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In *Vetus Testamentum* IV, 1954, pp. 246-275, Professor H. L. Ginsberg makes a sustained and intemperate attack on me which compels me to crave space for a brief reply. Ginsberg and I have been friends for so long that I shall try to be more restrained in reply than he has been in attack, since I desire our friendship to continue.

In my presidential address to the Society for Old Testament study, delivered in January 1950, and printed in the *Hebrew Union College Annual* XXIII (not XXXIII, as stated by Ginsberg), Part I, and in my book *The Servant of the Lord*, I dealt with the problem of the unity of the book of Daniel. Ginsberg says that he was the main target of my attack, and that his monograph was obviously the immediate occasion of my choice of subject. I invite him to turn again to my address, which occupies thirty-two pages in *The Servant of the Lord*. Some six of these pages are devoted to Ginsberg, and he is one of more than a score of authors whose divisive views I review. Over a period of thirty years now I have published articles dealing with problems of the book of Daniel, as well as two books devoted to the same range of problems. Professor Ginsberg can hardly claim that because he had written on the book of Daniel in 1948, it was improper for me to refer to it again, or that there was anything unnatural in my choosing for my presidential address an aspect of the subject in which I have been particularly interested throughout my working life. Had I refrained from mentioning his view, he would have had reason to complain; he has none to complain that I gave it its due place in a review of so many opinions, which divide the book in various ways. I gave it no undue space, and imported no heat into my references to him that could justify the supposition that he was the main target of my attack. In truth no one was the target of my attack. The reader who reflects that
Ginsberg's reply to my few pages is of about the same length as my whole article will have a better sense of proportion than Ginsberg has been able to maintain.

He writes of my 'jihad' against divisive theories, and my 'phobia' against them. I deplore such language in scholarly discussion. The view which I defended was not original with me, but has long been common amongst scholars of widely different schools. It is to be regretted that Ginsberg should speak of 'Rowley's muddleheaded propagandist', and so forth, in his subtle effort to conceal the fact that while his own view is peculiar to himself, mine is not. He says: 'I have proved elsewhere to the satisfaction of anyone who has no mental block against being satisfied...', when all that this unfortunate choice of language means is the modest assertion that he has proved something to his own satisfaction. I greatly regret that Vetus Testamentum has sunk to this level of controversy. Let it be remembered that there has been a great variety of divisive theory on the book of Daniel. Of the many such theories put forward Ginsberg rejects all but one, and he is the sole exponent of that view. Why should it be evidence of 'phobia' against divisive views in me that I reject one more of them than does Ginsberg?

He does not hesitate to mislead his readers about my positions in his effort to discredit them. On p. 267 he says that when Jerome speaks of those 'qui in Syria Ptolemaeo favebant', he means by Syria Coele-Syria. No reader would imagine that I had drawn attention to this possibility in my Darius the Mede, p. 113 n., in a passage to which Ginsberg refers for what suits him, though I had in fairness added that Bouché-Leclercq took a different view. Ginsberg goes on to add that I adduce three supporting witnesses for Ptolemy VI's kingship over the Seleucid empire, and then points out that this evidence deals with a period twenty years after the time of Antiochus IV. He omits to inform his readers that this is precisely what I said in the passage he referred to, and that that passage was written to correct an imprecise statement of Wright's that Ptolemy VI never sat on the Syrian throne, and had no relevance whatever to the issues between Ginsberg and myself. He pours some scorn on me by drawing some analogy between the afterthoughts I find in the book of Daniel and the 'afterthought' of the tears consequent upon the spanking his imaginary child received (p. 254), when there is nothing even remotely comparable in it. Such afterthoughts as I find in the book of Daniel are clearly there in the present text, and it is not I,