genre Awareness and Interpretation of the Book of Daniel,” in \textit{To Understand the Scriptures}, ed. David Merling (Berrien Springs, MI: Institute of Archaeology, 1997), 144.

\textsuperscript{254}Ibid., 144-145.

\textsuperscript{255}Grayson, \textit{Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts}, 21.


\textsuperscript{257}See discussion above on The Composition of Daniel.

\textsuperscript{258}Towner, \textit{Daniel}, 6-10; Di Lella, \textit{Daniel: A Book for Troubling Times}, 7-10; and Lucas, \textit{Daniel}, 312-315.
background to the last six chapters. Whether the book of Daniel was written in the sixth or second century B.C., it still carries its predictive force, for more of its predictions took place after the second century B.C. and yet the cosmic grand finale is still to come in the time of the end. Therefore, Daniel cannot be characterized as a *vaticinia ex eventu* apocalypse because its dream predictions are *vaticinia ante eventu*.

This study has shown the fulfillment of many of the book’s predictions long after the book had been in circulation. In fact, some events portrayed in Daniel have not yet taken place. Some of Nebuchadnezzar’s (chap. 2) and Daniel’s (chaps. 7-12) dream predictions are still unfulfilled. The eschatological stone of Dan 2:44-45 has not yet come to destroy the world and create a new order. The resurrection of the saints (12:2) has not yet taken place, and also the saints have not yet received the kingdom (7:27).

**The Maccabean Hypothesis Approach**

The Maccabean hypothesis states that the book of Daniel was compiled by second-century B.C. unidentifiable writer(s) who posed as a sixth-century B.C. prophet named Daniel. Further, this hypothesis postulates that the book was written after the events it purports to describe (*vaticinium ex eventu*) and that its message was spuriously crafted and presented as genuine predictive prophecy (*vaticinium ante eventu*). Those who subscribe to this idea also argue that the book was written around 165 B.C. to

encourage Jewish patriotic resistance against the tyranny of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.  

The Maccabean hypothesis claims have since developed into several strands of arguments for the late date and the unhistoricity of the book of Daniel.

Historical Arguments

A wide range of issues has been raised against the text of Daniel with regard to the unhistoricity of some events or people such as Daniel, Nebuchadnezzar’s lycanthropy, Belshazzar’s kingship, the Chaldeans, and Darius the Mede. Daniel 1:1; Jer 25:1; and 46:2 relate to the same date but these texts have been taken as contradictory of each other and therefore charged with historical errancy. Other disputed texts on dating that are

---


263 See the discussion above on the Dating Problem.
taken as unhistorical include Dan 7:1; 8:1 and 9:1. In the Jewish canon Daniel is placed among the *Kethubim* or *Hagiographa* rather than among the prophets. Daniel’s placement in the *Kethubim* is interpreted to mean that it was written later than all the canonical prophets. In 170 B.C. Jesus ben Sirach (Ecclesiasticus) referred to all the prophets except Daniel, and this omission has been argued to mean that Daniel was not yet written at that time. The major thrust of all these arguments was to show that the book of Daniel was written in the second century B.C. However, the literary and artifactual discoveries have refuted these arguments and show that the book of Daniel is of more earlier provenance than had been suggested.

**Linguistic Arguments**

The book of Daniel is composed mainly in Hebrew and Aramaic, but the text also evinces some Greek and Persian loan-words. The appearance of some foreign words in the text of Daniel has been viewed as evidence for a late date of the entire work.\(^{264}\) Samuel R. Driver asserted that the appearance of some Greek words in Daniel demanded the date of the book after Alexander the Great had conquered Palestine.\(^{265}\) It was once believed that the word קִצּוּדר “the herald” (Dan 3:4; 5:29) was a loan-word from the

\(^{264}\) See the section above on Multilingualism in Daniel.

Greek κηφών, but it has been clearly shown that the word comes from the Old Persian khrausa “caller.” The three Greek words that appear as names of musical instruments are: στρατονοία, κηφών, κηρούς (Dan 3:5, 7, 10, 15). The last music instrument is attested in Greek literature during the time of Plato (ca. 370 B.C.) and this has been used to suggest that the book of Daniel should have been written after the fourth century B.C. The Assyrian king Sargon II (722-705 B.C.) caught the Greeks who lived on the islands like fish and sold them into slavery in the ancient Near East. In fact, the Greek poet Alcaeus of Lesbos (ca. 600 B.C.) wrote about his brother Antimenidas who was drafted into the Babylonian army. Moreover, some Greek carpenters and shipbuilders, along with musicians from Ashkelon, were attested as recipients of Nebuchadnezzar’s food rations. Apparently, Greek mercenaries, slaves, and Greek music instruments existed in the ancient Near East long before the time of Daniel.

266 BDB, 1097.


268 See discussion above on Musical Instruments (Dan 3:5).


270 ANET, 284.


272 ANET, 308; and Archer, A Survey of Old Testament Introduction, 431.

273 Archer, A Survey of Old Testament Introduction, 431; W. F. Albright, From Stone Age to Christianity, 2nd ed. (New York: 1957), 337; Edwin Yamauchi, Greece and
fact, if the book of Daniel was composed after 170 B.C., the Greeks would have
dominated the ancient Near East from 331-168 B.C. One would then expect Daniel’s
book to be full of Greek expressions, political as well as administrative terms, cultural
customs, and issues. Instead, the book of Daniel has several words of Old Persian
origin that relate mostly to government administration and politics.

Examples of the Old Persian loan-words include those attested in the Akkadian
cuneiform: "satraps" (Dan 3:2, 3, 27; 6:1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7); "law," "decree"
(2:9, 13, 15; 6:5, 8, 12, 15; 7:25), and "judges" (3:2, 3), and those found in sixth-
to fifth-century B.C. Elephantine papyri in Egypt, "word" (3:16; 4:17); "assured" or "certified" (2:5), "kind" or "type" (3:5, 7, 10, 15), "magistrate,"
"police officer" (3:2, 3), "the secret" (2:19, 27, 30), and "the treasure" (3:2, 3). Others are "the noblemen" (1:3), "food" (1:5), "palace"
(11:45), "tunic," "garment" or "shirt" (3:21), "root" (4:20, 23), "the lampstand" (5:5), "a present," "gift" (2:6; 5:17), "sheath," "body" (7:15),
"limb" (2:5; 3:29) and "necklace," "chain" (5:7, 16, 29). The presence of
some Persian words in the text shows that the author was well acquainted with current
affairs and incorporated the words in their proper context and meaning. Daniel may have
written his book later in life during the Medo-Persian period. The Old Persian words are

dated 300 B.C. or earlier but not later, and they point to an earlier date for the book of Daniel.276

Literary Arguments

The apocalypses literary genre flourished from 250 B.C. to A.D. 250.277 Many Jewish writings of this nature produced during this time include 1 Enoch, 4 Ezra, 2-4 Baruch, and the apocalypses of Abraham, Adam, Enosh, Paul, Sethel, Shem, and Zephaniah.278 The book of Daniel, which has been classified as a full-blown apocalypse, has also been considered as a product of this time period by those who advocate for the Maccabean hypothesis. It has been strongly suggested that the book was written to console the Jews who were undergoing persecution by Antiocus IV Epiphanes. Such an argument is no longer tenable because there are stronger reasons for the writer to have come up with such a document during the most devastating time in that nation’s history when Nebuchadnezzar murdered people, robbed and destroyed the temple, carried the people into exile, and left the country desolated.

To assert that Daniel must have been written during the time most of the apocalypses were written also ignores the fact that “the antecedents of apocalyptic literature can be found much earlier, in the prophetic and wisdom traditions of ancient


Israel, and the mythologies of the ancient Near East.” Daniel further develops the apocalyptic motifs that were already raised by the other Hebrew writers. Another distinct characteristic of the apocalyptic genre is pseudonymity, the idea of falsely ascribing one’s writings to an ancient renowned individual. Apparently, many pseudepigraphical writings have claimed Danielic authorship, but evidence is lacking to consider, classify, or identify the canonical book of Daniel as pseudonymous. In the Hebrew Bible no pseudepigraphon could ever be accepted or considered as an authoritative work, for there was resistance to the interpolation of any new material in a text.

Theological Arguments

The proponents of the Maccabean hypothesis argue that the book of Daniel shares some of the motifs and concerns occurring in the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical literature of the Intertestamental period. Such motifs include the concept of angelology, resurrection, judgment, messianic figure, God’s eschatological kingdom, deliberate avoidance of the name YHWH, and penitential prayer and fasting. Such works as Tobit (225-175 B.C.), the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs (second century B.C.), the book of Enoch (first century B.C.), Susanna, the Vision of Isaiah (first century A.D.) and the

---


Ascension of Isaiah (first century A.D.) have motifs similar to Daniel. It has been suggested that Daniel must have been written in the same time frame with the writings with which it shares similar emphases. However, examining the text of Daniel in light of the above-mentioned motifs shows that it has closer affinity to the other Hebrew Bible texts than the extrabiblical apocryphal and pseudepigraphical literature.

The role of angels in Daniel is consistent with what is found in the Pentateuch, historical books, and prophetic texts of the Hebrew Bible. Biblical angelology stands in "sharp contrast with extra-biblical intertestamental apocalyptic literature where angels of different kinds and ranks are bewilderingly teeming (see for example 1 Enoch 6:7-8; 9:1; 20:1-8; Tobit 3:8, 16-17; 5:4; 8:3; 12:15)." The idea of the resurrection of both the good and bad in Dan 12:2 is biblically based, but the only extrabiblical text that mentions this is the Book of the Twelve Patriarchs (Judah 25:4-5). The Hebrew Bible is full with texts on prayer and fasting, the last judgment, the messianic figure, and Yahweh's eschatological kingdom, which are either reiterated or elaborated in Daniel. Archaeological and literary evidence shows that the book of Daniel seems to belong more to the sixth-century B.C. provenance.


283 See the discussion above on The Ones Sleeping in the Dust (Dan 12:2). The New Testament further develops the resurrection motif in passages like John 11:23, 24; 1 Thess 4:13-17; 1 Cor 15:12-55; and Rev 20:4-6.
Exegetical Arguments

The main exegetical concern for the proponents of the Maccabean hypothesis is with the startling Danielic predictions which they have dismissed as vaticinium ex eventu. The four-kingdom schema, the chronological succession of the earthly kingdoms and their symbolism are an enigmatic puzzle. All the historical predictions are considered crafted by some author(s) who lived in the Maccabean times when Jews were militating against the Syrian hegemony. Chapter 11 of Daniel is taken as reminiscing on the Maccabean wars. Antiochus IV Epiphanes as the little horn looms large in the Maccabean hypothesis exegesis. It is therefore necessary to discuss Antiochus IV Epiphanes in relation to the book of Daniel.

Antiochus IV Epiphanes Omission

The person of Antiochus IV Epiphanes dominates in the understanding of the Danielic studies such that it is necessary to address briefly here the issues surrounding his role with regard to the interpretation of the book of Daniel. To begin with, it can be noted that the books of 1 and 2 Maccabees, Polybius,\textsuperscript{284} and Livy\textsuperscript{285} were some of the sources possibly available to Josephus as he was compiling the histories of the Jewish people.\textsuperscript{286} Josephus must have been influenced by 1 Macc 1:39, "her sanctuary became desolate like a desert," to suggest that Antiochus IV Epiphanes and subsequently the Roman

\textsuperscript{284}Polybius, \textit{The Histories}, 6.29.27.

\textsuperscript{285}Livy, \textit{The History of Rome}, 44, 45.

\textsuperscript{286}See 1 Macc 1:10-6:17; 2 Macc 9; Josephus, \textit{The Antiquities of the Jews}, 12.5-9; 13.5.5; 13.7.2-4; 13.8.2; and idem, \textit{The Wars of the Jews}, 1:1.1-6.
government fulfilled the problems of the “abomination that desolates” hinted in Dan 8:13; 9:17, 27; 11:31; 12:11.287

Despite Josephus’s point of view on Antiochus IV, some Jews still see the fulfillment of the “abomination that desolates” as referring specifically to the Romans.288

Atrocities by Pagan Rome include the proposal to erect an idol by Caius Caligula in the temple in Jerusalem, the setting up of Roman standards in the temple, the construction of the temple for Jupiter Capitolina by Adrian in A.D. 132, the crushing of the Bar Cochba revolt, and the oppression of the Jews.289 Of all the Seleucid Greek kings, biblical scholars have most popularized Antiochus IV Epiphanes, the younger son of Antiochus III, in the study of the book of Daniel.290 Hippolytus (140-235 A.D.) associated the activities of the little horn in Dan 8 and the king of the north in Dan 11 with Antiochus IV

287 Josephus, The Antiquities of the Jews, 10.11.7.

288 Regardless of holding on to the opinion that Antiochus IV Epiphanes had a role to play in Daniel’s writing, Josephus was also convinced that the Roman government would make Palestine desolate. Ibid., 10.11.7; see also Goldwurm, Daniel: A New Translation with a Commentary Anthologized from Talmudic, Midrashic and Rabbinic Sources, 199; Japheth Ibn Ali, A Commentary on the Book of Daniel, ed. and trans. D.S. Margoliouth (Oxford: Clarendon, 1889), 34, 51, 64, 65; and Archer, trans., Jerome’s Commentary on Daniel, 32.

289 Ibid., 134; and 1 & 2 Maccabees.

This idea was further capitalized by Porphyry (233-304 A.D.), a Syrian sophist and neoplatonic philosopher who strongly suggested that Antiochus IV Epiphanes fulfilled what was spoken of in Dan 9:27 and 11:31. Jerome tried to object to Porphyry’s views in Jerome’s Commentary on Daniel, and ever since, the debate over the identity and role of Antiochus IV Epiphanes in the book of Daniel remains unabated. The two burning issues with scholarship today are first, the identification of Antiochus IV with the little horn of Dan 7 and 8, and second, whether or not Antiochus IV fits anywhere in Dan 11. Unfortunately, over the years the book of Daniel has been grossly misunderstood, and this has resulted in erroneous interpretations of its theme and content and the miscalculation of its mathematics and dating.

The outline of the successive kingdoms in Dan 2, 7, and 8 began with Babylon, Babylon, Babylon, Babylon.


294 See the discussion above on The Four-Kingdom Schema (Dan 2), and also tables 5 and 12.

452
then Medo-Persia, followed by Greece, and lastly the fourth kingdom, which would subsequently fragment, finally be destroyed, and replaced by a divine one. In Dan 7 the bizarre beast with ten horns represented the fourth kingdom (v. 23). In this kingdom the little horn displaced three of the ten horns as it came into prominence. It is apparent that the little horn is from the bizarre beast which represents the fourth historical kingdom (vv. 23-25) after the fall of Neo-Babylonia. From the textual and historical evidence, it is very unlikely that Antiochus IV Epiphanes could possibly be identified as the little horn. Antiochus IV Epiphanes was one of the Greek kings who ruled from 175-164 B.C., but the Greeks were conquered by the fourth kingdom (Dan 2:33-35, 40-43; 7:7, 19; 11:20-45). According to the chronology of Daniel, Antiochus IV belonged to the third kingdom represented by the belly and thighs of bronze (2:32, 39), a beast like a leopard (7:6), and the he-goat (8:5-8, 21). His anti-Jewish devastations only cannot qualify him to be the little horn of Daniel. Some identifying marks of the little horn in Dan 7 have been

As already noted above in The Four-Kingdom Schema (Dan 2), the kingdom chronology in Daniel is viewed through either the Grecian scheme, which outlines the kingdoms as Babylonian, Median, Persian, and Greek (see Boutflower, In and Around the Book of Daniel, 13), or the Roman scheme which has Neo-Babylonian, Medo-Persian, Greek, and Roman (see Japheth ben Eli, A Commentary on the Book of Daniel, 33-34; Longman III, Daniel, 81; Goldingay, Daniel, xxxiii). The Roman scheme is to be preferred because it considers the Medo-Persian empire as a single unified empire, a view also shared by the book of Daniel.

As an illustration, Nebuchadnezzar seems to have had some of the characteristics of the little horn. He had worse atrocities done to Jerusalem and Judah than did Antiochus IV, but Nebuchadnezzar is never and cannot be identified with the little horn according to Daniel’s chronology, historical context, and logic. During the second World War (1939-1945) Adolf Hitler persecuted and orchestrated the genocide of about six million Jews in what is known today as the Holocaust, but in spite of this, Hitler does not qualify to be the little horn. The king to be identified as a little horn must fit all the description and characteristics defined by the Danielic text.
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provided by several scholars but a more elaborate list is as follows:

1. It rose out of the "fourth beast." Verses 8 and 24.
2. It appeared after "ten" other "horns." Verse 24.
3. It was "little" when it was first seen, but in time it became "greater than its fellows." Verses 8 and 20.
4. It was to "put down three kings" so that, as it arose, "three of the first horns were plucked up by the roots." Verses 8 and 24.
5. It had "eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things," and it spoke "words against the Most High." Verses 8 and 25.
6. It was to "wear out the saints of the Most High." Verse 25.
7. It was to "think to change times and the law." Verse 25.
8. It was allotted special powers for "a time, two times, and half a time." Verse 25.

Daniel 8 presents the picture of the little horn differently from chap. 7. The writer talks about the Ram (8:2-4) which stands for Medo-Persia (v. 20) and the Male Goat (vv. 5-10) which is Greece (vv. 21, 22). Several scholars make a compelling argument that the goat's one horn represents Alexander the Great, and that the breaking of the horn into four conspicuous ones represent, of cause, Alexander the Great's four successors. The four conspicuous horns were "toward the four winds of heaven" (v. 8). The little horn came "from one of them" (v. 9). The syntactic difficulty in Dan 8:8-9 is caused by the attempt to determine whether the little horn came from one of the four horns of the Greek kingdom or from one of the four winds of heaven. What does v. 9 "from them" (particle preposition suffix third-

297 Baldwin, Daniel, 140; Lucas, Daniel, 189-194; and Maxwell, God Cares, 1:122-143

298 Maxwell, God Cares, 1:127.

299 Baldwin, Daniel, 159; Collins, Daniel, 331; Di Lella, Daniel: A Book for the Troubling Times, 160; Stefanovic, Wisdom to the Wise, 316; and Longman III, Daniel, 206.
person masculine plural) refer to? The four horns or the four winds?

Interestingly, the syntactic ambiguity is resolved by noticing that the link between the last part of v. 8 “toward the four winds of the heavens” and the beginning of v. 9 “and from one of them” gives the clue as to where the little horn is coming from. Doukhan suggests that “through the use of the four winds Daniel alludes to the four beasts. In the mentioning that the horn comes from one of the winds, he is implying that it originates in one of the beasts. The prophet purposely makes no mention of the beasts to keep the attention of his readers solely on the ram and on the goat.” Doukhan’s insightful remark here seems to support the idea of a single little horn in the entire book of Daniel.

The book of Daniel seems to be internally consistent. It presents only one little horn, which is first shown in chap. 7:8 and then in chap. 8:9. In chap. 7 there are “the four winds” which vigorously stirred the sea and the little horn came forth from one of the four beasts which came out from the sea. The four winds in chap. 7 appear in chap. 8 and “from out of them” came forth the little horn. The difference between chap. 7 and chap. 8 is that the destructive and ruthless beast with ten horns, where the little horn comes from later, is omitted in chap. 8. The winds are the same ones in both chapters.

Hasel has concluded that “the syntax is gender matched and identifies the origin of the

300 Doukhan, Secrets of Daniel, 125. See also Holger Gzella, Cosmic Battle and Political Conflict (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2003), 112-114.

301 The little horn has been viewed as the eleventh horn which shares comparable characterizations to Typhon and Seth in the Greek mythology; see van Henten, “Antiochus IV as a Typhonic Figure in Daniel 7,” 223-243.
four winds of heaven."³⁰² Similarly, Martin Pröbstle, who presents the grammatical-
syntactic analysis of Dan 8:9-14, demonstrates that the syntactic arguments along with the
contextual, literary, and structural syntheses show that the "arguments for 'the four winds
of heaven' as referent outweigh the arguments for the 'four (horns)' as referent."³⁰³

All the characteristics and activities of the little horn in chaps. 7, 8, and 11 refer to
just one power, which, according to the chronological sequence of the events in Daniel,
comes after the Greek kingdom. William H. Shea further demonstrated "Why Antiochus
IV is not the Little Horn of Daniel 8"³⁰⁴ by tracing various interpretive views on the
subject. Observations indicate that those who refer to Antiochus IV Epiphanes as the little
horn do so "but not very judiciously."³⁰⁵ Daniel 11:21-39 does not fit Antiochus IV

³⁰² Hasel, "The 'Little Horn,' the Heavenly Sanctuary, and the Time of the End: A

³⁰³ Martin Pröbstle, "Truth and Terror: A Text-Oriented Analysis of Daniel 8:9-
14" (Ph.D. dissertation, Andrews University, 2006), 1:126; see especially pp. 90-133.

³⁰⁴ William H. Shea, Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation (Silver Spring,
MD: Biblical Research Institute, 1992), 31-66. See also Boutlflower, In and Around the
Book of Daniel, 2-5.

³⁰⁵ Newton, Observations on the Prophecies of Daniel and the Apocalypse of St.
John, 166. Examples of those who erroneously see Antiochus IV Epiphanes in Dan 7
include Montgomery, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel, 59-
63, 291-294; Ginsberg, Studies in Daniel, 20; idem, "The Composition of the Book of
Daniel," 246-275; Lebram, "König Antiochus im Buch Daniel," 737-772; D. S. Russell,
and DiLella, The Book of Daniel, 5, 209, 213-217; Chris C. Caragounis, "The
Interpretation of the Ten Horns of Daniel 7," Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses 63
(1987): 106-113; van Henten, "Antiochus IV as a Typhonic Figure in Daniel 7," 223-243;
Collins, Daniel, 299; DiLella, Daniel: A Book for Troubling Times, 13, 148-151; and
Lucas, Daniel, 190-194.
Epiphane's end and this part of Daniel can be viewed as “prophecy which fits in very badly if we restrict and apply it to the closing events of Antiochus' career.” What is said about the king of the north in Dan 11:36-45 also contradicts Antiochus IV's religious practices and because of this, Antiochus cannot be identified with that king.

If Dan 11:40-45 is applied to Antiochus IV Epiphanes, then it was also a “prophecy that was never fulfilled.” Prior to attempting to crush the Jewish opposition, Antiochus IV went to the East to raise funds for his military operations. There he failed to rob the temple of Artemis in Elymais because he was overpowered by the local residents. While returning from this failed venture, he died mad at Tabae in Persia in 164 B.C.

Second Maccabees 9:28 comments that Antiochus IV “came to the end of his life by a most pitiable fate, among the mountains in a strange land.” When the activities in the text do not fit Antiochus IV, the critics take the passage (Dan 11:40-45) as merely the author's

---

306 Uriah Smith, *The Sanctuary and Its Cleansing* (Battle Creek, MI: Steam Press), 1877), 44. See also Pusey, *Daniel the Prophet*, 136-140.


308 About Antiochus IV, Livy, 41.20.5, wrote, “Nevertheless in two great and important respects his soul was truly royal—in his benefactions to cities and in the honours paid to the gods,” and also Polybius 26.1.10 concluded, “but in the sacrifices he furnished to the cities and in the honours he paid to gods he surpassed all his predecessors.” Quoted also in Mark Mercer, “The Benefactions of Antiochus IV Epiphanes and Dan 11:37-38: An Exegetical Note,” *The Master's Seminary Journal* 12 (2001): 89-93.


own "speculation." Critics are guided by reference/application to Antiochus IV Epiphanes when viewing Daniel. They interpret Daniel to fit Antiochus IV Epiphanes.

Antiochus IV Epiphanes has been erroneously accused of being the little horn in the book of Daniel. To view Antiochus IV as the little horn is a specie of an *ad hominem* fallacy which has been subtly crafted into the Danielic interpretation, to deliberately disassociate the fourth kingdom (where the little horn actually originates) from the hermeneutics pertaining to the little horn. Scholars who posit this type of inaccurate inference, that Antiochus IV is the little horn, have distorted the basic theme and concerns in the book of Daniel. Daniel is viewed wrongly as having been written during the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. In fact, the book of Daniel never mentions or alludes to Antiochus IV Epiphanes, and therefore the Maccabean hypotheses is a not an accurate claim on the book of Daniel.

---


313 An *ad hominem* (lit. “to the man,” *Webster’s New World College Dictionary*, 4th edition [2001], s.v. *ad hominem*) fallacy appeals more to personal considerations than to logic.

The chronology of the earthly kingdoms based on the image (Dan 2) and animals (Dan 7; 8) has been distorted to accommodate Antiochus IV Epiphanes. For example, some scholars have argued that while Nebuchadnezzar was “the head of gold” (Dan 2:37, 38), Antiochus IV Epiphanes was “the toes” (2:41-43) as well as “the little horn” (Dan 7:8). Furthermore, interpreting the text of Daniel in light of Antiochus IV Epiphanes has caused some scholars to argue that the theme of Daniel is to comfort beleaguered Jews during persecution by Antiochus IV and that the compilers wrote the book in the second century B.C.

Although these views are widely accepted today, the internal evidence from the text and archaeological finds from the ancient Near East do not show Antiochus IV Epiphanes as playing a role in Daniel.

The appearance of Antiochus IV Epiphanes in the historical arena does not fit into the chronology of the book of Daniel. Antiochus IV came and disappeared into history before the little horn arose. Antiochus IV belonged to the Greek (third) kingdom, whereas the little horn king chronologically belonged to the fourth kingdom (Dan 7:7-8).

Since the Little Horn comes from the fourth beast, some have outlined the four kingdoms as Babylon, Media, Persia, and Greece. In this instance, the little horn would come from the Greek kingdom. The problem with this suggestion is that it does not consider the chronology in the text of Daniel and actual historical events. In the book of Daniel the Medes and the Persians appear together as a unified power and not as separate kingdoms (Dan 5:28; 6:8, 15; 8:20; 9:1).


Antiochus IV persecuted the conservative Jews only between 168 B.C. and 165 B.C., whereas the little horn kingdom dominated for 1260 literal years (Dan 7:25). Daniel 7:26 indicates that the little horn’s power would be taken away but the little horn power would continue to the end of time. The book of Daniel, therefore, does not mention, allude to, or implicate Antiochus IV Epiphanes in any way in its historical outline.

Several observations show that Antiochus IV Epiphanes is not mentioned in the book of Daniel nor is he to be associated with the little horn:

1. The little horn rises from the last or fourth beast kingdom in Dan 7. Antiochus IV Epiphanes belonged to the third beast kingdom, that of Greece. Chronologically he does not fit in Daniel’s outline of history. Moreover, in Dan 7:14, 22, 26, 27 the little horn kingdom is followed by the last judgment, and the divine eschatological and eternal kingdom which will be received by the saints.

---


319 Scholars point out that “time” in Dan 7:25 stands for a year (see for example Porteous, Daniel, 114; Collins, Daniel, 322; Walvoord, Daniel: The Key to Prophetic Revelation, 176; Lucas, Daniel, 194) which is a lunar calendar composed of 360 days (disputed by Lucas, Daniel, 193-194). The “times” would be double, amounting to 720 days and one-half time would be 180 days. If all these days represent years (the day-year principle in biblical prophecy, see Num 14:31-35; Ezek 4:1-8) then 360+720+180=1260 days, which, too, are a symbol of 1260 years. The 1260 years is the time the little horn power (Dan 7:25) was given for its devastating role. For the application of these years, see Montgomery, The Book of Daniel, 313; and Stefanovic, Daniel: Wisdom to the Wise, 281-282. Also, see de Montor, The Lives and Times of the Roman Pontiffs, from St. Peter to Pius IX, 2/1:489-490; and Maxwell, God Cares, 1:130-135.

2. Antiochus IV Epiphanes was not a world power; he was just one of the Greek rulers. He did not completely eradicate or destroy three kingdoms when he rose into prominence (Dan 7:8, 24).  

3. According to 1 Macc 1:54 Antiochus IV Epiphanes desolated and defiled the temple on 15 Chislev 167 B.C. but 1 Macc 4:52 stated that on 25 Chislev, 164 B.C., the Jews reestablished the temple services. The time period when the temple was nonfunctional is exactly three years and ten days. This does not fit any prophetic time outline in the book of Daniel.

Efforts to associate the three years and ten days with 2,300 days and evenings (Dan 8:14) or any other time frame in Daniel have not been successful.

4. From the New Testament perspective in the first century A.D. (Matt 24:15-16; Mark 13:14), the abomination that desolates (Dan 8:11-13; 9:27; 11:31; 12:11) was still anticipated and was fulfilled in A.D. 70 when Antiochus IV was long gone.

5. There is simply no textual evidence for the person and activities of Antiochus IV Epiphanes in the book of Daniel. The little horn must fit all the biblical identifying marks and not just some of them. Antiochus IV does not fit all that Daniel says about the

321 See Braverman, Jerome’s Commentary on Daniel, 90-94; Josephus, The Antiquities of the Jews, 12.5-9; 13.5-8; idem, Wars of the Jews, 1.1.1-6; and Pusey, Daniel the Prophet, 118-120.


323 See Wright, Daniel and His Prophecies, 240-241.
little horn.\textsuperscript{324} His inclusion in the interpretation of Daniel is a typical \textit{ad hominem} fallacy which cannot be supported by the biblical text or responsible hermeneutics.

The Interpretation Strains on Daniel

Different schools of thought have developed through the years in an attempt to understand the book of Daniel. As a result, the major strains of interpreting Daniel can be broadly categorized as preterism, futurism, and historicism and historical-criticism.\textsuperscript{325} These approaches differ widely on how they consider or understand the text of Daniel, but they also overlap in many instances.\textsuperscript{326} All of these four strains have not seriously considered archaeology as an interpretive resource for the book of Daniel. The nature of the text requires both symbolic and literal interpretation methods, but the difficulty encountered by the exegete is on determining the criteria one would use to distinguish

\textsuperscript{324}Pusey argues that in Dan 11 there “are traits, which have nothing to correspond to them in Antiochus, which are even contradictory of the character of Antiochus” but could fit the Anti-Christ to come. See his \textit{Daniel the Prophet}, 136. For the association of the little horn with Anti-Christ, see Walter K. Price, \textit{The Coming Anti-Christ} (Neptune, NJ: Loizeaux Brothers, 1985). Harry Bultema lists Antiochus the Great, papacy, Mohammed, Anti-Christ, and the king of the north in Dan 11, as some of the candidates to be identified with the little horn of Daniel. See his \textit{Commentary on Daniel} (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1988), 245-247.


that which is symbolic from that which is literal throughout the entire book.

Preterism considers the predictive text of the book of Daniel *vaticinium ex eventu* and always to have been fulfilled in the past.\(^{327}\) According to this way of interpretation, all the Danielic historical events culminated in the person of Antiochus IV Epiphanes (who is viewed as the anti-Christ) in the second century B.C. Some preterists regard the book of Daniel to have been a revelation from God but take its historical fulfillment to have occurred from the sixth century B.C. up to the time of the first coming of Christ or the fall of the Roman empire.\(^ {328}\) The historical kingdoms are outlined mainly as Babylonian, Median, Persian, and Greek. Some preterists accept the supernatural element of Daniel, while others object to it.\(^ {329}\)

Futurism or dispensationalism regards much of the predictive sections of the book of Daniel *vaticinium ante eventu*, which is yet to be fulfilled in the far future.\(^ {330}\) The point of departure for this approach is the outlining of the historical kingdoms of Daniel as


\(^{329}\)See Ford, ḤN, 65.

Neo-Babylonian, Medo-Persian, Greek, and Roman. The proponents of this view disregard the entire Christian era to have any historical significance in relation to Daniel. They place a parenthesis or gap in the historical time line from the first coming of Christ to about seven years before his second coming. They anticipate the fulfillment of most of Daniel’s symbolical predictions in the last seven years of the earth’s history. The Danielic authorship is accepted and dated to the sixth century B.C. but there is no association of the little horn with either Antiochus IV Epiphanes or Christian Rome. Instead, the person and activities of the little horn (Dan 7) are associated with the Antichrist who is to be expected in the eschatological future.

Historicism views Daniel to have been a historic figure who lived in the seventh to sixth century B.C. and was responsible for writing the book that bears his name. This approach takes the predictions of Daniel to cover the entire human history without any gap from the Neo-Babylonian times to the eschatological time of the end. The predictions of Daniel are said to have a continuous historical coverage of the past,

---


332 Núñez, The Vision of Daniel 8: Interpretations from 1700 to 1800, 11; Shea, Daniel 7-12, 33; and idem, Daniel, 130.

333 Bultema, Commentary on Daniel, 245-247.


present, and future. Historical-Criticism rejects considering the book of Daniel as predictive and as a revelation from God but takes it to be a *vaticinum ex eventu* apocalypse or a reflection of the Jewish political and religious status quo during the persecution of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. The role of Antiochus IV Epiphanes in the interpretation of Daniel is magnified and he is identified as the little horn. See table 12. Apparently, the Maccabean hypothesis is the indelible mark of this interpretive approach, although it cannot satisfactorily explain the dating of the book of Daniel. A second-century B.C. date is assigned for the final compilation to the book of Daniel, but archaeological and textual evidence favor a much earlier provenance.

It is true that the diversity of these four interpretation strains in the analysis of the book of Daniel has brought a wide range of ideas to the study (see table 12). Despite this observation, these approaches have also brought forth more irreconcilable, intractable, and recurrent questions on Daniel. To bring about a more coherent understanding of the Daniel, an interpretive approach should use appropriate exegetical tools in a responsible manner when working with the text and related archaeological and literary finds.

---

336 Shea, *Daniel 7-12*, 33; and idem, *Daniel*, 130.


TABLE 12

THE FOUR INTERPRETATION STRAINS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daniel 2: Gold Silver Bronze Iron Iron &amp; Clay</th>
<th>Historicist</th>
<th>Preterist</th>
<th>Futurist</th>
<th>Historical-Critical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td>Babylon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medo-Persia</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Medo-Persia</td>
<td>Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divided Rome</td>
<td>Seleucid Kings</td>
<td>Future Kings</td>
<td>Future Kings</td>
<td>Future Kings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel 7: Lion Bear Leopard 4th Beast 10 Horns Little Horn</td>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td>Babylon</td>
<td>Babylon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medo-Persia</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Medo-Persia</td>
<td>Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divided Rome</td>
<td>Seleucid Kings</td>
<td>10 Future Kings</td>
<td>10 Future Kings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papal Rome</td>
<td>Antiochus IV</td>
<td>Future Antichrist</td>
<td>Future Antichrist</td>
<td>Antiochus IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel 8: Ram He-Goat Little Horn</td>
<td>Medo-Persia</td>
<td>Medo-Persia</td>
<td>Medo-Persia</td>
<td>Medo-Persia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papal Rome</td>
<td>Antiochus IV</td>
<td>Future Antichrist</td>
<td>Future Antichrist</td>
<td>Antiochus IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persia</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Antiochus IV</td>
<td>Antiochus IV</td>
<td>Future Antichrist</td>
<td>Antiochus IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Antiochus IV</td>
<td>Future Antichrist</td>
<td>Antiochus IV</td>
<td>Antiochus IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papal Rome</td>
<td>Antiochus IV</td>
<td>Future Antichrist</td>
<td>Antiochus IV</td>
<td>Antiochus IV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is true that the diversity of these four interpretation strains in the analysis of the book of Daniel has brought a wide range of ideas to the study (see table 12). Despite this observation, these approaches have also brought forth more irreconcilable, intractable, and recurrent questions on Daniel. To bring about a more coherent understanding of the Daniel, an interpretive approach should use appropriate exegetical tools in a responsible manner when working with the text and related archaeological and literary finds.
Conclusion

While the debate on the origin of the book of Daniel seems inconclusive, it is interesting to note how some archaeological discoveries shed light on the interpretation of the text. As can be noted, the recovered documents from the ancient Near East indicate that Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, Cyrus, and Jeremiah were historical persons who seem to have been contemporary with the author of Daniel. Several events described in Daniel can be dated without much difficulty in light of ancient literature. This serves to show that scholars have not seriously sought to consider archaeology material as a resource for helping understand the provenance of the book of Daniel.

The book of Daniel can be viewed as multilingual although it can be divided mainly into Hebrew (1-2:4a; 8-12) and Aramaic (2:4b-7) components. Evidence to date the book linguistically suggests that the words which appear in Daniel, whether borrowed or not, already had been in use in the sixth century B.C. or earlier. Supplementary and complementary information leading to a better understanding of Daniel has been provided through voluminous ancient literature from the ancient Near Eastern milieu. However, some of this literature carries stories like that of Aqhat and Ahikar, which share some literary motifs but no close affinities to warrant any association of those characters with the biblical Daniel. Qumran has produced impressive documents for the study of Daniel (tables 9 and 10). Eight scrolls of the canonical book of Daniel were recovered and such evidence helps not only to show that by Qumranic times the book of Daniel was viewed as authoritative scripture, but also indicates that the book belongs to a much earlier provenance than what popular opinions suggest. Despite this, several nonbiblical texts
including the Prayer of Nabonidus, apocryphal, and pseudepigraphal writings show some parallels with the text of Daniel but basically no evidence of literary dependence.

In the wake of understanding the book of Daniel, the Maccabean hypothesis attempted to posit a second-century B.C. date for the document but the archaeological and literary discoveries apparently show a sixth-century B.C. provenance. Daniel does not refer or allude to Antiochus IV Epiphanes at all. Its socioreligious and historicopolitical emphases by far transcend the person and activities of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, who is erroneously identified as the little horn by some interpreters.

On the whole, archeology elucidates many difficult passages in the book of Daniel and this leads to the understanding that the major concern of the book of Daniel is the chronological succession of world empires leading to the time of the end when a divine kingdom will displace the earthly ones.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

Archaeology has been considered real-time evidence for the events described in the Bible. As already pointed out in chapter 1 of this study, archaeology is a valuable exegetical tool to address the recurrent interpretive problems encountered in the study of the book of Daniel. This dissertation shows that many seemingly enigmatic words and passages in Daniel can be better understood in light of the related literary and material finds from the ancient Near East. The comparative analysis of the text of Daniel and related archaeological data has shown that many of the problems encountered in the interpretation process can be eliminated and that the intention of the writer in the text can easily be discerned.

Chapter 2 of this study begins by sampling people and geographical names mentioned in the book of Daniel. While scholars cannot agree on the identification of some ancient places mentioned in Daniel, this study demonstrates that the identification of such places is made easier through related archaeological evidence. For example, this dissertation concludes that the Tigris (Dan 10:4) can also be viewed as a great river because surveys show that it carries more volume of water, flows faster than the Euphrates, and joins the Euphrates the last forty miles (64 km) to the Persian Gulf.
Ulai (8:2, 3, 6) as a river/canal is attested in several Assyrian and Babylonian epigraphical texts. For example, Ulai river/canal is mentioned on the stele of Shutruk-Nahhunte king of Elam (1165 B.C.),\textsuperscript{339} on kudurr\textsuperscript{u} “a boundary stone” of Nebuchadnezzar I (1124-1103 B.C.),\textsuperscript{340} and on the Bull Inscription of Sennacherib king of Assyria (704-681 B.C.).\textsuperscript{341} Also, the Great Sea (7:2) is identified as the Mediterranean Sea on a foundation stone laid by Shamshi-Adad I (1808-1776 B.C.),\textsuperscript{342} on a broken slab inscribed by Adad-Nirari III (810-783 B.C.),\textsuperscript{343} in both the India House Inscription and the Wadi Brisa Inscription,\textsuperscript{345} and Nebuchadnezzar identified the Mediterranean Sea as the upper sea and the Persian Gulf as the lower sea.

Kittim (11:30), well renowned for its maritime activities, is mentioned on the stela of Sargon II (707 B.C.)\textsuperscript{346} and has been associated with Kition/Citium, a major Bronze Age town near modern Larnaca, south-central coast of Cyprus.\textsuperscript{347} While the Plain of Dura (3:1) and Uphaz (10:5) have not been positively identified, the context of the text shows

\textsuperscript{339}Roaf, Cultural Atlas of Mesopotamia and the Ancient Near East, 148.
\textsuperscript{340}King, Babylonian Boundary-Stones, 32, col. 1, lines 18-23, 28.
\textsuperscript{341}Luckenbill, The Annals of Sennacherib, 75, lines 87-88.
\textsuperscript{342}Grayson, Assyrian Royal Inscriptions, 1:19-21; and COS, 2:259.
\textsuperscript{343}ANET, 281.
\textsuperscript{344}Rogers, Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament, 364-365.
\textsuperscript{345}ANET, 307.
both of them to be historical geographical sites. Archaeology provides impressive evidence for the sociopolitical interaction between the Neo-Babylonians and their contemporary nations mentioned in Daniel, which include Israel and Judah (1:3-4, 6), Ammon (11:41), Moab (11:41), Edom (11:41), Egypt (11:8), Elam (8:2), Šušan/Susa (8:2), Ethiopia (11:43), Libya/Lybia (11:43), and Greece (8:21). The discoveries from these ancient sites along with textual evidence reveal that the author of Daniel is well informed on the contemporary geopolitical affairs and offers information unique to himself.

Some scholars have preferred to present the Medes and Persians separately in Daniel’s chronology. However, the book of Daniel consistently views and presents Medo-Persia as a single unified kingdom (Dan 5:28; 6:8, 12, 15; 8:20). Also, the book of Esther presents them together although the order is reversed to Persians and Medes (Esth 1:3, 14, 18, 19). Many finds from the ancient Near East attest to the Medes and Persians as a united kingdom. These include the Sippar Cylinder of Nabonidus (556-539 B.C.), reliefs from the Apadana at Persepolis, which depict alternating Persians and Medes (521-486 B.C.), and the foundation tablet of Xerxes (485-465 B.C.). The difficulty in sequencing the four kingdoms of Daniel is resolved by identifying Medo-Persia, first, as a single kingdom after 550 B.C. and second, as the next world kingdom following the fall of Babylon.

---

348 See respective topics above.

349 COS, 2:310-313.

350 Yamauchi, “Persians,” 111.

351 ANET, 316-317.
of Neo-Babylonia in 539 B.C. Thus, scholars can understand better Daniel’s theme and geopolitical concerns by considering Medo-Persia as a single kingdom.

Chapter 3 of this dissertation further demonstrates a close examination and comparative analysis of the text of Daniel in light of the ancient Near East geopolitical events and material finds. The text of Daniel is significantly elucidated on the person of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon (605-562 B.C.), his administration, and imperial interests in Judah. Ample evidence is cited to support the claims of Daniel on the Babylonian royal officials (Dan 1-5), wise men (Dan 1-5), social distinctions (Dan 1-6), eunuchs (Dan 1:3), and legislation (Dan 2:9).

The Babylonian imperial interaction with Judah began in the time of Hezekiah king of Judah (715-687 B.C.) but the military attack on Judah started from the time of Jehoiakim in 605 B.C. onwards (Dan 1:1). Although Daniel does not present a detailed account on how the Babylonian captivity took place, complementary information which broadens our understanding on captivity and subsequent attacks on Judah comes from other biblical texts outside of Daniel and some recovered ancient texts.

Extrabiblical data are available for interpreters on the devastation of Judah and Jerusalem by the Babylonians, the siege of Jerusalem, the role of temples during times of military attacks and deportations. Examining these data in light of the text of Daniel leads to solutions on problems encountered in the interpretation process. For example, interpreters have failed to agree on the meaning of "the square and the

---

352 For Nebuchadnezzar’s first visit to Jerusalem, see Josephus, Against Apion, 1.19; and Boutflower, In and Around the Book of Daniel, xvii.
moat" in Dan 9:25. However, archaeologists have found some architectural remains in Jerusalem which are identified as "the square" and "the moat." Since the name Jerusalem in Dan 9:25 refers to a physical city, likewise "the square" and "the moat" should refer to the physical structures that have been identified by archaeologists. Therefore, the writer of Dan 9:25 may have been referring to the building of specific architectural structures in Jerusalem that were fulfilled physically as well as institutionally.

Nebuchadnezzar had symbolic and enigmatic dreams that had geopolitical implications (Dan 2, 4). These dreams were complemented by the dreams/visions of Daniel, a Jewish captive who worked in the Babylonian court (Dan 7-12). Although the dreams/visions of both Nebuchadnezzar and Daniel were dominated with symbolism, they reflected the basic theme and concern of the book of Daniel, which is the chronological succession of the historical kingdoms from Neo-Babylonia onwards, until the complete destruction and displacement of these kingdoms by a divine one. Evidence also shows that while the dreams/visions of Daniel share some literary parallels with some related ancient Near Eastern literary works, no interdependence or borrowing from each other has been ascertained.

The events and transition from the Neo-Babylonian to the Medo-Persian era is the focus of chapter 4 of this study. Belshazzar is central to the events that surrounded the collapse of the Neo-Babylonian empire on October 12/13, 539 B.C. (Dan 5). The

archaeological finds which illuminate Dan 5 include those identifying Belshazzar and his entrusted kingship while his father was in Tema for ten years,\textsuperscript{354} the \textit{Nabonidus Chronicle} which describes the fall of Babylon and the presence of some gods in Babylonian,\textsuperscript{355} and the discovery on the site of ancient Babylon of the 169 feet (52 m) long by 55 feet (17 m) wide banquet hall\textsuperscript{356} where Belshazzar possibly held a feast for his officials and Daniel read the inscription.

Some individuals in Daniel have not been positively identified from the recovered archaeological finds. Examples include Daniel, Nebuchadnezzar with lycanthropy (Dan 4), Darius the Mede (Dan 5:31; 6:1, 6, 9, 25, 28; 11:1), and the queen mother who appeared at Belshazzar’s feast (Dan 5:10). Nevertheless, conclusions on the identity of such individuals should not be forced by identifying these individuals with other historical figures but by waiting for the extrabiblical evidence on them to surface someday. Daniel 11 further illustrates the geopolitical developments of the successive empires beginning with the Medo-Persian empire onwards to the time of the end.

The archaeological finds seem to affirm that the book of Daniel reflects the prevailing situation from Neo-Babylonian times onwards. A large volume of literature has erupted as supplementary or commentative material on the book of Daniel. However, some of these writings in relation to Daniel, as illustrated in chapter 5 of this study, have

\textsuperscript{354}See \textit{The Verse Account of Nabonidus} in \textit{ANET}, 313; and Sack, \textit{Images of Nebuchadnezzar}, 27.

\textsuperscript{355}Grayson, \textit{Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles}, 106-108.

\textsuperscript{356}Koldewey, \textit{The Excavations at Babylon}, 123.
been classified as apocryphal additions and pseudepigraphal texts and they have caused intractable interpretive problems. Scholarship has made a deliberate effort to understand the book of Daniel and formulated models for understanding that book. The book of Daniel does not mention or allude to Antiochus IV Epiphanes as supposed by popular opinions. Daniel focuses more on the time of the end to be that point in time when earthly kingdoms are displaced by a divine one. However, the use of archaeology in an attempt to understand the book of Daniel helps interpret many difficult words and passages in Daniel.

Conclusions

This research demonstrates that the book of Daniel can be understood better in light of the related ancient archaeological and literary finds. Therefore, this study draws the following conclusions:

1. The place names mentioned in the book of Daniel are attested as geographical locations by various archaeological discoveries.

2. Archaeology provides impressive evidence that highlights the socioreligious and geopolitical interaction between Neo-Babylonia and contemporary nations of which the author of Daniel was well informed.

3. Enigmatic words and phrases in the text of Daniel are made unambiguous when analyzed through related archaeological finds.

4. The archaeological evidence related to the book of Daniel shows a closer affinity to the Neo-Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian, and Medo-Persian periods more than the later archaeological periods.
5. The individuals mentioned by Daniel who have not been positively attested in any extrabiblical documents are not to be identified through other known persons but by considering them as historical persons known to the author, while we wait for the archaeological evidence on them to surface some day.

6. The main theme or concern of Daniel is reiterated through dreams/visions which symbolically outline the chronological succession of world empires from Neo-Babylonia onwards to the time of the end when these empires will be destroyed and displaced by the divine kingdom.

7. The book of Daniel as well as ancient literary finds present the Medes and Persians as a single unified kingdom that displaced Neo-Babylonia in 539 B.C. Understanding the chronology of the four world kingdoms presented in Daniel is made less cumbersome by considering Medo-Persia as a single power.

8. By focusing more on the person of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, the Maccabean thesis does not accurately and adequately provide an understanding of the main theme or concerns of the book of Daniel. As this study shows, the book of Daniel never mentions or alludes to the person of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Moreover, Antiochus IV does not fit in the chronology of the four kingdoms dominating the message of Daniel. Also, Antiochus IV does not fit in the prophecy of Dan 11. He was a Greek king (third kingdom), whereas it is clear that the little horn appears from the fourth kingdom.

9. The expression “time of the end” in the ancient literary sources generally refers to future time but in the book of Daniel it specifically refers to the eschatological period of time leading to the ultimate end when God will completely destroy the earthly kingdoms and establish an ethereal one.
10. On the whole, the archaeological perspective on the book of Daniel not only helps elucidate many enigmatic phrases and passages in a plausible manner, but brings new insights and authenticity to the text. Indeed, it is an effective exegetical tool necessary for interpreting the book of Daniel.

**Suggestion for Further Study**

The text of Daniel seems to have closer affinity to the related Neo-Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian, and Medo-Persian archaeological finds than those of the later archaeological time periods. It would be profitable to explore the Neo-Assyrian sociocultural and religiopolitical background to the Neo-Babylonian Empire in an attempt to ascertain the background and world of the book of Daniel.
# Appendix A

## TABLE 13

### MONTHS OF THE YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BABYLONIAN</th>
<th>JEWISH</th>
<th>PERSIAN</th>
<th>JULIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nissanu</td>
<td>Nisan</td>
<td>Adukanaiša</td>
<td>March/April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajaru</td>
<td>Iyyar</td>
<td>Thûravâhara</td>
<td>April/May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simanu</td>
<td>Sivan</td>
<td>Thâigaciš</td>
<td>May/June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Du'ûzu</td>
<td>Tammuz</td>
<td>Garmapada</td>
<td>June/July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Âbu</td>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>Turnabaziš</td>
<td>July/August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulûlu</td>
<td>Elul</td>
<td>Karbašiyaš</td>
<td>August/September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tašritu</td>
<td>Tishri</td>
<td>Bâgayâdiš</td>
<td>September/October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arâhsamna</td>
<td>Marheshvan</td>
<td>Markâsanaš</td>
<td>October/November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kislîmu</td>
<td>Kislev</td>
<td>Âsiyâdiya</td>
<td>November/December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tebêtu</td>
<td>Tebeth</td>
<td>Anâmaka</td>
<td>December/January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabatu</td>
<td>Shebat</td>
<td>Samiyamaš</td>
<td>January/February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addaru</td>
<td>Adar</td>
<td>Viyaxama</td>
<td>February/March</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B

### ARCHAEOLOGICAL TIMETABLE

#### Stone Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neolithic</th>
<th>8000-4500 BC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Chalcolithic</td>
<td>4500-3800 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Chalcolithic</td>
<td>3800-3200 BC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Copper/Bronze Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Bronze</th>
<th>3200-2200 BC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle Bronze</td>
<td>2200-1550 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Bronze</td>
<td>1550-1200 BC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Iron Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iron I</th>
<th>1200-1000 BC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron II</td>
<td>1000-586 BC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Empires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neo-Babylonian/Exilic Period</th>
<th>586-539 BC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medo-Persian Period</td>
<td>539-332 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek/Hellenistic Period</td>
<td>332-37 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hasmonean Period</td>
<td>141-37 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Period</td>
<td>37 BC-AD 324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byzantine Period</td>
<td>AD 324-640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic Period</td>
<td>AD 640-1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crusader Period</td>
<td>AD 1099-1291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottoman Period</td>
<td>AD 1517-1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Mandate Period</td>
<td>AD 1917-1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>AD 1948-Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

586-539 BC

539-332 BC

332-37 BC

141-37 BC
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