

is that πλὴν for ἀλλά . . . was actually a mark of a *more* pretentious style, the opposite of what our present-day authorities and their predecessors for more than a century have been saying” (315).

Lee also provides lists of NT lexicons, works not included as lexicons, and older lexicons; a general bibliography; four appendices; and three indices including Greek words, ancient sources, and modern names.

This book addresses what, at first, might appear to be an issue of little moment. After all, scholars and students have been able to use existing lexicons to read and understand the Greek NT. The problem is that the process of substituting English glosses for Greek words is not really translating. What is needed is a feel for the language. Definitions are a significant advance in facilitating this process.

If the volume were simply to have chronicled the history of NT lexicon making, it would have been helpful. In fact, the book is much more than this. It lays out an agenda for the twenty-first century by one who is intimately involved in a similar work of updating Moulton and Milligan. Thus it is required reading for the whole gambit of NT scholars: first, those working in any direct way with the Greek text and using any sort of lexicon to understand it; second, for those using a translation. Third—and perhaps the most importantly—the book provides guidelines for any scholar contemplating creating or updating a lexicon for the Greek NT. Should that not be sufficient motivation to read the book, be aware that NT lexicons have inherent limitations, and are to be used with caution for the reasons indicated in this book.

Loma Linda, California

BERNARD A. TAYLOR

Lucas, Ernest. *Daniel*. *Apollos Old Testament Commentary*, 20. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2002. 359 pp. Hardcover, \$34.95.

The purpose of the newly launched *Apollos Old Testament Commentary* series is to provide a combination of excellent exegetical analysis and insightful elucidation of the contemporary significance of the text. The volume on *Daniel* by Ernest Lucas, vice-principal and tutor in biblical studies at Bristol Baptist College in England, is the second in the series and fulfills this task description extremely well.

The commentary is divided into introduction, text and commentary, and epilogue. In the introduction, Lucas provides, first, a brief overview of the text, the different versions, and the major guidelines for the text-critical study of *Daniel*. The main section of the introduction deals with the methodology of interpretation of the stories in Dan 1–6 and of the visions in Dan 7–12. Lucas stresses the importance of genre awareness in understanding both. While in line with the usually held position (Lucas accepts the stories as court tales, distinguishing between tales of court contest [Dan 2; 4; 5] and tales of court conflict [Dan 3; 6]), he does not exclude the possibility of their historical character: “fiction and truth are not mutually exclusive” (27). The story in Dan 1,

which does not fit the court-tale genre, functions as an introduction to both the stories in Dan 2–6 and the whole book. Regarding the visions, he distinguishes the symbolic visions of Dan 7 and 8 from the epiphany visions of Dan 9 and 10–12. A well-taken point is that the symbols should not be regarded as simple ciphers, a “this is that” reference (34). Rather, they carry a wider meaning that could be identified by the original audience. For example, the symbol “horn” not only represents a particular king, but also conveys the idea of strength with all its associations. Lucas concludes the introduction with an overview of the historical context of Daniel (plus a chart with relevant dates), covering the major events from the end of Assyrian dominion through Babylonian, Median, and Macedonian rule to the Seleucid kingdom and the Maccabean revolt.

In the main part of the commentary, Lucas deals with each chapter—Dan 10–12 is naturally taken as one unit—in five sections (similar to the WBC series): a fresh translation of the text in “readable, idiomatic, modern English” that tries to preserve features of the original text where necessary; notes on the text, which mainly discuss lexical (etymological, comparative Semitic languages), grammatical, and text-critical issues and regularly refer to the Greek versions and the Qumran texts of Daniel; form and structure; comment; and explanation.

In the sections on “form and structure,” Lucas covers literary matters and includes a number of informative discussions on specific topics: the introductory role of Dan 1; the unity of several chapters which Lucas convincingly affirms (Dan 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10–12); the role of individual chapters in the context of Dan 2–7; the Greek versions in Dan 4, 5, 6; the use of imagery in Dan 8; allusions to earlier Hebrew prophets in Dan 10–12; the literary form of 8:23–25 and 11:3–45; and the literary genre of Dan 10–12. An additional note under Dan 7 deals with the background to the imagery (167–176), and a section under Dan 9 gives a brief survey of the interpretations of the “seventy weeks” (245–248).

In the “comment” section, Lucas explicates the text verse by verse. The comments are well balanced. If there is a special focus in this commentary, it is on Dan 7, for the commentary on this chapter is about double the length (44 pages) of the other chapters, with the exception of the commentary on Dan 10–12 (49 pages), which of course has more than double the amount of text material.

Finally, in the “explanations,” Lucas elaborates on (major) theological issues as they evolve from the text and includes practical insights for application. For example, on Dan 1 he introduces Niebuhr’s concept of how faith relates to culture (58); on Dan 6 he discusses “the rule of law” as it could be misused by earthly powers (governments, employers, social groups, families) or Darius’s surprising use of the epithet “the living God,” a unique expression in Daniel; and on Dan 12 he traces the various beliefs about resurrection and life after death in the Hebrew Bible, Jewish literature, and the NT (302–305). Lucas identifies the sovereignty of God as the central theological theme in Daniel.

The distinction between “notes” and “comments” and between “comments” and “explanations” is somewhat fluid. At times, the material under the sections “notes” and “comments” overlaps to some degree, e.g., on 3:15 both mention

that this is an incomplete conditional phrase (cf. 84 with 90); the comment and the note on 3:2 both list loan words for professions and their use in the context from where they originated (cf. 83 with 89). Similarly, the material under "comments" and "explanations" can be similar, e.g., when discussing the (deuteronomic) theology of the prayer in 9:3-19 (cf. 236-240 with 250-252) or the alleged deterministic view of history (cf. 241 with 252). However, such repetitions seem inevitable if later sections in the commentary build on earlier ones.

Quite unorthodox in the commentary genre is the inclusion of an epilogue discussing the date, composition, and authorship of the book. The reason for this is that Lucas would like the reader to be open-minded about these issues until the commentary provides evidence from the text to decide upon them (18). He thus tries to point out that these "introductory questions" in actual research are the final questions to be answered. Many scholars may find such an arrangement questionable since commentaries are usually used for reference and are not read cover-to-cover. I suspect that Lucas's intention is to avoid any distraction on the part of his conservative Christian readers. However, putting his view on date and composition at the end of the book seems to give it even more prominence. In any case, for Lucas, alleged historical inaccuracies, the linguistic character of Daniel's Aramaic and Hebrew, and Greek and Persian loan words do not provide decisive evidence for dating, whereas the apocalyptic genre of Daniel—particularly Dan 10-12, which exemplifies an historical apocalypse—is a pointer to a later date for the final book.

An appendix presents a translation of the additions to Daniel headed by brief introductory remarks. The commentary concludes with a bibliography and three indices: scriptural and other references, authors, and subjects. Strangely, the index of Dead Sea Scrolls is found under the subject index and not under the "Index of References to Scripture and Related Literature," where the Apocrypha and intertestamental literature are referenced.

In comparison with earlier commentaries on Daniel, it is refreshing that Lucas focuses and comments primarily on the text in its final form. His comments provide a wealth of details, especially in regard to the Mesopotamian background of the language and imagery in Daniel. He generally substantiates his views, argues cautiously when the text or meaning is difficult, and is not shy about admitting that an issue has to be left undecided for lack of conclusive evidence. For example, Lucas judges the literary relationship between Dan 4 and other stories of Nebuchadnezzar and Nabonidus as "unclear, and no doubt complex" (107), and he finds none of the proposals to explain the representation of Belshazzar as Nebuchadnezzar's son satisfactory, so that one can only state that it enhances the contrast between Dan 4 and 5 (127-128). Concerning Darius the Mede, he lists the pros and cons of four major suggestions before he concludes that Wiseman's proposal that Darius the Mede is Cyrus provides the best answer and should be rated as "probable" (135-137). A final example is Lucas's treatment of the meaning of the opening clause in Dan 8:12, in which he presents four proposals and concludes cautiously that a change of meaning for "host," now

referring to the horn's host, "seems the least unsatisfactory solution" (216-217). Quite correctly, Lucas takes the verb forms in 8:12 as future in tense (206), although he does not explain the sudden shift in tense from v. 11 to v. 12.

In the following, I summarize selected noteworthy points of Lucas's interpretation: Not only Dan 2-7 shows a chiasmic structure (so Lenglet), but also the individual units of Dan 3, 5, and 6 are structured chiasmically (for Dan 6, following Goldingay); the expression "third in the kingdom" (5:16, 29) refers probably to a high official title (130; so Montgomery); the handwriting on the wall refers originally to weights and can be translated with "counted, a mina, a shekel and two halves" (119, 132-134); the different judgment of the fourth beast in Dan 7:11-12 is due to its different nature, while the prolonging of life of the other beasts may indicate that Israel will rule over them, serving as mediator of God's blessings (183, 200-201).

Lucas believes that the literary origin of the imagery of four ages as symbolized by the specific four metals in Dan 2 is the eastern Mediterranean world (73-74) and concludes that these represent Babylon, Media, Persia, and Macedonia. That the fourth empire is Rome is a later reinterpretation from 2 Esd 12:11-12 (76-77). Lucas, therefore, interprets the four beasts of Dan 7 accordingly. However, it is not entirely convincing to regard Media and Persia as separate kingdoms on the basis of eastern Mediterranean evidence alone. The book of Daniel itself rather presents Media and Persia together (5:28; 6:9, 12, 16) and in Dan 8 the two are explicitly represented by one animal with two horns (8:20). The only evidence from Daniel that Lucas puts forth for separating them is the distinct use of Darius the Mede and Cyrus the Persian (188). However, he observed previously that these names refer to the same person (136-137), which again would indicate a connection of Media and Persia.

In contrast to recent commentators, Lucas opts to explain the lion's metamorphosis as an act of judgment, regarding the possible link to Dan 4 merely as indications of Nebuchadnezzar's experience of judgment (178-179). He fails to notice that the metamorphosis in Dan 7 is from a hybrid creature to a human-like being and therefore corresponds in Dan 4 more closely to the king's positive restoration from an animal-like being to a human being with full mental capacities at the end of the seven periods.

Lucas proposes several sources of the animal imagery of Dan 7. He finds the background of the bizarre animal shapes in Babylonian birth omens; the imagery of the beasts rising out of a turbulent sea alludes to the Babylonian creation myth *Enūma Ešš*, and the four types of beasts stem from Hos 13:7-8. He refutes the theory of an astral background to the animal imagery of Dan 7 and also of Dan 8, demonstrating that there is no unified scheme of astrological geography that could explain the animal imagery (168, 213-214). The origin of the imagery of the throne scene is supposedly found in Canaanite mythology and has been transmitted via earlier biblical texts (167-176). The primary significance of the "one like a son of man" is to point to the establishment of God's rule over the cosmos, with Ps 8 and Gen 1:26-28 in the background, representing as symbolic

figure the "(people of) the holy ones of the Most High" (185-187). Lucas considers the phrase "holy ones of the Most High" (7:18, 22) to be ambiguous in reference, designating either angels (which he seems to prefer) or humans, while the phrase "people of the holy ones of the Most High" has possessive function and refers to the Jewish people (191-192, 194).

Since it is a faith-oriented commentary in an overtly evangelical commentary series, three major interrelated points come more or less as a surprise. First, Lucas follows in his exegesis and understanding of the prophetic visions the modern, historical-critical interpretation that regards Antiochus IV Epiphanes as the climax and focus of the vision's attention. In regard to Dan 2 and 7, Lucas favors a four-empire scheme that ends with the Macedonian, respectively Seleucid kingdom. In regard to Dan 9:24-27, Lucas expounds a combination of an Antiochene and chronographic interpretation, understanding the numbers as being primarily symbolic in nature (241-248). In contrast to the more widely held chronological interpretation, a chronographic reading refers to "the writing of a symbolic scheme of history which is intended to interpret major events in it, not to provide a means of predicting when they will happen" (248). He specifically rejects a messianic interpretation since, among other reasons, he cannot detect any clear messianic interest in Daniel (243, 246). In his interpretation of Dan 11, he refers 11:5-20 to the conflict between Ptolemaic and Seleucid rulers, and 11:21-45 to Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Whereas 11:2-39 are quasi-prophecy, 11:40-45 are genuine prophecy—more a promise of the ultimate downfall of Antiochus than a prediction of specific events. Almost as a concession, Lucas mentions that it is theologically, though not exegetically, legitimate to apply the theme of certain fall after blasphemous hubris in vv. 40-45 to other rulers (e.g., Antichrist).

Second, Lucas is clearly inclined to the view that the final form of the book dates possibly to the second century (312)—a conclusion which he bases primarily on his understanding that the literary form of Dan 8:23-25 and 11:3-45 resembles that of the Akkadian Prophecies and has to be regarded as pseudonymous quasi-prophecy (269-272, 308-309). That an evangelical scholar can argue that the visions of Daniel are "for the most part" pseudonymous quasi-prophecy has already been exemplified by Goldingay, who bases his conclusion on the concept of theological relevancy, which for him rules out that detailed prophecies for the second century could have been given centuries earlier (J. Goldingay, *Daniel* [Dallas: Word, 1989], 321). Lucas does not find Goldingay's theological argument conclusive (309). Instead he insists that the literary-critical argument of similarities between the texts in the so-called Akkadian Prophecies, which were obviously written after most of the events they describe and after Dan 8:23-25; 11:2-12:4, is a far better reason to regard the Daniel texts as "prophetic surveys of history" or *vaticinia ex eventu*. He holds that the Akkadian Prophecies illuminate the purpose of the two Daniel texts, which is to show "how past history bears on the situation dealt with at the end of the survey of history" and "not to predict the course of history but to interpret it" (272; cf. 309). In this regard, Lucas accepts Goldingay's position that the prophecy in Dan 11 is a revelation of

significance and not a revelation of future factuality (*Models of Scripture* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994], 295). However, the argument based on genre comparison is not completely persuasive. Although the Akkadian Prophecies are close in affinity to Jewish historical apocalypses and there are a number of similarities between the Akkadian Prophecies and Dan 8:23-25; 11:2-12:4, one should be careful to note that the Akkadian Prophecies lack elements of eschatology (particularly an eschatological divine intervention), mediation, and symbolism and thus may be considered to constitute a different genre (so, e.g., T. Longman, *Fictional Accadian Autobiography* [Winona Lake: Eisenbauns, 1991]). If Dan 11 belongs to a different genre, *ex eventu* prophecy, which occurs in all Akkadian Prophecies, does not need to be one of its characteristics. The similarities could indicate an influence, but they are not sufficient to assign to the texts in Daniel the nature of pseudonymous quasi-prophecy.

Third, Lucas suggests that "the whole book originated in the eastern Diaspora" (314). Not only the stories in Dan 1-6 originated there in the Persian period to command "a lifestyle of Diaspora" (Humphreys, *JBL* 92 [1973]: 211-223), which seemingly is a scholarly consensus, but also the animal imagery of Dan 7-8 and the quasi-prophecy in Dan 11 exhibit close links to Mesopotamian literature. He is convinced that the author(s) of Daniel's prophecies knew the Akkadian Prophecies and lived in Babylonia. Consequently, he rejects the different views of the identity of the *maskilim*, who supposedly are responsible for the final form of Daniel: they are neither the Hasidim, nor those "seeking righteousness and justice" (1 Macc 2:29-38), nor later wisdom teachers originating from ben Sirach, nor the forerunners of the Qumran community. Instead, Lucas believes they are "a group of upper-class, well-educated Jews . . . working as administrators and advisors in the service of pagan rulers in the eastern Diaspora" (289). From a conservative perspective, it is commendable that Lucas finds the origin of Daniel in Babylonia rather than in Palestine. However, he dates the final step in the formation of the book and most of its prophecies in the second century B.C. The connection of a late date for Daniel and a Mesopotamian provenance is Lucas's original contribution. One is, however, faced with the question, Why should a group of well-educated Jews in Mesopotamia change their positive outlook on Diaspora life because of the crisis of the Antiochene persecution in Palestine, as Lucas argues (314)? The presumed focus on Antiochus, as Lucas suggests it, does not seem to fit too well with a Mesopotamian setting of the final form of Daniel.

These three issues—the interpretation and the nature of prophecy in Daniel, the date of redaction, and the authorship of the book—illustrate how demanding it can be for a conservative exegete to interpret the book of Daniel while at the same time respecting the results of critical scholarship. It is not difficult to predict that many conservative scholars will not be persuaded by Lucas's approach. Although Lucas assures that "acceptance of both a late sixth-century date and a second-century date are consonant with belief in divine inspiration and authority of the book" (312; cf. 309; Goldingay, *Daniel*, xxxix-

xl), it is precisely the question whether a second-century date is compatible with divine inspiration that will be at the forefront of criticism.

So what is the place of this commentary in comparison with others? Lucas's *Daniel* cannot and does not replace the major commentaries by Goldingay (WBC, 1989) and Collins (Hermeneia, 1993) which have more detailed introductions and comments and more extensive bibliographic references; but it certainly complements them. The strengths of Lucas's commentary are the more holistic approach to the text, the careful attention to literary features and the Mesopotamian background of Daniel, and the faith-based explorations of the text's broader biblical and historical context, including possible implications for today. It should be considered as a possible choice for classroom adoption as long as one is aware of Lucas's idiosyncratic suggestions regarding the composition of Daniel.

Seminar Schloss Bogenhofen
St. Peter am Hart, Austria

MARTIN PRÖBSTLE

McLay, R. Timothy. *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003. xiv + 207 pp. Paper, \$30.00.

At the time of the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, LXX studies were clearly in decline. It was commonly believed that the latter was, for the most part, a poor paraphrase of the Hebrew Bible, and had little to offer in the study of the MT. The Scrolls have had wide impact on both Hebrew and Greek textual studies, attracting bright young students trained in modern linguistics and related fields. McLay is part of this new wave of LXX scholars. His dissertation from Durham University was published as *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel* (SCS 43), and he has written several articles in this field of study.

Unfortunately, the implications of the renewed interest in the LXX have generally not been adequately recognized in NT studies, and it is to this issue that McLay gives his attention in this volume. Since at least Reformation times, the scriptural background for the NT has normally been sought in the Hebrew Bible/MT—or in translation, in the OT. Recourse to the LXX is had only when the reference is not found in any of those places, such as the reference to Deut 32:43 (LXX) found in Heb 1:6. McLay argues—and demonstrates—that precisely the converse is the approach that should be adopted. By NT times, apart from the Scribes into whose care the Hebrew Scriptures were committed, few could read Hebrew. The Bible of the Christian church was the Greek LXX.

In the Introduction, McLay lays important groundwork, carefully explaining the interrelationship between concepts such as "Scripture" and "canon" and defining terminology. To some, this may seem like splitting hairs, but the distinctions are important. To follow McLay's reasoning, one must be able to distinguish clearly, for instance, between "Septuagint" and "Old Greek," and "Masoretic Text" and "Hebrew Bible." From the outset, some will be tempted to skip or pass quickly over the more technical discussions found as