

NSBT NEW STUDIES IN BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

With the Clouds of Heaven

The book of Daniel
in biblical theology



James M. Hamilton Jr.

Series Editor: D. A. Carson

NEW STUDIES IN BIBLICAL THEOLOGY 32

With the clouds of heaven

NEW STUDIES IN BIBLICAL THEOLOGY 32

Series editor: D. A. Carson

With the clouds of heaven

THE BOOK OF DANIEL IN
BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

James M. Hamilton Jr.



IVP Academic

An imprint of InterVarsity Press
Downers Grove, Illinois

Titles in this series:

- 1 *Possessed by God*, David Peterson
- 2 *God's Unfaithful Wife*, Raymond C. Ortlund Jr.
- 3 *Jesus and the Logic of History*, Paul W. Barnett
- 4 *Hear, My Son*, Daniel J. Estes
- 5 *Original Sin*, Henri Blocher
- 6 *Now Choose Life*, J. Gary Millar
- 7 *Neither Poverty Nor Riches*, Craig L. Blomberg
- 8 *Slave of Christ*, Murray J. Harris
- 9 *Christ, Our Righteousness*, Mark A. Seifrid
- 10 *Five Festal Garments*, Barry G. Webb
- 11 *Salvation to the Ends of the Earth*, Andreas J. Köstenberger and Peter T. O'Brien
- 12 *Now My Eyes Have Seen You*, Robert S. Fyall
- 13 *Thanksgiving*, David W. Pao
- 14 *From Every People and Nation*, J. Daniel Hays
- 15 *Dominion and Dynasty*, Stephen G. Dempster
- 16 *Hearing God's Words*, Peter Adam
- 17 *The Temple and the Church's Mission*, G. K. Beale
- 18 *The Cross from a Distance*, Peter G. Bolt
- 19 *Contagious Holiness*, Craig L. Blomberg
- 20 *Shepherds After My Own Heart*, Timothy S. Laniak
- 21 *A Clear and Present Word*, Mark D. Thompson
- 22 *Adopted into God's Family*, Trevor J. Burke
- 23 *Sealed with an Oath*, Paul R. Williamson
- 24 *Father, Son and Spirit*, Andreas J. Köstenberger and Scott R. Swain
- 25 *God the Peacemaker*, Graham A. Cole
- 26 *A Gracious and Compassionate God*, Daniel C. Timmer
- 27 *The Acts of the Risen Lord Jesus*, Alan J. Thompson
- 28 *The God Who Makes Himself Known*, W. Ross Blackburn
- 29 *A Mouth Full of Fire*, Andrew G. Shead
- 30 *The God Who Became Human*, Graham A. Cole
- 31 *Paul and the Law*, Brian S. Rosner
- 32 *With the Clouds of Heaven*, James M. Hamilton Jr.

An index of Scripture references for all the volumes may be found at
<http://www.thegospelcoalition.org/resources/nsbt>

*InterVarsity Press, USA
P.O. Box 1400
Downers Grove, IL 60515-1426, USA
Website: www.ivpress.com
Email: email@ivpress.com*

© James M. Hamilton Jr. 2014

James M. Hamilton Jr. has asserted his right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as Author of this work.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher or the Copyright Licensing Agency.

InterVarsity Press®, USA, is the book-publishing division of InterVarsity Christian Fellowship/USA® <www.intervarsity.org> and a member movement of the International Fellowship of Evangelical Students.

Unless stated otherwise, all Scripture quotations are from The Holy Bible, English Standard Version, published by HarperCollins Publishers © 2001 by Crossway Bibles, a division of Good News Publishers. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

Scripture quotations marked TNIV are taken from the HOLY BIBLE, TODAY'S NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION ® TNIV ® Copyright © 2001, 2005 by Biblica www.biblica.com, and used by permission.

ISBN 978-0-8308-9721-6 (digital)

ISBN 978-0-8308-2633-9 (print)

*For
Tom Schreiner*

*teacher, mentor,
pastor, friend*

Contents

List of tables	11
Series preface	13
Author's preface	15
Abbreviations	17
1 Preliminaries	21
Biblical theology	21
The canon of Scripture	27
An evangelical approach	30
Chapter by chapter preview	40
2 From Eden to the end: Daniel in Old Testament salvation history	41
The history of Israel's future in the Torah	42
The fulfilment of Mosaic prophecy in the Prophets and the Writings	44
From Daniel to the end of days	47
Conclusion	58
3 The literary structure of Daniel	61
Daniel's discrete units	61
Relationships between Daniel's discrete units	66
The literary structure of the book of Daniel	77
4 Four kingdoms; then everlasting dominion: the history of the future	85
The image in Daniel 2	87
The beasts in Daniel 7	90
The ram and the goat in Daniel 8	94
Kings of south and north in Daniel 10 – 12	98
Conclusion	104

5	Seventy weeks and seventy weeks of years:	
	Daniel's prayer and Gabriel's revelation	105
	The prayer	105
	The revelation	109
	Conclusion	133
6	The one like a son of man and other heavenly beings in Daniel	135
	Heavenly beings in Daniel	137
	The pre-incarnate Christ?	144
	The one like a son of man	147
	Conclusion	153
7	Interpretations of Daniel in early Jewish literature	155
	Tobit	156
	Qumran	159
	1 Maccabees	162
	<i>4 Ezra</i>	166
	<i>1 Enoch</i>	173
	Conclusion	176
8	Interpretations of Daniel in the New Testament (except Revelation)	179
	A summary of what we have seen	180
	Stock language, thematic similarity and fulfilment	181
	New Testament quotations of Daniel	183
	Thematic fulfilments of Daniel	195
	Conclusion	199
9	Interpretations of Daniel in the Apocalypse	201
	John's reuse of Daniel's language	201
	John's imitation of Daniel's structure	205
	John's fulfilments of Daniel's prophecies	208
	John's clarification of Daniel's revelations	212
	Conclusion	219
10	Typological patterns: Daniel in biblical theology	221
	A promise-shaped paradigm	222
	Abraham	225
	Psalms	228
	Joseph and Daniel	229

CONTENTS

Jehoiachin, Esther and Nehemiah	232
Fulfilment in Christ	234
Conclusion	235
Bibliography	237
Index of authors	247
Index of Scripture references	249
Index of ancient sources	262

Tables

3.1	David Gooding's adapted structure	79
5.1	The seventy weeks	116
6.1	Ezekiel 1:26–28 and Daniel 7:9–10	149
6.2	Daniel 7:14 and 7:27	152
9.1	John's reuse of Daniel's language	202
9.2	The chiastic structure of Daniel and Revelation	207
10.1	Correspondences between Joseph and Daniel	230

Series preface

New Studies in Biblical Theology is a series of monographs that address key issues in the discipline of biblical theology. Contributions to the series focus on one or more of three areas: (1) the nature and status of biblical theology, including its relations with other disciplines (e.g. historical theology, exegesis, systematic theology, historical criticism, narrative theology); (2) the articulation and exposition of the structure of thought of a particular biblical writer or corpus; and (3) the delineation of a biblical theme across all or part of the biblical corpora.

Above all, these monographs are creative attempts to help thinking Christians understand their Bibles better. The series aims simultaneously to instruct and to edify, to interact with the current literature, and to point the way ahead. In God's universe, mind and heart should not be divorced: in this series we will try not to separate what God has joined together. While the notes interact with the best of scholarly literature, the text is uncluttered with untransliterated Greek and Hebrew, and tries to avoid too much technical jargon. The volumes are written within the framework of confessional evangelicalism, but there is always an attempt at thoughtful engagement with the sweep of the relevant literature.

Volumes in this series have often used the expression 'biblical theology' in several ways. For example, it may refer to the carefully worked out theology of a particular biblical book or corpus (think of the volume by Gary Millar on Deuteronomy in this series); it may refer to a theme or trajectory carefully traced through all the Bible (think of the volume by G. K. Beale on the temple). Focusing on the book of Daniel, Dr Hamilton melds both of these usages. He studies Daniel while maintaining two perspectives: he wants to know what antecedent biblical sources have been taken up by Daniel as he writes his book (which of course raises a nest of complicated questions about the dating of sources), and he traces out how Daniel has been used by later biblical writers. Doubtless some will disagree with Dr Hamilton over this or that detail, for the book is rich in details, but

most readers will also find it wonderfully stimulating. In addition to providing his readers with this biblical theology of Daniel, with its thought-provoking trajectories running both backward and forward, Dr Hamilton's work is also an implicit call to engage in similar work on other biblical books, in self-conscious determination to reverse two centuries or more of atomistic approaches to Scripture.

D. A. Carson
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School

Author's preface

I don't deserve to read the Bible, much less write about it. What a privilege to have God reveal himself to us in his word. What a great God, keeping covenant and steadfast love, forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin, and everywhere manifesting his power and love. The voice of the Lord breaks the cedars, and yet he also speaks so tenderly that the bruised reed doesn't break. I join the ranks of the heavenly hosts, the saints across space and time, and everything in this cosmic temple to ascribe to the Lord the glory due his name. Would that I could do so in a way worthy of him. I thank God the Father through Christ the Son by the power of the Spirit for his merciful salvation, full and complete revelation, and gracious provision.

I also gladly recite my gratitude for the support of my family as I worked on this project. My sweet wife is a wonder beyond words. She manages her household well. Let me rise to bless her. What a joy to write at home, in the context of our family. I praise God for the way my wife and our children provided blessed distractions from this Ecclesiastes 12:12 labour. Unexpected refreshment came from unplanned breaks (some would call them 'interruptions'!) that took the form of opportunities to converse with sweet Jill, to read books to our two-year-old daughter, to throw the football to the boys as they jumped on the trampoline, or to hold the newborn. The support of our parents, too, has been a strengthening encouragement. God has been unaccountably merciful to us.

My fellow elders at Kenwood Baptist Church prayed for me and helped me finish by taking on more of the preaching load as the deadline approached. Thanks to Denny Burk, Owen Strachan, John Watson, Matt Damico and Mike Frantz, and special thanks to Randall Breland and Mike Thompson for the ways they serve and lead at Kenwood. I must also thank the body of believers gathered weekly at the table of the Lord to be sustained by bread and cup, word and worship. Hallelujah! So many servants. So much Christ-likenss. Such a joy to know the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. Praise God.

I am also glad to thank my PhD students for their help on this project: Mitch Chase, David ‘Gunner’ Gundersen and Colin Smothers read the book and offered helpful feedback, and they were joined by Casey Croy, Matt Emadi, Sam Emadi, Wyatt Graham, Nick Moore, Johnson Pang and Dieudonne Tamfu, all of whom helped to compile author and Scripture indexes. We at Southern are thankful to be led by Dr Albert Mohler, whose conviction is as strong as his breadth of knowledge is inspiring. I am grateful that Dan Dumas makes sure the lights come on when I show up to teach, that Randy Stinson shepherds all things academic like a wise father and that Greg Wills sets such an example as a scholar-teacher. The privilege to stand with my colleagues in this faculty is past my power to tell, and I am thankful for each of them.

I first preached through Daniel at Baptist Church of the Redeemer in Houston, Texas, in the spring and summer of 2008. I then joined the faculty of Southern Seminary, and, receiving the opportunity to lead a PhD seminar in the autumn of 2009, chose to focus that course on Daniel. Unable to find a suitable evangelical, biblical-theological study of Daniel to assign for that course, I proposed this book to D. A. Carson, and I thank him for accepting the proposal and welcoming this volume into the New Studies in Biblical Theology, a series I have long admired.

The Lord’s kindnesses to me are more numerous than I can tell, as are the people whom I would like to thank. I will limit this litany of gratitude, however, to one man more: I dedicate this book to my PhD mentor at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Dr Thomas R. Schreiner. The combination of competent scholarship and commitment to the glory of God that I saw in Dr Schreiner’s writings was part of what first attracted me to Southern, and that only got stronger when I met him in person. I am thankful that he took me under his wing as a student. He is a scholar who serves the Lord Jesus and his church, who preaches like a believer, and lives like one too. His wisdom and example, counsel and friendship have meant so much to me. Recently my wife and I were discussing a knotty problem and I told her I wanted to seek counsel on it. She knew at once that I planned to talk to Tom. The dedication of this book to you, Tom, is an attempt to communicate my gratitude, esteem and affection. Thank you for joyfully following Christ. What a blessing to follow you as you follow him.

James M. Hamilton Jr.
1 January 2014

Abbreviations

1QS	<i>Community Rule/Manual of Discipline</i> (Dead Sea Scrolls)
4Q397 (4QMMT ^d)	<i>4QHalakhic Letter^d</i> (Dead Sea Scrolls)
4QDan ^c	<i>Daniel Manuscript C</i> (Dead Sea Scrolls)
4QDan ^e	<i>Daniel Manuscript E</i> (Dead Sea Scrolls)
4 QMMT	<i>Halakhic Letter / Sectarian Manifesto</i> (Dead Sea Scrolls)
AB	Anchor Bible
AGAJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AOTC	Apollos Old Testament Commentary
Aram.	Aramaic
<i>Aram</i>	<i>Aramaic Studies</i>
AV	Authorized (King James) Version
<i>BBR</i>	<i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i>
BDAG	W. Bauer, F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt and W. F. Gingrich, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> , 3rd ed., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
<i>BSac</i>	<i>Bibliotheca sacra</i>
CC	Concordia Commentary
CEB	Common English Bible
Col.	column
ConBOT	Coniectanea biblica
CRINT	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
CSB	Christian Standard Bible
ESV	English Standard Version
ET	English translation

WITH THE CLOUDS OF HEAVEN

Frag.	fragments
HCSB	Holman Christian Standard Bible
HDR	Harvard Dissertations in Religion
Hebr.	Hebrew
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
<i>JATS</i>	<i>Journal of the Adventist Theological Society</i>
<i>JDFM</i>	<i>Journal of Discipleship and Family Ministry</i>
JPS	Jewish Publication Society translation
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament, Supplement Series
<i>JTI</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Interpretation</i>
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
masc.	masculine
LXX	Septuagint
MT	Masoretic Text
NA27	Nestle-Aland <i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> , ed. Barbara and Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini and Bruce M. Metzger, 27th rev. ed., Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993
NA28	Nestle-Aland <i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> , ed. Barbara and Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini and Bruce M. Metzger, 28th rev. ed., Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012
NACSBT	NAC Studies in Bible and Theology
NASB	New American Standard Bible
NET	New English Translation
NETS	New English Translation of the Septuagint
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NIV	New International Version
NKJV	New King James Version
NLT	New Living Translation
NSBT	New Studies in Biblical Theology
NT	New Testament
NTT	New Testament Theology
OG	Old Greek
OT	Old Testament
pl.	plural
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>

ABBREVIATIONS

RSV	Revised Standard Version
<i>SBJT</i>	<i>Southern Baptist Journal of Theology</i>
SCHT	Studies in Christian History and Thought
sing.	singular
s.v.	(sub verbo) under the heading or word given
Th	Theodotion
TNIV	Today's New International Version
TOTC	Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries
tr.	translation, translated by
<i>TynB</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

Chapter One

Preliminaries

If you're wondering what kind of book this will be, this opening chapter sets forth the parameters within which I will pursue the contribution the book of Daniel makes to biblical theology. I am here attempting an evangelical and canonical biblical theology of Daniel. This introductory chapter seeks to define biblical theology, provide an orientation to the canonical framework in which I will work and draw out the implications of the word 'evangelical', implications that impinge upon how we think about the historicity of the events described in the book of Daniel, the date of its composition and who wrote it. This chapter will provide neither an exhaustive treatment nor the final word on these issues; it will set forth my perspective on them. The discussion that follows addresses each word in the phrase 'evangelical and canonical biblical theology of Daniel'. This chapter on preliminaries will end with a preview of those to follow.

Biblical theology

Biblical theology is the attempt to understand and embrace the interpretative perspective of the biblical authors. Rather than repeat what I have tried to say in other places,¹ this section will focus on how we access the interpretative perspective of the biblical authors, the relationship between this definition of biblical theology and authorial intent, and the difference between other approaches to biblical theology and the one pursued here.

The only access we have to *the interpretative perspective of the biblical authors* is what they wrote. Rather than try to go behind the text to get at what really happened, as though the text is mere propaganda, we are trying to understand what the biblical authors have written.

When we seek to understand *what they wrote*, however, we also have inspired indications of *what they meant* in the interpretations of earlier Scripture found in the writings of later biblical authors. These are not

¹ I have pursued this definition in *What Is Biblical Theology?* (Hamilton 2014c), employed it in an attempt at whole-Bible biblical theology (2010b) and operated on the basis of it in shorter biblical-theological studies (see 2010a; 2012a).

limited to the interpretations of the Old Testament in the New but include the interpretations of the Old Testament in the Old. To reiterate for clarity, we have *both* what earlier biblical authors wrote *and* how later biblical authors interpreted them.

Anticipating the section below on my evangelical approach, one of my assumptions is that later biblical authors correctly understood what earlier biblical authors meant. At the human level, there is exegetical warrant for the interpretations of earlier Scripture we find in the writings of later biblical authors: these later authors were good exegetes. At the theological level, the inspiration of the Spirit ensured that they correctly understood earlier Scripture.² So for instance, if Psalm 78:69 likens the temple to the heavens and the earth, the psalmist has correctly understood what Moses intended to communicate in his Pentateuchal depiction of the relationship between the created world and the tabernacle.³ We thus have insight into the interpretative perspective of Moses both from what he wrote (Gen. 2 and Exod. 25–40) and from the way later inspired authors interpreted his writings.

Pursuing biblical theology in this way will be profoundly intertextual.⁴ How did Daniel engage earlier Scripture to summarize, interpret and build on what the biblical authors who preceded him had accomplished? Answering these questions about Daniel requires attending not only to the way that he engaged earlier authors but also to the way that later authors engaged him. Later biblical authors, inspired by the Holy Spirit, have correctly understood Daniel, and we who believe the Bible to be inspired should allow the inspired interpreters to guide our interpretation of what Daniel wrote (see Hamilton 2010b: 46–47).

In addition to a significant focus on intertextuality (which constitutes the whole-Bible dimension of any biblical-theological endeavour),

² This is against the perspective of Longenecker (1999), with Schreiner (2008), Silva (1996), Beale (1994) and others.

³ For further discussion see Hamilton (2010b: 73–74), which relies on Wenham (1994), Beale (2004), Alexander (2008) and others.

⁴ Careful attention to the biblical texts in their original languages and in more literal English translations, many conversations with Tom Schreiner (who should not be blamed for my views!) and the writings of Hays (2005) and Beale (2008: 22–35) have shaped my thinking on intertextuality. Beale (2012: 39–40) now thinks it may be better to use phrases such as ‘inner-biblical exegesis’ or ‘inner-biblical allusion’ instead of ‘intertextuality’, but I am not ready to surrender this handy term. In using it I am focused on authorial intent, and I employ it as an umbrella term for the ways later biblical authors engage earlier Scripture. Cf. Scheetz’s discussion of ‘Intertextuality, Canon Criticism, and Biblical Studies’ (2011: 1–35).

understanding what the biblical authors wrote demands an understanding of how literature functions. Among other things, being sensitive to the literary dimensions of biblical texts requires us to discern how the authors structured their work, what kinds of things they assumed their audience would know,⁵ and the perspective from which they intended their work to be interpreted. The insight we can gain on some topics will be limited by the amount of evidence we have, but evangelical assumptions enable more confidence than is possible from other perspectives. For instance, once Deuteronomy was in place,⁶ later authors expected their writings to be interpreted against the backdrop of Deuteronomy.

Thus the author of Ruth did not feel the need to quote Deuteronomy 23:3 but simply assumed that his readers would know that it excludes Moabites. He intended his book to be interpreted in the light of Deuteronomy 23:3, but he took for granted the fact that his audience would know that text. In the opening words of his book, the author of Ruth also assumed that his audience would know the book of Judges: ‘And it came about in the days of the judging of the judges’ (Ruth 1:1, my tr.). Similarly, the author of Kings assumed that his audience would interpret 1 Kings 11 in the light of Deuteronomy 17. Validating these assertions about what the biblical authors assumed is exactly what the work of tracing the interpretative perspective of the biblical authors entails. In part, this means understanding how later authors quote and allude to earlier Scripture, which is a literary endeavour. Hays (2005: 34–45) has outlined helpful criteria, on which Beale (2008: 15–35) has built, and the ensuing paragraphs stand on the shoulders of their useful discussions.

What follows may at first seem unconventional, but those who understand what authors are doing *constantly* make these kinds of interpretative moves. The previous paragraph contained the assertion that the author of Ruth invoked the book of Judges and engaged Deuteronomy 23:3, even though he neither used a quotation formula nor overtly alluded to those texts in ways that are typically acknowledged in academic discussions of intertextuality. The author of Ruth did not need to allude to, echo or quote Deuteronomy 23:3 in order to engage it. How can such a suggestion be made? The validity of the suggestion depends on how we understand the culture in which

⁵ Moses, for instance, assumed in Leviticus that his audience would understand quite a lot about sacrifice.

⁶ The evangelical assumption here is that the true story is the one the Bible itself tells, with Deuteronomy coming from Moses (cf. Deut. 31:9, 24, 30; 33:1).

the biblical authors wrote. For this suggestion to stand, that culture would have to have been saturated in the Scripture that was available when the author of Ruth wrote. This takes us right to the question of the interpretative perspective of the biblical authors.

A contemporary example will illustrate the way authors and audiences share unstated information. I wrote the first draft of these thoughts on Tuesday 5 February 2013. The previous Sunday, 3 February 2013, was ‘Super Bowl Sunday’. The Baltimore Ravens beat the San Francisco 49ers in the NFL Championship Game. Consider for a moment everything assumed about readers of this book in the use of the abbreviation ‘NFL’, the mention of the ‘Baltimore Ravens’, and the reference to the game that was played as both ‘the NFL Championship’ and ‘the Super Bowl’. No flock of birds comes to mind at the mention of the Ravens, no one (in the USA) needs the explanation that the Super Bowl *is* the National Football League Championship game, and everyone knows that Baltimore and San Francisco are both cities.

These things are so much a part of US shared culture that they require no explanation. In fact, they are so much a part of our culture that we can talk to others about the events – and write about them – without overtly mentioning them. Consider the way that I referenced the game during the announcements before the worship service of Kenwood Baptist, the church I serve as pastor, on the morning under discussion. One of our elders was hosting a Super Bowl party at his home (we do not have a Sunday evening service). I did not have to use the words ‘Super Bowl party’ to make that announcement. Overt mention of the event was unnecessary. The announcement went something like this:

Warren and Jody are opening their home this evening to all and sundry. Evidently there’s something happening on television tonight, maybe you know the details, apparently some commercials are going to be aired. If you’d like to watch the proceedings with others from our congregation, you’re welcome to bring a bag of chips, a jar of salsa or a two-litre to Warren and Jody’s house.

At the words ‘Evidently there’s something happening on television tonight, maybe you know the details’ there were smirks and sniggers in the congregation, and there was a wry look on my face. Everyone knew what was referenced, even though the words ‘Super Bowl’ and the phrase ‘football game’ were never used. Nor did anyone need an

explanation of the connection between the Super Bowl and the commercials that have become part of the cultural phenomenon.

The fact that authors can do this sort of thing in writing – make allusions that are not overt – is what Peter Leithart discusses in his chapter ‘The Text Is a Joke’ (2009: 109–139). The chapter expounds the way that jokes assume cultural information that comedians need neither articulate nor explain. Comedians assume shared information, and this information is crucial for anyone to ‘get’ their jokes. The biblical authors make similar assumptions, and the task of biblical theology is to identify and demonstrate such assumptions.

From the way the biblical authors have written, it appears that awareness of earlier biblical texts could be taken for granted in their culture the way awareness of the Super Bowl can be in ours. The evidence of rampant disobedience in ancient Israel does not prove the biblical writings were unknown but that the Bible’s teaching about sin is true. A strong indication of widespread awareness of the Scriptures can be found in the clipped, compressed, evocative references to the Torah that pervade the Old Testament Prophets and Writings. The conclusion that David, Isaiah, Hosea and the others were writing for people who would have understood their elided utterances is hard to deny. Authors intend to be understood. If they have not explained themselves, they probably thought no explanation necessary.

The pursuit of *the interpretative perspective of the biblical authors* will thus be a literary and intertextual enterprise, and both of these factors inform our pursuit of the backstory against which the biblical authors intended their writings to be read. This backstory is not always presented on the surface of the biblical writings. There is a plot that continues when Genesis ends and Exodus begins, but that plot is not on the surface, where Charles Dickens puts it at the end of ‘Book the First: Recalled to Life’ in *A Tale of Two Cities*, with readers continuing into ‘Book the Second: The Golden Thread’. Instead, the unfolding plot of the Pentateuch must be discerned from the accumulation of the statements and stories, and developments often come in dialogue between the characters or in speeches or prayers.⁷

The Bible’s plot is like what we find in James Joyce’s *Ulysses*, which on the surface bears little resemblance to Homer’s *Odyssey* but was intended by Joyce to be something like an instalment in an Odyssean

⁷ For a book focused ‘on the story line as it unfolds’, see Schreiner 2013: xii.

typological pattern (cf. Gilbert 1959: 34–37).⁸ If Joyce intended Leopold Bloom as an instalment in a typological pattern, and if there is even a character that represents Joyce himself in Stephen Dedalus, I would suggest that Joyce has imitated biblical authors such as David and Daniel, who presented themselves and others as instalments in typological patterns.⁹ The point here is that the Bible's backstory plot informed the book of Daniel, as Daniel plugged into that wider narrative, and in the revelations his book describes the story was carried forward.

Everything said here about biblical theology is based squarely on the pursuit of the meaning that the biblical authors intended to communicate. Focusing biblical theology on the *interpretative perspective of the biblical authors* moors it to authorial intent. This has massive implications for how we approach both salvation history and thematic questions in biblical theology.

For thematic studies, the question of what the biblical authors intended trains our gaze on themes they themselves develop. If we are pursuing this method, we do not bring themes to the Bible but examine the texts to see how later biblical authors have developed thematic issues set forth in earlier biblical texts.

Similar things can be said about our examination of the salvation-historical unfolding of the Bible's story. If we are looking for the interpretative perspective of the biblical authors, we will only be interested in a transition from one so-called dispensation to another if we can demonstrate that it was the intention of Moses or Paul or John to communicate a change in dispensations. If we think that Moses has indicated a change from one dispensation to another, our claims will be significantly strengthened if we can show that Isaiah or Peter

⁸ Note that Gilbert read his commentary on Joyce's *Ulysses* aloud to Joyce himself, and that Joyce both affirmed and corrected Gilbert's interpretation. Gilbert writes, 'in the course of writing this Study I read it out to Joyce, chapter by chapter, and that, though he allowed me the greatest latitude in the presentation of the facts and indeed encouraged me to treat the subject on whatever lines were most congenial to me, it contains nothing . . . to which he did not give his full approbation; indeed, there are several passages which I owe directly to him' (1959: viii; cf. v–ix).

⁹ Earle Ellis rightly wrote, 'a typological understanding of Scripture governed the interpretation of NT writers', and explained that 'typology views the relationship of OT events to those in the new dispensation not as a "one-to-one" equation or correspondence, in which the old is repeated or continued, but rather in terms of two principles, historical correspondence and escalation. . . . the OT type not only corresponds to the NT antitype but also is complemented and transcended by it' (1982: 1–2). I have largely followed Ellis in my efforts to exposit the typological patterns in the Bible (2008a; 2008b; 2010c; 2012c; 2014d). Cf. the proposal from Ribbens that typology be defined as iconic *mimēsis* (2011).

or some other biblical author interpreted Moses that way. The question for dispensationalists and covenant theologians alike is this: Did the biblical authors intend to communicate the contours of these systems?

Similar questions can be asked of those who argue for one schematic understanding of the Bible's storyline over another (as does Goldsworthy [2012]). Did the biblical authors intend to communicate this schema rather than another?¹⁰ If someone proposes a schematic outline of Israel's history (as do covenant theologians, dispensationalists, and biblical theologians such as Goldsworthy), the question they must answer is: Where did the biblical authors themselves indicate that this was their own schematic perspective on the Bible's big story?

If we are looking for the interpretative perspective of the biblical authors, an outline that biblical authors have used to summarize and interpret the Bible's big story, along the lines of what we find in Nehemiah 9 or Acts 7, will be more convincing than one that modern scholars have discerned from the text. We should seek to show that our schemas and outlines are ways of bringing into sharper focus those that the biblical authors themselves have employed. Our aim is to explain how and why they saw things the way they did.

In this study of the theology of the book of Daniel, the goal is to understand and explain Daniel's interpretative perspective. We thus seek to understand both how Daniel has engaged earlier Scripture to present his message and how later Scripture engaged Daniel to exposit what he wrote. This approach to biblical theology moves us towards greater understanding of what Daniel intended to communicate. As indicated above, examining how Daniel engaged earlier Scripture and how later writers of Scripture engaged Daniel makes certain assumptions about the canon of Scripture.

The canon of Scripture

I am convinced that the sixty-six books of the Protestant canon have been inspired by the Holy Spirit and are therefore inerrant (see further Hamilton 2010d). Roger Beckwith's (1985) masterful treatment of the question of the Old Testament canon provides a thorough, logical, convincing discussion of the issues. Michael Kruger (2012) has recently 'revisited' the question of the New Testament canon. There are two main ways that canonical issues will influence this study of

¹⁰ I am referring here to Graeme Goldsworthy's book *Christ-Centered Biblical Theology*, a good portion of which is devoted to arguing that the Robinson–Hebert schema is superior to that of Vos–Clowney (Goldsworthy 2012).

the theology of the book of Daniel. The first has to do with the boundaries the word ‘canonical’ provides for ‘biblical’ theology, and the second has to do with the tripartite (i.e. three-part: Law, Prophets, Writings) order of the Old Testament books.

There may be redundancy in the assertion that this is an exercise in ‘canonical biblical theology’, because for me the words ‘biblical’ and ‘canonical’ both refer to the sixty-six books of the Protestant canon. The redundancy is necessitated, however, by the confusion of biblical theology with the study of the history of religions. A history of religions approach to biblical theology focuses on the historical development of ideas and concepts, with an evolutionary undercurrent at work, as though the theology reflected in the texts mutated in more sophisticated directions as humanity evolved upward, becoming ever more refined. This problematic approach does not distinguish between the books of the Old Testament and non-canonical early Jewish literature, and liberal scholarship typically associates the book of Daniel with those inter-testamental books. Evangelical persuasion and canonical methodology intersect in the following two conclusions: (1) that Daniel was written prior to the events the book prophesies, and (2) that the Old Testament canon was closed before the Maccabean crisis. These conclusions have tremendous interpretative implications.

The fact that this is a ‘canonical’ biblical theology does not mean I will ignore early Jewish literature (see chapter 7), but I do not think the authors of that body of literature were inspired by the Spirit of God the way the author of Daniel was. At points these authors of non-biblical literature distinguish their writings from the books they view as having been inspired by the Spirit (e.g. 1 Macc. 4:46; 9:27; 12:9; 14:41; 2 Macc. 2:13; Prologue to Sirach; 4 *Ezra* 14:45–46; 2 Bar. 85:1–3; for discussion see Hamilton 2010d: 240–244), nor were apocryphal books either recognized as authoritative Scripture by the synagogue or quoted as Scripture in the New Testament (on which see esp. Beckwith 1985; and more briefly Hamilton 2010d: 245–247). So the phrase ‘biblical theology’ distinguishes this project from an attempt to describe the history of religions, and the word ‘canonical’ connotes the sixty-six books of the Protestant canon.

The word ‘canonical’ also points to the tripartite arrangement of the books of the Old Testament aiding our attempt to understand the interpretative perspective of the biblical authors. There are both historical and theological reasons for embracing the tripartite arrangement of the books of the Old Testament in Hebrew Bibles and, for instance, in JPS Torah printings of the Old Testament in English.

The historical reasons for embracing the tripartite order include the most significant fact that *this is the only order of the Old Testament books that has come down to us from antiquity*. There simply is no such thing as a Septuagintal or ancient Christian order of the Old Testament books. The orders of the Old Testament books in Greek translations of the whole Bible differ from one another and include apocryphal books. The order of Old Testament books we now find in our English translations is nothing more than a modern printing convention (Seitz 2008: 27–30). By contrast, we have attestation to the tripartite order from intertestamental literature (Prologue to Sirach, lines 8–10), Qumran (4QMMT¹¹), the New Testament (Luke 24:44) and rabbinic writings (*Baba Bathra* 14b). Beckwith (1985) has answered virtually every question that could be imagined on this topic, and I have followed Stephen Dempster’s lead (1997; 2003) in building on work that David Noel Freedman has done (1991) on the symmetry of the tripartite arrangement of the Old Testament (Hamilton 2010b).

When we turn from historical to theological considerations for embracing the tripartite order of the books of the Old Testament, the simple fact is that Luke presents Jesus as speaking of the Old Testament in these terms (Luke 24:44). Why wouldn’t followers of Jesus want to follow him in their mental organization of the books of the Old Testament? Should we replace with human tradition the way Jesus thought about the Old Testament? Should we shrink from the difficulty of rearranging our thoughts to match the thoughts of Jesus? Should we decline opportunities to conform our thinking to the way Jesus thought because our way of thinking seems simpler to us? In addition to the way the tripartite arrangement is validated by and sheds light on Luke 24:44, embracing the tripartite order puts us in a position to understand other statements that Jesus made. The most natural understanding of what Matthew and Luke present Jesus as saying about the blood of all the martyrs from Abel to Zechariah (Matt. 23:35; Luke 11:51) is that Jesus has in mind the first and last martyrs described in the Old Testament (Gen. 4:4; 2 Chr. 24:20–21). We can see this, however, only if we think of Chronicles as the last book in the Old Testament, which seems to be the way Jesus thought about it. Why would followers of Jesus arrange the books of the Old Testament in such a way that it is more difficult for

¹¹ 4Q397, Frags. 14–21 (= 4Q398 14–17 I; 4QMMT C 1–17), line 10 (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000: 801).

people to understand something Matthew and Luke present Jesus as having said?

To the historical evidence for the tripartite order and the interpretative traction it gives us on Matthew 23:35 and Luke 11:51 we can add that there are biblical-theological advantages for approaching the Old Testament from this perspective. Broad generalities here briefly present what I have explored in greater detail elsewhere (Hamilton 2010b: 59–64, 139–140, 187–190, 267, 271–275, 350–352): the Torah tells the true story of the world, and the ramshackle narrative rumbles forward in the Former Prophets. The Latter Prophets provide poetic commentary on the narrative. The Writings continue the poetic commentary, summarizing and interpreting the narrative that began in Genesis and continued through Kings; then the latter books of the Writings return to narrative storyline, beginning with Esther, continuing through Daniel, Ezra–Nehemiah, and concluding with Chronicles.

This way of conceptualizing the arrangement of the books of the Old Testament canon fosters a dynamic interaction in our thinking between the narrative in the Torah and Former Prophets, the interpretative proclamation based thereon in the Latter Prophets and early Writings, and the continuation of the narrative in the later books of the Writings, among which we find Daniel. Beckwith (1985: 138–139) has suggested, persuasively, that Daniel and Chronicles have been put where they are because of their narrative character.

In conjunction with this canonical approach to the books of the Old Testament, I accept the claims of the books as they stand. This means that I will accept at face value the evidence in the texts that points to the conclusion that Daniel would have had access to most of what we now recognize as the Old Testament. He would not, of course, have had access to those books written after his time. Anticipating what follows in the next section regarding an evangelical approach to Scripture, those who go behind what is on the surface of the text to create an alternative narrative that explains what really happened, as though the story the texts tell is propaganda, are at best engaging in hazardous speculation, which at worst serves projects of subversive revisionism that cannot be regarded as historical or critical.

An evangelical approach

One catalyst of the desire to write this book was the lack of a robust canonical biblical-theological treatment of Daniel that took an

evangelical perspective on the date of the book of Daniel.¹² Since work on this project began, some studies have appeared (e.g. Davis 2013; Greidanus 2012), but we will never exhaust the Bible's riches. The evidence favours evangelical conclusions on questions of date and authorship. This discussion focuses mainly on date. On authorship, the fact that Jesus is presented as referring to Daniel as having said what we find in the book of Daniel settles the matter (Matt. 24:15).¹³ It is possible that a later author or editor may have put Daniel's first-person accounts into a wider narrative. It is more probable, however, that the biblical authors often referred to themselves in both first and third person, and that works of genius and inspiration were written by inspired prophets who were themselves geniuses who needed no editor(s) to shape their material for distribution.

The Maccabean date of Daniel is a foregone conclusion for many scholars. The view that the book of Daniel was written after the events it purports to predict has become so ensconced as to be assumed – surprisingly – even by more evangelical interpreters.¹⁴ In the Daniel volume of the *Apollos Old Testament Commentary*, Ernest C. Lucas posits that where one lands on these questions does not affect the interpretation of the book. Having referenced the introductory issues of 'the unity of the book, its authorship, the date of its composition and issues of historicity', Lucas asserts that 'the theological meaning of the stories and visions in Daniel is not closely tied up with decisions about the issues traditionally dealt with in the Introduction' (2002: 18).

On the contrary, such issues *do* result in a significantly different theological meaning. There is a massive difference between the theological meaning of a wish-fantasy and that of a historically reliable account of God miraculously preserving someone alive in a fiery furnace. Dismissing a false fable as irrelevant to my conduct reflects my view of the theological meaning and value of fairy tales. Risking my life because I believe the stories results from convictions about

¹² This is not to say that evangelicals have not written on Daniel. It is to say that many evangelical treatments advocate either dispensational or covenantal perspectives and are not endeavours in canonical biblical theology.

¹³ See also the recent discussions defending Danielic authorship in Steinmann (2008: 1–19) and Greidanus (2012: 14–15).

¹⁴ For instance, in a discussion of 'The "Most High" God and the Nature of Early Jewish Monotheism', Richard Bauckham writes, 'I exclude Daniel from this count [of instances of the phrase 'the Most High' in the Hebrew Bible] and include it in early Jewish literature simply because it so clearly belongs chronologically with the latter' (2007: 378, n. 11; cf. 41). N. T. Wright also seems to assume, without discussion, a 'second century BC' date for Daniel (2003, 3: 109).

theological meaning that cannot be separated from historicity. The narratives portray God as preserving his people and promising to raise them from the dead, and this material will influence my conduct only if I believe that God has done and will do those things. The author of Daniel encouraged people to be faithful to Yahweh even unto death (e.g. Dan. 11:32–35). The book of Daniel inspires faithfulness to Yahweh because it teaches that God and his kingdom matter more than the preservation of one's own life. Undergirding this is the fact that Yahweh can deliver people from death (Dan. 3, 6) and predict the future (Dan. 11), including the future resurrection and reward of the faithful (Dan. 12:2–3).

If some Maccabean-era author is making fraudulent claims, if these are fictional deliverances and not future predictions but recitals of what has already happened presented *as though* being predicted by Daniel, then there is no real proof that Yahweh can either deliver from death or predict the future. This means that there is no proof that he is any better than the false gods who can neither reveal the future nor deliver their worshippers, which is exactly what the book of Daniel claims Yahweh can do, especially by means of the revelations in Daniel 2 and 7–12 and the deliverances in Daniel 3 and 6.

If the deliverances of Daniel 3 and 6 are not historical, no one should be encouraged by these stories to trust that Yahweh can also deliver them if they are faithful like Daniel and his friends, nor should anyone think that Yahweh might raise the dead and reward them for their faithfulness. That man who risks his own life or the safety of his children for a God who cannot predict the future or raise the dead is a fool. The whole theological meaning of the book depends upon Yahweh's ability to deliver his people and declare the future before it takes place. If he cannot do these things, no one should 'stand firm and take action' and risk his life for Yahweh (Dan. 11:32).

We should not be shallow in our thinking about these issues and their implications: if the stories of deliverance are not historical, and if the predictions are not actual declarations of events yet to take place, the book of Daniel is nothing more than a curious piece of fiction from the ancient world retaining no right to bind the conscience in any authoritative way. It may entertain us. It may even ennoble us the way Shakespeare and Dickens do. But if not historical and predictive, Daniel is no better than a mythological account, on a level with the *Illiad*, the *Prayer of Nabonidus* or *Bel and the Dragon*. If, on the other hand, the deliverances described in Daniel actually took place in history, and if the future really has been predicted in the book of Daniel, then Daniel

demands to be regarded as the very word of God, speaking authoritatively to how people should live, binding their conscience to obey.

As Greidanus (2012: 5–15) has recently argued, the stronger position is the historic one: that Daniel wrote the book attributed to him before the events the book predicts took place. There are good historical reasons for these conclusions, and going away from them creates massive theological problems. The following historical and theological considerations inform the evangelical starting points, or presuppositions, within which I operate.

Historical evidence for an early date

In his *Jewish Antiquities*, Josephus describes an event he presents as having taken place in 332 BC:¹⁵

he [Alexander the Great] gave his hand to the high priest and, with the Jews running beside him, entered the city. Then he went up to the temple, where he sacrificed to God under the direction of the high priest, and showed due honour to the priests and to the high priest himself. And, when the book of Daniel was shown to him, in which he had declared that one of the Greeks would destroy the empire of the Persians, he believed himself to be the one indicated; and in his joy he dismissed the multitude for the time being, but on the following day he summoned them again and told them to ask for any gifts which they might desire . . .

Two things to note here: first, Josephus clearly regarded Daniel to be the author of the book: ‘the book of Daniel . . . in which he had declared . . .’ Secondly, Josephus placed this event in 332 BC, so Josephus believed that the book of Daniel had been written by then. This is historical testimony that can be taken to reflect general opinion among Jews in the first century AD. Josephus gives no indication that the book of Daniel might have been written *after* rather than *before* the events it purports to predict.

Along with what we see in Josephus, some observations on the state of Judaism at the time many believe Daniel was written are in order. As is well known, by the time of the Maccabean crisis Judaism had fragmented into sects and parties. Those who had entered into a covenant with one another at Qumran appear to have concluded that the Jerusalem

¹⁵ For the date and the text, see the LCL ed. of *Jewish Antiquities* 11.317, p. 467, notes c and e (Josephus 2001).

establishment was so corrupt the only hope was to go out to the wilderness to prepare the way of the Lord (cf. the quotation of Isa. 40:3 in 1QS VIII, 14¹⁶). The literature produced by these various groups is recognized as *sectarian* precisely because it reflects the agendas, emphases and concerns of particular groups within Judaism. The book of Daniel was accepted not by a particular sect or set of groups within Judaism but by *all Judaism*,¹⁷ and this strongly indicates that it was written before the fragmentation of Judaism, as Beckwith (1985: 357–358) argues:

both the Essenes and the rest of the Jews accepted Daniel into the canon. This extraordinary difference of treatment strongly suggests that Daniel cannot have been either of sectarian or of recent origin. Well before the emergence of the three contending religious parties in the Maccabean period, two of the books of 1 Enoch had already been written, yet even so they had only achieved acceptance in narrow circles, as the later books of 1 Enoch were also to do. The book of Daniel, on the contrary, though related in a particularly distinct manner to one of the former two books of 1 Enoch, the Book of Watchers (1 En. 1–36), was to achieve nationwide acceptance, as nothing less than Holy Scripture. The simplest explanation of this phenomenon would be that Daniel is the oldest of the apocalypses; that it did not, like the rest, have a secretive (much less a sectarian) origin; and that the production of other apocalypses, in imitation of it, was due not only to its impressive character as literature, but to the fact that, when they began to be written, it was already a contender for a place in the canon.¹⁸

¹⁶ García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000: 89.

¹⁷ Ulrich writes, ‘The book of Daniel exercised greater influence in the late second temple period than would be expected of one of the smaller books of the Bible . . . Various groups within Judaism appear to have found the person of Daniel . . . important for their developing religious reflections. While this is true for broader Judaism in general, it is likewise true for the covenanters at Qumran’ (2001: 573).

¹⁸ Ulrich writes, ‘A final observation on the text of Daniel as illumined by the scrolls found at Qumran is that there are no textual variants due to “sectarian” motivation’ (2001: 583). Ulrich basically acknowledges the point Beckwith makes – that all sects embraced Daniel – but Ulrich maintains his a priori commitment to a Maccabean era date for Daniel in spite of this evidence: ‘Despite the fact that the twelve-chapter edition of the book was composed in the troubled period that gave rise to several of the Jewish parties, including the Pharisees and the Essenes, none of the variants betrays any clue that a scribe altered the prophet’s text in favor of one party’s theology or beliefs as opposed to another’s. Sectarian or denominational polemics were not uncommon, of course, but the evidence for Daniel, in line with other books of Scripture, indicates that all parties apparently agreed to argue their points of difference elsewhere and to keep the text of the Scriptures free of such’ (583).

At least eight manuscripts of Daniel have been found at Qumran. Gerhard Hasel (1990) has summarized the impact these findings ought to have on the discussion of the date of Daniel. Hasel quotes Frank Moore Cross on the point that ‘one copy of Daniel is inscribed in the script of the late second century B.C.’. Hasel identifies this text as 4QDan^c, for which he posits a date of ‘around 125 B.C.’ (1990: 38–39).¹⁹ Regarding the proposed Maccabean date for Daniel, with Daniel originating at the time of the crisis brought about by Antiochus Epiphanes between 168 and 164 BC, Hasel observes, ‘It seems difficult to believe that such a significant number of Daniel manuscripts would have been preserved in a single desert community, if the book had really been produced at so late a date’ (40). Hasel also points out that those who adhere to the late date ‘will now have to demonstrate that a mere forty or fifty years was sufficient time for all the editorial and other processes needed – according to their tradition-historical and redaction-critical theories – for the book to be developed into its present form *and* become canonical’ (41; similarly, Waltke 1976: 321–322).

4Q *Florilegium* (4Q174, Frags. 1 Col. II, 3, 24, 5) quotes Daniel as Scripture, using the phrase ‘as is written in the book of Daniel, the prophet’ (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000: 355). The reference here to ‘the book of Daniel, the prophet’ constitutes another indication that Daniel was viewed as the author of the book. VanderKam and Flint observe, ‘The last surviving parts of the text cite Ps. 2:1 (persecution in the last days, with survival of a remnant who will perform the law), which is clarified by Dan. 12:10, and Ps. 5:2–3, which relate to the last days and are elaborated through the promise in Isa. 65:22–23’ (2002: 224). 11Q *Rule of Melchizedek* (11Q13, Col. II, 18) also quotes Daniel as Scripture, apparently interpreting the anointed one predicted in Daniel 9:25 as the fulfilment of Isaiah 52:7.²⁰

¹⁹ Ulrich lists both 4QDan^c and 4QDan^e as ‘late 2nd or early 1st c. BCE’ (2001: 574). In the same volume, Peter Flint lists 4QDan^c as ‘late 2nd c. BCE’ and 4QDan^e as ‘2nd c. BCE’ (2001: 330). Flint also holds to a ‘2nd century BCE’ date for Daniel (2001: 365). On the earliest translation of Daniel into Greek, Alexander A. Di Lella writes, ‘The date of OG-Dan. has generally been assigned to the late second or early first century BCE. What is beyond question is that OG-Dan. is prior to Th-Dan’ (2001: 590–591). Theodotion-Daniel (Th-Dan) is the translation typically cited in the NT (Wesseliuss 2001: 593).

²⁰ The text is as follows: ‘This [. . .] is the day of [peace about whi]ch he said [. . . through Isa]jah the prophet, who said: [Isa. 52:7 <<How] beautiful upon the mountains are the feet [of] the messen[ger who] announces peace, the mess[enger of good who announces salvati]on, [sa]ying to Zion: your God [reigns.>>] Its interpretation: The mountains [are] the prophet[s . . .] . . . [. . .] for all . . . [. . .] And the

The manuscript evidence – the copies of Daniel found at Qumran – is in itself a strong argument for an early date for Daniel. When we combine the hard evidence of the manuscripts with the *treatment* of Daniel at Qumran – the book of Daniel being interpreted as *Scripture* in non-biblical Qumran texts – the argument for an early date for Daniel from the evidence at Qumran grows stronger still.

Another weighty indication of an early date for Daniel is the influence of Daniel on books such as *1 Enoch*, Tobit and Ecclesiasticus (Beckwith 2002). In addition to these books we should add Baruch, which makes heavy use of Daniel (cf. esp Bar. 1:15–22 and Dan. 9:7–14). Moore writes of Baruch, ‘The place and time of the final compilation seem to be Palestine in the early part of the second century B.C., i.e. prior to the defiant Jewish mood of 168 B.C. . . .’ (1977: 260). Harrington writes of Tobit, ‘It was probably composed by a Jewish author in the third or second century’ (1999: 11). Given the obvious influence of Daniel on Baruch and Tobit,²¹ with these books reflecting a situation *prior* to the Maccabean crisis,²² it would seem very difficult to date Daniel *after* the Maccabean crisis. Against the notion that the direction of influence goes the other way (Tobit influencing Daniel) stands the fact that Daniel, not Tobit or Baruch, is quoted as Scripture and used to interpret other Scripture at Qumran and in the New Testament. The evidence that Qumran, the synagogue and the early church recognized Daniel as Scripture indicates that Daniel influenced *1 Enoch*, Baruch and Tobit rather than the other way around. *1 Enoch* in particular looks like a development of Daniel,

messenger i[s] the anointed of the spir[it] as Dan[iel] said [about him: *Dan. 9:25* <<Until an anointed one, a prince, it is seven weeks.>>’ (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000: 1209). Waltke observes that Dan. 11:40–45 is taken by modern liberal scholars to be an actual attempt at prediction that failed and points out that were that the case ‘it seems incredible’ that Daniel’s ‘alleged contemporaries’ from the Maccabean era would have regarded him as a prophet (Waltke 1976: 322).

²¹ The influence of Daniel on Tobit will be discussed in chapter 7.

²² Nickelsburg on Tobit: ‘It surely antedates the persecution of Antiochus’ (1984: 45). Moore: ‘most scholars of the past two centuries have dated [Tobit] to somewhere between 250 and 175 B.C.E., that is, after the canonization of the Prophets as Scripture (cf. Tob. 14:4) but before the Maccabean period (167–135 B.C.E.). . . . The book’s *terminus ad quem* is unquestionably pre-Maccabean’ (1996: 40–41). DeSilva: ‘It seems reasonable to set the earliest date of composition as sometime during the third century B.C.E. The book reflects the same ethos as in Ben Sira and Judith with regard to dietary laws, burial of the dead, endogamy, and piety . . . based on the discovery of the fragments of Tobit at Qumran, the earliest of which dates from 100 B.C.E. Tobit’s failure to reflect any knowledge of the issues surrounding the Hellenization crisis and Maccabean Revolt suggests that the book was written sometime between 250 and 175 B.C.E.’ (2002: 69).

with Daniel being the more restrained in its description of heavenly beings.²³

There are other factors that point to an early date for Daniel and an early recognition of it as Scripture, such as the fact that while we have Daniel in Hebrew/Aramaic and translated into Greek, neither Origen nor Jerome knew of a Hebrew text for Tobit (Moore 1996: 52), nor do Hebrew texts survive for Baruch, 1 Maccabees or *1 Enoch*.

In addition to these historical considerations, there are also relevant theological issues.

Theological considerations for an early date

The theological issue in view here is not the one mentioned earlier, that Jesus referred to the content of the book of Daniel as having been spoken by the prophet Daniel, though for me that is a decisive consideration. The issue now under consideration is the moral and ethical problem created by the suggestion of a late date for Daniel. Some more evangelical interpreters seem to regard questions of date and historicity as matters of indifference, but these issues are not morally neutral. Put bluntly, a late date for Daniel demands an author who was a scoundrel of a high order. A late date for Daniel requires some later author setting out to deceive his audience, creating in them the impression that things *he knew* had already taken place were actually being predicted. His purpose in creating this impression was to give himself the moral standing with his audience necessary for him to call them to suffer and die for the cause he advocated – when he knew all along that his claims were false.²⁴

Imagine the level of cynicism involved in such a project. The author knew he was not giving actual predictions. He knew he was being deceptive. He knew he was calling people to lose their lives, *and he knew he was calling them to take on impossible odds in a campaign whose foundation he knew to be false*. This cannot be compared to a

²³ Beckwith writes, ‘Though the angelology and eschatology of Daniel are more highly developed than those of the Prophets and Psalms . . . , they are less highly developed than those of even the earliest books of 1 Enoch’ (1985: 415, n. 75).

²⁴ Beckwith writes, ‘there was no convention which allowed writers to make such claims without danger of their being taken literally. It is sometimes suggested that writers conscious of being inspired were not doing anything seriously misleading by attributing their works to other inspired writers, but this is open to two objections: (i) they did not simply attribute their writings to other inspired writers, but to *ancient* inspired writers, and this involved them in the use of deceitful devices like *vaticinia post eventum*, which *were* seriously misleading. (ii) If they were conscious of being inspired, why did they not have the confidence to use their own names?’ (1985: 359). And again, ‘God does not need men’s lies to support his truth’ (362).

situation where authors engage in fictional projects in which they intend to tell the truth and inspire readers, along the lines of what J. R. R. Tolkien or J. K. Rowling have accomplished. No one reading those books thinks that this world is Middle-earth or that there really is a Hogwarts out there somewhere. By contrast, the book of Daniel is set in the world as we know it. The author gives no indication that his intention is to teach by means of a fictional presentation. He claims to represent the real world, the world as the Bible describes it.

Faithfulness to Yahweh was the foundation of the Maccabean resistance (cf. 1 Macc. 1:54–63). Old man Maccabee and his sons were willing to die rather than be defiled with the pig flesh of Antiochus (2:15–38, 50). The author of 1 Maccabees presents father Mattathias on his deathbed exhorting his sons to remember what God had done for previous generations of Israelites: Abraham, Joseph, Phineas, Joshua, Caleb, David, Elijah (2:51–58), and then appealing to the examples found in the book of Daniel: ‘Hananiah, Azarias and Misael, because of their faith, were saved from fire. Daniel, by his simplicity, was rescued from the mouth of lions’ (2:59–60, NETS). The author of 1 Maccabees presents Mattathias as exhorting his sons to risk their lives the same way that Daniel and his friends did, and for the same reasons: because Yahweh is more important than life, because Yahweh’s power trumps death.²⁵ For this argument to work, Mattathias, the author of 1 Maccabees, and the audience of 1 Maccabees had to believe that Daniel and his friends *belonged with biblical heroes* of the faith and that the book of Daniel described *what really happened*. No one risks his life for fables, legends and myths, and cruel would be the father who exhorted his sons to do so.

Was it a deception? Did some pseudonymous author successfully deceive everyone from Mattathias, father of Judas Maccabeus, to Jesus of Nazareth? I find it historically implausible, yea impossible, to imagine that someone could so successfully sell such a despicable deception. The proposed pseudonymous author of the supposedly forged and false book of Daniel could never have hoped to have been so wildly successful that not until Porphyry (third century AD) would anyone suspect what he had done, and then not until the modern age

²⁵ Early Christians came to similar conclusions and were encouraged to do so by the book of Daniel. Shelton’s study of Hippolytus’ *Commentary on Daniel* shows that ‘about 204 CE during a time of severe Roman persecution against the church, the commentary applies the text of Daniel in a way that offered encouragement and theological credibility to the martyrs witnessed by the church’ (2008: 1).

would it be widely recognized that he had duped the vast majority of those exposed to his fabrications.²⁶

This moral issue has implications that go beyond what we should think of the author who would attempt such a scam to what we should do with his book. Those who conclude that the book of Daniel is a forgery should not print it in the Protestant canon, esteeming and treasuring it, but should rather repudiate it as repugnant.

If it is a forgery, a fraud used to compel people to risk their lives for the sake of falsehood, even to the point of having their babies hanged and whole families put to death (1 Macc. 1:61), then we should regard this book the way we would respond to a book by some Second World War era propagandist who encouraged Japanese soldiers that the honour of the emperor mattered more than their lives, so they should fight to the death for the emperor, crying out, ‘may you [the emperor] live ten thousand years!’ (the meaning of *banzai!*). We would not venerate such literature but scorn it for its narrow, benighted, devastating perspective. Its only value would in such a case derive from the limited, slanted, ultimately false historical information to be found in it. Issues of authorship and historicity, however Ernest C. Lucas may protest, very much affect the theological meaning of the book of Daniel.²⁷

Evangelical presuppositions

The book of Daniel should not be rejected as a forged piece of unfortunate resistance literature produced in the lost cause of a false god. Rather, the God described in the book of Daniel is the only living and true God, who did and can deliver from death, and he revealed the future to his prophets. He inspired Daniel to write this book, the supernatural deliverances recorded in the book really happened, the book really did, and does, predict the future. The book of Daniel is the word of God, and God so worked through the inspiration of its author, whom the evidence indicates was Daniel himself, that error did not

²⁶ Even as he endorses the Maccabean date for Daniel, Spangenberg describes what a new idea it is: ‘The theory of the Maccabean origin of the Book of Daniel . . . was introduced at German universities towards the end of the nineteenth century. The theory only became acceptable in Protestant scholarly circles outside Germany after the First World War (1914–1918) and in Catholic scholarly circles after the Second World War (1939–1945). In South Africa, however, scholars in the departments of Biblical Studies and the Old Testament only introduced the theory to students during the seventies of the previous century’ (2006: 440).

²⁷ Gerald Bray (2012: 87) comes to similar conclusions regarding the Pastoral Epistles.

enter into the book. As the word of God, the book of Daniel binds the conscience and demands obedience.

Chapter by chapter preview

Believing that Daniel is the word of God and that it records both true events and future prophecies neither closes down interpretative possibilities nor answers all questions. The questions multiply, and this study will not answer all of them.

This book explores Daniel's theology by seeking answers to the following queries. Chapter 2: How does the Old Testament present the history and future of the world, and what does Daniel contribute to that presentation? Chapter 3: How has Daniel structured his presentation, and what does that structure contribute to the meaning of the book? Chapter 4: What do the visions of Daniel 2, 4, 7–8 and 10 – 12 mean? How are we to understand the depiction of the four kingdoms that are followed by the kingdom that will never be destroyed? Chapter 5: What does Gabriel reveal to Daniel when he tells him about the seventy weeks of years in Daniel 9? Chapter 6: How are we to understand the various heavenly beings in the book of Daniel? Is the fourth man in the fire to be identified with the one like a son of man?

The next three chapters move from the book of Daniel itself to how later writers interpreted Daniel. Chapter 7: How was Daniel understood in non-canonical early Jewish literature? Chapter 8: How was Daniel understood in the New Testament outside the book of Revelation? Chapter 9: How has the book of Daniel influenced the book of Revelation?

The final chapter of this project takes up the question of the patterns in Daniel seen against the context of the whole canon. Chapter 10: What can we say about the patterns of events in Daniel and the similarities between Daniel and other characters in the big story of the Bible, that is, what does Daniel contribute to biblical typology?

This book will not be an exhaustive or final word on these matters. 'Of making of many books there is no end' (Eccl. 12:12). My hope is to pay close attention to the text of Daniel, in both the original languages in which it was written and in Greek and English translations, to set what Daniel wrote in the broader context of biblical theology, and to move readers towards a clearer understanding of how we should live today in response to the message of Daniel.

MORE TITLES FROM INTERVARSITY PRESS

For a list of IVP email newsletters, including information about our latest ebook releases, please visit [**www.ivpress.com/eu1**](http://www.ivpress.com/eu1)

FINDING THE TEXTBOOK YOU NEED

The IVP Academic Textbook Selector is an outline tool for instantly finding the IVP books suitable for over 250 courses across 24 disciplines.

[**www.ivpress.com/academic/**](http://www.ivpress.com/academic/)