

## Daniel's Position in the Tanach, the LXX-Vulgate, and the Protestant Canon

JORDAN SCHEETZ (TYNDALE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NETHERLANDS)

### *ABSTRACT*

*Starting from the observation that Daniel has different placements in the Tanach, Septuagint, Vulgate, and Protestant Canon, this essay examines the early historical evidence in relation to biblical collections and in particular the placement of Daniel within these collections. The argument is that these various placements are due to the dialogue already present within the Book of Daniel and further continues into the various placements within these different canons. The exegetical significance is found not only in the text being placed among the other texts of the canon, but also through the actual arrangement of these texts (its canonical intertextuality).*

### A INTRODUCTION

The Book of Daniel falls in various places within printed biblical texts. Hebrew Bibles place Daniel within the Ketuvim or Writings and in particular between Esther and Ezra/Nehemiah with Chronicles closing the Hebrew Bible. The Septuagint places Daniel in the Prophets and in particular the last of the Major Prophets and since the Minor Prophets begin the Prophets, Daniel actually closes the Old Testament directly following Ezekiel. The Vulgate also places Daniel as the last of the Major Prophets but since the Minor Prophets follow the Major Prophets, Daniel is located between Ezekiel and Hosea. Protestant Bibles clearly follow the order found in the Vulgate but only include books found in the Hebrew Bible. Obviously the book of Daniel has been placed in different portions of the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament and at that, even different positions within these portions. Arguments for the placement of Daniel in these various portions have taken several forms.<sup>1</sup> My own argument will not be

<sup>1</sup> Rolf Rendtorff, *Theologie des Alten Testaments, Ein kanonischer Entwurf Band 1, Kanonische Grundlegung* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner, 1999), 359, notes in relation to Daniel's placement in the Hebrew Bible, "Die Stellung des Buches im Hebräischen Kanon weist jedoch auf seine späte, nachprophetische Entstehung hin." Herbert Niehr, "Das Buch Daniel," in *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (ed. Erich Zenger; 7th ed., Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2008), 507, notes in a more reserved fashion, "War der Propheten bereits abgeschlossen, konnte das Danielbuch als apokalyptisches Buch in bestimmten Kreisen nur allmählich kanonische Anerkennung gewinnen, oder steht es aufgrund der Sprachmischung von Hebräisch und Aramäisch vor dem Esrabuch, das dieselbe Mischung aufweist?" Gleason Archer, *Survey of Old Testament Introduction* (Chicago: Moody Publishers, 2007), 363, states, "It was probably because of the mixed character of this book, partaking partly of historical

to take an apologetic stance for one or the other position, but to demonstrate that these various placements reflect a theological and interpretive tension already reflected within the book itself and persists in the various placements in biblical canons.

## B CANONICAL PLACEMENTS OF DANIEL

The underlying presupposition of my own work on Daniel has been that the text of Daniel is a book found in the Hebrew Bible and further that it is rightly located in the Ketuvim or Writings in the tripartite division of Torah, Nevi'im, and Ketuvim. Support for this presupposition has not been simply based on modern printed editions of the Hebrew Bible, but on the text from *Baba Batra* 14b:

סידרן של כתובים רות וספר תהלים ואיוב ומשלי קהלת שיר השירים  
וקינות דניאל ומגילת אסתר עזרא ודברי הימים<sup>2</sup>

The order of the Writings: Ruth, and the book of Psalms, and Job, and Proverbs, Qohelet, Song of Songs, Lamentations, Daniel, the scroll of Esther, Ezra, and Chronicles.

This section represents part of the only statement from antiquity that actually lists each of the books that are found in the tripartite divisions.

The often quoted section from Josephus in *Contra Apionem* I.8, although representing the tripartite division, does not actually list which books are in each division:

οὐ μυριάδες βιβλίων εἰσὲ παρ' ἡμῖν ἀσυμφώνων καὶ μαχομένων, δύο δὲ μόνα πρὸς τοῖς εἴκοσι βιβλία τοῦ παντός ἔχοντα χρόνου τὴν ἀναγραφὴν, τὰ δικαίως πεπιστευμένα. καὶ τούτων πέντε μὲν ἔστι τὰ Μωυσέως, ἃ τοὺς τε νόμους περιέχει καὶ τὴν ἀπ' ἀνθρωπογονίας παράδοσιν μέχρι τῆς αὐτοῦ τελευτῆς· οὗτος ὁ χρόνος ἀπολείπει τρισχιλίων ὀλίγον ἔτων. ἀπὸ δε τῆς Μωυσέως τελευτῆς μέχρις Ἀρταξέρξου τοῦ μετὰ Ξέρξην Περσῶν βασιλέως οἱ μετὰ Μωσῆν προφήται τὰ κατ' αὐτοὺς πραχθέντα συνέγραψαν ἐν τρισὶ καὶ δέκα βιβλίοις. αἱ δὲ λοιπαὶ τέσσαρες ὕμνους εἰς τὸν θεὸν καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὑποθήκας τοῦ βίου περιέχουσιν. ἀπὸ δὲ Ἀρταξέρξου μέχρι τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνου γέγραπται μὲν ἕκαστα,

---

narratives and partly of prophetic vision, that the later Jewish scribes relegated it to the third or miscellaneous category in the canon.”

<sup>2</sup> For the Aramaic/Hebrew text see <http://www.mechron-mamre.org/b/1/14301.htm> [cited December 24, 2008].

πίστεως δ' οὐχ ὁμοίας ἤξίωται τοῖς πρὸ αὐτῶν διὰ τὸ μὴ γενέσθαι τῆν τῶν προφητῶν ἀκριβῆ διαδοχὴν.<sup>3</sup>

There are not myriads of discordant and opposing books to us, but only twenty-two from the books having of all time the registering, the ones justly having been believed. And of these are the five ones of Moses, which encompass both the laws and the tradition from the origin of man until his last. This time leaves off a little of three thousand years. And from the last of Moses until Artexerxes, the king, after Xerxes of the Persians, the prophets after Moses composed in writing the things having been done, according to them, in three and ten books. And the remaining four encompass hymns to God and suggestions for human things of life. And from Artexerxes until our time all things have been written, they are not thought worthy in a state of assurance equal in force to the ones before them because there is not the exact succession of the prophets.

Thackeray suggests in a footnote with regard to his translation that the Prophets should probably be: Joshua, Judges and Ruth together, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah together, Esther, Job, Isaiah, Jeremiah and Lamentations together, Ezekiel, the Minor Prophets, and Daniel.<sup>4</sup> He further suggests that the third section is probably composed of: Psalms, Song of Songs, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes.<sup>5</sup> Koch adds in relation to this particular quotation from Josephus and Thackeray's comments,

There is no doubt that Josephus included Daniel, who plays an important role in 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.<sup>6</sup>

However, the quote itself is silent in this regard other than "the five ones of Moses" (πέντε . . . τὰ Μωυσέως).

The other famous tripartite quotations from the Prologue of Ecclesiasticus also prove themselves to be elusive in relation to enumerating the exact books in the two further divisions.<sup>7</sup> The opening line states "many and great

<sup>3</sup> H. St. John Thackeray, *Josephus, The Life and Against Apion*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1926), 178.

<sup>4</sup> Thackeray, *Josephus*, 179.

<sup>5</sup> Thackeray, *Josephus*, 179.

<sup>6</sup> Klaus Koch, "Is Daniel Also Among the Prophets?," *Interpretation* 39/2 (1985): 122.

<sup>7</sup> Jürgen-Christian H. Lebram, "Aspekte der Alttestamentliche Kanonbildung," *Vetus Testamentum* 18 (1968): 175, is just one of many examples that comment on this passage: "Die Gliederung des Kanons unter diesem Gesichtspunkt ist alt. Schon in der

things have been given to us through the Law and the Prophets and the others, the ones having followed, according to them” (Πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων ἡμῖν διὰ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν κατ’ αὐτοὺς ἠκολουθηκότων δεδομένων). This quote supports a tripartite division but suggests some sort of division between those before, “the Law and the Prophets” (τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν), and “the others, the ones having followed, according to them” (τῶν ἄλλων τῶν κατ’ αὐτοὺς ἠκολουθηκότων). The further statement “the Law and Prophets and the other books belonging to the fathers” (τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πατρίων βιβλίων) only reinforces the tripartite division, giving no further clarity into what books in particular are included in the second two divisions.<sup>8</sup> Sanders notes that the actual text of Ecclesiasticus in 48:22-49:12 does enumerate Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Twelve, but even this does not appear to be an exhaustive list.<sup>9</sup>

Though it is true that the New Testament overwhelmingly refers to the whole of “the Holy Scriptures of the Jews” through the collocation “the Law and the Prophets” (ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται), there is one example where the tripartite division is at least hinted at in Luke 24:44:<sup>10</sup>

<sup>44</sup> Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς· οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι μου οὓς ἐλάλησα πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔτι ὡν σὺν ὑμῖν, ὅτι δεῖ πληρωθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωϋσέως καὶ τοῖς προφήταις καὶ ψαλμοῖς περὶ ἐμοῦ.

And he said to them, “These are the words which I spoke to you while I was still with you, that it was necessary to fulfill all things having been written in the Law of Moses and the Prophets and Psalms concerning me.”

Vorrede zum Buch seines Grossvaters, die er der griechischen Übersetzung desselben vorausgeschickt hat, spricht der Enkel des Ben Sira von dem Vielen und Bedeutenden, ‘was uns durch das Gesetz, die Propheten und die anderen, die ihnen nachgefolgt sind, überliefert worden ist.’” Arie Van der Kooij, “The Canonization of the Ancient Books,” in *Canonization and Decanonization, Papers presented to the International Conference of the Leiden Institute for the Study of Religions (LISOR), held at Leiden 9-10 January 1997* (eds. Arie van der Kooij and Karel van der Toorn; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 37, concludes that this text and 2 Maccabees 2:13-14 give support for a tripartite canon already in the second century B.C.: “The tripartite collection of holy books can be traced back to the middle of the second century BCE.” He states further in his conclusion, “The period around (or just before) 150 BCE marks a crucial moment in the history of the canonization of the Hebrew Bible” (38).

<sup>8</sup> Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*, vol. 2 (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935 and 1979), 377.

<sup>9</sup> James A. Sanders, *Torah and Canon* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), 94.

<sup>10</sup> Walter Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch* (eds. Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland; 6<sup>th</sup> ed., Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1988), 1099, lists Matt 5:17, 7:12, 11:13, 22:40; Luke 16:16; Acts 13:15, 24:14, 28:23; and Rom 3:21 in relation to the normal title in the New Testament.

The understanding would then be that “Psalms” (ψαλμοῖς) is a sort of title for the third division. It would be a stretch to understand Luke 24:27 in this same regard:

<sup>27</sup> καὶ ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν διερμήνευσεν αὐτοῖς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς τὰ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ.

And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he explained to them in all the writings the things concerning himself.

What the New Testament does have to offer in relation to the identification of the Book of Daniel in relation to these divisions is found in Matthew 24:15:

<sup>15</sup> Ὅταν οὖν ἴδῃτε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Δανιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου ἐστὸς ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ, ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω,

Therefore when you behold the abomination of devastation, the word through Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place, let the one reading consider.

Even though this is obviously not a list as found in *Baba Batra* 14b, it does represent a statement in relation to what Daniel was considered, namely “Daniel the prophet” (Δανιὴλ τοῦ προφήτου). In this same regard Qumran has also yielded an interesting statement. 4Q174 4:3 (4Q Florilegium II,3) states, “being written in the writing of Daniel, the prophet” (כתוב בספר דניאל הנביא).<sup>11</sup>

In tracing a similar line of evidence, Klaus Koch makes this evaluation:

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 millennium 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 *K<sup>e</sup>tubim* is to be placed somewhere between the fifth and eighth centuries A.D.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>11</sup> For the observation see Koch, “Is Daniel Also Among the Prophets?,” 122. For the Hebrew text see Garcíá F. Martínez, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, vol. 1 (Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill, 1997), 354.

<sup>12</sup> Koch, “Is Daniel Also Among the Prophets?,” 123. Thomas J. Finley, “The Book of Daniel in the Canon of Scripture,” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 165/2 (2008): 208, also notes in his conclusion based on Koch's earlier work, “Evidence from the first century and earlier favors the view that the Book of Daniel was originally a part of the Prophets, and only later was moved to the Writings.”

Whether one would like to disagree with the dating of the Babylonian Talmud, the basic chronological sequence still stands with regard to the written/literary evidence.<sup>13</sup>

Regardless of which placement is the “original,” the fact that Daniel is understood as being a part of two different sections of the Hebrew Bible demonstrates a tension in the interpretation of the Book of Daniel. In a formal sense, the book of Daniel is structured in similar fashion to the Later Prophets in the Hebrew Bible in that it is made up of smaller scenes that have been placed together not necessarily with a chronological system like Samuel, Kings, Ezra, Nehemiah, or Chronicles. Instead it is shaped like Ezekiel, where the smaller units have been placed together for thematic reasons. For example, the nine-chapter prophecy in Ezekiel 40-48 does not close the book because this was the last vision Ezekiel saw (cf. 40:1 בעשרים וחמש שנה לגלותנו “in the twenty-fifth year to our exile” and 29:17 בעשרים ושבע שנה “in the twenty-seventh year”), but because it draws together the prophetic hope from the previous chapters. This same structural observation could be made in relation to Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the Twelve. Beyond the overall structure, Beyerle notes the similarities between the vision in Daniel 7 and Ezekiel 1: “der visionäre Kontext, die Feuermotivik (v.a. Ez 1,13; Dan 7,10), die Räder (Ez 1,16; Dan 7,9) und der Thron (Ez 1,26 [vgl. 10,1]; Dan 7,9).”<sup>14</sup> Fishbane notes in relation to Daniel 11-12 and Isaiah, “As repeatedly observed, the preceding references to מִשְׁכִּילִים, to ‘vindication’, and to ‘the many’ allude to and even reinterpret the great ‘servant’ passage of Isa 52:13-53:12.”<sup>15</sup> Finley notes, “The pattern of a vision followed by its interpretation (Dan. 7-12) occurs also in Zechariah 1-6,” and further, “[a]pocalyptic features are also found in Isaiah 24-27; Ezekiel 38-39; Joel 2:28-3:21, and the book of Zechariah.”<sup>16</sup> The relationship between Jeremiah and Daniel is quite clear, where Daniel 9:2 makes clear reference to Jeremiah 25 and 29 in relation to the seventy-year waste of Jerusalem. This connection with other prophets is further solidified as Koch notes through the already mentioned Qumran quote (4Q174) where “Daniel is explicitly quoted

<sup>13</sup> Günter Stemberger, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch* (8th. ed., München: C. H. Beck, 1992), 44, notes, “In Babylonien finden sich Erwähnungen solcher Bücher im Zusammenhang mit Lehrern des 4. Jhs.” Of course this does not mean that the particular text from *Baba Batra* 14b was among these texts.

<sup>14</sup> Stefan Beyerle, “Der mit den Wolken des Himmels kommt,” in *Gottessohn und Menschensohn, Exegetische Studien zu zwei Paradigmen biblischer Intertextualität* (ed. Dieter Sänger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner, 2004), 43.

<sup>15</sup> Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 493. Harold L. Ginsberg, “The Oldest Interpretation of the Suffering Servant,” *Vetus Testamentum* 3/4 (1953): 400-404, unfolds this observation in greater detail.

<sup>16</sup> Finley, “The Book of Daniel in the Canon of Scripture,” 206 and 207.



as a prophet along the same line as the prophets Isaiah and Ezekiel.”<sup>17</sup> It is not a stretch, therefore, to understand the book of Daniel among the Prophets.

However, it is also not difficult to understand the book of Daniel among the Writings.<sup>18</sup> Von Rad and his exploration of apocalyptic having its roots in wisdom, makes the clear case for the connection between the Joseph stories in Genesis and the stories in Esther and Daniel.<sup>19</sup> As well, Daniel and Ezra are the only (significantly) bilingual books and their similar time periods are further obvious connections. The stories of Daniel 1-6 seem to easily fit not into Josephus's number but the description of the third section, “and the remaining four encompass hymns to God and suggestions for human things of life” (αἱ δὲ λοιπαὶ τέσσαρες ὕμνους εἰς τὸν θεὸν καὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὑποθήκας τοῦ βίου περιέχουσιν).

This interpretive tension in relation to Daniel's placements in the Ketuvim or the Prophets arises from the book itself. The opening six chapters of the book of Daniel show how Daniel and his companions distinguished themselves under the reigns of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, and Darius. The text of each chapter reveals not only common characters, setting, and plot, but also themes, phrases, and repeating narrative patterns. Descriptions that have a particular meaning in one narrative scene develop into something quite distinct in another

<sup>17</sup> Klaus Koch, “Stages in the Canonization of the Book of Daniel,” in *The Book of Daniel, Composition and Reception*, vol. 2 (eds. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint; Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill, 2001), 431-432, makes this observation in relation to whether or not Daniel is considered canonical at Qumran.

<sup>18</sup> Roger Beckwith, *The Old Testament of the New Testament Church* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1986), 160, gives an overall summary for the placement of each of the books based on the order found in *Baba Batra* 14b-15a: “We have now found an explanation for (a) the order of the books in the Law, which is chronological; (b) the order of the four historical books in the Prophets (Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings), which is the same; (c) the position of those four books before the four visionary books, which is based both on continuity and on chronology; (d) the presence and position of Ruth [introduction to the genealogy of David the primary writer in the Psalms], Chronicles [recapitulation of biblical history] and Daniel [a history book] in the Hagiographa, which is a different explanation in each case; (e) the order of the four historical books in the Hagiographa (Daniel, Esther, Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles), which is, in its intention, chronological; (f) the position of those four books after the lyrical and sapiential books, which is based on the position of Chronicles.”

<sup>19</sup> Gerhard von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments Band 2, Die Theologie der prophetischen Überlieferungen Israels* (10th ed., Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser, 1993), 324-326. Rendtorff, *Theologie des Alten Testament*, 359, views this relationship even in the differences between Daniel and Esther: “Im Esterbuch werden die Juden als ‘Volk’ ihrer nichtjüdischen Umwelt gegenübergestellt, während im Danielbuch die Juden als einzelne auftreten und sich behaupten müssen.”

scene. The scenes with dreams and visions, and with interpretations and confessions in relation to God, demonstrate the exemplary character of Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, mixed with the reality of God's power, sovereignty, and glory.<sup>20</sup> The closing six chapters of the book repeat many of the key elements found in the earlier portion of the book.<sup>21</sup> However, rather than functioning as scenes demonstrating the superior qualities of the key characters from the opening portion of the book, the scenes focus on the visions narrated by Daniel in the first person. What were only details in relation to Nebuchadnezzar's dreams and visions become the focal point of the narratives. All of this is highlighted through chronological markers at the beginning of each narrative scene that on the one hand indicate a general chronological flow of the book, moving from Nebuchadnezzar's besieging of Jerusalem to the third year of the reign of Cyrus, but on the other hand demonstrate that the narrative scenes have not been ordered chronologically but thematically as certain scenes are "out of sequence."<sup>22</sup> In this interplay between chapters 1-6 and 7-12, the book itself reveals a dialogue in relation to its purpose, even without the Christological debate from the first century forward.

<sup>20</sup> Les P. Bruce, "Discourse Theme and the Narratives of Daniel," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 160/2 (2003): 186, proposes this last statement as the overarching theme that unifies the whole of the book: "The theme proposed in this study—that only God is truly sovereign and that He will establish an eternal kingdom—provides coherence for the entire Book of Daniel."

<sup>21</sup> Harold L. Ginsberg, "The Composition of the book of Daniel," *Vetus Testamentum* 4/3 (1954): 246, in arguing against Harold H. Rowley's one author theory "during the persecution of the Jewish religion by Antiochus IV," lists the then present understanding of the book under issues of authorship and dating with the key connection points: "Daniel, 'The Book of the Courtier Tales', comprising chs. i-vi, which is pre-Epiphianian; and Daniel B, 'The Book of the Apocalypses', comprising chs. vii-xii, which is Epiphianian. The respective starting-points for the analyses of the two parts are two chapters—ii and vii—whose similarities are obvious but whose differences are no less real and instructive."

<sup>22</sup> It is fairly easy to reorder the narrative based on the book's own references to time and inferred narrative connections. 1:1 begins with the besieging of Jerusalem. 2:1 moves into the second year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign (presumably over Jerusalem). 3:1, inferred from the elevation of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego in 2:49, follows the scene chronologically from the previous chapter. 4:1 sits in an indefinable time after the events of chapter 2 but before the reign of Belshazzar. The next identifiable scene chronologically is indicated with 7:1 during the first year of Belshazzar's reign, followed by 8:1 during the third year of his reign and then by 5:1 which marks the end of his reign. 6:1 marks the next chronological point of the narrative with Darius' receiving of the kingdom and appointing of new leadership and followed by the scene in 9:1. Though the narrative retreats through direct speech into events in the first year of Darius' reign in 11:1, the final scene actually begins with the superscription in 10:1 during the third year of Cyrus' reign.



## C HEBREW BIBLE PLACEMENTS

However, the argument can be taken to a further level by demonstrating interpretive tensions even through Daniel's various placements within a particular broader canon. Sailhamer notes two different placements of Daniel in the Ketuvim based on *Baba Batra* 14b and Codex B19a.<sup>23</sup> In Codex B19a Daniel falls as the second to the last book of the Ketuvim with Ezra/Nehemiah (one book) closing the section. In Ezra 1:2-4 the edict of Cyrus is given:

<sup>2</sup> כֹּה אָמַר כְּרֶשׁ מֶלֶךְ פָּרַס כָּל מַמְלָכוֹת הָאָרֶץ נָתַן לִי  
 יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהוּא־פָקַד עָלַי לְבָנוֹת-לוֹ בַּיִת  
 בִּירוּשָׁלַם אֲשֶׁר בִּיהוּדָה:  
<sup>3</sup> מִי־בְכֶם מִכָּל-עַמּוֹ יְהִי אֱלֹהֵיו עִמּוֹ וַיַּעַל לִירוּשָׁלַם אֲשֶׁר  
 בִּיהוּדָה וַיִּבֶן אֶת-בַּיִת יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הוּא הָאֱלֹהִים  
 אֲשֶׁר בִּירוּשָׁלַם:  
<sup>4</sup> וְכָל-הַנְּשָׂאָר מִכָּל-הַמְּקוֹמוֹת אֲשֶׁר הוּא גָר-שָׁם יִנְשְׂאוּהוּ  
 אַנְשֵׁי מְקוֹמוֹ בְּכֶסֶף וּבְזָהָב וּבְרִכּוּשׁ וּבְבַהֲמָה עִם-הַנְּדָבָה  
 לְבַיִת הָאֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר בִּירוּשָׁלַם:

2 Thus says Cyrus the Persian king of all the kingdoms of the earth, "YHWH, God of the heavens, gave to me and he appointed upon me to build for him a house in Jerusalem which is in Judah. 3 Who among you from all of his people, let him go up, his God is with him and let him go up to Jerusalem which is in Judah and let him build a temple of YHWH, God of Jerusalem, he is the God who is in Jerusalem 4 and everyone left over from all the places which he is sojourning there, let men of his place take him up with silver and gold and property and with livestock, with the freewill-offering to the temple of God which is in Jerusalem."

This decree to (re)build Jerusalem takes on a new dimension of meaning when this text is connected with the time schematic given in Daniel 9:25-27:

<sup>25</sup> וְתַרְדֵּעַ וְתִשְׁכַּל מִן-מִצְרָא דָבָר לְהָשִׁיב וּלְבָנוֹת יְרוּשָׁלַם  
 עַד-מִשְׁיַח נְגִיד שְׁבַעִים שְׁבַעַה וְשִׁבְעִים שָׁשִׁים וּשְׁנָיִם תְּשׁוּב  
 וּנְבִנְתָה רְחוֹב וְחַרוּץ וּבְצוּק הָעֵתִים:  
<sup>26</sup> וְאַחֲרָי הַשְּׁבַעִים שָׁשִׁים וּשְׁנָיִם יִכְרַת מִשְׁיַח וְאִין לוֹ וְהָעִיר

<sup>23</sup> John H. Sailhamer, "Biblical Theology and the Composition of the Hebrew Bible," in *Biblical Theology: Retrospect and Prospect* (ed. Scott Hafemann; Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2002), 34-36, serves as a point of reference for my overall line of reasoning, although my own conclusions differ in a nuanced way from Sailhamer's.

וְהַקִּדְשׁ יִשְׁחִית עִם נְגִיד הַבָּא וְקִצּוֹ בְשִׁטְף וְעַד קֵץ מַלְחָמָה  
 נִחְרָצֶת שְׁמֹמֹת:  
 27 וְהַנְּבִיר בְּרִית לְרַבִּים שָׁבוּעַ אֶחָד וְחֻצֵי הַשָּׁבוּעַ יִשְׁבִּית  
 זָבַח וּמִנְחָה וְעַל כִּנְף שְׁקִינִים מִשָּׁמַיִם וְעַד־כְּלָה וְנִחְרָצָה  
 תִּתַּד עַל־שָׁמַיִם:

25 And you will know and you will have insight, from the going out of the word to return and to build Jerusalem until the anointed prince, seven weeks, and sixty-two weeks it will return and the broad place and the moat will be built and in distress of the times. 26 And after sixty-two weeks an anointed one will be cut off and there will be nothing to him and the city and the holy place, he will destroy a people, the prince going in, and his end is in a flood and until an end a battle is determined devastation. 27 And he will cause a covenant to grow great to many, one week, and half a week he will put an end to sacrifice and offering and one causing horror upon an edge of detestable things and until complete destruction and it is determined, it will pour forth upon one causing horror.

With the placement of Daniel before Ezra/Nehemiah and these texts closing the Ketuvim, Daniel functions as a type of introduction to the conclusion found in Ezra/Nehemiah. As these texts are placed next to one another, they begin to exegete one another. The decree of Ezra 1:2-4 gives the starting point for the seventy weeks of years described in Daniel 9:25-27. Daniel 9:25-27 heightens the significance of the decree in Ezra 1:2-4 from Cyrus to mark not simply the beginning of the rebuilding of the temple and Jerusalem but of the beginning of the seventy weeks of years (490 year) period. As this time period unfolds in Ezra/Nehemiah, there is certainly a rebuilding of the temple and Jerusalem, but as a whole this conclusion to the Hebrew Bible is less than climactic. Ezra 3:12-13 records polar responses to the building of the temple:

12 וְרַבִּים מִהַכֹּהֲנִים וְהַלְוִיִּם וְרֹאשֵׁי הָאָבוֹת הַזִּקְנִים אֲשֶׁר רָאוּ  
 אֶת־הַבַּיִת הָרִאשׁוֹן בְּיָסְדוֹ זֶה הַבַּיִת בְּעֵינֵיהֶם בָּכִים בְּקוֹל  
 גָּדוֹל וְרַבִּים בְּתִרְעָה בְּשִׂמְחָה לְהָרִים קוֹל:  
 13 וְאִין הָעָם מְכִירִים קוֹל תְּרִיעַת הַשִּׂמְחָה לְקוֹל בְּכִי הָעָם  
 כִּי הָעָם מְרִיעִים תְּרִיעָה גְדוֹלָה וְהַקוֹל נִשְׁמַע עַד־לְמִרְחֹק:

12 And many from the priests and the Levites and the heads of the fathers, the elders, who had seen the former house, when this house was founded before their eyes they were weeping in a great voice and many with a shout of rejoicing to cause to raise a sound 13 and the people could not recognize the sound of the shout of rejoicing from the weeping of the people because the people were shouting a great shout and the sound was heard for a great distance.

Nehemiah 13 closes with a recounting of the various ways in which the people were being disobedient (1-14; 15-22; 23-30). As a whole, the details found in Ezra/Nehemiah focus on the details of the return from exile, which was anticipated based on Daniel's understanding of the prophet Jeremiah in Daniel 9:2 (cf. Jer 25 and 29), but say little about further details found in Daniel 9:25-27.<sup>24</sup>

In *Baba Batra* 14b, Esther intervenes between Daniel and Ezra/Nehemiah, however, Chronicles closes the Ketuvim. In this arrangement a shorter version of Cyrus's decree in 2 Chronicles 36:23 closes the Ketuvim:

23 כֹּה־אָמַר כּוֹרֵשׁ מֶלֶךְ פָּרַס כָּל־מַמְלָכוֹת הָאָרֶץ נָתַן לִי  
יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהוּא־פָקַד עָלַי לְבָנוֹת־לוֹ בַּיַּחַד  
בִּירוּשָׁלַם אֲשֶׁר בִּיהוּדָה מִי־בְכֶם מְכֹל־עַמּוֹ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי  
עַמּוֹ יַעֲלֶה:

Thus says Cyrus king of all the kingdoms of the Earth, "YHWH the God of the heavens gave to me and he appointed upon me to build for him a house in Jerusalem which is in Judah. Who among you from all his people YHWH is with him, and let him go up!"

Sailhamer, based on an observation from David Noel Freedman, notes,

[T]his arrangement of Chronicles and Ezra/Nehemiah is noticeably out of chronological sequence. After the close of Nehemiah, the Chronicler begins his narrative with Adam! This suggests the book of Chronicles was deliberately placed at the end of the Tanak, after the books of Ezra/Nehemiah and after the book of Daniel. It also suggests a conscious effort to close the Tanak with a restatement of the edict of Cyrus at the end of Chronicles.<sup>25</sup>

The curious placement of the shortened restatement of Cyrus's decree at the conclusion of the Ketuvim brings a heightened sense of anticipation, anticipation that inaugurates the seventy weeks of years (490 years) from Daniel 9:25-27 and leaves in open terms what was localized in Ezra/Nehemiah.

However, the placement of Esther in this order should not be overlooked by appealing only to the eschatological and apocalyptic implications. The book of Daniel closes on a less than positive note as the cryptic numbers are left uninterpreted, salvation is deferred to a significantly later date, and a time of un-

<sup>24</sup> Sailhamer, "Biblical Theology and the Composition of the Hebrew Bible," 35, notes in similar fashion, "In that position, the edict of Cyrus identifies the historical return under Ezra and Nehemiah as the fulfillment of Jeremiah's vision of seventy years. It is as if Daniel 9, and its view of the seventy weeks of years, were nowhere in sight."

<sup>25</sup> Sailhamer, "Biblical Theology and the Composition of the Hebrew Bible," 35.

paralleled difficulty is promised until the dead awaken from the dust (אדמת-עפר) (יקיני). The book of Esther, like the opening six chapters of Daniel, gives an example of how hope will continue during this time period of great difficulty.

## D SEPTUAGINT, VULGATE, AND PROTESTANT PLACEMENTS

Both the Septuagint and the Vulgate pose interesting cases in that there is not only an issue of placement but of the actual text itself. With regard to placement both have a fourfold instead of a threefold form in relation to the Old Testament. In this structure of Law, History, Poetry, and Prophets, Daniel is located among the Prophets, a placement, as was noted earlier, that has a strong historical precedent. However, this is not as simple as it initially sounds because the placement of Daniel is actually different in these two canons. In both the Septuagint and the Vulgate, Daniel comes as the last of the Major Prophets, following Ezekiel but the Septuagint places the Major Prophets after the Minor Prophets, so that Daniel closes this portion of scripture and the Vulgate, which modern translations follow, places the Major Prophets before the Minor Prophets.

As has already been noted, Daniel shares characteristics with the Prophets in that smaller narrative scenes have been placed together not based on pure chronological order, but for thematic purposes. With regard to the order found in the Septuagint and Vulgate, it is interesting that Ezekiel consistently precedes Daniel.<sup>26</sup> Ezekiel closes with a chronologically out of sequence scene that spans from chapters 40-48 “in the 25<sup>th</sup> year to our exile” (ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ καὶ εἰκοστῷ ἔτει; 40:1). 29:17 has already reached the furthest chronological point in the book “in the 27<sup>th</sup> year” (ἐν τῷ ἐβδόμῳ καὶ εἰκοστῷ ἔτει). Ezekiel is purposely shaped to close with this final scene that focuses on the temple and city (Jerusalem). What is rather climactic in the Hebrew text is enigmatic in the Septuagint in 48:35b, “And the name of the city, from which day might be, it will be the name of it” (καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς πόλεως, ἀφ’ ἧς ἂν ἡμέρας γένηται, ἔσται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς). The Hebrew text states, “And the name of the city from this day will be ‘YHWH is there’” (ושם-העיר מיום יהוה שמה). Daniel opens with a focus on the temple and Jerusalem, not with restoration but with the besieging of Jerusalem and the removal of articles from the temple (1:1-2).<sup>27</sup> Daniel chap-

<sup>26</sup> Niehr, “Das Buch Daniel,” 507, gives this explanation for the placement, “Die Einordnung des Danielbuches hinter Ezechiel hängt damit zusammen, dass der Prophet Ezechiel im Exil wirkte und auch die Danielerzählungen in dieser Zeit spielen. Die Vulgata hat diese Stellung des Buches Daniel innerhalb des Prophetenkanons übernommen.” My own argument does not disagree with this statement, but refines it in relation to a compositional strategy through the placement of these texts next to one another.

<sup>27</sup> Greg Goswell, “The Order of the Books in the Greek Old Testament,” *Journal of the Evangelical Society* 52/3 (2009): 463, gives a similar argument: “Following Ezekiel, which ends with the vision of the new temple (Ezekiel 40-48), the temple

ter 9 becomes the key in the sense that the return from exile after seventy years as found in Jeremiah 25 and 29 marks only the starting point for the sort of restoration found in Ezekiel 40-48, something that is still quite in the future by the close of the book of Daniel, as Daniel is told, "And you Daniel hide the commands and seal up the book until the time of the end" (καὶ σύ Δανιηλ κάλυψον τὰ προστάγματα καὶ σφράγισαι τὸ βιβλίον ἕως καιροῦ συντελείας). This is exactly where the Septuagint ends the Prophets. The Vulgate continues into the Minor Prophets, a corpus that focuses on "the day of Lord" (*dies domini*). The final section of Malachi even opens with this statement in 3:1:

*ecce ego mittam angelum meum et praeparabit viam ante faciem meam et statim veniet ad templum suum dominator quem vos quaeritis et angelus testamenti quem vos vultis ecce venit dicit Dominus exercituum*

"Behold I am sending my messenger and he will prepare the way before my face and suddenly he will go in to his temple, the Lord who you are seeking and the messenger of the covenant which you are desiring, behold he is going in," says the Lord of the army.

The temple is the place where "you" (*vos*) meet "the Lord" (*Dominum*).

The striking textual features in relation to the Septuagint and Vulgate texts are the large textual pluses found in 3:24-90, *Susanna*, and *Bel and the Dragon*.<sup>28</sup> 3:24a in the Vulgate gives the setting for the text in chapter 3: "and they were going about in the midst of the flame" (*et ambulabant in medio flammae*). What follows is an expanded parallel to Daniel's praise of God in 2:20-23. *Susanna* and *Bel and the Dragon* represent two further scenes that demonstrate Daniel's superior ability and character. Although the text is placed among the prophets, these pluses function to remind the reader not to get lost in the eschatological and apocalyptic details. No, the book shows how Daniel and his companions distinguished themselves under the reigns of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, and Darius, as well as gives a series of eschatological and apocalyptic visions.

---

theme of the book of Daniel is highlighted, commencing as it does with the sacking of the temple."

<sup>28</sup> Niehr, "Das Buch Daniel," 514, states in relation to the placement of *Susanna*, "Im Theodotion-Text wird die Susanna-Erzählung an den Anfang des Danielbuches gerückt oder z.T. auch als eigenes Buch gewertet. Dies tun auch LXX und S. Die Vg setzt die Susanna-Erzählung als Abschluss an das Ende des Danielbuches." In relation to *Bel and the Dragon* Niehr states, "Dan 14 enthält zwei Erzählungen (14,1-22; 14,23-42). Die Erzählungen liegen wie die Susanna-Erzählung in der LXX und Theodotion vor" (515).

Both the Septuagint and Vulgate, through their inclusion of books beyond the Hebrew Bible including the so-called Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical<sup>29</sup> books *and* the New Testament, give actual texts that are clearly referencing Daniel, offering points of dialogue in relation to the interpretation of texts in the book of Daniel. 1 Maccabees 1:54 and 6:7 give examples where the text of Daniel could be seen as having its referent in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes and in Matthew 24:15 and Mark 13:14 Jesus interprets the same quote from Daniel 9:27 as applying to the present temple and not to the historical situation from the Hellenistic era. In each of these cases the perspective moves past the initial fulfillment found in Ezra/Nehemiah and Chronicles and to the end of the seventy-weeks of years. What is not clear is to what extent the status of Maccabees as some sort of second level canonical book impacts the significance of its interpretation as a part of the larger whole when Matthew and Mark are unquestioned in relation to their status. Further, Daniel 7:13 as quoted in Matthew 24:30, 26:64; Mark 13:26, 14:62; Luke 21:27; and Revelation 1:7, are clearly interpreted in relation to Jesus.

The Protestant Bible represents an interesting mixture in that it contains only the books found in the Hebrew Bible *but* in the Latin order *with* the New Testament. All of the observations made in relation to the Vulgate are valid in reference to the shaping of Ezekiel, the structure of Daniel, and the day of YHWH found in the Minor Prophets. However, there is no reference in relation to the texts from 1 Maccabees 1:54 and 6:7. This is to say that the dialogue in relation to Daniel 9:27 in the Protestant Bible is found in Matthew 24:15 and Mark 13:14.<sup>30</sup> The dialogue is thoroughly Christological in orientation.

## E CONCLUSION

Through the examination of the placements of Daniel a dialogue in relation to the particular arrangement of these books is evident. The examples do not lead to endless possibilities but to a dialogue, a dialogue that is evident from the dialogue within the text of Daniel itself and the *Überlieferungsgeschichte*. Although this creates an interpretation that is plural, it is not infinite. There are *particular points* of dialogue with the larger whole that, through their placement with one another, exegete one another. The exegetical significance is found not only in the text being placed among the other texts of the canon, but also through the actual arrangement of these texts (its canonical intertextuality).

<sup>29</sup> I use the term so-called in relation to these books because writers in the early church like Eusebius and Athanasius reserved the term apocryphal for books that were to be completely rejected which is not the case for many of the books found in what are now called the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical books.

<sup>30</sup> It should be noted that the 203 references to the book of Daniel in the New Testament are all found in the Septuagint, Vulgate, and the Protestant Bible. The example from Daniel 9:27 in the Septuagint and Vulgate was chosen because it demonstrates a dialogue that is not present in the Protestant Bible.



**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Archer, Gleason. *Survey of Old Testament Introduction*. Chicago: Moody Publishers, 2007.
- Bauer, Walter. *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*. Edited by Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland. 6<sup>th</sup> ed. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1988.
- Beckwith, Roger. *The Old Testament of the New Testament Church*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Beyerle, Stefan. "Der mit den Wolken des Himmels kommt." Pages 1-52 in *Gottessohn und Menschensohn, Exegetische Studien zu zwei Paradigmen biblischer Intertextualität*. Edited by Dieter Sänger. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner, 2004.
- Bruce, Les P. "Discourse Theme and the Narratives of Daniel." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 160/2 (2003): 174-186.
- Finley, Thomas J. "The Book of Daniel in the Canon of Scripture." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 165/2 (2008): 195-208.
- Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.
- Ginsberg, Harold L. "The Composition of the book of Daniel." *Vetus Testamentum* 4/3 (1954): 246-275.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Oldest Interpretation of the Suffering Servant." *Vetus Testamentum* 3/4 (1953): 400-404.
- Goswell, Greg. "The Order of the Books in the Greek Old Testament." *Journal of the Evangelical Society* 52/3 (2009): 673-688.
- Koch, Klaus. "Is Daniel Also Among the Prophets?" *Interpretation* 39/2 (1985): 117-130.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Stages in the Canonization of the Book of Daniel." Pages 421-445 in *The Book of Daniel, Composition and Reception*, vol. 2. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint. Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill, 2001.
- Lebram, Jürgen-Christian H. "Aspekte der Alttestamentliche Kanonbildung." *Vetus Testamentum* 18 (1968): 173-189.
- Martínez, García F. and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, vol. 1. Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill, 1997.
- Niehr, Herbert. "Das Buch Daniel." Pages 507-516 in *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. Edited by Erich Zenger. 7th ed. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2008.
- Rahlfs, Alfred. *Septuaginta*, vol. 2. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935 and 1979.
- Rendtorff, Rolf. *Theologie des Alten Testaments, Ein kanonischer Entwurf Band 1, Kanonische Grundlegung*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner, 1999.
- Sailhamer, John H. "Biblical Theology and the Composition of the Hebrew Bible." Pages 25-37 in *Biblical Theology: Retrospect and Prospect*. Edited by Scott Hafemann. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2002.
- Sanders, James A. *Torah and Canon*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972.
- Stemberger, Günter. *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch*. 8th. ed. München: C. H. Beck, 1992.
- Thackeray, H. St. John. *Josephus, The Life and Against Apion*, vol. 1. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1926.

Van der Kooij, Arie. "The Canonization of the Ancient Books." Pages 17-40 in *Canonization and Decanonization, Papers presented to the International Conference of the Leiden Institute for the Study of Religions (LISOR), held at Leiden 9-10 January 1997*. Edited by Arie van der Kooij and Karel van der Toorn. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Von Rad, Gerhard. *Theologie des Alten Testaments Band 2, Die Theologie der prophetischen Überlieferungen Israels*. 10th ed. Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser, 1993.

Jordan M. Scheetz, Dr. theol. Assistant Professor of Old Testament Languages and Literature, Tyndale Theological Seminary, the Netherlands. E-mail: [jordan@tyndale.nl](mailto:jordan@tyndale.nl)