

revolution has made and how it has facilitated production. In some industries, such as health care, electronization has increased costs, while in others it has led to downsizing and unemployment. Another side effect of readily available communication is the increased promotion of pornography and pedophilia. On a positive note, Christians have also found another global means of sharing their messages.

Finally, the author analyzes the essential role of "the good leader." These are individuals who "had a vision of what they had to do and why" (175). He points out essential skills and attributes that leaders need to possess: ability to delegate, patience and perseverance, and courage. A good leader is fair and provides a good environment for his or her workers. Jesus is held up as "the greatest leader," who chose twelve unlikely people, taught them for a period of three years, and sent them to teach others about his kingdom. Now his teachings have developed into "the leading religion in the world today" (195). Christian leaders are faced with unique challenges in the secular societies of today and are under great pressure to compromise their beliefs. It is the love of neighbors that disarmed opposition in the past and the same principle holds true for the future.

Catherwood persuasively argues that the Christian faith has contributed to economic development in the West, and that access to the Bible by common individuals led to another worldview that promoted personal responsibility toward God and others. One question that remains unanswered in the book is how Japan and other newly industrialized nations of the Far East were able to make such progress toward industrialization without adopting Christianity on a large scale. Are the virtues that made economic development possible in the West also found in the religions or social mores of the East? This question is worth investigating.

Andrews University

LEONARD GASHUGI

Collins, John J., and Peter W. Flint, eds. *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, assist. Cameron VanEpps. Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum*, 83. Formation and Interpretation of Old Testament Literature, 2. Leiden: Brill, 2001. Vol. 1: xx, 1-290 pp.; vol. 2: xxii + 291-769 pp. Hardcover, \$85.00 + \$133.00.

Recent years have seen a new impetus in Daniel studies. Among the subjects discussed more intensely are the apocalyptic genre of the book, its historical and social setting, and its relationship to Qumran literature and other intertestamental writings. The essays in the two volumes of *The Book of Daniel*, written by an international array of 32 scholars, delve into the center of these discussions and examine the composition and reception of Daniel. They are organized in eight parts: "General Topics," "Daniel in Its Near Eastern Milieu," "Issues in Interpretation of Specific Passages," "Social Setting," "Literary Context, including Qumran," "Reception in Judaism and Christianity," "Textual History," and "The Theology of Daniel." Each essay has its own up-to-date bibliography, and there is a twenty-five-page cumulative bibliography

at the end of volume 2. Five indices covering 55 pages (Scripture, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, Dead Sea Scrolls, Other Ancient Writings, and Modern Authors) make the information in the volumes easily accessible.

In this review, I focus specifically on volume 1, summarizing the main contributions of each essay and assessing briefly a few selected points that seem particularly relevant, while the individual essays in volume 2 are only listed briefly. For a more detailed discussion of them, see my review in *RBL* [<http://www.bookreviews.org>] (2003).

The first two essays are more general in focus. J. J. Collins ("Current Issues in the Study of Daniel") sketches the present state of Daniel scholarship with emphasis on the textual variety (Old Greek of Dan 4–6, Greek additions, and pseudo-Danielic literature from Qumran), composition and genre, social setting, ethics of the book, and a few remarks on the history of interpretation. Collins outlines the issues in a brief and balanced way, without failing to provide his own input. For example, he strongly argues that Dan 7 belongs with the visions and not with the tales, and that the social setting of Daniel has to be found around the politically disillusioned מַשְׁכִּילִים, who set their hopes in the world-to-come and are therefore willing to sacrifice their lives (Dan 11:35). In both cases, Collins differs markedly from Albertz's interpretation found in one of the other essays.

Exploring the literary context of the book of Daniel, M. A. Knibb ("The Book of Daniel in Its Context") studies its relationship to the Danielic texts from Qumran and the additions to the Greek book of Daniel. 4Q243-246 "presuppose[s] the existence of a well-developed Daniel tradition and apparently of the book of Daniel itself" (19), as do the Greek additions, even though *Susanna* and *Bel and the Dragon* portray Daniel differently than Dan 2–6. Knibb also suggests enlarging the wider literary context of Daniel, to which stories of court officials (e.g., Esther) and apparently similar apocalyptic writings are usually reckoned (e.g., *Enoch*), by sapiential texts from Qumran, in particular by 4QInstruction and 4QMysteries. A number of connections between Daniel and these writings seem to underline that Daniel exhibits traits of wisdom tradition. One can only agree with Knibb that the entire literary context of Daniel testifies that the book "is in the end *sui generis*" (34).

The next three essays argue more or less convincingly that the author of Daniel is familiar with Mesopotamian literature tradition. K. van der Toorn ("Scholars at the Oriental Court: The Figure of Daniel against Its Mesopotamian Background") suggests that letters from Assyrian and Babylonian scholars, which provide insight into the scholars' situation at the court, offer a background to the tales about Daniel (very similar to his article in *CBQ* 60 [1998]: 626–640). He claims that the author of Daniel reflects in general the Oriental court situation, but also reveals his "imperfect knowledge of the Babylonian court" (42). He bases this assumption on two reasons: First, the Danielic list of different groups at the court is schematic only and does not include the important physicians and lamentation priests and, second, the profession of dream interpreters mentioned in Daniel was unfamiliar, even unwelcome, at the Assyrian

court. However, it appears to me that the nature of the challenge in Dan 2 and 5, that is, to provide an interpretation of a dream, would be reason enough to explain why physicians and lamentation priests are not mentioned. Further, the position of the dream interpreters at the Babylonian court is still an open question, as van der Toorn himself admits (42).

Van der Toorn's main thesis is that the "lions' pit" used in Dan 6 is a literary *topos* known from Mesopotamian literature. That *topos* is used in narratives of the type *Tale of the Vindicated Courtier* to describe metaphorically the hostility of colleagues, sages, and scholars at the Assyrian court. In other words, lions are human adversaries. The exemplary type of this literature is the story of *Ludlud bēl nēmeqi* (twelfth century B.C.E.) and the letters of the forlorn scholar Urad-Gula (ca. 664 B.C.E.). The author of Dan 6 supposedly followed such a court-tale genre and used the Mesopotamian literary *topos* of the lions' pit, taking the metaphor literally. The miracle described in Dan 6 is then nothing more than a misunderstanding of metaphoric language.

Although van der Toorn's ingenious suggestion is an interesting one, two questions in particular remain and pose a challenge to his hypothesis. First, how is it possible that the *topos* of the lions' pit could be separated from the immediate metaphorical context so that the author of Dan 6 could misunderstand it as a real description? In *Ludlud bēl nēmeqi*, the immediate context before and after the line "Marduk put a muzzle on the mouth of the lion that was devouring me" refers to Marduk's obstructing the enemy by using metaphors of military terminology (attack with a smiting weapon and with a sling). The metaphoric nature of the language here is obvious. If the author of Daniel was acquainted with the literary *topos* of the lions' pit, it is difficult to see why its metaphoric nature should not have been transmitted together with the *topos*. The reference to the local Palestinian setting of the author (52) is not really convincing in this regard. In any case, van der Toorn has to some degree substantiated the knowledge of the Mesopotamian literary culture on the part of the author of Daniel, whether he followed or contrasted it, knowingly or ignorant of the original context. And second, how is it possible that the author, who certainly had a knowledge of the metaphor of being rescued from lions' mouths in the Hebrew Bible (Pss 7:3; 22:22; 35:17; 91:13)—a fact referred to but not commented on by van der Toorn in his *CBQ* article (638-639) nor mentioned at all in his present essay—could misunderstand a very similar metaphor from the Mesopotamian literary tradition and take it literally? It seems that even if for some reason the *topos* of the lions' pit was detached from its original metaphoric setting, the author probably could still have understood it as a metaphor because of the similar metaphor used in the Hebrew Scriptures. In addition to the texts above, the persecuted one refers to the wicked or the enemy with the metaphor of a lion (Pss 22:13, 22; 34:11; 35:17; 58:7; 91:13; cf. Nah 2:11-13; and with the preposition ׀ ["like"] in Pss 7:3; 10:9; 17:12); even God, as enemy, is referred to as a lion (Joel 1:6; Lam 3:10; cf. Hos 5:14; 13:7).

S. M. Paul ("The Mesopotamian Background of Daniel 1-6") proposes a

Mesopotamian linguistic and philological background of words and phrases that occur in Dan 3:29; 5:6, 16; 6:5; 6:8; 9:27, and finds a correlation of Dan 1 with a letter from Mari. The discussions on five of the six texts that Paul has chosen to comment on are each a summary of a previous article or essay that he has written. A new proposal is to interpret the Aramaic שלו in Dan 6:5 as “negligence” in light of Akkadian *šeli* (“to be negligent”; noun *šilūtu* “negligence”) or to regard וְשִׁחִיתָהּ וְשָׁלוּ as equivalent to *arnu u šillatu* (“crime and/or improper speech”). Paul explains these remarkable connections by the continuing influence of Babylonian literature in the Hellenistic era. On the other hand, if the respective material of Daniel originated in Babylon itself, such influence should be expected to some degree.

J. H. Walton (“The *Anzu* Myth as Relevant Background for Daniel 7?”) analyzes the possible extent of the literary interrelationship between Dan 7 and the ancient chaos-combat myth pattern as exemplified in the Ugaritic myth of *Baal and Yamn*, the Akkadian *Enuma Elish*, and the *Anzu* myth. He notes the similarities, but also points out those elements that are unique in Dan 7. Walton quite convincingly concludes that the author of Dan 7 must have been knowledgeable of these mythic materials and used motifs and elements thereof in an eclectic manner. The author creatively arranged and adapted them, adding his own unique features, to produce a new literary piece that serves his own theological purpose: “Daniel’s own theologically unique chaos combat myth” (87). Walton’s specific contribution to the discussion on the religion-historical and tradition-historical background of the vision of Dan 7 is the addition of the *Anzu* myth to the proposed Babylonian influences on Dan 7. At the same time, he is careful to emphasize that “Daniel 7 is not just a recension of some other ancient work” but needs to “be treated as an independent exemplar” (86).

The four essays in Part 3 deal with the interpretation of specific passages. R. G. Kratz (“The Visions of Daniel,” a translation of his essay in the *Steck Festschrift. Schriftauslegung in der Schrift*, BZAW 300 [2000], 219-236) undertakes a sophisticated redaction-critical study of the visions of Daniel. He suggests that Dan 7 was composed with the context of the narratives Dan 1–6 in mind, introducing, as the major focal point, the eschatological dimension (kingdom of God). Passages in Dan 2–6 that contain an eschatological outlook he regards as additions by the author of Dan 7. Later additions in Dan 7 are the ten horns and the little horn. The next stage in the compositional development according to Kratz is the addition of chapter 8, a “Hebrew targum to the first vision” (100). There are so many points of contact between chapters 7 and 8 that, for Kratz, chapter 8 “translates the Aramaic vision of chapter 7 into Hebrew and updates it” (111). Daniel 8 receives the longest analysis by Kratz. In short, the original layer of chapter 8 consists of vv. 1, (2), 3-8, 15, 17, 20-22, 26b, 27a. Secondary are the additions to the vision reception (vv. 16, 18-19, 27b) and the addition of the little horn (vv. 9-12, 23-25 with vv. 11-12a as still later insertion), together with the calculation of the end (vv. 13-14, 26a). Next comes the addition of chapters 10–12 in the second century B.C.E. which constitutes

a continuation of and *peshet* to chapter 8. Here, too, there are interpolations (mainly in chap. 10) and supplements (12:5-12). Finally, chapter 9 intrudes into the context of chapters 8-12 and is a *peshet* to Jeremiah's seventy-years prophecy, but also a continuation of the vision in chapter 8.

It is evident that Kratz stays within the line of the German tradition, which divides Daniel into quite a number of redactional stages, emphasizing seemingly disjunctive elements over against possible features that create unity, although that tradition is not unified (cf. the redactional analysis by R. Stahl, *Von Weltengagement zu Weltüberwindung*, CBET 4 [Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994], 61-127). Kratz's analysis is at times laborious and always remains hypothetical. One gets the impression that he follows a preconceived redaction history when he excises all eschatological elements in Dan 2-6 and attributes them to the specific theological focus of the author of Dan 7. Particularly in the difficult question of the redactional stages of the visions, it might have been advisable to also include in this volume other positions, according to which the visions of Daniel went through redactional stages, or basically form a coherent unit without any or only a few interpolations.

The main thesis of A. LaCocque ("Allusions to Creation in Daniel 7") is that Dan 7 is a historicization of the Canaanite (but not so much Mesopotamian) cosmological-myth pattern—the battle between Baal and Yam/Mot/Chaos—and describes Antiochus IV as the last embodiment of the chaotic monsters over which the Ancient of Days and the Son of Man are victorious through re-creation, which implies divine judgment and the enthronement of the Son of Man. In support for his thesis, LaCocque identifies elements in the vision of Dan 7 that by synecdoche point to the different themes of kingship, temple and cult, conflict, and ordering of chaos (e.g., the celestial throne as synecdoche for the palace-sanctuary), themes that all center in the overarching theme of creation, as well as elements that are also found in Canaanite myths. The roles of El and Baal in the Ugaritic myth are taken over by the "Ancient of Days" (El) and the "Son of Man" (Baal). The difference in Dan 7 from the mythological pattern is that the Ancient of Days and the Son of Man are not in rivalry. Here, the creation element is seen in the title "Son of Man," which is not so much Messianic—though this aspect is in the background (cf. Pss 2, 110)—but Adamic (cf. Ps 8). The kingship of the Son of Man, who for LaCocque designates both Israel's guardian angel Michael (122) and the saints (128), presents the victory over Chaos and thus a "new" creation.

E. Haag ("Daniel 12 und die Auferstehung der Toten") undertakes an exegesis of Dan 12:1-4. Both *מְשֻׁבְּרִים*; and *הַרְבִּים* (in contrast to *רְבִים* in v. 2a) are interpreted as words of apocalyptic motif, *מְשֻׁבְּרִים* referring to those with understanding among the religious leadership of Israel, and *הַרְבִּים* designating the faithful remnant who is inspired by the dedication and martyrdom of the *מְשֻׁבְּרִים*. Following the divine-servant motif in Isa 53 (vv. 11b and 13), the *מְשֻׁבְּרִים* led "the many" to righteousness and will be exalted from death to attain resurrection glory. Of particular interest is that, contrary to most

commentators, Haag (following Alfrink, Hartman and Di Lella, Lacocque) regards 12:2b as a nominal sentence that does not contrast two subdivisions of the “many” (a double resurrection), but contrasts those who awake (the “many” in v. 2a) with others who do not (the transgressors in 11:32, 40-45): “these . . . the others.” Consequently, the resurrection in 12:2 refers only to God’s chosen ones, who, for Haag, are the martyrs of the religious conflict in the Maccabean era. Although Haag’s reading is grammatically possible, it seems more likely that the contrasting *וְאֵלֶּה . . . אֵלֶּה* both refer to the “many” which immediately precedes and should be translated “some . . . some.” In a theological synthesis, Haag traces the roots of the resurrection motif in Dan 12:2-3 back to Ezek 37:1-14 and Isa 26:19, which show signs of a restitution of the individual pious one in the hereafter, a motif that is continued and expanded in a theology of resurrection in 2 Macc 7 and 12. In light of a double resurrection that includes the shame of the wicked, one may also add Isa 66:24 as possible allusion.

J. W. Van Henten (“Daniel 3 and 6 in Early Christian Literature”) throws light on the question of how early Christian literature has used the wisdom tales of Dan 3 and 6 (Van Henten does not regard them as court tales). Most of the references that he surveys interpret the fate and deliverance of early Christians in analogy to the stories in Dan 3 and 6 (Acts 12:11; Rev 13:7, 14-15; 2 Tim 4:17; *The Martyrdom of Polycarp* 14-15). Some portray Daniel and his companions as examples of faithful loyalty and endurance (Heb 11:33-38; 1 Clem. 45-46), while Matthew uses the fiery furnace as an instrument of punishment (13:42) and parallels the sealing of Jesus’ grave with the sealing of the lions’ den (27:62-66). In sum, Van Henten demonstrates successfully that Daniel and his friends have become models of Christian martyrs and that the heroes’ deliverance has become a source of hope for the Christian’s deliverance, even for the resurrection after death.

The last five essays in volume 1 attempt to illuminate the social setting of the book of Daniel. It is in this section that one finds the most diverging views in the two volumes, testifying to the still-vexing question of the social setting of Daniel and the never-ending dispute over it, as well as to the hypothetical character of the different proposals. R. Albertz (“The Social Setting of the Aramaic and Hebrew Book of Daniel”) rejects the usual theory of a collection of nonapocalyptic Aramaic stories (Dan 2-6) and argues in favor of Dan 2-7 as a literary unit. He then proposes the *Tendenz*, social background, and date of the Greek narrative collection (Dan 4-6), the Aramaic apocalypse (Dan 2-7), and the Hebrew apocalypse (Dan 1, 8-12). The Greek Dan 4-6 has an optimistic tendency regarding the diaspora and the heathen powers, and originated in the upper-class of the Alexandrian diaspora in the early third century B.C.E. The Aramaic Daniel apocalypse has a new central theme—praise and establishment of God’s kingdom against the Gentile powers—and stems from an intellectual psalmic poet, who stands in opposition to the official Jerusalem temple cult, and supposedly dates to the time of Antiochus III (late third century B.C.E.). Finally, during the Maccabean crisis a quietistic Hebrew author added the Hebrew Daniel apocalypse (Dan 1, 8-12), with the *Tendenz*

of salvation solely by divine activity, and corrected the topical interest of the Aramaic apocalypse to prevent any militant use. Albertz perceives two different groups of apocalyptic teachers that were the result of a split when the military resistance during the Maccabean crisis began (167 B.C.E.): those who supported a nonmilitant, purely religious resistance, to which the author of the Hebrew Daniel apocalypse belonged—these were the *חֲשִׁיּוֹת* in Dan 11:34-35, identifiable with the *Ḥasidim* in 1 Macc 2:42—and those who favored aggressive resistance (the outlook of the Animal Apocalypse in 1 *Enoch* 85-90), which the Hebrew author of Daniel identified as false *חֲשִׁיּוֹת*, who “will stumble” because of their coalition with the militant Maccabees (Dan 11:35a; for Albertz, *כָּשַׁל* [“fall”] denotes failure of action, not martyrdom). These two split groups of *Ḥasidim* were learned scribes and teachers.

S. Beyerle (“The Book of Daniel and Its Social Setting”) identifies the Danielic apocalypticists not with the *Ḥasidim* but with the *חֲשִׁיּוֹת*, which he describes as a group of highly educated intellectuals, “upper class” people who used traditional motifs and forms to create a new genre and composition and rearranged traditional symbols, giving them a new understanding. Based on his sociological analysis of Dan 12:1-3 (and to some extent of 11:33-35), Beyerle reconstructs the distinct belief system of the Danielic *חֲשִׁיּוֹת* that centers on the eschatological hope for salvation (resurrection) within an otherworldly reality and includes a radical replacement of social organization. The Torah-abiding group of Danielic *חֲשִׁיּוֹת* was isolated and under intense oppression by Hellenizing Jews, and finally disappeared.

L. Grabbe (“A Dan[iel] for All Seasons: For Whom Was Daniel Important?”) takes the view that a single author of high status in the Jewish community of Jerusalem used the legendary tales (Dan 1-6) and added the visions in Dan 7-12 during the Maccabean crisis. Thoroughly acquainted with Jewish historical and religious tradition and showing extensive knowledge of Hellenistic history (as seen in Dan 11) and a fair knowledge of the Neo-Babylonian and Persian history, the author belonged to the Jerusalem aristocracy, was maybe even a priest (Grabbe rejects the idea that priests could not write apocalypses), possibly Eupolemus (1 Macc 8:17; 2 Macc 4:11), who was first part of the Hellenistic reform of Jason but later joined the Maccabees.

For P. R. Davies (“The Scribal School of Daniel”) the authors of the final form of Daniel are the *חֲשִׁיּוֹת*, an unknown scribal group of non-Palestinian origin, probably Mesopotamia or Syria (inferred from the tales from a foreign court in Dan 2-6), who moved to Jerusalem (inferred from the interest in temple and cult in Dan 8-11) and were employed at the Seleucid court in the administration of political affairs. He further proposes that those who wrote some or all the texts of Qumran might be the successors of the Danielic *חֲשִׁיּוֹת*, for he perceives similarities in the use of the terms *חֲשִׁיּוֹת* and *רַבִּים* in the *Community Rule* and Daniel, and the common emphasis on esoteric wisdom as key to eschatological salvation. Following Boccaccini’s hypothesis of two traditions of Judaism present in Qumran—apocalyptic Enochic and priestly

Zadokite—Davies suggests that Daniel belongs to the Zadokite theology, making the מְשִׁילִים possible allies of the Zadokite priests.

D. L. Smith-Christopher (“Prayers and Dreams: Power and Diaspora Identities in the Social Setting of the Daniel Tales”) reads Dan 1–6 as folklore of resistance that addresses the need for negotiating Jewish identity in cross-cultural contacts of uneven distribution of power. Against the majority view that Dan 1–6 exhibits an optimistic outlook toward the conditions of the exile, he suggests assessing the exile more negatively, when worldly powers claim imperial control and subordinate minority groups. The dreams in Dan 1–6 should be read as “a literary form of ‘spiritual’ warfare” (282), pointing to a greater power than the divine-like political rulers. To that greater power, Daniel and the reader can connect by knowledge and wisdom. Here then is the real message of the politicized dreams and prayers: the survival of the exilic Jews depends on the redefined identity of being a group with superior knowledge and wisdom.

The second volume of *The Book of Daniel* contains parts 5 to 8. Six essays are found in the section on the “Literary Context, including Qumran.” J.-W. Wesselius (“The Writing of Daniel”) proposes an intertextual parallel of structural framework between the books of Ezra and Daniel that should explain discontinuities in Daniel. G. Boccaccini (“The Solar Calendars of Daniel and Enoch”) argues that Daniel follows the Zadokite solar calendar—a 360+4-day sabbatical calendar—which helps to explain the different times of the end in Daniel. He particularly proposes a new calculation of the 2,300 “evenings-mornings” in Dan 8:14. P. W. Flint (“The Daniel Tradition at Qumran”) presents nine nonbiblical manuscripts from Qumran that are relevant to Daniel. L. T. Stuckenbruck (“Daniel and Early Enoch Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls”) examines the tradition-historical relationship between Daniel and Enochic apocalyptic traditions in the Qumran manuscripts *Pseudo-Daniel* (4Q243-245) and the *Book of Giants* (4Q530) and infers that there was a period of fluid traditions between the Danielic and the Enochic apocalyptic traditions in the second century B.C.E., so that the book of Daniel supposedly could adapt Enochic material to its own interests. E. Eshel (“Possible Sources of the Book of Daniel”) identifies as sources of Daniel the following: 4Q242 (*Prayer of Nabonidus*) for Dan 4, 4Q248 (Historical Text A) for Dan 11:21-45 and 12:7, and 4Q530 (*Book of Giants*) for Dan 7. In a comparative study, J. F. Hobbins (“Resurrection in the Daniel Tradition and Other Writings at Qumran”) surveys the common and distinguishable features of the expectations about life after death and the concept of resurrection in early Enochic literature, *Jubilees*, the Words of Ezekiel (or Pseudo-Ezekiel), and Dan 12.

Another six essays are listed under the section “Reception of Daniel in Judaism and Christianity.” In this section, one learns about the influence of Daniel upon literature from the second-century B.C.E. until early Jewish and Christian sources during Roman times (K. Koch, “Stages in the Canonization of the Book of Daniel”), Targumic literature (U. Gleßner, “Die ‘vier Reiche’ aus Daniel in der targumischen Literatur”) or upon such persons as Aphrahat



and Ephrem the Syrian (M. Henze, "Nebuchadnezzar's Madness [Daniel 4] in Syriac Literature") or Thomas Müntzer (Charles Rowland, "The Book of Daniel and the Radical Critique of Empire: An Essay in Apocalyptic Hermeneutics"). Two essays on the NT leave no doubt that Daniel did influence the NT writings: Jesus' concept of the kingdom of God (C. A. Evans, "Daniel in the New Testament: Visions of God's Kingdom"), as well as the "son of man" motif in the Gospel tradition are rooted in the book of Daniel (J. D. G. Dunn, "The Danielic Son of Man in the New Testament").

The "Textual History" section comprises three essays: E. Ulrich ("The Text of Daniel in the Qumran Scrolls") lists all the textual variants in the Daniel manuscripts from Qumran and evaluates their significance in regard to the textual history of Daniel; A. A. Di Lella ("The Textual History of Septuagint-Daniel and Theodotion-Daniel") gives an overview of the issues in the study of the Greek texts of Daniel, with reference to the major scholarly contributions; and K. D. Jenner ("Syriac Daniel") surveys the available sources of the Syriac Daniel, summarizes the results of scholarly research, and identifies the important areas in the discipline.

The final three essays deal with "The Theology of Daniel": J. Goldingay ("Daniel in the Context of Old Testament Theology") explores the concept of God's sovereignty and the portrayal of Gentile and Jewish leaders in Daniel; J. Barton ("Theological Ethics in Daniel") underlines that the ethical concerns in Daniel are in complete harmony with other mainstream Jewish literature and cannot be regarded in any way as sectarian; and J. Lust ("Cult and Sacrifice in Daniel: The Tamid and the Abomination of Desolation," originally published in 1993) investigates one aspect of the cultic motif in Daniel and suggests that the expression *שקין משמים* (Dan 9:27; 11:31; 12:11) is best understood as the "abomination of the desolator" and constitutes a pagan sacrifice in replacement of the Tamid.

In summary, Collins and Flint have ensured that the two volumes of *The Book of Daniel* cover a breadth of topics and stand at the cutting edge of Daniel scholarship. The individual essays offer at times refreshingly different opinions. For example, whereas Hobbins interprets Dan 12:2 as a resurrection of the spirit in comparison with the Qumran material (1 *En.* 22 and *Jub.* 23), Haag argues that the resurrection theme in Dan 12 follows the OT tradition and thus expresses a physical resurrection. Striking are the different opinions of who is responsible for the final form of the book of Daniel, as presented by Albertz, Beyerle, Grabbe, and Davies. The editors have to be congratulated for resisting to smooth away such differences, for they reflect adequately the present state of discussion. I believe this is the optimal way to stimulate further thinking and research: bringing together a variety of scholars who present their views in the best way possible, even, or especially, if they differ significantly from each other. It is friction that generates new sparks of thought.

A few shortcomings need to be noticed, too. Substantial parts of some essays simply present either an adaptation, a slightly modified version, or

sometimes even a reproduction, of previously published material (e.g., Van der Toorn, Paul, Kratz, Flint, Stuckenbruck, Henze, and Lust). What is missing, strangely enough, regarding the reception history is an essay on the influence of Daniel on the only apocalyptic book of the NT, Revelation. Finally, the editorial finesse leaves much to be desired. Without including repetitive errors, I counted thirty typos or slips in the first volume and sixty-four in the second, with the first two lines of p. 674 taking the cake by garbling subtitle and text in the first line followed by two slips in the second line.

These minor drawbacks do not detract from the fact that these volumes present without question a standard work on recent Daniel scholarship. No student of the book of Daniel can afford to bypass them. While their main emphasis is on the composition and reception of the book of Daniel, including a special focus on the relation of Daniel to the Qumran literature, they go far beyond and deal with a wide range of interpretational issues. Thus I trust that anyone interested in Daniel will benefit tremendously from carefully perusing these volumes.

Seminar Schloss Bogenhofen  
St. Peter am Hart, Austria

MARTIN PRÖBSTLE

Ervin, Howard. *Healing: Sign of the Kingdom*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002. 116 pp. Paper, \$12.95.

Given his two books on Tongue-Speech, his book on the baptism of the Holy Spirit, his position as Professor of Pneumatology at Oral Roberts University, and his practice of the healing ministry in the contemporary charismatic world, Howard Ervin is well suited to expound on the spiritual gift of healing. His conclusions are based upon biblical exposition, yet his style is anything but heavy-handed theology. Even his chapter on "The Gift," in which he presents an exegesis of a small portion of 1 Cor 12, is written in a light-weight prose that lay persons can easily digest.

Ervin's primary thesis is that there is a nearly seamless gift of healing that has pervaded the Christian church from Christ's time to ours, even though the function and purpose of that healing gift has changed. Jesus' miracles of healing were signs to unbelievers that the messianic kingdom had come. Today, a miracle of healing is simply a gift of the Spirit to believers. Accordingly, Jesus' threefold ministry was comprised of preaching the advent of the kingdom of God, teaching the nature of that kingdom and healing as a sign that the kingdom had indeed come. In fact, Ervin is quite unequivocal in stating that healing by Jesus or his disciples was "*the* sign that the kingdom of God has drawn near" (2, emphasis supplied). That statement seems a bit strong until you read his balancing statement a few pages later: "Healing is not an end in itself, nor is it self-validating. It is the message that distinguishes the divine from the counterfeit." However, that qualification is so broad that one could conclude that any healing not directly connected with the "message," which he defines