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Abstract

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN DANIEL RESEARCH

By Erwin J. Joham

This thesis analyzes and evaluates significant directions in Daniel research during the past fifteen to twenty years. The material is organized in two categories (a) introductory, (b) exegetical, which form the two main parts of the thesis.

In the first chapter on introductory material I review studies dealing with provenance, authorship, text, and literary style and form of the Book of Daniel. The second chapter examines the interpretations of specific portions of the Book, particularly chapter seven.

The general finding of this study shows a more cautious use of extra-Biblical sources for Daniel, and a growing emphasis upon the Biblical, particularly the prophetic connections.

The main contribution should lie in the presentation of the general direction taken by the numerous and complex Daniel research of the recent years.
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PREFACE

We live in an apocalyptic age. From the background of optimistic rationalism via utopian romanticism in the past century to a defeatist, pessimistic mood of nihilism and cynicism we have today arrived at a time of hazy apocalyptic expectations. This is evidenced in society at large by apocalyptic preoccupation in literature and films, and in theological circles by a tremendous revival of apocalyptic studies. Within these theological, apocalyptic studies, Daniel plays a key role, because it is considered the oldest known, complete Jewish apocalyptic book. The wealth of recent articles, dissertations and monographs on Daniel invites a close investigation and an attempt to tie them together in a thesis in order to make them more systematically accessible to the exegete behind pulpit or desk.

Thus the question of why to write a thesis on Daniel seemed to be answered from the preoccupation with the apocalyptic studies in general and Daniel research in particular and the need to tie these studies of the last years together. What limitations do I need to set for this survey? How much of the literature of Daniel in the last decade and a half do I include in the survey? Should I include all the literature as published by denominational presses in professional journals, evangelistic and missionary literature, and devotional readings on the topic, or should I limit myself to the academic, scholarly discussion on the subject? I decided upon the latter for two main reasons. First, it is a Master's thesis which is an academic
undertaking rather than devotional or evangelistic. And secondly, the
general unfamiliarity of the evangelical, fundamentalist exegete with
the scholarly "communis opinio" in the field of Daniel studies also
encouraged this limitation.

When we engage in Bible studies, we have to recognize that
none of us is free from theological biases and presuppositions from
which we start in our attempts to get a hold of the message of a
particular book for our day. Some come to Daniel studies with the
theological presupposition that no prophecies concerning concrete,
detailed future events are contained in Scriptures. Others come with
the presupposition that God knows all future events in advance, and
has chosen to predict some of these events in detail before they
happen, through apocalyptic symbolism, for instance.

Our tendency is to stay close to those interpretations that
resemble or reflect our own theological biases. Thus, theological
camps are built and we sometimes label them "liberal" and "conserva-
tive." In our exegetical activities we usually stay pretty well within
these camps. Perhaps in no other field is this exclusiveness as
flagrant as in the studies of Daniel and the Revelation of John. Here
the lines between "liberals" and "conservatives" are drawn very sharply.
The discussions of "liberal" scholarship are carried out in academically
oriented journals and monographs and published by scholarly, usually
non-denominational and university presses. The research and dis-
cussions of the "conservative" schools are carried out in a more
fragmented forum. Their books usually come from denominational
presses and their articles appear in professional journals, with little awareness of or reference to the rest of the scholarly community.

This thesis is designed to pull Daniel studies of the past decade and a half together in a systematic treatise and to make the studies more readily accessible, in the form of an overview. Furthermore, this thesis is thought to inform those of us from "conservative" circles of where our "liberal" colleagues in this field stand. It will help us see how other Christians read and interpret this important canonical book and what value they see in it for our day. Also, it will help bring into focus some of our own problems in Daniel studies and hopefully give us additional insights on the meaning of Daniel for our generation.
INTRODUCTION

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN DANIEL RESEARCH

The purpose of this present thesis is to investigate the development of Daniel research in the past decade and a half. A variety of aspects of Daniel material have been subjected to scientific investigation within this period of time. Most of the studies have appeared in scholarly journals and monographs.

By way of setting the stage, I would like first to go back a century and sketch the development of the research up to the mid-sixties in broad outline. This plunges us right into the middle of the great discussions of the unity of Daniel and the date of its authorship. The idea of multiple authorship of the book, though not new, had gained great attention around the turn of the century.¹ A variety of possible solutions were explored and proposed. In the nineteenth century the concept of a single author of the book was still generally held, though the rise of form-critical scholarship had already begun to make an impact. As many as nine different authors had already been suggested. By the turn of the century the single authorship view was still more popular, but it was being challenged more noticeably and with wider impact. Meinhold's thesis gained great attention. In 1888 he suggested that of the Aramaic

portion of Daniel the major part (chaps. 2-6) was composed about 300 B.C. with chapter seven as a later but still pre-Maccabean appendix, while the rest of the book was written in Hebrew during Maccabean times. This proposal gained wide-spread attention and at the same time aroused controversy.¹

The unity of the book was once again proposed by von Gall (1895) and Cornill (1905), but this had no lasting effect on the emerging prevalent opinion of multiple authorship that ultimately gained the majority of adherents and is in our days almost unanimously accepted by liberal scholars. The last major defense of the unity of the book was made by H. H. Rowley² who wanted to see it in its entirety as the product of one author who lived in Maccabean times. This article sparked a vigorous controversy and debate all through the fifties between Professors Rowley and Ginsberg.³

In our days there are very few voices recorded in scholarly circles that see Daniel as authentic, in the traditional sense of a sixth century authorship by Daniel in Babylon. Those who hold this kind of view are restricted to evangelical, fundamentalist circles.

²Ibid.
Scholars of these circles find little entrance into general theological debate concerning this book as pointed out in the preface.

In the late fifties and sixties much emphasis has been put on trying to identify the particular background and prototypes of various details of the Daniel material. This background has been sought mostly in foreign parallels, such as Persian, Greek, and others. Origins have been sought as far away as Ugaritic material. Thus we come into our period of concern from an era that focused on details in Daniel in light of a Maccabean contemporary milieu.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY MATERIAL ON DANIEL

The purpose of this chapter is to review and assess those studies dealing with questions usually treated in introductions of commentaries on Daniel. These questions have to do with issues of origin, authorship, background and occasion for its composition, and the literary style.

DANIEL AND THE ORIGIN OF APOCALYPTIC

Daniel is very closely related to apocalyptic studies. It is generally accepted that Daniel is the oldest known apocalyptic book. Therefore it is fundamentally tied in with the question of the origin of apocalypticism.\(^1\)

First, we will need to take an overview of where apocalyptic studies have come from and where they seem to be heading, in order for us to understand the importance and role of Daniel in this vast field of apocalyptics.

In recent decades a renewed interest in apocalyptic studies is shown by the publication of several important works on the subject.\(^2\)

---

\(^1\) Apocalyptic and apocalypticism are used here as referring to a particular mode of literature and thinking, especially in Judaism, whose clearly distinguishable beginnings are usually dated around 200 B.C.

Formerly the trend was to attempt to find extra-Israelite sources for the matrix of Jewish apocalypticism and to view it, in general, as a decadent form of literature compared to the higher, more sophisticated prophetic literature of the Old Testament.¹

Now the trend has shifted.² Already Gerhard von Rad,³ following Gustav Hoelscher⁴ saw apocalyptic as coming from the Old Testament itself. He tied it in with Hokma (wisdom), and the Old Testament wisdom literature. Recently, Paul Hanson in his fairly well received book The Dawn of Apocalyptic,⁵ attempts to prove through a thorough analysis of the Old Testament prophetic texts that


¹Examples of scholars who have seen apocalyptic as a decadent form of prophetic literature: M. Buber, Kampf um Israel (Berlin: 1933); H. Ringgren, Juedische Apokalyptik (1957).


apocalypticism has its matrix indeed in Israelite exilic and post-exilic prophecy\(^1\) and that it constitutes its legitimate successor.

The idea of a dynamic relationship between Old Testament prophetic literature and Jewish apocalyptic is widely acknowledged today and foreign influences\(^2\) are recognized as peripheral or secondary.\(^3\)

Consequently, within our period of concern most articles are dealing with the "how" of this development. In other words, what steps can we discover in this development from Old Testament prophecy to Jewish apocalyptic? Who introduced this new form of literature and for what purpose? Those are some of the issues dealt with in apocalyptic studies in our period of concern.

Now we want to turn to some articles that deal specifically with this "how" of the rise of apocalypticism and its connection specifically with Daniel.

---

\(^1\) See also his article "Jewish Apocalyptic Against Its Near Eastern Environment," RB 78 (1971): 31-58, where he states that Near Eastern influences such as Persian Dualism are secondary in their impact on Jewish apocalyptic.

\(^2\) Eva Osswald is one of the last to attribute strong extra-Biblical connections to the origin of apocalypticism, but she also saw its primary roots in "altisraelitischen Vorformen;" see "Zum Problem der Vaticina ex Eventu," ZAW 75 (1965: 27-44.) Lambert also draws attention to extra-Biblical materials and models, but concludes with this: "I am not wishing to detract from the importance of the finished work. Its author was in line of decent from the Hebrew prophets." Lambert, The Background of Jewish Apocalyptic (London: 1978): 16f.

\(^3\) So much so that Willi-Plein in "Das Geheimnis der Apokalyptik," VT 27 (1977), categorically talks about the "eindeutig entschiedene Kontroverse ueber den Ursprung der Apokalyptik," after referring to P. von der Osten-Sacken's work of correcting and refining G. von Rad's thesis. (p. 3)
Schmid differentiates between "imperialistic" and "priestly" apocalyptic. The imperialistic apocalyptic was developed by Jews in the diaspora, modeled after similar forms of literature among their neighbors. In the Golah in Babylon the Jews had certain traditions and legends which they guarded and handed down in apocalyptic form. "Priestly" apocalyptic was practiced back home in Jerusalem, and, though the method was the same, it had a different content and intent. These two forms of apocalyptic intent and expression meet in the book of Daniel. They were fused by a charismatic leader, the head of the apocalyptic circle in Jerusalem at the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, with the intention of tying together under his leadership all factions that cherished apocalyptic traditions.

Lebram agrees with the basic distinction of "priestly" and "imperialistic" apocalyptic. He finds the origin of the apocalyptic in non-Jewish, possibly Babylonian groups. When the priests in smaller sanctuaries like Jerusalem got into hard political situations, they applied the method of their famous brothers, pagan apocalyp ticists.


2Which happened in "Anschluss" (in line) with pagan apocalyptic, though under Old Testament conditioning. The pagan influence is seen in particular in the four empire schema of Daniel 2 and reflects Umweltapokalyptik.


4Ibid., p. 524. For English translation see p. 64f.

This idea that the apocalyptic method came into the Jewish community through Jews returning to Palestine who had made the acquaintance with that form of literature in the diaspora, is becoming very widely accepted. Says J. J. Collins,¹

The hypothesis that a group of Jews returned from the diaspora had something to do with the origins of apocalyptic, is neither implausible nor novel. The reason for the widespread acceptance of this hypothesis is that it is able to account for both the foreign and the Biblical prototypes in the form as well as in the content of apocalyptic. Moreover, it is this theory that will serve as a springboard for a relative unity of Daniel that is being proposed today by some.

THE UNITY OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL

This section will deal with the questions of date, authorship and intentions of the book of Daniel and relate these to its unity.

By the early 1960's general agreement concerning the date of Daniel in Maccabean times had emerged.² This still holds true today, though the idea of the unity of the book has been reformulated by way of more or less complicated reaction theories.


Daniel. He places chapters 4, 5, 6, 10 and 12 into the time of Alexander the Great\(^1\) and then after Alexander he adds the eschatological parts, chapters 2 and 8 and into Maccabean times he puts only the final touches, namely chapters 1, 3, 11 and certain verses of chapters 7 and 8. Chapter nine deserves a separate treatment, according to Jepsen.

Others have proposed similar redactionist theories.\(^2\) The major problem with most of them is, as J. J. Collins points out so aptly,\(^3\) their highly subjective nature. Collins puts it this way, "Scholarly ingenuity has 'resolved' the issue with a bewildering variety of contradictory solutions." Besides their highly subjective nature, other problems with these redaction analyses are, insufficient notice of the close relationship of the court-tales to the rest of Daniel and little notice of the bilingual problem. These problems will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter.

Thus, though the plea for a unity of Daniel in the traditional sense of the term, has been abandoned, we detect a trend towards

---

\(^1\)These chapters have as their common central theme the confession of the one God of heaven and the preservation of his faithful ones even in extreme times of anxiety.


The classical defense of the unity of Daniel was given by H. H. Rowley in the fifties and reprinted in 1964.¹ There he puts the onus of proof on those who would want to dissect Daniel and he denies any valid reason for doing so. For Rowley the whole book of Daniel was written by one single author, though in different stages and all of it in Maccabean times.²

Noteworthy, though the attempt may have been, it was not very successful in gathering a great following. In 1969 Harold Sahlin wrote:³

Das Danielbuch hat anerkannterweise seine endugueltige Form zur Zeit Antiochus IV Epiphanes erhalten...(though)...die rein literarische Genesis des Danielbuches ist dunkel und umstritten.

Sahlin takes as a springboard for his understanding of Daniel's literary and religionsgeschichtliche significance, the eleventh chapter of the book.⁴ Thus the intention as well as the Sitz im Legen of Daniel Sahlin explains from chapter eleven. Its present unity is only attributable to its final editor.

Jepsen also only sees its unity as a final editorial unity⁵ and supposes a fairly complicated redaction historical development of

²Ibid., p. 249.
⁴Ibid.
⁵Jepsen, p. 386.
theories which propound a "limited" or "relative" unity of the book of Daniel that goes beyond a mere editorial unity. Thus Ploeger, when he pleads,

Nur so viel sei hier bemerkt, dass zum Verständnis dieses Buches die heute vorliegende Form stärker berücksichtigt werden sollte, als es allgemein geschah, auch wenn man nicht in dem Masse von einer literarischen Einheit des Buches Daniel überzeugt ist, wie sie etwa Rowley vertritt. 1

So for instance, the works of J. J. Collins, 2 Herbert Schmid, 3 and Harold Sahlin, 4 all emphasize this kind of limited unity.

The major contribution among these is the work of J. J. Collins, who claims that the theory of the unity of the book of Daniel, as championed by H. H. Rowley, can be more adequately explained if one accepts his (Collins) hypothesis.

He starts out with Tcherikover's and Hengel's thesis 5 that the Maskilim, the wise men, of Daniel are to be identified with the Chassidim of the Ben Sira type. The greatest problem with the thesis of Tcherikover, according to Collins, is that it fails, along with Hengel's and Gerhard von Rad's before him, to differentiate between

---


proverbial wisdom of the Chassidim of the Ben Sira type, and the mantic wisdom which is associated with Joseph, Daniel and the like.

Mantic wisdom...especially if it is considered to include the interpretation of Scripture, is a phenomenon of basic importance for the apocalyptic. Mantic wisdom, however, especially when considered with political oracles, is closer to prophecy than to proverbial wisdom.2

Since Collins considers Tcherikover's thesis "very dubious"3 and at the same time sees a wisdom background for the Maskilim of Daniel, he has to ask the question, "Where might we find in Palestine at the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes a group of wise men whose wisdom was mantic rather than scribal?"4 and he answers this with the hypothesis that they were the descendants of the same group of wise men, who in the diaspora wrote the court-tales.5 These descendants migrated to Palestine in the second century B.C.6 and under the changing political climate of the persecution of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, they combined their court-tales with their apocalyptic vision of victory over the Syrians. They not only combined the two, but actually made the older

1 Mantic wisdom is characterized by the interpretation of dreams, signs, and omens.


3 Ibid.

4 Ibid.

5 Ibid., p. 220. He has argued on that page, convincingly I thought, that the court-tales have their Sitz im Leben in the diaspora at some court, rather than in Jerusalem.

6 For support of such migrations he refers to among others, S. Iwry, "Was There a Migration to Damascus?" in W. F. Albright Volume
court-tales the basis for these visions. The influence of the chapters 1-6 is very evident in the rest of the book.\(^1\) They are not merely juxtaposed but masterfully connected with each other by means of "two editorial devices"\(^2\) namely its symmetrical arrangement and its use of both languages in both halves of the book.\(^3\)

Herbert Schmid takes the thesis of Collins one step further and starts out with the identification of Daniel.\(^4\) He ties Daniel in with the Daniel of Ezra and Nehemiah's time,\(^5\) who was in the priestly line. According to him, the hero of the book of Daniel was a priest by that name in the 4th century B.C.\(^6\) The Maccabean author-editor took the name of this Daniel for himself. This author was from the priestly circle in Jerusalem which was made up of individuals recently returned from the Golah and vitally interested in the political occurrences of their day. This man writing under the pseudonym of Daniel,


1. e.g. The schema of the four kingdoms in both halves.
   The detailed interpretation of dreams and visions in both parts.
   The Maskilim appear in both parts.
   The symmetrical arrangement.


3. For details see below.


5. For further detail and critique, see chapter on THE QUEST FOR THE HISTORICAL DANIEL, p. 23.

wanted to tie those groups that cherished the old Daniel traditions, the keepers of the court-tales, to himself and to his cause. So he integrated their legends into his apocalyptic work.\(^1\) When he died, before he could accomplish his goal, others of his group added some glosses to his words and he became the figure of the 'one in human likeness.' We will come back to this in greater detail later.

Sahlin sees the intent of the book in a similar fashion,\(^2\) except according to him the redactor-visionary was not trying to bind the factions together under his own leadership; rather he wanted to portray a realistic picture of history during the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. In his apocalyptic vision he saw the victory of the Maccabean revolt and he wanted to support it by painting the apocalyptic picture of Judas Maccabee and his struggle for freedom from the oppression of the Syrians.

So the interest of the book and its intent, according to Harold Sahlin was to establish Judas Maccabee as the one sent from God firmly in the minds of his contemporaries. Thus without ever mentioning his name, he wanted to make it plausible to his readers that Judas was indeed the Messiah.\(^3\)

In summary one can say that as a reaction to the strong plea for the unity of the book of Daniel by Rowley in the fifties we see a

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 219.
\(^2\)Sahlin, p. 41.
\(^3\)For details see below, p. 48-50.
The Aramaic Problem

Kitchen thinks it is time to re-examine some of the facts and earlier conclusions in light of new studies and finds. The distinction between Eastern and Western Aramaic, for instance, that scholars used to make, has to be given up today, because it is recognized that such a distinction arose out of a failure to understand the phonetic and orthographic changes that took place in the Aramaic language. The phonetic changes had already taken place by the end of the fifth century B.C. and the orthographic changes lagged behind by several centuries. Today we can speak of a difference between a late Aramaic as opposed to a Reichsaramaeisch, ("official" or "imperial" Aramaic), which is undateable with any precision between the sixth and fourth century B.C., according to Kitchen.

in the Book of Daniel (London: 1965), p. 32 is applicable here; "In dealing with the book of Daniel, theological presuppositions are apt to colour even the treatment and dating of its Aramaic." Could it be Driver's conclusions have not been challenged more, because they fit the basic tenet of modern liberal scholarship so well, namely a Maccabean authorship of the book of Daniel?

1 Kitchen, p. 31.
2 Ibid., p. 65, 75.
3 See also Fitzmyer, "The Genesis Apocryphon: A Commentary," Biblica et Orientalia (1971): 20 and also his paper "Aramaic Epistleography," JBL 93 (1974): 203: "Official or Imperial Aramaic, dating roughly from 700 to 200 B.C." It seems to me, the major reason for Fitzmyer to extend the Official Aramaic to 200 B.C. is in order to accommodate a Maccabean Daniel. In this case it becomes circular reasoning to use the Aramaic of Daniel as an indication of its age.
rise of studies stressing the different parts of Daniel and a bloom of redaction theories. But finally by the late sixties the concern once more shifts to the unity of the book. This time, though the proposed unity goes beyond mere editorial unity, it is none-the-less no longer the traditional, one-author-unity of earlier days. This may be viewed as a welcome trend, though in my opinion it does not go far enough. It is positive because it lays more emphasis on the finished product and with this emphasis comes also a renewed emphasis on the authority of the book for the church in our days.

THE PROBLEM OF THE TWO LANGUAGES

The phenomenon of the use of two separate languages in the book of Daniel has been as perplexing and challenging to scholars as it has been an occasion for the rise of new ideas and theories.

Many studies mention the bilingual problem or deal with it in one way or another, but not very much has been written on the languages themselves in recent literature. Basically, the old conclusions of the classic study on Daniel's Aramaic, written by Driver over 50 years ago, still stand today and have received little challenge or re-evaluation.

1Daniel 2:4 to chapter 7 (inclusively) is written in Aramaic, the rest of the book is written in Hebrew.


3This leads one to wonder if Kitchen's statement in "The Aramaic of Daniel," in D.J. Wiseman et al. Notes on Some Problems
Daniel was written in Reichsaramaeisch and agrees in style and syntax very well with inscriptions of the eighth to fourth century B.C.¹ On the other hand, there is a significant difference between the Aramaic of Daniel and some of the Aramaic manuscripts of the Qumran library, stemming from the first and second century B.C.² which is supposedly the time of the final edition, or even authorship, of Daniel.

A Maccabean author would be expected to reflect an Aramaic much closer to that of the other documents of the Maccabean times and one much further removed from the older documents of the Reichsaramaeisch.

On the matter of the Persian loan-words found embedded in the Aramaic portion of Daniel, Kitchen notes that they are all old-Persian and not late or middle Persian as would again be expected in the case of a late Maccabean author.³ This again would seem to support an earlier date for Daniel.

¹Here Kitchen refers to several documents including the Genesis Apocryphon and the Targum of Job.

²Kitchen cites among others, the Assur Ostracon and fifth century papyri from Egypt.

³Gammie in his article, "The Classification, Stages of Growth, and Changing Intentions in the Book of Daniel," JBL 95 (1976): 99 explains the Persian words differently: "The several Persian loanwords of the work may be explained on the basis of the author's deliberate attempt to give the setting in Babylonian Exile a verisimilitude." However, we note that if Kitchen's observation is right, and the words are indeed from Old-Persian, then it seems highly improbable to me that a Jew in Palestine in the second century B.C. would have been able to reflect this nuance in a "make-up" job of a Babylonian milieu of the sixth century which he was trying to create.
Another reason for the late dating of the Aramaic of Daniel, are the Greek words used in it. On this Kitchen comments,

The idea that Greek words and influence could not affect the Near East and appear in Aramaic before Alexander the Great must be given up.¹

The reasons for this demand are: (1) only three such words are found in the Aramaic text of Daniel, (2) good archeological evidence exists for Greek trade in the Orient well before the Maccabean time. Such evidence goes back in the Orient as far as the eighth century B.C., (3) "Greek mercenaries are attested in the Orient from the late seventh century on," and (4) Greek artisans "were apparently employed in the Babylon of Nebuchadnezzar."²

Later another article came out dealing with the prosthetic aleph in connection with the verb istiw.³ It used to be taken as a sign of a late Aramaic, but this has been revised now, according to the article of P. W. Coxen.⁴ He compares the prosthetic aleph in Aramaic of Daniel to inscriptions in Parthian and Middle Persian which also carry this same prosthetic aleph in connection with the verb istiw and he draws the conclusion that this indicates further

---


²Ibid., pp. 44-49.

³="they drank."

that Daniel's Aramaic is Reichsaramaeisch, the prosthetic aleph indicating its Eastern origin.

The Hebrew Problem

The Hebrew question by itself would not be so difficult. It really only gains its perplexing nature when seen together with the Aramaic problem.

The Hebrew of Daniel is of poor quality which has led Collins to the observation that it suggests "the author may have been more comfortable with Aramaic."¹ As early as 1919 it was suggested that this poor quality of Hebrew would seem to indicate that it was a translation from an earlier Aramaic Daniel.² In more recent times this same argument was made by Ginsberg³ and subsequently refuted by J. J. Collins who lists as reasons the fact that Ginsberg has to use too "radical textual surgery" and the finds of Qumran which have included fragments of both portions in the languages as we have them now.⁴

Martin has asserted that the Hebrew of Daniel could be dated

⁴Collins, p. 16f.
anywhere from the sixth century on.\(^1\) "There is no intrinsic proba-
bility that any words used in Daniel could not have been used much
earlier" than the Maccabean age.\(^2\) In order for anyone to prove a
late date for Daniel's Hebrew, one would have to prove that any word
or words, in Daniel could not have been used prior to the second
century B.C., a task that is rather impossible to perform, according
to Martin.

The Bilingual Problem

What elevates the use of two languages from the state of a
mere phenomenon to a real problem is the fact that Daniel chapter one,
by its content close to chapters 2-6, is none-the-less written in
Hebrew, while chapter seven, which is closer in content to the Hebrew
chapters 8-12, is in Aramaic. Collins observes that "scholarly
ingenuity has 'resolved' this problem in a bewildering variety of
contradictory solutions."\(^3\) Hammer echoes the same feeling,\(^4\) "The
fact that so many different suggestions have been made ... is itself
an indication of the uncertainty attached to any theory."

Some, as already noted above,\(^5\) have suggested the whole

---

1W. J. Martin, "The Hebrew of Daniel," in D. J. Wiseman
28-30.

2Martin, p. 30.


5cf. footnote 2, p. 19.
document was originally written in Aramaic. Porteous, in following Rowley's footsteps, suggests the author issued the court-tales anonymously in Aramaic to encourage the masses of people, but when he went to the eschatological visions, he intended them for a somewhat different audience and therefore wrote them in Hebrew. Others have seen chapters 2-7 as a distinct corpus of writing, which was later combined with the eschatological visions.

Gammie explains it by saying that some of chapter seven, namely most of vs. 1-18, was already written along with chapters 2-6 and formed a distinct corpus of writings. Later when certain interpolations had to be made, they were naturally made in the language of the original document, even though the other parts of Daniel were at the same time written in Hebrew. Mertens sees the change in the language as an indication of its age, which he says is no more than 200 years older than the Qumran texts.

Collins does not see chapter seven as part of the complex of court-tales, rather it was written in Aramaic as a very clever and

effective stylistic device of the author to tie together his visions with some Aramaic tales.¹

The author preferred to write in Hebrew, but he used the tales in their original Aramaic and in order to tie them closely to his work, he "interlocked" them by use of Aramaic in chapter seven and Hebrew in chapter one, and further by a symmetrical arrangement of chapters 2-6.² And he sums up his conclusion in this way:

Our main conclusion, then, on the unity of Daniel is that the book is made up of a collection of traditional court-tales and a group of apocalyptic visions which were composed at the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. These two blocks of materials are combined by the process of interlocking which we have described."³

In our period of concern, philological studies have not, or only very carefully been used to support the dating of the book. The studies that have been done have brought to light some limitations of philological considerations in dating Daniel. Though a number of these recent philological studies have leaned toward supporting an earlier date for the book, it does not appear that this would turn into a trend or otherwise make a significant dent in the question of dating Daniel.

As far as the bilingual problem of Daniel is concerned, no consensus has been reached either. The weight of studies seems to favour a solution that is reached from stylistic and literary

¹Collins, "The Court-Tales," p. 218-34.
³Ibid., p. 19.
The Historical Daniel at the Time of the Exile

Conservative scholars\(^1\) have consistently held the view that Daniel the author of the book is the historical Daniel at the time of the exile. This was the virtually unanimous understanding of the problem of authenticity of Daniel until the rise of the religio-historical approach.\(^2\) However, most scholars in our period of concern do not take this view. Sahlin calls the identity of the historical Daniel "dunkel und umstritten."\(^3\) Porteous says, "we know nothing about this Daniel ... during the exile."\(^4\) Collins draws a comparison to the Melchizedek of Hebrews and says, Daniel "appears on the Biblical scene ... without father, without mother, or genealogy,"\(^5\) and he gives this bleak prognosis for the discovery of the historical Daniel: "The account of the book itself does not inspire much hope for his historicity."\(^6\) One dissenter to this majority opinion is Claus Schedl who takes a somewhat different view:

Wir haben eine wirkliche Prophetenschrift, aus den

---

\(^1\) e.g. Leupold, Exposition of Daniel (Columbus: 1949); Joyce Baldwin, Daniel (Madison: 1978); J. Walvoord, Daniel the Key to Prophetic Revelation (Chicago: 1971).


\(^6\) Ibid.
considerations of the final work, as we have it today, rather than trying to find an answer derived from a redaction-historical analysis.

THE QUEST FOR THE HISTORICAL DANIEL

Most scholars, as we have seen, place the composition of the book of Daniel in Maccabean times and leave the questions (more or less) open, whether there was actually a historical Daniel, and who he was.

The figure of Daniel is mentioned in several places. In the book bearing his name, the hero is portrayed as living in the sixth century B.C. at the courts of Babylon. A Daniel is also mentioned in the Ugaritic AGHT text which portrays this Daniel as a popular king, who liked to help the widows and fatherless. And a Daniel is mentioned in Ezekiel 14 and 28, together with Noah and Job. He is characterized by exceptional wisdom. And finally, there are other Daniel's mentioned in the Bible, for instance in the post-exilic literature of Ezra and Nehemiah.

Several attempts have been made to identify the historical Daniel.

---

1 Many have observed with H. H. Rowley, ["The Unity of the Book of Daniel," Servant of the Lord and Other Essays (Oxford: 1965): 250] that the first part of Daniel talks about Daniel, but makes no claim to have been written by him, while the second is written in the first person.
Sturmjahren 522-520 B.C. vor uns, die in der Macabaerzeit neu aktualisiert wurde.¹

For him there was a Daniel in the exile who exercised the prophetic office and who also wrote a book which is later in Maccabean times re-written.

So we conclude that modern scholarship by and large, discounts the idea of identifying the hero of the book of Daniel with any historical personage at the time of the exile. And we note that such a denial is largely based on an argumentum e silentio which is negative evidence. In other words it is felt, there is just not enough evidence in the Biblical account to warrant a connection between any historical, exilic Daniel and the hero of the book.

The Ugaritic Danil of AQHT

In the AQHT text a popular king is named, who is well-known and liked for his right judgment and tender heart towards widows and the fatherless. Some scholars have attempted to tie him in with the historical Daniel in some way, either directly or indirectly.

Without identifying or equating the two, Porteous suggests a link between the Danil of Ras Shamra with the Ezekclian Daniel on the one side and the Daniel of the Jubilees on the other.² The connection of the Biblical hero with these two sides is obvious,

²Porteous, Daniel, p. 18.
according to Porteous. They are both wise, of good judgment, and ante-deluvian.

Harold Dressler recently examined the connection between the Ugaritic and Ezekclian Daniel closely and arrived at the conclusion that they cannot be identified with each other or tied together. The reasons being that the Ugaritic Danil does not show the same characteristics that Ezekiel stresses for his hero, namely legendary wisdom and righteousness. The Ugaritic Danil has neither. Dressler leans toward identifying the Daniel of Ezekiel with the hero of the book of Daniel.¹

John Day on the other hand concluded in a similar study that the Danil of Ugarit and the Ezekclian Daniel can still be the same, which does not mean, however, that Ezekiel knew about the AQHT text. According to Day it is more plausible that there used to be an old, pagan tradition concerning such a Daniel before Ezekiel's and possibly before Ugaritic times, that found its way into the Ugaritic material and independently also had become incorporated into the Yahwistic tradition of the Old Testament.²

The Daniel of Ezekiel

Some negative evidence for identifying the Daniel of Ezekiel with the hero of the Biblical book has already been presented in the


above discussion of the Ugaritic Daniel. So here we shall concentrate mostly on positive evidence for such an identification.

Schmid states without further comment:

Für ausgeschlossen halte ich es, dass Daniel etwas zu tun hat mit dem in Ez. 14:2 ff nach Noah und vor Hiob genannten Daniel.¹

Collins is more cautious when he says there is "some reason to associate them."² For Hammer, an association with the Daniel of Ezekiel is plausible because of the fact that, "the book of Daniel appears indebted to Ezekiel for much of its imagery." But this Daniel belongs to "the dim and distant past," not to exilic times.³ Lacocque also sees the Daniel of Ezekiel as the hero of the book of Daniel, but he calls him a "mythical personage" and equates him with the popular Ugaritic king.⁴

No clear consensus has emerged from the study of the Daniels of Ugarit and Ezekiel. There are, however, a few guidelines that can be seen against the background of the prophetic writings. It is unthinkable against that background that Ezekiel did borrow directly from the Ugaritic material. Neither Ezekiel nor the author of the book of Daniel would have knowingly referred to a known Baal-devotee as an example of righteousness. If there is a connection between the

---

two Daniels, it has to be in form of a common, presumably very old tradition, probably ante-dating both sources.

The Post-Exilic Priestly Daniel

Schmid has used the Daniel of the post-exilic era mentioned in Nehemiah 10:7 and Ezra 3:2, as the cornerstone of his interpretation. He gives two main reasons: In connection with the priestly Daniel in Nehemiah three names are mentioned that are the same as the names of Daniel's friends in the apocalyptic book.

The second reason for this identification of the Daniel in Nehemiah with the hero of the book of Daniel is that right from the first chapter, where it mentions the temple vessels, the author seems preoccupied with cultic elements. He concludes,

Zum Schluss sei noch darauf hingewiesen, dass sich der vermutlich priesterliche Verfasser von Kapitel 8f unso leichter mit dem Daniel der Legenden identifizieren konnte, wenn dieser tatsäichlich Priester gewesen war.

Against this view, says Lacocque, speaks the fact that the name Daniel was very common in Biblical times. This criticism is particularly appropriate if we look at the names Hananjah, Misael, Asarijah, and Daniel in their relationship to each other in the Nehemiah account. They do not appear in any particular order or would not demand or even

---

2 See Nehemiah 10:3, 7, 24; 8:4, 7.
3 Schmid, p. 214.
4 Lacocque, p. 3.
suggest any special affinity to each other. Thus the identification with the heroes of the book of Daniel is highly speculative and grammatically, historically, and contextually unfounded. Collins directs the same kind of criticism against Schmid and says all he has proven with the Ezra and Nehemiah texts, is that those names were commonly used at the time after the exile, no more.¹

¹Collins, The Apocalyptic Vision, p. 2
CHAPTER II

EXEGETICAL MATERIAL ON DANIEL

In this second chapter we will review and discuss interpretations of specific portions of the book of Daniel. The special emphasis here will no doubt be on chapter 7 because there we have mention of two entities, "the saints of the Most High" and the "one in human likeness" that have preoccupied recent Daniel studies more than anything else.

THE UNITY OF CHAPTER 7

We have already discussed Daniel seven as it related to the book of Daniel in general, and now it is our task to examine the unity of chapter seven in particular.¹

One of the most detailed redaction-historical analyses is provided by Luc Dequeker² in which he tries to show two redactors at work who altered the original vision for their own purpose.

¹Chapter 7 is the only vision of Daniel whose internal unity has been seriously questioned. cf. Collins, The Apocalyptic Vision, p. 126.

J. J. Collins\(^1\) has argued quite eloquently against Dequeker's view. Against the first complex of supposedly later redactionist interpolations, namely the enthronement vision\(^2\) which is said to have come from a different source than the preceding imagery of the four beasts,\(^3\) Collins argues that the beasts originating from the sea, "belong to the same complex of mythic material as the enthronement of the 'one like a Son of Man'--specifically the Canaanite myth of the conflict between Baal and Yamm for kingship."\(^4\)

And he concludes that the verses "which refer to the enthronement of the 'one like a Son of Man' cannot be regarded as later additions."\(^5\)

The second complex of verses which are at issue as later additions, are the references to the eleventh, 'little' horn\(^6\) which is supposedly a reference to Antiochus IV Epiphanes.\(^7\) Collins argues against this dissection as well. He explains the apparent discrepancy in the description of the beast having ten and later eleven horns, as

---


\(^2\)Vs. 9f, 13f.


\(^4\)Collins, p. 127.

\(^5\)Ibid., p. 128.

\(^6\)Chapter 7, vs. 8, 11a, 20-21, 24-25.

\(^7\)The problem is seen in the fact that the fourth beast is initially (vs. 7) described as having ten horns and then all of a sudden it has an eleventh one, as if it were an afterthought.
being due to the fact that the visionary wanted to emphasize that the little horn was clearly different from all other horns, "a special phenomenon." 1 And he concludes:

The content of Daniel 7 does not require the hypothesis that any verses were inserted by an editor other than the original author. 2

As far as the supposed "stylistic inconsistencies" 3 are concerned, Collins concludes that the formulaic expressions used to introduce different scenes and visions are not used rigidly and consistently enough to provide a case for late editorial activity. 4 And he sums it up,

In short, despite the persistent efforts of critics to drive wedges between the sentences of Daniel 7, there is no reason to posit that this vision existed in any form before the Maccabean times or that it includes any later editorial insertions. 5

Thus, though by no means unanimous, the majority of the scholarly opinion favors the unity of Daniel 7. Andre Lacocque imples this unity, 6 Ziony Zevit calls it an "essential unity" and "rather obvious," 7 and Gerhard Hasel says it is "imperative to accept the

1 Collins, Apocalyptic Vision, p. 128.

2 Ibid., p. 129.


4 Collins, p. 130f.

5 Ibid., p. 132.


conclusion of recent scholarship that Daniel 7 is a literary unit."¹

THE SON OF MAN AND THE SAINTS OF THE MOST HIGH

Background

Many different prototypes for the 'son of man' or 'the one in human likeness' and for the other imagery of Daniel seven have been proposed over the years, ² and many origins and parallels suggested.

Some of these have essentially been ruled out or given up by the mid-sixties, others have continued to be held while new ones have been proposed. The accounts of Daniel's visions whether they were objectively revealed by a supernatural source, or subjectively received in his imagination, or whether the author simply composed them as literary works, the result is none-the-less given in traditional language of Near Eastern mythological imagery. This imagery was not derived from Wisdom literature, according to Collins, ³ but from Canaanite myth, ⁴ as recorded for instance in the Ugaritic material.

¹Gerhard Hasel, "The Identity of the Saints of the Most High in Daniel 7," Bib 56 (1975): 189. For other references see his article on the same page.


³Collins, Apocalyptic Vision, p. 147.

⁴He sees this in line with the earlier proposal of Hermann Gunkel, who wrote before the Ugaritic material was discovered in 1929 and associated the origin of the Daniel imagery with Babylonian...
Ferch points to a lack of objective evidence in the various attempts to associate the Daniel imagery with various extra-Biblical sources. And perhaps it is precisely the great variety of different parallels suggested for one and the same image that is again the disturbing factor and would caution us against any hasty conclusions about borrowing, especially against direct borrowing, by the apocalyptic author, from these foreign sources. In too many alleged parallels it seems that the new connection is seen in different fields, not because of a thorough textual connection, but depending on one's own field of interest or expertise.

It seems more plausible to look either for Biblical parallels and origins, or to see the images as an original creation of the author himself. Of course this is not to argue for a complete vacuum or against any secondary or peripheral influences of extra-Biblical material on the Daniel accounts. Rather this argument is against making quick primary or direct connections to these extra-Biblical sources.


e.g. Julian Morgenstern studied the religion of Tyre and promptly proposed that the religio-historical roots could be found there.

Ferch, p. 189. Lacocque, The Book of Daniel, p. 125 too sees parallels to Ezekiel 1 and 8-11 in particular, although Lacocque also sees certain parallels to the Ugaritic material, cf. p. 129.
Ferch, for instance, sees certain Biblical connections. So also Lacocque, after considering Canaanite and Babylonian parallels for the imagery of Daniel seven, concludes, ¹

The question as to their origin has not received any convincing solution. We believe they are an original creation of the author.

The Saints of the Most High

The phrase 'the saints of the Most High' occurs four times in the seventh chapter of Daniel. ² The phrase has given rise to a tremendous amount of literature. Some of it dealing with the religio-historical questions which we have already discussed very briefly in the foregoing section. The rest of this literature is concerned with the meaning of the phrase in the final text of Daniel itself.

Our present task is to see what parallels and correlations of this phrase with other parts of the book of Daniel have been suggested and how this phrase has been interpreted.

Ginsberg has raised some questions in regard to the deletion of the definite article in the Aramaic phrase. ³ Zevit ⁴ has followed his argument and contends that the lack of the definite article means the phrase should be translated into English "saints of the Most High"

¹Ibid., p. 139.
²Vs. 18, 22, 25, 27.
also without article. However, Gerhard Hasel\(^1\) has pointed out that the Aramaic grammar does not require the definite article for the phrase to be translated into English with the definite article and says that "the translation 'the saints' is grammatically correct and can stand."

Mertens also brings out this point and says that the long-sought Hebrew equivalent of the Aramaic term has now been found in the Damascus document XX, 8 and he concludes that

> Die bisher übliche Übersetzung des Ausdrucks in Daniel 7 'die Heiligen des Hochtsten' ist also bestätigt.\(^2\)

Martin Noth\(^3\) revived the thesis that goes back to Otto Procksch\(^4\), suggesting that the reference in Daniel is to angels or celestial beings. From Noth's lead several have taken the same or a similar interpretation. So, for instance, Kruse\(^5\) identified the 'saints of the Most High' with angels as did Dequeker,\(^6\) Colpe,\(^7\) and Zevit.\(^8\)

\(^1\)Hasel, "The Identity of the Saints of the Most High in Daniel 7," \textit{Bib} 56 (1975): 173.
\(^3\)M. Noth, as referred to in G. Hasel, "The Identity of the Saints of the Most High in Daniel 7," p. 173.
\(^7\)C. Colpe, "ho huios tou anthropou," \textit{TDNT} (Grand Rapids: 1969) 8: 400-77.
\(^8\)Zevit, "Structure and Individual Elements."
This revival of the celestial view of the saints has in turn sparked a vehement discussion and opposition. For instance, writes Lacocque, "we do not believe that L. Dequeker's thesis can stand up under examination."¹ And he gives as reasons certain Old Testament texts, which fit the context of Israël very well, and some other texts that seem open to either terrestrial or celestial interpretation. Hahnhart already pointed to this same double usage of the term,

Das ausserkanonische Schrifttum der vorchristlichen Zeit...die spaetjuedischen Apokalyptik, das Schrifttum von Qumran, sagt ebenso eindeutig, wie die kanonische, alttestamentliche Ueberlieferung, dass der Begriff 'heilig' im absoluten Gebrauch nicht ausschliesslich auf den himmlischen Bereich, Gott und die Engel, beschraenkt ist, sondern auch Glieder des irdischen Israel bezeichnen kann.²

Mertens in his investigation of the book of Daniel in its relationship to the Qumran documents also states, "An unserer Stelle sind offenbar Menschen gemeint und zwar die treugebliebenen Juden."³ This is a less frequent usage of the expression than its references to celestial beings. According to Mertens the new and different usage in Daniel will certainly have influenced the later Qumran writings, which now use the term for both celestial and terrestrial beings. Hasel shares this opinion as well and he sums up,

¹Lacocque, The Book of Daniel.
It seems then, that among thirteen passages using qedoshim in the Old Testament aside from the book of Daniel seven refer without doubt to celestial beings and that among the five disputed ones three (Proverbs 9:10; 30:3; Hosea 12:1) refer in all likelihood to terrestrial beings. To this we must add the undisputed passage of Psalm 34:10 where it is acknowledged that qedoshim refers to a body of faithful people.¹

All of this goes to show that extra-Daniel evidence is inconclusive due to its ambivalence. Because of this inconclusiveness of the philological considerations, the present context of Daniel has to decide the meaning, according to Collins.²

Brekelsmann has argued that the giving of the kingdom to the 'holy ones' in Daniel 7, points strongly to the equation of the holy ones with the people of God, because the eschatological kingdom of the angels is practically unknown in this period.³ In similar fashion Collins argues against identifying the 'holy ones' purely with angelic beings, mainly because the 'people' of the holy ones in Daniel 7 cannot be translated as 'host.'⁴ From this he proceeds towards some kind of middle ground when he says,

In Daniel, the faithful Jews are not yet described as 'holy ones' but they are 'the people of the holy ones' and will join with their heavenly counterparts in the eschatological victory.⁵

³Brekelsman, "The Saints of the Most High," OTS 14 (1965); 329.
⁴As Noth does, for instance.
The One in Human Likeness

Just as the 'saints of the Most High' so also the 'one in human likeness' cannot be interpreted purely on the ground of philological considerations. The expression also has to be determined from its context as we have it today.

It is generally agreed that the term 'son of man' or the 'one in human likeness' is not yet a title in Daniel as it is later in the New Testament or in the Similitudes of Enoch. Rather it is seen by most as the root for the later use of this expression as a title. But with these two statements, the general agreement that there is "sufficient consensus that the kebar enas 'one in human likeness' (7:13), is a symbol for the gaddise elyonin, 'the saints of the Most High',"¹ We see serious disagreements even on this question.²

The appearance of the 'one in human likeness' continues to give rise to studies, new interpretations, and variants of old interpretations. In fact, no other expression of the Bible, certainly of the Old Testament, has received so much attention. Collins calls it an "immense literature,"³ and Joyce Baldwin observes,


²For an assessment of the major interpretations see J. Bowker, "The Son of Man," JTS 28 (1977): 24ff. I certainly do not deny that a weight of agreement is found along these lines. In my opinion Di Lella's statement is too narrow too specific. The agreement is on the fact that the two entities are closely related to each other, the nature of this relationship, however, is still debated and debatable.

It is no exaggeration to say that no other concept in the Old Testament, not even the Servant of the LORD has elicited a more prolific literature. Of all the figures used in the Old Testament to designate the coming deliverer, ....none is more profound than the 'Son of Man.'

This attention has resulted in a wide variety of different interpretations on the subject. In our time we find those who see the 'one in human likeness' as a symbol of Israel, or others who see it as a representative of the angelic host, or as one of the angels, and among conservative scholars are those who view it as an expression referring to some individual such as the author of the book or Judas Maccabees.

One particular phenomenon in Daniel seven is recognized by many to play a key role in the interpretation of the phrase, "one in human likeness." It is customary for Daniel first to describe the vision and then to interpret it after that description. Here in Daniel seven, however, the 'son of man' plays a prominent role in the first part where the vision is described and not in the second part where it

2e.g. Mowinckel*, Di Lella Lacocque, Collins. See below pp. 43, 45, 46 (respectively).
3e.g. Colpe. See below p. 44.
4e.g. Mueller, Ferch, Zevit. See below pp. 44, 45.
5e.g. Wood, Dexinger. See below p. 47.
6e.g. Sahlin. See below p. 45.

*Mowinckel, He That Cometh, p. 350.
is interpreted. The 'saints of the Most High,' on the other hand, appear in the second part quite prominently, but find no mention in the first. This phenomenon, coupled with the fact that the kingdom is reported to be given to both groups,\(^1\) plays a key role in most interpretations as we shall see.\(^2\)

Though there are a variety of different interpretations of this heavenly figure, they all fall basically into two or three categories.

(1) There are interpreters who identify the 'one in human likeness' with the 'saints of the Most High' directly. That is to say, 'the son of man' is synonymous with the 'saints of the Most High.'

(2) Other interpreters say 'the son of man' is a representative of the 'saints of the Most High.' This is the most widely held view.

(3) Then there are those who interpret the figures separately, and consider them independently of each other.

---

\(^1\) Concerning the 'son of man': v. 14 "and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom." Concerning the 'saints of the Most High' it says, v. 18 "but the saints of the most high shall take the kingdom." v. 22 "Until the Ancient of Days came and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High, and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom." v. 27 "And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom...shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High."

\(^2\) Di Lella, "One in Human Likeness," p. 3.
Now we want to look at these categories of interpretation individually and analytically.

The Synonymous Interpretation

The main proponent of this school is Di Lella, who argues that the 'saints of the Most High' and the 'one in human likeness' are synonymous, referring to the same entity. The reason for this is the symbolic nature of the book of Daniel,\(^1\)

Just as the four horrifying and vile beasts (7:3-7) are not real animals, but symbols, pure and simple, of the pagan kingdoms of the Babylonians, Medes, Persians, and Greeks, so too the 'one in human likeness' is not a real individual, celestial or terrestrial, but is only a symbol of the 'holy ones of the Most High' a title given to the faithful Jews—men, women and children—who courageously withstood the persecution of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.

Di Lella reviews possible prototypes of this expression and seems to favor the Canaanite hypothesis.\(^2\) Then he argues against those who view the man-like figure as a representative of the angels. He refutes this interpretation on two grounds: Firstly, he argues that such an interpretation would make the chapter void of meaning for the Maccabean time.

The first major difficulty with the opinion that 'the holy ones of the most high' are angels...and not primarily the people of Israel is that Daniel 7 would then have virtually no meaning or relevance for the addressees of the book, viz., the disenfranchized Jews who were being hounded by Antiochus IV,\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) Di Lella, "The One in Human Likeness," p. 3.

\(^2\) As expounded by Colpe, "ho huios tou anthropou," p. 400-77.

\(^3\) Di Lella, "The One in Human Likeness," p. 7.
And his second reason for refuting the 'son of man' as a representative of angels is that,

The final redactor, and the author before him, must then be judged guilty of unusually careless rhetoric and of a deplorable use of symbolism.¹

This argument arises out of his understanding that every apocalyptic symbol can only have one possible interpretation: a point he has not sufficiently established.

On the ground of these two arguments and underscored by the observation that "Semitic mentality was fond of personifying the people,"² Di Lella sums up his study with the words,

Thus we may conclude that the expression kebar enas, 'one in human likeness,' does not in itself point to an angel...rather the expression is nothing less than a symbol of 'the holy ones of the Most High,' who are, as we have seen...the faithful Israelites."³

The Symbolic Interpretation

There are different variations in this category of interpretation. What binds them together and gives them their common denominator is the fact that they all see the 'one like a human being' as a symbol of the 'saints of the Most High.' Due to the great variety of opinions concerning the identity of these saints, we have the same variety within this category of interpretation.

¹Ibid., p. 8.
²Ibid., p. 15.
Colpe has distinguished two stages of interpretation of the expression 'saints of the Most High.' In the first stage it referred to the angelic host, and later under the persecution of Antiochus it was re-interpreted and applied to the faithful Jews. In both stages the term 'son of man' is symbolic of the 'saints of the Most High.'

U. B. Mueller suggests that instead of referring to the host of angels collectively, the 'one like a son of man' refers specifically to their leader, namely Michael, who in turn is connected with Israel by being their guardian. Also, according to Ferch, Michael shows the most connections to the 'one like a son of man.' He is inclined to see in Michael the prototype of this "son of man," but he ultimately leaves the question open.

On the basis of contextual correspondences...the person of Michael seems to offer the closest longitudinal parallel...In short, though the attempt to explain the nature and identity of the son of man through alleged roots and parallels demonstrated...that the closest parallel to the son of man is the figure of Michael, it generally led to a position which offers no hope of progress.

Collins argues along similar lines. Though the son of man is primarily a reference to the angelic host and its leader, it refers

---

1Colpe, "ho huios tou anthropou," p. 400-77.
to the faithful Israelites under persecution as well, in so far as they are connected with the angels in the eschatological era.¹

Also in the same line is Z. Zevit, who argues for an identification of the 'one in human likeness' with an angel, but for him it is Gabriel that is referred to, not Michael. The reason is that the author refers to Gabriel in 9:21 as the man "whom I had seen in the vision in the beginning." The same word "in the beginning" also occurs in 8:1 and can only refer to the vision of chapter seven. Since the author describes Gabriel as having been in that previous vision, he has to be identified with one of the personages of chapter seven. The 'Ancient of days' disqualifies, because of his clearly divine status, the 'one saint' in verse 16 also disqualifies because of insufficient identification, which is a hint to his probable insignificance. Thus by a process of elimination Zevit arrives at the son of man as the only possible identity for the angel Gabriel.²

Lacocque gives a different twist to this symbolic representation of the 'one in human likeness.' Within Daniel seven the son of man participates in the divine stature. This ties the scene in with the old enthronement rituals. Says Lacocque,³ whereas before the exile


the king was "one entity with Yahweh," now after the exile a 'democratization' process took place in the sense that what was previously applied to the pre-exilic king, was now seen as applying to the people. Thus the royal title 'son of God' was transferred to Israel qua elect and to the individual righteous man...The son of man is the personification of the righteous people.¹

Ploeger² sees in the 'saints of the Most High' a reference to Israel and the 'one like a son of man' as their representative or symbol.

The Independent Interpretation

Under this umbrella we see those interpretations of the 'one in human likeness' that do not have as their foundation the identification of the son of man with the 'saints of the Most High.'

Here we see those who interpret the expression messianically. This is the traditional, conservative view. Leon Wood in his commentary says that the expression of 'one like a son of man' has to be a messianic designation, for the following reasons: Christ used the expression as a title for himself, the son of man is ascribed the status of Deity, all people pay respect to him, the oldest interpretation of the expression, namely Enoch, is messianic, and the picture of Christ the king fits the overall description of Daniel's vision of the son of man.³

¹Ibid., p. 149.
²Ploeger, Das Buch Daniel (Guetersloh: 1965).
Ferdinand Dexinger expresses a similar view. He views the expression 'one like a son of man' as a "Hochheitsbezeichnung" (an honorary title) and he explains or interprets the expression by paralleling it with the Book of Enoch and the fourth book of Ezra, and by considering extra-Israelite influences. Finally he concludes that Daniel which came into being under the sponsorship of priestly apocalyptic circles, contains and combines two separate traditions,

In dieser Gestalt sind zwei verschiedene Traditionen verschmolzen, die von einem Messias und die andere vom idealen Menschen der Urzeit.

Di Lella opposes such interpretations on the ground that it constitutes "eisegesis" rather than "exegesis" reading into the text ideas that arose at a much later time. He calls attention to A. C. Welches words, that "it may be wiser to interpret Daniel from his predecessors than from his successors."

An altogether different type of interpretation of the son of man is offered by H. Schmid and H. Sahlin, who see in the expression

---

2 Ibid., p. 65.
3 Ibid.
4 Di Lella, "One in Human Likeness," p. 4.
5 Quote with Di Lella, "One in Human Likeness," p. 4. This critique is valid as long as one accepts the axiom that Daniel wrote strictly for his own time. If on the other hand one sees God revealing truths here that go beyond the author's time, then a messianic understanding is not implausible. Thus Di Lella's and Welches critique hinge on the axiom that Daniel is a viticinium ex eventu.
a reference to some specific human being in the time of Antiochus' persecution.

Schmid¹ propounds the idea that the son of man is a reference to the author himself. In order to establish this thesis, Schmid goes back to the literary development of the book and finds, similarly to Dexinger and others, that the legends of chapters 2-6 originated in the imperialistic apocalyptic circles of the diaspora. Chapters 8-12 were authored by a priestly charismatic who was activated by Antiochus' interference in the cultic affairs of Jerusalem. By incorporating the legends in his work he wanted to tie those factions in Jerusalem to his cause that were attached to those legends.

Eventually this charismatic leader died and the guardians of the imperialistic apocalyptic included the Thronbesteigungsvision and thus they moved far beyond the original intention of the priestly author and came closer to the later messianic interpretation of this expression.

Schmid sums up,

Mit dem 'Menschensohn' in 7, 13f ist der pseudonyme Daniel gemeint (vgl 8, 17)...Nach dem Tode Daniels (vgl. 12, 3) verkündeten sie in der Zeit schwerster Bedrängnis durch eine eingeschobene Vision der Thronbesteigung ihres Representanten.²

For Sahlin the starting point of interpretation of the 'one

¹Schmid, "Daniel der Menschensohn," p. 192-221.
like a son of man' is the historical occasion, the *Sitz im Leben* of the book of Daniel. He writes,

Fuer uns ist wesentlich, dass das Danielbuch seine endgültige Form offenbar kurz vor dem Tode des Antiochus Epiphanes im Jahre 164 v. Chr. erhalten hat.¹

And from there he proceeds to establish his thesis, namely that the intent of the book was to establish Judas Maccabee as the Messiah in the mind of the author's contemporaries. Sahlin also sees a messianic meaning connected with the 'one like a son of man.'

Daniel sieht also im Inneren, wie Judas Mackabaeus vor den Thron Gottes geführt wird, um von ihm mit messianischer Macht bekleidet zu werden.²

To explain the plausibility of such an identification of a leader of a revolt with the Messiah, Sahlin refers to the revolt leader Simon bar Kochba who was hailed a Messiah by the great Rabbi Aqiba.³

So for Sahlin the center and key to the understanding of Daniel is the person of Judas Maccabee, for,

Der eigentliche Zweck des Buches ist derjenige, Judas Mackabaeus als den Gottgesandten Messias darzustellen, der Israel von Antiochus befreien und das messianische Reich errichten wird.⁴

Sahlin, of course, recognizes the weakness of such a hypothesis when

---

²Ibid., p. 49.
³Ibid., p. 50. The lateness of the reference does not seem to bother Sahlin.
he declares, "Es liegt in der Natur der Sache selbst, das eine Arbeitshypothese sich nicht beweisen läesst."\(^1\)

Neither Schmid nor Sahlin have found any great following. Both have been severely criticized for their disregard of the context of Daniel. Di Lella points out that the pacifist tenor of the book of Daniel would warn against designating Judas Maccabee to be the son of man.\(^2\) Collins observes that neither Sahlin's nor Schmid's solution has any basis in the text itself.\(^3\) And Lebram sees Sahlin's hypothesis as evidence for the vulnerability of apocalyptic symbolism and imagery,

Noch mehr will Sahlin den Skopus von Daniel von der Realität der Geschichte her bestimmen...Es zeigt sich, wie leicht sich die apokalyptische Symbolik mit den verschiedensten geschichtlichen Situation verbinden läesst.\(^4\)

'The Saints of the Most High' have been interpreted both as celestial and terrestrial beings. Those who interpret the phrase celestially, seem to rely more, almost exclusively, on philological considerations, while the scholars of the terrestrial interpretation recognizing to a greater extent the ambivalent usage of the term in Biblical and extra-Biblical accounts, seem to rely more in final analysis, on the context of the present Daniel document.

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 58.


\(^3\)Collins, The Apocalyptic Vision, p. 150.

The array of interpretations of the 'one in human likeness' in Daniel is bewildering. Because of parallels in appearance, some special connections between the 'saints of the Most High' and the 'one in human likeness' have been sought. Unfortunately, the suggestions have been as plentiful as the attempts made. Certainly no consensus has been reached in the interpretation of the "Son of Man." The trend seems to be for each scholar to go his own way.

MISCELLANEOUS EXEGETICAL PROBLEMS IN DANIEL

A number of other articles have appeared that deal with interpretative material on Daniel. The volume of these articles on any given subject within our period of concern is rather small, compared to the volume of articles that have to do with chapter seven.

Here we will deal with these studies, especially those that have either continued an ongoing debate or have sparked a new one.

The Imagery of Daniel Chapter Two

Collins sees the schema of the four kingdoms as a widespread Near Eastern phenomenon in Hellenistic times. It was "essentially designated for anti-Hellenistic propaganda,"¹ schema of Daniel, but emphasizes that what distinguishes Daniel from the extra-Biblical usage of this imagery is the "idea that God is visibly at work in the history of Israel and the nations."²

Gerhard Hasel has written an important survey and assessment of proposed prototypes for the imagery of Daniel two. He discounts a Persian, Greek, or Roman background for the kingdom schema and then proceeds to analyze the more recent suggestion that Daniel two reflects Babylonian imagery. The specific reference is to the so-called Accadian prophecies. Hasel acknowledges certain places where these prophecies come close and even seem to touch each other. However, major differences remain. He refers to the alternating pattern of good and evil, the cyclical view of history, which excludes an eschatological kingdom, neither of which characteristics are found in the Daniel imagery. Though Daniel is closer to these Babylonian dynastic prophecies than to previously suggested Persian, Hellenistic, or Roman imagery, Hasel still considers the differences to be too grave, to speak of any direct influence.

Possibly they have a common root somewhere, but he concludes:

Aside from the appropriation of this common prototype with its own variances in each setting one may hardly any longer speak of sources and/or direct influences of one tradition upon the other.


2Ibid., p. 24.

The Ereb-Boqer of Daniel Eight

Schwantes\(^1\) has written on the *ereb-boqer* and has refuted the idea that the 2,300 *ereb-boqer* (evening-morning) mean 2,300 evening and morning sacrifices, or the passing of 1,150 days. He argues that the cultic usage of *tamid* (the daily) was either a reference to the evening and morning sacrifices together, or to the complete daily service with all its different functions and aspects. And finally he argues that the only clear reference anywhere in Scripture to *ereb-boqer* can only be found in the Genesis account where it clearly refers to 24-hour periods.

The Prayer of Daniel Nine

Much discussion has centered around the question of the authenticity of the prayer of Daniel nine. This question arises out of the observation that the prayer is of much better literary quality than the rest of the book, and from its apparent liturgical character.

Lacocque\(^2\) states that with chapter nine a new literary genre presents itself to the reader: a *pesher* (a textual commentary). The point of departure is no longer a dream or vision but a text from the prophet Jeremiah.\(^3\)

---


\(^3\)True, a study of Jeremiah is the occasion for chapter nine, but the exposition is none-the-less of a previous vision, not of the
Several articles and commentaries have come out recently in favor of the authenticity of the prayer in Daniel nine. Ploeger\(^1\) has argued that the pattern of Daniel nine is the same as that of other chapters in the book. If we take out the prayer, this pattern is disrupted. The pattern is a peril, followed by a rescue, a dream or vision followed by an interpretation. B. W. Jones also wrote a defense of the authenticity of the prayer.\(^2\) In it he argues that on philological grounds stronger arguments can be made for the authenticity of the prayer than have been made in the past on contextual grounds. For instance, the word titakh (poured out) occurs in both halves of the book and constitutes a wordplay. In verse eleven the 'oath' sh:vua is 'poured out' and then in verse twenty-seven the 'weeks' sharuim are 'poured out.' The oath is 'written' while the weeks are 'decreed.' "The balance is quite artistic."

The charge that the burden of the prayer is apparently not answered or dealt with in the second part of the chapter, Jones refuses to acknowledge. The petition of the prayer is indeed related to Gabriel's answer. The prayer represents the Deuteronomistic idea of reward and punishment, which has become increasingly unable

\(^{1}\) Ploeger, Das Buch Daniel, p. 135.


\(^{3}\) Ibid., p. 492.
to answer the questions of the suffering people. Gabriel answers this problem by showing a deterministic, pre-ordained understanding of history. And Jones closes his argument with the thought, "We may not consider determinism to be the better answer, but obviously the author did."¹

The Resurrection in Daniel

Several questions in regard to the mentioned resurrection in Daniel 12:3 have been raised. Is it a spiritual resurrection or a physical one? Is it general or partial, in other words, how do we interpret the rabbim (many)?² G. Hasel has made a study³ comparing the resurrection statements in Isaiah 26:19 and in Daniel 12:3. Concerning the rabbim he appeals to "normal Hebrew Grammar" and says it is more inclusive than the statement in Isaiah 26. According to Hasel there are definite links between Isaiah 26 and Daniel 12, with Daniel introducing some new ideas.

As for the brevity of the resurrection account, Hasel concludes:

The tantalizing brevity of Daniel 12:1-4 suggests that the resurrection idea was not a novel one...But the idea of

¹ Jones, "The Prayer in Daniel IX," p. 492.
a resurrection of righteous and wicked is new.¹

The Numbers in Daniel

The numbers in apocalyptic writings have long been fascinating to Bible scholars and laymen alike. What is behind the numbers in Daniel? What calendar did he use? How do the numbers relate to one another, if at all? These are some of the questions that have vexed Bible students. Two recent articles have gained particular attention, dealing with the problem of numbers in Daniel.²

A quite complicated and ingenious approach to the numbers of Daniel is taken by Hans Burgmann.³ He writes against the generally accepted notion that the writer or compiler of Daniel kept putting the date of the end of the world further and further into the future as it became apparent that nothing was happening. "Es duerfte bestimmt diese Vorstellung nicht richtig sein,"⁴ he states categorically and tries to prove this assertion with his hypothesis.

The basic axiom of his thesis is that the number 3.5 or the time, times and division of time, as it is called, takes the central


³Ibid.

⁴Ibid., p. 543.
position among the Danielic numbers. And from there he proceeds to show that all the numbers in Daniel, the 2,300 days, the 1,290 days, and the 1,335 days are modifications of the three and a half years.

Then why so many different expressions of the three and one half year period? The reason is found in different calendars, different intentions of the redactors, and different intercalary periods. He does not agree with Otto Ploeger and others who see in the numbers the attempt to set new dates for the end of the world when this end does not occur at the predicted time.

Koch, too, is concerned in his article with the seventy weeks in particular, and his basic argument is the shift from the importance of the sacred numbers twelve and forty to the new sacred number seven.

By the time the book of Daniel was written, at least in its final form, the numbers twelve and forty had been replaced by the sacred number seven for all ideological reckoning. In the earlier deuteronomistic tradition the numbers twelve and forty had played the governing factor in chronologies; later when the chronistic tradition took over, the ideal number seven was introduced and consequently accepted as the basis for ideological reckoning.

---

1 Ploeger, Das Buch Daniel.

2 B. S. Childs, Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture (Philadelphia: 1979) agrees with Burgmann in the basic axiom against Ploeger.


4 Ibid., p. 29.
Jeremiah 34:14 may be seen as a bridge or overlapping of the two traditions.¹

Later, Jewish apocalypticism, intent on finding strict determinism for historical sequences, looked at the accounts in Kings concerning the period of 480 years from the Exodus to the beginning of the first temple construction (480 = 40×12). Then they also found the 430 years recorded that brings them to the Exile in Babylon and when they added the 70 years of exile, prophesied by Jeremiah, they came up with a total of 980 years or two periods of 490 years (7×70) each. Says Koch,² "Die Entdeckung dieser Zahl muss die Leser geradezu elektrisiert haben." This jolt caused the reader to dare another 490 year prediction for the future which aimed at prophecying the end of the time of this world.³

While this is a fascinating proposal, it seems to be too speculative without sufficient support from the intent of the Daniel account. If this was truly the way the author arrived at his number

¹Koch, "Die mysterioesen Zahlen," p. 31.
²Ibid., p. 34.
³He refers to Daniel 9:24, but the prophecy is "unto Messiah the Prince," not "zum Ende der Weltzeit" as he argues. The only continuity is the 490 year period, and since that has not been mentioned expressly before in the Bible, the argument is basically very weak. There seems to be no thought continuity from the supposedly 490 years from the Exodus to the first building of the temple, and the next 490 years—again not explicitly mentioned—to the beginning of the second temple construction. And from there, there is even less connection to the actually mentioned 490 years in Daniel nine, which according to Koch refer to the end of the world. Koch does not provide any thought continuity.
490, then what about the other numbers? The 1,290, 1,335, and the 2,300 days do not seem to be based on the number seven. If some Maccabean author dared to make a prophecy, then why do we have so many different numbers?

No doubt the number seven played a significant role in the Bible, and no doubt the connection with 490 is intentional, but there are too many unknowns to make the theory about the shift from twelve and forty to number seven stick as presented by Koch.

The 2,300 Evening-Mornings. In line with other scholars, Burgmann takes the expression "unto 2,300 ereb-boqer" to mean 1,150 literal days. The redactor of the Maccabean time used this as an "Ausgleich" between the old Daniel tradition of three and a half years and the actual historic developments. 1,150 is, when you figure it according to the moon calendar of 354 days a year, exactly 89 days shorter than the three and a half year period and 88 days longer than the true historic fulfillment of three years of persecution under Antiochus IV Epiphanes. So the 1,150 days represents the medium between the two.

---

1Daniel 8:14.

2For a review and critique of this view, see this thesis p. 59. S. J. Schwantes, "The Ereb-Boqer," AUSS 16 (1978).

3Which are 1,239 days according to moon calendar, 3.5 times 354.

4Which are 1,062 days according to moon calendar, 3.5 times 354.
Why did the Maccabean redactor express it as 2,300 evening-mornings then, rather than as 1,150 days which he really meant? According to Burgmann this expression of 2,300 evening-mornings served the double purpose. It was first a medium between the old Daniel tradition of the divided seven, and the actual fulfillment in history and it further provided the possibility that God would still intervene at the end of the literal 2,300 days.

The 1,290 Day Period. According to Burgmann the 1,290 day period is in line with the Chassidic tradition, using the solar calendar, rather than the lunar one. The Chassid arrived at the 1,290 days by figuring the last week before God's kingdom.3 Thus seven times 364 days equals 2,548 days, to which he added an intercalary month of 28 or 35 days,4 and because they were fond of the divided seven, they divided those numbers by two and arrived at 1,288 or 1,291.5, respectively, which they then rounded off to 1,290 days.

2Daniel 12:11.
3There is no textual support for this statement. Again it is "eisegesis" rather than "exegesis."
4Where do these figures come from? Burgmann gives no answer or source. These figures fit his calculation. I notice that later he states that the Jews used an intercalary period of 24.5 days—which is seven times a divided seven,—instead of the 25.6 which they should have used.
The 1,335 Day Period.  

Burgmann breaks the riddle of the 1,335 days by stating that the beginning of any closed time period for the Jews was always a Wednesday. The kingdom of God, he says, had to start on a Wednesday in the mind of a pious Chassid who glossed or edited the Danielic material. So the Chassid will have added one holy week times seven to the 1,290 days and arrived at the 1,339 days and then in order to arrive at a Wednesday, he had to shorten it by four days. Thus he arrived at the 1,335 days.

If this is the work of a Chassid, glossing the text, why would he put these two numbers, 1,290 days and 1,335 days right next to each other?

---

1Daniel 12:12.

2Again I miss a source or proof for this statement. In my judgment this is too fundamental a statement to his argument, for him not to offer proof of some kind. The year was a closed period, did it always start on a Wednesday?

3Why should he have done this? Was there any reason? Is this "eisegesis" or "exegesis?"
CONCLUSION

This investigation has sought to study the developments in recent Daniel studies found in scholarly publications. This is a fairly wide field of concern and consequently the summary or conclusion has to be rather general in nature. All through the study the writer has attempted to summarize and evaluate the studies relevant to each section under discussion. Here we shall limit ourselves to general observations.

A tremendous amount of energy and study has gone into Daniel studies in these past years. This may in part be related to the resurgence of interest in apocalyptic studies in general, not just in theological circles. An understanding of a long and complex history of development of the book of Daniel has emerged from the studies of redaction-critical analyses and from form-critical studies. This understanding has led in our period of review to a focus on details in light of their common apocalyptic milieu in the Maccabean age.

Recent studies have moved away from interpreting Daniel primarily from its extra-Biblical, supposedly contemporary surroundings, in isolation from its Biblical, prophetic context. Recent studies tend to take better account of possible Biblical background and of the connections between prophetic messages and the apocalyptic thought and even expression. Bearing in mind the situation of the book in our present Biblical canon, the present writer views this trend as positive.
While we may evaluate the attempts to understand details of Daniel better as they relate to the prophetic books and to the apocalyptic literature in general, there may be also a tendency to become so engrossed with the details that the whole is disregarded. We need more studies now that will pull the detailed findings of recent years together and present them in their relevance for today. Hopefully the monograph of J. J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* will prove to become a trend, namely to focus again on the book of Daniel as a whole.

What is particularly needed are exegetical-theological studies. We need studies that talk about the intention of the book as a whole that go beyond the time of the author or redactor. How can we tie the detailed studies together and bring them to bear on the theological-pastoral, possibly hermeneutical value of the book?
APPENDIX

All German quotations appearing in this thesis are rendered here according to my own English translation. Only full sentences are translated.

Page 8:

"They relativized the present events, by synchronizing them with the mighty numbers of the world evolution. Thus they relativized their own pain and received hope and consolation."

Page 8, Footnote 3:

"That the book of Daniel in its current form comes from Maccabean times, can in principle still be considered general opinion, but with this, the unanimity is already come to an end."

Page 9:

"It is acknowledged that the book of Daniel has received its final form at the Maccabean times." (However) "The strictly literary Genesis of the book of Daniel is dark and disputed."

Page 11:

"Let me say only so much here, that in order to understand this book, more emphasis should be placed on its final form than is generally done. Even if one does not speak of a literary unity of the book of Daniel in the same sense as for instance Rowley does."

Page 24:

"We have a true book of a prophet before us, namely from the tempestuous years 522-520. A book which was reactualized in Maccabean times."

Page 26:

"I consider it out of the question that Daniel has got anything to do with the Daniel mentioned in Ez. 14:2ff after Noah and before Job."
"Finally let me point out that the probably priestly author of chapters 8f could identify himself even more readily with the Daniel of the legends if that one was indeed a priest."

"The customary translation of the expression in Daniel seven as 'the saints of the Most High,' is thus validated."

"The extra-canonical writings of the pre-Christian era, the late-Jewish apocalyptic, the writings from Qumran, they all say just as unanimously as the Old Testament traditions that the term 'holy' in its absolute usage is not limited to the celestial sphere, of God and angels. Rather it may also characterize members of the earthly Israel."

"At this point the reference is obviously to human beings, namely the faithful Jews."

"In this personage two traditions blend, the one of a Messiah, and the other about the ideal primordial man."

"The son of man in 7:13f refers to the pseudonymous Daniel (cf. 8:17)...After the death of Daniel (cf. 12:3) they gave a proclamation in a time of utmost difficulties through the vision they interpolated of the ascension of their representative to the throne."

"For us it is essential to know that the book of Daniel received its final form obviously shortly before the death of Antiochus Epiphanes in 164 B.C."

"Thus Daniel sees within himself how Judas Maccabee is brought before the throne of God in order to be invested with messianic power."
Page 49:

"The real purpose of the book is to present Judas Maccabbee as the God-sent Messiah who will deliver Israel from Antiochus and erect the messianic kingdom."

Page 50:

"It is the very nature of a working hypothesis that it cannot be proven."

Page 50:

"Sahlin tries to define the scope of Daniel even more from the reality of history. This goes to show how easily the apocalyptic symbolism can be connected with the different historical situations."

Page 56:

"This presumption is presumably not correct."

Page 58:

"The discovery of this number must have been like an electric shock to the reader."
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