

# Literature Relevant to Daniel

Frank W. Hardy

## Introduction

The literature relevant to Daniel comes in many forms. There is journal literature, there are books, and there is ancient literature. A problem raised by the third category has to do with objectivity, because Daniel is universally used to date the literature which by which Daniel is dated.

## First Sample: Journal Literature

Here we offer an overview of papers relevant to Daniel that have been reviewed in *Old Testament Abstracts* over the past thirty-five years. The goal will be to identify major trends.

*Old Testament Abstracts* classifies publications as articles, books, or essays. Here these are referred to without distinction as “sources.” From 1987 to 2021, counted inclusively, *OTA* reviewed some 1223 sources that deal with Daniel in some way. In a little over one third of the sample (460 = 37.6%) the book is mentioned without specifying a chapter as being of special interest, while another third (404 = 33.0%) refers to chapters without specifying verses, and the rest (359 = 29.4%) refer to both chapters and verses. We will call the first group, A (general reference to the book); the second, B (reference to a specific chapter); and the third, C (verse references). Group A can be set aside at the outset. The references to Daniel in group A are too general to be of interest here.

The chapter references in group B are either to narrative chapters or to major apocalyptic prophecies, with a slight preponderance of interest in the prophetic chapters (45.5%/54.5%). See table 1.

## Review of Literature

Table 1  
Group B Sources

Dan	Narrative Chapters		Prophetic Chapters	
	Chap. Refs.	Pct. of 488	Chap. Refs.	Pct. of 1073
1	60	5.6%		
2			108	10.1%
3	96	8.9%		
4	94	8.8%		
5	91	8.5%		
6	88	8.2%		
7			132	12.3%
8			62	5.8%
9			88	8.2%
10			63	5.9%
11			67	6.2%
12			65	6.1%
Susanna 13	44	4.1%		
Bel/Draco 14	15	1.4%		
Subtotals	488	45.5%	585	54.5%
Total	1073			

Our focus in group C, excluding sources such as proceedings volumes, *Festschriften*, and other books, will be on sources having to do with one or more of the three chapters discussed in the study (Dan 10-12). This reduced version of group C sources consists of 54 documents, which can be divided into nine categories, as follows.<sup>1</sup> See table 2.

Table 2  
Numeric Summary of Topics

Topics	Count	Percent
Literary Themes	18	33.3%
Historical Analysis	13	24.1%
Lexical Studies	8	14.8%
Intertextual Studies	4	7.4%
Textual Relationships	4	7.4%
Source Criticism	3	5.6%
Chronology	1	1.9%
History of Interpretation	1	1.9%
Other	2	3.7%
Total	54	100%

<sup>1</sup> Reference information for these papers appears in the Bibliography at the end of the study.

## Review of Literature

Four of the papers in group C discuss textual relationships between clauses. Of these, only one was written by a critical scholar.<sup>2</sup> From this I draw that textual analysis on an inter-clausal level has not captured the imagination of critical scholars. If I am right, this has less to do with the scholars who avoid this level of analysis, than with the models that inform their study. One's model will play a major role in determining what is and is not a potentially interesting area for research.

When referring to critical scholars, or the critical model, a further distinction is necessary. In Dan 11:2-35 there is little or no functional difference between preterist positions and futurist positions. What seemingly unites the two models cannot have been the investigator's overall belief system, because these groups have widely different concepts of inspiration and Scripture generally. In later verses such as Dan 11:36-12:4 futurists typically skip forward to an end time antichrist,<sup>3</sup> but in the chapter's earlier verses the focus of both camps is on the evil done by Antiochus Epiphanes. Thus, it is the school and not the scholar which distinguishes the research interests of these interpreters in Dan 11, and I think this may prove to be the case generally. What one chooses to investigate or finds interesting will be largely determined by one's school of thought. Scholarly training and personal inclination has less to do with it.

## Second Sample: Commentaries and Specialized Studies

Studying Dan 11 from a historicist point of view means considering, and taking seriously, issues that others may find uninteresting. In our second sample the focus shifts from journals to commentaries, and instead of tracing broad trends we come down to specific cases. Here we consider a list of twelve topics with which the commentaries in the discipline either do or do not engage. There are exceptions, but critical commentaries tend to focus heavily on historical issues. This is necessary and expected, but there should be a corresponding emphasis on textual analysis. To the degree that a scholar allows an understanding of history to add something to the text,<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Gillian Bampfylde, "The prince of the host in the Book of Daniel and the dead sea scrolls," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 14/2 (1983), 129-134. The papers written by historicist authors are Roy Gane, "Methodology for Interpretation of Daniel 11:2-12:3." *JATS* 27 1/2 (2016), 294-343; Samuel Nunez, "Narrative Structure of Daniel 8 : A Text Linguistic Approach." *JATS* 26 (2015), 88-110; Gerhard Pfandl, "Daniel's `Time of the End'." *JATS* 7/1 (1996), 141-158.

<sup>3</sup> Futurists debate where the gap should be placed. Available choices are 11:5, 21, 36, and 40, with a majority opting for vs. 36. See Frank Hardy, "An Historicist Perspective on Daniel 11" (MA, Andrews University, 1983), Digital Commons Andrews University (<https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/theses/9/>), 42-57.

<sup>4</sup> One example will suffice. Consider Dan 11:30. In this verse the Hebrew says in part, *w<sup>e</sup>nik'â w<sup>e</sup>šâb w<sup>e</sup>zâ'am* (lit., "and he will be discouraged, and again he will be enraged" = three terms). In this verse ESV has, "and he shall be afraid and withdraw, and shall turn back and be enraged" = four terms. Where did "and withdraw" come from? Neither these words nor the concept that gives to them belongs in vs. 30.

## Review of Literature

or take something away,<sup>5</sup> that is wrong. We must build on a foundation of textual analysis. Some might feel that such a statement is unfair, that the text has been considered at sufficient length and nothing has been skipped over. But textual analysis in Dan 11 needs to be taken to a new level.

Apart from the Hebrew original (BHS),<sup>6</sup> our baseline text for this study will be the widely accepted English Standard Version (ESV),<sup>7</sup> bearing in mind that even this translation must be read with open eyes.

### Topics

Below I list the twelve topics mentioned above and show how the twenty-five source documents in the sample have engaged with them, or not, as the case may be. Numbers in the various columns of the following table are to page numbers. In column f (11:20/21) no source engages with the implications of the fact that vss. 20 and 21 begin with identical clauses. The issue is important enough that in this one case page numbers are placed in parentheses to show, not where the issue is discussed, but where it should have been discussed, but was not. Complete reference information for the sources listed in the table appears in the Bibliography at the end of the study. See Table 3.

---

<sup>5</sup> In Dan 11:29 the Hebrew says, *kārīšōnā w<sup>e</sup>kā`aḥārōnā* (lit., "like before and like after"). Here "before" means before the present, and "after" means after the present = three periods. But ESV has, "it shall not be this time as it was before" = two periods. What happened to the concept that something else would follow? It is important for our interpretation that this concept of a subsequent contrasting state not be removed.

<sup>6</sup> *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, Karl Elliger und Wilhelm Rudolph, editors, 5th edition (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1977, 1997).

<sup>7</sup> The Holy Bible, English Standard Version. Copyright © 2001, 2006, 2011, 2016 by Crossway Bibles, a division of Good News Publishers.

Review of Literature

Table 3  
Twelve Textual Topics in Commentaries

Commentaries	Key to Above List											
	10:5-6	11:3, 16, 36	11:4	11:16-22/23-28	11:20/21	11:21/23	11:23/24	11:28, 29-30a	11:29-35/36-39	11:35-36/12:6-7	11:40	12:10-11/11:31-35
	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l
Modern Commentaries												
Baldwin (1978)					(191)				197		202	208
Collins (1993)	373-374	380, 386		382	(382)				386			400
Doukhan (2019)	3			144	(136)			164	184			
Driver, S.R. (1900)	155	164			(177)	183					198	205
Goldingay (1989)		304	277		(399)		279		304			
Goldingay (2019)		543			(536)		511		542			
Hartman & Di Lella (1977)	279-280	301			(269)				301			
Keil, C.F. (1975)	410	432			(450)				462		470	496
Leupold (1969)					(493)		496					544
Longman (1999)	248	276-277		278	(277-278)				280-282			
Lucas (2002)		280			(283)				289			297
Miller (1994)		306			(298)							324
Montgomery, James A. (1927)	408-409	462	426		(450)				462			
Newsom & Breed (2014)	331	339			(346)				353, 354			
Seow (2003)		182			(175)				182			193-194
Steinmann (2003)	497-501				(525)	515						566
Ancient Commentaries												
Hippolytus	460-461											
Jerome					(149-150)							
Theodoret					(294-295)							
Other Sources												
Gane (2016)					(300)		315					
Hasslberger (1977)		273			(247)							
Pröbstle (2006)												718
Wildgruber (2013)					(85, 110)	18-19						42
Winkle (2012)	297-298											

## Review of Literature

No commentary in the sample mentions all of the topics shown above, and yet only two topics (e, j) fail to be mentioned in any source. The number of commentaries engaging with the various topics is: (a) x11, (b) x13, (c) x2, (d) x3, (e) x0, (f) x3, (g) x4, (h) x1, (i) x12, (j) x0, (k) x3, (l) x11. By contrast, the number of topics dealt with in the above sources is: x0 (e, j), x1 (h), x2 (c), x3 (d, f, k), x4 (g), x11 (a, l), x12 (i), x13 (b).

### Sources

In the following text exhibit I quote the sources, showing the nature of each author's interaction with the question at issue. Quoting a source does not imply that I share the writer's views, or that the writer shares mine, only that he or she acknowledges that an issue exists and that there is something to discuss. See Text Exhibit 1.

### Text Exhibit 1 References Corresponding to the Twelve Textual Topics

#### a. 10:5-6

Collins: "In Rev 1:15 the voice of the 'one like a son of man' is like the sound of many waters" (374; see 373-374), making the connection between Dan 10 and Rev 1.

Doukhan: Includes 10:5-6 in a list of passages that make reference to Christ (3).

Driver: "With the last three clauses of this verse, comp. the description of the risen Christ in Rev. 1:14b, 15" (155).

Hartman & Di Lella: "Jeffery (p. 502), following the lead of Charles, writes: 'The description given here . . . suggests some supernatural being superior to Gabriel and Michael and carefully distinguished by the writer from them. Early Christian commentators saw in this figure the Messiah Jesus.' The dazzling description of Jesus in Rev 1:13-16 and 2:18, which contain remarkable similarities with Dan 10:5-6, 9, undoubtedly suggested this identification" (279-280).

Hippolytus: "In the first vision he says, 'Behold, the angel Gabriel (was) sent.' Here, however, it is not so; but he sees the Lord, not yet indeed as perfect man, but with the appearance and form of man, as he says: 'And, behold, a man clothed in linen'" (460; see 460-461).

Keil: ". . . the  $\psi\iota\chi$  [*ish*] seen by Daniel was no common angel-prince, but a manifestation of Jehovah, i.e., the Logos. This is placed beyond a doubt by a comparison with Rev. i. 13-15, where the form of the Son of man whom John

## Review of Literature

saw walking in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks is described like the glorious appearance seen by Ezekiel and Daniel” (410).

Longman: “Later, we will develop a connection between Daniel 10 and Revelation’s description of Christ (cf. Rev. 1:15). Both the antecedent reference to Ezekiel and the later use of the imagery for Christ might lead us to the conclusion that the supernatural being standing before Daniel is divine” (248).

Montgomery: “In Eze. 9 it is translated by ποδήρης [*podērēs*], a long garment reaching to the feet, which is repeated Rev. 1:13 in reminiscence of this passage; . . .” (408; see 408-409).

Newsom & Breed: “Many of the details of the appearance of the angel in Dan 10 are also used by the author of Revelation to describe the Son of Man (1:13-16)” (331).

Steinmann: “Yet he does not use his power to terrify or judge Daniel; rather, he touches and speaks to him to strengthen and console him (Dan 10:18-19), just as the exalted Christ will do for John (Rev 1:17-18)” (501; see 497-501).

Winkle: “Consequently, if the dress imagery that appears prominently in Rev 1 – in association with the ὅμοιον υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου [*homoin huion anthrōpou*] standing in the midst of the seven golden lampstands – has any allusion to OT dress imagery, a reasonable source to seriously consider would be Exod 28:4–29:9” (297-298).

### b. 11:3, 16, 36 (and 8:4)

Collins: “*His invader will do as he pleases*: This is also said of Alexander (11:3\*) and Antiochus Epiphanes (11:36\*)” (380). “*The king will do as he wishes*: Compare above, Dan 8:4; 11:2, 16” (386).<sup>8</sup>

Driver: “*did according to his will*] carry out whatever he wishes: an expression implying the possession of irresistible and irresponsible power. . . . Comp. on 8:4; and below vv. 16, 36.” (164).

Goldingay: “‘The king will act as he pleases’: the standard description of apparently unchallengeable authority (8:4; 11:3, 16) . . .” ([1989], 304).

\_\_\_\_\_ (2019): “That “the king will act as he pleases” (v. 36) is the standard description of apparently unchallengeable authority that presages unexpected disaster or at least the frustration and failure of the king’s plans (8:4; 11:3, 16)” (543).

---

<sup>8</sup> “11:2” is a typo for “11:3.” Asterisks in original. Bolding removed.

## Review of Literature

Hartman & Di Lella: "That the tyrant 'will do as he pleases' (11:36a) should come as no surprise, for after all Alexander (11:3) and Antiochus the Great (11:16) are said to have done the same; cf. also 8:4" (301).

Hasslberger: "Finally 3c, with its formula  $\acute{S}Y k:=ra\acute{s}\delta+n=o$  is noteworthy. Within the unit one encounters it further in 11:16, 36 (273).

Keil: "Of his government it is said עָשָׂה כְּרִצּוֹנוֹ [*ʿasa kirtsono*], he does, rules, according to his will (cf. ch. viii. 4), so that his power might be characterized as irresistible and boundless self-will" (432).

Longman: "In verse 16 Daniel notes that the victor began to get heady and perhaps overconfident. Earlier we heard this about Alexander just before his death (v. 3), and later we will hear it about another king (v. 36)" (276-277).

Lucas: "The statement that he would 'do as he pleases' repeats what is said of the Persian ram in 8:4 and becomes a motif in what follows: 11:16, 36" (280).

Miller: "Variations of the expression 'do as he pleases' are used of God in 4:34, Persia in 8:4, Alexander the Great in 11:3, and Antiochus III in 11:16" (306).

Montgomery: "'According to his will': so of the other 'Greats,' 8:4 and 11:3 (Alexander), 11:16 (Antiochus III)" (462).

Newsom & Breed: "The phrase 'do as he pleases' echoes the description of the powerful kings in 8:4. It will be further used in this chapter to describe Antiochus III (v. 16) and Antiochus IV (v. 36)" (339).

Seow: "He is depicted as an autocrat who does whatever he pleases (v. 36; see also v. 16). In that he is hardly unique, of course, for people in such positions of power are often like that, and the book of Daniel in fact characterizes other rulers that way (8:4; 11:3)" (182).

### c. 11:4

Goldingay: "אחרית [*ʾakharit*] is broader than 'descendants' (cfr. Amos 4:2; 9:1) (Keil); OG (cf. *BHS*) assimilates to 8:22, 24" ([1989], 277).

Montgomery: "'But to others apart from these': the antecedent is generally understood to be 'his posterity'; but Jer. interprets: in addition to the four kingdoms of the Diadochi also to the lesser states, Armenia, Cappadocia, etc., and so AEz., Grot., Leng., Bev." (426).<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> The latter suggestion, by Jerome, would be possible if it were not for a grammatical disagreement in the Hebrew involving gender. We discuss this below.



## Review of Literature

### d. 11:16-22/23-28

Collins: “The reference is probably to the alliance with Pergamum [at the beginning of Antiochus’ career], which enabled Antiochus to gain power with a small force” (382).<sup>10</sup>

Doukhan: “These echoes of language suggest that the prophetic vision of the second paragraph (11:22-24) concerns the same power and the same time as in the first paragraph (11:16-21) and does not, therefore, move chronologically” (144).<sup>11</sup>

Longman: “Collins believes that verse 22 is a general statement about Antiochus IV’s reign with a dischronologized reference to the deposition of Onias III from the high priesthood (see below), then verses 23-24 go back to describing Antiochus’s initial takeover of Seleucia from his nephew. Miller, on the other hand, [takes an opposing position]. I find the latter improbable and so side with Collins” (278).

### e. 11:20/21

Collins quotes the introductory formulas at vs. 20 and vs. 21, but does not comment on them. According to Seow, “The climax of this history, told in considerable detail in verses 21–39, is the reign of Antiochus IV (175–164 B.C.E.)” (175); and Lucas, “21. The stage is now set for the account of the career of Antiochus IV (Epiphanes)” (283). The page numbers in this column are placed in parentheses because I wanted to show where vs. 21 is discussed, but no source in the sample keeps vss. 20 and 21 together. Each source places a major transition at vs. 21 in the middle of the verse group.

### f. 11:21/23

Driver: “In (time of) security (v. 21) and upon the fattest places (cf. Gen. 27:28, Heb.) of the province shall he come] The Heb. Is unusually harsh; though the fact in both A.V. and R.V. is most successfully concealed. ‘In security’ is probably accidentally out of place, and should follow ‘come’ . . . .” (183).<sup>12</sup>

Steinmann: 11:21, 24 בְּשָׁלוֹהַ ... בְּשָׁלוֹהַ [beshalwa ... beshalwa]—Both 11:21 and 11:24 use שָׁלוֹהַ [shalwa], “ease, peace,” with the preposition בְּ [be-] in a temporal

---

<sup>10</sup> The significance of saying this is that the alliance with Pergamum was something that occurred at the time Antiochus was rising to power, and which facilitated his rise. What Collins has in view at vs. 23 is a reference, out of chronological sequence, back to an earlier time.

<sup>11</sup> I would prefer to say 11:23-24, rather than 11:22-24. See Doukhan, *Daniel 11 Decoded*, 68.

<sup>12</sup> What is out of place is not a word, but the number marking the beginning of the verse. Bolding in original removed.

sense: “when [it is] at ease, peaceful” (515). Steinmann does not mention the subsequent problem of *beshalwa* being out of place at the beginning of vs. 24.

Wildgruber: In vs. 21 and again in vs. 24 Wildgruber translates *beshalwa* with the same word, showing an awareness of the parallel. Thus, “und kommen wird er in Sorglosigkeit [*beshalwa*]” (21c); “In Sorglosigkeit [*beshalwa*] und mit Mächtigen eines Landes wird er kommen” (24a) (19 n. 24; see 18-19).

g. 11:23/24

Gane: “In fact b + *šalwāh* [*shalwa*] in this verse syntactically belongs with v. 23 (see above): ‘And from the time that an alliance is made with him he shall act deceitfully, and he shall become strong with a small people <sup>24</sup> in the midst of peace” (315).

Goldingay: “See n. 8:25.c; RSV links בשלוח [*beshalwa*] with v 23, Syr. omits” ([1989], 279; see also [2019], 511).<sup>13</sup>

Leupold: “We have departed from the punctuation of the Hebrew by drawing the phrase ‘by stealth’ back into v. 23, where it fits into the picture more easily than in vs. 24” (496).

h. 11:28, 29-30a

Doukhan: “This section (d<sub>1</sub>) begins with the emphatic marking of a ‘return’ (four occurrences in 11:28-30), which points back to the ‘return of 11:9-13a (d)’” (164).

i. 11:29-35/36-39

Baldwin: “Attention returns to *the king*, whose character and deeds are the main subject of the chapter; . . . .” (197).

Collins: “Verses 36-39 do not continue in chronological sequence but recapitulate the king’s behavior during the persecution” (386).

Doukhan: “This [11:36] is the second occurrence of the phrase ‘shall do according to his own will’” (184).<sup>14</sup>

Goldingay: “The quasi-prophecy closes with an evaluative summary of Antiochus’s religious attitudes as king. . . . The reference has been taken to be to Antichrist, but the paragraph begins resumptively (not even ‘the *northern* king’) and there is no hint that the subject might be different from that in vv 21-35” ([1989], 304).<sup>15</sup>

<sup>13</sup> Two translations that get this same point right are NEB and REB.

<sup>14</sup> Actually it is the third reference Dan 11 (vss. 3, 16, 36), and the fourth in the book (8:4).

<sup>15</sup> I would prefer to say vss. 29-35. The important point is that the range of verses given stops at vs. 35.

## Review of Literature

\_\_\_\_\_ : “But there is again no indication that the identity of ‘the king’ has changed. Rather, the quasi-prediction in ch. 11 closes with an evaluative summary of Antiochus’s religious attitudes. . . . The paragraph begins resumptively with a general statement in v. 36; more detail follows in vv. 37-39” ([2019], 542).

Hartman & Di Lella: “The inspired author’s survey of history as interpreted from a uniquely theological viewpoint was brought up to his own day in 11:35. The next section provides a description and evaluation of the [earlier] conduct of the supercilious and contemptible Antiochus; . . .” (301).

Keil: “This would also have been stated in vers. 32-34 if the king in ver. 36 had been a different person from the one previously described. המֶלֶךְ [*hammelek*] with the definite article undeniably points back to the king whose appearance and conduct are described in vers. 21-33” (462).<sup>16</sup>

Longman: “The difficulty is that there is no clear transitional statement between verses 35 and 36 or later between verses 39 and 40” (281; see 280-282).

Lucas: “These verses summarize and evaluate Antiochus’ character and policies” (289).

Montgomery: “‘The king,’ the fascination of the writer, now stands alone upon the stage” (462).

Newsom & Breed: “These verses interrupt the historical narration in order to focus on the person of Antiochus and in particular his relationship with deity” (353). “As in 7:8, 11, 20, and 25, the focus is on Antiochus’s blasphemous speech” (354; see 353-354).

Seow: “Verses 36-39 appear to be a recapitulation of the offenses of Antiochus as a summary judgment of his character” (182).

j. 11:35-36/12:6-7

[Not addressed]

k. 11:40

Baldwin: “The allusive language is highly evocative: *like a whirlwind* (cf. Is. 21:1; Je. 4:13; Hab. 3:14; Zc. 9:14) bringing sudden destruction; *overflow and pass through* is an expression of Isaiah 8:8, already used in Daniel 11:10, and

---

<sup>16</sup> In my view, 29-35.

## Review of Literature

comparing the inescapable devastation caused by enemy armies to that of a flood” (202).

Driver: “*overflow, and pass through*] like a flood (as v. 1).” (198, bolding omitted).

Keil: “For the figurative expression יתנגח [yitnaggakh] (*shall push*), cf. ch. viii. 4” (470).

### I. 12:10-11/11:31-35

Baldwin: “The suffering is neither accidental nor meaningless, but serves the positive goal of purifying, cleansing and refining God’s people (cf. 11:35)” (208).

Collins: “*Many will be purified*: This is a reference back to 11:35” (400).

Driver: “The wicked act blindly, not perceiving the consequences of their wickedness; the ‘wise,’ the religious teachers of the nation (the same word as in v. 3, 11:33, 35), shew insight into the ways and providence of God” (205).

Keil: “The first clause of this verse is interpreted from ch. xi. 35” (496).

Leupold: “Those that meet such persecution and tribulation in true faith will have the benefit of being ‘purified and made white and refined,’ figurative expressions that are taken respectively from sifting, washing, and smelting (cf., 11:35)” (544).

Lucas: “The messenger begins by making clear that no further revelation is going to be given. He then more or less recapitulates what has been said in 11:32–35” (297).

Miller: “. . . and it is true that afflictions have always tended to make believers more holy (cf. 11:35, where the same terms are used of Antiochus’s persecution; cf. also Mal 3:2-3)” (324).

Pröbstle: “In fact, the text in 12:10-11 recapitulates 11:31-35. One can detect a chiasmic-like arrangement of lexical links in three sections: . . .” (718).

Seow: “Even though verse [12:]10 echoes 11:35, a subtle difference is of note. Whereas the text has said that some of the wise will be tripped up and be refined, purified, and cleansed (11:35), while they try to make many understand (11:33), now many will be purified, refined, and cleansed” (193-194).

Steinmann: “These three passive meanings, with God as the implied agent who does the actions to ‘the many’ (רַבִּים [rabbim]), are also consistent with 11:35, which uses active Qal (G), Piel (D), and Hiphil (HP forms of the same three verbs) to state that God’s purpose is לְצַרוֹף בָּהֶם וּלְבַרֵּר וּלְלַבֵּן [litsrop bahem

## Review of Literature

*ulebarer wealben*], ‘to refine them [those who have insight], purify [them], and make [them] white’ (566).

Wildgruber: “The statement on the fate of the wise adopts the corresponding formulation from 11:35, where the order of the verbs and verb stems changes. The sinner as an opponent of the community of the wise has already been encountered in 11:32. The two dates in 12:11-12 are based on the time when the daily sacrifice is removed and the ‘devastating abomination’ set up and thus refer to the event indicated in 11:31” (42).<sup>17</sup>

It is not enough to identify the above topics and to point out that a point has been mentioned. The twelve issues listed above must shape our understanding of the material. The list I have given is not intended to be exhaustive, but merely to show the scope of what remains to be discussed. We have not begun to understand Dan 11, or discuss it, or realize that there are topics which merit discussion, in the depth this prophecy deserves.

### Third Sample: Intertestamental Literature

The first two samples show some general trends and list specific topic areas where scholars contributing to the literature have engaged with matters of interest to Dan 11. I have suggested certain topics as being of sufficient interest to merit discussion. Now we turn our attention to a different type of sample. The third sample draws lessons, not from the literature on Jewish intertestamental literature, but from the literature itself. Here our focus will be on what the documents themselves say about Daniel, and what we can learn from their testimony or their silence as the case may be.

#### Background

Critical scholars are carefully aware of the parallels between Daniel and post-exilic Jewish apocalyptic writings. This body of literature is significant, but it would be possible to misunderstand its significance. If we make a second century date for Daniel our starting point, building on that foundation, our logic becomes inverted. Assumptions become axioms and nothing is as it seems. What I propose doing is to accept the available textual data, including any historical claims implicit in those data, at face value.

---

<sup>17</sup> “Auch die in 12,10 folgende Aussage über das Schicksal der Weisen übernimmt die entsprechende Formulierung aus 11,35, wobei sich lediglich die Reihenfolge der Verben und der Verbstamm ändern. Die Frevler als Gegenspieler der Gruppe der Weisen begegnen ebenfalls bereits in 11,32. Die beiden Zeitangaben in 12,11–12 orientieren sich an dem Zeitpunkt, zu dem das tägliche Opfer entfernt und der „verwüstende Abscheu“ eingerichtet wurde, und nehmen damit Bezug auf das in 11,31 angedeutete Ereignis“ (Wildgruber, 42).

## Review of Literature

For Breed, Daniel is a late document because it betrays Persian influence.<sup>18</sup> But the Persian part of this comparison must itself be accounted for. If Daniel was still alive when Medo-Persia conquered Babylon, as the book claims, Breed's position could be accounted more in than one way. If Daniel lived in the sixth century, it would be equally possible that Daniel's writings influenced Persian sources.

The four-metals schema is an interesting possible exception, because Hesiod outlines a four metals schema corresponding to a succession of empires.<sup>19</sup> I mentioned this case in the Preface, pointing out that for Hesiod the schema consists only of a sequence of metals (gold, silver, brass, iron). The analogy of a human body plays no part in his schema. Nor is there any progression toward an end time kingdom that takes precedence over all human kingdoms. But however this may be, saying Daniel was shown something similar to what Hesiod wrote about is not incompatible with any claim made in the book of Daniel as we know it.

*Direct references.* Some intertestamental literature makes direct reference to Daniel and others named in that book. Consider three examples: "Daniel, who through envious slanders was cast down into the ground to lions as food for wild beasts, you brought up to the light unharmed" (3 Macc 6:7); "And Daniel the righteous was thrown to the lions, and Hananiah, Azariah, and Mishael were hurled into the fiery furnace and endured it for the sake of God" (4 Macc 16:21); "He told you of the zeal of Phineas, and he taught you about Hananiah, Azariah, and Mishael in the fire. He praised Daniel in the den of the lions and blessed him" (4 Macc 18:12-13). The reader will have noticed that the above quotations refer only to Dan 3 (fiery furnace) and 6 (lions' den). The two documents involved are 3 Macc, which is quite early (221-203 BC), "half a century prior to the Maccabean period and the persecution of Palestinian Jewry under Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175-164 B.C.),"<sup>20</sup> and 4 Macc, which is late (A.D. 20-54).

*Additions and imitations.* A second body of intertestamental literature bears a witness to Daniel that is compelling, but less direct. These sources overtly add to or imitate Daniel.<sup>21</sup> One thing that makes such documents interesting is that one cannot add to or imitate a document which does not already exist. See Table 4.

---

<sup>18</sup> Brennan Breed, "Daniel's Four Kingdoms Schema: A History of Re-writing World History," *Interpretation* 71/2 (2017), 181, 182.

<sup>19</sup> Ernest C. Lucas, "The Origin of Daniel's Four Empires Scheme Re-Examined," *Tyndale Bulletin* 40 (1989), 191, 194.

<sup>20</sup> Bruce M. Metzger, ed., *The Apocrypha of the Old Testament: Revised Standard Version* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), 294.

<sup>21</sup> Dan 3:24-30 in Protestant Bibles corresponds to 3:91-97 in Catholic Bibles; vss. 98-100 in English Catholic Bibles correspond to Dan 3:31-33 in the Hebrew and to Dan 4:1-3 in English Protestant Bibles.

## Review of Literature

Table 4  
Additions to Daniel and Imitations of Daniel

Additions	
Prayer of Azariah	Dan 3:24-45
Prose Narrative	Dan 3:46-51
Hymn of the Three Young Men	Dan 3:52-90
Susanna	Dan 13
Bel and the Snake	Dan 14
Imitations	
Daniel Apocryphon	4Q246 (4QAramaic Apocalypse)
Daniel Florilegium	4Q174 (4QFlorilegium)
Prayer of Nabonidus	4Q242 (4QPrayer of Nabonidus ar)
Pseudo-Daniel <sup>a,b,c</sup>	4Q243 ar 488, 244 ar 490, 245 ar 492 (4QPseudo-Daniel)

Cary A. Moore occasionally speaks of the "Prayer of Azariah and the Hymn of the Three Young Men" as though they were a single addition to Daniel, written in Hebrew. But elsewhere he suggests that a Prose Narrative of six or seven verses, written in Aramaic, serves as a bridge between the Prayer and the Hymn.<sup>22</sup> Thus, these documents are properly not one addition, but two.<sup>23</sup> All four additions to Daniel, or five with the Prose Narrative, are secondary to the book and have interesting origin stories of their own.<sup>24</sup>

These additions, like the ones mentioned earlier, have to do with the stories of Dan 3, while the imitations contain references to a range of other chapters. Such documents include 4Q242, which speaks of making "a proclamation in writing" and praying "for seven years," and takes us to Dan 4.<sup>25</sup> Another is the fragmentary 4Q246, which says in part, "[...k]ing forever. You are angry and have changed you" (Col. 1, line 2); "[...] ... your vision, and everything that shall come forever" (Col. 1, line 3). That is reminiscent of Dan 2:28, 44. Three lines later the same document refers to the "[...] king of Assyria [and E]gypt" (1:6),<sup>26</sup> which is reminiscent of Dan 11. Separately, 4Q174 says, "[...a]s is written in the book of Daniel, the prophet: <[The wicked] act wicked[ly ...]; and the just [... shall be whi]tened and refined and a people knowing God will remain strong>" (Frag. 1 Col. II, lines 3 and 4), which points either to Dan 11:32 or 12:10.<sup>27</sup> Thus, the above documents provide references to Dan 2, 3, 4, and either 11 or 12, plus a reference to "the book of Daniel, the prophet."

<sup>22</sup> Carey A. Moore, *The Anchor Bible, Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah: The Additions: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1977), 6.

<sup>23</sup> *Idem*, 49.

<sup>24</sup> *Idem*, 7, 44-49, 84-89, 121-125. Moore speaks of the Bel narrative as originally distinct, and "the three 'mini' tales of the Snake narrative" being added to it later (121).

<sup>25</sup> *Idem*, 1.487.

<sup>26</sup> Florentino García Martínez & Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition (Translations)* (Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 1997), 1.493.

<sup>27</sup> *Idem*, 1.355.

## Review of Literature

1 Baruch does not fit well in table 4 (above) or in table 5 (below). It gives evidence of being a composite work, with the document coming together in final form between perhaps 150 and 60 BC.<sup>28</sup> The question to what degree 1 Baruch 1:15-3:8 imitates Dan 9:3-27 could be debated. The author was clearly aware of Daniel's work.

*Unselfconscious adaptations.* A third group of intertestamental documents relevant to our topic consists of those which develop an idea from Daniel in some novel but unselfconscious manner. In my view this third category is the most interesting because it shows that, over time, others not only became aware of Daniel's writings but made his ideas their own. Themes adapted in this way include: (a) the four-kingdom motif (Dan 2, 7, 8, 11),<sup>29</sup> (b) the explaining of symbols (Dan 2, 7, 8), (c) the term "Watchers" (Dan 4),<sup>30</sup> (d) giving specific names to angels (Dan 8, 9, 10, 12),<sup>31</sup> (e) a fascination with prophetic chronology (Dan 7, 8, 9, 12),<sup>32</sup> (f) corporate penitential prayer (Dan 9),<sup>33</sup> (g) the North/South motif,<sup>34</sup> and (h) the term "Kittim."<sup>35</sup> In what follows we focus on a subset of these.<sup>36</sup>

The term "Watchers" is found in the Genesis Apocryphon, 1 Enoch<sup>a, b, c, e, g</sup>, the Book of Giants, the Damascus Document, the Book of Noah, Pseudo-Jubilees<sup>c</sup>, and the Visions of Amram<sup>b</sup>.<sup>37</sup> Many watchers, or angels, have specific names and in two lists

---

<sup>28</sup> Bruce M. Metzger, *The Apocrypha of the Old Testament, Revised Stand Version; Expanded Edition Containing the Third and Fourth Books of the Maccabees and Psalm 151* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), 198. The books of 2 Baruch (I/II AD: Syriac, Arabic), 3 Baruch (Greek Apocalypse of Baruch, AD 70/III AD: Greek), and 4 Baruch (Paralipomena of Jeremiah, II AD: Greek, Geez) were written too late to be of interest here, except as the later imitators of Baruch illustrate how the later imitators of Daniel might have approached their work, and the timescales involved.

<sup>29</sup> García Martínez & Tigchelaar, *Scrolls*, 2:1105 (4Q552, 1.ii.5-11), 1105-1107 (4Q553, 6.ii.4-6). The Four Kingdoms document (4Q552-553) illustrates both the four kingdoms motif and explanation of symbols.

<sup>30</sup> 4Q202 Col. ii:3-17 gives a list of twenty-one named Watchers. It begins with the chief Watcher, Shemihazah, #1 from him, #2 from him, and so on. The list ends with Anan'el [#13], Sato'el [#14], Shamshi'el [#15], Shahari'el [#16], Tumi'el [#17], Turi'el [#18], Yomi'el [#19], Yehadi'el [#20]).

<sup>31</sup> Many watchers have names. There may or may not be a difference between watchers and angels.

<sup>32</sup> Jubilees is an example. See García Martínez & Tigchelaar, *Scrolls*, 1.459-465 (4Q216-4Q227); Kenneth Atkinson, "Periodization "Periodization at Qumran and Its Importance for Understanding Hellenistic History," *The Qumran Chronicle*, 30/1-4 (2022), 1-16.

<sup>33</sup> See Emanuel Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint, Vetus Testamentum, Supplements*, vol. 72 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 519. The reference here is to 1 Baruch.

<sup>34</sup> In the War Scroll the North/South motif is more highly developed than it is in Daniel. First, the term "king of the North" has become the "kings of the North" (1Q33 Col. i:4). These exist at the same time and presumably fight side by side. Also, "South" has been replaced by "Egypt" (ibid.). See also 4Q496 Col. i Frag. 3:3.

<sup>35</sup> The "Kittim" is also a concept that has developed at Qumran beyond what it is in Daniel. Thus, we have expressions as "Kittim of Ashur" (1Q33 Col. i:2), "Kittim in Egypt" (1Q33 Col. i:4). The fact that the "Kittim" could be associated with both "North" and "Egypt" is in itself a significant development. The term has become a type of opponent, rather than a specific opponent.

<sup>36</sup> Two themes (a, b) are so broad that they deserve special study, and one (f) is not represented at Qumran.

<sup>37</sup> 1QapGen ar Col. ii:1, 16; vi:13; vii:2; 4Q201 (4QEnoch<sup>a</sup> ar) Col. i:3, 6; 4Q202 (4QEnoch<sup>b</sup> ar) Col. ii:3; iv:6; 4Q203 (4QBook of Giants<sup>a</sup> ar) Frag. 7,i:6; 4Q204 (4QEnoch<sup>c</sup> ar) Col. v:3; vi:8, 9, 12(x2); 4Q206 (4QEnoch<sup>e</sup> ar) Frag. 2,ii:5; 4:19; 4Q212 (4QEnoch<sup>g</sup> ar) Col. iii:21; 4Q227 (4QPseudo-Jubilees<sup>c</sup>?) Frag. 2:4; 4Q266 (4QDamascus Document<sup>a</sup>) Frag. 2 ii:18; 4Q532 (4QBook of Giants<sup>d</sup> ar) Frag. 2:7; 4Q534 (4QNoah ar) Col. ii:16, 18; 4Q544 (4QVisions of Amram<sup>b</sup> ar) Frag. 2:2.



## Review of Literature

these are carefully ranked by number relative to each other.<sup>38</sup> This goes far beyond Daniel's mention of "Gabriel" and "Michael."<sup>39</sup> At Qumran the naming and ranking of angels has become varied and systematic. Here are some examples of named angels (or watchers). The list includes 28 names from 15 documents and is not exhaustive:

Anan'el (4Q201 Col. iii:10; 4Q202 Col. ii:15; 4Q204 Col. ii:27); Ar'teqof (4Q204 Col. ii:24); Asa'el (4Q201 Col. iii:9); Azael (4Q201 Col. v:5); Azazel (11Q19 Col. xxvi:4, 13); Baraq'el (4Q201 Col. iii:8; iv:2; 4Q202 Col. iii:2; 4Q203 Frag. 1:2; 4Q204 Col. ii:26); Dani'el (4Q201 Col. iii:8); Gabriel (1Q19 Frag. 2:4; 1Q33 Col. ix:15, ix:16; 4Q202 Col. iii:13; iv:5; 4Q285 Frag. 10:3; 4Q529 4; 4Q557 Frag. 1:2); Hermoni (4Q201 Col. iii:9; iv:1; 4Q202 Col. iii:2; 4Q204 Col. ii:27); Kokab'el (4Q201 Col. iv:2; 4Q202 Col. iii:3; 4Q204 Col. ii:25); Makarios (4Q553 Frag. 1:4); Mastema (CD-A Col. xvi:5); Matar'el (4Q201 Col. iii:9); Michael (1Q33 Col. ix:15, 16; xvii:6, 7; 4Q201 Col. iv:6; 4Q202 Col. iii:7; iv:8[x2]; 4Q285 Frag. 10:3; 4Q470 Frag. 1:2; 4Q529 1); Ra'ma'el (4Q204 Col. ii:25); Ramt'el (4Q201 Col. iii:6); Raphael (1Q33 Col. ix:15, 16; 4Q197 Frag. 4 i:15; Frag. 5:8; 4Q201 Col. iv:6; v:5[x2]; 4Q202 Col. iii:7; 4Q203 Frag. 8:12; 4Q285 Frag. 10:3); Sahari'el (4Q201 Col. iii:11; iv:4; 4Q202 Col. iii:4; 4Q204 Col. ii:28); Sariel (1Q33 Col. ix:15, 16; 4Q201 Col. iv:6; 4Q202 Col. iii:13; 4Q285 Frag. 10:3); Sato'el (4Q201 Col. iii:10; 4Q202 Col. ii:15); Shamshi'el (4Q202 Col. ii:15; iii:4); Shemihazah (4Q201 Col. iii:6; iv:1; 4Q202 Col. ii:5; 4Q203 Frag. 8:5); Tumi'el (4Q201 Col. iii:11); Turi'el (4Q201 Col. iii:12; 4Q204 Col. ii:29); Uriel (4Q206 Frag. 4:19); Yehadi'el (4Q201 Col. iii:12); Yomi'el (4Q202 Col. ii:17); Zeq'el (4Q201 Col. iii:8; 4Q202 Col. iii:3; 4Q204 Col. ii:26).

There was also a fascination with chronology at Qumran. The paradigm example of this interest is the book of Jubilees, which is more extensive than anything we find in Daniel.<sup>40</sup> Some key terms are uniquely associated with Dan 11. The terms I have in mind are "the kings of the North"<sup>41</sup> and "Kittim."<sup>42</sup>

In the following summary we focus on watchers, named angels, chronology, kings of the North, and Kittim, because these themes are easily documented and because they had become so widely entrenched in people's thinking by the time of the Maccabean crisis. See Table 5.

---

<sup>38</sup> See 4Q201 (4QEnoch<sup>a</sup> ar) 4Q201 f1iii:5-13; 4Q204 (4QEnoch<sup>c</sup> ar) f1ii:24-29.

<sup>39</sup> "Gabriel": Dan 8:16; 9:21; "Michael": Dan 10:13, 21; 12:1.

<sup>40</sup> See Dan 4:16, 23, 25, 26, 32, 36; 7:25; 8:13-14; 9:24-27; 11:24; 12:11-12

<sup>41</sup> See 1Q33 i:4; 4Q496 i Frag. 3.

<sup>42</sup> See 1QpHab (1QPesher to Habakkuk) Col. ii:12, 14; iii:4, 9; iv:5, 10; vi:1, 10; ix:7; 1Q16 (1QPesher to Psalms) Frag. 9:4; 1Q33 (1QWar Scroll) Col. i:2, 4, 6, 9, 12; xi:11; xv:2; xvi:3, 6, 8, 9; xvii:12, 14; xviii:2; ix:10; 4Q161 (4QIsaiah Pesher<sup>a</sup>) Frags. 8-10:3, 7, 8; 4Q169 (4QNahum Pesher) Frags. 1-2:4, 6; 3-4 i:3; 4Q247 (Apocalypse of Weeks [?]) Frag. 1:6; 4Q285 (4QSefer ha-Milhamah = Destruction of the Kittim) Frags. 6 + 4:5; 4Q491 (4QWar Scroll<sup>a</sup>) Frags. 8-10 ii:8, 9, 10, 12; 11 ii:1, 5, 7, 8, 20; 13:3, 5; 4Q492 (4QWar Scroll<sup>c</sup>) Frag. 1:12; 4Q496 (4QWar Scroll<sup>f</sup>) Col. i Frag. 3:6; 4Q554 (4QNew Jerusalem<sup>a</sup> ar) Frag. 2 iii:16.

## Review of Literature

Table 5  
Documents Possibly Influenced by Daniel

Qumran	Document	Watchers	Named Angels	Fascination with Chronology	North/South Motif	Kittim
	Inspiration	Dan 4	Dan 8, 9, 10, 12	Dan 7, 8, 9, 12	Dan 11	Dan 11
1Q19	1QBook of Noah		X			
1Q33	1QWar Scroll		X		X	X <sup>43</sup>
1QapGen ar	1QGenesis Apocryphon	X				
1QpHab	1QPesher to Habakkuk					X <sup>44</sup>
4Q161	4QIsaiah Pesher <sup>a</sup>					X
4Q169	4QNahum Pesher					X
4Q197	4QTobit <sup>b</sup> ar		X			
4Q201	4QEnoch <sup>a</sup> ar	X	X			
4Q202	4QEnoch <sup>b</sup> ar	X	X			
4Q203	4QBook of Giants <sup>a</sup> ar	X	X			
4Q204	4QEnoch <sup>c</sup> ar	X	X			
4Q206	4QEnoch <sup>e</sup> ar	X	X			
4Q212	4QEnoch <sup>g</sup> ar	X				
4Q216	4QJubilees <sup>a</sup>			X		
4Q227	4QPseudo-Jubilees <sup>c?</sup>	X				
4Q247	4QApocWeeks?					X
4Q266	4QDamascus Document <sup>a</sup>	X				
4Q285	4QSefer ha-Milhamah		X			X
4Q470	4QText Mentioning Zedekiah <sup>45</sup>		X			
4Q491	4QWar Scroll <sup>a</sup>				X	X
4Q492	4QWar Scroll <sup>b</sup>				X	X

<sup>43</sup> "Kittim" x16.

<sup>44</sup> "Kittim" x8.

<sup>45</sup> Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition (Translations)* (Leiden; New York: Brill, 1997–1998), 949.

## Review of Literature

4Q496	4QWar Scroll <sup>f</sup>				X	X
4Q529	4QWords of Michael ar		X			
4Q532	4QBook of Giants <sup>d</sup> ar	X				
4Q534	4QNoah ar	X				
4Q544	4QVisions of Amram <sup>b</sup> ar	X				
4Q553	4QFour Kingdoms <sup>b</sup> ar		X			
4Q554	4QNew Jerusalem <sup>a</sup> ar					X
4Q557	4QVision <sup>c</sup> ar		X			
11Q19	11QTemple <sup>a</sup>		X			

## Review of Literature

The War Scroll is especially interesting in the present context. In it there are references to: (a) named angels (see Dan 10:21; 12:1); (b) "the kings of the North" (see Dan 11:6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 15, 40, 44); (c) "Daughters of my nation" (see Dan 11:17); (d) "Kittim" (x16, including "Kittim in Egypt" and "Kittim of Ashur") (see Dan 11:30);<sup>46</sup> (e) "perfect ones of the path" (see "the wise" in Dan 11:33, 35); (f) the nations of "Edom and of Moab and of the sons of Ammon" (see Dan 11:41); (g) and certain books ("Book of the Rule of his time," "Book of War") (see Dan 12:1). All of these have a direct and specific connection with the prophecy of Dan 10-12.

Not only did Daniel's thoughts and motifs achieve wide circulation in the years following his death, but they took on new meanings as they spread. Thus, while Daniel uses "ships of Kittim" to refer to a Southern power, in the intertestamental literature it almost always refers to a Northern power.<sup>47</sup> This change might seem small and it might be nothing more than an exegetical slip, but I don't think so. There has been a change from South to North,<sup>48</sup> not in strict exegesis but in the popular mind.

### Other themes

Some types of content should not be traced to Daniel. These include mysticism, symbolic dreams, messianic thinking,<sup>49</sup> an emphasis on the distant past (not future), and ascents into heaven with guided tours. The intertestamental literature reflects many influences and, while some of these reflect Daniel's influence, others may or may not.

Logically one could imagine four chronological scenarios at this point. First, Daniel could be late, and the intertestamental literature later; second, the inverse could be true, i.e., that the intertestamental literature could be late, and Daniel later than that; third, Daniel could be earlier than we had thought with the intertestamental literature a late response to Daniel; and fourth, the intertestamental literature could be earlier than we had thought with Daniel a later response to that.

The fourth alternative is untenable. We cannot make the intertestamental period earlier than it is. The critical position appears to be a mix of the first alternative and the second. The third alternative is the one that makes most sense to me. There is simply not enough time in the years immediately following the Maccabean Revolt to put all the

---

<sup>46</sup> 1QpHab Col. ii:12, 14; iii:4, 9; iv:5, 10; vi:1, 10; ix:7; 1Q16 Frag. 9:4; 1Q33 Col. i:9, 12; xv:2; xvi:3, 6, 8, 9; xvii:12, 14; 4Q161 Frags. 8–10:3, 7, 8; 4Q169 Frags. 1–2:4; 4Q247 Frag. 1:6; 4Q285 Frags. 6 + 4:5; 4Q491 Frags. 8–10 ii:8, 9, 10, 12; Frag. 11 ii:1, 5, 7, 8, 20; 13:3, 5; 4Q492 Frag. 1:12; 4Q496 Col. i Frag. 3:6; 4Q554 Frag. 2 iii:16.

<sup>47</sup> It would be possible for Kittim at Qumran to derive from Num 24:24 rather than Dan 11:30, but this is unlikely. In the present context it would be more reasonable to suggest that Daniel got the term from the story of Balaam and that later intertestamental writers got it from Daniel.

<sup>48</sup> For Northern applications see 1Q33 Col. i:2, 6; xi:11; xviii:2. In 4Q169 Frags. 1–2:6 the association is with "Bashan." There is probably no difference between "Ashur" and "Rome" in popular usage. For a Southern application see 1Q33 Col. i:4.

<sup>49</sup> And yet in the War Scroll consider such expressions as "Man of Glory" (1Q33 Col. xii:10; 1Q33 Col. xix:3; cf. "Prince of the host" [Dan 8:11], "Prince of princes" [Dan 8:25]).

## Review of Literature

data which confront us. The problem is that copies of Daniel start appearing at Qumran within fifteen years of the events he is said to have described, which does not give Daniel's ideas enough time to develop as they obviously did.

I suggest that Daniel was written at an early time without reference to the Maccabean Revolt. That is not what it describes. Intertestamental writers certainly thought it was, and this led them to develop Daniel's themes around their understanding of current events.

### Summary

After being written down and edited in an earlier day, Daniel was widely read, his writings resonated with readers, and the ideas they saw there, or thought they saw, gained wide currency. Daniel's readers pondered his writings and over time adapted them in whatever way they thought would be most interesting. The effects of this process can be seen in the intertestamental literature, prominently including Qumran.

But in order to get this kind of response, there first had to be a document to respond to. Daniel had to write something. When he did, his work attracted a cloud of imitators. Daniel was a source, and not a beneficiary, of their ideas. It is a mistake to put Daniel and his imitators on the same level.

## Discussion

The canon of Scripture preserved in the Hebrew Bible has three main parts: *Torah*, *Nebi'im*, *Ketubim* (Law, Prophets, Writings). The Law is the core of the Jewish canon, the Prophets come next, and any poetic or late documents are placed in the Writings. Since that is where we find Daniel, the question is why his work would not be placed among the Prophets, as we see in the Septuagint and in modern Bibles? Koch suggests that at one time Daniel was indeed among the Prophets, but was demoted to the *Ketubim* during the second half of the first millennium AD.<sup>50</sup>

According to McDonald, "there is little evidence that [prophecy] ever died out in postexilic Israel, even though the forms of expression changed and the prophets then expressed their oracles as additions to existing collections of prophetic writings."<sup>51</sup> Aune goes further, blurring the distinction between Judeo-Christian and pagan sources.

---

<sup>50</sup> Klaus Koch, "Is Daniel Also Among the Prophets?" *Interpretation*, April 1985, 117-130. Koch's argument is based on: (a) Jesus' own testimony in Matt 24:15, (b) the order of the books in the Septuagint, (c) Josephus (*Against Apion*, 1:38-41; *Antiquities* 10:11.4), (d) Qumran (some manuscripts of Daniel were written on leather, 4QFlorilegium 2:3.20). Koch concludes that "there is not a single witness for the exclusion of Daniel from the prophetic corpus in the first half of the first millennium A.D." (idem, 123). See idem, 117-130.

<sup>51</sup> McDonald, *The Biblical Canon: Its Origin, Transmission, and Authority* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2007), 173.

## Review of Literature

This study [Aune's commentary on Revelation] is written from the perspective that early Christianity must be understood within the setting of the ancient Mediterranean world, without unduly emphasizing the Israelite-Jewish heritage of early Christians nor neglecting the dominant Greco-Roman culture within which both Judaism and early Christianity grew and changed.<sup>52</sup>

The issue cannot be settled here, but in my view there is a distinction to be made between what is inspired and what is not. There is no question that Jewish writers continued writing after the fifth century BC.<sup>53</sup> The question is whether during this time people continued receiving prophetic inspiration from God. Consider two statements from the book of Maccabees: “Thus there was great distress in Israel, such as had not been since the time that prophets ceased to appear among them” (1 Macc 9:27). Also, the Maccabees “tore down the altar, and stored the stones in a convenient place on the temple hill until there should come a prophet to tell what to do with them” (1 Macc 4:46). Thus, whoever wrote 1 Maccabees was of the opinion that there were no prophets to give them such instruction.

The above statements are consistent with the idea that Daniel was a prophet who lived before 1 Maccabees – before the prophetic gift faded away – and that prophecy persisted in Israel during his lifetime (see Dan 9:1-2). McDonald’s argument would be consistent with the opposing view that, while Daniel may have been a prophet, he could have lived in any age, not excluding the second century, and that the time when prophecy disappeared in Israel is irrelevant because it did not disappear. Such thinking has the effect of making Daniel indistinguishable from his imitators, one more voice in an ever-expanding nebula of others busily expressing themselves in whatever way might have seemed most appropriate at the time. That is not my concept of prophecy. Inspired prophecy is more than simply a form of self-expression.

---

<sup>52</sup> David Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1983), xi.

<sup>53</sup> See Sid Z. Leiman, *The Canonization of Hebrew Scripture: The Talmudic and Midrashic Evidence*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (New Haven, CT: Connecticut Academy of Arts, 1991), 130.