

## THE BOOK OF DANIEL AND THE "MACCABEAN THESIS"

ARTHUR J. FERCH  
Avondale College  
Cooranbong, N. S. W. 2265  
Australia

Up until about a century ago, the claims laid out in the book of Daniel as to its authorship, origin, etc., during the sixth century B.C. were quite generally accepted. However, since 1890, according to Klaus Koch, this exilic theory has been seriously challenged—so much so, in fact, that today it represents only a minority view among Daniel scholars.<sup>1</sup> The majority hold a view akin to that of Porphyry, the third-century Neoplatonist enemy of Christianity, that the book of Daniel was composed (if not entirely, at least substantially) in the second century B.C. during the religious persecution of the Jews by the Seleucid monarch Antiochus IV Epiphanes.<sup>2</sup> The book is considered to have arisen in conjunction with, or in support of, the Jewish resistance to Antiochus led by Judas Maccabeus and his brothers.

Thus, according to this view, designated as the "Maccabean thesis,"<sup>3</sup> the book of Daniel was composed (at least in part) and/or edited in the second century by an unknown author or authors who posed as a sixth-century statesman-prophet named Daniel and who pretended to offer genuinely inspired predictions (*vaticinia ante eventum*) which in reality were no more than historical narratives

\*This article is based on a section of a paper presented in 1982 to the Daniel and Revelation Committee of the Biblical Research Institute (General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Washington, D.C.).

<sup>1</sup>See Klaus Koch (in collaboration with T. Niewisch and J. Tubach), *Das Buch Daniel* (Darmstadt, 1980), pp. 8-9. A review of this book is found in *JSOT* 23 (1982): 119-123, and reprinted in slightly revised form as an excursus at the end of this article.

<sup>2</sup>Regarding Porphyry, cf. Koch, pp. 9,185; R. H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York, 1941), p. 755; and the discussion in Arthur J. Ferch, "Porphyry: An Heir to Christian Exegesis?" in *ZNW* 73 (1982): 141-147.

<sup>3</sup>So Koch's appropriate designation (*Makkabäerthese*), pp. 8-12 and *passim*.

under the guise of prophetic predictions (*vaticinia ex eventu*). Obviously, this Maccabean thesis rejects the idea that a sixth-century Babylonian/Persian milieu is depicted in Daniel. Rather, it presupposes a reflection of second-century Judaism of the time of the Maccabean struggle against Antiochus.

In this connection, it should be pointed out that an increasing number of scholars have in recent years proposed a dual- or multiple-authorship theory allowing the material in the historical chapters to go back in origin beyond the Maccabean period, but not doing likewise for the substance of the prophetic portions of the book. Especially for chap. 11 has the Maccabean connection been considered to be particularly prominent.<sup>4</sup>

While earlier articles in *AUSS* by Gerhard F. Hasel and William H. Shea have examined matters relating to persons,

<sup>4</sup>There has recently been a tendency to consider chaps. 1-6 in Daniel as being pre-Maccabean (or "pre-Epiphanean"), while still maintaining a substantial Maccabean-period origin for chaps. 7-12. E.g., H. Louis Ginsberg, *Studies in Daniel* (New York, 1948), p. 29, refers to Dan 2 (within his "Daniel A," chaps. 1-6) as dating to "between 292 and 261 B.C.E. for the body, and between 246 and 220 B.C.E. for some two and a half secondary verses." "Daniel B" (chaps. 7-12), he goes on to say, confronts us with a "totally different picture," each of its four apocalypses bearing "the imprint of the reign of Antiochus IV." John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* (Missoula, Montana, 1977), pp. 45-46, also sees chaps. 1-6 as pre-Maccabean, but would place them later than does Ginsberg—namely, within a seventy-year period from 240-170 B.C. Cf., further, André Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel*, trans. David Pellauer (Atlanta, Georgia, 1979), pp. 8-10; and L. F. Hartman and A. A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel*, AB 23 (Garden City, N.Y., 1978).

Although it is beyond the scope of this brief article to describe and discuss the debate that has arisen on the question of single authorship as versus dual or multiple authorship of Daniel, mention may just be made here that Ginsberg and H. H. Rowley were central to engendering the debate. See Rowley's responses to Ginsberg in *JBL* 68 (1949): 173-177, and the article entitled "The Unity of the Book of Daniel," *HUCA* 23 (1950-51): 233-273. A later exchange occurred: Ginsberg, "The Composition of the Book of Daniel," *VT* 4 (1954): 246-275; and Rowley, "The Composition of the Book of Daniel," *VT* 5 (1955): 272-276. Rowley, of course, endeavored to place total authorship in the Maccabean period. Cf. more recently, J. G. Gammie, "The Classification, Stages of Growth, and Changing Intentions in the Book of Daniel," *JBL* 95 (1976): 191-204; and Koch, pp. 55-76. Gammie contends that "the single, most outstanding weakness in the Maccabean theory of interpretation is that the king in chaps. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 is uncommonly friendly and sympathetic with the young Jewish members of his court. This portrait hardly suits the latter days of the hated Hellenizer, Antiochus IV Epiphanes" (p. 191).

chronology, Aramaic language, and archaeology, I propose here to ask whether the book of Daniel—especially Dan 11—reflects the second-century situation envisaged by, and basic to, the Maccabean thesis.<sup>5</sup>

### 1. *Basic Assumptions of the Maccabean Thesis*

This Maccabean thesis proposes that the actual time of final composition of the book of Daniel may be ascertained by recognizing certain historical hints within the book and by discerning the precise point in time at which the author passed from genuine history writing to “imaginary expectation” and mistaken future predictions. Thus, André Lacocque suggests that in Dan 11 the author (1) gives evidence of knowing of the profanation of the Jerusalem temple by Antiochus IV Epiphanes (Dec. 7, 167 B.C.; cf. Dan 11:31), and (2) alludes to the revolt of the Maccabees and the first victories of Judah (166 B.C.), but (3) is unaware of both the purification of the temple by Judas (Dec. 14, 164 B.C.) and the death of Antiochus (Autumn, 164 B.C.). Nevertheless, the demise of Antiochus, he claims, is wrongly predicted and described in Dan 11:40-45. Lacocque concludes that “we can at least situate the second part of the Book of Daniel (chapters 7-12), therefore, with a very comfortable certainty, in 164 B.C.E.”<sup>6</sup>

It may be of interest to note, in passing, that as long as the view prevailed that the book came from the hands of a sixth-century author, few if any problems arose concerning matters of authorship, composition, and structure. This situation has significantly changed with the introduction of the Maccabean thesis. In fact, in 1975 J. J. Collins declared that “the composition of the

<sup>5</sup>See especially the two articles by Gerhard F. Hasel devoted explicitly to this matter: “The Book of Daniel: Evidences Relating to Persons and Chronology” and “The Book of Daniel and Matters of Language: Evidences Relating to Names, Words, and the Aramaic Language,” in *AUSS* 19 (1981): 37-49, 211-225. A series of three articles by William H. Shea in the Spring, Summer, and Autumn issues of *AUSS* in 1982 are directed more broadly to providing a correlation of biblical and archaeological data with respect to several of the historical chapters in Daniel (chaps 3, 5, and 6), but these articles nevertheless speak incisively to the issue at hand. Cf. also Joyce G. Baldwin, *Daniel: An Introduction and Commentary* (Downers Grove, Ill., 1978), pp. 18-46.

<sup>6</sup>Lacocque, p. 8.

Book of Daniel has given rise to a bewildering range of scholarly opinions."<sup>7</sup> One may query as to whether this "bewildering range of scholarly opinions" in connection with the Maccabean thesis is not itself an argument against the thesis. At the very least, this confusion raises serious questions as to how, if at all, the book of Daniel gives any clear depiction or *bona fide* clues to the second-century situation it supposedly reflects.

In any event, basic to the Maccabean thesis is the presupposition that a rather reliable historical reconstruction of events between 168-164 B.C. is possible and that such a reconstruction coincides closely with the data provided by the latter half of Dan 11 (and to a lesser degree by the earlier portions of the book). Further, the suggestion that the author was either a Maccabean or had Maccabean leanings would lead one to expect that emphases and perspectives evident in Daniel would find parallels in the contemporary Maccabean literature.

## 2. *The Maccabean Thesis and the History of the Maccabean Revolt*

When one turns to an historical analysis, however, the argument that Dan 11 parallels events from the second century B.C. so closely that it actually provides us with the book's *Sitz im Leben* presents the researcher with significant problems.<sup>8</sup>

### *Sparse and Conflicting Primary Sources*

A first consideration is that the most important primary or contemporary sources depicting the events between 168-164 B.C. with considerable detail are unfortunately few, being limited primarily to 1 and 2 Maccabees and Polybius.<sup>9</sup> Complicating the matter further is the fact that there are a number of weighty

<sup>7</sup>John J. Collins, "The Court-Tales in Daniel and the Development of Apocalyptic," *JBL* 94 (1975): 218. Cf. also pp. 219-234.

<sup>8</sup>At this juncture it is interesting to note a pertinent observation by Baldwin: "No other part of the Old Testament, or even of the New Testament, has ever been dated so confidently" (*Daniel*, p. 183).

<sup>9</sup>Writers of lesser importance for this period include Josephus, Diodorus Siculus, Eupolemus, Nicolaus of Damascus, and Strabo of Amasea.

disagreements within these sources about the details and the order of events during this period. Given the divergences in the presently available primary and contemporary sources, it is difficult to draw up a consistent and accurate historical reconstruction for the events under consideration.<sup>10</sup> This fact, as well as the occurrence of what could at least be considered only as several vague allusions in the text of Dan 11, makes a satisfactory and sorely needed comparison between the book of Daniel and the mid-second century happenings somewhat problematical.

Indeed, events during this period which still remain a matter of controversy among historians include the cause of the religious persecution of the Jews, the precise time of Jason's rebellion, the date of Antiochus' death, and the matter of whether there was one campaign or whether there were two campaigns of Antiochus against Jerusalem. In view of these questions and the fact that the books of Maccabees do not speak of two campaigns by Antiochus against the Holy City, it is interesting to note that the well-known Jewish scholar V. Tcherikover reconstructs events of the period between 168-164 B.C. by resorting to the debatable procedure of treating Dan 11—which mentions a twofold contact between the king of the north and God's people—as an eye-witness account for two visits by Antiochus to Jerusalem.<sup>11</sup> Tcherikover simply assumes what scholars discussing a second-century *Sitz im Leben* of Daniel are trying to prove. The validity of this kind of circular argument is particularly open to question, since it is precisely these two visits of Antiochus to Jerusalem which are advanced as one of the major proofs that the book of Daniel arose in the second century B.C.

<sup>10</sup>Cf. P. Schäfer, "The Hellenistic and Maccabean Periods," *Israelite and Judaeon History*, ed. J. H. Hayes and J. M. Miller (Philadelphia, 1977), pp. 560-568; J. A. Montgomery, *The Book of Daniel*, ICC (Edinburgh, 1927), pp. 447-449. Baldwin, though herself recognizing the role of Antiochus in Dan 11, observes that "given a thorough knowledge of the ancient historians of the period . . . a commentary on the chapter can become a maze of information which bewilders the reader. . . . not all the events in Daniel 11 fit into the evidence culled from other sources. . . . we ought not to exaggerate the extent to which the Daniel narrative fits into known history of the period" (*Daniel*, p. 41).

<sup>11</sup>V. Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (Philadelphia, 1959), p. 186, and n. 20 on pp. 473-474.

*Similarities and Dissimilarities Between Dan 11 and the Maccabean Situation*

Moreover, while it is possible to propose several similarities between the book of Daniel and the Maccabean situation, there are a greater number of dissimilarities which have to be either ignored or passed over. The resemblances between Dan 11 and the accounts in the books of Maccabees and Polybius include (1) reference to the setting up of the "abomination of desolation" (Dan 11:31; cf. 1 Macc 1:54; Dan 9:27; 12:11; and Matt 24:15); and (2) the twofold conflict of the king of the north with the king of the south, as well as the northern tyrant's withdrawal after an encounter with the ships of Kittim (Dan 11:25-31). When these details are compared with the profanation of the temple by Antiochus and with his two campaigns against Egypt and expulsion by the Roman legate Popillius Laenas, parallels can suggest themselves; and one can appreciate therefore that someone reading Dan 11 in the time of Antiochus could apply these passages to the situation of that time.

However, given the premise that Dan 11 (and so much else in the book of Daniel) is a *vaticinium ex eventu* and was possibly written only a few months after the episodes took place, it becomes incredible that *so little* in the biblical account reflects the events recorded in 1 and 2 Maccabees. If, as has been suggested, the writer of the book of Daniel was a Maccabean author<sup>12</sup> or at least an individual or group sympathetic to the Maccabean cause, one should be able to detect quite a number of accurate details regarding recent happenings and should be able to discover evidences of a basic philosophy common to both the writers of the books of Maccabees and Daniel. Yet, the tenor of 1 and 2 Maccabees and that of Daniel appear to be at odds. The Maccabean literature is far more concerned with Jewish opposition to the Seleucid king, while Daniel is more interested in the activities of the king of the north. Dan 11 (esp. vss. 36-39 and also Dan 8:9-12) demonstrates a great deal of interest in the character of the blaspheming tyrant and describes him in terms which *far surpass* anything we presently know concerning the character, pretensions, and actions of Antiochus Epiphanes.

<sup>12</sup>Recently again in B. S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (London, 1979), p. 616.

Antiochus left an indelible impression on the minds and lives of the Jews of his day. He interfered with their religious observances, their ideals, and their cultic system. He attracted traitors to the Jewish cause, and he persecuted mercilessly those who were unwilling to comply with his program. Antiochus and his henchmen marched through Jewish territory. He defiled the temple by erecting a pagan image on its altar. Yet, for all this, he never destroyed the temple (contrast Dan 8:11). Ever since his father's defeats, Antiochus had lived in the ever-lengthening shadow of Rome. As far as we can ascertain, his military exploits hardly match those attributed to the little horn in Dan 8:9 and the king of the north in Dan 11:22.

Even the Maccabean thesis concedes that Dan 11:40-45 does not conform to what is known about the end of Antiochus. These verses create a problem which the thesis seeks to solve by relegating these verses to the wishful but mistaken imaginative expression of hopes of the second-century author. Such an explanation is a *tour de force* and would hardly survive elsewhere in OT criticism. Here the majority view becomes incredible, particularly if one accepts the notion that the fulfillment of Dan 11:1-39 was designed to inspire hope and validation for the fulfillment of future prophecies.

It is equally strange that though the visions were allegedly written within living memory of the events, the various time periods listed in Daniel for the persecution of God's people and the restoration of the sanctuary services nowhere coincide with the three-year period mentioned in Maccabees for the desecration of the temple.<sup>13</sup>

Moreover, whereas in the Maccabean literature the Maccabees and their vicissitudes are of central importance, commentators generally see no more than a vague allusion to these freedom-fighters in Daniel (i.e., Dan 11:34).<sup>14</sup> If the writer of the book of Daniel were a Maccabean author, why is he so silent about the exploits of the Maccabees and their exciting defeats of Apollonius and Seron (1 Macc 3:10-26), and of Gorgias and Lysias (1 Macc 4:1-35)? Why is there no call to arms in Daniel, when the Maccabees

<sup>13</sup>Since proponents of the Maccabean thesis contend that the book of Daniel was penned before the temple cleansing and restoration in December, 164 B.C., these time periods are in a sense genuine prophecies.

<sup>14</sup>E.g., Montgomery, p. 446; and Norman W. Porteous, *Daniel: A Commentary*, 2d ed. revised (London, 1979), p. 168.

were even prepared to break the sabbath in their all-out insurrection to achieve survival and independence? Even if the author was a member of the *Hasidim* or was a pacifist, it is unlikely that he would not warm up more to the successes of his countrymen and that he would leave unnamed such heroes as Mattathias and Judas Maccabeus.

In the light of these problems, the contention that Dan 11 parallels events in Palestine between 168-164 B.C. so closely that it provides us with the book's *Sitz im Leben* needs to be called into question. While the Maccabean thesis demonstrates how someone who read Dan 11 in the time of Antiochus could apply sections of this chapter to his own situation, this theory does not prove that Dan 11 (or the rest of the book) originated at that time.

### 3. *Further Problems for the Maccabean Thesis*

Two further weak links in the chain of arguments proposed in defense of the Maccabean thesis may be noted very briefly here: (1) the claims made for pseudonymity, and (2) the supposed significance of Greek terms in the book of Daniel.

#### *Pseudonymity*

The basic problem in considering the book of Daniel as a pseudonymous composition lies in the fact that this book nonetheless qualified for inclusion in the canon of Scripture. Joyce Baldwin, after assessing the issue of pseudonymity in the world of the OT, concludes: "It is significant that within the period covered by the Old Testament no example has so far come to light of a pseudepigraphon which was approved or cherished as an authoritative book, and . . . there was opposition to the interpolation of new material into a text."<sup>15</sup>

In fact, the functions which scholars claim pseudepigrapha fulfill are mutually exclusive, for "on the one hand we are asked to believe that this [pseudonymous authorship] was an accepted literary convention which deceived no-one, and on the other that the adoption of the pseudonym, which presumably went undetected, increased the acceptability and authority of a work."<sup>16</sup>

<sup>15</sup>Joyce G. Baldwin, "Is There Pseudonymity in the Old Testament?" in *Themelios* 4 (1978): 8.

<sup>16</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 11.

Another serious problem with the notion of pseudonymity in the book of Daniel is the fact that it robs this biblical book of its impact. G. Wenham appropriately remarks that "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 a part of OT Scripture."<sup>17</sup> In any event and in the final analysis, the task of demonstrating that the book is in any part pseudonymous still rests with those who make this claim.

### *Greek Loan Words*

Scholarship has come to recognize that most of the words once considered as being Greek terms in Daniel are actually of *Persian origin*, so that today the list of Daniel's supposedly Greek terms has been reduced to *only three*—all being names of musical instruments.<sup>18</sup> In view of the fact, on the one hand, that certain Greek words are attested in the ancient Near East long before the conquests of Alexander the Great, and also the fact, on the other hand, that by the Maccabean period the Greek influence was pervasive in the Near East, scholars who support the Maccabean origin of the book of Daniel may actually be asking the wrong question. Given a rigid second-century-origin thesis, the question is not so much as to why there are three Greek words in the book, but rather the question is why there are *only three* Greek words at a time of such extensive Greek influence.

### 4. *Conclusion*

In conclusion, it appears to me that rigorous historical analysis does not support the positive and confident statements made by adherents of the Maccabean thesis. As an alternative, the exilic

<sup>17</sup>G. J. Wenham, "Daniel: The Basic Issues," *Themelios* 2 (1977): 51.

<sup>18</sup>Cf. Koch, p. 37. These musical instruments which are mentioned in Dan 3:5,7,10,15—"harp," "psaltery," and "sackbut"—appear in extrabiblical sources subsequent to the sixth century B.C. *Sûmpōnyâ*, in the sense used in Daniel, is thus far not documented prior to the second century, but Gammie p. 198, considers this a gloss. However, the term did have early usage in Greek (*sumphōnia*) as a "sounding together" (see E. Yamauchi, "The Archaeological Background of Daniel," *BSac* 137 [1980]: 12).

thesis, which, though not without problems, seeks to take the explicit claims of the book of Daniel seriously, should again receive careful consideration.

## EXCURSUS

### REVIEW OF KLAUS KOCH, *DAS BUCH DANIEL*

(*Editor's Note:* Although we normally do not publish book reviews which have appeared in other journals, the significance of Koch's publication and its relatedness to the topic of the foregoing article have led us to include it here as an "excursus." This review of Koch's *Das Buch Daniel* by Arthur J. Ferch appeared in *JSOT*, Issue 23 [July 1982], pp. 119-123. We express our gratitude both to the author of the review and to the editors of *JSOT* for permission to make this reprint, which is essentially the original review with only minor revisions.)

Koch's monograph is a critical survey of research on the book of Daniel since the late 19th century, which developed in connection with a form-critical and linguistic project on Daniel carried out in Hamburg, Germany. A related and more comprehensive study examining the history of interpretation during the last two millennia is currently under way, entitled *Europa und das Danielbuch*.

The nine chapters of the present volume focus on text-critical and canonical questions, issues of unity and genre, the assumed contemporary situation, origins of apocalyptic, and several theological themes, including the kingdom of God, angelology, the resurrection, and the identities of the "one like a son of man" and the "(people of) the saints of the Most High."

Koch notes with regret that the study of Daniel is no longer as intense as it was in past centuries, when both synagogue and church accepted its sixth-century B.C. origin (the "exilic-date thesis") and consequently recognized in its pages divine providence in history. Nowadays, Daniel research is complex and requires the interdisciplinary cooperation of linguists, literary critics, historians of antiquity, and specialists in comparative religions.

Despite the wide variety of opinions on Daniel, the majority of scholars have come to agree since ca. 1890—though contrary to the book's testimony—that the substantial composition of the protocanonical Daniel took place during the religious persecutions of Antiochus IV Epiphanes (the "Maccabean-date thesis"). This latter thesis finds its central pillar in the putative correspondence of the *šiqquš šōmēm* with the desolating abomination introduced into the Jerusalem temple (1 Macc 1:54) and

assumes anonymous formation of the first and pseudonymous composition of the second half of Daniel (p. 136). Koch observes that more recently linguistic, literary, and traditio-historical considerations have softened this thesis. Thus, while the *terminus ad quem* generally remains the Maccabean period, it is conceded that the seer(s) incorporated earlier materials which, though redacted, still show their seams. Here, according to Koch, the scholarly consensus ends.

Koch stresses the need for additional text-critical study of the MT, LXX, Theodotion, Syriac, Latin, Coptic, and Ethiopic versions. While the DSS readings of Daniel inspire confidence in the MT, the divergence between the MT and the presumed Semitic originals of the LXX and Syriac may indicate no more than an independent MT redaction. The position of Daniel among the prophets in the Alexandrian canon and the fact that the DSS, NT, and Josephus regard the writer of Daniel as being a prophet provide evidence that in the older documents Daniel was at home among the prophets (p. 28). Since other biblical books are represented on papyri, Koch rejects D. Barthélémy's claim that the Danielic papyrus fragment from cave 6 demonstrates the non-canonical status of Daniel within the Qumran community. Why then does the massoretic-rabbinic tradition include Daniel before the bilingual Ezra in the Kethubim? Koch tentatively suggests that the mixture of sacred language and Aramaic may have led to the present position of Daniel.

Since the seventeenth century, questions pertaining to the two languages, the Persian loan words, and the Greek terms for musical instruments in Daniel, have contributed to the debate over the inspiration and genuineness of the book. Recent scholarship leads Koch to conclude that the Aramaic of Daniel—allowing for orthographic changes in the process of copying—is Imperial Aramaic of an eastern type which should be dated as early as the fifth century B.C. but no later than 300 B.C. (p. 45). Though this assessment challenges earlier scholarly opinions, it seems to be corroborated by the evidence; and commentaries, OT introductions, and even grammars will need to make changes accordingly.

In relation to the Aramaic of Daniel, Koch claims that radical criticism and its Maccabean date have lost the battle, though the numerous Persian loan words arguing for a time after 500 B.C. prevent proponents of the exilic thesis from carrying off the victory (pp. 45-46).

Koch finds an increasing number of scholars arguing for a lengthy tradition history in Daniel. His own proclivity toward this approach becomes repeatedly evident. He detects at least six successive stages and suggests the term *Aufstockungshypothese* ("hypothesis of extensions") to describe the complex development of the book. While this interpretation may convince those already committed to a traditio-historical growth of Daniel, scholars arguing for the book's unity will undoubtedly require

more evidence. Indeed, the tendency to impose Daniel upon an occidental Procrustean bed will need to be watched, particularly when it requires an unnecessary proliferation of arguments.

Though various cultures and literatures may have provided religio-historical building blocks for Daniel (and Koch provides the most comprehensive table of suggested derivations seen by this reviewer), he suggests that only future research will demonstrate which, if any, source(s) is (are) final. This reviewer has expressed the hope elsewhere (*JBL* 99:75-86) that future study will examine parallel terms and motifs in their total context to avoid the dangers of misreading elements of one culture in terms of another and of suppressing adverse evidence in the interests of a pre-determined theory.

Koch is cautious, and is only certain of prior stages in Dan 4 in which Nebuchadnezzar's eviction and reinstatement are recognized as part of an organic development with the prayer of Nabonidus (4QPr Nab) and Nabonidus' inscription on the Sin temple of Harran (*ANET*<sup>3</sup>, pp. 562-563). Yet, given the significant differences in these three texts, a great deal of more plausible evidence is needed to make compelling the case for organic development.

Koch challenges the notion that Daniel is the crowning witness to the second-century-B.C. clash between Hellenism and late Judaism. This *communis opinio* disregards the complexity of Hellenism and fails to recognize that second-century Judaism was hardly characterized by law and synagogue as sole centers of religion. Instead, Koch surmises that both the writer(s) of Daniel and the Maccabees were threatened by a mighty wave of astral religion, astronomy, and astrology, coupled with both calendar and eon speculations which found a significant expression in *ba<sup>c</sup>al šāmēm* (= Olympian Zeus = *šiqquš šōmēm*).

Koch is equally dissatisfied with the critical interpretations of the time periods in Daniel. The suggestion is unsatisfactory that the 1150-day period (?) of Dan 8:14 was successively extended to 1260, 1290, and finally 1335 days, as victory eluded the nation. Similarly, while the 3½ times which are clearly too long to fit the Maccabean three-year revolt may be explained in terms of prophecy before the event, Koch argues that such an error is hardly adequate for a time in such close proximity to the presumed events. Critical explanations of the 490 years of Dan 9:24-27 are equally problematical. Indeed, it is impossible to apply these time periods with any certainty to events between 168-164 B.C. (p. 154). Yet, Koch's alternative, viz. to regard the 490-year period as part of an epochal schema involving a world year of  $7 \times 490$  years spanning the period between creation and eschaton, appears equally desperate.

In the opinion of the author, there is no evidence for the view that the writer of Daniel belonged to the Maccabean party. If written to meet the

second-century crisis, why is there such silence concerning the Maccabean revolt and its leaders? Why is there no call to arms? Why the predominance of *vaticinia ex eventu*? Since the immediate socio-historical circumstances provide no clear indication for the circle out of which Daniel developed, scholarly discussion during the last few decades has sought to derive the *Sitz im Leben* from the peculiar language of the book—particularly developments out of prophecy or wisdom. On the assumption of the Maccabean date, Koch argues that quarrels over whether prophecy or wisdom is the source of this book are anachronistic.

As for the human and divine kingdoms in Daniel, Koch is critical of the trend which views these merely as opposites in which divine kingship could irrupt at any moment. This reviewer agrees with Koch's distinction between "the manlike figure" and "the saints of the Most High" in Dan 7. The latter, according to the interpretation, are present prior to and during the eschatological judgment. While Koch is reasonably certain that the *nomen regens* "people" refers to Israel, he prefers (with O. Procksch) to translate the *nomen rectum* of "saints of the Most High" as a plural (clearer in German as "*der Höchsten*") and to apply it to angelic beings (pp. 238-239).

Koch suggests a number of areas in need of further study. These include: (1) an exhaustive comparison of the Aramaic in Daniel, Ezra, and the targumim (p. 36); (2) a comparison of the Hebrew in Daniel and Qumran (p. 48); (3) the ultimate origin of the Aramaic visions and narratives (p. 92); (4) socio-historical research studying the Chaldeans, magi, and apocalypticists (p. 178); (5) angelology in Daniel and apocalyptic (p. 210); and (6) an analysis of relations between heavenly and earthly communities in apocalyptic literature (p. 237).

The extensive bibliographies following individual chapters include the major works on the topics discussed. Koch presents both conservative and liberal scholarship fairly and accurately. While challenging scholarship in a number of critical areas, he is never pejorative. The reviewer spotted only three typographical errors (on pp. 59, 123, 184). Also G. F. Hasel's work cited on p. 236 is partially misunderstood, for Hasel does not identify the manlike figure and the saints.

In sum, this monograph is indispensable as the best, up-to-date, compact, and yet-comprehensive critical summary of issues related to the oft-neglected book of Daniel. Its importance merits an English translation.