Themelios

An International Journal for Pastors and Students of
Theological and Religious Studies

Contents

Approaching the Old Testament

Alan R Millard

Much contemporary criticism still relies on the conclusions of earlier scholars who tended to study the Old Testament in isolation from its own world of the ancient Near East. Alan Millard, as an Assyriologist, here indicates some of the short-comings of such an approach, and suggests ways in which the Old Testament may be more responsibly studied in the light of its historical context. Mr Millard is Rankin Senior Lecturer in Hebrew and Ancient Semitic Languages at the University of Liverpool.

Old Testament studies, like New Testament studies, are separated by some from their companion disciplines of ancient languages and history on the ground of their theological content. The writer does not believe this is acceptable. Primary questions of textual history and criticism, literary and stylistic analysis, historical evaluation and exegesis, demand the same methods of investigation for the biblical texts as for the other ancient documents. The Bible differs in conveying an abiding theological message, but that message comes to us through the text. That message is an extra gift which other texts do not bring to their readers (and it can be rejected like any 'free gift'). The fact of the message does not change the technique of examining the text. Even when a writer had a theological purpose, there is no reason to suppose he worked in any abnormal way.

Accordingly, the subsequent paragraphs comment upon several levels of approach to the Old Testament literature (which inevitably overlap). Where the Word of God is concerned we shall employ every ability to achieve some understanding of it, recognizing that it remains above and beyond us. We should listen to it before we speak about it. Our concern in this paper, then, is chiefly with the first stage of the hermeneutical process, exegesis.

Textual criticism

'These things were written' describes any ancient text—genealogy, love-song, letter, or ration-list, treaty, law, or history, whether in the Bible or without, Israelite or 'Gentile'. To discuss the beginnings of writing in the ancient Near East, the development of various scripts there, and the use made of them, is outside our present purpose, but some appreciation of these matters should be acquired by all who study any document that survives.[1] How scribes performed their task is a more immediately relevant question. When faced with a manuscript or its reproduction we inquire how accurately it was written. Scribal error is a well-attested phenomenon that has been subjected to adequate study in the classical and New Testament texts,[2] but currently needs review as regards Hebrew in the light of the Dead Sea Scrolls and of writings contemporary with the Israelite Scriptures. Beside the commission of error should be set the care that is equally evident. Counting verses and similar checks were not rabbinic inventions; Babylonian scribal tradition encouraged the counting of lines from early in the second millennium BC. Why a scribe copied this manuscript or that may no longer be known, nor why some show corrections while others do not.

The properly critical scholar may suspect a corruption in a text, words omitted, misplaced, or mis-spelt, a phrase or sentence wrongly construed. Then he may propose an emendation to obtain a grammatical form or sense more satisfactory to him. However acceptable the reconstruction may be, it cannot be more than a reconstruction, and so will be hypothetical until a text of good quality is found that gives support. (Even then there should be envisaged the possible action of an ancient scribe making the same alteration as the modern scholar!) Any text, indeed, may contain error, and those may be resolved with the aid of other manuscripts. When the oldest form or most authoritative text is in question only suggestions can be made.

We are saying no more than that the text we receive from antiquity has primacy over our ideas of what it ought to say. When we feel it should give a different sense, we should attempt to reach the new reading only in the light of habits and conditions known to have been in force during the text's history.[3] Particular care is necessary to avoid any change in a text to support a theory of its form or

[1] See, for the present, 'The Practice of Writing in Ancient Israel', *Biblical Archaeologist* 35 (1972), pp. 98-111.

[2] See B. M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*[2] (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968); P. Maas, *Textual Criticism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958); E. G. Turner, *Greek Papyri* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), chs. v, vii.

[3] For discussion of a mistaken attitude in this sphere see 'Scriptio Continua in early Hebrew: ancient practice or modern surmise?' *Journal of Semitic Studies* 15 (1970), pp. 2-15.

metre, or putative content, however that is reached.

Evidence from early translations is frequently invoked to aid understanding of the Hebrew text. Indeed, these may indicate a different and superior underlying original, giving an acceptable emendation. Nevertheless, translations are to be used with great caution, for translations did not replace the original in Judaism. As a result, translators enjoyed greater liberty to interpret or paraphrase than modern ideals might envisage.[4] Current research into the Septuagint emphasizes the need to evaluate it book by book, avoiding general conclusions. Moreover, growing ability to separate various recensions of the Greek Bible calls for caution in using them to emend the Hebrew; that may have been done tacitly by the ancient translator. Furthermore, since the Dead Sea Scrolls have revealed a variety of Old Testament texts in Hebrew immediately prior to the fall of Jerusalem, it becomes apparent that ancient translations may represent traditions differing from the Massoretic Text, so these can hardly be used to correct the Massoretic Text. Great attention is rightly paid to these deviant texts, for they may tell of earlier phases in textual history, but they should not blind us to the predominance of Massoretic Text type manuscripts amongst the Dead Sea Scrolls. Here is an area for further exploration.

Literary criticism

With a text before us to interpret, what position are we, the interpreters, to adopt for our task? Two levels of interpretation are possible: firstly, what the text is about, what it meant to the man responsible for its present form, that is, its intended meaning; secondly, what the text can reveal about that man and his contemporaries, his sources, and any earlier history the text may have had.

Our Old Testament is the final product of a long period during which the documents may have been edited, revised, translated. Much labour has been spent by Old Testament scholars in attempts to trace this story, starting from the fixed form of the texts as they have been handed to us. Regrettably, the fruits of this labour are often unsatisfying. The cause lies in the subjective nature of the arguments used. That may be excusable in part because of the closed nature of the evidence. Yet even taken within their own horizons, the literary arguments used can

be seen to be superficial and inadequate. Several scholars have indicated this.[5]

There is, however, some material to provide a standard for testing the approaches made to the Old Testament texts. While the damp soil of Palestine is unlikely to yield lengthy literary texts on parchment or papyrus from the Monarchy period (although one scrap of papyrus has survived from the seventh century BC in a cave near the Dead Sea), the long-established cultures of Egypt and Babylonia have given us many texts. It is reasonable to draw analogies from these documents, for there is sufficient evidence to suggest that the scribal art was carried out in a similar way all over the area of the biblical world.

Written literature already existed in Babylonia in the mid-third millennium BC and in Egypt almost as early, as existing manuscripts witness. Our following observations are drawn from the Babylonian material. Two processes can be traced in the transmission of these ancient texts. On the one hand, some compositions current *c.* 2500 BC were being copied almost a millennium later with very little change. (Modernization of spelling and grammar was normal, though not mandatory. Through the innate conservatism of writing, these two always lag behind the state of the spoken language, as occasional lapses show.) Other works written out about 1600 BC were still being copied in the seventh century with little change. On the other hand, the effects of revising and editing, and of different streams of tradition, can be seen in many cases. This is possible because copies of basically the same texts made centuries apart have been found. Thus we may read an account of the flood in a copy written soon after 700 BC and its ancestor written almost a millennium earlier, and trace the differences. In series of omens first compiled early in the second millennium BC there is little organization in comparison with the 'canonical' versions of the first millennium BC where a desire for consistency and completeness has been indulged (*e.g.* balancing a phenomenon of the left-hand by one for the right).[6]

For the Old Testament it is impossible to go far beyond the first century BC in so objective a way —there are no earlier manuscripts. Any hints that the cuneiform texts may give as to the reason for the observable differences between earlier and later

---

[4] This last comment should be followed through the essays of D. W. Gooding, *e.g. TSF Bulletin* 56 (1970), pp. 8-13; *Relics of Ancient Exegesis* (Society for Old Testament Study Monograph Series 4, Cambridge University Press, 1975). When the currently live question of re-interpretation (*rélecture*) within the Old Testament is considered, this should be kept in mind, too.

[5] See briefly D. A. Hubbard, art. 'Pentateuch' in *NBD*; W. J. Martin, *Stylistic Criteria and the Analysis of the Pentateuch* (London: Tyndale Press, 1955); A. Hurvitz, 'The Evidence of Language in Dating the Priestly Code', *Revue Biblique* 81 (1974), pp. 24-56.

[6] See E. V. Leichty, *The Omen Series Šumma izbu* (New York: Augustin, 1969).

texts may be of value, therefore, as guides in building hypotheses about stages in the development of the Old Testament text. So far no clearly traceable practices have been observed, but study of textual history is still in its infancy in Assyriology.

Striking lessons may be drawn from some exercises that have been conducted on the basis of texts extant from one period alone. An important prayer to the goddess Ishtar was known from a Neo-Babylonian copy (c. 600 BC). By studying its literary form, a leading scholar was led to assign a date for its composition towards the end of the second millennium BC. Then an exact duplicate and a Hittite translation were recovered, copied c. 1400 BC, that indicate a date just before the middle of the second millennium BC as the time of composition.[7] At various times scholars have claimed to trace different sources in the Babylonian flood story on the basis of varying elements and names involved, but with the recovery of additional texts the criteria are proved illusory.[8] To predict the early state of a text on the basis of a later copy alone is risky, if not inadmissible.

Recovery of manuscripts of ancient texts copied at different times may allow us to discern some patterns in the way scribes of the Old Testament period handled their literature. When this can be done there will be a satisfactory model available for literary analysis of the Old Testament. Theories of literary criticism that import attitudes to texts quite unattested in the biblical world or fail to recognize and allow for known ancient practices should be accepted no longer.

The golden calf passage of Exodus 32 can serve as an example (in limited and abbreviated form). A recent article lists 'the more noticeable inconsistencies', and concludes 'the composite nature of the chapter' is 'so apparent'.[9] 'The most significant problem is the uncertainty as to who actually made the calf': Aaron at the people's request, according to verses 1 to 6, or the people themselves, verses 8, 20, or Aaron and the people, verse 35, cf. Dt. 9: 16, 20. In an ancient text just unearthed these variations would present no problem. Shifts of subject are quite in order, especially where an authority and an agent are concerned. In Assyrian royal records great claims are made by the kings, but occasionally it is made clear that a campaign was conducted by one of the generals, not by the monarch himself.

We may suspect this was so on other occasions. One version of Sennacherib's records carefully relates the suppression of a rebel in Cilicia by a force despatched from Assyria; another, later, text attributes the conquest to the king himself.[10] Neither is wrong, nor is there inconsistency; the troops and their commanders were agents of the king's will. In other examples fluctuation of person, between first and third, singular and plural, is not significant, on the same grounds. So the problems over the making of the calf resolve themselves. The idol was made for the Israelites, at their bidding, under the guidance of Aaron (verses 1-6). That is the initial narrative. Then Moses in the mountain is informed of the sin, in general terms. Why should Aaron be specified here, verse 8, or in verse 20? He was the agent of the people; in effect they had the calf made, which differs little from making it in a situation like this.

Form criticism

Credit for emphasizing the relevance of the ancient texts in comparative literary study belongs to H. Gunkel. He observed particular areas of content linked with particular formulations, firstly in Genesis, and notably in the Psalms. Analogous patterns were traced in Egyptian and Babylonian religious poetry.[11] The general theory is very sensible; Gunkel's classification of the Psalms gives some helpful insights. Another successful application is to be seen in the study of the covenant form during the past two decades. Recognition of the basic pattern and its concomitants has clarified many passages, and the writer is convinced that yet more can be gained from research into this matter. What is to be specially noted is the order in which the pattern was discovered, first of all in the Hittite texts by V. Korosec in 1931, without any reference to the biblical material, then, long after, applied to the Hebrew sources by G. E. Mendenhall (1954), K. Baltzer (1960), and many others.

Besides using such parallels, Gunkel applied wholesale to the Old Testament premises and techniques developed by students of Indo-European folk-lore. While general comparisons may be in order, each argument deserves a proper test on several ancient Near Eastern traditional tales. As developed in biblical studies, form criticism has tended to become far too rigid and extreme. At least three propositions advanced may be questioned: first is the ascription of priority to poetry over

[7] See E. Reiner and H. G. Güterbock, *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 21 (1967), pp. 255ff.

[8] Compare J. Laessøe, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 13 (1956), pp. 95ff. with W. G. Lambert and A. R. Millard, *Atrahasis. The Babylonian Story of the Flood* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969).

[9] L. G. Perdue, *Biblica* 54 (1973), pp. 237-46.

[10] *Cuneiform Texts* 26 (London: British Museum, 1909), 10, nn.1, 15.

[11] For a convenient summary see H. Gunkel, *The Psalms: a Form-Critical Introduction* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967).

prose; second is the assertion that the older the material the briefer it will be; third is the demand for consistency within a unit of composition (a requirement shared by classic literary criticism). Application of these three criteria is an exercise comparable with the mathematical process of discovering the lowest common denominator. A striking case is the form-critical reconstruction of the Ten Commandments. Four commands are short, rhythmic, each with four stresses, and a negative frame, according to the form-critics, so the remainder are reduced and re-cast until they have an identical appearance.[12] Yet the scribes and authors of antiquity were no more bound to a rigid consistency than we are. True, they may have been more strongly tied to traditional forms, but they could use them flexibly. Greetings from one king to another in the Amarna Letters exemplify the sort of variation seen in the Commandments as they stand, as do several other texts. Further, differences between prose and poetic accounts of a single event do not necessarily reveal a development of tradition from the poetic to the prose, as is often believed. Both accounts may have been written simultaneously for differing purposes. Egypt and Assyria provide examples of that, in the Qadesh inscriptions of Ramesses II and in the poem known as the Epic of Tukulti-Ninurta compared with his 'annals'.

Gunkel's work assumed the literary analysis of the Pentateuch crystallized by Julius Wellhausen, and both approaches underlie the development from form criticism made by A. Alt and M. Noth in investigating the traditions of early Israel. In the works of these two scholars there appear strongly the demands for consistency already criticized. Alt took an interest in ancient Near Eastern documents and their value to Old Testament research, yet allowed his work to be controlled by 'interests of exact analysis' and 'ideal patterns' of what can have happened constructed on grounds of historical analogy. Here, too, texts are forced into an alien mould.[13]

Historical criticism

Reading the Law caused Wellhausen great perplexity; there seemed to be so little relationship between its ideals and the impression given by history and prophecy once Israel was settled in her land. So he reached the conclusion 'the law is later than the prophets'. He expounded his ideas so compellingly, utilizing the literary analysis of the Pentateuch and the optimistic notions of progress in human behaviour that had grown during the nineteenth century, that his work has held the field through its brilliant logic and the satisfying way Israel's career can be fitted into a human view of history. Judged on the points already considered, however, his thesis falls: the criteria of literary criticism he used as a basic tool are unsatisfactory, the approach to the text and content arbitrary (especially in the light of ancient Near Eastern material), expecting from them a rigid and consistent thought-world similar to his own.

But another question deserves consideration at this juncture: the completeness of the writings, or otherwise. Perhaps it is a disadvantage that the canon of Scripture encourages a feeling of completeness, an assumption that adequate answers to every problem should be obtainable from within it. True as this may be theologically, there are no reasons for assuming it in the historical, linguistic, or literary spheres. Acquaintance with contemporary writings unearthed in the lands around Israel soon brings realization of how small a proportion of the material once committed to writing does survive.[14] Often what we can read presents a partial picture only, composed for a single purpose. Even when two accounts of one event are in our hands, it may be impossible to align them exactly because we lack some vital clues. Consequently, reconstructions based upon such incomplete data can be helpful in stimulating further research only so long as they are treated as hypotheses and not as facts. When new information is made available that calls the reconstructions into question, they are not to be treated as a drowning man's last hope, clung to at all costs. The new may well aid penetration of the old.[15] In many cases of supposed contradiction or discrepancy within the text, improved understanding of Hebrew language and style may also point to satisfactory solutions.[16]

In reading any text it is a grave matter to state the presence of an error without positive proof. Frequently the text in question will be the only

[12] See E. Nielsen, *The Ten Commandments in New Perspective* (London: SCM Press, 1968).

[13] *Cf.* examples in a review, *TSF Bulletin* 65 (1973), pp. 14, 15.

[14] For a demonstration see E. Yamauchi, *The Stones and the Scriptures* (London: Inter-Varsity Press, 1973), pp. 160f.

[15] As exemplified in the case of Tirhakah and Sennacherib's invasion of Palestine where the idea of two Assyrian invasions is maintained by John Bright despite the removal of its basis through advances in Egyptology. See K. A. Kitchen, 'Late Egyptian Chronology and the Hebrew Monarchy' in *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University* 5 (1973) (The Gaster *Festschrift*), pp. 225-31.

[16] See, for example, W. J. Martin, ' "Dischronologized" Narrative in the Old Testament', *Vetus Testamentum*, Supplement 17, *Congress Volume, Rome 1968* (Leiden: Brill, 1969), pp. 179-86.

source of evidence and so if it is 'corrected' or treated with suspicion the evidence is destroyed or adulterated with speculation. Where there is only one source of evidence a sceptical attitude towards it may be maintained, but not as a pretext for erecting theories that conflict with that only witness. In the happy circumstance of two texts surviving there may be incongruencies. If so, one does not have to be forced to agree with the other. The danger of the difference being in the mind of the reader deserves consideration continually. Harmonization on the basis of known ancient processes is the next, quite legitimate, historical method. To answer 'I do not know' is no less respectable academically than politically if the alternatives are unsatisfactory!

Without denying that the ancients made false claims and mistakes we should be extremely reluctant to allege the existence of them, in particular (to repeat) when the supposedly misleading information is our only source, rendering any alternative reconstruction completely speculative. Thus Babylonia supplies one case of fairly well-proved forgery, a document appearing to be several centuries older than it really is, providing for a temple's maintenance.[17] Likewise, the recovery of several accounts of a certain battle enables us to see how the Assyrian version has turned a defeat into a victory![18] But both examples can be demonstrated through the aid of other ancient sources, not from themselves alone.

Wellhausen was convinced his opinion was right. The possibility that the canonical works had been written and selected so as to avoid unnecessary repetition was not allowed, nor any weight given to the maxim 'absence of evidence is not evidence of absence', problematic though it may be in application. Clearly the prophets were aware of various aspects of the Priestly laws, so since Wellhausen's day even the most extreme have come to agree upon the high antiquity of some passages ascribed to the exilic or post-exilic 'P'.

Again, arguments from language and style are employed,[19] but the effects of such re-evaluation on the underlying view of Israelite religion have yet to be spelt out. While attested ancient practices

are not conclusive proof of their equally ancient existence in Israel, the recovery of parallels to one and another of the Priestly requirements supports the possibility of their presence early in Israelite history.[20] All views sceptical of a highly organized religious element in early Israel stem from the view that her career saw a development from simple to complex forms over a long period. As Dr Kitchen has shown forcefully, that cannot be substantiated.[21]

Towards a balanced criticism

To depart so far from the accepted methods of Old Testament study may seem radical. To discount the work at which the majority of Old Testament students have laboured may seem ungrateful. That is not so. We shall not close our eyes to the achievements of the past, so long as we can test and approve their foundations by modern techniques. Where the foundations are found to be insecurely laid, the wall will have to be rebuilt. Some of the old bricks may be re-used, some may have to be jettisoned completely. Again, there is no reproach involved. In every active field of study the same action occurs, whether an entire revolution such as Copernicus fathered, or a radical re-appraisal such as Darwin's work has suffered, or a completely new approach such as has been accepted in Homeric studies. The ancient Near East has been plundered for a century or more to provide 'illumination' for the Bible when, rather, the Bible should be read within its ancient horizons so far as textual, literary, and historical matters are concerned. Old Testament studies cry for release from their chains, and the hammers lie ready!

If the fetters are snapped, which paths lead from the prison to profitable places? Here are seven roads, some already opened, that may prove helpful:

1. Study of Hebrew syntax through modern linguistics; *cf.* F. I. Andersen, *The Hebrew Verbless Clause in the Pentateuch* (Society for Biblical Literature, Monograph Series); and *The Hebrew Sentence* (The Hague: Mouton, 1974).
2. Examination of Hebrew style from the texts themselves, without concern for criteria for dating or distinguishing sources; *cf.* E. König, *Stylistik, Rhetorik, Poetik* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1900) and the papers of W. J. Martin and A. Hurwitz, nn.5,16 above.
3. Exploration of new approaches to literature; *e.g.* structuralist—P. Beauchamp, *Création et sépéra-*

[17] There is a similarity with the False Decretals of the medieval church. See E. Sollberger, 'The Cruciform Monument', *Jaarbericht . . . ex Oriente Lux* 20 (1967-8), pp. 50-70.

[18] A. K. Grayson, 'Problematical Battles in Mesopotamian History', *Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger, Assyriological Studies* 16 (Chicago University Press, 1965), pp. 337-42.

[19] A recent study is F. M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Harvard University Press, 1973), pp. 293-325. On the question of 'priests and levites' see D. A. Hubbard's entry in *NBD*, pp. 1028-34.

[20] For one case see J. Milgrom, 'The Shared Custody of the Tabernacle and a Hittite Analogy', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 90 (1970), pp. 204-9.

[21] *TSF Bulletin* 64 (1972), pp. 2-10.

tion. Etude exégétique du chapitre premier de la Genèse (Paris: du Cerf, 1969), and several papers in *Vetus Testamentum, Supplement* 22 (1972); 'literary themes'—M. Liverani, *Orientalia* 42 (1973), pp. 178-94, *Vetus Testamentum* 24 (1974), pp. 438-53 and elsewhere.

4. Application of form criticism without attention to 'source' analysis that might cut across the forms.

5. Evaluation of biblical themes and practices as they stand in the light of the ancient Near East (*e.g.* supposing the tabernacle and laws of Leviticus to be phenomena of the thirteenth century BC).

6. Demonstration of the common cultural heritage Israel shared with her contemporaries in many spheres (*cf.* the paper cited in n.1).

7. The converse of 6, demonstration of peculiarly Israelite traits by comparison of views on deity, sacrifice, history *etc.*; for history *cf.* B. Albrektson, *History and the Gods* (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1967), and the responses by W. G. Lambert, *Orientalia* 39 (1970), pp. 170-77 and *Oudtestamentische Studien* 17 (1972), pp. 65-72.

APPROACHING DANIEL: THREE STUDIES

Robert Gurney's article was originally intended to stand alone as an exegetical study, and he has not seen the two following articles. He has kindly agreed to his article forming the starting-point for this symposium, even though it was not designed for this purpose. It is a product of many years of study of Daniel (soon to be published in book form) while Dr Gurney has been a medical missionary working among Muslims at Moyale in the Northern Frontier District of Kenya.

The two following articles, by our Associate Editor for Old Testament studies and by Dr Gordon Wenham, Lecturer in Semitic Studies at the Queen's University of Belfast, were specially commissioned to draw out some of the critical and theological issues involved in evangelical study of the book of Daniel.

The four kingdoms of Daniel 2 and 7

Robert J M Gurney

The visions of Daniel and world history

My basic thesis with regard to Daniel's prophecies[1] is that Daniel was primarily looking forward to the first coming of Christ. He predicted both the historical setting (in chapters 2, 7, 8, 11 and 12) and the date (in chapter 9) of the first advent.

The 'four kingdoms' of Daniel 2 and 7 are, I believe, to be identified with Babylon, Media, Persia and Greece. The Greek empire is described in special detail because it immediately preceded the kingdom of heaven. Christ was born around 6 BC, very soon after the final obliteration of the Greek empire in 27 BC, when Egypt was made a Roman province. The destruction of the Greek empire was the first step in the process of setting up the kingdom of heaven, and it began in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. In fact the special sign that God had begun to destroy the fourth kingdom—and so begun the process of establishing the kingdom of heaven—was probably the death of Antiochus Epiphanes himself.

As I pointed out in an earlier article,[2] Daniel 11: 2 describes the first four powerful kings of Persia, from Cyprus to Xerxes, corresponding to the four heads of the third beast in chapter 7; and 11: 3–39

---

[1] I have elaborated this in a book on Daniel's prophecies which I hope to publish in the near future.

[2] 'A Note on Daniel 11: 40-45' in *TSF Bulletin* 47 (1967), pp. 10-12.

is a detailed description of the Greek empire from Alexander to Antiochus Epiphanes, corresponding to the specially important fourth kingdom. I suggested that verses 40-43 are a description of the destruction of the Greek empire by Rome, corresponding to the destruction of the body of the fourth beast in Daniel 7: 11, 26. To be more precise, they describe the annexation of Syria by Scaurus and Pompey. I also suggested that verses 44 and 45 describe the unsuccessful campaign of Crassus against the Parthians in 54 BC.

In the previous verses 'the king of the north' has always been a Greek king of Syria. The words 'at the time of the end' (verse 40) indicate, however, that the identity of the king of the north has changed. Daniel has already shown that at the time of the end Greece will be destroyed, following the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, and that this will precede the coming of the kingdom of heaven. Since this section follows a description of Antiochus Epiphanes, precedes a description of the kingdom of heaven and is introduced by the words 'at the time of the end', we should expect it to concern the destruction of Greece. If we take it that it is describing this, it is reasonable to assume that the destroying 'king of the north' here is some new non-Greek character. In view of the fact that the description does not apply to any Greek king of Syria, but does apply perfectly to the nation which destroyed the Greek empire, one might say it is more than reasonable. The correct translation throughout the chapter should be *a* king of the north, not *the* king of the north. The phrase simply indicates a king to the north of Israel. The period of history between verses 39 and 40 is irrelevant and therefore not described (*cf.* the gap in time between Xerxes and Alexander, 11: 2, 3).

The final two verses of chapter 11, which describe the unsuccessful campaign of Crassus against the Parthians, are relevant for at least two reasons: (a) they show that the fourth kingdom was *not* the Roman empire, and (b) they explain how Daniel 7: 12 was fulfilled.

(a) *They show that the fourth kingdom was not the Roman empire.* Firstly, they draw attention to the fact that the Roman armies were not invincible. In this case Rome was badly defeated when still in her prime and her empire still expanding. Secondly, they draw attention to the fact that the Romans did not by any means tread down 'the whole earth'. The Parthians ruled a very large part of the former Babylonian, Median, Persian and Greek empires, and in the context of the book of Daniel 'the whole earth' must surely include the area covered by those empires. The Roman empire was essentially an

empire of the West, and Palestine lay right on its eastern border. All the land to the immediate east of Palestine (including Babylonia, Media and Persia) lay outside the Roman empire. Trajan did have some success against the Parthians many years after the time of Christ (and after the establishment of the kingdom of heaven) and he incorporated part of their empire into the Roman empire; but his successor Hadrian immediately abandoned these conquests. Most of the Median empire and about half of the Persian and Greek empires were never at any time within the Roman empire. Media and Persia themselves were never within the empire.

(b) *They explain how Daniel 7: 12 was fulfilled.* Because of Rome's failure against Parthia, *Babylonia, Media and Persia all remained outside the Roman empire*. Their dominion was taken away, but they were independent of Rome.

Radical authors always identify the four kingdoms as Babylon, Media, Persia and Greece, while conservative authors usually identify them as Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece and Rome. One of the reasons radical scholars give for their belief in a second century BC date of authorship is the fact that the Greek empire is described very accurately and in much greater detail than the preceding empires. They believe that Daniel's first three kingdoms are supposed to represent Babylon, Media and Persia, but that his description of them is inaccurate. I believe that both the radicals and the conservatives have missed the truth. Daniel's four kingdoms are an *accurate*, true-to-history description of the Babylonian, Median, Persian and Greek empires. Conservative scholars claim that a major objection to this interpretation is found in the statement that the heavenly kingdom was to be set up 'in the days of those kings' (Dn. 2: 44), whereas Christ was born *after* the destruction of the Greek empire. I suggest, however, that the fourth kingdom was destroyed by *the pre-incarnate Christ*, and this destruction was part of the process of setting up the kingdom of heaven. A key verse supporting this interpretation is Daniel 8: 25 (*cf.* Dn. 2: 34; Rev. 17: 14; 19: 16).

This interpretation does justice to both visions. The vision of the image indicates that the setting up of the heavenly kingdom *began* with the destruction of the fourth kingdom—the stone struck the feet of iron and clay *before* it became a mountain and filled the earth. The vision of the four beasts indicates that the fourth kingdom was destroyed *before* the 'one like a son of man' received the kingdom. Many passages in the New Testament indicate that these visions (of the stone becoming a mountain and the one like a son of man receiving

the kingdom) found their primary fulfilment around the time of *the first advent* (Mt. 16: 28; 26: 64; 28: 18; Lk. 22: 69; Acts 7: 56; Rom. 8: 16, 17; 1 Cor. 15: 24–28; Eph. 1: 20–22; 2: 6; Heb. 1: 3; 1 Pet. 3: 22; Rev. 1: 5, 6; 3: 21; 5: 9–13 RV; 12: 5).

This interpretation also does justice to the fact that the fourth kingdom is so detailed and accurate a picture of the Greek empire, that radical scholars believe the author lived during the time of that empire after the events had taken place. It also does justice to the visions of chapters 8, 11 and 12, where the Persian and Greek empires and Antiochus Epiphanes are described, the descriptions corresponding very closely indeed to those of the third and fourth kingdoms and the 'little horn' in chapters 2 and 7. In chapters 8, 11 and 12 Persia and Rome are mentioned only very briefly, whereas Greece and Antiochus Epiphanes are described in immense detail. Likewise, the fourth kingdom and its 'little horn' are described in far greater detail than the other kingdoms, and Daniel takes a special interest in them (7: 19, 20).

This interpretation also agrees with the way in which the Median origin of 'Darius the Mede' is emphasized (5: 31; 9: 1; 11: 1), and the way in which he is depicted as the successor of the kings of Babylon (I am *not* saying that the kingdom of Darius *was* the Median kingdom—I am merely suggesting that the book of Daniel uses Darius to get across the idea that Media was the second of the four world powers).

This interpretation also gives full weight to the twice-repeated statement that the vision of chapter 8 concerns 'the time of the end' (8: 17, 19; *cf.* 11: 35, 40 and 12: 1–4), as well as to the New Testament passages which indicate that 'the time of the end' and 'the last days' began around the time of *the first advent* (Lk. 18: 31; 21: 22; Acts 2: 15–17; 3: 24; Heb. 1: 1, 2; 9: 26; 1 Pet. 1: 20).

So much for the basic thesis. In the following paragraphs[3] I shall seek to show that Daniel's first three kingdoms are accurate, true-to-history descriptions of Babylon, Media and Persia. I shall not deal with the fourth kingdom in detail, because the way in which it corresponds to the Greek empire is already well known and has been described by many authors.

The image (Dn. 2)

The image has a head of gold, and Daniel interprets it as follows: 'You, O king, the king of kings, to whom the God of heaven has given the kingdom, the power, and the might, and the glory, and into

[3] Most are taken, in slightly modified form, from my book.

whose hand he has given, wherever they dwell, the sons of men, the beasts of the field, and the birds of the air, making you rule over them all—you are the head of gold.' Thus we are told that the head of gold represents *Nebuchadnezzar*, king of Babylon. Under Nebuchadnezzar, Babylon rose to a position of great power, wealth and magnificence.

The breast and arms of this image are of silver and Daniel interprets as follows: 'And after you shall arise another kingdom inferior to you'. In my opinion, Daniel is here describing the Median empire. This empire was contemporaneous with the Babylonian empire, but after the death of Nebuchadnezzar in 562 BC *it became the stronger of the two*, because the power and wealth of Babylon immediately declined. Babylon was still a power, but the scales had tipped in favour of the Medes. Remember that the head of gold symbolizes Nebuchadnezzar, and Daniel says, 'And after *you* (Nebuchadnezzar) shall arise another kingdom inferior to *you*.' Following the death of Nebuchadnezzar, Media was the major power for at least twelve years until it was united with Persia in 550 BC under the rule of Cyrus. The Median empire did not, however, have the glory and magnificence of Nebuchadnezzar's Babylon—it was of *inferior* quality.

It is often objected that the Median empire did not really follow after the Babylonian empire—it was contemporaneous with it. It may be replied, however, that the order of Daniel's kingdoms is *the order of their rise to the height of power and prominence.* Daniel does not say that each kingdom exists only from the time of destruction of the preceding kingdom to the time of its own destruction. The order of the kingdoms is *not* merely the order of their existence—it is the order of their occupation of the seat of supreme power: in other words, the order in which they held the title of 'top nation'! This is confirmed in the vision of the four beasts, because we learn there that after the fourth kingdom has been destroyed, the first three kingdoms continue to exist for a while *together*, although their dominion is taken away from them. This clearly indicates that they are to some extent contemporaneous.

The assertion that there was no Median empire between the Babylonian and Persian empires seems to be based on a misconception. This misconception is the idea that Persia succeeded Babylon as dominant world power when it overthrew Babylon in 539 BC. Persia in fact became the dominant world power some years *before* Babylon fell. Cyrus built up a very large and powerful empire which outstripped the Babylonian empire several years

before he got round to conquering the latter empire. If it be admitted, and so it must, that Persia became dominant world power before the actual fall of Babylon, it can also be admitted that Media may have been the dominant world power before Persia.

Babylon and Media were the two great rivals for world power, and after the death of Nebuchadnezzar, it seemed inevitable that Media would overthrow Babylon. This was the state of affairs for a few uneasy years. But suddenly, events took an unexpected turn. Media's king was overthrown by one of his own vassals, the brilliant Persian king, Cyrus. Cyrus united the Medes and Persians as allies under his own rule; but from this time Persia was on the ascendant. For some years the two peoples held the reins of power together; but the Persians had the edge on the Medes and increased their power until they were completely dominant.

Daniel continues the interpretation as follows: '. . . and yet a third kingdom of bronze, which shall rule over all the earth'. The third kingdom is symbolized by the image's belly and thighs of bronze and is to 'rule over all the earth'. The characteristic of this third kingdom is the immense area over which it rules. This is the perfect description of the Persian empire, because the most striking aspect of that empire was the huge area it covered—it was by far the vastest empire the world had seen. The following Greek empire was in fact slightly smaller than the Persian empire. In all regions except Greece and across the Indus river, Alexander's Greek empire either fell short of or failed to extend beyond the limits of the Persian empire.

Cyrus himself created the largest empire the world had seen up to that time; but his successors continued to push the frontiers outwards until the Persian empire was truly breathtaking in size. In a series of brilliant campaigns Cyrus annexed the entire Median empire, the large and powerful kingdom of Lydia in Asia Minor, much territory in the East—and then the Babylonian empire. His successors added all Egypt, a chunk of Europe and more territory in the East.

Note also the way in which Daniel groups together the second and third kingdoms. The second kingdom is passed over quickly with a brief and belittling remark, possibly indicating that its term of supreme power is comparatively insignificant and short-lived, as well as being inferior in wealth and magnificence. It is grouped with, and closely followed and overshadowed by, the world-ruling third kingdom. The whole description is strongly suggestive of the Medo-Persian situation, because

the comparatively insignificant Median empire was absorbed and eclipsed by the subsequently enormous Persian empire only a very short time after it (Media) had itself surpassed Babylon. The description of the second and third kingdoms fits the Median and Persian empires far better than it fits the huge, wealthy, long-lived Persian empire and the rather smaller Greek empire.

The four beasts (Dn. 7)

Daniel recounts, 'The first was like a lion and had eagles' wings. Then as I looked its wings were plucked off, and it was lifted up from the ground and made to stand upon two feet like a man; and the mind of a man was given to it.'

The winged lion is familiar in Babylonian art. The eagle was a symbol of swiftness and the lion one of strength and nobility (2 Sa. 1: 23). The eagle was the king of birds, and the lion the king of beasts. They correspond to the image's head of gold, the metal which was regarded as the noblest and most valuable of all metals. Almost all are agreed that this beast represents Babylon and that the change which comes upon it probably symbolizes Nebuchadnezzar's madness and subsequent restoration (Dn. 4). Note that again Babylon *in the time of Nebuchadnezzar* is strongly indicated. The Bible repeatedly describes Nebuchadnezzar and the Chaldeans of his time as being like both an eagle (Dt. 28: 49–53, *cf.* 2 Kings 25: 1–11; Je. 49: 19, 22; La. 4: 19; Ezk. 17: 1–5, 11–14; Hab. 1: 6–8) and a lion (Is. 5: 25–30; Je. 4: 6, 7, 13, *cf.* 25: 9, 38; 49: 19, 22; 50: 17, 44). These creatures were used to convey a picture of Nebuchadnezzar coming from afar against the Jews and their neighbours and carrying them off as captives to Babylon. The book of Daniel always associates the glory and magnificence of Babylon with *Nebuchadnezzar* (Dn. 2: 37, 38; 4: 22, 30, 36; 5: 18, 19).

It is a historical fact that Nebuchadnezzar was largely responsible for the glory of the Neo-Babylonian empire. He came to the throne when his father died in 605 BC, soon after the final obliteration of Assyria—an event which Nebuchadnezzar helped to bring about. During his long reign of 43 years, Babylon was practically invincible. Moreover, he lavished immense wealth and architectural skill on his capital city, making it world-famous for its magnificence and strength. Nebuchadnezzar was both a great soldier and a great builder. After his death, however, a series of relatively weak kings followed each other in rapid succession and Babylon's power declined. She was still a power, but whereas she formerly had the edge on her

great rival, Media, the position was now reversed.

Daniel continues, 'And behold, another beast, a second one, like a bear. It was raised up on one side; it had three ribs in its mouth between its teeth; and it was told, "Arise, devour much flesh." ' Although the bear is not so swift as the lion, it was equally feared, owing to its great strength and the unpredictability of its actions. The lion and the bear are mentioned together a number of times in Scripture (1 Sam. 17: 34; Prov. 28: 15; La. 3: 10; Am. 5: 19), and both were clearly objects of special fear and respect. In a similar way the rival powers of Babylon and Media together commanded the nations' fear and respect. The bear is a comparatively slow-moving and clumsy creature; therefore this symbol applies better to the Median empire than to the Persian. The career of Cyrus the Persian was characterized by a succession of swift and brilliant victories, better symbolized by the next beast, which is a leopard.

We are told that the bear 'was raised up on one side', and I suggest the following explanation. *Media's period of power was divided into two very different stages.* During the first stage she was the powerful head of a large empire—this is represented by the side of the bear which is raised up. During the second stage she was the somewhat inferior partner of Persia—Daniel is careful to emphasize (chapters 5, 6 and 8) that the Medes and Persians *ruled together as allies* for a number of years following Cyrus's victory over the Median king in 550 BC. This part of Media's reign is represented by the lower side of the bear. During her partnership with Persia, *she was still ruling the nations*, but in a humbler capacity than before. Her partnership with Persia constituted the world's most powerful empire; but despite the exalted nature of her continued ruling of the nations, it was not as exalted as it had been before the rise of Persia.

We are told that three ribs were in the bear's mouth between its teeth, and that it was commanded, 'Arise, devour much flesh.' It is generally agreed that the three ribs must represent three nations conquered by the bear, and that the bear is ordered to arise and make fresh conquests. The identities of the three nations, however, have remained in doubt. The Bible itself, as is so often the case, provides the answer. We find it in Jeremiah 51: 27–29. In this passage God stirs up four nations against Babylon. This reminds us that the bear with the three ribs was also stirred up—and probably against Babylon. Three of these nations were the small kingdoms of Ararat, Minni and Ashkenaz. They all lay to the north of Babylon and *all were within the Median empire.* The fourth nation was

the Median empire itself. The bear with the three ribs between its teeth is a perfect picture of the Median empire and the three small subject kingdoms of Ararat, Minni and Ashkenaz. Note that *Media* is the principal nation stirred up against Babylon. In the eleventh verse of the same chapter we read, 'The Lord has stirred up the spirit of the kings of the Medes, because his purpose concerning Babylon is to destroy it.' In Isaiah 13: 17 we read, 'Behold, I am stirring up the Medes against them (the Babylonians).' We can see therefore that the prophets repeatedly proclaimed that God would stir up the Medes against Babylon. This is the meaning of the command to arise and devour much flesh. In Isaiah 21: 2 Elam and Media are ordered to besiege Babylon, and in verse 9 the fall of Babylon is proclaimed. By the time Media got round to actually besieging Babylon, it had become the inferior partner of Persian-occupied Elam, Cyrus's country of origin. (Elam is not mentioned in Je. 51:27, because although it was a vassal of Media, it formed an alliance with Babylon during the period of Media's primacy.)

Thus the general picture we have is that Media became stronger than Babylon on the death of Nebuchadnezzar and planned to overcome her, being stirred up to this by God. But before Media was able to carry her plans into effect, she was joined and surpassed by Persia.

Daniel continues, 'After this I looked, and lo, another, like a leopard, with four wings of a bird on its back; and the beast had four heads; and dominion was given to it.' The swift and agile winged leopard contrasts vividly with the slow-moving, clumsy bear. Such was the contrast between the ponderous Median empire and the brilliant, swiftly-moving armies of Cyrus the Persian. The early kings that followed Cyrus were not as brilliant as he, but they certainly moved much faster and more purposefully than the Medes.

Now the main characteristic of this third kingdom is, like that of the 'bronze' kingdom, one of widespread authority or 'dominion', which was the chief characteristic of Persia. This is shown by the four wings symbolizing the four winds, one for each of the 'four corners of the earth' (Ps. 104: 3; Zc. 2: 6). On a clay cylinder, Cyrus described himself as 'king of the four corners of the earth'. On another he said, 'Sin, the light of heaven . . . gave into my hands the four corners of the earth.'

The beast had four heads. Now a head naturally suggests a king or some similar authority. In the eleventh chapter of Daniel we are specially told about *four kings of Persia.* The first is Cyrus and the fourth is Xerxes. This interpretation of the

meaning of the four heads is eminently suitable, because Persia's main period of expansion and aggression only covered the reigns of these first four kings—Cyrus, Cambyses, Darius and Xerxes (Pseudo-Smerdis being merely a short-lived impostor). Between them these first four kings created the Persian empire in all its vast extent and wealth; and it was after the reign of Xerxes that the decline of the empire began. Xerxes' small gains in Greece were lost within a few months; but the empire reached the pinnacle of its power, wealth and size during his reign. Each of these four kings had a part to play in the creation of this enormous empire. It was not the work of one man, and the four-headed beast is a perfect picture of this.

Note that the four heads have nothing to do with the four horns of Greece (8:8). The four heads appear to be a feature of the beast's great *dominion*, whereas the four horns of Greece are connected with a *loss* of dominion (cf. 11:4). In 11:2–4 the number four is mentioned twice—once in connection with Persia, and once with Greece. The reference to Persia speaks of an initial phase of riches and power, whereas the reference to Greece speaks of a second phase of division and *loss* of territory and power. If the third kingdom is the Persian empire, it also follows that the unequal horns of the Persian ram (8:3–4, 20) do not signify the same thing as the unequal sides of the bear (7:5). There is a connection, however, since in both cases the inequality has something to do with the partnership between the Medes and Persians.

We can see therefore that whatever resemblance the third beast might have to any other empire, it was fulfilled in every respect by the Persian empire. Let it again be pointed out that the only thing said about the beast's rule was the fact that it was to have *dominion*—which corresponds to the statement that the bronze kingdom was to 'rule over all the earth'. This was by far the most striking aspect of the Persian empire. It was several times the size of any previous empire. The Greek empire, on the other hand, was no larger than the Persian, and was probably in fact slightly smaller. Moreover, the Persians maintained their vast empire for over two hundred years, whereas the Greek empire was broken up and reduced in size only nine years after its foundation. Note, however, that both the third kingdom and the fourth kingdom are said to rule over or tread down 'the whole earth' (2:39; 7:23), and we are given the impression that the fourth kingdom crushes the first three kingdoms (2:40; 7:7, 23). We have already noted that Rome was defeated by the Parthians, and that Babylonia, Media and Persia all remained outside the Roman

empire. Greece, on the other hand, rapidly crushed and took over the entire Persian empire (apart from some border areas), including Babylonia, Media and Persia. Thus the third and fourth kingdoms both rule over 'the whole earth', and regarding this, we note that Greece ruled over almost the same vast area (both in size and location) as Persia. Note also that the third kingdom *rules* over the whole earth, but the fourth kingdom *devours* it, and tramples it down and breaks it to pieces. The Persians ruled over their great empire for over two hundred years. Alexander smashed it rapidly and thoroughly, but he died soon afterwards, before he was able to organize it into as closely cohesive a system as that of the Persians. His successors were unable to maintain it, and it split up into a number of separate kingdoms and was reduced in size. This is all vividly portrayed in Daniel's fourth kingdom, but I am not dealing with that kingdom here in any detail.

I shall, however, summarize very briefly the ways in which Greece fulfilled the visions of the fourth kingdom and Rome did not—leaving out of consideration the idea that the Roman empire (in its 'feet of iron and clay' stage) is still in existence or is to be revived at the end of the present age. (1) The Greek armies of Alexander were invincible, whereas the Roman armies were not (2:40; 7:7, 19). (2) The Greek empire was divided in a very clear-cut way into an initial period of invincible strength and a second period of division and weakness, whereas Rome was not (2:41, 42). (3) Daniel 2:43 was fulfilled very exactly by the Greek attempt to fuse East and West through intermingling and intermarriage, whereas Rome provided no such fulfilment. (4) The western nation of Greece was very 'different' from the oriental nations of Babylon, Media and Persia, whereas Rome was in many respects very similar to Greece (7:23). (5) In the context of the book of Daniel, Greece can be said to have 'devoured the whole earth' and to have crushed the first three kingdoms, whereas this cannot be said of Rome (2:40; 7:23). (6) The horns of the fourth beast found a very precise fulfilment in the kings of the Syrian part of the Greek empire from Seleucus Nicator to Antiochus Epiphanes (nearly all of whom are described in chapter 11), whereas Rome provided no such fulfilment. (7) The Greek empire was destroyed before Christ was glorified, whereas Rome was not (2:34, 35; 7:11, 13, 14; cf. the verses quoted earlier which show that the stone became a mountain and the one like a son of man received the kingdom at the time of the first advent. Note that the Roman empire reached its greatest extent and was at *the*

zenith of its power during the reign of Trajan, many years *after* the time of Christ. At this time Christianity had already spread to most parts of the empire and far beyond.)

These conclusions are reinforced when we take chapters 8, 11 and 12 and other matters into consideration. I think, however, that enough has been written here to show that the case for identifying Daniel's four kingdoms as Babylon, Media, Persia and Greece is very strong indeed.

The book of Daniel: three issues

John E Goldingay

1. An exegetical issue

My concern in this note is to formulate an approach
to some of the problems in Daniel, which is at some
points parallel to that of Dr Gurney (I shall not try
systematically to note the parallels and differences)
but is independent of it. Like him, however, I am
concerned to interpret the book of Daniel in a way
that does justice to its place in the canon of
Scripture. Like him, I believe that Daniel's fourth
empire is Greece, not Rome. Unlike him, however,
I see the book as originally God's message to Jews
in Maccabean times, and, indeed, as written in that
period.

The two main ways of interpreting the four
empires (Dn. 2 and 7) and the seventy weeks
(Dn. 9) are represented, for instance, by Driver and
Heaton[1] on one hand, and by Young and Harrison[2]
on the other. The first concludes that the fourth
empire and the seventieth week refer to the Greek
period and specifically the Maccabean crisis; but
that this means that Daniel got his history wrong
both in implying that there were separate Median
and Persian empires between the Babylonians and
the Greeks, and in suggesting that sixty-two 'weeks
of years' passed between the restoration and the
Maccabean period. The other main view is that if
we are to abide by a belief in the inspiration of
Scripture, we must see the climax of the visions as
referring to the Roman period; they look forward
to the first coming of Christ, and beyond that to his

second coming[3]

I find neither of these views entirely satisfactory.
First, both general and specific considerations
suggest that these visions focus historically on the
Maccabean crisis.

(1) It is desirable to argue from the known to the
unknown; as one would put it theologically, we
interpret Scripture by Scripture. Now we know
from the two other major visions of the book, the
ram and the he-goat (Dn. 8) and the appalling
abomination (Dn. 10–12),[4] that Daniel is concerned
with the Maccabean crisis. We would expect the
same concern to lie behind the other visions,
though we will not want to force the interpretation
of the former on to the latter. Nevertheless the
whole vision series has a degree of unity if its
consistent main concern is to reassure God's people
with regard to the one time of crisis.

(2) Particular considerations in fact reinforce this
preliminary understanding. There are several specific
resemblances between the promised deliverance
from Antiochus described in chapters 8 and 10–12
and the fall of the fourth empire described in
chapters 2 and 7. The enigmatic 'little horn' (7: 8)
which is obscure and problematical on the alterna-
tive interpretation,[5] becomes intelligible, for 8: 6–11
speaks of Antiochus as a 'little horn' (such a
phrase comes nowhere else in the Bible) which
'magnified itself' (cf. 'speaking great things' in

[1] S. R. Driver, *The Book of Daniel* (Cambridge Bible,
1900); E. W. Heaton, *The Book of Daniel* (Torch Bible
Commentaries, London: SCM, 1956).

[2] E. J. Young, *A Commentary on Daniel* (London:
Banner of Truth, 1972; originally published as *The
Prophecy of Daniel*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949) (also
more briefly in *NBCR*); R. K. Harrison, *Introduction to the
Old Testament* (London: IVP, 1970).

[3] Some understand the main reference to be to Christ's
first coming (so Young, *Daniel*, pp. 213-19), others to his
second coming (the dispensationalist view: cf. J. C.
Whitcomb in *NBD*), but for the purpose of this article
these may be regarded as variants on the same type of
approach.

[4] Part of this vision looks beyond Antiochus, of course,
but there is no dispute that he is the primary historical
reference of Dn. 11.

[5] Cf. Harrison, p. 1130.

7: 8).[6] Further, Antiochus is to be broken by no human hand (8: 25); similarly, the feet of the image (representing the fourth empire) are to be broken by a stone cut by no human hand (2: 34). Again, the 'time, two times, and half a time' of 7: 25 invites equation with and explanation by that of 12: 7 and the 1,290 days of 12: 11, which certainly refers to the Antiochene persecution.[7]

It is difficult to believe that the same language is several times used to describe events that are the prelude to the bringing in of God's kingdom with the events being different in some passages from what they are in others. This is confusing enough to us now, let alone what it would have been to the first hearers.

So the book of Daniel forms a more coherent whole if the empires in chapters 2 and 7 are those of the Babylonians, Medes, Persians and Greeks. Does this, however, imply, secondly, that the author misunderstood the historical outline of the period? Pointers elsewhere in the book show that he recognized that there was only one Medo-Persian empire. Daniel speaks of the Babylonian kingdom being given to the Medes and Persians (5: 28) and of 'the law of the Medes and Persians' (6: 8, etc.), apparently one law. He symbolizes the Medo-Persians as one animal (8: 20), though it has two horns which might again suggest that he saw it as having two elements.

Since Daniel speaks elsewhere of one Medo-Persian empire, why does he divide it in chapters 2 and 7?

The four-empire scheme resembles a pattern which appears in Greek, Latin, and Persian writings, whereby four successive ages are symbolized by metals of diminishing strength or value, as in Daniel 2;[8] the oldest certain occurrence of this symbolism comes in the eighth century Greek poet Hesiod (*Works and Days* 106-201). These parallels suggest that Daniel's fourfold scheme pictures post-exilic history according to a common pattern. Probably it is more than merely a literary device: it makes a polemic point, like the use of near-Eastern mythological motifs elsewhere in the Old Testament.[9] It expresses the conviction that Yahweh is the God who is really putting his will into effect in history. He is in control even of the degeneration which men can observe. Daniel applies the common image of four empires to the period of history with which he was concerned. This began with the Babylonians and ended with the Greeks, who thus have to be the first and last members of the scheme. What about the intervening material? Dr Gurney suggests that two empires fit quite happily in between since a period of Median ascendancy occurred in between that of the Babylonians and of the Persians. But even if one has to grant that the material has to be squeezed (or rather stretched) to fit the scheme, this does not entail finding Daniel confused over post-exilic history. If he stretches a point over a period of history that is not in itself his main concern, this is because he is using an illustration which cannot be modified (otherwise, the point of using it disappears). His situation, in fact, is not unlike Paul's with his unlikely horticulture in Romans 11: 24, or even Jesus's with his unlikely business methods in Matthew 20: 1-15. Gardeners do not remove and then regraft branches, employers do not pay a day's wage for an hour's work. The Medes (perhaps) did not strictly rule the Middle East between the Babylonians and the Persians: but at each point the illustration is nevertheless used because it helps to communicate a point.[10]

A similar approach may be taken to Daniel 9: 24-7. Young himself describes the seventy sevens as a 'symbolical number' which does not refer to an exact 490 years. 'The emphasis . . . is not so much upon the beginning and termination of this period as it is upon the great results which the period has been set apart to accomplish.'[11] Young in fact takes it that this period lasts from the issuing of God's command concerning the rebuilding in Jerusalem to the appearance of Christ, but the exegetical approach outlined above would

[6] The identification is disputed by Young (pp. 275-79; cf. Harrison p. 1129), but his analysis proves no more than that the two descriptions are complementary. C. F. Keil (Keil and Delitzsch's commentary, *in loc.*) grants the identification, though explains it typologically.

[7] Young (*in loc.*) refers 12: 7 to Antichrist alone, 12: 11 to Antiochus and, typologically, Antichrist. The complicated switching of reference is not suggested by the text itself.

[8] For summary and references see, as well as the commentaries, J. J. Collins in *JBL* 94 (1975), pp. 221-23; M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism* (London: SCM, 1974), I, pp. 181f.; II, pp. 122f.

[9] *E.g.* G. F. Hasel, 'The Polemic Nature of the Genesis Cosmology', *EQ* 46 (1974), pp. 81-102.

[10] Of course a further purpose in a reference to the Medes, and in the mention of the Median Darius (especially if he is to be identified with Cyrus: so D. J. Wiseman in *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel*, London: Tyndale Press, 1965, pp. 12-16) may be a desire to indicate the fulfilment of prophecies that Babylon would fall to the Medes (*e.g.* Is. 13: 17, 18). The argument about the identity of this Darius tends on both sides to lead to a losing sight of the question why he is mentioned, whoever he was.

[11] *NBCR*, *in loc.* The non-literal interpretation of a round number is paralleled by the approach now usually adopted to the 480 years of 2 Ki. 6: 1.

suggest that here, too, the reference is to the period lasting until the Antiochene deliverance.[12]

The alternative to the mainstream approaches to these visions which I would therefore like to suggest is that, while it is correct to see their climax as referring to the Antiochene crisis, it is not necessary to infer that their inspiration is thereby imperilled. On the contrary, in as far as a more coherent and intelligible interpretation of them is made possible, it is buttressed. In all ways, Daniel focuses on the Maccabean crisis and encourages God's people to believe that they will see evil deposed and punished, and righteousness established and rewarded.

2. A theological issue

But the eschaton was not ushered in by the Antiochene crisis. There is here a more serious issue of biblical theology to be considered—one raised, indeed, by the book even if the above approach to these particular chapters is incorrect. The book seems to promise the imminent establishment of God's kingdom; but the kingdom does not so arrive.

As with the exegesis, the 'liberal' and 'conservative' views of this question of Daniel's eschatological beliefs present us with what I believe to be a false alternative. The former assumes that Daniel was simply mistaken. The latter suggests that at crucial points such as the end of chapter 11 Daniel's reference moves on from the present crisis to the final one, rather as Jesus, in Mark 13, distinguishes between the crisis of his own ministry and the fall of Jerusalem on the one hand, and that day and hour of which no-one knows (v. 32) on the other. Similarly, the prophets are sometimes thought of as leaping from some present historical crisis to the millennium.[13]

There is, of course, a profound sense in which it is true that prophecies refer to events far beyond the prophets' own time; more precisely in what sense, I shall try to suggest below. But the text itself rarely implies a distinction between what was historically imminent and what belongs to the distant future. One would never guess that 'the time of the end' (Dn. 11: 35, 40) is thousands of years after the events related in the rest of the chapter; it naturally implies the end of the crisis which the rest of the chapter refers to. The descrip-

tion that follows in the last paragraph (vv. 40–45) is of the same kind of events as have been referred to in the earlier part of the chapter. Even when the transition to a more other-worldly picture comes in 12: 1–3, the events now described happen 'at that [same] time'. At least one of the references to the timing of these events in the book's closing verses explicitly alludes to the Antiochene crisis (12: 11). But this deliverance was not historically the prelude to the resurrection: hence exegetical attempts to find points where Daniel moves from referring to the one to referring to the other.

But descriptions of an imminent consummation of God's final judgment and salvation do occur rather often in the Bible. In Genesis God declares that Adam will die on the day he eats the fruit of a certain tree. In Exodus God says he is about to fulfil his promise of such material and spiritual blessing that the whole world will be aroused to envy. Amos declares in the northern kingdom that Yahweh's day of judgment is imminent; Zephaniah asserts the same in the south. Jeremiah promises Judah a new covenant. Ezekiel promises the exiles a new heart. Zechariah says the world will flock to Jerusalem. Daniel sees the kingdom given to Israel. Jesus declares God's kingdom is here. Paul says the eschaton is round the corner.

In a literal final sense, these expectations are not fulfilled. We thus find the question asked, 'Were the exilic prophets/Daniel/Jesus/Paul mistaken in suggesting that the eschaton was imminent?' If these passages are discussed in isolation from one another, however, the point is missed that they are actually examples of the same recurring phenomenon in the Bible. That phenomenon is, to see each evil, each crisis, each judgment, each victory, each blessing as the embodiment in time of the ultimate struggle between right and wrong, chaos and cosmos, in which evil ever threatens to be victorious, but God wins the actual victory. Biblical theology eventually crystallizes the conviction—how early, opinions will differ—that the ultimate achievement of this victory will only come at the end; though it is at the same time somehow a victory won finally at the beginning, when tōhû wābōhû gave way to cosmos and Rahab was cut to pieces. Within history, however, there are recurrent partial realizations of that ultimate achievement—of which the greatest came through the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ.[14]

The Jews' deliverance from Antiochus—and there was a notable deliverance—was one such realization. It was not the final breaking-in of the eschaton. But it was the breaking-in of the eschato-

[12] There is no space here for a discussion of the verses' interpretation. Many of the terms are sufficiently allusive to be applicable to the Maccabean deliverance or to the work of Christ, though I find it difficult to connect the anointing of a most holy place, for instance, with anything but the former.

[13] See, for instance, J. B. Payne's systematic treatment in his *Encyclopedia of Biblical Prophecy* (London: Hodder, 1973).

[14] On this paragraph, see G. B. Caird's comments on eschatology in *Exp T* 74 (1962-63), p. 84.

logical God. It was not the fulfilment of God's final purpose but it was an *arrabōn* of that fulfilment, and (we can see with hindsight) pointed forward to it.

By virtue of their all constituting temporal embodiments of the ultimate conflict these events are also linked to each other, and are described in similar terms. Indeed Jesus can pick up the description of Antiochus's 'appalling abomination' and apply it to an incident to occur as part of the coming fall of Jerusalem.[15] This is not the event to which Daniel directly refers, but it is a parallel realization of the same sacrilegious arrogance of evil.

And if Daniel (or Paul) is not careful to distinguish too sharply between the present crisis or opportunity and the ultimate one, then he has something to teach us. We would do well to look at what happens to us as individuals and as the church as part of the struggle between chaos and cosmos which is the world's story from its beginning to its end, and to see these things as the dealings of the eschatological God. In all the power, holiness, and love that belong to creation and to the end, he is with us in each crisis, and we can experience another foretaste of the final victory.

3. A critical issue

But when did the eschatological God give this revelation about his intervening in the Maccabean crisis? The book asserts *prima facie* that he gave it to a man named Daniel in the sixth century, a man who saw the beginning of the four empires'/seventy weeks' history described in chapters 2, 7, and 9—which, then, must have been revealed to him ahead of time by the God who was in control of it.

Most (non-'conservative') scholars date the book of Daniel much later than the time of its hero, however, and assume that, although the stories about him may well be ultimately based on fact, they have been at least extensively elaborated in a subsequent period in order to bring God's message to a later generation. The time to which the book finally belongs, according to this approach, is the period to which it refers and to which its message relates, namely the second-century Maccabean crisis. The declaring of future history in visions is a literary device, whereby events of the history (which is nearly all in fact past from the perspective of the real writer) are declared to have been in the control of the God of Israel all along. He knew

how this history was going to develop; his lordship is certain. Therefore he can be trusted in the crisis of the present situation to control historical events that really are future from the writer's perspective.

In justification of this approach, scholars commonly refer to questions of historical accuracy (Daniel is thought to be strangely unreliable in his description of events in the exile for a man who allegedly lived then), of history of language (in Driver's often quoted tag,[16] 'the *Persian* words presuppose a period after the Persian empire had been well established; the Greek words *demand*, the Hebrew *supports*, and the Aramaic *permits*' a date after 332), and of history of ideas (did apocalyptic appear in full flower in the sixth century?). Some of these points are not very impressive.[17] The point to be made here, however, is that underlying these detailed reasons is another, often unstated. Daniel did not prophesy the second century in the sixth because this would be impossible and irrelevant. And the 'conservative' underlying response to these points is that such prophecy is by no means impossible if you believe in God. To exclude it is ultimately rationalist. And the relevance of it lies not in the sixth century but in the second, for the function of the book in the second century was to assure people that God was in control by showing how he had foreseen the situation long before. And further, for it to make this point, it is important that the book really comes from long before: if it does not, it is (however well-meant) a fraud.[18]

What are we to make of this conversation? The comfort that the book would have been to the believers of the second century may be granted. Further, the danger of rationalism is real. It is easy to be beguiled by the world's assumptions and to refuse to let these be corrected by Scripture's own evidence. The possibility of God having revealed these events to Daniel in the sixth century must be granted. But on the other hand, the assertion that 'if pseudonymous and *ex eventu*, then fraudulent', is surely without adequate foundation.

Pseudonymity is a complex phenomenon. Its motivation is equally complex: Metzger[19] mentions fear, shame, financial greed, malice, respect, modesty, dramatic concern, and desire for credence. It was evidently quite possible for an author in good faith to publish in the name of someone else; Metzger instances the Neo-Pythagoreans who, centuries after Pythagoras, attributed their treatises

---

[15] Despite the verbal correspondence between Mt. 24:15 and Dn. 11:31 (whose Antiochene reference is undeniable), Payne (p. 486) connects Mt. 24:15 with Dn. 9:26-7 (where the correspondence is less exact but the interpretation more equivocal).

[16] p. lxiii.

[17] See, for instance, the symposium by Wiseman *et al.* (n.10 above).

[18] *E.g.* Young, *Daniel*, p. 25.

[19] B. M. Metzger, 'Literary Forgeries and Canonical Pseudepigrapha', *JBL* 91 (1972), pp. 5-12.

to him rather than ascribe to themselves the glory of their inventions.

We have no hard information, only guesses, as to the motivation or psychology that lay behind inter-testamental pseudonymous apocalyptic.[20] The possibility that these authors, too, wrote in good faith cannot be denied. At least one of their works is quoted with approval in the New Testament (see Jude 14); this may suggest that we are mistaken to trouble ourselves over the ethics of the matter. In the case of Daniel, then, too, 'whatever idiom or mode of expression he would use in ordinary speech must surely be allowed him when moved by the Holy Spirit'.[21] The synoptists' 'plagiarizing' of one another is a clear enough proof that we cannot apply our literary conventions and morals to the Bible, and the fact that the theory involves an appeal to pseudonymity ought not in itself to be allowed to rule out the possibility of a second century date.[22]

For the sake of argument, let us grant that what we might call the argument from theological propriety against a second century date (namely, that such a date involves the appearance of pseudo-nymity in the Bible) is not necessarily conclusive;

but also, on the other hand, that prediction of the second century events in the sixth century is both theologically possible, and pastorally relevant to the second century; and furthermore, that the historical arguments against a sixth century date are not necessarily conclusive. The question we might then ask is not 'could God?' but 'would God?' It seems to me to be at least arguable that the God who is revealed elsewhere in Scripture would not. He does not give signs and reveal dates. His statements about the future are calls to decision now; he is not the God of prognosticators.[23] He calls his people to naked faith and hope in him in the present, and does not generally bolster their faith with the kind of revelations that we are thinking of here. He does sometimes grant evidences to those who cannot believe without them, and thus we dare not exclude the possibility that this was the case with the book of Daniel. But the presumption is by no means in favour of this possibility.

Dating Daniel in the sixth century, indeed, brings not more glory to God but less. It makes it a less impressive and helpful document. It makes it seem more alien to me in my life of faith, for God does not treat me this way. But if in the book of Daniel God is revealing himself to his people in the second century, and calling them in that situation, by means of this strange literary form, to faith in him as the one who is Lord despite the evidence to the contrary, then this God I recognize both in Scripture and in experience. He is the one who says, 'Blessed are those who have not seen and yet have believed.'

[20] See the survey by D. S. Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic* (London: SCM, 1964), pp. 127-39. Russell himself appeals to the notion of 'corporate personality', but this is itself a dubious concept.

[21] Metzger, p. 22. The question why Daniel alone was included in the canon if it was of similar date and origin to other apocalypses, invites the responses (1) Have you read the other apocalypses? (2) Why weren't Paul's other letters included in the NT? (3) Perhaps Daniel's was the original?

[22] I have discussed these issues more generally in an article on 'Inspiration, Infallibility, and Criticism' in *The Churchman* 90 (1976), pp. 6-23.

[23] See recently the remarks of George Steiner in *After Babel* (London: OUP, 1975), pp. 146f.

Daniel: The Basic Issues

Gordon J. Wenham

[p.49]

There is a great gulf between the simple conservative view of Daniel and the liberal understanding of the book. The one holds that its stories tell of real events in which God's power was demonstrated and real prophecy disclosing his knowledge of the future: the other that its stories are parables, perhaps with a historical core, and that its prophecies are by and large interpretations of past history. The conservative believes that the book was written by a real Daniel living in the sixth century BC; the liberal by an unknown writer using Daniel as his pseudonym. In interpreting the book the two sides differ on various issues: the most important being, the identity of the four kingdoms in chapters 2 and 7. Does the last kingdom (*i.e.* the clay feet of the image, 2:41ff.; the fourth beast, 7:19ff.) represent

[p.50]

the Greek empire founded by Alexander (the liberal view) or the Roman empire (the traditional view)?

The articles by Gurney and Goldingay represent attempts to bridge the gulf between naive conservatism and liberal scepticism. Gurney argues that the fourth kingdom is indeed Greece, but that the book of Daniel was written in the sixth century and is therefore true predictive prophecy. Goldingay admits virtually the whole liberal position, but denies that this affects belief in the inspiration or canonicity of the book. How far do they succeed?

The issues surrounding the book of Daniel are certainly more complex than the uninitiated realize, and it may be helpful to set the Gurney/Goldingay proposals in a wider context. What are the arguments for a sixth-century date, and for a secondcentury date? And what are the difficulties with each view?

Arguments in favour of a sixth-century date
(1) *The book's claim to be predictive prophecy.* This is made on many occasions (2:29ff.; 4:24; cf. 31ff.; 5:24-30; chapters 7-12). Several times Daniel is told to write his visions down and seal them up (8:26; 12: 4, 9). This old prophetic custom was designed to demonstrate to sceptical audiences that God was indeed speaking through the prophet. When later something happened, they could check the sealed prophetic records to see what the prophet had said beforehand. If his word proved accurate that would suggest he was inspired (Is. 8:16; 29:11; 30:8; Je.30:2; 32:14; 36; Hab. 2:2ff.; cf. Dt. 18:22). Daniel explicitly compares his work to that of Jeremiah (9:2ff.).

(2) *The book's claim that the chief character and author lived in the sixth century BC.* Daniel was a contemporary of Nebuchadnezzar (605-562), Belshazzar (556-539) and Cyrus (539-530) (2:1; 5:1; 10:1 *etc.*).

(3) *The author's knowledge of Babylonian history* is unequalled by later authors. Dougherty wrote: '*the fifth chapter of Daniel ranks next to cuneiform literature in accuracy...* The total information found in all available chronologically-fixed documents later than the sixth

century BC... could not have provided the necessary material for the historical framework of the fifth chapter of Daniel.'[1]

Difficulties with a sixth-century date
(1) *Language.* Despite his famous dictum quoted by Goldingay, S. R. Driver admitted that linguistic evidence did not absolutely compel one to accept a late date for Daniel.[2] The study of K. A. Kitchen,[3] endorsed by the famous Aramaic scholar E. Y. Kutscher,[4] disposed of the linguistic argument for good.

(2) *Historical inaccuracies.* For example, Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-Nego were supposedly Babylonian names (1:7) but no suitable etymologies could be suggested for them. But now a satisfactory explanation has been offered.[5]

Another problem is that contemporary texts know nothing of Darius the Mede ruling as king in Babylon (5:31; 9:1; 11:1). Various suggestions have been made: two have some plausibility. One is that Darius is an alternative name of Gubaru, the governor of Babylon appointed by Cyrus.[6] The other is that Darius is an alternative name of Cyrus himself (cf. 6:28).[7] Neither seems wholly satisfactory, and this is one of the weaker points in the conservative view.

(3) *The apocalyptic character of the book* of *Daniel.* It is argued that since most works of apocalyptic date from the second century BC onwards, Daniel should be dated then too. This does not necessarily follow. First, Daniel is not pure apocalyptic. Second, the apocalyptic style may be partly inspired by Daniel and therefore the other works could be later than our book. Third, some other OT passages, *e.g.* Isaiah 25-27 and Zechariah 9ff. have apocalyptic features yet can hardly be dated as late as the second century.

(4) *Daniel 11.* Verses 21-39 describe the career of Antiochus Epiphanes in some detail, but the following verses (40-45) appear less accurate. Therefore it is argued that chapter 11 was written during the life-time of Antiochus. Up to verse 39 is retrospective historical narrative, but the closing verses are unfulfilled prophecy.

This is the most telling point against a 6th century date. But it rests on the assumption that the same people are being spoken of in verse 39 as in verse 40 and that there is no change of personnel (such as between 11:2 and 11:3, where there is a gap of some 130 years presupposed, between Xerxes and Alexander). Gurney believes that verses 40ff. refer to the exploits of the Romans in the East.

[p.51]

---

[1] R. P. Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (New Haven: Yale, 1929), pp. 199f.
[2] S. R. Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the OT*[9] (London: T. and T. Clark, 1913), p. 509.
[3] K. A. Kitchen, 'The Aramaic of Daniel' in *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel,* ed. D. J. Wiseman (London: Tyndale Press, 1965), pp. 31-79.
[On-line at http://www.biblicalstudies.org.uk/pdf/daniel_kitchen.pdf]
[4] E. Y. Kutscher, *Current Trends in Linguistics* 6 (1970), pp. 399-403.
[5] See A. R. Millard, 'Daniel 1-6 and History', *Evangelical Quarterly,* forthcoming.
[6] J. C. Whitcomb, *Darius the Mede*[2] (Presbyterian and Reformed, 1974).
[7] D. J. Wiseman, *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel*, pp. 9-18. [On-line at http://www.biblicalstudies.org.uk/pdf/daniel_wiseman.pdf]

Traditional exegetes believe these verses must be linked with chapter 12 and therefore refer to the last times. There does not seem to be enough information in these verses to decide between the various proposals.

Arguments in favour of a second-century date
These have already been eloquently expounded by John Goldingay, so it is hardly necessary to restate them in detail. Furthermore some of the difficulties facing a sixth-century date serve as arguments in favour of the second-century date, and conversely arguments in favour of a sixth-century origin are objections to a second-century date. Again I shall just pick out three arguments in favour of and four against the second-century date.

(1) *The emphasis on the Greek period in the prophecies.* All agree that the deeds of Alexander and his successors are described quite fully in chapters 8 and 11, but that the Romans are not discussed in detail unless the fourth kingdom refers to them. The prominence of Greece has been explained by Gurney. The Greek empire was the true precursor of Christ's coming: the Roman empire was contemporary with it. Incidentally to accept the Greek view together with a sixth-century dating is not a new view; it was held by various conservative Christians, including the Westminster divines, long before the Greek view became the hallmark of liberal orthodoxy.

(2) *The Maccabean age is the ideal* Sitz im Leben *for Daniel.* The book is designed to encourage men to remain faithful to the law even when persecuted. Few would doubt that Daniel proved very popular in Maccabean times, for it does record some remarkable deliverances in the face of oppression. It is not so clear, however, that it wants people to take up arms against godless rulers as the Maccabees did: Daniel and his friends seem to be passive resisters, not freedom fighters. For this reason von Rad[8] argued that Daniel was written by opponents of the Maccabees, not their supporters. One may ask whether Daniel would have provided much comfort to those suffering Antiochus' wrath, if it was not believed to be old and authentic. A book of new parables would have carried less conviction.

(3) *Prophecy is not long-range.* This is generally true but not a universal rule. While most prophetic teaching does deal with the immediate situation facing the people of God, more distant visions cannot be ruled out. Otherwise Isaiah's prophecies of Christ's birth and ministry or even our Lord's remarks about his second coming have to be explained away.

Difficulties with a second-century date
The historical Antiochus Epiphanes was unlike the Nebuchadnezzar and the Darius described in Daniel. Yet on the second-century view these figures should reflect the character of the great persecutor Antiochus. Whereas Antiochus deliberately attempted to root out the Jewish religion, Nebuchadnezzar and Darius persecuted faithful Jews only inadvertently and they were both converted after they had discovered their mistakes (see chapters 2, 3 and 6). Perhaps, though, the author of Daniel was more sanguine about Antiochus' salvation than appears from his prophecies.

---

[8] G. von Rad, Old *Testament Theology* II (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1965), p. 315.

(2) *The closing of the canon.* A recent study[9] has concluded that the OT canon was closed in Maccabean times, not at the end of the first century AD as is often asserted. Should this view win scholarly acceptance, it will become the more difficult to explain how Daniel was ever accepted into the canon if it was written in the second century BC. It is a surprise to find an allegedly pseudonymous work being accepted as holy Scripture at all; it would be startling if it were accepted as Scripture as soon as it appeared, when everybody would at least have realized its novelty.

(3) *The prophecy of the 70 weeks* (*9:24-27*). It is impossible to squeeze in 490 years between the decree of Cyrus (538 BC) and the Maccabean period, c. 170 BC. Messianic interpreters argue that if the decree of Artaxerxes in Ezra 7 (458 BC) is the starting point, this prophecy gives a fairly accurate date for Christ's crucifixion c. AD 32. But more probably 490 is a symbolic number, equal to ten jubilees (Lv. 25).

(4) *Theology and pseudonymity.* Goldingay makes a case for supposing that pseudonymity is not incompatible with inspiration. Conservative theologians might accept this if it were proved that pseudonymous writing was an accepted convention which deceived none of its original readers. What worries me is not so much the alleged pseudonymity but the claim that Daniel's God, unlike the gods of Babylon, knows and reveals the future (2:27ff.). The idea that God declares his future purposes to his servants is at the heart of the book's theology. If, however, Daniel is a second-century work, one of its central themes is discredited, and it could be argued that Daniel ought to be relegated to the Apocrypha and not retain full canonical status as part of OT Scripture.

[p.52]

Conclusion

A brief summary cannot do justice to the complexity of the problems associated with the book of Daniel. If these articles have highlighted some of them, and saved conservatives and liberals alike from defending their pet theories with unjustified dogmatism, they will have served their purpose. They are a reminder that in many areas the 'assured' results of criticism need rethinking. In formulating his critical views the evangelical scholar must take with equal seriousness the explicit claims of the biblical writings (*e.g.* when they say they were written) and the implicit indications of a different date of authorship (*e.g.* historical imprecisions or late words). Simple-minded conservatives pay attention only to the former and forget about the implicit data, while naive liberals disregard the explicit claims of the biblical writings and base their theories solely on the latter. Those who believe that all Scripture is inspired by God should listen both to what Scripture says about its composition and to what it implies about its origins.[10]

---

[9] S. Z. Leiman, *The Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures* (Hamden: Archon Books, 1976).
[10] I have discussed the theological implications of critical study in 'History and the Old Testament' in *History, Criticism and Faith,* ed. C. Brown (shortly to be published by IVP).

A bibliographical guide to the study of the reformation

Part 1: Beginnings

A Skevington Wood

In 1971-72 the TSF Bulletin *carried three biblio-graphical articles covering the early and the modern periods of church history (TSFB 59, 60 and 63). A companion article on the Reformation was delayed, but we are now grateful to Dr A. Skevington Wood of Cliff College, near Sheffield, England, for filling the gap. We expect to publish Part II of his bibli-ography in about a year's time.*

Part I of this guide deals with the inception of the reform movement in Germany and Switzerland, with particular reference to the three key figures, Luther, Calvin and Zwingli. Erasmus, whose in-fluence is increasingly recognized, is also included, along with Melanchthon and Bucer. The spread of Protestantism will be reserved for Part II, as will the Radical Reformation which is engaging so much attention at present. The catalogue consists mainly of works written in English within the last thirty years and goes out of its way to urge the student to get at the primary sources, *i.e.* the products of the reformers themselves. Books are listed with the publisher's name and the date of publication (occasionally the latest edition is recom-mended): the place of publication is London unless otherwise indicated.

1. Source material

The most comprehensive one-volume selection is still *Documents Illustrative of the Continental Re-formation*, ed. B. J. Kidd (OUP, 1911), although students should be warned that whereas German is translated into English, Latin and Greek are not. *The Reformation in its Own Words*, ed. H. J. Hillerbrand (SCM, 1964) relates well-chosen extracts to the developing course of the movement and thus aims to provide a consecutive history rather than a mere anthology. Hillerbrand has collected items of more specifically theological interest in *The Protestant Reformation* (New York: Harper and Row, 1968). The wide-ranging documents in G. R. Elton's *Renaissance and Reformation 1300-1648*[a] (New York: Macmillan, 1976) include much il-luminating material. The writings of the reformers themselves constitute a major source and these will be indicated below. *Concordia or Book of Concord: the Symbols of the Evangelical Lutheran Church* (St Louis: Concordia, 1957) contains the Augsburg Confession, the Schmalkald Articles, and Luther's two catechisms. *Reformed Confessions of the Six-teenth Century*, ed. A. C. Cochrane (SCM, 1966) covers twelve statements of faith from Zwingli's

Sixty-Seven Articles (1523) to the Second Helvetic Confession (1566), with crisp introductions to each.

2. Reference works

A bird's eye view of the Reformation can easily be gained by reading R. D. Linder's entry in *The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. J. D. Douglas (Exeter: Paternoster, 1974). *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*,[a] ed. F. L. Cross (OUP, 1974) is rather less sympathetic. The articles by E. G. Rupp in *Encyclopedia Britannica* (1964 ed.) vol. 19, and by R. H. Bainton in *The New Encyclopedia Britannica* (1974) vol. 15 are preferable to that by G. G. Coulton in previous editions (1929-1957). *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, ed. J. Hastings (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1908-27) carries a clear account of the Reformation by H. M. Gwatkin, as well as helpful contributions by H. E. Jacobs and J. Orr on Luther and Calvinism respectively. The best over-all reference work for the Reformation, however, is *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia for Religious Knowledge*, 13 vols., ed. S. M. Jackson (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1949-50), based on the revised *Real-Encyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, ed. J. Herzog, G. L. Plitt and A. Hauck. It needs to be supplemented and on occasions corrected in the light of more recent research. *The New Cambridge Modern History*, II, *The Reformation 1520-1559*, ed. G. R. Elton (CUP, 1958) contains detailed analyses by experts in their field.

3. General histories

For a brief and comprehensive introduction from the historical angle the student should begin with R. H. Bainton, *The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1953). Bainton rightly insists that the Reformation was a religious revival. The background of the period is admirably filled in by G. R. Elton, *Reformation Europe 1517-1559* (Collins Fontana, 1963), while O. Chadwick, *The Reformation* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1964) describes the transformation of the church. H. J. Grimm, *The Reformation Era 1550-1650*[a] (New York: Macmillan, 1973) is notably useful, but F. Lau and E. Bizer, *A History of the Reformation in Germany* (Black, 1969) is somewhat disappointing and suffers from an indifferent translation. E. G. Léonard's comprehensive *History of Protestantism* is being reproduced in English and the first of these volumes, on the Reformation, appeared in 1965 (Nelson). J. Lortz, *The Reformation in Germany*, 2 vols. (Darton, Longman and Todd, 1968) represented a landmark in the Roman Catholic approach when it was first published in 1939-40. H. J.

Hillerbrand, *Christendom Divided: the Protestant Reformation* (Hutchinson, 1971) makes a necessary distinction between religious, theological and political factors. K. Holl's illuminating essay on *The Cultural Significance of the Reformation* (New York: Meridian, 1959) is essential reading.

V. H. H. Green, *Renaissance and Reformation*[a] (Arnold, 1964) is a standard textbook designed for undergraduates, while H. Holborn, *A History of Modern Germany: 1. The Reformation* (New York: Knopf, 1959) presents the national standpoint. S. A. Fischer-Galati, *Ottoman Imperialism and German Protestantism 1521-1555* (OUP, 1959) underlines political pressures not fully appreciated before. The sociological significance of the Reformation cannot properly be overlooked and A. G. Dickens, *Reformation and Society in Sixteenth Century Europe* (Thames and Hudson, 1966) serves as a short if admittedly sketchy introduction. R. Pascal, *The Social Basis of the German Reformation* (Watts, 1933) and J. Lecler, *Toleration and the Reformation*, 2 vols. (Longmans, 1960) are more thoroughgoing specialist studies, the latter by a Roman Catholic scholar.

4. Luther

a. *Luther and the German Reformation*

A first-class appetizer for the general reader is A. G. Dickens, *Martin Luther and the Reformation* (EUP, 1967). The same writer's Birkbeck Lectures on *The German Nation and Martin Luther* (Arnold, 1974) reveal the reformer as leading a genuinely popular movement. Strong on the political side, but less impressive when dealing with theology, is V. H. H. Green, *Luther and the Reformation*,[a] published in the University Paperbacks series (Methuen, 1969). J. Atkinson, *The Great Light: Luther and the Reformation* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1968) sees Luther as the focal figure in a distinctly religious renewal.

b. *Luther's works*

The novice should start with *Martin Luther*, ed. E. G. Rupp and B. Drewery (Arnold, 1970)—a judicious and attractive anthology. As the editors explain, documents are quoted as fully as possible 'rather than innumerable extracts marred by too frequent dots, which as all historians learn to fear often cover all manner of creeping things.' *Luther*, ed. I. D. K. Siggins (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1972) contains selections freshly translated from the definitive Weimar edition, with hints on the critical treatment of sources. Already well established are *Reformation Writings of Martin Luther*, 2 vols. ed. B. L. Woolf (Lutterworth, 1952-55) and *Martin Luther: Selections from his Writings*, ed. J. Dillen-

berger (New York: Doubleday, 1961). Beyond these collections, the most practical shorter edition for students is *Selected Writings of Martin Luther*, 4 vols. ed. T. G. Tappert (Philadelphia, Fortress, 1967). The fine American edition of *Luther's Works*, 56 vols., ed. J. J. Pelikan and H. T. Lehmann (St Louis: Concordia; Philadelphia: Fortress), begun in 1955, is nearing completion, and is incomparable in its scope. Four volumes in *The Library of Christian Classics* (SCM) cover Luther: *Luther's Lectures on Romans*, ed. W. Pauck, 15 (1962); *Luther: Early Theological Works*, ed. J. Atkinson, 16 (1962); *Luther and Erasmus on Free Will*, ed. E. G. Rupp, 17 (1969); and *Luther's Letters of Spiritual Counsel*, ed. T. G. Tappert, 18 (1955). Each has an instructive introduction. The famous *Commentary on Galatians*, ed. P. S. Watson (Clarke, 1953), originally published in 1535, is now presented in a revised and completed translation based on that of 1575. Volumes 26 and 27 of the American edition contain both the 1535 Lectures on Galatians and those of 1519 in modern English.

c. *Lives of Luther*

The first of the Luther biographies was written by his close friend, Philip Melanchthon, and since then their name has been legion. For a review and assessment, see E. W. Zeeden, *The Legacy of Luther* (Hollis and Carter, 1954). We can only mention a few of the most recent. Authentic and delightfully readable is R. H. Bainton, *Here I Stand* (New York: Abingdon, 1950). Exhaustive, and not a little exhausting by reason of its massive erudition, is E. G. Schwiebert, *Luther and his Times* (St Louis: Concordia, 1950). This is an indispensable store of information. An authoritative summary is found in G. Ritter, *Martin Luther: his Life and Work* (Collins, 1963), while the breach with Rome is dealt with in H. Boehmer, *Martin Luther: Road to Reformation* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1946) and E. G. Rupp, *Luther's Progress to the Diet of Worms* (SCM, 1951).

d. *Luther's Theology*

H. Bornkamm, *Luther's World of Thought* (St Louis: Concordia, 1958) is dedicated to R. H. Bainton and admirably complements his biography. First published in Germany in 1947, it shows that the categories of Luther's teaching are valid for today. A pioneer survey in English was P. S. Watson, *Let God be God! An Interpretation of the Theology of Luther* (Epworth, 1947) which retains its value. The most detailed and systematic treatment is found in P. Althaus, *The Theology of Martin Luther* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966). Essential in-

sights are reflected in E. G. Rupp, *The Righteousness of God* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1953). G. Ebeling, *Luther: an Introduction to his Thought* (Collins, 1970) is an exciting analysis of Luther's dialectical method which tends to read too much back into the sixteenth century. Original research is evidenced in J. Wicks, *Man Yearning for Grace: Luther's Early Spiritual Teaching* (Washington: Corpus, 1968).

From a long list of studies dealing with specific themes in Luther we can pick out only a few. His handling of Scripture is crucial and in this area H. Bornkamm, *Luther and the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969) is masterly. H. S. Bluhm, *Luther, Creative Translator* (St Louis: Concordia, 1965) is based on sound philological investigation. In J. M. Headley, *Luther's View of Church History* (New Haven: Yale University, 1963) the claim is made that the biblical interpretation of history found a major expression in Luther. V. Vajta, *Luther on Worship* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1958) is concerned with the theological presuppositions of liturgy, while R. Prenter, *Spiritus Creator* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1956) is an outstanding treatment of Luther's teaching on the Holy Spirit. It leads neatly to J. J. Pelikan, *Spirit versus Structure: Luther and the Institution of the Church* (Collins, 1968) which in turn follows on from *Obedient Rebels* (SCM, 1964) by the same author. A neglected aspect of Luther—namely, his exposition of Christian ethics—is covered by G. W. Forell, *Faith Active in Love* (New York: American Press, 1954).

5. Calvin

a. *Calvin and the Reformation in Switzerland*

Part II of J. T. McNeill, *The History and Character of Calvinism* (OUP, 1954) deals with 'Calvin and the Reformation in Geneva'. J. Mackinnon, *Calvin and the Reformation* (Longmans Green, 1936) provides an over-all account which still has merit, as does W. Walker, *John Calvin, the Organizer of Reformed Protestantism 1509-1564* (New York: Putnam's, 1906).

b. *Calvin's works*

A conveniently simple entrée is supplied by H. T. Kerr, *Introduction to the Writings of John Calvin* (New York: Association Press, 1960) in the Reflection Book series. The same editor was responsible for *A Compend of the Institutes of the Christian Religion* (Lutterworth, 1964), which is an alternative to *A Calvin Treasury: Selections from the Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ed. W. F. Keesecker (SCM, 1963). There is unfortunately no uniform set of Calvin's works in English to match the American edition of Luther. The *Institutes* has been translated

by F. L. Battles in what is virtually a new critical edition made from the Latin text of 1559; *Calvin: Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 2 vols., ed. J. T. McNeill (*Library of Christian Classics* 20, 21; SCM, 1960). This is a considerable improvement on the cramped and dated style of Beveridge's version. The same series includes *Calvin: Theological Treatises*, ed. J. K. S. Reid, 22 (1954), and *Calvin: Commentaries*, ed. J. Haroutunian, 23 (1958)—extended extracts on major themes.

The Calvin Translation Society of Edinburgh published a forty-volume set of the reformer's biblical commentaries from 1843 to 1855. These are still available from Eerdmans. The St Andrew Press of Edinburgh, taking over from Oliver and Boyd, is producing a new and more accurate rendering of the New Testament expositions edited by D. W. and T. F. Torrance (twelve volumes to date). T. H. L. Parker, *Calvin's New Testament Commentaries* (SCM, 1971) is a good introduction to Calvin's methods. Some of Calvin's more important occasional writings have recently been reprinted as *Tracts and Treatises*, 3 vols., ed. T. F. Torrance (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1958). *Concerning the Eternal Predestination of God*, ed. J. K. S. Reid (Clarke, 1961) is mandatory for all who would grasp Calvin's viewpoint. *Letters of John Calvin*, 4 vols. ed. J. Bonnet (New York: Franklin, 1972-73) is a reprint of the Edinburgh and Philadelphia editions of 1855-58. Calvin, like Luther, deserves to be read at first hand. As Jean Cadier remarks, 'the student will find . . . that Calvin makes richer and more straightforward reading than any of his expositors.'

c. *Lives of Calvin*

Théodore de Bèze was the first in the line of Calvin's biographers and his account may be read in vol. I of *Tracts and Treatises*. E. Doumergue's monumental panegyric in French (8 vols., 1899-1927) lacks an English translator. An easily read trailer is T. H. L. Parker, *A Portrait of Calvin* (SCM, 1954), leading to the same writer's *John Calvin: A Biography* (Dent, 1975). J. Cadier, *The Man God Mastered* (IVP, 1960) treats Calvin as 'one of the great warriors of the Spirit,' while A-M. Schmidt, *Calvin and the Calvinistic Tradition* (Longmans, 1960) places him in historical perspective as 'the second patriarch of the Protestant Reformation.' 'You animate history, you do not invent it,' was Doumergue's compliment to the litterateur, E. Stickelberger, author of *Calvin: A Life* (Clarke, 1959; German 1931). Doing double duty both as a biography and an introduction to Calvin's theology is F. Wendel, *Calvin: The Origin and Development of his Religious Thought* (Collins Fontana, 1965) which is commendably free from ideological preconceptions.

d. *Calvin's theology*

A. M. Hunter, *The Teaching of Calvin*[2] (Clarke, 1950), first published in 1920, holds its ground as a convincing exposition. The author is Adam Mitchell Hunter of New College, Edinburgh, as distinct from Archibald MacBride Hunter of Aberdeen. W. Niesel, *The Theology of Calvin* (Lutterworth, 1956) supplements Hunter as a basic survey. T. H. L. Parker, *Doctrine of the Knowledge of God: A Study in the Theology of John Calvin* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1952), though brief, is useful as a general introduction as well as a specialized study. As belonging to the latter category it may be filled out from E. A. Dowey, *The Knowledge of God in Calvin's Theology* (New York: Columbia, 1952). T. F. Torrance, *Calvin's Doctrine of Man* (Lutterworth, 1949), rich in quotation from a wide range of the reformer's writings, sets the record straight especially on the image of God and total perversity. On the atonement, P. van Buren, *Christ in our Place: The Substitutionary Character of Calvin's Doctrine of Reconciliation* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957) no doubt raises evangelical eyebrows by the juxtaposition of author and subject, but is nevertheless a sympathetic piece of work. R. S. Wallace, *Calvin's Doctrine of Word and Sacrament* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1953) should be compared with K. McDonnell, *John Calvin, the Church and the Eucharist* (Princeton University Press, 1967), a well-received study by a Roman Catholic scholar. R. S. Wallace, *Calvin's Doctrine of the Christian Life* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1959) is a reminder that reformed theology is not coolly theoretical, while H. Quistorp, *Calvin's Theology of the Last Things* (Lutterworth, 1955) examines his views on soul sleep, among other eschatological items. For an appreciation of Calvin as a preacher, see T. H. L. Parker, *The Oracles of God* (Lutterworth, 1947) and for moving samples of his preaching, turn to *Sermons on the Death and Passion of Christ*, ed. T. H. L. Parker (Clarke, 1936). Some important essays are contained in *John Calvin*, ed. G. E. Duffield (Appleford: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1966)—including J. I. Packer on 'Calvin the Theologian' and J. Cadier on 'Calvin and the Union of the Churches.' W. F. Graham, *The Constructive Revolutionary: John Calvin and his Socio-Economic Impact* (Richmond: Knox, 1971) is the best current assessment of the Weber-Tawney thesis.

6. Zwingli

Ulrich Zwingli has been dubbed 'the great unknown of the Reformation' but scholars are increasingly realizing his stature. A fully annotated German edition of his collected works was completed in 1969. The standard English translation is *The Latin Works of Huldreich Zwingli with Selections from his German Works*, 3 vols., ed. S. M. Jackson and C. N. Heller (Philadelphia: Heidelberg Press, 1912-29). In *The Library of Christian Classics* (SCM) there are selections in *Zwingli and Bullinger*, ed. G. W. Bromiley, 24 (1953), prefaced by a review of Zwingli's life, work and theology. The most detailed German biography is that in four volumes by O. Farner yet to be done into English. There is, however, a translation of a much shorter popular life in O. Farner, *Zwingli the Reformer* (Lutterworth, 1952), reprinted in 1968. The most attractive non-specialist biography in English is J. Rilliet, *Zwingli: Third Man of the Reformation* (Lutterworth, 1964), presenting him as a prophetic figure 'at once prudent and audacious'. For a concise analysis of Zwingli's teaching the student should consult J. Courvoisier, *Zwingli, A Reformed Theologian* (Epworth, 1964). R. C. Walton, *Zwingli's Theocracy* (OUP, 1968) discusses the type of corporate government established in Zürich and the relationship between clergy and magistrates.

7. Erasmus

Erasmus of Rotterdam is nowadays regarded as a reformer in his own right. A new edition of his Latin works in twenty volumes was launched in 1969 from Amsterdam. His collected works in English are now being released in forty-five volumes, starting with *The Correspondence of Erasmus: Letters 1 to 141 (1484 to 1501)*, ed. B. Corrigan (University of Toronto Press, 1974). Ten major works of Erasmus are also translated separately, including *Praise of Folly*, ed. A. H. T. Levi (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971), *The Colloquies*, ed. C. R. Thompson (Chicago University Press, 1965), and *On Free Will*, ed. E. F. Winter (New York: Ungar, 1961). The *Enchiridion* is in *Advocates of Reform*, ed. M. Spinka (*Library of Christian Classics* 14; SCM, 1953), together with an informative essay on 'Desiderius Erasmus, A Humanistic Reformer'.

J. Huizinga, *Erasmus of Rotterdam* (Phaidon, 1952) is a justly famous biography (1924) which is still worth reading. It has been reproduced as *Erasmus and the Age of Reformation* (New York: Harper Torchbook, 1957). The best recent life is R. H. Bainton, *Erasmus of Christendom* (New York:

Scribners, 1969), now available as a paperback (Collins Fontana, 1972). A. Hyma, *The Youth of Erasmus²* (New York: Russell and Russell, 1968) and M. M. Phillips, *Erasmus and the Northern Renaissance* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1949) are worth attention. L. Bouyer, *Erasmus and the Humanist Experiment* (Chapman, 1959) should be compared with the same writer's final chapter in *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, vol. 2, *The West from the Fathers to the Reformation*, ed. G. W. H. Lampe (CUP, 1969). J. W. Aldridge, *The Hermeneutic of Erasmus* (Richmond: Knox, 1966) and J. B. Payne, *Erasmus: His Theology of the Sacraments* (Richmond: Knox, 1969) deal with important aspects of his thought. A more general coverage is found in *Erasmus of Rotterdam: A Quincentennial Symposium* ed. R. L. de Molen (New York: Twayne, 1971).

8. Melanchthon and Bucer

a. *Melanchthon*

A modern selected edition of Melanchthon's works was begun in 1951 under the supervision of R. Stupperich. The English reader can use *Melanchthon: Selected Writings*, ed. E. E. Flack and L. J. Satre (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1962). His *Loci Communes* is accessible in *The Library of Christian Classics* (SCM): *Melanchthon and Bucer*, ed. W. Pauck, 19 (1969). The most readable biography is C. Manschreck, *Melanchthon, the Quiet Reformer* (New York: Abingdon, 1958). R. Stupperich, *Melanchthon* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965) is a popular account from a leading authority. More recent is M. Rogness, *Melanchthon: Reformer without Honour* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1969). An intriguing question is raised in F. Hildebrandt, *Melanchthon: Alien or Ally?* (CUP, 1946).

b. *Bucer*

According to T. F. Torrance, *Kingdom and Church: A Study in the Theology of the Reformation* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1956), 'history has not yet taken its full measure of Martin Butzer'. Torrance deals with Bucer's 'Eschatology of Love' in chapter two. F. Wendel and R. Stupperich were chiefly responsible for an edition of Bucer's works started in 1955. There are translated extracts in D. F. Wright, *Common Places of Martin Bucer* (Appleford: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1972) and *The Library of Christian Classics* 19 contains his *De Regno Christi*. His life is effectively covered by H. Eells, *Martin Bucer* (New York: Russell and Russell, 1971; reprinted from 1931). W. P. Stephens, *The Holy Spirit in the Theology of Martin Bucer*

(CUP, 1970) regards this as 'the pivotal doctrine' in the writings of 'the neglected reformer'. The fruits of the Bucer renaissance in Holland are reflected, for example, in G. J. Van de Poll, *Martin Bucer's Liturgical Ideas* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1954). There are chapters on 'Luther and Butzer' and 'Calvin and Butzer' in W. Pauck, *The Heritage of the Reformation* (OUP, 1968).