

HERMENEUTICAL ISSUES IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL

Edwin M. Yamauchi*

Recent articles by Bruce K. Waltke¹ and Gleason L. Archer² have emphasized important hermeneutical issues involved in interpreting the book of Daniel. Elsewhere I have examined some of the historical, archaeological and linguistic problems bearing on the authenticity and date of Daniel—in particular, the problem of the Greek words in the Aramaic of Daniel.³

These studies indicate that there are no insuperable barriers to accepting a sixth-century date for the book. Questions of interpretation remain, however, to divide conservative and liberal scholars over the character of the book. Is it a genuine prophecy or is it a *vaticinium ex eventu*?

I. THE CONSERVATIVE POSITION

The traditional position of conservative Christians has been that Daniel accurately portrays the experiences of the exiled Daniel at the Babylonian court (Daniel 1-6) and records the visions of the future revealed to him by God (7-12). This viewpoint has been expounded in many studies and commentaries.⁴

Conservative scholars are not unaware that there are some serious problems that face such a traditional view. An important attempt to confront some of these major issues has been contributed by distinguished British scholars—D. J. Wiseman, T. C. Mitchell, R. Joyce, W. J. Martin and K. A. Kitchen.⁵ An excellent evangelical work that interacts with the critical literature is Joyce G. Baldwin's recent commentary.⁶

II. APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE

It is clear that the book of Daniel differs from the prophetic books. Daniel, like Joseph, served as a statesman in a royal court. Later Jews placed the book of Daniel in the third section of their Scriptures (the "Writings") rather than in the second section (the "Prophets"). On the other hand, both Jesus and Josephus

*Edwin Yamauchi is professor of history at Miami University in Oxford, Ohio.

¹B. K. Waltke, "The Date of the Book of Daniel," *BSac* 133 (1976) 319-329.

²G. L. Archer, "Modern Rationalism and the Book of Daniel," *BSac* 136 (1979) 129-147.

³E. M. Yamauchi, *Greece and Babylon: Early Contacts between the Aegean and the Near East* [hereafter *GB*] (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1967); "The Greek Words in Daniel in the Light of Greek Influence in the Near East" in *New Perspectives on the Old Testament* (ed. J. B. Payne; Waco: Word, 1970) 170-200.

⁴J. F. Walvoord, *Daniel, The Key to Prophetic Revelation* (Chicago: Moody, 1971); L. Wood, *A Commentary on Daniel* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1973).

⁵*Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel* (London: Tyndale, 1965).

⁶J. G. Baldwin, *Daniel* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1978).

esteemed Daniel as a prophet.

The Qumran community, which had at least eight copies of Daniel (including one MS dated to the late second century B. C.), valued the work highly and cited it often.⁷ Though there are also some fragments of so-called Pseudo-Daniel, no copies corresponding to the apocryphal Greek additions to Daniel have been found.⁸

It is incontestably clear that the people of Qumran regarded Daniel as a prophet. In 4Q174 2:3 we read [ʾš]r ktwb bspr dnyʿl hnbyʿ (“[whi]ch is written in the book of Daniel the prophet”).⁹ The passage, called a *florilegium* by J. M. Allegro, contains a quotation of Dan 11:32 and 12:10.

Most modern scholars, however, classify Daniel as an example of apocalyptic literature because of its visions and emphasis on eschatology. As most examples of apocalyptic literature date from the second century B. C. and later, Daniel is also regarded—for other reasons as well—to date to this late period. Against this facile assumption G. J. Wenham argues:

First, Daniel is not pure apocalyptic. Second, the apocalyptic style may be partly inspired by Daniel and therefore the other works could be later than our book.

Third, some other OT passages, e. g. Isaiah 25-27 and Zechariah 9 ff., have apocalyptic features, yet can hardly be dated as late as the second century.¹⁰

In the 1970s there has been a renewed interest in the apocalyptic works, spurred by continued study of the Dead Sea scrolls and by such seminal works as Klaus Koch's *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*.¹¹

John J. Collins, citing such works as the Egyptian Demotic Chronicle and the Potter's Oracle, discerns as the sociological context of apocalyptic the loss of national independence following the conquests of Alexander: “Jewish apocalyptic grew out of a situation of political alienation brought about by the loss of national independence in the post-exilic period.”¹²

As against older views (cf. R. H. Charles, H. H. Rowley, D. S. Russell), Paul D. Hanson has sought the roots of the apocalyptic genre in the OT itself, particu-

⁷F. F. Bruce, “The Book of Daniel and the Qumran Community,” *Neotestamentica et Semitica* (ed. E. E. Ellis and M. Wilcox; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1969) 222. See also R. I. Vasholz, “Qumran and the Dating of Daniel,” *JETS* 21/4 (1978) 315-321; G. F. Hasel, “Daniel Survives the Critics’ Den,” *Ministry* (January 1979) 8-11.

⁸C. A. Moore, *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah: The Additions* (AB; Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1977).

⁹J. M. Allegro and A. A. Anderson, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 5. 53-57; Bruce, “Book,” 235; L. F. Hartman and A. A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel* (AB; Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1978) 25; A. Mertens, *Das Buch Daniel im Lichte der Texte vom Toten Meer* (Echter: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1971) 29.

¹⁰R. J. M. Gurney, J. E. Goldingay and G. J. Wenham, “Approaching Daniel: Three Studies,” *Themelios* 2/2 (1977) 55.

¹¹For a survey of recent publications see J. Barr, “Jewish Apocalyptic in Recent Scholarly Study,” *BJRL* 58 (1975-76) 9-35.

¹²J. J. Collins, “Jewish Apocalyptic against Its Hellenistic Near Eastern Environment,” *BASOR* 220 (1975) 34. Cf. idem, “The Court-Tales in Daniel and the Development of Apocalyptic,” *JBL* 94 (1975) 218-234; *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel*; idem, ed., *Semeia 14: Apocalypse* (Missoula: Scholars, 1979).

larly in the exilic period: "The folly of having recourse to third and second century Persian influence to account for the eschatology and dualism in Jewish apocalyptic is demonstrated by the fact that the essential elements of apocalyptic are all nascent in this sixth century oracle (Isaiah 66)."¹³

III. AKKADIAN PROPHECIES

One of the most interesting developments shedding light on the literary genre of Daniel has been the identification of Akkadian works that have been called prophecies. A. K. Grayson identifies five compositions belonging to this genre: the Dynastic prophecy, Text A, the Uruk prophecy, the Marduk prophetic speech, and the Shulgi prophetic speech.¹⁴

Though the examples so far identified are but few, such prophecies had a very long vogue, beginning with Sumerian prototypes. The Marduk prophetic speech comes from the reign of Nebuchadnezzar I (1126-1105 B. C.); Text A also comes from the late Kassite period. The Uruk prophecy, discovered in 1969, has been dated to the coregency of Nebuchadnezzar and Amel-Marduk (Evil-Merodach)—that is, to the period of Daniel.¹⁵ The Dynastic prophecy comes from the Seleucid era.

As Hallo has noted, there are striking parallels between these Akkadian prophecies and the book of Daniel.¹⁶ Most striking are the predictions of the Dynastic prophecy, which forecasts in succession the fall of Assyria, the rise and fall of Babylonia, the rise and fall of Persia, and the rise of Macedonia. The badly-damaged final section may have forecast the capture of Babylon by the Seleucids. Grayson comments that

the concept of the rise and fall of empires, which must have its roots in the dynastic tradition of Mesopotamian chronography, is mirrored by the similar concept in Daniel. Compare also the rubric regarding secrecy at the end of the Dynastic prophecy with the command to Daniel to keep the book sealed. But of prime significance is the possibility that the Dynastic prophecy concludes, as suggested both by internal evidence and on analogy with the prophecy in the Sibylline oracles, with a real attempt to predict the downfall of the Hellenistic kings.¹⁷

The implications of these Akkadian prophecies for the dating of Daniel are ambiguous. On the one hand, conservative scholars may point out that prior to the Neo-Babylonian period there were literary antecedents for Daniel's apocalyptic visions.¹⁸ On the other hand, inasmuch as these texts are all *vaticinia ex*

¹³P. D. Hanson, "Jewish Apocalyptic against Its Near Eastern Environment," *RB* 78 (1971) 54; *The Dawn of Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975). For appraisals see Baldwin, *Daniel*, 46 ff.; R. J. Bauckham, "The Rise of Apocalyptic," *Themelios* 3/2 (1978) 10-23. The study by Hanson's student, W. Millar, *Isaiah 24-27 and the Origin of Apocalyptic* (Missoula: Scholars, 1976), dates the Isaiah apocalypse to the sixth century B. C.

¹⁴A. K. Grayson, *Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts III* (Toronto: University Press, 1975) 13 ff.

¹⁵H. Hunger and S. A. Kaufman, "A New Akkadian Prophecy Text," *JAOS* 95 (1975) 371-375.

¹⁶W. W. Hallo, "Akkadian Apocalypses," *IEJ* 16 (1966) 235.

¹⁷Grayson, *Babylonian*, 21.

¹⁸GB, 90. Cf. G. F. Hasel, "The Four World Empires of Daniel 2 Against Its Near Eastern Environment," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 12 (1979) 17-30.

eventu ("prophecies after the event") and may be found as late as the Hellenistic age, liberals may seek to find support for their position in these texts.

IV. THE FOUR EMPIRES

With the exception of a few aberrant views¹⁹ there have been two major interpretations of the four empires of Daniel 2 and 7. Following ancient Jewish and Christian traditions, conservative scholars believe that the four kingdoms represent the Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, the Hellenistic and the Roman empires.

Liberal scholars, on the other hand, interpret the four kingdoms as the Babylonian, the Median, the Persian and the Hellenistic empires.²⁰ Though Gurney has recently attempted to maintain that such a scheme may accord with a view of Daniel as a true prophet,²¹ almost all who hold this latter position believe that such a projection was mistaken inasmuch as there was no Median empire. The Medes did have a kingdom partly concurrent with the Neo-Babylonian empire but did not rule over a territory comparable to the other empires.²²

V. DANIEL 11 AND ANTIOCHUS IV

Both conservatives and liberals alike agree that Daniel 11:1-35 corresponds remarkably with the events of the Seleucid era and particularly of the reign of Antiochus IV (Epiphanes). Conservative scholars such as Baldwin believe that the details, though accurate, are not so precise as to require "that the prophecy must have been written after the event."²³ They believe that the remarkable correspondences serve to demonstrate the truth of God's predictive revelations.²⁴

All scholars recognize that the final verses of the chapter, Dan 11:36-45, do not correspond to the historical events of Antiochus IV's death.²⁵ That this was the

¹⁹Beek interpreted the four kingdoms as Nebuchadnezzar, Evil-Merodach, Nergal-sharezer, and Nabonidus and Belshazzar; Löwinger suggested Sargon, Sennacherib, Esarhaddon, and Ashurbanipal and Shamash-shum-ukin. Cf. S. Löwinger, "Nebuchadnezzar's Dream in the Book of Daniel," *Ignace Goldziher Memorial Volume* (ed. S. Löwinger and J. de Somogyi; Budapest, 1948), 1. 336-352. Dennefeld viewed them as Assyrian, Median, Persian and Macedonian; Rinaldi maintained they were Babylonian, Medo-Persian, Alexander and Seleucid. Cf. F. Dexinger, *Das Buch Daniel und Seine Probleme* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1969) 34.

²⁰H. H. Rowley, *Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel* (Cardiff: University of Wales, 1935); D. Flusser, "The Four Empires in the Fourth Sibyl and in the Book of Daniel," *Israel Oriental Studies* 2 (1972) 148-175; H. S. Kvanvig, "Struktur und Geschichte in Dan. 7,1-14," *ST* 32 (1978) 95-117.

²¹Gurney *et al.*, "Approaching," 40-41.

²²Prior to the current revolution in Iran, archaeologists were just beginning to conduct excavations in Median territories; the Median capital of Ecbatana (modern Hamadan) is still unexcavated. See E. Yamauchi, "The Achaemenid Capitals," *Near East Archaeological Society Bulletin* 8 (1976) 14-19.

²³Baldwin, *Daniel*, 43.

²⁴For a detailed historical commentary on Daniel 11 from a conservative view see W. K. Price, *In the Final Days* (Chicago: Moody, 1977). The major monograph on Antiochus is O. Mørkholm's *Antiochus IV of Syria* (Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandel, 1966).

²⁵Archer, "Modern," 137-138.

case must have already been evident by the second century B. C. As Hartman notes:

That is to say: whoever published Daniel, whoever started a procedure of copying it for private or public usage, it seems questionable whether he expected the end to appear in some few weeks. And if he did, it did not take long until the measured time had run out.²⁶

Bruce suggests that the Qumran *Rule of War* may be an early attempt to interpret the end of Daniel 11.²⁷

Conservative scholars believe that the final verses of Daniel 11 refer to future events involving the Antichrist. They also believe that the prophecy of "seventy weeks" in Daniel 9 can be shown to have predicted the precise date of Christ's ministry.²⁸

VI. VATICINIA EX EVENTU?

It was Porphyry (A. D. 233-305), the disciple of the Neo-Platonist Plotinus, who first concluded that Daniel was not a true prophecy but rather a "prophecy after the event" in his work *Fifteen Books against the Christians*.²⁹ According to Jerome,

Porphyry wrote his twelfth book against the prophecy of Daniel, denying that it was composed by the person to whom it is ascribed in its title, but rather by some individual living in Judea at the time of the Antiochus who was surnamed Epiphanes. He furthermore alleged that "Daniel" did not foretell the future so much as he related the past, and lastly that whatever he spoke of up till the time of Antiochus contained authentic history, whereas anything he may have conjectured beyond that point was false, inasmuch as he would not have foreknown the future.³⁰

It is ironic that not only Jewish scholars, such as Bickerman,³¹ but also so-called "Christian" scholars now prefer the views of the anti-Christian Porphyry to that of his Christian opponent Jerome.³² Casey concludes: "Porphyry's work now emerges as a creditable scholarly achievement. His main results, the Macca-bean dating and the pseudepigraphic nature of Daniel, were correct."³³

²⁶L. Hartman, "The Functions of Some So-Called Apocalyptic Timetables," *NTS* 22 (1975) 5.

²⁷Bruce, "Book," 233.

²⁸H. H. Hoehner, "Chronological Aspects of the Life of Christ VI: Daniel's Seventy Weeks and New Testament Chronology," *BSac* 132 (1975) 47-65. Cf. J. Doukhan, "The Seventy Weeks of Dan 9," *AUSS* 17 (1979) 1-22; J. B. Payne, "The Goal of Daniel's Seventy Weeks," *JETS* 21/2 (1978) 97-115.

²⁹M. V. Anastos, "Porphyry's Attack on the Bible," *The Classical Tradition: Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of H. Caplan* (Ithaca: Cornell University, 1966) 433-434.

³⁰Cited by J. Braverman, *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel* (Washington, D. C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1978) 116 n. 1. Cf. G. L. Archer, *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1958).

³¹E. Bickerman, *Four Strange Books of the Bible* (New York: Schocken, 1967) 128-129.

³²E. g., A. Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1978) 7.

³³P. M. Casey, "Porphyry and the Origin of the Book of Daniel," *JTS* 27 (1976) 30-31.

It is above all the close correspondence of Daniel 11 to events in the life of Antiochus IV that convinces scholars that these are *vaticinia ex eventu*. As Baldwin notes: "Though several arguments are adduced with the intention of giving cumulative force to a second-century date, there is basically one reason for the tenaciously-held opinion, and that is the content of chapter 11."³⁴ Numerous studies have underscored the close parallels between Daniel and the actual events.³⁵

The divergence of vv 36-45 from the known history of Antiochus simply proves to liberal scholars that the author was ignorant of the death of Antiochus, which took place in Persia in 164 rather than in Palestine.³⁶ Scholars believe that they can pinpoint the exact date of Daniel's composition from these verses:

Since the book mentions neither Epiphanes' military campaign into Asia (begun in 165 BCE) nor the rededication of the temple (December, 164 BCE), the year 165 BCE is fixed as the *terminus ad quem* for the work's final redaction.³⁷

According to a recent study by Clifford, "in Dan 11:36-12:3, where he (the author) was not bound by Seleucid history, he re-used OT traditions and transformed Canaanite mythic materials to the same purpose."³⁸ Clifford does agree with conservative scholars on one point—that the author in these last verses had in mind someone other than the historical Antiochus: "It appears that the author saw the ultimate enemy of the Most High God and his people not as Antiochus IV or any human empire, but as a more radical power persisting among the succession of empires."³⁹

Inasmuch as liberal scholars believe that the "situation in life" for the work's composition is the crisis of Antiochus IV, they have also sought evidence for allusions to this king in all the chapters of Daniel. According to Lacocque, "the unity of the book is assured by the omnipresent shadow of Antiochus IV, as much in the first part as in the second part."⁴⁰

For example, Mastin interprets Dan 2:46 as a veiled allusion to Antiochus: "It is enough for him to demonstrate the blindness of a heathen king, a theme which would be particularly attractive if he were writing after Antiochus Epiphanes had desecrated the Temple."⁴¹ The figure of the Son of Man in Daniel 7 has been interpreted as the hero, Judas Maccabeus, who opposed

³⁴Baldwin, *Daniel*, 41.

³⁵H. Sahlin, "Antiochus IV. Epiphanes und Judas Mackabäus," *ST* 23 (1969) 41-68; A. Lenglet, "La structure littéraire de Daniel," *Bib* 53 (1972) 175; M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), 1. 184 ff.; J. C. H. Lebram, "König Antiochus im Buch Daniel," *VT* 25 (1975) 737-772.

³⁶J. C. H. Lebram, "Perspektiven der gegenwärtigen Danielforschung," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 5 (1974) 5.

³⁷P. Schäfer, "Hellenistic and Maccabean Periods," in *Israelite and Judaeon History* (ed. J. H. Hayes and J. M. Miller; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977) 540.

³⁸R. J. Clifford, "History and Myth in Daniel 10-12," *BASOR* 220 (1975) 23.

³⁹*Ibid.*, 25.

⁴⁰Lacocque, *Book*, 24.

⁴¹B. A. Mastin, "Daniel 2:46 and the Hellenistic World," *ZAW* 85 (1973) 93.

Antiochus.⁴² According to many the narratives of Daniel 1-6 are not historical accounts but are "tales" and "legends," which have been designed to encourage the Jews who were suffering from the persecutions of Antiochus.⁴³

Some scholars who believe in the Maccabean origin of Daniel 7-12 are willing to concede that the stories of 1-6 may have come from an earlier period. According to McNamara, "one of the strongest arguments for a pre-Maccabean date for chapters 1-6 is the fact that in these 'Nebuchadnezzar' is depicted in a favourable light; he is no prototype of the infamous Epiphanes."⁴⁴

In any case, the liberal position that dates the composition or redaction of Daniel in the second century entails with it the corollary that the book is neither by or about the historical Daniel. It is rather a pseudepigraphical work by an anonymous author who issued the work under the name of Daniel.

VII. PSEUDONYMITY AND INERRANCY

Since the promulgation in 1943 of the papal encyclical *Divino afflante Spiritu*, Roman Catholic exegetes have as a whole accepted the critical views of liberal Protestant scholars.⁴⁵ Speaking of Daniel, the late Louis Hartman asserts:

Inasmuch as neither of these genres (haggadic and apocalyptic) is concerned with history, it is no longer the task of Catholic exegetes to try to solve the seeming inerrancies in historical matters where an inspired writer, such as the author of Dn, did not intend to write history.⁴⁶

Hartman was entrusted with the Anchor Bible volume on Daniel. After his death the work was completed by another Catholic scholar, Alexander A. Di Lella. In the work, which bears the *nihil obstat* and *imprimatur* of the Catholic Church, the authors refer to the stories in the first part of Daniel as "mildly incredible or even childish"⁴⁷ and accept the view of Daniel as a late pseudonymous work full of historical errors. On the other hand, by some exercise of casuistry they are able to maintain: "At the same time it should be emphasized that in no way at all does the argument presented above impugn or even call into question the sacredness, authority, and inerrancy of the Book of Daniel which are accepted here without question as truths of Christian faith."⁴⁷

Recently some of the more "progressive" evangelical scholars in the United

⁴²Sahlin, "Antiochus," 49; A. Caquot, "Sur les quatre bêtes de Daniel VII," *Sem* 5 (1955) 5-13; idem, "Les quatre bêtes et les fils de l'homme," *Sem* 17 (1976) 37-71.

⁴³H. P. Müller, "Märchen, Legende und Enderwartung: Zum Verständnis des Buches Daniel," *VT* 26 (1976) 338-350; W. L. Humphreys, "Life-style for Diaspora: A Study of the Tales of Esther and Daniel," *JBL* 92 (1973) 211-223.

⁴⁴M. McNamara, "Nabonidus and the Book of Daniel," *ITQ* 37 (1970) 131.

⁴⁵See J. W. Montgomery, "The Approach of New Shape Roman Catholicism to Scriptural Inerrancy," *BETS* 10 (1967) 209-226.

⁴⁶L. Hartman, "The Great Tree and Nabuchodonosor's Madness," in *The Bible in Current Catholic Thought* (ed. J. L. McKenzie; New York: Herder & Herder, 1962) 75.

⁴⁷Hartman and Di Lella, *Book*, 103.

Kingdom have also accepted the liberal view of Daniel's date and composition.⁴⁸ This turnabout has been vigorously defended by John E. Goldingay. After affirming that "Biblical faith stands or falls by history," Goldingay qualifies this by affirming that "writers who accept 'infallibility' (rather than 'inerrancy'), however, do not necessarily go on to take every detail of biblical history literally."⁴⁹ Noting that evangelicals have indeed made concessions in response to criticism he goes on to ask, "I wonder whether there is any point to draw a line, and whether there is a necessary connection at all between Evangelical theology and conservative criticism."⁵⁰

In his own case Goldingay has evidently decided that the answer to the last question is "no." In his own view of Daniel he attempts on the one hand to apply critical views and on the other hand to retain traditional values of Daniel as God's Word. Goldingay writes:

Dating Daniel in the sixth century, indeed, brings not more glory to God but less. . . . But if in the book of Daniel God is revealing himself to his people in the second century, and calling them in that situation, by means of this strange literary form, to faith in him as the one who is Lord despite the evidence to the contrary, then this God I recognize both in Scripture and in experience.⁵¹

I am afraid that most untutored Christians would find such reasoning schizophrenic.

Responding in the same journal, other British evangelical scholars have questioned both Goldingay's premises and the compatibility of his views with the traditional conception of Daniel as God's Word. In response to Goldingay's contention—shared also by Bauckham⁵²—that pseudonymity was not necessarily designed to deceive the readers, Joyce Baldwin observes:

It will be noted that pseudepigraphy is said to fulfil functions which are mutually exclusive. On the one hand we are asked to believe that this was an accepted literary convention which deceived no-one, and on the other that the adoption of a pseudonym, which presumably went undetected, increased the acceptability and authority of a work. Those who contend that Daniel was written under a pseudonym cannot have it both ways.⁵³

In responding to Goldingay's contention that God can speak through *vaticinia ex eventu*, Gordon J. Wenham objects:

The idea that God declares his future purposes to his servants is at the heart of the book's theology. If, however, Daniel is a second-century work, one of its central themes is discredited, and it could be argued that Daniel ought to be relegated to the Apocrypha, and not retain full canonical status as part of OT Scripture.⁵⁴

⁴⁸Ibid., 54.

⁴⁹J. E. Goldingay, "Inspiration, Infallibility, and Criticism," *The Churchman* 90 (1976) 11.

⁵⁰Ibid., 20.

⁵¹In Gurney, *et al.*, "Approaching," 49.

⁵²Bauckham, "Rise," 18.

⁵³J. G. Baldwin, "Is There Pseudonymity in the Old Testament?," *Themelios* 4/1 (1978) 11.

⁵⁴In Gurney, *et al.*, "Approaching," 51.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

It is quite clear that liberal commentators, though they may cite works by Wiseman and Kitchen, are not dissuaded from their unshakeable conviction that Daniel is a second-century-B.C. pseudonymous *vaticinium ex eventu*.

At the same time conservative scholars are equally unmoved from their position by the historical problems, which they do not regard as insuperable. They welcome the increasing mass of linguistic and archaeological data that help to support an early date.⁵⁵ They are convinced that Daniel indeed was a true prophet with a message both for his generation and for us today.

⁵⁵See Yamauchi, "Archaeological Backgrounds of the Exilic and Postexilic Era, Part 1: The Archaeological Background of Daniel," *BSac* 137 (1980) 3-16.