

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_bib-sacra\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php)

---

*Archaeological Backgrounds of the  
Exilic and Postexilic Era*

*Part 1:*

# The Archaeological Background of Daniel

---

Edwin M. Yamauchi

---

Two recent articles by Bruce K. Waltke and by Gleason L. Archer, Jr. have appeared in this journal, emphasizing the importance of the Book of Daniel.<sup>1</sup> In two earlier works this author has discussed some of the archaeological, linguistic, and historical data bearing on the Book of Daniel especially as they relate to the date of its composition and its authenticity as a prophecy.<sup>2</sup>

Conservative scholars are aware that some serious problems face the traditional view of Daniel as a prophetic work. An important attempt to confront some of these major issues has been contributed by distinguished British scholars — D. J. Wiseman, T. C. Mitchell, R. Joyce, W. J. Martin, and K. A. Kitchen.<sup>3</sup> This article is a discussion of some of these historical problems in the light of extra-biblical data.

## **Historical Problems**

### NEBUCHADNEZZAR

The apparent contradiction between the third year of Jehoiakim (Dan. 1:1) and the fourth year of Jehoiakim (Jer. 46:2) for the date of Nebuchadnezzar's initial attack can be readily explained by the use of different calendars (Nisan and Tishri), and of different regnal systems.<sup>4</sup> Though Hartman and Di Lella list in their bibliography,<sup>5</sup> the monograph by Wiseman and others which addresses this problem,<sup>6</sup> their commentary still asserts: "Whatever the case, Nebuchadnezzar did not besiege Jerusalem in 606 B.C., as Dan 1:1 would have us believe, for . . . he did not

become king of Babylon till the following year.”<sup>7</sup> Millard points out the possible solution:

However, on the accession year system and with an autumnal New Year, his [Jehoiakim’s] first year would run from September 608 to September 607, his second 607-6, his third September 606 — October 605. This last would just accommodate the statement of Daniel 1:1 in chronological terms.<sup>8</sup>

As to the further question of whether there was indeed a Babylonian campaign against Jerusalem, McNamara asserts: “The siege of Jerusalem mentioned in 1, 1 for the third year of his reign (i.e. 603 B.C.) is, however, an anachronism; the first siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar known to history was in 597 B.C. (but compare 2 Kings 24:10-16 with 2 Chron. 36:6-10).”<sup>9</sup> In rebuttal Wiseman points out that the *Chaldean Chronicles* which he published in 1956 indicate that Nebuchadnezzar claims to have conquered “all Hatti land,” that is, Palestine, in 605.<sup>10</sup>

In a recent work Wiseman has written: “In the following years (604-603 B.C.), the Babylonians marched unopposed through Palestine (‘Hatti-land’). Heavy tribute was brought to them by all the kings and with it many prisoners (including Daniel) were sent back to Babylon.”<sup>11</sup> Elsewhere Wiseman has suggested still another possible date for Daniel’s deportation. In referring to a passage in the *Babylonian Chronicle* (BM 21946, rev. 4) he writes, “If this passage does refer to numerous persons it could well be that in this year 602 B.C., rather than in 605 B.C. (as CCK [*Chronicles of Chaldaean Kings*] 26), captives, possibly including Daniel and other Judeans, were taken to Babylon.”<sup>12</sup> It should be noted that the biblical text in Daniel 1:1 does not explicitly state that Daniel and his companions were deported in the very first attack against Palestine, though many writers (including this writer) have assumed this conclusion.

The Babylonian names given to Daniel and his three companions in Daniel 1:7 have sometimes been regarded as artificial. But recently a distinguished Assyriologist has proposed satisfactory explanations of these names on the basis of Akkadian analogies as follows:<sup>13</sup>

*Belteshazzar* from bēlet-šar-ušur, “Lady protect the king.”

*Shadrach* from šādurāku, “I am very fearful (of God).”

*Meshach* from mēšāku, “I am of little account.”

*Abed-nego*, “Servant of the Shining One,” using West Semitic *abed* instead of Akkadian *’arad* “servant,” and assuming a play on the name of the god *Nebō*.

The restless nature of Nebuchadnezzar, who could not sleep at night because of his dreams (Dan. 2:1; cf. 6:18 and Esther 6:1), may be illustrated by a text published by Lambert in 1965, which he called "The King of Justice."<sup>14</sup> The unnamed king, who must be identified with Nebuchadnezzar, is so concerned with justice that it is claimed, "he did not rest night or day." Of course, one must reckon with the probability that both in the biblical texts and in the Babylonian text such a trait of restlessness brought on by responsibility is a general characteristic of royalty rather than the distinctive feature of a given monarch.

Scholars have frequently regarded the use of the term *Chaldean(s)* in Daniel 2:2, etc., in its professional sense as "astrologer" in addition to its ethnic sense (Dan. 3:8; 9:1) as a clear case of anachronism.<sup>15</sup> The term *Chaldean (Kaldu)* is used originally in its ethnic sense, for example, in the texts of Shalmaneser III (ninth century B.C.). In the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman periods the name *Chaldean* became a designation for astrologers.

As Millard points out, during the Neo-Babylonian period there is as yet no known example of its use as either an ethnic or professional term.<sup>16</sup> Surely this is the result of the accidents of survival and/or publication.

Certainly the Babylonians were interested in astrology long before the Chaldean or Neo-Babylonian Empire. An interesting Greek text of Pseudo-Berosus asserts:

From the time of Nabonassar (747-734 B.C.), the Chaldeans accurately recorded the times of the motion of the stars. The polymaths among the Greeks learned from the Chaldeans that — as Alexander (Polyhistor) and Berossus, men versed in Chaldean antiquities, say — Nabonassar gathered together (the accounts of) the deeds of the kings before him and did away with them so that the reckoning of the Chaldean kings would begin with him.<sup>17</sup>

Now this account is somewhat confused inasmuch as Nabonassar was the king of Babylon who fought against rebellious Chaldeans. But it does preserve an accurate tradition in that both the Babylonian Chronicle and the Ptolemaic Canon commence their accounts in 747 with the reign of Nabonassar. As Brinkman notes, "From this point on, chronologically precise records of historical events were kept systematically."<sup>18</sup>

The Chaldeans, who fought against the Assyrians under Merodach-baladan II (at the end of the eighth century B.C.) and established their own kingdom under Nabopolassar and his great

son, Nebuchadnezzar, must have inherited the established traditions of astronomical observation from Babylonian scholars. Although quite different in origins, the word *Chaldean* underwent an evolution similar to the word *Magi*, which originally meant the priestly tribe of the Medes and gradually came to mean "astrologer" or "magician."<sup>19</sup>

The ceremony in which Nebuchadnezzar ordered his subjects to do homage to his statue (Dan. 3:2-6) is rather different from the usual rites which were conducted by the priests in private. This practice may possibly be illustrated by the discoveries of Leonard Woolley in the Neo-Babylonian stratum at Ur. Woolley presents an interesting theory in describing the E-NUN-MAḪ sanctuary originally dedicated to the moon god Nannar and his wife Nin-gal.

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 so arranged as to focus attention on the rites in progress: the change in the temple plan must correspond to a change in religious practice. The explanation which was given when the discovery was made has been generally accepted; it is drawn from the story of "the Three Children" in the book of Daniel. . . . 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. Nebuchadnezzar was substituting a form of congregational worship for the mysteries of an esoteric priesthood.<sup>20</sup>

#### NABONIDUS AND BELSHAZZAR

Clear cuneiform evidence now demonstrates why the Book of Daniel names Belshazzar, rather than his father, Nabonidus, as king of Babylon. Nabonidus, who venerated especially the moon god Sin of his native city Harran, became alienated from the people of Babylon. He took the unprecedented step of moving to the Arabian city of Tema, leaving "kingship" in the hands of his son.<sup>21</sup>

A recent reexamination of all the relevant cuneiform data has helped clarify the chronology of the coregency. Hasel has argued that the third year in the Persian Verse Account should not be equated with the third regnal year but with the sixth. As a result the coregency of Nabonidus and Belshazzar should be dated as early as 550 and not just before the fall of Babylon in 539. Hence Daniel's vision in the first year of Belshazzar (Dan. 7:1) should be dated 550, and his vision in the third year (Dan. 8:1) should be dated 547.<sup>22</sup>

## NEBUCHADNEZZAR'S DERANGEMENT AND NABONIDUS'S EXILE

In view of the lack of any cuneiform attestation for Nebuchadnezzar's derangement (Dan. 4),<sup>23</sup> liberal scholars have accepted the view that this episode is a garbled version inspired by Nabonidus's "madness" in withdrawing to the desert.

After the publication of the *Nabonidus Chronicle* in 1882, F. Hommel and P. Riessler in 1902 first proposed such a transference.<sup>24</sup> This view has gained wide currency among commentators who discuss the passage (Dan. 4).<sup>25</sup>

This position has now been reinforced by the publication in 1956 of the celebrated "Prayer of Nabonidus" (4QOrNab) from Qumran.<sup>26</sup> There are indeed some broad parallels between this text and the text of Daniel 4:

1. In both accounts a Babylonian king is afflicted by God.
2. As Nebuchadnezzar was afflicted for "seven times," Nabonidus is smitten for "seven years."
3. Daniel helped secure Nebuchadnezzar's sanity; an unnamed Jewish exorcist (GZR) urged Nabonidus to repent from his worship of "the gods of silver and gold . . . wood, stone and clay."<sup>27</sup>

Scholars have disagreed about the possible relationships between the Qumran Nabonidus text and Daniel. (1) Dupont-Sommer and Geveryahu assume the priority of Daniel. (2) Others such as Milik, Dommershausen, and Hartman affirm the priority of the Nabonidus text, taking the late date of Daniel for granted. Typical is the comment by Jongeling: "It is fairly safe to assume that the original Nabonidus tradition . . . was transferred in Daniel to the well-known Nebuchadnezzar II . . . and that the seer, a Jewish man, was not yet identified with Daniel in 4QOrNab."<sup>28</sup> (3) Freedman and others argue that the differences preclude any direct literary dependence.<sup>29</sup>

Despite the ready assumption of a common tradition between the historical Nabonidus, the Qumran Nabonidus, and Daniel's Nebuchadnezzar, there are far more dissimilarities than resemblances in these three sources.<sup>30</sup>

1. The names of the two kings are, of course, different. Moreover, Nebuchadnezzar is afflicted in Babylon, whereas Nabonidus was in Tema in Arabia.

2. According to Daniel 4:13, 20, 22, Nebuchadnezzar was to be banished for a period of seven "times," which may or may not mean seven years as in the case of the Qumran Nabonidus text. The Aramaic word ܥܘܢܝܢ (ܥܘܢܝܢ, plural) is the general word for "time" or "season," as can be seen from other biblical passages and from

the Aramaic papyri.<sup>31</sup> The related Akkadian word *adannu* is used in the Harran text to designate the entire period of Nabonidus's sojourn in Arabia, which was *ten* years and not *seven* as previously surmised.

3. Nebuchadnezzar was afflicted with lycanthropic insanity.<sup>32</sup> But the Qumran Nabonidus was smitten with  $\check{s}^e h\hat{i}n$  (literally "inflammation"), a skin ailment (cf. Exod. 9:9; Job 2:7), and not with madness.

4. The phrase in the Persian Verse Account (*ANET*, p. 134a) "the king is mad" does not depict Nabonidus as insane but as angry (Akkadian *a-gu-ug šarru*).<sup>33</sup> Though some of his contemporaries may have thought the king's behavior strange, the Harran texts show that Nabonidus went to Arabia for a justifiable reason — he felt that the people of Babylon had offended his god, Sin.

5. As pointed out by van der Woude and by Grelot,<sup>34</sup> Jongeling's restoration of line 3 in the Qumran Nabonidus text, שׁוֹי [לחיותה] וכן "and so I came to be li[ke the animals]," is quite gratuitous, resting on the assumption that the Qumran text conformed to Daniel 4.<sup>35</sup>

6. The literary contexts of the Qumran text and Daniel 4 are quite different. The former is a descriptive narrative, whereas Daniel 4 is a public proclamation by the king himself. Hartman concedes, "There 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."<sup>36</sup>

It is in the face of these rather important discrepancies that critics, including Hartman, have still chosen to derive Daniel's story of Nebuchadnezzar's madness from a garbled tradition about Nabonidus's illness.

#### DARIUS THE MEDE

The identification of Daniel's "Darius the Mede" remains as contested as ever.<sup>37</sup> There have been two major attempts to resolve the problem: (a) the proposal by Whitcomb that Darius the Mede is to be identified with Gubaru/Gobryas, the provincial governor of Babylon,<sup>38</sup> and (b) the proposal by Wiseman that Daniel 6:28 be translated, "Daniel prospered in the reign of Darius *even* the reign of Cyrus the Persian," i.e., taking the former name as a throne name.<sup>39</sup>

A recent attempt has been made by Bulman to add further

support to Wiseman's thesis. Bulman notes the use of dual names, points to the Septuagint and Theodotion which render Daniel 11:1 the "first year of Cyrus" rather than the "first year of Darius," and cites other passages in which statements attributed to Darius the Mede may be compared to the career of Cyrus. He explains the use of the byname "Darius the Mede" for Cyrus in Daniel as follows: "Unlike the authors of Chronicles and Ezra, however, he does not represent Cyrus as the agent of fulfillment of prophecy. But since Jeremiah, who mentioned no name, emphasized the Medes as conquerors of Babylon, Daniel was led . . . to use the name which was associated with them."<sup>40</sup>

Schedl has identified Darius the Mede with Darius I, the great Persian king.<sup>41</sup> He argues that the title comes from the fact that Darius I marched into Media to quell the revolt of Fravartis. This, however, is hardly a convincing theory.

In conclusion, none of the proposed solutions to the identity of Darius the Mede is entirely convincing. Yet one need not despair of an ultimate resolution, if one recalls the history of attempts to identify Daniel's Belshazzar. As Dougherty recounts, before the discovery and publication of cuneiform documents demonstrating that Belshazzar was Nabonidus's son, scholars proposed that Belshazzar was (a) a pure invention, (b) a brother or son of Evil-Merodach, or Evil-Merodach himself, (c) Neriglissar, (d) a grandson of Nebuchadnezzar, or (e) another name for Nabonidus.<sup>42</sup>

The failure to appreciate the fragmentary nature of available evidence leads to the false assumption that a figure in literary sources must be unhistorical if contemporary epigraphical documentation for his existence is unavailable. It was not until 1961 that the first epigraphical text for Pontius Pilate was discovered, and it was not until 1966 that similar documentation for Felix, the governor of Judea, was found.<sup>43</sup>

After surveying all the historical problems involving Nebuchadnezzar, Nabonidus, Belshazzar, and Darius the Mede, Baldwin affirms, "In concluding this section on the historical assumptions of the writer of the book of Daniel I strongly assert that there is no reason to question his historical knowledge."<sup>44</sup>

### Linguistic and Archaeological Data

#### AN EGYPTIAN LOANWORD

In discussing the interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream by Daniel, Hartman with other critics has concluded that here is a



clear case of literary dependence on the similar story of the interpretation of pharaoh's dreams by Joseph: "The borrowing in Dn is evident from the fact that, with all the other words used here for various kinds of soothsayers, Dn (1,20; 2,2.10.27; 4,4.6) also uses the same word for 'magicians' (Heb. *ḥartummim*) that occurs in Gn 41,8.24. . . ."45 Hartman argues, "this is a loanword from Egyptian and should, strictly speaking, be used only in regard to Egyptian magicians (who would hardly be at the Babylonian court of Nobuchodonosor!)."46

Though the Egyptian loanword may be used in these passages without any reference to Egyptian nationals, the idea that there were Egyptian magicians and soothsayers in Mesopotamia is not so far-fetched as Hartman believes. The Jehoiachin ration tablets indicate that, among other nationals, Egyptians were given provisions by the royal court.<sup>47</sup> Moreover, a recent study by Eph'al indicates that among the Egyptians who resided in Mesopotamia in the fifth and sixth centuries B.C. were the following professionals: *lúbārê* "diviners," *lúḥartibi* "dream interpreters," and *lúmušlahḥê* "snake charmers."<sup>48</sup> *Ḥartōm* and *ḥartibi* are cognate.<sup>49</sup>

#### ARAMAIC

Rowley, in his meticulous study published in 1929, has argued that the Aramaic of Daniel is compatible with a second century B.C. date despite certain affinities with earlier Official Aramaic.<sup>50</sup> He stressed what he regarded as parallels with the later Targums.

From a recent examination of seven pairs of words which Rowley has used, Coxon, on the basis of new evidence, concludes, "In the lexical field Biblical Aramaic contains unmistakable traits of Official Aramaic. In his attempt to re-affirm the second century (date) of *Daniel* ROWLEY fails to do them justice."<sup>51</sup>

Fitzmyer, who extends the classification of Official Aramaic from 700 to 200 B.C. and who dates the final redaction of Daniel to 165 B.C., is willing to concede with Albright that the Aramaic portions of Daniel may well be older than the second century.<sup>52</sup>

In a review of Kitchen's important study on "The Aramaic of Daniel,"<sup>53</sup> which had refuted many of his own arguments, Rowley reaffirmed that he still regarded the spelling of the Aramaic of Daniel as a key to its late date.<sup>54</sup> In a very important survey of the recent developments in the study of Aramaic, the eminent Israeli scholar, Kutscher, sided with Kitchen against Rowley.<sup>55</sup> Kutscher

cited the new evidence from the Hermopolis papyri, which were contemporary with the fifth century B.C. Elephantine papyri, but which employed different spelling conventions. On the basis of spelling alone one might mistakenly date the Hermopolis papyri a thousand years too late.<sup>56</sup>

#### THE GREEK WORDS FOR MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS

As expressed long ago in S. R. Driver's classic statement, the Greek loanwords in the Aramaic of Daniel have been regarded as objective proof for the late date of Daniel. As restated by Coxon, "Of all the linguistic arguments which have been used in the debate concerning the age of the Aramaic sections of *Daniel* and the date of the composition of the book, the Greek loans seem to provide the strongest evidence in favour of the second century B.C."<sup>57</sup> Though Hartman and Di Lella list Kitchen's study which demonstrates otherwise, they reiterate the standard critical position: "The Greek names for the musical instruments in 3:5 probably do not antedate the reign of Alexander the Great (336-323 B.C.)."<sup>58</sup>

The three Greek words in Daniel 3:5 are all musical terms<sup>59</sup> (variant spellings are found in other verses):

<u>Aramaic:</u>	<u>Greek:</u>
קִיָּתָרִס qayt <sup>e</sup> rōs	κίθαρῖς kitharis
פְּסַנְתְּרִין p <sup>e</sup> santērîn	ψαλτήριον psaltērion
סוּמְפֹנְיָה sumpōn <sup>e</sup> yâ	συμφωνία sumphōnia

The first instrument was a kind of lyre. As to the specific Greek word which was borrowed, Coxon observes that its spelling indicates that the loan was adopted in the pre-Hellenistic period:

The fact that the Ionic form *kitharis* found its way into the list in Dan. 3 and not the Attic *kithara* is a striking one, especially in view of the consistent use of *kithara* in Greek material of the post-Alexander period. Heirs of Attic literary tradition, the Septuagint, the New Testament and patristic sources alike know only *kithara*. One might suppose that the *kitharis*-form stems from Asia Minor and/or the Greek islands and that it was absorbed by Official Aramaic as a result of cultural and linguistic contacts at a period much earlier than the second century B.C.<sup>60</sup>

Though the Greek *psaltērion* was a harplike instrument, Sendry suggests that Daniel's p<sup>e</sup>santērîn was more akin to a dulcimer. He further suggests that it had been one of a number of musical instruments originally imported from the east, improved by the Greeks, and re-exported to the east.<sup>61</sup>

It is altogether surprising that the Anchor Bible commentary reverts to the discredited view of *sumpon<sup>e</sup>yâ* as a “bagpipe” in the light of clear evidence that this was a very late sense of the word.<sup>62</sup> The earliest meaning of the Greek word *sumphōnia* was “sounding together,” that is, the simultaneous playing of instruments or voices producing a concord. Jerome, commenting on Luke 15:25 where the word occurs, noted: “The *symphōnia* is not a kind of instrument, as some Latin writers think, but it means concordant harmony. It is expressed in Latin by *cosonantia*.”<sup>63</sup> Coxon concludes as follows:

We have tried to show that the use of *sumphōnia* in Dan. 3 accords with its older meaning and not, as in the later classical sources, with an individual musical instrument. But since the traditional meaning of “harmony, concord of sound” is also found late (Polybius, Athenaeus, etc.) the classical evidence in so far as it affects Dan. 3 must be pronounced neutral.<sup>64</sup>

Rowley in his review of Kitchen’s work still maintained that the evidence of these particular Greek words was proof of the late date of Daniel’s Aramaic.<sup>65</sup> Kutscher’s appraisal of this argument is worth quoting at length.

Rowley’s argument that the Greek loans *ψαλτήριον* and *συμφωνία* as names for musical instruments occur in Greek several hundred years after the suggested date of Daniel also does not sound convincing. After all, if we assume Greek influence prior to Alexander, it is not the Attic dialect, or other dialects of Greece, that must be taken into consideration as the place of origin of these loans, but rather dialects of Asia Minor and/or those of the Greek isles. What do we know about the Greek of Asia Minor and of the Greek isles during the period in question? To the best of my knowledge, very little. . . .

The fact that the field of music is the only one where Greek influence has come to light, calls to mind Otto Jespersen’s words . . . : “If all other sources of information were closed to us except such loan-words in our . . . North-European languages as *piano*, *soprano*, *opera*, *libretto*, *tempo*, *adagio*, etc., we should still have no hesitation in drawing the conclusion that Italian music has played a great role all over Europe.” . . . Greek musicians might have been dominant enough to make their impact felt in those (Near Eastern) languages, as the Italian musicians did in English.<sup>66</sup>

As this writer has shown elsewhere, the exchange of musicians and their musical instruments played a prominent role at royal courts from time immemorial.<sup>67</sup> To these examples the following may be added.

Speaking of fifteenth-century B.C. Egypt, Drower notes: “The influence of Asiatic on Egyptian music was profound: new in-

struments included the long-necked lute, the lyre (*kinnōr*), the angled harp and the double flute, and the Syrian musicians who introduced them must have popularised new melodies and new dances."<sup>68</sup>

Texts from the Kassite period of Mesopotamia (twelfth century B.C.) indicate that there were Elamite singers who entertained the royal household of Marduk-apal-iddina I at Dur Kurigalzu."<sup>69</sup>

Referring to eighth-century Nimrud, Mallowan reports, "It is also of interest that a tablet, ND 6219, discovered in Fort Shalmaneser, referred to the king's male choir which included Kassite, north Syrian and Assyrian singers, a further testimony to the Assyrians' delight in music."<sup>70</sup>

Ellermeier has made a detailed study of the distribution of the Near Eastern double flute (or oboe), which has been found in Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, Cyprus, Crete, and Greece. He notes that the Syrian *embūbu* passed into Latin as *ambubaiae*, a word which designated both the instrument and the Syrian girls who played them.<sup>71</sup>

## Conclusions

It is clear that liberal commentators do not acknowledge that there are possible solutions to the historical problems in the Book of Daniel. Nor do many liberal scholars seem to be aware of the mass of linguistic and archaeological data that demonstrates the ample contacts between the Aegean and the Near East before Alexander's conquests. The Greek words for musical instruments in the Aramaic are therefore no obstacle for a pre-Hellenistic date for Daniel's composition.

Conservative scholars welcome the increasing mass of linguistic and archaeological data which helps support an early date or at least helps undermine arguments for a late date for Daniel. They are convinced that Daniel indeed was a true prophet with a message both for his generation and for today.

## Editor's Note

This is the first in a series of four articles delivered by the author as the W. H. Griffith Thomas Memorial Lectures at Dallas Theological Seminary, November 6-9, 1979.

## Notes

- 1 Bruce K. Waltke, "The Date of the Book of Daniel," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 133 (1976):319-29; Gleason L. Archer, Jr., "Modern Rationalism and the Book of Daniel," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 136 (1979):129-47. On the issue of "Daniel" in Ezekiel, discussed by Archer, see Harold H. P. Dressler, "The Identification of the Ugaritic DNIL with the Daniel of Ezekiel," *Vetus Testamentum* 29 (1979):153-54.
- 2 *Greece and Babylon: Early Contacts between the Aegean and the Near East* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1967); "The Greek Words in Daniel in the Light of Greek Influence in the Near East," in *New Perspectives on the Old Testament*, ed. J. Barton Payne (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1970), pp. 170-200.
- 3 *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel* (London: Tyndale Press, 1965).
- 4 Edwin R. Thiele, *A Chronology of the Hebrew Kings* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1977), p. 68, n. 3.
- 5 L. F. Hartman and A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel*, The Anchor Bible (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., 1978), p. 123.
- 6 Wiseman et al., *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel*, pp. 16-18.
- 7 Hartman and Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel*, p. 48.
- 8 A. R. Millard, "Daniel 1-6 and History," *Evangelical Quarterly* 49 (1977):69; Joyce G. Baldwin, *Daniel: An Introduction and Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1978), pp. 19-21.
- 9 Martin McNamara, "Nabonidus and the Book of Daniel," *Irish Theological Quarterly* 37 (1970):132.
- 10 Wiseman et al., *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel*, p. 18.
- 11 D. J. Wiseman and Edwin M. Yamauchi, *Archaeology and the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1979), p. 50.
- 12 In a review of A. K. Grayson, *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles* in *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 34 (1977):336; Baldwin, *Daniel: An Introduction and Commentary*, p. 35.
- 13 P.-R. Berger, "Der Kyros-Zylinder . . . und die akkadischen Personennamen im Danielbuch," *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 64 (1975):224-34; Millard, "Daniel 1-6 and History," p. 72.
- 14 W. G. Lambert, "Nebuchadnezzar King of Justice," *Iraq* 27 (1965):8.
- 15 Archer, "Modern Rationalism and the Book of Daniel," pp. 136-37; Baldwin, *Daniel: An Introduction and Commentary*, p. 29.
- 16 Millard, "Daniel 1-6 and History," p. 70.
- 17 Cited by J. A. Brinkman, *A Political History of Post-Kassite Babylonia 1158-722 BC* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1968), p. 227.
- 18 *Ibid.*, pp. 226-27.
- 19 Franz Cumont, *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans* (1912; reprint ed., New York: Dover Publications, 1960), p. 16; G. Messina, *Der Ursprung der Magier und die zarathuŝtriche Religion* (Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1930).
- 20 Leonard Woolley and M. E. L. Mallowan, *Ur Excavations IX: The Neo-Babylonian and Persian Periods* (London: British Museum, 1962), p. 24.
- 21 Yamauchi, *Greece and Babylon*, p. 79. McNamara observes: "The Harran Inscription of Nabonidus, narrating his Taima sojourn, changes abruptly from the first to the third person, just as Daniel 4 . . . does" ("Nabonidus and the Book of Daniel," p. 137).
- 22 Gerhard F. Hasel, "The First and Third Years of Belshazzar (Dan 7:1; 8:1)," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 15 (1977): 153-68.
- 23 It is most improbable that such an unflattering episode would ever have been recorded in royal documents.

- 24 McNamara, "Nabonidus and the Book of Daniel," p. 134.
- 25 L. Hartman, "The Great Tree and Nobuchodonosor's Madness," *The Bible in Current Catholic Thought*, ed. J. L. McKenzie (NY: Herder and Herder, 1962), p. 77; J. C. Lebram, "Perspektiven der gegenwärtigen Danielforschung," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 5 (1974):7-8.
- 26 J. T. Milik, "Prière de Nabonide," *Revue Biblique* 63 (1956): 407-15.
- 27 Among the many studies of this text, see R. Meyer, *Das Gebet des Nabonid* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962); Alfred Mertens, *Das Buch Daniel im Lichte der Texte vom Toten Meer* (Echter: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1971), pp. 34-42; and B. Jongeling, C. J. Labauschagne, and A. S. van der Woude, *Aramaic Texts from Qumran I* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976), pp. 123-31 (these pages reproduce the Aramaic text).
- 28 *Ibid.*, p. 124.
- 29 David N. Freedman, "The Prayer of Nabonidus," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 145 (1957):31-32.
- 30 Edwin M. Yamauchi, *The Stones and the Scriptures* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1972), p. 89; Yamauchi, *Greece and Babylon*, p. 89, n. 149.
- 31 Isaac Jerusalemi, *The Aramaic Sections of Ezra and Daniel* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College — Jewish Institute of Religion, 1970), p. 100; Ernestus Vogt, *Lexicon Linguae Aramaicae Veteris Testamenti* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1971), p. 124.
- 32 For discussion of a modern case of lycanthropy, see R. K. Harrison, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (London: Tyndale Press, 1970), pp. 1115-16.
- 33 Hartman, "The Great Tree," p. 80; McNamara, "Nabonidus and the Book of Daniel," p. 141.
- 34 Pierre Grelot, "La prière de Nabonide (4QOrNab)," *Revue de Qumran* 9 (1978):487.
- 35 Jongeling, Labauschagne, and van der Woude, *Aramaic Texts from Qumran I*, pp. 126-27.
- 36 Hartman, "The Great Tree," p. 81.
- 37 Archer, "Modern Rationalism and the Book of Daniel," pp. 135-36.
- 38 John C. Whitcomb, *Darius the Mede* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1959).
- 39 Wiseman et al., *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel*, pp. 12-16.
- 40 James M. Bulman, "The Identification of Darius the Mede," *Westminster Theological Journal* 35 (1973):267.
- 41 C. Schedl, *History of the Old Testament* (Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 1973), 5:51-86, as reported by Hartman and Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel*, p. 50, n. 96.
- 42 Raymond F. Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1929), pp. 13-14.
- 43 Yamauchi, *The Stones and the Scriptures*, pp. 159-60.
- 44 Baldwin, *Daniel: An Introduction and Commentary*, p. 29. This recalls Dougherty's verdict: "Of all non-Babylonian records dealing with the situation at the close of the Neo-Babylonian Empire, the fifth chapter of Daniel ranks next to cuneiform literature in accuracy so far as outstanding events are concerned" (*Nabonidus and Belshazzar*, p. 200).
- 45 Hartman, "The Great Tree," pp. 77-78.
- 46 *Ibid.*
- 47 Ernst F. Weidner, "Jojachin, König von Juda, in Babylonischen Keilschrifttexten," *Mélanges Syriens offerts à M. René Dussaud* (Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1939), 2:930-31; cf. D. J. Wiseman, "Some Egyptians in Babylonia," *Iraq* 26 (1966):154-58.
- 48 I. Eph'al, "The Western Minorities in Babylonia in the 6th-5th Centuries B.C.," *Orientalia* 47 (1978):78.

- 49 Both the Hebrew and the Akkadian words are derived from the Egyptian *ḥry-tp*, literally "chief lector priest." See K. A. Kitchen, "Magic and Sorcery," *The New Bible Dictionary*, ed. J. D. Douglas (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1962), p. 769; J. Vergote, *Joseph en Égypte* (Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1959), pp. 80-94, 209.
- 50 H. H. Rowley, *The Aramaic of the Old Testament* (London: Oxford University Press, 1929).
- 51 Peter W. Coxon, "The Distribution of Synonyms in Biblical Aramaic in the Light of Official Aramaic and the Aramaic of Qumran," *Revue de Qumran* 9 (1978):512.
- 52 J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I*, 2d ed. (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971), pp. 20-21, n. 56; J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament," *New Testament Studies* 20 (1974):382, n. 4.
- 53 K. A. Kitchen, "The Aramaic of Daniel," in Wiseman et al., *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel*, pp. 31-79.
- 54 H. H. Rowley, review of *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel*, by D. J. Wiseman et al., *Journal of Semitic Studies* 11 (1966):112-16.
- 55 E. Y. Kutscher, "Aramaic," *Current Trends in Linguistics VI*, ed. T. A. Sebeok (The Hague: Mouton, 1970), pp. 347-412, esp. pp. 401-402.
- 56 E. Y. Kutscher, "The Hermopolis Papyri," *Israel Oriental Studies* 1 (1971):103-19.
- 57 Peter W. Coxon, "Greek Loan-Words and Alleged Greek Loan Translations in the Book of Daniel," *Glasgow University Oriental Society Transactions* 25 (1973-74): 24.
- 58 Hartman and Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel*, p. 13.
- 59 See T. C. Mitchell and R. Joyce, "The Musical Instruments in Nebuchadnezzar's Orchestra," in Wiseman et al., *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel*, pp. 19-27.
- 60 Coxon, "Greek Loan-Words," p. 31.
- 61 Alfred Sendry, *Music in Ancient Israel* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1969), p. 297.
- 62 Hartman and Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel*, p. 157. See Yamauchi, *Greece and Babylon*, p. 19.
- 63 Cited by Sendry, who devotes a long discussion to this word (*Music in Ancient Israel*, pp. 325-33).
- 64 Coxon, "Greek Loan-Words," p. 36.
- 65 Rowley, "Review of *Notes on Some Problems*," pp. 114-15.
- 66 Kutscher, "Aramaic," pp. 401-402.
- 67 Yamauchi, *Greece and Babylon*, pp. 19-24; and "The Greek Words in Daniel," pp. 176-77.
- 68 Margaret S. Drower, "Syria c. 1550-1400 B.C.," in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 3d. ed (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1970-), vol. 2, pt. 1, p. 482.
- 69 D. J. Wiseman, "Assyria and Babylonia c. 1200-1000 B.C.," in *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 3d. ed. (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1970-), vol. 2, pt. 2, p. 445.
- 70 M. E. L. Mallowan, *Nimrud and Its Remains* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1966), p. 217.
- 71 Friedrich Ellermeier, *Sibyllen, Musikanten, Haremsfrauen* (Herzberg am Harz: Junger, 1970), pp. 12-19.