The Preterist Model for Interpreting Daniel

Copyright (c) 2006 by Frank W. Hardy, Ph.D.

Introduction

The present paper gives a brief overview of ways in which preterist scholars interpret Daniel.[1] Issues raised and discussed include views on inspiration, the historicity of Daniel as a person, the dating of Daniel as a book, predictive prophecy and historical applications of Dan 11, a chapter outline for Dan 11, and preterist attitudes toward interpreting Daniel in terms of the belief systems of Israel's pagan neighbors. The paper closes with some evaluative comments.

Dan 11 is singled out for special attention because doing so represents the emphasis of those whose work is being evaluated.[2] Preterists ever since Porphyry have used the eleventh chapter of Daniel as a basis for dating the rest of the book[3]. Their exegetical framework for all of Daniel therefore rests heavily on the late date of authorship derived from an interpretation of Dan 11. The implications that follow from this starting point are far-reaching indeed.[4]

Inspiration

For preterists the concept of inspiration is one that has no substantive meaning. John J. Collins states:

> We do not wish to prejudge the question whether the author of Daniel had genuine visionary experiences in which he "saw" these visions, or whether he composed them as literary works. There is in fact no criterion by which we can establish the author's state of mind. For our purpose, the difference between the two alternatives is not significant. In either case, the visions are imaginative constructs which arise out of the author's experience of historical events.5

Since the preterist accepts no basis for distinguishing writings that are inspired from ones that are not, the circumstances which operated to produce extra-biblical apocalyptic serve as the norm for evaluating biblical apocalyptic as well. The two groups of documents are considered fully equivalent, and the evidence gathered in this way concerning biblical apocalyptic is then used to evaluate Scripture in general. Note the following remarks by John C. Trevor:

> Once again the evidence from the Qumran documents is such that it should force concerned students of the Bible to take a new and careful look at the history of the Biblical canon. Books that deal with how the Bible came to be must be rewritten. More attention must be paid to the human decision-making process that has always been implied in the story of the Bible but now comes forcefully to light in such a way as to demand new answers to the vital question, How does God work in history? Our definitions of such phrases as "the Bible as

the inspired Word of God," or "the Bible as revealed Word," or "the prophetic Word," must be re-examined.[6]

From such a viewpoint the divine element in Scripture is minimized, to the extent it is acknowledged at all.

The Historicity of Daniel

Another matter laid under light emphasis by preterists is the historicity of Daniel as a person. Collins observes that,

> While we cannot exclude the possibility that there may have been a Jewish youth named Daniel during the exile, whose career gave rise to certain stories, no critical scholar could entertain much hope for the success of a quest for the historical Daniel.[7]

In any event the existence of such a sixth century individual would be irrelevant for dating the various literary fragments brought together under his name, since the historical prophet Daniel is not seen as having authored any part of the later book of Daniel.[8]

It is possible to speak of a "final author or redactor" for the book,[9] but beyond this there lies an entire "apocalyptic community" which shapes the writer's thought.[10] No firm concensus on the literary prehistory[11] of Daniel has yet emerged among preterists and the topic really deserves separate treatment as a study in its own right.[12]

As regards a date for the final redaction of Daniel, however, there is profound agreement. Few questions in the field of Old Testament scholarship are thought to be so solidly established as the proposed second century date for the final redaction of Daniel. Richard J. Clifford writes:

> . . . the author of Daniel, writing between 168 and 163 B.C.E., i.e. after the second campaign against Egypt of Antiochus IV and before his death in Persia, is living in the crisis period of 11:29-35, while describing events future to him (Dan 11:40-12:3).[13]

Sometimes more general estimates are given, with the book's date being placed variously at "c. 165 B.C.,"[14] "about 160 B.C.,"[15] or in "the middle of that [second] century."[16] But Lacocque is quite specific: "According to all the evidence Dan. 11 was written during the first part of 166."[17]

Historical Applications and the
Issue of Genuine Prediction

The reason why there is such widespread agreement on the date for Daniel in its final literary form has to do with the way preterists interpret its final chapters. The events of Dan 11 are associated with those of Antiochus IV Epiphanes' reign, the events of Antiochus' reign are for the most part readily datable within the mid-second century B.C., and so the events of Dan 11 are themselves assumed to be readily datable within the mid-second century B.C. Thus, Dan

11:2-39 is taken to be history rather than prophecy, and no part of the book is applied to events later than those of the second century. Note the following comments by Lacocque:

> In chapter 11 we come to the heart of the message of the angel in human guise. In an enigmatic form designed to establish the fiction of a prophecy *ante eventum*, and also perhaps to maintain a prudently esoteric manner, the angel presents the chronological unfolding of history between the fourth and second centuries BCE. In so doing, he shows that everything takes place according to a pre-established divine plan.[18]

Dan 11:40-45 is taken, as a majority view, to be genuine prediction. But this does not mean the prediction was made in an earlier age. Rather it was made during Antiochus' lifetime and had in view the time of his death.

> The fictional prophecy begun in 11:2 concludes in 11:39. The present section contains no historical information at all, but purports rather to be a genuine prediction of events to happen after this apocalypse was composed and presumably circulated among the faithful. The trouble is that nothing in these verses matches the actual course of history as it is known from other sources.[19]

The only reason why the last verses of the chapter are said to contain genuine prediction is because they do not represent genuine history; they are "absolutely imaginary."[20] History in Dan 11 ends with vs. 39 in 166 B.C.

Chapter Outline of Dan 11

All preterist commentaries consulted for the present paper offer an outline of Dan 11 compatible with the following three divisions of the text: vss. 2-20, history before Antiochus Epiphanes; vss. 21-39, history during the time of Antiochus Epiphanes; and vss. 40-45, prediction of the death of Antiochus. A summary of selected preterist commentaries appears in the table below, which shows page numbers for each writer's entire discussion of Dan 11, as well as for the points where treatment of vs. 21 and vs. 40 begin.[21]

Table 1
Selected Preterist Commentaries

Author/Date	Dan 11	Vs. 21	Vs. 40
Bentzen (1937)	45-51	49	51
Beven (1892)	170-200	186	198
Charles (1929)	272-322	297	317
Clifford (1975)	23-26	24	25
Driver (1922)	162-200	177	198
Hartman & DiLella (1978)	256-305	294	303
Lacocque (1979)	214-33	226	232
Montgomery (1927)	420-70	446	464
Porteous (1965)	155-70	165	169
Slotki (1951)	86-100	94	99
Szold (1897)	573-600	590	598

Three writers--Bentzen, Lacocque, and Szold--group the verses of the chapter in a way that appears to reduce the importance of making a break at vss. 21 and 40. Bentzen's groupings consist of vss. 2-10, 11-28, 29-45;[22] Lacocque's are vss. 1-9, 10-45;[23] and Szold's are vss. 2-4, 5-15, 16-24, 25-35, 36-45.[24] But despite this seeming novelty the comments offered on crucial verses are no different from those of other preterist interpreters, as listed above. Thus, vs. 21 introduces Antiochus Epiphanes and vs. 40 introduces a genuine attempt at prediction. Of the above commentators only Driver[25] and Slotki[26] suggest that vss. 40-45 deal with real events in the years immediately following 166 B.C.[27]

Mythical Elements

There is a strong inclination on the part of recent preterist writers to see elements of Canaanite or Syrian myth in Daniel. We may approach this topic under three headings--attempts to identify the symbolic beasts of Dan 7 with mythical creatures of pagan origin, to identify the hero of Daniel with the hero of the Ugaritic Aqhat myth, and finally to identify even the Ancient of Days and the Son of Man in Dan 7 with pagan deities.

Pagan beasts

There are four symbolic beasts in Dan 7. The first three are compared with a lion (vs. 4), a bear (vs. 5), and a leopard (vs. 6), respectively, while the fourth (in vss. 7, 19, and 23) remains nondescript. The point of origin for this series of beasts has become an object of considerable speculation.

> Among the four beasts of vii, the fourth is clearly of mythological origin, even if it can hardly be the chaos monster which has here served as pattern, as Gunkel thought, but rather the figure of Typhon belonging to northern Syria, i.e. the realm of the Seleucid power which it symbolises, or one of those monsters with which, according to the Ugaritic texts, Ba`al had to contend, strongly supported by his sister `Anat.[28]

Collins suggests that "The choice of those particular beasts probably derives from the signs of the zodiac."[29]

A pagan Daniel

John Day, writing about Ezekiel's references to Daniel,[30] defends what has come to be the normative view among critical scholars, that the Daniel mentioned by Ezekiel is not the same as the hero of the book of Daniel, but is to be identified instead with a fourteenth century hero of the Ugaritic Aqhat myth transposed by a misguided second century Jew into a sixth century Babylonian context.

> . . . it is clear that Daniel's righteousness was not only ethical but embraced what we should call piety. That this is true of the Ugaritic Daniel is indicated by the constant reference to him as *mt.rpʾi* "man of Rpʾu (El)", which one may justly compare with the expression in Hebrew *ʾîš ʾelōhîm*, "man of God".[31]

Because the Ugaritic Daniel was a pious devotee of one god he was now taken over as a model for later Jewish piety. This view might seem incredible, but those who oppose it are the ones on the defensive. It has become an accepted critical position.

Pagan gods

Day takes the above position on the offensive when he asserts that Rp'u is another name for the Ugaritic god El. This might seem inconsequential, but he then points out that Yahweh is the same as the Hebrew God El, and, on the assumption that Ugaritic El and Hebrew El are the same, implies that Ugaritic El and Yahweh are also the same. Day's claim is a significant one, whether or not it is correct, and it allows him to argue that the Daniel of Ugarit was a worshiper of Yahweh after all and in this way to set aside the obvious theological difficulty of modeling Jewish piety on the practices of a pagan worshiper of Rp'u. Day states:

> Accordingly, it may be maintained that Daniel was a pious devotee of the god El. This is significant, since the Old Testament identifies El with Yahweh, and did not have the scruples about so doing which it had with regard to Baal. It would therefore have been perfectly possible for Daniel to have been integrated into the Israelite Yahwist tradition as a pious man, just as was the case with the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, who were likewise worshippers of El, and like Daniel were granted offspring by him.[32]

There are two things wrong with Day's argument. First, El to the Hebrews was a generic term and not a proper name. Thus, in Exod 3 Moses could be confronted by a Being who identifies Himself as El and then, as the main point of the narrative, ask to be told what that Being's name was.

> Moses said to God [$hā^{ʾ}lōhîm$], "Suppose I go to the Israelites and say to them, 'the God of your fathers has sent me to you,' and they ask me, 'What is his name?' Then what shall I tell them?" (Exod 3:13, NIV)

Second, showing that two words have the same origin is not to be confused with showing that they refer to the same object. In the present case it is not at all obvious that the Ugaritic god El was the same as the Hebrew God El, even though the words used in both cases are identical. The West Saxon word God[33] is etymologically the same as our modern English word God, but to reason from this linguistic fact to a theological connection between the objects our ancestors worshiped and the loving, caring deity we call God would be to find a relationship where none exists. I submit that the same fallacy is at work in Day's very serious attempt to establish a link between the earlier El of Ugarit and the later El of Israel and Judah. The word is the same in both cases, granted, but the entities referenced by it are not.

Julius Morgenstern goes farther than Day by trying to show that the two central figures of Dan 7--the Ancient of Days and the Son of Man--originated as Baᶜal Shamem and Melcarth, respectively.

> True, the picture in th[e]se two verses differs somewhat in its essential details from the picture of the parallel scene in Tyrian religious belief and practice of Hiram's day [subsequently borrowed by Solomon], as we have reconstructed this, for there Ba`al Shamem departed at about the time of the autumnal equinox, while Melcarth appeared, to take his divine father's place as king of the world only at the vernal equinox.[34]

The problem of when the one god leaves office and the other assumes it is resolved by pointing out that Antiochus IV merged the two events, celebrating them together at the time of the winter solstice. He personally acted out the part of Melcarth in this drama "and thus acquired for himself, so he maintained, permanent divinity and with this the title *Epiphanes*, 'the god in human form.'"[35]

If I read the implications of Morgenstern's theory correctly, Dan 7 is a literary celebration of Antiochus' claims to divinity. This thought taxes my imagination, and I am sure Morgenstern would want to disagree with such a conclusion, but I wonder what consistant basis he would have for doing so. Collins holds essentially the same view as Morgenstern:

"In all, the imagery of Dan 7:9-14 is unmistakeable. It derives from a Canaanite enthronement scene in which Baal, rider of the clouds, approaches El, the whitehaired father of years who confers kingship on him."[36]

And Eissfeldt agrees:

". . . the conception of the *ancient of days*, whose *raiment was white as snow and the hair of his head like pure wool* in vii,7 can hardly have grown up within the religion of Yahweh, but was derived from elsewhere, more probably from northern Syrian mythology than from the Iranian-Babylonian religion."[37]

There is a fundamental incongruity--one which grows out of the preterist's own historical presuppositions--in saying that a document so steeped in pagan symbols, heroes, and deities could serve as a Jewish rallying cry to resist such influences during the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Daniel cannot at one and the same time be a book that comfortably draws the heart of its ideological nourishment from paganism and also be a pamphlet of resistance so urgent that each successive prediction of Antiochus' death was simply added on at the end without taking so much time as to modify what had been predicted earlier.[38] There are seeds of two radically different models here and preterists need to decide which of them they want to endorse. I emphasize that this criticism follows from assumptions that preterists themselves make about the book of Daniel.

The issues discussed above, however, go far beyond the need of an exegetical system to maintain internal consistency. I submit that any attempt to interpret the divine figures in Dan 7 as Baal and Melcarth, or El and Baal as the case may be, is an exegetical equivalent of idolatry, where by idolatry I mean displacing the true God of heaven with a pagan substitute.

If a person does not allow the book of Daniel to praise the One God wants to--referred to as the one "like a son of the gods" in chap. 3, the "one like a son of man" in chap. 7, "the Prince of the host" in chap. 8, "the Anointed One" in chap. 9, "Michael your prince" in chap. 10, "the prince of the covenant" in chap. 11, and "Michael, the great prince" in chap. 12--then he will end by praising the things Belshazzar wanted to--"the gods of gold and silver, of bronze, iron, wood and stone" (5:4). The truth of this statement has been documented above.

Other Comments

There needs to be a thoroughgoing reorientation of the scholarly community's perspectives in the study of Daniel. This document does not have pagan roots, nor does it make

false or misleading claims. For too long our collective attention has been restricted to the business of either asserting or denying such negative propositions. The time is right for a more positive approach. The one I propose is to allow the messianic implications of the book to speak openly and without embarassment on their own behalf. To see Christ in the prophecies of Daniel is to see those prophecies in a setting that buys a wealth of insight. The implications that follow from this starting point are also far-reaching, just like those of systematically ignoring Him have been shown to be.

It is one of the principal aims of *Historicism* to explore the implications of taking Daniel seriously and at face value, including what is said in that book about a Being which can only be the pre-existent Christ. Exegetically as well as spiritually, here is the stone the builders rejected.[39] He should be made the cornerstone[40]--exegetically as well as spiritually--and when this is done an ediface can be erected that demands, and rewards, our most careful attention.

---

[1]The present paper is based on Frank W. Hardy, "An Historicist Perspective on Daniel 11" (M.A. thesis, Andrews University, 1983), pp. 28-36.

[2]"On the other hand, the more theologically minded, who recognized that their interpretations of cc. 2. 7-9 were logically involved, found still in this chap. a symbolic prophecy of the conflict of the kingdoms of the World, . . ." (James A. Montgomery, in *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, The International Critical Commentary [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927], p. 470). Dan 11 is the preterist starting point in Daniel.

[3]See P. M. Casey, "Porphyry and the Origin of the Book of Daniel," *Journal of Theological Studies* 27 (1976):15-33. The argument put forward by Casey is that Porphyry did not originate the views he championed, but inherited them. If such is the case then the father of modern preterism was an unknown Christian or Jew living in Syria during a previous generation.

[4]Otto Eissfeldt (*The Old Testament: An Introduction*, translated by P. R. Ackroyd [New York: Harper & Row, 1965], p. 520) points out the importance of the book's presumed second century date, based on an interpretation of Dan 11: "The New Testament applied the book's description of the tribulations which should precede the breaking in of the kingdom of God to contemporary events or interpreted it eschatologically (Mark xiii; II Thess. ii,4). So there followed quite naturally the interpretation of the fourth empire in Daniel as referring to the empire which existed in New Testament times, namely the Roman empire. On this basis, exegesis in the Church, taking the visions to be genuine prophecies of the exilic Daniel, regarded the first empire as the Babylonian, the second as the Persian, the third as the Greek, and the fourth as the Roman, and this scheme has, as is well known, dominated the writing of history down to modern times. But when the book came to be dated between 167 and 163, this carried with it at the same time the recognition that only the proclamation of the imminent coming of the end-time was genuine prophecy. Otherwise the book provides *vaticinium ex eventu* and the description of the distress preceding the end refers to the violent activity of Antiochus IV, and so the historical outlook does not extend beyond the Seleucid period and the interpretation of the fourth kingdom as applying to the Romans was no longer valid. The fourth and last empire must refer to the Greeks, and this meant that since in ii,38 the reference of the first empire was clearly to the Babylonians, the second and third had to be referred to the Medes and Persians. This became the normal interpretation of the four empires in scholarly circles. Admittedly the older interpretation in the Church did not entirely die out even in critical circles in so far as Lagarde and Hertlein still applied the fourth empire to the Romans, and since they did not believe in a genuine prophecy here, found it necessary to date i-vii, or parts of it, towards the end of the first century A.D."

[5]*The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel*, Harvard Semitic Monographs, no. 16 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), p. 95.

[6]John C. Trever, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Personal Account*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), p. 173.

[7]*Apocalyptic Vision*, p. 1.

[8]Some of the fragments contained in it, however, are thought by critical scholars to be early--some even dating from the fifth century (see A. Mertens, *Das Buch Daniel im Lichte der Texte vom Toten Meer* [Stuttgart, 1971], p. 39), or the sixth (ibid., p. 15). See also Eissfeldt, *Introduction*, pp. 524-25.

[9]Ziony Zevit, "The Exegetical Implications of Daniel VIII 1, IX 21," *Vetus Testamentum* 28 (1978):489.

[10]Roger Alan Hall, "Post-Exilic Theological Streams and the Book of Daniel" (Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1974), p. 226. Insight is attainable into "both the experience and the psychology of the apocalyptic group" (ibid.).

[11]There is also a post-history and a para-history. The post-history revolves around a series of later additions to the book which are not included in canonical Daniel. These are the Prayer of Azariah and the Hymn of the Three Young Men, Susanna, Bel and the Snake (Bel and the Dragon), and--in the Syriac only--a number of interpretive words and phrases inserted at various points in Dan 11 that indicate an application to events in the second century B.C. For further discussion of the first three additions see Carey A. Moore, *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah: The Additions*, The Anchor Bible (Garden City: Doubleday, 1977), pp. 23-149; for the Syriac additions to Dan 11 see *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version*, Part III, fascicle 4: Dodekapropheton -- Daniel-Bel-Draco (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1980), pp. xviii-xix.

The para-history consists of an apocalyptic Daniel cycle largely independent of the canonical book. This cycle includes the Prayer of Nabonidus and 4QpsDan. For the Prayer of Nabonidus see Mertens, *Das Buch Daniel*, pp. 34-42; for 4QpsDan, see ibid., pp. 42-50. A distant cousin of this body of text is the Qumran War Scroll: "The primitive work, represented in the present composition by columns i and xv-xix, draws its inspiration from Daniel xi,40-xii,3, and describes the final battle against the Kittim. This account was later combined with the concept of a holy forty years' war against the entire Gentile world, and was extended by the addition of a long series of Rules concerned with the military and religious preparation and with the conduct of the fighting (cols. ii-xiv)" (G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 2nd ed. [Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1975], pp. 122-123).

Only the prehistory of the text is linked to the preterist model. What I have here called the book's textual "post-history" and "para-history" are not directly associated with any one theoretical viewpoint.

[12]For general discussion of the prehistory of Daniel see Eissfeldt, *Introduction*, pp. 522-28; H. L. Ginsberg, "The Composition of the Book of Daniel," *Vetus Testamentum* 4 (1954):246-75; John J. Collins, "The Court-Tales in Daniel and the Development of Apocalyptic," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94 (1975):218-34; idem, *Apocalyptic Vision*, pp. 7-21; John G. Gammie, "The Classification, Stages of Growth, and Changing Intentions in the Book of Daniel," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 95 (1976):191-204; J. Coppens, "Le livre de Daniel et ses problemes," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 56 (1980):1-9. Against positing a deep literary prehistory is H. H. Rowley, "The Unity of the Book of Daniel," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 23 (1950-51):233-73; idem, "The Composition of the Book of Daniel: Some Comments on Professor Ginsberg's Article," *Vetus Testamentum* 5 (1955):272-76. The exchange between Ginsberg and Rowley was unusually heated and bitter.

We now turn to individual chapters. For discussion of Dan 2 see David Flusser, "The Four Empires in the Fourth Sibyl and in the Book of Daniel," *Israel Oriental Studies* 2 (1972):148-75. On Dan 7 see M. Delcor, "Les sources du chapitre VII de Daniel," *Vetus Testamentum* 18 (1968):290-312. On Dan 9 see Carey A. Moore, "Toward the Dating of the Book of Baruch," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 36 (1974):312-20; Emanuel Tov, "The Relation between the Greek Versions of Baruch and Daniel," in *Armenian and Biblical Studies*, ed. E. Stone

(Jerusalem: St. James Press, 1976), pp. 27-34. On Dan 11 see John J. Collins, "The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and the Qumran War Scroll: A Point of Transition in Jewish Apocalyptic," *Vetus Testamentum* 25 (1975):596-612.

[13]"History and Myth in Daniel 10-12," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental research*, no. 220 (1975):23. See also André Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel*, trans. David Pellauer (Atlanta: John Knox, 1979), p. 214.

[14]G. R. Driver, *The Judaean Scrolls* (New York: Schocken, 1965), p. 447.

[15]G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 2nd ed. (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1975), p. 123.

[16]Stephen A. Kaufman, "The Job Targum from Qumran," *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 93 (1973):327; cited in Gerhard F. Hasel, "The Book of Daniel and Matters of Language: Evidences Relating to Names, Words, and the Aramaic Language," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 19 (1981):211-25.

[17]Lacocque, *Daniel*, p. 232. See also W. Baumgartner, "Neues keilschriftliches Material zum Buch Daniel?" *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 44 (1926):38, where it is stated that "On few questions is Old Testament scholarship so united as with regard to the time of composition [Abfassungszeit] for the book of Daniel, whose placement in the Maccabaean age during the course of the nineteenth century has been adopted more and more and today enjoys an almost general recognition."

[18]Lacocque, p. 214.

[19]Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. DiLella, *The Book of Daniel*, Anchor Bible (Garden City: Doubleday, 1978), p. 303. See also James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, International Critical Commentary (New York: Scribners, 1927), p. 465; Lacocque, p. 232.

[20]Montgomery, p. 465.

[21]Bibliographical information for the commentaries listed is as follows: Aage Bentzen, *Daniel*, Handbuch zum Alten Testament, no. 19 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1937); A. A. Beven, *A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel for the Use of Students* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1892); R. H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929); A. Cohen, gen. ed., *Soncino Books of the Bible*, 14 vols (London: Soncino Press, 1951), vol. 13: *Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah*, edited by Judah J. Slotki; S. R. Driver, *The Book of Daniel*, The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922); Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. DiLella, *The Book of Daniel*, The Anchor Bible, vol. 23 (Garden City: Doubleday, 1978); André Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel*, translated by David Pellauer (Atlanta: John Knox, 1979); James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, The International Critical Commentary (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927); Norman W. Porteous, *Daniel: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965); Benjamin Szold, "The Eleventh Chapter of the Book of Daniel", in *Semitic Studies in Memory of Rev. Dr. Alexander Kohut*, ed. George Alexander Kohut (Berlin, 1897; reprint ed. Jerusalem, תשל״ב [1972]). For an extensive bibliography of commentaries and other literature on Daniel up through 1965, including a small number of futurist works, see Eissfeldt, *Introduction*, p. 512.

[22]Bentzen, pp. 46, 48, and 50, respectively.

[23]Lacocque, pp. 214, and 218, respectively.

[24]Szold, pp. 580, 583, 588, 592, and 596, respectively.

[25]S. R. Driver, *Daniel*, pp. 296-98.

[26]Slotki, p. 99.

[27]A view held by only a minority of preterist scholars. For discussion see A. A. Bevan, *A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel for the Use of Students* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1892), p. 298; Hartman and DiLella, *Daniel*, p. 303.

[28]Eissfeldt, *Introduction*, p. 524.

[29]"Mythology of Holy War," p. 601.

[30]For an opposing view see Hardy, "The Daniel of Ezek 14:14, 20 and 28:3," in this issue of *Historicism*.

[31]"The Daniel of Ugarit and Ezekiel and the Hero of the Book of Daniel," *Vetus Testamentum* 30, 2 (1980):176.

[32]Day, "Daniel of Ugarit," pp. 177-78.

[33]Gothic and Old Norse *guþ/Gup*, East Franconian and Bavarian *got*. See E. Prokosch, *A Comparative Germanic Grammar*, William Dwight Whitney Linguistic Series (Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America, 1939), p. 298.

[34]"The 'Son of Man' of Daniel 7 13 f.: A New Interpretation," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 80, 1 (1961):73-74.

[35]Ibid., p. 74.

[36]*The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel*, Harvard Semitic Monographs, no. 16 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), p. 101. Three years earlier Collins had identified the Son of Man in Dan 7 with Michael in Dan 10 and 12, which I think is closer to the truth: "Accordingly it seems most likely that the figure of the one like the son of man represents the archangel, Michael, who receives the kingdom on behalf of his host of holy ones, but also on behalf of his people Israel" ("The Son of Man and the Saints of the Most High in the Book of Daniel," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 93, 1 [1974]:64).

[37]Eissfeldt states that, "In both halves of his book, the compiler is assuring both himself and his contemporaries of consolation and strength in the bitter struggle of faith" (p. 527). And again: "The author's purpose in compiling the book was to encourage his compatriots in their terrible sufferings under the tyranny of Antiochus, so that they would remain faithful to their religion" (*Introduction*, p. 528).

[38]Hall ("Theological Streams," pp. 226, 231) writes: "I have already stated the unlikelihood that the vision reports were all written at the same time, in view of the variations from one another and the several interpolated passages. The strongest evidence that they were written on different occasions, however, is probably the presence of the differing indications of the length of time anticipated before the events of the end--3 1/2 years in 7:25, 9:27 and 12:7; 1150 days in 8:14; 1290 days in 12:11; and 1335 days in 12:12. . . . A handbook would be absolutely invaluable when the precise fulfillment of the eschatological expectations had several times failed to occur, and inner as well as outer voices began to suggest that perhaps the expectations had been a delusion after all."

[39]Psa 118:22; Luke 20:17.

[40]Luke 20:17 (margin); the NIV of Psa 118:22 and Luke 20:17 reads "capstone."