
A Contemporary Defense of the Authenticity of Daniel

Kirk R. MacGregor¹

INTRODUCTION

The authorship and date of composition of Daniel remains a subject of great controversy. Conservative scholars have traditionally affirmed that the book was composed by the exilic prophet Daniel around 530 BC, while liberal scholars embrace the view of the early Christian critic Porphyry that the work is a *vaticinium ex eventu* (i.e., prophecy after the fact) written by a Jewish priest to encourage the resistance movement against the tyranny of Antiochus IV Epiphanes in 164 BC. Some evangelical scholars, like John Goldingay in the *Word Biblical Commentary on Daniel* (1989) and F. F. Bruce in *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* (1959), have adopted the critical assessment.² Further, John J. Collins' *Daniel* (1993), the most thorough historical-critical commentary to date on this book, has persuaded many scholars of the pseudonymous nature of Daniel, including several Roman Catholic exegetes who now dismiss its authenticity.³ However, the liberal explanation fails to withstand the force of several archaeological and textual discoveries, as scholars including Gleason Archer, Kenneth Kitchen, Edwin Yamauchi, and Steven Anderson have illustrated.⁴ This piece will summarize the critical argument regarding

¹ Kirk R. MacGregor (Ph.D., University of Iowa) teaches religion at Carthage College and philosophy at the College of DuPage.

² John Goldingay, *Word Biblical Commentary: Daniel* (Dallas: Word, 1989) xxxix-xl, 304-19, 324-34; F. F. Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959) 59-65.

³ John J. Collins, *Daniel* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993) 122.

⁴ Gleason L. Archer, Jr., *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction* (Chicago: Moody, 1974); Kenneth A. Kitchen, "The Aramaic of Daniel," in *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel* (ed. Donald J. Wiseman; London: Tyndale, 1965) 31-79; Edwin M. Yamauchi, *Greece and Babylon* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1967) 19-24, 79, 89; idem, *The Stones and the Scriptures* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1972), 87-91; idem, "The Archaeological Background of Daniel," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 137 (1980) 3-16; idem, "Hermeneutical Issues in the Book of Daniel," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 23 (1980) 13-21; idem, *Persia and the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1990), 57-9, 281, 303, 379-82, 389,

Daniel and proceed to refute this argument by presenting the archaeological and textual evidence which undermines its foundations.

SURVEY OF THE CRITICAL VIEW

While the Jews of late antiquity and Christians disagreed about the role of Jesus in fulfilling the prophecies of Daniel, they agreed that the book was an authentic foretelling of future events by the power of God. This notion was first challenged by the Neoplatonic philosopher and anti-Christian critic Porphyry (AD 232–305) in his fifteen-volume set *Against the Christians*. He argued that the correspondence between the predictions of Daniel 11 and the events of the Hellenistic age is explained only by the supposition that the predictions were written after the fact.⁵ According to Porphyry, Daniel 11:1-4 reveals that its prophecies are to be interpreted with regard to the Persian assault on Greece and the subsequent rise of a “mighty king” whose kingdom is divided into four parts. The former reference suggests one of the Persian kings who attacked Greece, possibly Xerxes who invaded the kingdom in 480 BC. The “mighty king” is an obvious allusion to Alexander the Great, who conquered the Persians, and whose kingdom was divided into four parts among his four generals, as confirmed in the earlier visions of Daniel 8:20-26. Daniel 8:22-24 indicates that the “little horn” who destroys the saints emerges from the four horns or kingdoms that come to power after Alexander.⁶ In addition, Daniel 11 surveys the wars between the northern (Seleucid) and Southern (Ptolemaic) kingdoms, and culminates in a detailed account of Antiochus IV Epiphanes’ war against the Jews. Daniel 11:1-39 is remarkably accurate concerning the events from Cyrus (530 BC) to the Maccabean Revolt against Antiochus IV Epiphanes and the rededication of the Temple (164 BC). However, Daniel 11:40-45 predicts another disastrous war provoked by Ptolemy, king of the South, Antiochus IV Epiphanes’ conquest of Libya and Ethiopia, and his death along the Palestinian coast, none of which ever happened.⁷ Therefore, Porphyry poses the following question: if Daniel is a true prophecy about the events leading up to and

462-3; Steven D. Anderson, “Darius the Mede: A Reappraisal” (Ph.D. diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 2014).

⁵ Collins, *Daniel*, 25.

⁶ Goldingay, *Daniel*, 206-8, 217-8.

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 282-6, 305.

including the persecution of Jews by Antiochus IV Epiphanes and the Jewish rebellion against the Syrian ruler, why does the book correctly predict these events only to the point of the rededication of the Temple? His solution asserts that Daniel is not prophecy, but a symbolic rendering of actual historical events only up to the writer's own day. Thus, the author is inaccurate about the events following the rededication of the Temple, and especially regarding the later career and death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, because these events had not yet happened at the time the book was composed. According to Porphyry, Daniel is not an example of divine prophecy, but a pious forgery written to help Jews cope with and endure the crisis of 167–164 BC.⁸

Liberal scholars such as John J. Collins have championed Porphyry's thesis and added some objections of their own against the authenticity of Daniel. Collins alleges that the book's references to Hellenistic events are accurate, but those concerning Babylonian history are "notoriously confused."⁹ He contends that the various sections of Daniel cannot be reconciled with internal or external data. For example, Daniel 2 takes place in the "second year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign" (2:1), while Daniel 1 assumes that the prophet has already completed a three-year training period under this king.¹⁰ Further, Nebuchadnezzar secured the throne in 605, and Babylonian sources do not record the capture of Jerusalem until his seventh year (597 BC). Since Daniel 1:1 claims that Nebuchadnezzar attacked Jerusalem in 605, the book's chronology cannot be harmonized with the Babylonian records. Hence, Collins insists that Daniel is the end result of a longer development, bringing together various pieces by different authors.¹¹ He believes that the Babylonian names given to Daniel and his three companions in Daniel 1:7 are specious, and the term *Chaldean* used in its professional sense as "astrologer" (2:2) together with its ethnic sense (3:8; 9:1) is an anachronism, as the texts of Shalmaneser III (9th century BC) only refer to Chaldeans in the ethnic sense.¹² He feels that Nebuchadnezzar's derangement in Daniel 4 is a jumbled version of Nabonidus' "madness" in withdrawing to the desert,

⁸ *Ibid.*, xxxi, 315-9; P. M. Casey, "Porphyry and the Origin of the Book of Daniel," *Journal of Theological Studies* 27 (1976) 15-33.

⁹ Collins, *Daniel*, 26.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 29.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 130-4.

¹² *Ibid.*, 137-8, 140-1.

described in the *Prayer of Nabonidus* (4QPrNab) from Qumran.¹³ Collins maintains that many events and persons mentioned in Daniel cannot be coordinated with otherwise known history. He argues that Darius the Mede cannot be identified with any historic figure, and that Babylon was conquered by Cyrus and the Persians instead of the Medes. In addition, there is no evidence that any officer overseeing Cyrus' conquest of Babylon (other than Cyrus himself) was ever called "king" of Babylon, or "Darius," and thus Darius the Mede represents a confusion with the later Persian king Darius the Great.¹⁴ Collins asserts that the references in Daniel 5 to Belshazzar as "son" of Nebuchadnezzar are blatant earmarks of forgery, as Nabonidus was the father of Belshazzar.¹⁵ Collins observes that the book Daniel is bilingual, with a Hebrew-Aramaic-Hebrew structure, and cites this as undeniable evidence that the book was composed by at least two different authors, for a single author would not have written a text in two languages.¹⁶ Moreover, he charges that Greek loanwords in the Aramaic of Daniel demand a late date.¹⁷ On the basis of the Aqhat story from Ugaritic literature (*i.e.*, Ras Shamra texts) which concerns a righteous king named Dn'il who fairly judges widows and orphans, Collins suggests that Daniel was the name of a legendary wise man rather than a historic person.¹⁸ The literary form of Daniel also resembles the later apocalyptic works.¹⁹ As a result, Collins dates the "tales" of Daniel 1-6 as earlier than the prophecies but still Hellenistic in origin and post-Alexander the Great, Daniel 7 as written early in the persecution of Antiochus IV Epiphanes around 167 BC, Daniel 8-12 as added sometime between 166 and 164 prior to any knowledge by the author of Antiochus' eastern campaign or his subsequent death, and Daniel 12:11-12 as composed just before the rededication of the Temple on 25 Kislev 164.²⁰

¹³ Ibid., 216-34.

¹⁴ Ibid., 30-1, 264.

¹⁵ Ibid., 29, 32-3.

¹⁶ Ibid., 24.

¹⁷ Ibid., 12-20.

¹⁸ Ibid., 1-2.

¹⁹ Ibid., 56-60.

²⁰ Ibid., 38.

REFUTATION OF THE CRITICAL VIEW

We now enter into a pointwise assessment of the critical view.

1. Who is the king in Daniel 11:36-45?

As Porphyry deduced, Daniel 11:1-4 indeed alludes to the Persian invasion of Greece, and the “mighty king” connotes Alexander the Great. Such is unproblematic for the believer in predictive prophecy. Nevertheless, the crux of Porphyry’s thesis alleges that Daniel 11:40-45 fabricates events in the reign of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, including his conquest of Libya and Ethiopia, the war waged against him by the Southern king Ptolemy, and his death while camping in the coastlands of Palestine. However, Daniel 11:36–12:13, which contains Daniel 11:40-45, does not refer to Antiochus IV Epiphanes, but predicts incidents that will occur just prior to the end of the world.²¹ In the Masoretic Text, there is a clear paragraph break between Daniel 11:35 and 11:36, where only Daniel 11:21-34 is describing the life of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.²² As a prelude to the next paragraph, Daniel 11:35 shifts forward in history by expressly stating that the following material portrays events near the end of time: “Some of the wise will stumble, so that they may be refined, purified and made spotless until the time of the end, for it will still come at the appointed time.” This fact is verified by comparing Daniel 11:28 with Daniel 11:40. To illustrate, all scholars concur that Antiochus IV Epiphanes is the “king of the North” in Daniel 11:28 who plundered the Second Jerusalem Temple in 167 BC. But, the king spoken of by Daniel 11:40 cannot be Antiochus IV Epiphanes, for this king is distinguished from the king of the North and will actually be attacked by the king of the North and the king of the South at the end of time: “At the time of the end the king of the South will engage him in battle, and the king of the North will storm out against him with chariots and cavalry and a great fleet of ships.”²³

To determine the identity of the king in Daniel 11:36-45, we must

²¹ Yamauchi, “Hermeneutical Issues,” 16-9.

²² *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1977), 1409.

²³ Earl D. Radmacher, Ronald B. Allen, and H. Wayne House, ed., *The Nelson Study Bible* (Nashville: Nelson, 1997) 1441-2.

ascertain the figure symbolized by the “little horn” of Daniel 7:8, whom Porphyry correctly equates with the king in question. The visions of Daniel 2 and 7 refer to four kingdoms, as revealed by the prophet in 2:36-45 and an angel in 7:16-17. The “head of gold” (2:32a) and “lion” (7:4) are Babylonia (2:37), the “chest and arms of silver” (2:32b) and “bear” (7:5) are Medo-Persia (8:20), the “belly and thighs of bronze” (2:32c) and “leopard” (7:6) are Greece, including the Ptolemies and Seleucids (8:21), and the “legs of iron with feet of clay and iron mixed” (2:33) and “terrifying and frightening beast” (7:7) is the Roman Empire.²⁴ This latter identification is confirmed by Daniel 2:33, 41-42, 7:7, and 7:19. For instance, the beast’s “legs of iron, its feet partly of iron and partly of baked clay” (2:33) represents the democratic system of checks and balances in the Roman senate and assemblies.²⁵ The fact that this beast was “different from all the former beasts,” “very powerful,” “most terrifying,” and had “large iron teeth” and “bronze claws” which “crushed and devoured its victims and trampled underfoot whatever was left” (7:7, 19) indicates the magnitude of Rome’s sphere of authority and irresistible power that surpassed all its predecessors, and the “ten horns” (7:7) correspond to the “ten toes” (2:41-42).²⁶ Liberal scholars repeat Porphyry’s error that the four empires of Daniel 2 and 7 are Babylon, Media, Persia, and Greece, even though the author clearly states that “the Medes and Persians” together constituted the second in the series of four kingdoms (5:28; 2:39). Only through perpetuation of this mistake can the “little horn” be classified as Antiochus IV Epiphanes.²⁷

Daniel 7:8 points out that the “little horn” originated after the ten horns of the Roman Empire and had “eyes like the eyes of a man and a mouth that spoke boastfully.” While the “little horn” uttered pompous words, “thrones were set in place, and the Ancient of Days took his seat” (7:10), and the horn was finally destroyed and thrown into the blazing fire (7:11). Then, “one like a son of man came” with the clouds of heaven, approached the Ancient of Days, and was led into the presence of the Ancient of Days (7:13). This one like a son of man was given “authority, glory, and sovereign power” so that “all peoples, nations, and speakers of every language worshiped him,” where his kingdom is “everlasting” and

²⁴ Archer, *Old Testament Introduction*, 388.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 403-7.

²⁶ Yamauchi, “Hermeneutical Issues,” 13-5.

²⁷ Yamauchi, *Persia and the Bible*, 57-8.

“the one which shall not be destroyed” (7:14). The “little horn” is further regarded as “different from the other” kings (7:24), in that he would “speak against the Most High and oppress his saints and try to change the set times and the laws,” and the saints would be handed over to him for “a time, times, and half a time” (7:25). Afterwards, the court will abolish his dominion (7:26), and the “sovereignty, power, and greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven will be handed over to the saints, the people of the Most High” (7:27). Given that the “little horn” will wage war against the saints at “the time of the end” (11:40), prevail against them for a short time, and be defeated by the return of the one like a son of man, it is apparent that the “little horn,” *i.e.*, the king of Daniel 11:36–12:13, denotes a figure who will emerge near the end of the world, not Antiochus IV Epiphanes.²⁸ Therefore, the prophecies in Daniel 11:40–45 are not fabrications concerning Antiochus IV Epiphanes, but are referring to the reign of a king which will occur during the end times and who will be defeated by the return of the one like a son of man. Daniel 12 clearly portrays this end-of-the-world scenario, for the final resurrection of the righteous to everlasting life and the wicked to eternal condemnation will take place immediately after the “little horn” is destroyed (12:2–3).²⁹

2. Are Daniel’s references to Babylonian history accurate?

The historical objections presented by Collins, many of which are rooted in a misreading of the biblical text, have been resolved by archaeological finds. The alleged irreconcilable problem between Daniel 1, which reports that Daniel experienced three years of training before entering the king’s service (1:5, 18–20), and the setting of Daniel 2 in the “second year of Nebuchadnezzar’s reign” (2:1), is explained by the accession-year regnal system attested by the Nabonidus Chronicle and the Gezer Calendar.³⁰ The Nabonidus Chronicle is an inscription of the Neo-Babylonian king Nabonidus (553–539 BC) in the Semitic Akkadian language.³¹ The four-

²⁸ Archer, *Old Testament Introduction*, 398–401.

²⁹ Alfred J. Hoerth, *Archaeology and the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998) 297, 317–9; Yamauchi, *Stones and the Scriptures*, 82; *idem*, *Persia and the Bible*, 76–7, 86.

³⁰ Hoerth, *Archaeology and the Old Testament*, 297.

³¹ Edwin R. Thiele, *A Chronology of the Hebrew Kings* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1977) 68.

inch high Gezer Calendar, discovered in 1908, is a schoolboy's writing exercise inscribed in paleo-Hebrew which dates to the reign of King Rehoboam (922–905 BC).³² In the accession-year regnal system, a king would regard his first full year as the accession year and start to count his own reign at the beginning of the next year. Further, the Gezer Calendar commences in the month of Tishri, the fall month which roughly parallels our September, and Edwin Thiele points out that Judah counted from Tishri.³³ If Daniel was written by its namesake, a Judean captive who was well-versed in Babylonian politics (1:6; 2:48; 5:29; 6:2-3), then the book would have dated Nebuchadnezzar's reign through the Babylonian and Judean calendars. Daniel 1:1 reveals that Nebuchadnezzar besieged Jerusalem in "the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim king of Judah," which can be calculated as lasting from September 606 to September 605 upon comparing it with the Israelite Nisan calendar employed by Jeremiah 46:2. Because Nebuchadnezzar succeeded his father Nabopolassar as king of Babylon in 605 BC, Daniel 1:1 indicates that he must have assumed the throne between January and August of 605. Under the Babylonian and Judean systems, Nebuchadnezzar's accession year lasted from September 605 to September 604, his first year from September 604 to September 603, and his second year from September 603 to September 602. Because Daniel was captured when Nebuchadnezzar seized Jerusalem between January and August of 605 BC, his three-year training period started between January and August of 605 and ended between January and August of 602, when the chief official presented him to Nebuchadnezzar (1:18). Since this training period ended before September 602, the text correctly reports the subsequent events of Daniel 2 in the second year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign (2:1).³⁴

Collins' assertion that there is no mention of Nebuchadnezzar's capture of Jerusalem until 597 BC overlooks the Nabonidus Chronicle. It reports that Nebuchadnezzar conquered "all Hatti land," *i.e.*, Palestine, in 605 BC, and that "in the accession year" he "went back again to the Hattiland and marched victoriously through it until the month of Sebat (spring of 604)," which directly corroborates Daniel 1:1-3.³⁵ Far from Collins'

³² Yamauchi, "Archaeological Background of Daniel," 3.

³³ Thiele, *Chronology*, 69-70.

³⁴ Yamauchi, "Archaeological Background of Daniel," 4-5.

³⁵ D. J. Wiseman and Edwin M. Yamauchi, *Archaeology and the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979) 50.

view that Daniel cannot be reconciled with the Babylonian records, these records actually confirm the historicity of Daniel. With regard to the Babylonian names given to Daniel and his three companions in Daniel 1:7, Paul-Richard Berger has verified that these names are authentic and based on Akkadian analogies. Belteshazzar is from the analogy *belet-sar-usur*, “Lady protect the king,” Shadrach from *saduraku*, “I am very fearful (of God),” Meshach from *mesaku*, “I am of little account,” and Abed-nego means “Servant of the Shining One,” using the West Semitic *abed* instead of the Akkadian *arad*, “servant,” and using a play on the name of the god *Nebo*.³⁶ Archaeology has unearthed the Greek text of Berossus, which shows that Chaldeans were known as professional astrologers long before the time of Daniel: “From the time of Nabonassar (747–734 BC) the Chaldeans accurately recorded the times of the motion of the stars.”³⁷

3. Does Daniel 4 accurately depict something that happened to Nebuchadnezzar?

Collins posits that the *Prayer of Nabonidus* (4QPrNab) from Qumran was transmuted into the account of Nebuchadnezzar’s derangement in Daniel 4. Indeed, there are three broad parallels between these texts. First, a Babylonian king is afflicted by God in both accounts. Second, Nebuchadnezzar was tormented “seven times,” and Nabonidus was disturbed for “seven years.” Third, Daniel helped obtain Nebuchadnezzar’s sanity, and an unnamed Jewish exorcist convinced Nabonidus to repent from his worship of “the gods of silver and gold...wood, stone, and clay.” On the basis of these three parallels, Bastiaan Jongeling asserts: “It is fairly safe to assume that the original Nabonidus tradition...was transferred in Daniel to the well-known Nebuchadnezzar...and that the seer, a Jewish man, was not yet identified with Daniel in 4QPrNab.”³⁸ However, Yamauchi challenges the premise of a common tradition between the Qumran Nabonidus and the Nebuchadnezzar of Daniel, arguing that there

³⁶ Paul-Richard Berger, “Der Kyros-Zylinder mit dem Zusatzfragment BIN II Nr. 32 und die akkadischen Personennamen im Danielbuch,” *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 64 (1975) 224-34.

³⁷ In J. A. Brinkman, *A Political History of Post-Kassite Babylonia, 1158–722 BC* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1968) 227.

³⁸ Bastiaan Jongeling, C. J. Labauschagne, and A. S. van der Woude, *Aramaic Texts from Qumran I* (Leiden: Brill, 1976) 124.

are far more dissimilarities than resemblances in these two sources. For example, the names of the two kings are different, and Nebuchadnezzar was afflicted in Babylon while Nabonidus suffered in Tema of Arabia. Nebuchadnezzar was banished for a period of seven “times” in Daniel 4:23, 25, which may not equate to the seven years asserted in the Qumran Nabonidus text. For the Aramaic word *iddan* is the general word for “time” or “season,” as illustrated by Daniel 2:8-9, 3:5, 15, 7:12 and the Aramaic papyri (495–398 BC) found in 1898 on the Elephantine Island near Aswan in Upper Egypt.³⁹

In 1956 D. S. Rice discovered three stelae at Haran which recount the death of Nabonidus’ mother, who lived to be 104. These significant inscriptions report that Nabonidus had forsaken Marduk, the patron god of Babylon, to worship the moon-god Sin at Haran and Tema. These stelae use the Akkadian word *adannu* to designate the entire period of Nabonidus’ sojourn in Arabia, which was ten years and not seven as previously thought.⁴⁰ Moreover, Nebuchadnezzar suffered from lycanthropic insanity, while Nabonidus was afflicted with *sehin* (literally “inflammation”), a skin ailment (Ex. 9:9; Job 2:7), and not with delusion. The Persian Verse Account, an Akkadian source which dates from the reign of Cyrus (539–530 BC), does not depict Nabonidus as insane but angry: “the king is mad” (Akkadian *a-gu-ug sarru*).⁴¹ Sidney Smith’s mistranslation of a line in the Persian Verse Account, “an evil demon (*shedu*) had altered him,”⁴² has been corrected in the latest version by A. Leo Oppenheim, “(his) protective deity became hostile to him.”⁴³ Jongeling’s reconstruction of line 3 in the *Prayer of Nabonidus*, “and so I came to be li[ke the animals],” rests on his presupposition that the Qumran text conforms to Daniel 4, as conceded by A. S. van der Woude and Pierre

³⁹ Yamauchi, “Archaeological Background of Daniel,” 7-8.

⁴⁰ Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel*, The Anchor Bible (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1978) 123.

⁴¹ Louis F. Hartman, “The Great Tree and Nabuchodonosor’s Madness,” in *The Bible in Current Catholic Thought* (ed. J. L. McKenzie; New York: Herder, 1962) 80; Martin McNamara, “Nabonidus and the Book of Daniel,” *Irish Theological Quarterly* 37 (1970) 141.

⁴² Sidney Smith, *Babylonian Historical Texts Relating to the Capture and Downfall of Babylon* (London: Meuthen, 1924) 98.

⁴³ A. Leo Oppenheim’s translation of the “Verse Account of Nabonidus,” in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (3rd ed.; ed. James B. Pritchard; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969) 313.

Grelot.⁴⁴ Moreover, the literary genres of the Qumran text and Daniel 4 are quite different. The former is a descriptive narrative, while the latter is a public proclamation by the king himself. Therefore, Louis Hartman asserts that “[t]here is no sign of literary dependence of one story on the other: the relatively few words and expressions which they have in common are standard terms that could occur anywhere,”⁴⁵ and Yamauchi concurs that “[i]t is in the face of these rather important discrepancies that critics...have still chosen to derive Daniel’s story of Nebuchadnezzar’s madness from a garbled tradition about Nabonidus’ illness.”⁴⁶

4. Was Darius the Mede a historical figure?

Perhaps the most intractable problem surrounding the authenticity of Daniel has been to establish the existence of a Median king who can be positively identified as Darius the Mede. In 2014, this problem seems to have been definitively solved by Steven Anderson. Anderson’s solution proceeds in two parts. First, based on the classical Greek historian Xenophon’s *Cyropaedia* (370 BC), one of two ancient biographies of Cyrus the Great, Anderson has persuasively argued that Cyrus shared power with a Median king until two years after the fall of Babylon.⁴⁷ Xenophon denominates this king as Cyaxares II. According to Xenophon, Cyrus was the son of Cambyses I, King of Persia, who was subordinate to his brother-in-law Astyages, King of Media. At Astyages’ death, his son Cyaxares II succeeded him to the Median throne at about the time Cyrus reached adulthood.⁴⁸ When the Babylonians with the assistance of other nations attacked the Medes and Persians, Cyaxares II and Cyrus, then the crown prince of Persia and commander of the Persian army, joined forces to overthrow the Babylonians. Cyaxares II remained in Media with a home guard, while Cyrus conducted the war as the commanding general of both the Medes and Persians.⁴⁹ In 539 BC, Cyrus became King of Persia upon

⁴⁴ Jongeling, Labauschagne, and van der Woude, *Aramaic Texts*, 126-7; Pierre Grelot, “La priere de Nabonide (4QPrNab),” *Revue de Qumran* 9 (1978) 487.

⁴⁵ Hartman, “Great Tree,” 81.

⁴⁶ Yamauchi, “Archaeological Background of Daniel,” 8.

⁴⁷ Anderson, “Darius the Mede,” 53-9.

⁴⁸ Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* 1.5.2, 1.5.4.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 5.5.38-40; 6.1.6; 6.1.19.

the death of Cambyses I. Later that same year, Cyrus took Babylon by diverting the Euphrates River and attacking the riverbed on the night of a feast, killing the troops and the king of Babylon, whom Xenophon identifies as the son of “the king who then was.”⁵⁰ At the fall of Babylon, therefore, Cyaxares II was recognized as the highest official in the Medo-Persian Empire, with Cyrus a subordinate co-regent.⁵¹ When Cyrus returned to Persia and met Cyaxares II, Cyaxares II gave Cyrus his daughter in marriage and bestowed upon Cyrus accession to the throne of Media at his death. When Cyaxares II died in 537 BC, Cyrus, now king of Media and Persia, united the two peoples under a single monarch.⁵²

Second, Anderson presents strong evidence that “Darius the Mede” was the throne name of Cyaxares II. Anderson appeals to Berossus, a priest of Bel/Marduk in Babylon who composed the *Babyloniaca*, an account of Babylonian history from the origins of Babylon to the beginning of the Hellenistic period, between 281–261 BC. The best text-critical reconstruction of the *Babyloniaca* contains the following description of the fall of Babylon:

But it came to pass in the seventeenth year of [Nabonidus’] reign, that Cyrus came out of Persia with a great army; and having subdued all the rest of his kingdom, he rushed upon Babylonia. And when Nabonidus learned of his attack, he met [him] with his army and joined battle, and was defeated in the

⁵⁰ Ibid., 4.6.3; 7.5.26-31.

⁵¹ Hence it is false, as is commonly assumed by liberal scholars, that Cyrus made a hostile conquest of Media and dethroned the last Median king. This assumption comes from Herodotus’ account of the life of Cyrus, which contradicts the account of Xenophon at various points. However, application of the criteria of authenticity to both accounts shows Xenophon’s report to be accurate and Herodotus’ report to be inaccurate concerning Cyrus’ relationship to Media and its king (Anderson, “Darius the Mede,” 36-50). Moreover, on this score Xenophon is confirmed and Herodotus disconfirmed by Josephus (*Jewish Antiquities* 10.248) and Harpocration (*Lexeis of the Ten Orators* Δ 5). As Anderson deduces, “The version of the accession of Cyrus which Herodotus gives is a legendary embellishment of a deceitful propaganda history created by Cyrus as a means of legitimating his kingship in the minds of an unfavorable Babylonian populace” (“Darius the Mede,” 182-3).

⁵² Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* 8.5.18-27.

battle; and, fleeing with a few [troops], he was confined within the city of the Borsippans. Then Cyrus seized Babylon, and ordered the outer walls of the city to be torn down, because the city had been very troublesome to him, and seemed hard to conquer. He then marched against Borsippa to force Nabonidus to capitulate. But Nabonidus did not wait out the siege, but gave himself up. Cyrus at first treated him kindly, and, giving a residence to him in Carmania, sent him out of Babylonia. *But Darius the king took away some of his province for himself.* So Nabonidus passed the rest of his time in that land and died.⁵³

This text intersects quite nicely with the account of Xenophon, filling out its missing details. While Xenophon recounted Cyrus' killing of a Babylonian king who was co-regnant with his father but said nothing more of the father, Berossus described the surrender, exile, and natural death of that father, Nabonidus. More stunning for our purposes is the italicized line, which reveals that Darius was a king whose rule stretched over the exploits of Cyrus just after the fall of Babylon. Since we know from Xenophon that the only king with this type of authority was Cyaxares II, Anderson concludes that Darius and Cyaxares II were one and the same figure, with Darius serving as his throne name.⁵⁴ And since this figure was king of Media, it is only natural that the further designation "the Mede" would be added to the throne name Darius.⁵⁵

Corroboration for this conclusion comes from the first-century AD Jewish historian Josephus, who reported: "Now Darius put an end to the dominion of the Babylonians with Cyrus his relative, being sixty-two years

⁵³ Translated and discussed in Anderson, "Darius the Mede," 148-52.

⁵⁴ Anderson, "Darius the Mede," 55-7, 152-3. Further, I concur with the prominent nineteenth-century Old Testament commentator C. F. Keil (against Anderson) that Cyaxares and Astyages are Median names whose respective Persian equivalents are Darius and Ahasuerus (*Biblical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* [trans. M. G. Easton; Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1847] 200).

⁵⁵ The Greek tragic dramatist Aeschylus (writing in 472 BC) reported that Astyages was dubbed "the Mede" and that Astyages' son reigned between Astyages and Cyrus (*Persians* 765-9; see Anderson, "Darius the Mede," 162-3). Accordingly, there is nothing unusual about Astyages' son (Darius/Cyaxares) bearing the same descriptor.

old when he took Babylon—who was the son of Astyages, but was called by another name among the Greeks.”⁵⁶ Because the son of Astyages has been identified by Xenophon, a Greek historian, as Cyaxares II, it follows inescapably from the combined testimony of Josephus and Xenophon that Darius was Cyaxares II. The existence of this earlier Darius before Darius the Great is also confirmed by the second-century AD Greek lexicographer and rhetorician Harpocration, who traced the derivation of the term “daric” to the earlier Darius’ reign: “Darics are gold staters, and each of them also had the value of what the Athenians call the ‘gold coin.’ But darics are not named, as most suppose, after Darius the father of Xerxes, but after a certain other more ancient king.”⁵⁷ In sum, the cumulative force of the ancient evidence permits little doubt that the Median king Cyaxares II was Darius the Mede.

5. *Does Daniel misrepresent Belshazzar’s relationship to Nebuchadnezzar?*

Collins faults Daniel for referring to Belshazzar as the “son” of Nebuchadnezzar, since he was the son of Nabonidus and the *de facto* king in his father’s absence. It should be noted that liberal scholars denied the existence of Belshazzar until 1956, since Nabonidus was known to be the last king of Babylon and there was no known evidence for Belshazzar outside Daniel. However, the skeptics were forced to reverse their views when the Haran stela were unearthed. These tablets report that Nabonidus “entrusted kingship” to his son Belshazzar, thus proving the existence of Belshazzar and confirming Daniel’s allusions to Belshazzar as king (5:1, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 17, 18, 30).⁵⁸ The objection to Belshazzar being styled as the “son” of Nebuchadnezzar is petty, because inscriptions from the Ancient Near East demonstrate that the word “son” (Aramaic *bar*) was employed quite loosely in the political sphere to mean “successor.”⁵⁹ The Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser III, which dates to 830 BC, pictures Jehu bringing tribute to the Assyrian king: “The tribute of Jehu, son of Omri.” However, Jehu was not the literal son of Omri, but a usurper of no relation who

⁵⁶ Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 10.248.

⁵⁷ Harpocration, *Lexeis of the Ten Orators* Δ 5.

⁵⁸ Yamauchi, *Stones and the Scriptures*, 88.

⁵⁹ Hoerth, *Archaeology and the Old Testament*, 321-2.

murdered the previous king, Joram, the grandson of Omri. Thus, the Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser III certainly takes “son” in the sense “successor.” The Moabite Stone of Mesha (870 BC), one of the earliest archaeological finds concerning the Old Testament, reveals that “Omri had taken possession of the land of Medeba and [Israel] dwelt in it his days and half the days of his son, forty years.” But we know from 2 Kings 3 that the “son” was Joram, the grandson and successor of Omri, and not his literal son Ahab.⁶⁰ Further, the Haran stelae designate Belshazzar as the “son of the king,” which is almost precisely what Daniel calls him (5:22).⁶¹ A telltale sign of Daniel’s historicity is realized when Belshazzar made Daniel the “third highest ruler in the kingdom” (5:29) after he correctly interpreted the writing on the wall (5:25-28). The position of “third highest ruler” is noteworthy, as one would have expected Belshazzar to make Daniel the second highest ruler. However, the Haran inscriptions reveal that Nabonidus was still the highest ruler and *de jure* “king” of Babylon in absentia. Therefore, as Belshazzar was the second highest ruler, the best position he could grant Daniel was that of third highest ruler, confirming the precise accuracy of Daniel.⁶²

6. Do the structure and language of Daniel demand second-century BC authorship?

Cyrus Gordon points out that the Hebrew-Aramaic-Hebrew structure of Daniel reflects the ABA chiastic pattern common in ancient Near Eastern rules of composition, where the main body of a text is enclosed within language of a contrasting style. A similar chiastic phenomenon is displayed by Ezra (c. 420 BC), whose structure is Hebrew-Aramaic-Hebrew-Aramaic-Hebrew or ABABA.⁶³ The *lingua franca* of the Babylonian Empire was Aramaic, spoken by the king and his astrologers (2:4), while only the Jews could understand Hebrew. In 1942 an Aramaic papyrus, a letter from King Adon to an Egyptian pharaoh written in 604

⁶⁰ Ibid., 308-10; Yamauchi, *Stones and the Scriptures*, 72-3.

⁶¹ Yamauchi, “Archaeological Background of Daniel,” 6.

⁶² Yamauchi, *Stones and the Scriptures*, 88-9; Hoerth, *Archaeology and the Old Testament*, 381.

⁶³ Cyrus H. Gordon, “Higher Critics and Forbidden Fruit,” *Christianity Today* 4 (1959) 131-4.

BC, was discovered in a jar at Saqqara in Egypt. With regard to the finding, John Bright comments: “[T]hat courtiers should address Nebuchadnezzar in Aramaic as the story in Dan. 2:4 has it, no longer appears at all surprising.”⁶⁴ Daniel 2:4–7:28 was composed in Aramaic, since these six chapters deal with matters of importance to the Gentile nations of the Babylonian Empire and thus were written in a language understandable to all. However, Daniel 8–12 returns to Hebrew, because it deals with special concerns of the Jews. As a well-educated Jew in the Babylonian palace, Daniel possessed all the linguistic skills and the historical and cultural knowledge needed to author this book. In fact, his language argues for a date earlier than the second century BC. Linguistic evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls, which provide authentic samples of Hebrew and Aramaic writing from the second century BC, verifies that Daniel’s Hebrew and Aramaic was composed several centuries earlier.⁶⁵ For example, the Aramaic of Daniel bears little resemblance to that of the Qumran Genesis Apocryphon composed in the first century BC. However, eight Aramaic epistles, now known as the Hermopolis Papyri, were discovered in 1945 at Hermopolis in Middle Egypt and date to the late sixth century BC. Daniel’s Aramaic is contemporary with these papyri, as well as the Elephantine Papyri drafted in the fifth century BC.⁶⁶ Some of the technical Aramaic terms in Daniel were already obsolete by the second century, and the Septuagint, the Greek version of the Hebrew Bible completed between 250–100 BC, translated them incorrectly. Therefore, Peter Coxon declares the futility of holding a second-century date of Daniel,⁶⁷ and Cyrus Gordon assures that Daniel “should be understood as a whole, consciously composed unit.”⁶⁸

Collins repeats the century-old argument of S. R. Driver that the Greek loanwords in the Aramaic of Daniel are objective proof for the book’s late date. Since Driver made this statement, a wealth of archaeological materials have been found which establish that contacts

⁶⁴ John Bright, “A New Letter in Aramaic, Written to a Pharaoh of Egypt,” in *The Biblical Archaeologist Reader* (ed. David N. Freedman and G. Ernest Wright; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1961–64) 105.

⁶⁵ Kitchen, “The Aramaic of Daniel,” 41-2.

⁶⁶ Archer, *Old Testament Introduction*, 398-403.

⁶⁷ Peter W. Coxon, “The Syntax of the Aramaic of *Daniel*: A Dialectal Study,” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 48 (1977) 120-2.

⁶⁸ Gordon, “Higher Critics and Forbidden Fruit,” 132.

between the Aegean and the Near East started long before the reign of Alexander the Great. The Greeks of Cilicia and Cyprus encountered Mesopotamia through Assyrian expansion to the northwest in the eighth and seventh centuries BC. The Greek rulers of these areas paid tribute to Assyria, and other Greeks were sailors in the Assyrian navy. In the seventh century BC, Egypt employed Greek mercenaries to defeat the Assyrians.⁶⁹ A few months before his succession to the Babylonian throne in 605 BC, Nebuchadnezzar defeated the Egyptian pharaoh Necho at Carchemish in northwestern Mesopotamia. Excavations here by Leonard Woolley and T. E. Lawrence unearthed evidence of this battle, including an Ionian shield which belonged to a Greek mercenary defending the Egyptians.

Nebuchadnezzar also hired Greek mercenaries to fight for the Babylonians, including the brother of the famous poet Alcaeus, and Greek mercenaries were stationed in Palestine at this time.⁷⁰ In 1960 the site of Mesad Hashavyahu between Ashdod and Jaffa was excavated, and the large quantity of Greek pottery revealed that it was a small fort built by the Greeks between 630–625 BC. The settlers were Greek mercenaries employed by Psammetichus I of Egypt, and the fort was conquered by Josiah just before 609 BC. Ostraca have been discovered just west of the Dead Sea at Arad from the stratum which was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar in 598 BC. These ostraca mention weapons given to the *Kittim*, the Greek mercenaries serving in the remote forts of Judah. It is significant to note that the *Kittim* are explicitly mentioned in Daniel 11:30: “For ships of Kittim will come against him.” The walls of Nebuchadnezzar’s throne room at Babylon were decorated with Ionic (Greek) capitals, showing that he enlisted Greek craftsmen. Yamauchi contends that Cypriote Greeks were well known to Nabonidus. To illustrate, one Greek sherd of the seventh century BC and sherds of nine Greek vessels of the sixth century BC have been discovered at Babylon. Elements of Greek style are also portrayed in the architecture at Pasargadai, the palace that Cyrus built in 550 BC. He conquered Lydia and Ionia in 546 BC, and he used numerous Ionian Greeks in his building activities, as did his successors Darius the Great and Xerxes.⁷¹

⁶⁹ Archer, *Old Testament Introduction*, 104; Edwin M. Yamauchi, “Book Review: *Daniel* by John J. Collins,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 41 (1998) 124-5.

⁷⁰ Yamauchi, *Stones and the Scriptures*, 81.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 90-1.

All three of these Greek loanwords are musical terms found in Daniel 3:5: *qayteros* (Aramaic) or *kitharis* (Greek), *pesanterin* (Aramaic) or *psalterion* (Greek), and *sumponeya* (Aramaic) or *sumphonia* (Greek). The first instrument was a type of lyre, and the spelling of the specific Greek word which was borrowed shows that the loan was adopted in the pre-Hellenistic period. Coxon points out that the Ionic form *kitharis* is mentioned in Daniel 3 instead of the Attic *kithara*, which was used exclusively in Greek material of the post-Alexander period, including the Septuagint, the New Testament, and Patristic sources. The spelling *kitharis* originated from Asia Minor and the Greek Islands, and it was absorbed by Official Aramaic as a result of cultural and linguistic contacts well before the second century BC.⁷² Although the Greek *psalterion* was a harplike instrument, Alfred Sendry proposes that the *pesanterin* of Daniel was a dulcimer, one of many musical instruments which was originally imported from the east, improved by the Greeks, and re-exported to the east.⁷³ The theory that *sumponeya* alludes to a “bagpipe,” as endorsed by the Anchor Bible commentary on Daniel,⁷⁴ has been discredited by clear evidence which shows that this was a very late sense of the word. Yamauchi explains that the earliest meaning of *sumphonia* was “sounding together,” *i.e.*, the simultaneous playing of instruments or voices which produces consonant harmony.⁷⁵ As Jerome commented on this word, “The *symphonia* is not a kind of instrument, as some Latin writers think, but it means concordant harmony. It is expressed in Latin by *cosonantia*.”⁷⁶

Yamauchi points out that the exchange of musicians and musical instruments played a prominent role at royal courts from time immemorial. For instance, the influence of Asiatic on Egyptian music in the fifteenth century BC was considerable, as new instruments included the long-necked lute, the lyre, the angled harp, and the double flute, and the Syrian musicians who introduced them popularized new melodies and dances. Twelfth-century BC texts from the Kassite period of Mesopotamia recount that Elamite singers entered the royal household of Marduk-apal-iddina I at Dur Kurigalzu. The ND 6219 tablet from eighth-century Nimrud shows

⁷² Yamauchi, *Persia and the Bible*, 380-1.

⁷³ Alfred Sendry, *Music in Ancient Israel* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1969) 297.

⁷⁴ Hartman and Di Lella, *Daniel*, 157.

⁷⁵ Yamauchi, *Persia and the Bible*, 381.

⁷⁶ Quoted by Sendry, *Music in Ancient Israel*, 325.

that the king's male choir comprised Kassite, North Syrian, and Assyrian singers.⁷⁷ The Near Eastern double flute, or oboe, has been discovered in Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, Cyprus, Crete, and Greece, and the Syrian word *embubu* passed into Latin as *ambubaiae*, which specified both the double flute and the Syrian girls who played them.⁷⁸ E. Y. Kutscher argues that Greek musicians were dominant enough in the seventh and sixth centuries BC to influence Near Eastern languages, just as Italian musicians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries AD caused many loanwords like "*piano, soprano, opera, libretto, tempo, adagio*" to be adopted by all North-European languages.⁷⁹ This argument is confirmed by Greek loanwords inscribed in the fifth-century BC Elephantine Papyri. Therefore, in light of the widespread Greek contacts before Alexander the Great and the documented exchange of musicians, instruments, and terms, the Greek loanwords in Daniel do not imply a late date.⁸⁰

7. Was Daniel a historical figure of the sixth century BC?

Collins identifies Daniel with the legendary king Dn'il from the Aqhat story in the Ras Shamra texts rather than a historical figure, largely on the presupposition that Daniel is not mentioned by name in any Jewish literature until the Sybilline Oracles of 140 BC. On this point, Collins wants to have his cake and eat it too, as the motive for pseudepigraphy in the first place is to employ some famous person's name for the sake of one's own views. But, one may ask, if Daniel is not mentioned in any Jewish literature until 140 BC, then how famous could he be? However, there is substantial evidence that Daniel is mentioned by Jewish literature prior to this date. Ezekiel 14:14, 20 quotes God warning Israel about the destruction of Jerusalem: "[E]ven if these three men—Noah, Daniel, and Job—were in it, they could save only themselves by their righteousness" (v. 14). In Ezekiel 28:3, God asks the ruler of Tyre, "Are you wiser than Daniel? Is no secret hidden from you?" In order to maintain his view that Daniel is unknown to Jewish literature until 140 BC, Collins ingeniously

⁷⁷ Yamauchi, "Archaeological Background of Daniel," 13.

⁷⁸ Friedrich Ellermeier, *Sibyllen, Musikanten, Haremsfrauen* (Herzberger am Harz: Junger, 1970) 12-9.

⁷⁹ E. Y. Kutscher, "Aramaic," *Current Trends in Linguistics VI* (ed. T. A. Sebeok; The Hague: Mouton, 1970) 401-2.

⁸⁰ Yamauchi, *Persia and the Bible*, 393-4.

interprets the evidence to claim enough parallels between the Ugaritic Dn'il and Ezekiel's Daniel so that he can identify the former with the latter. For example, he notes that the spelling of the name Daniel in Ezekiel (*i.e.*, *daniel*) consistently differs from its occurrence in the book of Daniel (*i.e.*, *daniyyel*), while the Ugaritic Aqht Text has a spelling closer to Ezekiel.⁸¹ But this orthographic argument is weightless. As Harold H. P. Dressler notes in rebuttal, the "name *Danilu*, *Danel* is well attested (in different writings and perhaps with different meanings attached to it) in Old Assyrian, Old Babylonian, Northwest Semitic" and that "*Danil* is the Babylonian pronunciation of non-Akkadian Semitic *Dan'il*, '*Daniel*'."⁸² Even John Day, a prominent defender of the equation between Ezekiel's Daniel and the Ugaritic Dn'il, concurs with Dressler that "there are no linguistic objections to the equation of Daniel of Ezekiel xiv 14, 20 and the hero of the book of Daniel," since "Ezekiel simply spells the name without the vowel letter *yodh*."⁸³ Dressler argues that the *yodh* was intended by Daniel himself to be a personal infix as a constant reminder of his relationship with Yahweh, and thus it would be missing in Ezekiel's spelling of the name. While Daniel's spelling reminds him of his own responsibility before God and of his own humility, Ezekiel leaves out the *yodh* to broaden the scope of Yahweh as judge.⁸⁴

Liberal scholars maintain that the position of Daniel between two figures of antiquity, Noah and Job, shows that Daniel was not a contemporary of Ezekiel. But Dressler points out that Ezekiel does not assign importance to precise enumeration patterns, as evident from the random order of lists elsewhere in the book. Further, Dressler contends that Ezekiel intended to write an "inferential foreword" to the book of Daniel by his three references to his prophetic colleague.⁸⁵ Such a thesis is corroborated by earmarks in Daniel that the author expected skepticism of his audience to accept him as a real prophet of Yahweh because of his political status in the foreign Babylonian regime. Two of these indications are the many parallels with Joseph, son of Jacob the patriarch, in Daniel 1

⁸¹ Collins, *Daniel*, 1-2.

⁸² Harold H. P. Dressler, "The Identification of the Ugaritic DNIL with the Daniel of Ezekiel," *Vetus Testamentum* 29 (1979) 155-6.

⁸³ John Day, "The Daniel of Ugarit and Ezekiel and the Hero of the Book of Daniel," *Vetus Testamentum* 30 (1980) 181.

⁸⁴ Dressler, "Identification," 175.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 177.

and 2, which create a positive and subconscious *déjà vu* experience in the minds of the readers, and the interlacing of Daniel's personal history with prophecy to emphasize his own piety. These factors argue for a sixth-century BC date of Daniel, as second-century BC Jews never doubted the prophetic status of Daniel. Moreover, two valid connections can be illustrated between Noah, Daniel, and Job: all three were faithful to God despite not residing in the Promised Land, and all three were delivered by God for their righteousness (Gen. 8:1; Dan. 6:16-23; Job 42:10-16). Both of these elements are directly implied by Ezekiel 14:14, 20, since God declares that "Noah, Daniel, and Job...could save neither son nor daughter" but "would save only themselves by their righteousness" (v. 20).

Skeptics assert that an identification of the Daniel mentioned by Ezekiel with the hero of the book of Daniel presents chronological difficulties, as Daniel would have been a youth whose reputation was only of a local nature. However, if the historicity of Ezekiel is maintained, then a thirty-year period exists between the events of Daniel 2 and Ezekiel's composition c. 570 BC, which is enough time to establish Daniel's Babylonian fame.⁸⁶ The deathblow to the liberal identification of Ezekiel's Daniel with the Ugaritic Dn'il is the attribution of "righteousness" (Hebrew *sedaqah*) to Daniel in Ezekiel 14:14, 20. *Sedaqah* is an antonym to "unfaithfulness" in the sense of idolatry, *i.e.*, the worship of Baal. However, the Aqhat story in the Ras Shamra texts clearly states that Dn'il was a devoted worshiper of Baal. Thus, by definition the Ugaritic Dn'il was a completely unrighteous man, as *sedaqah* entails that one does not worship Baal, and it is incredible to think that Ezekiel would have used a Baal-worshiper to illustrate the virtue of not worshipping Baal. Hence, the Daniel cited by Ezekiel is the prophet of the book of Daniel, and its sixth-century BC date remains intact.⁸⁷

8. Do the apocalyptic elements of Daniel imply a late date?

Collins correctly notes the resemblance between Daniel and late apocalyptic writings, but fails to acknowledge that these apocalyptic writings were patterned after and derived from Daniel rather than vice versa. The antiquity of Daniel is displayed by Akkadian prototypes of

⁸⁶ Ibid., 157-8.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 160-1.

Daniel's prophecies, which date to the early second millennium BC. In their article on these *Akkadian Prophecies*, A. K. Grayson and W. G. Lambert contend that "the book of Daniel has many similarities to the *Akkadian Prophecies*."⁸⁸ In addition, the account of Daniel's rise, fall, and rise is paralleled by an undisputed fifth-century BC Aramaic document, the story of Ahiqar. Yamauchi declares: "It is now quite certain that Ahiqar was a historic figure at the Assyrian court of the seventh century."⁸⁹ Daniel also exhibits an accurate knowledge of sixth-century BC geography, including his description of the city of Shushan as contained in the province of Elam during the time of the Chaldeans (8:2).⁹⁰

Another significant discovery portrays Daniel as an authentic work of the sixth century BC. The ceremony in which Nebuchadnezzar ordered his subjects to worship his gold statue (3:2-6) is quite different from the usual rites which were conducted by the priests in private. However, this ceremony has been confirmed by the discoveries of Woolley in the Neo-Babylonian stratum at Ur. Woolley writes concerning the E-NUN-MAH sanctuary originally dedicated to the moon god Nannar and his wife Ningal: "Nothing could be more unlike the conditions of the old temple than this spacious building in which there was room for a multitude of people and everything was arranged as to focus attention on the rites in progress," and "the change in the temple plan must correspond to a change in religious practice."⁹¹ At the time of the discovery, the mode of worship was traced back to Daniel 3, and this explanation has been generally accepted. Regarding the sanctuary, Woolley notes that "what was novel here was not the setting up of the image but the order that all were to share in the adoration of it," as "Nebuchadnezzar was substituting a form of congregational worship for the mysteries of an esoteric priesthood."⁹²

CONCLUSION

It is clear that liberal scholars are ignorant of the flood of archaeological

⁸⁸ A. K. Grayson and W. G. Lambert, "Akkadian Prophecies," *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 18 (1964) 10.

⁸⁹ Yamauchi, *Stones and the Scriptures*, 89.

⁹⁰ Archer, *Old Testament Introduction*, 408.

⁹¹ Leonard Woolley and M. E. L. Mallowan, *Ur Excavations IX: The Neo-Babylonian and Persian Periods* (London: British Museum, 1962) 24.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 25.

and textual materials supporting the authenticity of Daniel. Porphyry's thesis, which serves as the foundation of any modern argument for a late date, collapses under the fact that Daniel 11:40-45 refers to the future reign and destruction of a figure during the world's end times instead of the military defeat and death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. The Nabonidus Chronicle and the Gezer Calendar demonstrate that no contradiction exists between the chronologies of Daniel 1 and 2, and the Nabonidus Chronicle verifies that Nebuchadnezzar conquered Palestine in 605 BC. Akkadian analogies authenticate the Babylonian names given to Daniel and his friends, and the Greek text of Berossus shows that Chaldeans were professional astrologers long before the sixth century BC. A careful comparison of the Qumran *Prayer of Nabonidus* with the portrait of Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel 4 establishes the literary independence of these texts. Recent analysis of Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* indicates that Darius the Mede was the throne name of the sixth-century BC Median king Cyaxares II, who headed the Medo-Persian Empire at Babylon's fall in 539 BC. Inscriptions from Haran demonstrate the existence and kingship of Belshazzar. Further, the Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser III and the Moabite Stone of Mesha endorse Daniel's loose description of Belshazzar as the "son" of Nebuchadnezzar. The Hebrew-Aramaic-Hebrew structure of Daniel reflects the ABA chiastic pattern of Near Eastern composition, and the Hermopolis and Elephantine papyri along with the Dead Sea Scrolls exhibit that Daniel's Hebrew and Aramaic parallel fifth-century BC linguistics rather than second-century BC writings. Excavations at Carchemish, Mesad Hashavyahu, Arad, Babylon, and Pasargadai reveal ample contacts between the Aegean and Near East before Alexander the Great, and the Greek words for musical instruments in the Aramaic are therefore no obstacle for an early date of Daniel. Since the Ugaritic Dn'il from the Ras Shamra texts was a Baal-worshiper, the Daniel mentioned in Ezekiel 14:14, 20, and 28:3 must correspond to the namesake of the book of Daniel. The *Akkadian Prophecies* and the story of Ahiqar demonstrate that late apocalyptic writings were modeled after Daniel and not vice versa, and Daniel's precise reference to the city of Shushan in the province of Elan displays his sixth-century BC knowledge. The E-NUN-MAH sanctuary discovered in the Neo-Babylonian stratum at Ur portrays the mode of worship described in Daniel 3. In sum, the plethora of archaeological and textual evidence surrounding the book of Daniel constitutes a powerful cumulative case that cries out for authorship by the historical prophet Daniel c. 530 BC.