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By its inclusion in the prophetic corpus, the Book of Daniel with its message of God’s final control over human destiny sheds a significant new light on the whole prophetic tradition.

IN THE GREEK, the Latin, and all succeeding translations of the Bible, the Book of Daniel has been positioned as one of the four major prophets. That means that for fifteen hundred years there was no doubt among Christian theologians about the prophetic authority of the book and its author. Since the printing of the first Rabbinic Bible in the early sixteenth century A.D., however, scholars have become aware that in the Hebrew-Aramaic Bible Daniel was placed not among the prophets but among the Writings (Ketubim). It was not until the growth of historical criticism in the eighteenth century and its applications to Daniel, however, that this issue was given serious consideration. The English deist Anthony Collins in his Scheme of Literal Prophecy Considered took up the issue. He quoted Maimonides with great pleasure:

Unanimi consensu gens nostra retulit librum Danielis inter libros Hagiographos, non vero propheticos!2

Regarding the Rabbinic Bible and its order as older and more reliable than

*1 would like to thank Dwight R. Daniels for improving my English.
that of the Septuagint and its followers, Collins denied the prophetic character of the content of Daniel's book. As did the anti-Christian Neoplatonist Porphyry (died about A.D. 304), Collins declared that all the Danielic predictions were *vaticinia ex eventu* (prophecies after the event), that they were written in the Maccabean era, and that they represented intentional forgeries.

Although this verdict was not accepted by all critical exegetes of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the strange position of the book in the Hebrew canon was debated again and again. It was, indeed, explained with reference to the historical circumstances of the formation of that canon rather than with regard to the contents of the book. By presupposing a relatively early closing of the canon of the prophetic books (c200 A.D.), scholars made the incorporation of Daniel among the Writings a cornerstone of the so-called Maccabean Theory\(^3\) (i.e., the theory that Daniel was written late, sometime in the first half of the second century B.C.). Subsequently, however, the question often arose whether such a pseudepigraphical book could really be called prophetic, and whether the Rabbinic doctrinal tradition that the spirit of prophecy ceased with the early postexilic century was perhaps the correct one after all. Corresponding judgments may be found in many modern introductions to the Old Testament and in commentaries on Daniel. Thus Otto Eissfeldt writes in his sophisticated *Introduction*, “The fact that the book was not included in the canon of the prophets shows already that it can only have been composed very late.”\(^4\)

In the latest important commentary Hartman and DiLella offer a similar view:

> It is possible that the rabbis did not consider the Book of Daniel as a prophetic writing. More probable, however, is the theory that because the book appeared so late (second quarter of the second century B.C.) it could not be included in the prophetic corpus which the rabbis held to be closed with the death of the fifth century B.C. prophet Malachi.\(^5\)

As the result of regarding the incorporation of Daniel among the Writings in the Masoretic Bible as the original position, two difficult questions arose. The first concerned the date of origin. Against its own
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claims, Daniel was not regarded as having been written in exilic times but in late postexilic times after the close of the prophetic corpus. The second question concerned the nature of Daniel’s content. If the author belonged to the Maccabean era, then his predictions are for the most part *vaticinia ex eventu*. Could he under these circumstances have been anything more than an imitator of classical prophecy? Does this not exclude the possibility that he could have been a genius of the same caliber as Isaiah? On the other hand, is it really certain that he wanted to be a prophet in the first place and that the intended circle of his readers did indeed view him as such a figure? All these issues must be considered if one takes seriously the location of the Book of Daniel among the *Ketubim* in the Masoretic collection.

Must that location of Daniel be taken all that seriously, however? To be sure the order of the Hebrew-Aramaic Bible is attested by the oldest available manuscripts, but they belong to the ninth and tenth centuries (Codex Leningradensis and Aleppo-Codex). That is a rather late date. Is there any other evidence which may strengthen the case?

Daniel—A Non-prophetic Book

1. In addition to the transmission of the order of Bible manuscripts, there are two explicit passages in the Gemara of the Babylonian Talmud which thematise the incorporation of Daniel among the *K’etubim* and not the prophets. The first one is bBB 14b where the sequence of the Hag­iographa is listed and Daniel appears before Esther and Ezra. The other one is bMeg 3a where Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi as prophets were distinguished from Daniel, who is important but not prophetic. The Babylonian Talmud was written in the fifth—eighth centuries A.D., somewhat earlier than the above mentioned Bible manuscripts.

2. A very early witness is provided by the list of the Worthies in Wisdom of Sirach (Ecclesiasticus) 44—50, about 180 B.C. The author Ben Sira names the three major prophets and Job as the fourth (49:9) together with the Book of the Twelve (i.e., the Minor Prophets) but not Daniel. Daniel’s name is also absent from among the heroes of the Exile and the time thereafter who are drawn from the *K’etubim*, such as Zerubbabel, Joshua the high priest, and Nehemiah. That absence, however, reduces the value of this passage as evidence of the non-prophetic view of Daniel, because it points to a later origin for our book. Ben Sira knows no Daniel at all, neither among the prophets nor among the *K’etubim*.

---

3. In the period shortly after the discovery of the Qumran texts, doubts about an originally prophetic understanding of the Book of Daniel were strengthened. Cave 6 revealed some Daniel fragments written on papyrus and not on leather; they thus appeared in a less prestigious format than the other canonical books. As a result the opinion seemed justified that the Qumran community, in spite of its high respect for the prophets, did not include Daniel in the Holy Scriptures and therefore did not accord his book prophetic rank. More recently, however, that opinion has been abandoned, as we shall see below.

4. Until 1965 the discussion of the prophetic claim of the book was based on evidence drawn from outside the book itself (see 1–3) or from literary critical hypotheses (the Maccabean theory). In that year Gerhard von Rad in his second volume of *Old Testament Theology* turned his view to the internal contextual evidence, following some suggestions of Hoelscher which had been neglected up until then. Von Rad points first to the title of the alleged author. He is named a wise man (Dan. 1:3–5; 2:48–49) and not a nabi (“prophet”). From a form-critical perspective Daniel does not belong to the prophetic genre, and there are no clear indications of such a genre at all. To be sure, Daniel utters predictions, but that is not due to any prophetic impulse; rather, it flows out of the interpretation of dreams, something which belonged to the task of the sages in the ancient Near East. Moreover the intention of the book is not to take part in actual social and political conflicts, something which the prophets Amos and Isaiah did. The book presents history from a spectator’s point of view in a deterministic fashion and results in a positively hybrid-seeming universal gnosis. To regard the author as a successor of the prophets is completely out of the question. Von Rad concluded that the only possible root from which the Book of Daniel can have grown was Wisdom.

Although von Rad is completely correct in his first observation—Daniel’s title—and partially correct in the second one—the question of the genre, his conclusions about the intention of the author are rather speculative. The attribution of Daniel to Wisdom literature has to meet the severe objection that Wisdom literature shows no real form-critical parallels to Daniel. In addition, there is no sign in Wisdom literature of a special interest in eschatology in the beginning of the second century B.C. (e.g.,
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Ben Sira), whereas this interest is dominant at least in the second part of the Book of Daniel. As a result, only a few scholars accepted von Rad’s views in this matter. We shall return to some of his arguments later on, but first we must consider the tradition which places Daniel among the prophetic books.

Daniel Among the Prophetic Books

There are some early witnesses in which Daniel is called a prophet and in which his writing is placed among the prophetic books.

1. The most famous source is Matthew 24:15. Jesus is admonishing his disciples: “When you see the desolating sacrilege spoken of by the prophet Daniel (to rhethen dia Daniel tou prophétou), standing in the holy place . . . .” That is, of course, a clear reference to Daniel 9:27 (11:31, 12:11). Although explicit reference to Daniel and his prophetic utterance is missing in the parallel passage in Mark 13:14, it is nevertheless apparent that the church of Saint Matthew in the second half of the first century A.D. did reckon Daniel among the prophets. Was that solely a Christian perspective?

2. The order of the books in the Septuagint places Daniel in the second division of Scripture, namely the prophetic writings, and this is the case in all manuscripts as well as in the lists of the early church fathers. Although Daniel could either precede Ezekiel (Origen, third century; Melito, second century, etc.) or follow Ezekiel (LXXBA, fourth–fifth centuries; pap. 967, second or early third century), the association of Daniel with the prophetic group is consistent. At one time the Septuagint was regarded as the Alexandrinian canon. Sundberg has raised some doubts about this place of origin, however. Perhaps the Diaspora in Alexandria used only the Pentateuch as normative Scripture; they are after all the only books quoted in the Letter of Aristeas and in the writings of Philo, both of which originated in Alexandria. In my opinion, however (against Sundberg), the firm order which already appears in the earliest papyri of the Septuagint presupposes an old Jewish diaspora canon, whether from Egypt outside Alexandria (e.g., Leontopolis) or from Syria (perhaps Antiochis). Wherever Daniel is preserved in the Greek Bible, it is placed among the prophetic books. (In the current LXX, the original Septuagint version of the book is replaced by another pre-Christian version which was [wrongly]

14. Ibid., chap. 5.
ascribed to Theodotion. This problem does not touch the order of the Scriptures, so it may remain outside our present consideration."

3. The next witness is Josephus, the historian. In his Against Apion I, 38–41 (about 100 A.D.) he writes concerning books given by divine inspiration:

... five are the books of Moses ... This period falls only a little short of three thousand years. From the death of Moses until Artaxerxes ... the prophets subsequent to Moses wrote the history of the events of their own times in thirteen books. The remaining four books contain hymns to God and precepts for the conduct of human life.

There is no doubt that Josephus included Daniel, who plays an important role in his Judean history, among these normative Scriptures. It is also clear that the book does not belong to the above mentioned third category, the hymns and precepts (probably Psalms, Song of Songs or Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes) but to the prophetic group. Josephus also writes of Daniel as one of the greatest prophets in Jewish Antiquities X, xi (4). Because he belonged to the Pharisees, Josephus certainly refers to a canon of that group, perhaps the canon of the school of Hillel. For these people Daniel was one of the prophetic voices within the Scriptures.

4. There is still a good deal of dispute about which books belonged to the Holy Scriptures in the community of Qumram. Yet there is no longer any question among the experts nowadays that Daniel was regarded by them as belonging among the prophets. Since the first discoveries of papyri fragments of the book, other fragments of Daniel have been found written on leather, whereas papyrus was also used for other biblical books (e.g., Kings). The type of manuscript material was therefore not an indication of the value of the Scripture written on it. Especially important, however, is a passage in 4Q Florilegium 11, 320 where a time of affliction is predicted “as it is written in the book of Daniel, the prophet.” Thus we have a clear indication of the prophetic character of the book according to the Qumran view.


17. Ibid., note e.


5. The Jewish tradition is not unanimous. The Codex Cairensis, the oldest known manuscript of the Hebrew Bible (A.D. 895), contains the so-called former and later prophets without Daniel. The writer Moshe B. Aser added a list of prophets: “And these are the prophets who prophesied in Babylon when they left Jerusalem: Haggai, Malachi and Daniel. All the prophets from Moses . . . to Daniel and Malachi number 117.”

For this Qaraean scholar the status of Daniel as a prophet was undoubted in spite of any order of the canon. Another example may be found in a Hebrew-Aramaic-Greek canon list, perhaps from the second century A.D., to which Audet has drawn attention. In that list Daniel appears after the three other major prophets.

If one looks for the conclusions to be drawn from this survey of the sources, one is forced to note that there is not a single witness for the exclusion of Daniel from the prophetic corpus in the first half of the first millenium A.D. In all the sources of the first century A.D.—Matthew, Josephus, Qumran—Daniel is reckoned among the prophets. In fact the earliest literary evidence of Daniel’s inclusion among the Ketubim is to be placed somewhere between the fifth and eighth centuries A.D. This leads to the conclusion that at some point the rabbis transferred the book from the prophetic corpus to the last third of their collection of Holy Scripture. That probably happened long before the fifth century. Audet may be right in looking to the second century as an appropriate date. There is no clear proof for that, but it may be conjectured that the important role played by some Danielic predictions during the first (and second?) revolt against Rome was the decisive cause. Josephus refers to one of them in The Jewish War VI:

But what more than all else incited them to the war was an ambiguous oracle, likewise found in their sacred scriptures, to the effect that at that time one from their country would become ruler of the world. This they understood to mean someone of their own race, and many of their wise men went astray in their interpretation of it. The oracle, however, in reality signified the sovereignty of Vespasian, who was proclaimed Emperor on Jewish soil.

Josephus was thinking of Daniel 7:13–14 or 9:26. The importance of

oracles taken from the Holy Scriptures is also stressed by the Roman historian Tacitus (*Historiae* V, 13) and Suetonius (*Divus Vespasianus* 4,9). The confidence in the fulfillment of such prophecy connected to a reckoning of an apocalyptic timetable had led Israel into decline. Such disappointed confidence may have been the reason why the influential rabbis displaced this dangerous book, separating it from classical prophecy and placing it among the narratives of the time of the Exile like Esther and Ezra. Though such an observation is pure conjecture, it would offer an understandable rationale for such a severe handling of material which was included within a sacrificial tradition.

*Here Is More Than a Prophet*

We have now seen that the search for the history of canonization and the changing place of Daniel in it leads to an ambiguous result. On the one side there is for the early centuries a rather unanimous consensus among the copyists and readers that Daniel was to be placed in the prophetic corpus. On the other side there are some indications, noted especially by von Rad, which speak against a prophetic claim raised by the author himself. How can this discrepancy between the author and his early recipients be explained? To answer that question, it is necessary to examine more fully the self-understanding of the Book of Daniel and to carry that examination beyond the observations von Rad has made.

There is more that needs to be said about the title of the hero. Indeed, it is related in Daniel 2:48 that Nebukadnezzar appointed Daniel as chief prefect over all the wise men of Babylon. Thus his importance in the realm of wisdom was acknowledged. Yet, he is not explicitly named a wise man, and the appointment is related to the viewpoints of a non-Jewish milieu (cf. 2:18, 21; 4:3–5). The correct title, however, appears in the address of the angel in 10:11, 19 (9:23): Daniel is “the man greatly beloved” (by God). Certainly this peculiar title does not mean a lesser position than a prophetic one. In reality, it designates a higher one. We are aided in understanding the meaning of that title by the interpretation accorded to it by the Babylonian kings, according to whom the spirit of the holy god(s) dwelt in him (Dan. 4:5–6, 14; 5:11, 14; cf. 6:4). The possession of that spirit elevates Daniel above the abilities of all other wise men and makes him an outstanding seer announcing the mysteries of the end of days (2:2–3) or the time of the end (11:35, 40; 12:4, 9, 13).

Daniel’s strict eschatological perspective also separates this book from the ancient prophets. According to Daniel 9, what Jeremiah had written remained as dark and enigmatic as the dreams and visions of the Babylonian kings (chaps. 2, 4, 5). Only with Daniel was the true understanding
of the prophetic writings revealed (9:22–23). We may suppose the same for the interpretation of the four horns of Zechariah 2:1–4 by means of the conception of the four world-wide monarchies (Dan. 2:36–38; 7:1–3), of the disclosure of the real content of the decreed end announced in Isaiah 10:23 (Dan. 9:27), as well as many other interpretations of earlier prophetic utterances contained in Daniel. In this book the prophetic word always is taken as a riddle, the solution of which is given by the angel to Daniel and by Daniel to his readers.

A form-critical investigation underlines this result. Contrary to von Rad's view, there is a clear connection between the reports of the prophetic visions, especially in their last stage with Zechariah, and the genre of Daniel 7–12 (2:28–30; 4:1–3), as I have shown elsewhere. There is always a two-fold sequence in Daniel: first, a vision, dream, or old prophecy is reported (thus chap. 9), and then a succeeding peshar (interpretation) is revealed by an angel to Daniel (or by Daniel if the vision or dream was that of a king). Daniel brings his readers the divine key for both the heathen king—ideology (chaps. 2 and 4) and for Israelite prophecy. The heavenly mysteries (2:18–19, 27–30) are finally disclosed with his message, and thus revelation has reached its last stage within this age. Clearly there is an underlying and determinative conception of a two-stage revelation: The prophets like Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel are indispensable but preliminary spokesmen of the Word of God; it is only with Daniel that the final stage begins. So he is more than a prophet; he is “a man greatly beloved” (Dan. 10:11, 19) and not a prophet. Today some exegetes like to designate the use of Scripture in Daniel as “midrashic.” That is, however, a rather misleading term. Besides the form-critical differences of the genres (Daniel's use of Scripture and a midrash), there is an important theological gap: The rabbis pronouncing a midrash never claim to announce a new revelation, a hitherto unknown Word of God, whereas Daniel does so in nearly every chapter of the book. Thus Daniel makes quite a different claim for his interpretations of Scripture than do the rabbinic sages.

A further question arises: What are we to make of Daniel's omission of the normal prophetic identification of the prophet's message with the Word of God himself? Daniel does not present his revelations as the very utterance of God. He never uses the so-called messenger formula, “Thus

saith the Lord,” or similar phrases, as Isaiah or Jeremiah did. How does this modesty fit with his claim to be more than a prophet? The lack of any directly divine “I” in the book was an important element for von Rad when he argued for its non-prophetic character. We do need to take into account, however, that in the last pre-Christian centuries the immediate identity of God’s words with human utterances had come under suspicion. The growing element of transcendance in the understanding of God led to the conviction that even in the prophetic books it was the Memra (Word) of the Lord (or the Holy Spirit) which was speaking, that is, an intermediary being and not God directly (cf. the frequent use of memra’ in the Targums or the alteration of the “Word of God” [dibre yhwh] superscriptions, Hos. 1:1, etc.). The most instructive example in this regard, however, is none other than Jesus of Nazareth. He also abstained from any equation of his logia with the “I” of God and never used formulas like “Thus saith the Lord.” According to the Synoptic Tradition there was a voice from heaven (bat qol) speaking to him at his baptism and heavenly being(s) speaking to him at the transfiguration and in the garden of Gethsemane, but no direct voice of God himself. Jesus in fact used more wisdom genres in his sayings than did Daniel.27 People addressed him as “teacher” (didaskale). Nevertheless they did not regard him as a sage but rather as a prophet (Mark 8:28). The ancient pre-exilic difference between wise men and prophets (and priests) as separate institutions (Jer. 18:18) had disappeared long ago and with it the corresponding gap in the genres of language.

Consequences of the Canonization

The Book of Daniel was incorporated into the prophetic part of Scriptures in pre-Christian times. That was probably more than merely a pragmatic decision arising out of the necessity of giving it a place in an already three-fold canon, and it had far-reaching consequences. Now Daniel spread his light over all the prophets. If we look at the Targum Jonathan on the prophets, a targentum which originated in the last half century b.c.28 and which may well represent an understanding rather contemporary to the final fixation of the prophetic corpus, we can see that all the prophets were interpreted along the lines set out in Daniel. The king of Assyria, for example, mentioned so often with Isaiah, has become a typical example of the heathen rule over Israel. Again, the expectation of the coming age (’alam) is found in many places in addition to Daniel.29 A

hint of a coming Kingdom of God was also found in many prophetic passages.\textsuperscript{40} In that way the apocalyptic book, once it was included among the prophets, shed light on the whole corpus and offered a concept of prophecy which is thoroughly related to the end time. Conversely, its incorporation in this part of the canon allows a new view of Daniel. The contemporary allusions meant literally by the Maccabean author also found renewed application in a typological understanding. To cite but one example: Antiochus Epiphanes did not remain as the last enemy of the people of God but became that enemy's prefiguration. By the inclusion and the resulting typological understanding of Daniel, the book lost its claim to be the final revelation.

It is against this background that the relocation of the book from the Prophets to the Writings within the canon, which occurred in the early rabbinic period, should be seen. Removing Daniel from the prophetic corpus and placing it among the narratives of late exilic and early post-exilic times like Esther and Ezra shifted the accent from eschatology to pedagogics. Now the behavior of the hero (e.g., his obedience to the Torah) appeared as the decisive point. Perhaps the exclusion of Daniel was accompanied by an altered conception of the prophetic books as well. More and more the prophets came to be understood as preachers of repentance and of the Torah and less and less as proclaimers of the coming Kingdom of God.

Why did the rabbis who disapproved of a revolutionary use of the prophet Daniel not reject the book altogether? They did not hesitate to exclude other writings which at various times and places had been counted among the Holy Scriptures, for example, First Enoch or The Wisdom of Sirach (Ecclesiasticus). Daniel, on the other hand, they merely degraded by a transposition (thus preventing a possible use of it as Haphtarot in the synagogues). There is no explanation available in the extant Rabbinic text as to why they did not simply reject it, so we are forced to make assumptions. Presumably it was the generally accepted interpretation of the fourth monarchy in Daniel 2 and 7 as the Roman Empire which stayed the rabbis' hand. This Roman option, as we may call it, was current among Jews and Christians at least since the first century A.D., and it lasted until the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It was not intended as a reinterpretation. Given the Roman occupation of Palestine and most of its surroundings, it appeared obvious that it was the empire of the Caesars and no other which had to be the kingdom made of iron and clay (Dan. 2:33) or the monster, terrible and dreadful and exceedingly strong, which

devoured all other nations (7:7). Thus for the oppressed or even persecuted Jewish and Christian communities Daniel received an actualization beyond all other prophets. This unique significance offers a possible explanation for the strange fact that out of the rich religious literature of the late Israelite period (since 200 B.C.) only Daniel was commonly accepted as a part of the Holy Scripture. The perception that Daniel's prophecies were being fulfilled was strengthened after the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, because along with many Christians nearly all the rabbis saw that terrible catastrophe as the fulfillment of the timetable of Daniel 9:24–27. 31 This book was therefore the only one within the Holy Scriptures which offered a key for the second destruction of the holy city and the existence of Israel in a further exile.

A Stumbling Block for the Modern Canonical Perspective

In recent years several attempts have been made to stress the canonical form of a biblical book as the decisive basis for a theological understanding of it, in contrast to the historical-critical quest for the intention of the original author. Brevard Childs has provided some interesting points with regard to Daniel. 32 According to Childs, the meaning of the writing “has been sharply altered” by the canonical editors. The “description of the ‘period of indignation’ was now understood typologically” and the end of the age was transferred to a distant future. 33 A second change was the diminution of the significance of the apocalyptic numbers, which are especially prevalent in the last chapter. “From a canonical perspective these calculations in ch. 12 do not play a significant role for understanding the book as a whole.” 34 Its aim is “to admonish the people of God in the crisis of faith. The manner in which the book was shaped in the canonical process provides a critical check against the perennial danger of politicizing and trivializing its message.” Lastly, as it stands now, it “calls into question all human endeavours of ‘bringing in the kingdom’ or of ‘humanizing the structures of society.’ Rather, this biblical witness challenges the faithful to be awake and ready for the unexpected intervention of God in wrapping up all of human history.” 35

To what extent are these conclusions convincing? There can be no doubt that the process of canonization must be taken into account in exegesis, since the establishing of a corpus of Holy Scriptures makes a decisive point in late Israelite history and became the indispensable condi-

33. Ibid., p. 619.
34. Ibid., p. 621.
35. Ibid., p. 622.
tion for the formation of both Christianity and Judaism. Years ago, writing from a form-critical perspective, I stressed the fact that “canonisation makes a deep divide in the transmission history of a biblical book.”

A given book became finally fixed and received new accents by its incorporation into a larger composite unit. At the same time, another way of dealing with the text arose. Instead of interpretation through internal textual additions, a practice common in pre-canonical times, new modes of interpretation exterior to the text and clearly subordinated to it became necessary for its correct understanding.

This raises a crucial difficulty. How can we identify the exact meanings intended by the canonizers? There is no evidence for any addition or gloss originating precisely at the time of canonization, so it is dangerous to speak of the canonical shape of a writing. How is one to grasp it? Perhaps one should speak in a more careful way of a canonical intention. The only way to comprehend this intention, it seems to me, is to look at the surroundings, the context, in which a certain book is incorporated. Therefore, the order of the Old Testament books and the three-fold division of the canon offer the only useful key for responsible observations. Strangely enough, Childs explicitly refrains from taking into account “whether or not the book is assigned a position in the canon among the Prophets or the Writings” (“The sequence of the books . . . had little significance.”)

Nonetheless he maintains that the author of Daniel 8—12 only intended to interpret the (older) prophets. “He had no new prophetic word directly from God,” a statement which is clearly contradicted in Daniel 9:23 (cf. 11:2).

What Childs offers as canonical perspectives is therefore a colorful bouquet of issues which belong, in part at least, to the first stage of canonization, the incorporation of Daniel into the Prophets, or else to the second stage, namely the relocation of the book from the prophetic corpus to the devotional narratives at the end of the "Ketubim. Perhaps most of all, the issues are related to some modern Protestant desires concerning the canon.

To the first stage of canonization belong the typological view and the extended expectation of the coming Kingdom of God. To the second stage we may ascribe the admonition to the faithful for the time of crisis. Such issues, however, as the playing down of the relevance of the apocalyptic numbers or the stressing of the unexpected intervention of God which will

wrap up all human history, are clearly the products of Christian theological thought. One wonders whether they can be verified by any investigation into the canon (or the extant text of the book).

The process of canonization is a historical one. As important as it is, it must be reconstructed on the basis of an elaborate analysis of the contemporary circumstances. There has never been one canon of the Old Testament but always several, and each is accompanied by a different theory about its significance for life and faith. The Book of Daniel is an outstanding example of how such theories affect the way a biblical book is understood.