



DISSERTATION

Titel der Dissertation

“The Concept of Canonical Intertextuality and the
Book of Daniel”

Verfasser

Jordan Scheetz, M.A.

angestrebter akademischer Grad

Doktor der Theologie (Dr. theol.)

Wien, 2009	
Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt:	A 082 041
Dissertationsgebiet lt. Studienblatt:	Evangelische Theologie
Betreuerin / Betreuer:	O. Univ.-Prof. Dr. DDr. James Alfred Loader

Table of Contents

Preface	3
Abbreviations	5
1. Intertextuality, Canon Criticism and Biblical Studies	6
1.1 Overview	6
1.2 Julia Kristeva's Concept of Intertextuality	8
1.3 Canon Criticism from Biblical Studies	12
1.3.1 Theories of Canonical Process	14
1.3.1.1 Michael Fishbane's Theory of Canonical Process	14
1.3.1.2 James Sanders's Theory of Canonical Process	16
1.3.1.3 Brevard Childs's Theory of Canonical Process	18
1.3.2 Canonical Hermeneutics	22
1.3.3 Criticism of Canon Criticism	24
1.3.4 Canon Criticism and Context	28
1.4 Intratextuality	29
1.5 Kanonisch-intertextuelle Lektüre	32
1.6 The Concept of Canonical Intertextuality	35
2. Three Approaches to the Interpretation of Daniel	39
2.1 Introduction	39
2.2 Babylonian Era	39
2.3 Maccabean Era	41
2.4 Spanning the Time Periods	45
2.5 Summary	49
3. Canonical Intertextuality: Daniel 1-6	51
3.1 Introduction	51
3.2 The Scenes	51
3.3 Chapter 1	54
3.4 Chapter 2	57
3.5 Chapter 3	60
3.6 Chapter 4	63
3.7 Chapter 5	67
3.8 Chapter 6	72
3.9 Summary of Chapters 1-6	78
4. Canonical Intertextuality: Daniel 7-12	80
4.1 Introduction	80
4.2 Chapter 7	81
4.3 Chapter 8	89
4.4 Chapter 9	97
4.5 Chapters 10-12	105
4.6 Summary of Chapters 7-12	115

5. Canonical Intertextuality and the Book of Daniel in the Old Testament	117
5.1 Introduction	117
5.2 Dan 6 and Dan 9 (Ezra 7; Deut; Exod)	118
5.3 Canonical Placements of Daniel	126
5.4 Conclusion	131
6. Canonical Intertextuality and the Book of Daniel in the New Testament	132
6.1 Introduction	132
6.2 Dan 3:6 (Mt 13:42,50)	133
6.3 Dan 7:13 (Mt 24:30; 26:64; Mk 13:26; 14:62; Lk 21:27; Rev 1:7)	135
6.4 Dan 9:27 (Mt 24:15; Mk 13:14)	139
6.5 Summary	140
Bibliography	144
Author Index	150
Biblical and Ancient Text Index	151
Abstract	156
CV	157

Preface

This proposal for *The Concept of Canonical Intertextuality* is an attempt to make sense of the complex issues one faces with the biblical text, which is at the same time a singular text and yet many texts. My presuppositions are orthodox and traditional in some ways. I believe that the text of Scripture is connected with historical realities where God has intervened in history. This revelation becomes the foundation from which texts are developed, collected, and ordered together. In turn this text, through the guidance of the Holy Spirit, is revelation. In other ways my research reflects a complexity in the development of the text that stands on the shoulders of both pre-critical and critical scholarship. Difficulties can be ignored or exaggerated, but my hope is to draw the debate in a more profitable direction where the biblical text's voice and plurality of voices can be heard and understood without the need for either overly harmonistic solutions or confused fictions.

All biblical quotes from the original languages have been taken from *Bible Works 5*. I have chosen to use pointed texts from the Hebrew Bible to allow for easier reading due to the extensive usage and citations from these texts. However, I have retained the Masoretic Text instead of the Ketiv/Qere readings given in the *Bible Works 5* text (except in one place). All translations are my own and are intended to aid in the reading of the ancient texts quoted in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek, whether biblical or extra-biblical. Quotes from German have not been translated. All verse references in relation to the Hebrew Bible correspond to the Hebrew text numbering system which at times differs from English translations. I am very thankful for those who have read and commented extensively on the whole of the text: Prof. Dr. DDr James Alfred Loader, David Sanford, and my wife, Rachel.

My own canonical opinions have been influenced heavily by not only the writers cited in the following pages but by personal contact with three professors in particular. Prof. Dr. Ray Lubeck first introduced me and a myriad of other students to the concept of an overarching logic operating in particular within the Hebrew Bible. Prof. Dr. John Sailhamer not only opened my eyes to reading the biblical text by sight in the original languages, but thoroughly grounded me through hours of discussion in and outside the classroom in relation to the historical and exegetical arguments for a canonical perspective. Prof. Dr. DDr. James Alfred Loader has broadened and sharpened my perspective through hours of discussion and pages upon pages of

interaction. I am thankful for their influence and devotion at different stages in my life. I have been shaped through their unique academic and Christian perspectives.

My wife and children have endured the most through this entire process. Over the course of nearly five years, I have been away from the home literally months, and even while at home countless hours of research and writing have possessed me again and again. To my wife Rachel and my children Lela, Hannah, Joshua, Joel and Jakob, I can only say a deep and sincere thank you. May my work on *The Concept of Canonical Intertextuality* somehow benefit them and many others for years to come.

Abbreviations

<i>BDB</i>	Brown, Driver, Briggs, <i>Hebrew English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i>
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
<i>GKC</i>	Gesenius, Kautzsch, Cowley, <i>Hebrew Grammar</i>
<i>HALOT</i>	<i>Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

1. Intertextuality, Canon Criticism and Biblical Studies

1.1 Overview

At the end of the 1960s, two movements began that at first glance do not appear to be related. In the field of literary theory, Post-structuralism began.¹ In the field of Old Testament theology, canonical theology or canon criticism began. Both methods raised important questions about context. In the field of literary theory, the question was more a challenge to the accepted theory of the relationship between the signifier and the signified.² In the field of Old Testament theology, there was the challenge of whether the research was moving overall in the right direction when the foundation of the research was based on the prevailing critical method.³

Context in both situations received a more refined meaning. Literary theory broadened the context. When one looks at a word, there is more than a static relationship between the signifier and the signified.⁴ Although one uses the same words, it does not mean that when the same words are used in another context that they will have the same meaning because there is not a static relationship between the signifier and the signified. Julia Kristeva first called this situation intertextuality, where one notes the transposition of the meaning. She did not mean it to be a diachronic analysis but as a notation of the so-called “third” possibility, where although the same words are used, they are not the exact sum of what they mean earlier or later.⁵

Context also had a challenge in the field of Old Testament theology. In the pre-critical era, context had to do with the inspired words of the canonical books (*Baba Batra* 14b-15a).⁶ In the critical era, context primarily had to do with the different diachronic texts in the Old Testament, where J, E, D, P represented different

¹ Jacques Derrida's, *Of Grammatology*, trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), which was originally published in French as *De la Grammatologie* in 1967, represents a seminal full-volume work in this regard.

² Julia Kristeva, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980), 64-65. This volume is mostly a translation of a work that originally appeared in French in 1969 as *Σημειωτική: Recherches pour une sémanalyse*.

³ Brevard S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 15.

⁴ Kristeva, *Desire in Language*, 64-65.

⁵ Kristeva, *Desire in Language*, 59-60.

⁶ The above mentioned tractates can be found in Jacob Neusner, ed. and trans., *Tractate Baba Batra*, vol. 15 of *The Babylonian Talmud: A Translation and Commentary* (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 2005), 54-56.

time periods in the development of the Old Testament.⁷ The search in both situations was similar. The authoritative texts were the “original texts.”⁸ The pre-critical era connected authority with the author (Moses, Isaiah, Daniel, et al.), because they were inspired. The critical era connected authority with the earliest texts of the Old Testament (normally J, especially the narrative texts) and, in the case of the prophets, the “original prophets” and their message (Isaiah, not Deutero-Isaiah or Trito-Isaiah).

The challenge comes through the question of the composition of the Old Testament. How was the Old Testament put together? The answer is probably best described as a post-critical position, because the answer goes further than both the pre-critical and critical position. The composition of the Old Testament is something that began relatively early in the history of Israel and grew over time. But it grew through a reflective process. This position says that the Old Testament grew through particular historical situations, reflection on these particular situations, and exegesis on the texts of these reflections. The whole Old Testament, containing as it does texts very different in their contents, is not merely the product of many books having simply been brought together (vis-à-vis the pre-critical assumption), neither is it only a collection of many texts from different times that were simply put together (as assumed by the classical critical position). The canonical perspective rather sees the Old Testament as a text that progressively grew and took shape through this process.

Michael Fishbane wrote a whole book, *Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, with the proposal that the interpretations one finds in the Talmud and the New Testament are not something that began in the post-biblical era, but something that came from the biblical era.⁹ This means that when one sees interpretations of Old Testament texts in the New Testament that are different from their original Old Testament contexts, and these interpretations move us in a direction that is different from the earlier context, this is not a new process that begins in the New Testament, but a process that already began in the Old Testament.

This tendency, where a text quotes or alludes to another text and through the quote or allusion the meaning is changed or broadened, is intertextuality. One sees the

⁷ Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*, trans. Black and Menzies (New York: Meridian Books, 1957), is not the first suggestion of this thesis, but certainly is looked to as the standard. His proposal was originally published in German in 1878.

⁸ James A. Sanders, *Canon and Community: A Guide to Canonical Criticism* (Philadelphia: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1984), 41.

⁹ Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 2.

“transposition,” the words in a new context with a new denotation.¹⁰ And so one sees a connection through this process between the two movements in literary theory and canon criticism. Further, there is at least the possibility where one can understand the relationship between texts in the Old Testament, the relationship between the Old and the New Testament, and the relationship between the Bible and extra-biblical literature.

1.2 Julia Kristeva’s Concept of Intertextuality

In theological studies the terms intertextual or intertextuality have become commonplace. These terms have become helpful in identifying the relationships between texts within the Bible, between those outside the Bible, and between the Bible and texts outside the Bible. As useful as these terms are, they have become opaque descriptions that are in need of a particular identity. As with all neologisms, it would be useful that they actually describe something new and not a process that has already been clearly defined through other terms and processes. So, for “intertextual” or “intertextuality” to be simply identified as quotations or allusions to other texts, is both obvious and clearly defined through centuries of research. For such a definition one needs to turn to the origin of the terms “intertextual” or “intertextuality” in the writings of a Post-structuralist writer.

Julia Kristeva is recognized as the originator of the term and theory of intertextuality.¹¹ As has already been noted, though the term has come into broad use over the course of the past thirty years, it has for the most part been misunderstood¹² and in the words of Kristeva “has often been understood in the banal sense of ‘study of sources.’”¹³ Others who have understood the concept in a more general sense have followed Derrida, who sees all of reality as intertextuality, noting, “There is nothing outside of the text.”¹⁴ As will be obvious in the following discussion the term and

¹⁰ Julia Kristeva, *Revolution in Poetic Language*, trans. Leon S. Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1984), 59-60. This volume is a much shortened translation of *La révolution du langage poétique* that first appeared in 1974.

¹¹ Barbara Godard, “Intertextuality,” in *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory: Approaches, Scholars, Terms*, ed. Irena R. Makaryk (Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 1993), 568. Timothy K. Beal, “Glossary,” in *Reading Between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible*, ed. Danna Nolan Fewell (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992), 22.

¹² Leon S. Roudiez, “Introduction,” in *Desire in Laungauge*, by Julia Kristeva, ed. by Leon S. Roudiez, trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1980), 15.

¹³ Kristeva, *Revolution*, 60.

¹⁴ Godard, “Intertextuality,” 569 and Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, 158.

theory were developed with different connotations than both of these derivative positions.

Kristeva, though very eclectic in her conclusions, began within the broad category of structuralism and her thinking became a stimulus to what has come to be termed Post-structuralism. Structuralism was based on Ferdinand de Saussure's linguistic concepts. He argued foundationally that "[a] linguistic sign is not a link between a thing and a name but between a concept and a sound pattern."¹⁵ He then argues that, "The link between signal and signification is arbitrary. Since we are treating a sign as the combination in which a signal is associated with a signification, we can express this more simply as: *the linguistic sign is arbitrary*."¹⁶ This last statement is qualified, "The signal, in relation to the idea it represents, may seem to be freely chosen. However, from the point of view of the linguistic community, the signal is imposed rather than freely chosen. Speakers are not consulted about its choice. Once the language has selected a signal, it cannot be freely replaced by any other."¹⁷ The relationship between what has become known as signifier and signified and signifier/signified in the intelligible structure, text, becomes the playground in which Kristeva's theory of intertextuality developed. Her challenge became what may be viewed as the static relationship between signifier and signified, whether diachronic, throughout time, or synchronic, within a particular time.

Kristeva's challenge to the static relationship between signifier and signified and the texts they create is heavily influenced by the literary theory of Mikhail Bakhtin.¹⁸ From Bakhtin, Kristeva picks up on the concept of dialogism. In writing about this discovery in Bakhtin she notes:

Bakhtin was one of the first to replace the static hewing out of texts with a model where literary structure does not simply exist but is generated in relation to another structure. What allows a dynamic dimension to structuralism is his conception of the "literary word" as an intersection of textual surfaces rather than a point (fixed meaning), as a dialogue among several writings: that of the writer, the addressee (or the character), and the contemporary or earlier cultural context.¹⁹

¹⁵ Ferdinand de Saussure, *A Course in General Linguistics*, ed. Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye, trans. Roy Harris (Chicago and La Salle, Illinois: Open Court, 1986), 66. Three years after Saussure's death in 1913 *Cours de linguistique générale* appeared not from his own hand but from his lecture notes and notes taken by his students from his lectures (xii).

¹⁶ Saussure, *A Course in General Linguistics*, 67.

¹⁷ Saussure, *A Course in General Linguistics*, 71.

¹⁸ Kristeva, *Desire in Language*, 64.

¹⁹ Kristeva, *Desire in Language*, 64-65.

The textual surfaces are the interaction between subject-addressee and text-context. These two surfaces are then axes that coincide to generate meaning, meaning that is not singular but plural. Bakhtin labeled these two axes dialogue (subject-addressee), and ambivalence (text-context). Ultimately this leads to the conclusion that “any text is constructed as a mosaic of quotations; any text is the absorption and transformation of another.”²⁰

From these observations in relation to dialogism Kristeva grabs onto what Bakhtin calls translinguistic science.²¹ She describes this translinguistic quality as semiotic practices which “operate through and across language, while remaining irreducible to its categories as they are presently assigned.”²² With this addition of a translinguistic quality, text is viewed as productivity. This means that the text redistributes language, which should be engaged through logical instead of linguistical categories. This also means that the text “is a permutation of texts.”²³

With these two concepts of dialogism and translinguistic science, texts are not signs functioning within a closed system or structure looking simply to be reordered to communicate. Instead there is “subjectivity and communication” due to the coinciding of subject-addressee and text-context.²⁴ Where these axes coincide, where this subjectivity and communication happens, there is intertextuality where “several utterances, taken from other texts, intersect and neutralize one another,”²⁵ where one sign system is transposed into another.²⁶

For Kristeva, intertextuality does not have value in understanding sources of a text, where one might be inclined to track down which texts have been used to see how they have been transformed.²⁷ She believes this is to misunderstand the connectedness of all texts. She also views it as problematic to say that one cannot comment at all on textual transformation because “[t]here is nothing outside the text,”²⁸ that there are no rules.²⁹ Instead intertextuality enables one to see the social,

²⁰ Kristeva, *Desire in Language*, 66.

²¹ Kristeva, *Desire in Language*, 71.

²² Kristeva, *Desire in Language*, 36.

²³ Kristeva, *Desire in Language*, 36.

²⁴ Kristeva, *Desire in Language*, 68.

²⁵ Kristeva, *Desire in Language*, 36.

²⁶ Kristeva, *Revolution in Poetic Language*, 59-60.

²⁷ Godard, “Intertextuality,” 569, and Kristeva, *Revolution*, 60.

²⁸ Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, 158.

²⁹ Kristeva, *Desire in Language*, 71.

political and philosophical transpositions from one sign system to another,³⁰ though “never single, complete, and identical to themselves, but always plural, shattered, capable of being tabulated.”³¹ Intertextuality is then the denoting of “this transposition of one sign system(s) into another” and, due to the common misunderstanding of intertextuality as the study of sources, she later opts for the term transposition.³²

One would well note that much of what Kristeva applies of these denotations is heavily dependent on what she calls “the new post-Freudian rationality that takes two stages into account, the conscious and the unconscious ones, and two corresponding types of performances.”³³ The Freudian concept of representability becomes most important as Kristeva explains, “Transposition plays an essential role here inasmuch as it implies the abandonment of a former sign system, the passage to a second via an instinctual intermediary common to the two systems, and the articulation of the new system with its new representability.”³⁴ The end result of intertextuality is something new, a change of these translinguistic elements, these social, political and philosophical sign systems. To read a text intertextually then is to denote this process of transposition of one sign system into another with its new representability.

With Kristeva’s ground breaking work, the terms intertextual and intertextuality were invented and further defined in distinction to already noted processes. Though Kristeva laments the “banal” connection in relation to the study of sources, this is at least a part of the research one must do to be able to understand the intertextuality or transposition within a text. Further, this opposition, as is the case with canon criticism, may be seen as a reaction to overly diachronic analyses in earlier literary theory at the expense of synchronic analysis. That is to say that intertextuality illuminates both the diachronic (especially in quotations and allusions) and synchronic (use within the present text) aspects of texts and their relationships to one another. This is of particular importance in biblical studies, where it is known that the text, the Bible, was developed over the course of centuries and gathered over time into an authoritative collection. Intertextuality allows us to note the development of the text through these transpositions seen in quotes and allusions and further the

³⁰ Kristeva, *Desire in Language*, 71.

³¹ Kristeva, *Revolution in Poetic Language*, 60.

³² Kristeva, *Revolution in Poetic Language*, 60.

³³ Kristeva, *Desire in Language*, ix.

³⁴ Kristeva, *Revolution in Poetic Language*, 60.

tension within the text in its synchronic single book form where all of these smaller texts are now connected into *a* text, though retaining a plurality of voices. In the case of biblical and extra-biblical examinations, intertextuality illuminates the dialogue in particular time periods between these texts.

1.3 Canon Criticism from Biblical Studies

Is there a proper context in which biblical texts are to be read? Of course there have been many contexts in which biblical texts have been read, both consciously and unconsciously, as has been noted in Kristeva's theory of intertextuality. Each new generation brings issues of their cultural context to the reading of biblical texts, issues that are consciously theorized and practiced (hermeneutics), and issues that are unconsciously practiced (in vogue philosophy, social mores and the like).

However, when one speaks of biblical texts a category has automatically been created by the very terminology itself, namely "biblical," a specific type of text. The term draws up already a certain context from which the texts are identified and to be read. Historically this has been the case. What has been pejoratively labeled as a pre-critical perspective has understood that biblical texts should be read within a certain range of texts. This range of texts has been described by the somewhat suspect term (in certain groups) of canon.

Blenkinsopp, at the beginning of his book *Prophecy and Canon* states, "We may dispense with etymologies and original meanings and begin by saying that a canon is generally taken to be a collection of writings deemed to have a normative function within a particular community."³⁵ With this general definition in place, several canons traditionally have been recognized within the field of biblical studies. Within Judaism, the Hebrew Bible functions in this sense as a canon, and some may even include the Written and Oral Torah together.³⁶ Catholic, Orthodox, and Protestant Christian groups have used canon in this sense to refer to either the Old and New Testament or Old and New Testament with Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical books.

As the discipline moved into a modern critical period, certain questions and hypotheses have led in the field of Old Testament studies to a strong challenge to the unity of the texts that are now possessed in their present received canon(s). What has

³⁵ Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Prophecy and Canon* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1977), 3.

³⁶ Jon D. Levenson, *The Hebrew Bible, the Old Testament and Historical Criticism* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), 62-81.

commonly come to be known as the documentary hypothesis has called for the dissection of the received text to establish their “original” texts. In this view the various layers of textual strata are separated from one another, the various texts are classified based on certain characteristics, and theories have abounded as to which of these various texts are foundational.³⁷

Obviously there has been much debate between these competing views, the traditional and critical views, for the context in which biblical texts are to be viewed. But in many ways the basic quest has been the same, and the search for the “original” text has played a prevalent role. The pre-critical perspective has desired to establish the context as those texts inspired by God as they were written by their original authors and brought together through divine providence as the appropriate context in which biblical texts are to be read.³⁸ The modern critical view has desired to establish the context as layers of textual strata that can be read distinct from one another and in which the original context(s) can be discerned. In either case the authoritative reading is the “original” reading.³⁹

Arguments against the pre-critical perspective have centered around two key issues, the concept of inspiration and, related, the reality of the development of the biblical texts themselves.⁴⁰ Arguments in the past fifty years against the modern critical perspective have centered around the highly speculative nature of establishing layers of textual strata and how one can legitimately “isolate older traditions away from their context within scripture.”⁴¹

Some, due to the concerns that have arisen in relation to both the pre-critical and modern critical approaches in the field of Old Testament studies and particularly biblical theology, have sought to establish a different position and in some cases what they view as a new discipline. This position has become known as a canonical approach and as a discipline has been termed canon criticism. Key to these canonical perspectives is a theory of the development of the canon and the significance of this development for the reading of the text.⁴² In turn Michael Fishbane, James Sanders, and Brevard Childs will be used to examine and navigate through each of these issues.

³⁷ Rolf Rendtorff, *Der Text in Seiner Endgestalt* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner, 2001), 83-102.

³⁸ Brevard S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 51.

³⁹ James A. Sanders, *Canon and Community: A Guide to Canonical Criticism*, 41.

⁴⁰ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 51-52.

⁴¹ Gerald T. Sheppard, “Canon Criticism,” vol. 1 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 861.

⁴² Sanders, *Canon and Community*, 21.

1.3.1 Theories of Canonical Process

Theories in relation to canonical process tend to operate from two differing perspectives. One perspective sees a high level of continuity between earlier revelation or authoritative tradition and further developments that are consciously upholding this earlier revelation or authoritative tradition. This might be described as a linear or diachronic perspective on the canonical process, where earlier revelation or authoritative tradition is determining what will be further developed and included in the canon. The direction of development is then from earlier revelation or authoritative tradition to a further unfolding or reinterpreting. At a certain point the process was simply stopped and the once developing canon, with earlier revelation or authoritative tradition and its subsequent reinterpretations, were isolated from further developments.

Another perspective sees a high level of discontinuity between earlier revelation or authoritative tradition and the canonical text. This might be described as the synchronic approach where one particular time period, the time in which the standard or canonized text was developed, gives decisive meaning to the text as a whole by establishing a new text from many older texts. In many cases through this canonical process texts which clearly had a different earlier context are now through this standardization given a new context. This is to say that many of these earlier texts now found within this canon had a definite earlier context that is different from the canonical context.

1.3.1.1 Michael Fishbane's Theory of Canonical Process

Michael Fishbane, the developer of inner-biblical exegesis, forms a theory of canonical process that runs hand in hand with his concept of inner-biblical exegesis. He finds:

The predominant authority of revelation over tradition in the diverse genres and expressions of inner-biblical exegesis reflects an incipient canonical consciousness. Texts believed to be divinely revealed had a fixed and controlling legitimacy about them in relation to all new developments.⁴³

⁴³ Michael Fishbane, "Revelation and Tradition: Aspects of Inner-Biblical Exegesis," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99 (1980): 343.

Fishbane locates this process “in the biblical period—both pre- and post- exilic—and ...already from this time tensions between revelation and tradition emerged and were resolved.”⁴⁴ From the examples that Fishbane cites both in the above referenced article and his extensive evaluation in *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, revelation would primarily be identified with texts from the Pentateuch/Torah (though there seem to be other marked points in the historical tradition) during presumably the pre-exilic period. Tradition that cites, innovates, and renovates this earlier revelation would be from the pre- and post-exilic periods and would represent the rest of the Hebrew Bible (Old Testament). Fishbane sees evidence in the canonical process where “older deposits of revelation had already achieved an authoritative status—thus suggesting a canonical consciousness of sorts, insofar as such authoritative texts would constitute a precanonical canon.”⁴⁵ With this said, texts from this older material include “laws, theological or narrative dicta, or prophecies.”⁴⁶ The close of this time of canonical process is also the close of inner-biblical exegesis with “the establishment of a fixed canon deemed prior in time and authority to rabbinic exegesis.”⁴⁷

One may be tempted to think that Fishbane has simply lapsed into a “pre-critical” perspective. However, underpinning this entire process are the concepts of *tradtum* and *tradtio*. *Tradtum* is the content of tradition and *tradtio* is “the complex result of a long and varied process of transmission.”⁴⁸ Thus the canon is viewed as being the result of successive stages where at “each stage in the *tradtio*, the *tradtum* was adapted, transformed, or reinterpreted”⁴⁹ and further:

The final process of canon-formation, which meant the solidification of the biblical *tradtum* and the onset of the post-biblical *tradtio*, was thus a culmination of several related processes. Each transmission of received traditions utilized materials which were or became authoritative in this very process; and each interpretation and explication was made in the context of an authoritative *tradtum*. Further, each solidification of the *tradtum* was the canon in process of its formation; and each stage of canon-formation was a

⁴⁴ Michael Fishbane, “Revelation and Tradition: Aspects of Inner-Biblical Exegesis,” 343.

⁴⁵ Michael Fishbane, “Revelation and Tradition: Aspects of Inner-Biblical Exegesis,” 359-360.

⁴⁶ Michael Fishbane, “Revelation and Tradition: Aspects of Inner-Biblical Exegesis,” 360.

⁴⁷ Michal Fishbane, *The Garments of Torah: Essays in Biblical Hermeneutics* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1992), 18.

⁴⁸ Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 6.

⁴⁹ Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 6.

new achievement in *Gemeindebildung*, in the formation of an integrated book-centered culture.⁵⁰

Far from a “pre-critical” approach, Fishbane has fully embraced a “critical” perspective concerning the biblical canon.

1.3.1.2 James Sanders’s Theory of Canonical Process

In a little book called *Torah and Canon* James Sanders unfolds in his introduction what he views as a new phase in research:

The following is an essay in the origin and function of canon; it is, in effect, an invitation to formulate a sub-discipline of Bible study I think should be called canonical criticism.⁵¹

Indeed his terminology has taken hold and an entire entry in the *Anchor Bible Dictionary* takes up the very topic under the title “Canonical Criticism” in a six-page article.⁵² It is Sanders who states, “Canonical criticism has two major foci. The one may be called the canonical process and the other canonical hermeneutics.”⁵³

Sanders’s own description of canon states, “The primary character of canon is its adaptability as well as its stability.”⁵⁴ These two key concepts also become Sanders’s understanding of the canonical process. Adaptability is for Sanders “the idea of the living word of God ever dynamically new and fresh” being heard.⁵⁵ Stability is the idea that earlier traditions become fixed in a particular form.⁵⁶ Indeed Sanders even views this process at work in the transmission of biblical manuscripts:

There is no early biblical manuscript which I am aware no matter how “accurate” we may conjecture it to be, or faithful to its *Vorlage*, that does not have some trace in it of its having been adapted to the needs of the community from which we, by archaeology or happenstance, receive it.⁵⁷

However, even with this statement Sanders does concede that the biblical text of the Old Testament was stabilized by the end of the first century C.E.⁵⁸

⁵⁰ Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 18.

⁵¹ James A. Sanders, *Torah and Canon* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), ix.

⁵² Sheppard, “Canon Criticism,” 861-866.

⁵³ Sanders, *Canon and Community*, 21.

⁵⁴ Sanders, *Canon and Community*, 22.

⁵⁵ James A. Sanders, “Text and Canon: Concepts and Method,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 98 (1979): 21.

⁵⁶ Sanders, “Text and Canon: Concepts and Method,” 21.

⁵⁷ Sanders, “Text and Canon: Concepts and Method,” 13.

⁵⁸ Sanders, *Canon and Community*, 28.

Canonical process for Sanders begins in the pre-exilic period with Torah. This is not to be confused with the Pentateuch, which he views as having its “earliest really clear use” exclusively in relation to the Pentateuch as such “in the prologue to Sirach, or Ecclesiasticus, which dates from the latter part of the second century B.C.”⁵⁹ For Sanders, Torah has a range of meaning within the Old Testament text that “denotes bodies of instruction or teachings of priests, prophets, and sages, and even of parental advice to children; but it appears that the oldest and most common meaning is something approximate to what we mean by the word *revelation*.”⁶⁰ Primarily Torah “is basically a narrative, a story, rather than a code of laws,”⁶¹ “a story of the origins of ancient Israel,”⁶² “those early traditions of ancient Israel which not only had a life of their own but gave life to those who knew them and molded their own lives around them.”⁶³

With this concept of Torah in place, Sanders then identifies a significant period of transition:

The period bracketed by the fall of the first temple and the fall of the second, from the sixth century BCE to the end of the first CE, precisely from the time of Deuteronomy to that of Rabbi Meir and the beginnings of the oral codification of the Mishnah, was marked by a co-existence of two distinct ideas about the Word of God, the idea of the living word of God ever dynamically new and fresh, and the idea of traditions which were becoming stabilized into certain forms but were generation after generation in need of being adapted to and heard afresh in new historical contexts.⁶⁴

With this said, Sanders judges that “by the end of the sixth century B.C., certainly by the beginning of the fifth, something like the core of the Law and the Prophets was fairly well shaping up.”⁶⁵ He views a high level of stability within what he calls the “Genesis-to-Kings complex at the end of the sixth century B.C.”⁶⁶ Though the “core” of the Prophets is in place during the sixth century it is not until some time in the early second century that the Prophets take their canonical shape, which must have been before 190 B.C. due to Jesus ben Sira’s enumeration of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and

⁵⁹ Sanders, *Torah and Canon*, 2.

⁶⁰ Sanders, *Torah and Canon*, 2.

⁶¹ Sanders, *Torah and Canon*, 3.

⁶² Sanders, *Torah and Canon*, 4.

⁶³ Sanders, *Torah and Canon*, x.

⁶⁴ Sanders, “Text and Canon: Concepts and Method,” 21.

⁶⁵ Sanders, *Torah and Canon*, 91.

⁶⁶ Sanders, *Torah and Canon*, 91.

the Twelve in Sirach 48:22-49:12.⁶⁷ Further only those books “that could be thought to have been composed before Ezra’s time” were those that were stabilized/canonized.⁶⁸ Sanders believes the same statement to be true of the Writings: only those writings that could be thought to have been written before Ezra’s time were stabilized/canonized. It is not until after A.D. 70 that Sanders sees complete stabilization/canonization of the Writings, which would ultimately be settled by a group of Jews settled in Jabneh or Jamnia somewhere between 90-100 A.D.⁶⁹

Though working soundly within the documentary hypothesis, Sanders’s concepts of adaptability and stability, linked with major catastrophes within Israelite history, have been the guideposts for his understanding of canonical process. The exile, the destruction of the second temple, and the destruction of Jerusalem, all marked the key points where older material was stabilized and then adapted for the new situation that the Jewish people found themselves in, a process where “biblical authors and thinkers themselves contemporized and adapted and reshaped the traditions they received.”⁷⁰

1.3.1.3 Brevard Childs’s Theory of Canonical Process

Brevard Childs states in the preface to what many consider a ground breaking work, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*:

I am now convinced that the relation between the historical critical study of the Bible and its theological use as religious literature with a community of faith and practice needs to be completely rethought. Minor adjustments are not only inadequate, but also conceal the extent of the dry rot.⁷¹

He labels his work as “an attempt to hear the biblical text in the terms compatible with the collection and transmission of the literature as scripture.”⁷² He views his perspective as radically different from what has gone before, which he labels as the product of a confused perspective:

Nevertheless, the deep-seated confusion within the discipline remains, and it has often rendered meaningless important observations, gained through years

⁶⁷ Sanders, *Torah and Canon*, 94.

⁶⁸ Sanders, *Torah and Canon*, 94.

⁶⁹ Sanders, *Torah and Canon*, 94-95.

⁷⁰ Sanders, “Text and Canon: Concepts and Method,” 28-29.

⁷¹ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 15.

⁷² Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 16.

of research, because of the inability to establish a proper context from which to read the literature.⁷³

With these bold statements Childs then begins to unfold the history that has led to this predicament and what he views as its impasse.

In due time, he turns to the issue of theories of canonical process. First, he outlines the traditional view of uninterrupted succession that was held “by both Jews and Christians at least until the seventeenth century” and was based on passages from 2 Esdras 14:44, 2 Maccabees 2:13 and *Baba Batra* 14b-15a from the Babylonian Talmud.⁷⁴ He then turns to the critical view based on “Wellhausen’s reconstruction of Israel’s history and literature” and found in articles and books by W. R. Smith, Cornill, Strack, Wildeboer, Buhl, and Ryle. The Hebrew Bible is understood to have developed in stages based on its tripartite division, Law, Prophets, and Writings. The Pentateuch was to a certain degree fixed in the fifth or fourth century BC based on the Samaritan schism. The Prophets were canonized in the third century, as testified by Daniel (composed about 165) not being included. The Writings as a section were fixed by the council of Jamnia (AD 90).⁷⁵ Both the critical view and the traditional view, he claims, met their demise through serious challenges. In the case of the traditional view “the discovery of a complex historical development of the literature, especially the Pentateuch, seriously damaged the idea of a direct, unbroken link between the original writing and its final state in which the book’s authority had been accepted from its inception.”⁷⁶ In the case of the critical theory “most of the fixed historical points upon which the theory had been built seem no longer able to bear the weight placed on them” and “the assumption that the Masoretic division of a tripartite canon was the original order reflecting three historical stages in the canon’s development, and that the Septuagint’s order was a later, secondary adjustment, has been questioned from several sides.”⁷⁷ He then catalogues several further views in the search for a new consensus, G. Hölscher, David Noel Freedman, Sid Z. Leiman, M. G. Kline, and James Sanders.⁷⁸ Childs is essentially critical of each position, while noting Hölscher’s impressive challenge to the critical theory and defense of a twenty-

⁷³ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 17.

⁷⁴ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 51.

⁷⁵ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 52-53.

⁷⁶ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 51.

⁷⁷ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 53.

⁷⁸ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 54-57.

two book tradition,⁷⁹ Leiman's "valuable contribution in showing the early age at which documents, particularly laws, exerted an authoritative role"⁸⁰ and Sanders's "broadening the definition of canon to cover a process extending throughout Israel's history which effected the shaping of the literature itself."⁸¹ Each of these highlights will ultimately play a role in Childs's own understanding of canonical process.

Childs begins his own theory of canonical process with a definition of canon that includes both a historical and a theological dimension. By historical he means that the "Hebrew scriptures developed in an historical process, some lines of which can be accurately described by the historian."⁸² By theological he means "a process of theological reflection within Israel arising from the impact which certain writings continued to exert upon the community through their religious use."⁸³ This description of the term canon is meant to emphasize the complexity of the historical and literary/theological process the Hebrew Scriptures went through that does not underestimate the "complex history of collecting and ordering of a corpus of sacred writings."⁸⁴ Further on this very point Childs elaborates:

Essential to understanding the growth of the canon is to see the interaction between a developing corpus of authoritative literature and the community which treasured it. The authoritative Word gave the community its form and content in obedience to the divine imperative, yet conversely the reception of the authoritative tradition by its hearers gave shape to the same writings through a historical and theological process of selecting, collecting, and ordering.⁸⁵

Childs wishes to put "a theocentric understanding of divine revelation" that views Israel's response in this "historical and theological process of selecting, collecting and ordering," that leads to a "new understanding of scripture."⁸⁶ This response is continually marked by a "process of interpretation" that comes from "a consciousness of canon"⁸⁷ and "can be clearly detected when the words of a prophet which were directed to a specific group in a particular historical situation were recognized as having an authority apart from their original use, and were preserved for their own

⁷⁹ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 54-55.

⁸⁰ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 55-56.

⁸¹ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 57.

⁸² Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 58.

⁸³ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 58.

⁸⁴ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 58.

⁸⁵ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 58-59.

⁸⁶ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 59.

⁸⁷ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 60.

integrity (cf. Isa.8.16f.).”⁸⁸ Though recognizing political, social, and economic factors as playing a role in relation to canonical process, “these were subordinated to the religious usage of the literature by its function within the community.”⁸⁹

With his theoretical groundwork laid, Childs gives his outline of the development of the Hebrew Canon. Deuteronomy 31:24 begins the process, where Moses recorded in book form the divine law, deposited it with the ark and was meant for periodical reading before the whole assembly of Israel. This most likely was pre-exilic and is not the whole of the Pentateuch.⁹⁰ He emphasizes that this should not be relegated to some late period, since Exodus 24:1-11, an early portion of the Pentateuch, speaks of Moses’s writing the words of the law, just as in Deuteronomy 31, but it is clear that this law has now received in Deuteronomy 31 a much more autonomous nature than Exodus 24, having been removed from its historical setting has now become a “law whose authority is unimpaired by Moses’ death.”⁹¹ 2 Kings 22, 621 BC, marks a further point along the historical path of the “already existing authority of the Mosaic law.”⁹² By the end of the late fifth century “the present form of the Pentateuch took its shape” including the priestly code as reflected by “the legal prescriptions recorded in Neh. 8:13-18.”⁹³ Childs sketches further “that the extent of the canonical corpus had already been settled by then [third century BC] and that the history of establishing the text of the sacred writings had begun” as demonstrated by translation work of the Pentateuch into Greek.⁹⁴ Testimony to the canonized form of the Pentateuch “is provided at the beginning of the second century by Ben Sira whose knowledge and use of all the legal portions can only presuppose the canonical status of the entire Pentateuch.”⁹⁵

In the same sort of canon conscious connection from Deuteronomy 31 and Exodus 24, the Prophets show signs from “the transition from the spoken prophetic word to a written form with authority” as evidenced in Isaiah 8:16 and Jeremiah 36:1ff, and Zechariah 1:4ff give reference to “former prophets whose writings appear to have a form and authoritative status.” Further, post-exilic exegesis within the Bible

⁸⁸ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 60.

⁸⁹ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 61.

⁹⁰ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 62.

⁹¹ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 63.

⁹² Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 63.

⁹³ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 63.

⁹⁴ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 64.

⁹⁵ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 64.

itself “begins to cite earlier oracles verbatim as an authoritative text which it seeks to interpret,” and “Dan. 9:2 offers evidence of some sort of fixed collection of prophetic writings.”⁹⁶ This evidence suggests, in Childs’s opinion, that “[a]t an early date the collections, Law and Prophets, were joined and both experienced expansion. By the first century BC both sections of the canon were regarded as normative scripture.”⁹⁷ Childs regards the whole of the canon to have closed and stabilized unequivocally by the end of the first century AD as testified by “Josephus’ famous statement [*Contra Apionem* I.8] c. AD 93-95,”⁹⁸ which he further speculates giving a fixed date earlier than AD 50 when Josephus would have received his Pharisaic training.⁹⁹

Childs, though working from a very complex concept of the development of the biblical text, is seeking to understand canonical process not only from a historical and theological process, a process where certain historical points (the writing down of the divine revelation) mark the development of canon, but also further where theological reflection (canon conscious exegesis) on this canon leads to its very own development. This historical and theological reflection, which takes the form of selecting, collecting, and ordering, marks a very intentional process.

1.3.2 Canonical Hermeneutics

In examining each of these perspectives it should be obvious that certain hermeneutical principles are implicit within each of these theories of canonical process. The assumed process itself determines how the canonical text is to be understood and used. Fishbane’s expressed purpose is to demonstrate that the sort of exegesis practiced after the close of the canon actually has its foundation in the biblical canon itself. When a word, phrase, verse, or even section is repeated and then revitalized, the focus should not be on the revitalization, but on the preservation of the older traditions with its newer denotation. This is not to be viewed primarily as something that happens simply by happenstance or under the pressure of social or political issues, but as an intentional exegetical renewal where the older tradition is purposely retained as a way of giving authority to this renewed exegetical expansion.

⁹⁶ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 65.

⁹⁷ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 65.

⁹⁸ Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 58.

⁹⁹ Childs, *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments*, 59.

Further, earlier “textual ambiguity or openness may serve to catalyze commentary”¹⁰⁰ and “exegetical tradition is not presented as an authority parallel to that of revelation; nor does it visibly cast out, neutralize, or otherwise displace revelation.”¹⁰¹ The text is to be read and examined in light of this sort of expansion, and the text should be used further in this same expansion as is testified by extra-biblical rabbinic interpretation.

Sanders’s concepts of stability and adaptability tied to historical crises are the foundations from which his hermeneutic arises. The text has its foundation in a sociologically defining Torah or story from which the people derive their identity. As the Torah becomes historically stable, and is no longer able to speak to the present situation with complete appropriateness, it is adapted. The focus is not on a complete displacement but on the repetition of the older story in the present situation which creates something new though not completely distinct from what has come before. These adaptations are found in light of a social crisis of identity and serve to give the people an identity in light of cultural challenges. The canonical text should be read in light of these processes and should be used in a similar developing fashion as the community that treasures it faces these sorts of political, social and economic crises, which seek to redefine who they are.

Childs’s concept of canon that contains a historical and theological dimension also gives shape to his canonical hermeneutic. The text has been defined through moments historically where divine revelation has been received and written. Though there are these discernable historical points where revelation has been received and recorded, they also went through a theological development where their significance for the community lies beyond the historical event through a canon conscious development, a process where texts were selected, collected, ordered, and closed.¹⁰² The canonical text should be read in light of this historical and theological process that primarily points the reader to the canonical text itself. The canonical text is then to be used normatively to define the community through continuing theological reflection.

By the very use of the term process, each of the aforementioned canonical approaches have definite areas of similarity. They view the development of the canon as a complex process that cannot be easily identified with any one person, group of

¹⁰⁰ Fishbane, *The Garments of Torah*, 7.

¹⁰¹ Fishbane, “Revelation and Tradition: Aspects of Inner-Biblical Exegesis,” 361.

¹⁰² Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 59.

people, or even time period in contrast to both the pre-critical/traditional and critical view of the development of the Hebrew Scriptures/Old Testament. They view this process as revolving around a tension between earlier revelation/tradition and the community that treasures it.

With this said the motivation for further development reveals deep-seated differences between the approaches. For Fishbane the primary motivation is exegetical, with an earlier revelation/tradition in need of further explanation or a newer tradition in need of a foundation. For Sanders the primary motivation is sociological, with an earlier stabilized tradition/revelation needing to be adapted to meet the needs of the community. For Childs the primary motivation is theological, with an earlier revelation/tradition treasured as a part of an ongoing experience with God that is realized through a new understanding of these revelations/traditions. For Fishbane and Sanders, the close of the canon marks the canonization not only of the canonical text, but also of the processes (the concepts of inner-biblical exegesis and of stability and adaptability), and for Childs the close of the canon marks a normative text for the believing community.

1.3.3 Criticism of Canon Criticism

Perhaps the most important critic of canon criticism, or better the canonical approach, has been James Barr. His response has been not so much to the movement as a whole but instead to a particular proponent, namely Brevard Childs. Barr's book *The Concept of Biblical Theology* is a very large negative response to Childs's canonical approach (or approaches, as Barr prefers to say).

Barr's critique of Childs's approach moves around one main front. He views Childs's actual approach as contributing little new to the realm of biblical theology other than focus "by infinite repetition on the word *canon*."¹⁰³ He understands in contradistinction to Childs's argument that:

[T]he main current of biblical theology has been canonical from the beginning, even if the words 'canon' and 'canonical' were not much used. The entire emphasis on the *internal* relations of biblical material implied the canon as the boundary.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰³ James Barr, *The Concept of Biblical Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999), 379.

¹⁰⁴ Barr, *The Concept of Biblical Theology*, 378.

He further illustrates his discovery of how little new there is in relation to Childs's approach when he first used Childs's commentary on the Book of Exodus and noted in careful reading of the book "how little the real difference was."¹⁰⁵ That is to say that Childs operates heavily within the normal methodology of the critical method. To add to this charge, Barr, as others have noted, makes the simple point how small a role the canon then plays in relation to the structure of his treatments within the biblical theology movement.¹⁰⁶ This leads to Barr's biggest problem that Childs's canonical approach is actually dogmatic and theological¹⁰⁷ and at that a particular brand of theology, namely Barthian theology.¹⁰⁸ Barr's main problem with this theological perspective is that:

[J]udgments against approaches that seem to differ from his own are not on matters like exegetical details or linguistic facts, where hard evidence might settle an issue: they are questions of theological values where discussion could often disclose unexpected common ground, where compromise is often possible, and where in any case both parties have the same basic purpose and interest, namely the theological interpretation of the Bible.¹⁰⁹

Much of what Barr has noted in relation to Childs's approach serves to highlight the reality that what is being proposed by Childs and others is what again may be labeled a post-critical approach, where observations, methodology, and categories from earlier approaches are clearly being used but yet the goal and foundation have shifted from these perspectives. What Barr does not explicitly concede in his analysis does come through in some of his questions and comments. Childs's contribution to the biblical theology movement, as well as that of other proponents of canonical approaches, is that the growth of the text points to reading the text as it stands.¹¹⁰

John Barton offered in *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study* a somewhat sympathetic critique of the canonical approach, though he, as Barr, is not sympathetic to Childs's prescriptive statements. Barton's main agreement with Childs is found in "that the historical critical methods are not completely adequate from a literary point of view, but Childs's primary thesis is that they are unsatisfactory

¹⁰⁵ Barr, *The Concept of Biblical Theology*, 391.

¹⁰⁶ Barr, *The Concept of Biblical Theology*, 392, 430-431, 439.

¹⁰⁷ Barr, *The Concept of Biblical Theology*, 403-404.

¹⁰⁸ Barr, *The Concept of Biblical Theology*, 401.

¹⁰⁹ Barr, *The Concept of Biblical Theology*, 404.

¹¹⁰ Barr, *The Concept of Biblical Theology*, 422, 425.

theologically.”¹¹¹ This agreement is found in that the historical critical method does not deal with a key aspect of the biblical text, namely that it is contained now within a particular group of texts, a canon. Barton views this as a literary issue where “the canonical level is at least one possible level of meaning in a text.... At the very least, the canonical approach extends the range of methods available to the student of the Bible and suggests new questions that we may ask of the text.”¹¹² Clearly Barton believes this also to be a post-critical approach in that “[i]t is only after we have seen how varied and inconsistent the Old Testament really is that we can begin to ask whether it can *nonetheless* be read as forming a unity.”¹¹³ This leads in his concluding statements that “once we abandon the author’s intention as the criterion of meaning: that one and the same text can change its meaning, according to the context in which it is read.”¹¹⁴

What Barton cannot agree with is the concept that this is *the* method for reading biblical texts. Key to his argument is the question of *which* canon:

There are two major ‘canons’ of the Old Testament, the Hebrew and Greek, which differ very widely; indeed from a ‘canon-critical’ perspective it is probably more accurate to say that there are *three* canons, among which the canon critic can choose. Jews and Protestant Christians, it is true share the same canon in the sense that they accept as canonical only the books of the Hebrew Bible, excluding those books of the Greek Bible called ‘apocryphal’ by them and ‘deuterocanonical’ by Catholic and Orthodox Christians.¹¹⁵

Once the list of books has been discerned the question becomes: Which text is the canonical text? Is it to be understood as the Masoretic text or some other text?¹¹⁶ This leads Barton to the conclusion that “[w]hat the canonical method can do is to establish what meanings a given text can have within a given canon, and to show how these meanings would change if the limits of the canon were differently defined.”¹¹⁷

These two points are well taken. However, due to Barton’s understanding of the canonical method as a literary technique *he misses the implications of his own statements*. These differences in canon are not just literary boundaries, but also

¹¹¹ John Barton, *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1984), 79.

¹¹² Barton, *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study*, 86.

¹¹³ Barton, *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study*, 99.

¹¹⁴ Barton, *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study*, 102.

¹¹⁵ Barton, *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study*, 91.

¹¹⁶ Barton, *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study*, 91.

¹¹⁷ Barton, *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study*, 92.

theological and exegetical trajectories. Within each of these traditions there is also the further question not so much of which *books* but which *texts*, which again reflect specific theological and exegetical trajectories.

John J. Collins in his *Encounters with Biblical Theology* also levels serious critique against Childs's canonical approach.¹¹⁸ He lays out his primary concern in the opening pages:

What these essays have in common is the attempt to address biblical theology consistently from the perspective of historical criticism, broadly conceived. On the one hand, they reject a view of historical criticism, and of biblical scholarship in general, that brackets out all questions of the significance of the text for the modern world. On the other hand, they also reject a view of biblical theology as a confessional enterprise, exempt from the demands of argumentation that characterize the discipline as a whole.¹¹⁹

A perceived guarding of the historical method stands at the heart of Collins's critique of Childs. He states about historical criticism, "One of the great strengths of historical criticism has been that it has created an arena where people with different faith commitments can work together."¹²⁰ Childs's approach on the other hand has as its "fundamental weakness" that it "would exempt the Bible from criticism based on external traditions and sources."¹²¹ He questions whether "Childs's view of the canon has ever been normative, even in Protestant Christianity, not to mention in Catholicism or Judaism."¹²² Further, he notes, "We are repeatedly told that the Scripture shapes and enlivens the church or mediates the revelation of God, but we are not told *how*."¹²³ With this said, Collins opts for the approach of Sanders, namely adaptability, that he calls a "sociohistorical approach to biblical theology."¹²⁴ In this approach, context is not "the canon of Scripture itself" but "the other writings of the time."¹²⁵

As has already been noted, Childs's actual approach is not an anti-historical-criticism approach. Like Barr, Collins makes clear in his Genesis 22 example that Childs notes textual layers. However, Collins does not like the fact that "canonical shapers" would be given any privileged place in the interpretation of the text though

¹¹⁸ John J. Collins, *Encounters with Biblical Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005).

¹¹⁹ Collins, *Encounters with Biblical Theology*, 1-2.

¹²⁰ Collins, *Encounters with Biblical Theology*, 4.

¹²¹ Collins, *Encounters with Biblical Theology*, 5.

¹²² Collins, *Encounters with Biblical Theology*, 15.

¹²³ Collins, *Encounters with Biblical Theology*, 15.

¹²⁴ Collins, *Encounters with Biblical Theology*, 27.

¹²⁵ Collins, *Encounters with Biblical Theology*, 27.

the text is found only in this shape.¹²⁶ Further, Childs's argument in relation to the canon is decidedly historical and based on many internal and external sources, as has already been outlined. Collins is of course correct that there are multiple canons, but this should not be confused with innumerable canons—the number is limited. In opting for a sociohistorical approach, one essential aspect of Sanders's approach is left out. His canonical process includes both stability and adaptability, a process where the *stabilized text* is adapted to new situations. This adapted text becomes stabilized and then further adapted, etc. This process creates multilayered texts that have a multifaceted historical perspective. However, with Collins's approach books are flattened into one historical situation, neglecting the process through which they have been composed and the hypothetical life situation in which the “final” form of the text was written (which Collins admits in some contexts there is not a way to verify) rules.¹²⁷ Historical criticism seems to be supported more by Childs's approach where one can point to the text for an answer than Collins's approach where the hypothetical can remain only hypothetical. However, Collins's critique in relation to methodology stands. How does the Bible shape and enliven the church or mediate the revelation of God in the canonical approach?

1.3.4 Canon Criticism and Context

With these three canonical explanations, there is a decided return to reading the biblical text within a canonical context. Far from being a return to pre-critical conceptions, there is an intentional resolve to read the text within a canonical context because this, it is argued, is how it has been shaped. A canonical approach may well be termed a post-critical perspective. It takes into account the observations that have gone before, namely the complex nature of the text from both a diachronic and synchronic view. Yet it argues in the end that the “ghost” of the original author, whether viewed from a traditional view or the documentary hypothesis, and his/her context, moves in the wrong direction because these views seek to find or recreate a context outside of what has clearly been developed. Instead, canonical criticism calls

¹²⁶ Collins, *Encounters with Biblical Theology*, 48 and 50.

¹²⁷ Collins, *Encounters with Biblical Theology*, 29, states in relation to his alternative approach using the genre of apocalypse to interpret Daniel, “A sociohistorical approach to the problem of pseudepigraphy places it in the wider context of the ancient, and especially of Hellenistic, world. . . . There is ultimately no way to verify such theories, but at least they show that Childs' theory is not the only one that allows that the authors may have acted in good faith.”

the reader to look with precision to why a particular text has been placed within its present context, knowing to a certain extent its complex development (that among other things included, by necessity, leaving other texts out).

For Fishbane, Childs, and Sanders, this canonical context gives not only a context within which to confidently read the biblical text, but also the process(es) that should continue to be followed. These processes call the reader to careful exegetical study (biblical reflection that both defines the community's life and adapts it to new challenges) or calls the reader to the text itself as a fixed set of normative writings for the community.

What these canonical approaches bring to the surface is tension between diachronic and synchronic aspects within the biblical text. These tensions are surfaced at the points of exegesis, theological reflection, and the cyclical pattern between stability and adaptability. Though the texts that are presently used have been crafted together within (a) particular synchronic canonical form(s), diachronic marks are found continually throughout the smaller texts of this larger text at these points of tension, where canon consciousness is obvious.

Though there has been much justified criticism leveled against the approach of Brevard Childs by James Barr (who essentially writes an entire book in critical response to Childs),¹²⁸ these fundamental observations that have come to the surface stand. These approaches are not a return to the pre-critical approach or even a rejection of previous critical scholarship. As well, they are not looking to ignore diachronic aspects within the text through focusing on the synchronic shape(s). Instead, they highlight these diachronic tensions within the synchronic text(s) rather than alleviating this tension through the separation into different texts (critical approach) or ignoring these tensions (pre-critical approach).

1.4 Intratextuality

Another theory to add to the discussion of Kristevian intertextuality and canon criticism is intratextuality. While Julia Kristeva's theory of intertextuality developed in the arena of literary theory and canon criticism developed in the field of the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament, George Lindbeck's theory of intratextuality developed

¹²⁸ Barr, *The Concept of Biblical Theology*.

in the arena of theological theories of religion and doctrine.¹²⁹ Though others have since used the term intratextuality, Lindbeck stands as the primary developer of intratextuality within the greater context of what he calls a cultural-linguistic approach to religion and doctrine.¹³⁰

He developed this theory of religion and doctrine in response to what he viewed as three other inadequate theories of religion. The first theory “emphasizes the cognitive aspects of religion and stresses the ways in which church doctrines function as informative propositions or truth claims about objective realities.”¹³¹ This could be labeled as the “once true, always true” category. The second theory focuses on the “experiential-expressive dimension of religion” that “interprets doctrines as noninformative and nondiscursive symbols of inner feelings, attitudes, or existential orientations.”¹³² In this view “there is at least the logical possibility that a Buddhist and a Christian might have basically the same faith, although expressed very differently.”¹³³ The third view “attempts to combine the first two.”¹³⁴

Lindbeck views each of these theories as falling short in really being able to describe “the variability and invariability in matters of faith.”¹³⁵ His proposal then is an attempt to deal with the anomalies in these other systems. This theory is what Lindbeck calls a cultural-linguistic approach where:

emphasis is placed on those respects in which religions resemble languages together with their correlative forms of life and are thus similar to cultures (insofar as these are understood semiotically as reality and value systems—that is, as idioms for the construing of reality and the living of life).¹³⁶

In this theory then, doctrines function not as truth claims or expressive symbols “but as communally authoritative rules of discourse, attitude, and action.”¹³⁷

What this leads to is the conclusion that the task of theology is descriptive, and one must learn the “language” in order to be a competent “speaker.” The learning of the system, the understanding of the normative rules, is what he calls an intratextual

¹²⁹ George Lindbeck, *The Nature of Doctrine: Religion and Theology in a Postliberal Age* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1984), 16.

¹³⁰ Lindbeck, *The Nature of Doctrine*, 18.

¹³¹ Lindbeck, *The Nature of Doctrine*, 16.

¹³² Lindbeck, *The Nature of Doctrine*, 16.

¹³³ Lindbeck, *The Nature of Doctrine*, 17.

¹³⁴ Lindbeck, *The Nature of Doctrine*, 16.

¹³⁵ Lindbeck, *The Nature of Doctrine*, 17.

¹³⁶ Lindbeck, *The Nature of Doctrine*, 17-18.

¹³⁷ Lindbeck, *The Nature of Doctrine*, 18.

or intrasemiotic approach.¹³⁸ Meaning is located within the semiotic system (the religion) not outside the semiotic system (“the meaning is immanent”).¹³⁹ Therefore, the meaning of a particular semiotic element is determined by how it operates within a religion, within the semiotic system. Reality and experience are then shaped by the meaning determined within this semiotic system.¹⁴⁰ To illustrate his point about reality and experience being determined from the particular semiotic system, “One can speak of all life and reality in French, or from an American or a Jewish perspective; and one can also describe French in French, American culture in American terms, and Judaism in Jewish ones.”¹⁴¹

Lindbeck makes the case that the major religions are literally intratextual because they have basically fixed canons that establish “normative instantiations of their semiotic code” which leads him to the conclusion: “One test of faithfulness for all of them is the degree to which descriptions correspond to the semiotic universe paradigmatically encoded in holy writ.”¹⁴²

Interpretation is focused on the immanent meaning of the text, that is, on “explicating their contents and their perspectives on extratextual reality that they generate.”¹⁴³ In the case of Christianity, “the biblical canon is read as a single interglossing whole; and second, all reality is interpreted in this same scriptural light—the biblical world absorbs all other worlds.”¹⁴⁴ Presumably this could be said about other religions. Lindbeck notes that of course the reader projects ideas on the text, but states that “when reading intratextually, we struggle against this reflex instead of consciously employing extratextual meanings as hermeneutical keys.”¹⁴⁵

In the Christian context, Lindbeck gives three keys to examining any intratextual understanding. The first is textual faithfulness: does the understanding line up with the metanarrative of the whole Bible?¹⁴⁶ The second is christological coherence: does it allow the proper place for the culminating place of Jesus Christ?¹⁴⁷

¹³⁸ Lindbeck, *The Nature of Doctrine*, 113-114.

¹³⁹ Lindbeck, *The Nature of Doctrine*, 114.

¹⁴⁰ Lindbeck, *The Nature of Doctrine*, 114.

¹⁴¹ Lindbeck, *The Nature of Doctrine*, 115.

¹⁴² Lindbeck, *The Nature of Doctrine*, 116.

¹⁴³ Lindbeck, *The Nature of Doctrine*, 116.

¹⁴⁴ George Lindbeck, “Atonement and Hermeneutics of Intratextual Social Embodiment,” in *The Nature of Confession: Evangelicals and Postliberals in Conversation*, ed. Timothy R. Philips and Dennis L. Ockholm (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1996), 226.

¹⁴⁵ Lindbeck, “Atonement and Hermeneutics of Intratextual Social Embodiment,” 228.

¹⁴⁶ Lindbeck, “Atonement and Hermeneutics of Intratextual Social Embodiment,” 230.

¹⁴⁷ Lindbeck, “Atonement and Hermeneutics of Intratextual Social Embodiment,” 228.

The third criterion is “when other criteria are not decisive, the interpretation that seems most likely in these particular circumstances to serve the upbuilding of the community of faith in its God-willed witness to the world is the one to be preferred.”¹⁴⁸

In the end intratextuality absorbs the whole of reality and experience primarily through figuration. Again from a Christian perspective, Lindbeck comments, “Figural reading was the glue that held the canon together, centering it in Christ, and enabled the intratextual biblical world to move out of the text and, through its social embodiment to absorb all other worlds.”¹⁴⁹ Thus figurative reading produced a “metaphorical interglossing unity of cosmic comprehensiveness.”¹⁵⁰ All of reality is then connected through the concept of intratextuality, moving from the interglossed holy text to the whole of reality.

What Lindbeck’s argument brings to the larger perspective under discussion is the reality that including and excluding different texts changes the “language” as a whole. The points of reference and the range of meanings that they create shift depending on which points (texts) are included. Biblical texts then become the primary points of reference, creating a particular range of meanings that would be very different if certain texts were not included in the canon. The “language” of the canon or canons shifts, therefore, depending on what texts are or are not included.

1.5 Kanonisch-intertextuelle Lektüre

In 1999 George Steins published a significant work dealing with many of the theoretical issues already examined in this project and developed the concept of *kanonisch-intertextuelle Lektüre*.¹⁵¹ He gives an extensive evaluation of Childs’s canonical approach (9-44) and states clearly, as he begins to unfold his own theory, what he believes to be missing from Childs’s approach: “Eine der methodologischen Schwächen des Ansatzes von B.S. Childs war darin gesehen worden, daß er zwar den Zusammenhang von Kanon und Rezeption benennt, jedoch keine entsprechende Rezeptionstheorie für den Kanon entwickelt.”¹⁵² His answer is mediated by Kristeva

¹⁴⁸ Lindbeck, “Atonement and Hermeneutics of Intratextual Social Embodiment,” 230.

¹⁴⁹ Lindbeck, “Atonement and Hermeneutics of Intratextual Social Embodiment,” 228.

¹⁵⁰ Lindbeck, “Atonement and Hermeneutics of Intratextual Social Embodiment,” 229.

¹⁵¹ Georg Steins, *Die „Bindung Isaaks“ im Kanon (Gen 22): Grundlegungen und Programm einer Kanonisch-Intertextuellen Lektüre: Mit einer Spezialbibliographie zu Gen 22* (Freiburg, Basel, Wien, Barcelona, Rom, New York: Herder, 1999).

¹⁵² Steins, *Die „Bindung Isaaks“ im Kanon (Gen 22)*, 84.

but more clearly comes from an in-depth evaluation of Bakhtin's theory of dialogue (45-83). In the combination of these two theories he believes to have found an answer to the problem of Childs's approach: "Der Bibelkanon als Gestalt gewordener Dialog erfordert die Mitarbeit der Rezipienten; ihre Lektüre ist zu beschreiben als ein fortwährende Intertextualisierung im privilegierten Raum des Kanons."¹⁵³ In this process of reading a different concept of reception is followed: "Eine rezeptionstheoretisch ansetzende Exegese richtet ihr Augenmerk nicht in erster Linie auf das Verhältnis Autor – Text, sondern auf das Nächstliegende, d.h. auf die Beziehung Rezipient – Text."¹⁵⁴ In distinction to other models of reading, this process includes the reader from the very beginning: "Der Kanon und das intertextuelle Lesen treten nicht sekundär zum Bedeutungsaufbau des Einzeltextes hinzu, sondern wirken von Anfang an bei der Sinnkonstitution mit."¹⁵⁵ The text itself, though it may have had an oral tradition, is transformed through the actual process of writing: "Ein Schrifttext ist nicht nur ver-schriftete mündliche Kommunikation, der Übergang von der Mündlichkeit zu Schriftlichkeit verändert die Rezeptionsbedingungen auch durch eine veränderte Materialität der Zeichen."¹⁵⁶ The Bible is then viewed as a product of this very process and gives a model for this type of interpretation: "Der Bibelkanon setzt Modell-Rezipienten voraus, die sich in einem umfangreichen und vielgestaltigen Literaturkomplex so bewegen können, daß sie auch über große Distanzen Ähnlichkeiten zwischen Texten entdecken und Relationen herstellen."¹⁵⁷ Because of this reality, the reader is caught in a continual process: "Im Horizont des Bibelkanons und der von ihm vorstrukturierten Intertextualität stellt sich die Lektüre als "interplay" von Text und Leser in einem Prozeß permanenter Neukontextualisierung dar."¹⁵⁸ For the actual reading process two different levels of interpretation are identified: "Auf *Stufe (1)* wird der im Hypertext anwesende Hypotext identifiziert und die Art der Anwesenheit des fremden Textes im auszulegenden Text beschrieben . . . Auf *Stufe (2)* schließt sich die Frage nach dem Beitrag des Hypotextes zum Bedeutungsaufbau des Hypertextes an."¹⁵⁹ The first level deals with two different types of texts. The hypertext is the main text that is being researched. The hypotext is the text that is

¹⁵³ Steins, *Die „Bindung Isaaks“ im Kanon (Gen 22)*, 84.

¹⁵⁴ Steins, *Die „Bindung Isaaks“ im Kanon (Gen 22)*, 86.

¹⁵⁵ Steins, *Die „Bindung Isaaks“ im Kanon (Gen 22)*, 89.

¹⁵⁶ Steins, *Die „Bindung Isaaks“ im Kanon (Gen 22)*, 92.

¹⁵⁷ Steins, *Die „Bindung Isaaks“ im Kanon (Gen 22)*, 96.

¹⁵⁸ Steins, *Die „Bindung Isaaks“ im Kanon (Gen 22)*, 97.

¹⁵⁹ Steins, *Die „Bindung Isaaks“ im Kanon (Gen 22)*, 100.

being referenced in relation to this main text. The second level of reading deals with how these relationships demonstrate a contribution from the hypotext to a further understanding of the hypertext.

Childs himself actually wrote a critique of intertextual canonical interpretation based largely on Steins's book.¹⁶⁰ Childs states about Steins's book, "One of the major contributions of Steins' book is his new and bold attempt to overcome this impasse respecting the exact nature of a canonical interpretation within the scope of modern biblical exegesis."¹⁶¹ Childs goes on to summarize the theoretical perspective: "Interpretation of a text is viewed as a dynamic, dialogical activity between the narrator, the addressee, and the context from which the interpretive endeavor is launched. This interaction is an ongoing, indeed never-ending process in which polyvalent meaning is continually exploited in fresh moments of creative contextualization."¹⁶² Childs's critique is leveled not at dialogue or tension within the text. He notes, "Yet it has long been recognized that there is a subtle dialectical relation between the OT's own view of the prophet as simply a vehicle of divine address who, as a messenger, communicates *verbatim* his charge, and the modern critical view that prophetic speech is always shaped by tradition and literary conventions. These words are not only adapted to the author's psychological disposition, but are also constantly reapplied to Israel's changing historical condition."¹⁶³ The critique is instead leveled at the combining of author, text, and addressee in the reception theory: "However, this necessary tension has been completely lost in Steins' reception theory when author, text, and addressee are fused and the divine voice of Scripture has been rendered mute within a highly ideological philosophical system."¹⁶⁴ From Childs's perspective the text, that already retains tension, should be given a privileged place. He states further, "When Steins' theory of intertextuality eliminates the privileged status of the canonical context and removes all hermeneutical value from any form of authorial intent, an interpretive style emerges that runs directly contrary to the function of an authoritative canon which continues to serve a confessing community of faith and practice."¹⁶⁵

¹⁶⁰ Brevard S. Childs, "Critique of Recent Intertextual Canonical Interpretation," *ZAW* 115/2 (2003): 173-184.

¹⁶¹ Childs, "Critique of Recent Intertextual Canonical Interpretation," 174.

¹⁶² Childs, "Critique of Recent Intertextual Canonical Interpretation," 175.

¹⁶³ Childs, "Critique of Recent Intertextual Canonical Interpretation," 176.

¹⁶⁴ Childs, "Critique of Recent Intertextual Canonical Interpretation," 176.

¹⁶⁵ Childs, "Critique of Recent Intertextual Canonical Interpretation," 177.

The present approach differs from Steins's approach in that canonical intertextuality, though noting points of dialogue within the text, does not create infinite possibilities. There is a particular larger context within which the dialogue occurs. This context is also further refined through the ordering of these texts together. Of course there are different canons with different orders, but even these are limited, creating further *points* of dialogue. However, like Steins, the text is the model for recontextualization, but from fixed points of dialogue within the canon to unfixed points of actual human life. The reader is certainly involved in interpretation from the outset, but the text retains a privileged position just as the process that drew together the canon also excluded many other texts. In this sense, the present approach is only influenced by Kristeva and Bakhtin, whereas Steins's approach is a complete application of Kristeva and Bakhtin's theories. Though these are certainly nuanced differences, the understanding of canonical intertextuality and its application are related, yet different from *kanonisch-intertextuelle Lektüre*.

1.6 The Concept of Canonical Intertextuality

In summarizing and drawing together much of the previous material, an explanation of the overall concept will now be given. *The Concept of Canonical Intertextuality* integrates concepts of Kristevian influenced intertextuality with canon criticism. The goal is an attempt to understand the actual composition of the text of scripture that is at the same time a text and many texts. It is not subversive in nature, where the canonical text is at all points undermined by its constituent texts¹⁶⁶ or an attempt to apply yet another methodology to texts.¹⁶⁷

The term "canonical" in canonical intertextuality speaks of the reality that certain texts have been intentionally placed together. Again, Blenkinsopp notes, "We may dispense with etymologies and original meanings and begin by saying that a canon is generally taken to be a collection of writings deemed to have a normative

¹⁶⁶ Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, 158, represents from a literary theory perspective almost in its entirety a subversive approach, where the relationship between signifier and signified are so compromised that the statement "[t]here is nothing outside of the text" is a necessary logical corollary. Something of a distaste for such an approach may be found in Michael S. Moore, review of *Circle of Sovereignty: A Story of Stories in Daniel 1-6*, by Danna Nolan Fewell, *CBQ* 53/2 (1991): 283-284, when concludes, "In short, scholars who are more interested in *aesthetics* than *theology* will probably love this book. But scholars who are interested rather in a reproducible *theology* of Daniel 1-6 for use by real people in the real world will probably feel otherwise" (284).

¹⁶⁷ Barton, *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study*, 101, in his evaluation wants to view canon criticism simply as another methodology that "has increased the biblical scholar's *literary* competence" but not as a constituent component of the text's actual composition.

function within a particular community.”¹⁶⁸ Again, there are a very limited number of canons within the Jewish and Christian traditions: the Hebrew Bible alone or the Written and Oral Torah together,¹⁶⁹ or either an Old and New Testament or Old and New Testament with Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical books.¹⁷⁰ Again, as Childs notes, these books were not placed together by accident but were the result of a process:

Essential to understanding the growth of the canon is to see the interaction between a developing corpus of authoritative literature and the community which treasured it. The authoritative Word gave the community its form and content in obedience to the divine imperative, yet conversely the reception of the authoritative tradition by its hearers gave shape to the same writings through a historical and theological process of selecting, collecting, and ordering.¹⁷¹

“Canonical” speaks both of a particular collection of literature and the fact that this literature has been *intentionally* placed together.

The term “intertextuality” in canonical intertextuality speaks of the dialogue inherent in the canonical text because of the canon and canonical process. There are points of dialogue between the context that gave rise to a particular text, the text that was consequently written, the greater literary context(s) in which the text has been gathered, and the reuse of text(s) in another context.¹⁷² This dialogue reflects points of continuity, where there are similar terms, phrases, and values, and points of discontinuity where these terms, phrases, and values have shifted in meaning.¹⁷³ What may be of secondary importance in one context becomes of primary importance in another context, and a term or phrase in one context is used in a different way in another context, all of which reflects not static textual units but a dialogue between

¹⁶⁸ Blenkinsopp, *Prophecy and Canon*, 3.

¹⁶⁹ Levenson, *The Hebrew Bible, the Old Testament, and Historical Criticism*, 79-81, especially illustrates this last statement.

¹⁷⁰ Albert C. Sundberg, Jr., *Harvard Theological Studies XX: The Old Testament of the Early Church* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964), 102-103, on the basis of the now heavily questioned Council of Jamnia argues in relation to this debate “that there was no ‘Alexandrian canon’ of Hellenistic Judaism that was distinct from and different in content from a ‘Palestinian canon.’ Rather, in addition to closed collections of Law and Prophets, a wide religious literature without definite bounds circulated throughout Judaism as holy scripture before Jamnia.”

¹⁷¹ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 58-59.

¹⁷² Kristeva, *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*, 65, of course includes the reader as a part of the picture and describes this concept from Mikhail Bakhtin “as a dialogue among several writings: that of the writer, the addressee (or the character), and the contemporary or earlier cultural context.”

¹⁷³ Kristeva, *Desire in Language*, 36, uses translanguistic science again from Bakhtin to describe practices which “operate through and across language, while remaining irreducible to its categories as they are presently assigned.”

smaller texts and a larger context. What Kristeva has described of all texts is especially transparent in relation to canonical texts, namely that they are “constructed of a mosaic of quotations.”¹⁷⁴ Intertextuality as a part of this description speaks of this dialogue within the canonical text.

Canonical intertextuality should not be confused with some sort of source excavation,¹⁷⁵ where pursuit of the original event or text is the main goal,¹⁷⁶ whether from a pre-critical¹⁷⁷ or critical perspective,¹⁷⁸ though of course the canonical text retains tension/dialogue in relation to these enterprises. It is also not inner-biblical exegesis in the normal sense where one text is produced by exegesis of another text.¹⁷⁹ Instead, texts exegete one another through their order and overall placement together, giving a big picture that would not have been possible if textual units had been left by themselves. In one sense it is intratextual where “the biblical canon is read as a single interglossing whole”¹⁸⁰ and “the meaning is immanent”¹⁸¹ and yet it ever highlights the dialogue between these smaller texts with their diachronic and synchronic similarities and differences, even noting that the order of texts plays a role in interpretation.

The formulation of this concept of canonical intertextuality has been achieved through both deductive and inductive research. The deductive aspect of the research is contained in this opening chapter through exploration into the theories of Kristeva, Fishbane, Sanders, Childs, Lindbeck, and Steins. The inductive aspect of the research is found in the following chapters that focus on the book of Daniel as a test case. The

¹⁷⁴ Kristeva, *Desire in Language*, 66.

¹⁷⁵ Kristeva, *Revolution in Poetic Language*, 59-60, labeled this the “banal” understanding of the term intertextuality which caused her to call the concept transposition instead.

¹⁷⁶ Sanders, *Canon and Community: A Guide to Canonical Criticism*, notes this interesting preoccupying similarity between pre-critical and critical pursuits, 41. John Sailhamer, *Introduction to Old Testament Theology: A Canonical Approach* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1995), 36-85, in a chapter entitled “Text or Event” gives an excellent discussion in relation to this whole issue.

¹⁷⁷ Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*, 3, is the classic though not earliest critique of this position where of primary importance from his perspective the composition of the Law is challenged and it is hypothesized that “the law of Judaism may also have been its product.”

¹⁷⁸ Rendtorff, *Der Text in seiner Endgestalt*, 99, notes in critique of the critical perspective and its lack of consensus on key textual units, “The value of texts can no longer depend on their early dating, as it did for Wellhausen and many others, or on their usefulness as historical sources, as some modern scholars claim. We have to learn to take biblical texts seriously for their own sake, from whatever period and in whatever context they appear.”

¹⁷⁹ Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 2, develops this concept in detail, whereas the exegetical tradition did not begin in the post-biblical era but during the biblical era.

¹⁸⁰ Lindbeck, “Atonement and the Hermeneutics of Intratextual Social Embodiment,” in *The Nature of Cofession: Evangelicals and Postliberals in Conversation*, 226.

¹⁸¹ Lindbeck, *The Nature of Doctrine: Religion and Theology in a Postliberal Age*, 114.

next chapter explores trends in relation to the interpretation of the book of Daniel. Two chapters demonstrate canonical intertextuality through the whole of the Masoretic text of the book of Daniel. One chapter explores examples of canonical intertextuality in relation to other particular texts in the Old Testament as well as the overall placement of the book of the Daniel in the Old Testament. The final chapter explores canonical intertextuality through quotes from Daniel in the New Testament. Though the nuanced concept of canonical intertextuality is unique, the examination on a broad scale is in particular a unique contribution to present research.

2. Three Approaches to the Interpretation of Daniel

2.1 Introduction

Interpretation of the Book of Daniel can be easily divided into three groups. Those who date the composition of the book from the Babylonian exile, those who date the composition of the book from the Maccabean era, and those who see evidence that spans the two time periods. Of those in either the early or later era there is a similarity of approach, namely an apologetic for their respective dating of the book. Further, those who have an early date normally view the text of the book as representing actual historical events from the lives of Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah. Those who opt for a later date normally view the book as fiction. Those who see evidence spanning the two time periods find material that has come from an earlier time period and has been interpreted for a later time period. This position may be identified more as historical texts but not in reference to historical events. One may well note how deeply tied the interpretation of the book of Daniel is to its theorized development.

In the following a series of introductions, whether from articles or commentaries, will be followed in relation to these trends in interpretation. Introductions have been chosen because of their summary nature and the fact that “decisions about the way a biblical book originated, developed, and achieved final form” are found in their pages.¹⁸² After moving through a survey of these particular approaches to the interpretation of Daniel, a clear case will be made for the book of Daniel as a case in point for canonical intertextuality, where the development of the text is tied to a series of intertextual relationships. As important as the question of authorship is, especially in the realm of apologetics, this is a study in interpretation.

2.2 Babylonian Era

R. Dick Wilson in his article on “The book of Daniel” in the *ISBE* devotes only a paragraph to the “Divisions of the Book.”¹⁸³ He understands the book to be broken into two main sections. The first section represents a series of historical events in relation to “Daniel and his three companions” in chapters 1-6. The second section

¹⁸² Christopher Seitz in *Prophecy and Hermeneutics: Toward a New Introduction to the Prophets* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2007), 41, makes this claim in relation to introductions of times past, but the statement seems also to be applicable to recent introductions.

¹⁸³ R. Dick Wilson, “The Book of Daniel,” in *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia: Volume II* (Clement-Hershey, ed. James Orr (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957), 783.

is comprised of “some visions of Daniel concerning the great world-empires, esp. in relation to the kingdom of God.”¹⁸⁴ Strive as one might to find further clues into the interpretation of the book of Daniel, the rest of the article is devoted to an apologetic for the early date and authenticity of the book of Daniel, defending the predictions, the miracles, the text, the language, and the historical statements of the book.

Gleason Archer in his *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction* devotes a three-page outline to his interpretation of the book of Daniel.¹⁸⁵ The book is a series of units and

represents a collection of his memoirs made at the end of a long and eventful career which included government service from the reign of Nebuchadnezzar in the 590s to the reign of Cyrus the Great in the 530s. The appearance of Persian technical terms indicates a final recension of these memoirs at a time when Persian terminology had already infiltrated into the vocabulary of Aramaic.¹⁸⁶

The rest of the material is devoted to an apologetic for both the early date and authenticity of the book of Daniel. He sees chapters 2, 7, and 8 as agreeing in a symbolic way that the kingdoms being identified are “Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome.”¹⁸⁷ In connection with this diachronic observation he further states:

There can be no doubt that the description given in Daniel 11:40-45 relative to the latter end of the little horn does not at all correspond to the manner in which Antiochus Epiphanes met his death; there is a definite break in the prophetic relation beginning at 11:40.¹⁸⁸

The book is then interpreted not to support the Maccabean era focus but a further push into a time past the Maccabean era.

R. K. Harrison in his *Introduction to the Old Testament* notes:

While the narratives and visions are set in general chronological order, the visions commence before the stories come to an end. This general arrangement would suggest that if the work was not actually written by Daniel himself in the sixth century B.C., it was compiled shortly thereafter, and in the view of

¹⁸⁴ Wilson, “The Book of Daniel,” 783.

¹⁸⁵ Gleason L. Archer, Jr., *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction* (Revised Edition; Chicago: Moody Press, 1974), the outlines extends from 377-379 though the chapter as a whole extends from 377-403.

¹⁸⁶ Archer, *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*, 379.

¹⁸⁷ Archer, *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*, 397.

¹⁸⁸ Archer, *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*, 400.

the present writer it was extant not later than the middle of the fifth century B.C.¹⁸⁹

These comments allow for a similar interpretation that combines Wilson's and Archer's understanding of the book. The historical material is found in the first six chapters and "the remainder of the book deals with visions that emphasized the destiny of the Hebrews in relationship to Gentile kingdoms."¹⁹⁰ With this said the majority of the chapter, like Wilson and Archer, is dedicated to an apologetic for the early date and the authenticity of the book.

What one may well note is that the interpretation of the book of Daniel is tied in a key way to the events to which they are connected. This is to say that the primary purpose is to recount the historical events that are contained within the book. The visions represented in the second half of the book are to be seen as foretelling with a decided shift from the Maccabean Era as the focal point. Through the sheer volume of the apologetic in each presentation there is a need to understand these positions as against the Maccabean Era position.

2.3 Maccabean Era

Norman W. Porteous in his commentary titled *Daniel* makes a standard presentation of an opposite position from the forgoing discussion. The breakdown of the book differs little from the previous discussion:

The book of Daniel contains twelve chapters, the first six containing stories about a Jewish captive, Daniel, and his three young compatriots at the court of Nebuchadnezzar and his successors Babylonian, Median and Persian, and the last six containing a series of visions which came to Daniel and were interpreted to him by angelic agency. The first of the visions (ch. 7) has its parallel in Nebuchadnezzar's dream (ch. 2) and links the two parts together.¹⁹¹

He further sees that "[t]he only element of genuine prophecy relates to the anticipated death of Antiochus and the expected intervention of God in the establishment of his kingdom."¹⁹² Though he does not explicitly connect his position with ancient witness he makes the simple observation that Daniel is found in the Writings and not in the Prophets in the "Palestinian Jewish Canon," all of which is in distinction to the place

¹⁸⁹ R. K. Harrison, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapid, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1969), 1127.

¹⁹⁰ Harrison, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, 1106.

¹⁹¹ Norman W. Porteous, *Daniel: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965), 13.

¹⁹² Porteous, *Daniel*, 13.

that Daniel has in “the Latter Prophets in the Greek Canon, which . . . was determinative for the early Christian view of the book.”¹⁹³ The former position is supported by Josephus who “makes it clear by implication (*Antiq.* XII.7.6) that the reference in the Book of Daniel was to something that happened during the reign of Antiochus IV Epiphanes in the second century BC.”¹⁹⁴ All this is in distinction to the Christian position where Matthew 24:15 and the “so-called ‘abomination of desolation’, of which Daniel spoke” refers to “something that is still future in the time of Christ.”¹⁹⁵ The assumption is that by putting Daniel in the Writings, it was not to be viewed as prophetic (foretelling?) and in connection with the details from Josephus it must be from the contemporary era of which the visions speak. This position, he asserts, goes all the way back to “the neo-Platonist Porphyry, as we know from Jerome” and maintains “the modern critical view that the Book of Daniel was Maccabaeian.”¹⁹⁶ With this distinction the Book of Daniel is to be viewed as apocalyptic and as having similar characteristics with other “books like Enoch, the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, Baruch, the Assumption of Moses, II Esdras and even Christian Apocalypses like the Ascension of Isaiah and the Book of Revelation.”¹⁹⁷ Daniel, like other Jewish Apocalyptic, is to be viewed as a work of pseudonymity.¹⁹⁸ He agrees with Rowley that the author intended the book (at least the Aramaic sections) “to encourage those who were suffering under the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes.”¹⁹⁹ The possible affinities with Daniel in Ezekiel (14:14, 20; 28:3) “cannot be an exilic figure, though he may have suggested a name for the latter.”²⁰⁰ An important comparison is made between chapters 1-6 and the Joseph narratives in Genesis “as illustrating the pride of the Jew that members of his race were able to play an important part at foreign courts and even win recognition for their religion from pagan potentates.”²⁰¹ In any case chapter 7 is what binds the whole of the book together, linking narrative and apocalypse together.²⁰² The interpretation of the book is tied with a heavy apologetic for the Maccabaeian dating of the book.

¹⁹³ Porteous, *Daniel*, 13.

¹⁹⁴ Porteous, *Daniel*, 13.

¹⁹⁵ Porteous, *Daniel*, 13.

¹⁹⁶ Porteous, *Daniel*, 14.

¹⁹⁷ Porteous, *Daniel*, 14.

¹⁹⁸ Porteous, *Daniel*, 17.

¹⁹⁹ Porteous, *Daniel*, 18.

²⁰⁰ Porteous, *Daniel*, 17.

²⁰¹ Porteous, *Daniel*, 19.

²⁰² Porteous, *Daniel*, 20.

The book is then interpreted as an apocalyptic book similar to others from the same era, including pseudonymity. It is a work of literature given as an encouragement to those who are suffering persecution from Antiochus Epiphanes.

W. Sibley Towner in his commentary titled *Daniel* outlines the book as a series of court scenes in chapters 1-6 and 7-12, which offer “[t]hree distinct apocalypses and a lengthy prayer with angelic response, all presenting slightly different scenarios of the coming End” that “culminate in the terrifying prospect of divine intervention and the resurrection of the dead.”²⁰³ The simple outline is accompanied by five assumptions from which he operates for the rest of his book. The first assumption is that “Daniel is a non-historical personage modeled by the author(s) of the book after the ancient worthy who is linked in Ezekiel 14:14, 20 with righteous Noah and righteous Job, and who is described (Ezek. 28:3) as a wise man.”²⁰⁴ The second assumption is that the book is the work of several authors, representing two main time periods. The opening six chapters “are assumed to have come down from the third century B.C. or even somewhat earlier” and “[t]hree apocalypses and the prayer vision . . . can be dated rather more precisely to the first third of the second century B.C.”²⁰⁵ The third assumption is that the authors of the text of Daniel “acted and thought like its heroes, Daniel and his three friends” and they should be identified as Hasideans that are witnessed to in 1 Maccabees 2:42 and 7:13-17.²⁰⁶ The fourth assumption is that “[t]he *hasidim* who completed the Book of Daniel drew from the wisdom tradition of their people for the stories about Daniel and his fellow heroes” that included literature from “the canonical Book of Esther, and in the apocryphal novelettes of Judith and Tobit, in the tales of the three young courtiers of I Esdras 3-4, as well as in the beloved international tale of Ahiqar.”²⁰⁷ Daniel in this wisdom tradition is pictured as the new Joseph.²⁰⁸ The fifth assumption is that apocalyptic is a sub-type of eschatology.²⁰⁹ Apocalypse is distinguished from realistic eschatology in that it “has been dramatically amplified in a cosmic direction.”²¹⁰ This form of apocalyptic can be found also in Isaiah 24-27, Zechariah 9-14, Joel 2:28-3:21 and

²⁰³ W. Sibley Towner, *Daniel: Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1984), 1.

²⁰⁴ Towner, *Daniel*, 5.

²⁰⁵ Towner, *Daniel*, 5.

²⁰⁶ Towner, *Daniel*, 6-7.

²⁰⁷ Towner, *Daniel*, 8.

²⁰⁸ Towner, *Daniel*, 8.

²⁰⁹ Towner, *Daniel*, 10.

²¹⁰ Towner, *Daniel*, 11.

Daniel 7-12.²¹¹ The whole interpretive scheme supports the goal of giving encouragement to “observant Jews in the days of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.”²¹² As with Porteous, the book is interpreted as an apocalyptic book with similar characteristics to other works of the same era, giving encouragement to the *hasidim* suffering persecution from Antiochus Epiphanes.

Werner H. Schmidt in his *Old Testament Introduction* begins his chapter on Daniel with this statement, “There is probably no piece of OT literature that has elicited so great a response as the book of Daniel with its teaching on the four empires (2; 7) and its expectation of the Son of man (7:13f.).”²¹³ The book is divided into the two main sections of stories and legends in chapters 1-6 and visions in 7-12.²¹⁴ The author is someone from “the beginning of the Maccabean period” who connects the name Daniel with “a figure who had from time immemorial been regarded as righteous and wise.”²¹⁵ Confirmation of this date is found in the Hebrew canon placing Daniel in the Writings and not the Prophets due to its late date.²¹⁶ He claims that “the visionary or historical presentation repeatedly has in mind Antiochus IV Epiphanes (2:4ff.; 7:8, 20ff.; 8:9ff., 23ff.; 9:26ff.; 11:21ff.), who did away with the cult in Jerusalem in 167 B.C. (8:12f.; 9:27; 11:31, 36f.) and tried to hellenize Judaism by force.”²¹⁷ These claims are somewhat tempered by the recognition that the overall composition is somewhat uneven due to the author “making extensive use of old narrative material that knows nothing yet of the tribulations in the time of Antiochus IV.”²¹⁸ In chapters 7-12 “[t]he dating of the imminent end-time, which is to dawn about three and a half years after Antiochus’s desecration of the temple, become clearer in the course of the visions (7:25; 8:14; 9:24ff.; 12:7), until it undergoes a slight correction (by the author himself? by a third party?) in the light of the actual historical course of events (12:11f.).”²¹⁹ Though Antiochus IV meets his demise in a different way than Daniel 11:40ff. suggests, it still “marks the beginning of the end-

²¹¹ Towner, *Daniel*, 11.

²¹² Towner, *Daniel*, 15.

²¹³ Werner H. Schmidt, *Old Testament Introduction*, trans. Matthew J. O’Connell (New York: Crossroad, 1990), 289.

²¹⁴ Schmidt, *Old Testament Introduction*, 290.

²¹⁵ Schmidt, *Old Testament Introduction*, 290.

²¹⁶ Schmidt, *Old Testament Introduction*, 289.

²¹⁷ Schmidt, *Old Testament Introduction*, 289.

²¹⁸ Schmidt, *Old Testament Introduction*, 290.

²¹⁹ Schmidt, *Old Testament Introduction*, 291.

time, and the punishment of the evildoer signals the reversal of Israel's tribulation."²²⁰ Though some of the materials are seen as predating the Maccabean era, they are still to be understood as being crafted in their present form from and for this era.

In distinction to the Babylonian era position, the text and its historical referents are almost reversed. The Babylonian era position sees the whole of the book tied to the events with which they describe; chapters 1-6 have particular historical events to which they are associated. The visions from this perspective that are described in chapters 2 and 7-12 are future and had no historical event with which to tie it. The Maccabean era position views the whole situation opposite. Chapters 2 and 7-12 have their reference in the particular historical events that are past and present. Chapters 1-6 do not have a historical referent but are literary devices used to encourage those who are suffering under the apocalyptic visions represented by chapters 2 and 7-12.

2.4 Spanning the Time Periods

Gerhard von Rad in his *Theologie des Alten Testaments Band 2* subtitled *Die Theologie der prophetischen Überlieferungen Israels* prefaces his treatment to the book of Daniel with an overview of apocalypse.²²¹ Apocalypse speaks "von einer Art Fernerwartung" and:

Erstaunlicherweise hat sich die religiöse Hoffnung Israels aber doch noch einmal und zwar unter ganz anderen Voraussetzungen und in Konzeptionen von einer bisher noch nicht erreichten universalen Weite ausgesprochen, in der Apokalyptik.²²²

He gives a more precise definition just a sentence later:

Am sichersten ist es, wenn man sich auf das beschränkt, was wissenschaftlich greifbar ist, nämlich auf ein bestimmtes literarisches Phänomen innerhalb des Spätjudentums, also auf jene Gruppe pseudepigraphischer „Apokalypsen“ von Daniel bis zur syrischen Baruchapokalypse.²²³

With these distinctions from prophetic literature and this definition, von Rad argues that apocalyptic literature has its background in two earlier forms of literature, namely

²²⁰ Schmidt, *Old Testament Introduction*, 296.

²²¹ Gerhard von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments Band 2: Die Theologie der prophetischen Überlieferungen Israels*, 10th ed. (Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser/Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1993), 316-331.

²²² Von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments Band 2*, 316.

²²³ Von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments Band 2*, 317.

prophetic and wisdom literature. The connection with prophetic literature is traced to the preoccupation with the “Eschata.”²²⁴ However, the key distinction is to be found in the picture of YHWH. The plans of YHWH in earlier prophetic literature were moveable “weil Jahwes Pläne beweglich waren.”²²⁵ This is in distinction to apocalyptic literature where God has already counted and numbered everything.²²⁶ The connection with wisdom literature is seen in the descriptions of the key characters as “höfischen Weisen” (Daniel), “Schreiber der Gerechtigkeit” (Enoch) and “Schreiber der Wissenschaft des Höchsten” (Ezra), who deal with proverbs and interpretations.²²⁷ This detail explains the aforementioned difference between prophetic and apocalyptic literature. The roots in wisdom literature add these concepts of “Beschaffenheit” and “Ordnungen” that are so prevalent in apocalyptic literature.²²⁸

With this background von Rad makes this statement in relation to the book of Daniel: “Die Danielforschung hat es uns doch gelehrt, was für ein langes und kompliziertes Wachstum hinter den apoklyptischen Stoffen liegt, die weit in die vorapoklyptischen Zeit zurückreichen.”²²⁹ This seems to differ from the previous Maccabean era positions in that the material from the chapters 1, 3-6 and 9 all represent material that does not come from this (late) period in which apocalyptic material was so prevalent.²³⁰ Further even with the parallels between chapters 2 and 7, chapters 1-6 are thought to represent “den relativ ältesten Überlieferungsstoff des Buches.”²³¹ Chapter 2, coming from a later period than the rest of the material from this section, is viewed as having more in common with “das Alexanderreich” than with “Antiochus Epiphanes.”²³² However, with this nuance the difference is made clear. Chapters 7-12 represent the latest material in the book with chapter 7 serving as a pivot point between the first section of legends and the second section of apocalyptic material. Chapter 7 is the oldest material from this complex and renews the material for a new situation.²³³ Chapters 8-12, the youngest of the material, serve

²²⁴ Von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments Band 2*, 320.

²²⁵ Von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments Band 2*, 322.

²²⁶ Von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments Band 2*, 322-323.

²²⁷ Von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments Band 2*, 317-319.

²²⁸ Von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments Band 2*, 318.

²²⁹ Von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments Band 2*, 324.

²³⁰ Von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments Band 2*, 324.

²³¹ Von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments Band 2*, 332.

²³² Von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments Band 2*, 334.

²³³ Von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments Band 2*, 328, 334, 336.

to give “die Dauer der Notzeit und den Beginn der Wende zum Heil zeitlich zu fixieren.”²³⁴ This scheme of reinterpretation of older material is seen within the book of Daniel as it interprets itself but is also found in its reinterpretation of the Joseph narratives and the seventy years from Jeremiah.²³⁵ Von Rad’s position views the text as having significantly older material than is represented in the Maccabean era position. By no means does he attempt to identify Daniel as a historical person as in the Babylonian era position, but some of the material does date from this time period. The book then is viewed as a series of texts from particular time periods that grows through further interpretation.

Brevard Childs in his *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* moves out from this already quoted premise:

I am now convinced that the relation between the historical critical study of the Bible and its theological use as religious literature within a community of faith and practice needs to be completely rethought. Minor adjustments are not only inadequate, but also conceal the extent of the dry rot.²³⁶

By this he does not mean that earlier tools and observations are worthless, as he in fact uses them all, but that the foundation from which these tools and observations flow needs to be replaced.²³⁷ His key critique of critical scholarship in relation to the book of Daniel is found in the assertion that “the final redactional stamp on the entire book was almost universally regarded as Hellenistic.”²³⁸ To challenge this he is “interested in exploring how the book of Daniel was heard by Jews in the post-Maccabean period,” which of course relates to the questions of “how did the book of Daniel originally function in its Maccabean context” and “how was this original function altered by its new canonical role.”²³⁹ Childs’s breakdown of the book should not be surprising at this point: “In terms of its structure the book falls into two clearly distinct parts. The first 6 chapters present stories about Daniel and his friends in a style in which the third person narrative dominates. In the last 6 chapters the visions of Daniel are offered, chiefly in a first person style.”²⁴⁰ The opening six chapters are apparently in reference to an actual Daniel from the Babylonian era who had at least

²³⁴ Von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments Band 2*, 336.

²³⁵ Von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments Band 2*, 325, 336.

²³⁶ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 15.

²³⁷ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 17.

²³⁸ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 613.

²³⁹ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 613, 614.

²⁴⁰ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 614.

one vision in chapter 2. However, the book itself then has subsequent material that “bears a clear Hellenistic stamp” in the vision of chapter 7 in which “[t]he Maccabean author had received the ancient prophecy of Daniel [found in chapter 2] which spoke of the rise and fall of the four world empires before the end.”²⁴¹ This “same exegetical move” is seen in chapter 8, where the focus is “on the last two within the original vision.”²⁴² Chapter 9, with its reinterpretation of Jeremiah from seventy years to seventy weeks of years, is the hinge that connects 10-12 with the rest of the book. “Finally, the last vision in chs. 10-11 with an epilogue in ch. 12 once again explicitly develops the themes of ch. 2 along with the interpretation of chs. 7-9.”²⁴³ Though Childs claims there is this “Hellenistic stamp” in the later half of the book, he makes clear:

It should be remembered that nowhere did the original author actually identify Antiochus by name with the evil one. The Maccabean author continued to work within the framework of Daniel’s prophetic vision and carried on the same idiom. The vision was a mystery, hidden from the human mind, which only God could reveal.²⁴⁴

Further, even the numbers that appear so often in the final half the book “were allowed to stand uninterpreted without a clear indication of their significance.”²⁴⁵ This respect of “Daniel’s prophetic visions” through not naming in particular Antiochus and leaving the numbers uninterpreted allows for the book “to be read as scripture in the post-Maccabean age.”²⁴⁶ Antiochus, though the historical referent, becomes a type “but he himself was not the fulfillment of the vision.”²⁴⁷ Childs essentially takes an eclectic approach to his interpretation of Daniel. The early material found in chapters 1-6 has at least its origin in the Babylonian era. Chapters 7-12 are placed in the Maccabean era. Like von Rad, he views the book as growing through interpretation of earlier material that he identifies as “revelation of scripture.”²⁴⁸ In essence his argument is an apologetic for how “[t]he Maccabean dating of the book does not undercut the validity of the witness when it is properly understood.”²⁴⁹

²⁴¹ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 616.

²⁴² Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 617.

²⁴³ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 617.

²⁴⁴ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 620.

²⁴⁵ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 621.

²⁴⁶ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 620, 619.

²⁴⁷ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 619.

²⁴⁸ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 616.

²⁴⁹ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 618.

Herbert Niehr describes the structure of the book of Daniel in different terms using the Hebrew-Aramaic-Hebrew structure to interpret the book. From this scheme the first section would be the introduction in 1:1-2:4a, which is in Hebrew. The second main section would be the main portion of the book found in 2:4b-7:28, which is in Aramaic. The third and final section is a group of expansions based on the visions of chapters 2 and 7 in chapters 8-12, which are in Hebrew again.²⁵⁰ In this schema chapters 2-7 form the heart of the book that is chiastically shaped, with 2 and 7 having a dream/vision and an interpretation, 3 and 6 contain stories that end in a doxology, 4 and 5 have a dream/appearance and interpretation, and at the center of it all is the confession of Nebuchadnezzar in 4:31-32, recognizing God's sovereign rule.²⁵¹ The visions in chapters 8-12 only serve to underscore the central message of God's sovereign rule. Though Niehr outlines five different approaches from the present time to the development of the book of Daniel, they are all some form of this present category, where Daniel is understood to have an extended *Entstehungsprozess* (509-511). His own assessment is, "Die entscheidende Zeit für die Herausbildung des Danielbuches stellt die erste Hälfte des 2.Jh.s v.Chr. dar. Diese Zeit ist gekennzeichnet durch die Hellenisierung Vorderasiens und damit auch Palästinas, welches zur seleukidischen Machtsphäre gehörte."²⁵²

2.5 Summary

Through a survey of these different perspectives, one notes the importance of especially diachronic issues in relation to the interpretation of the text. It is only in relation to the third perspective that synchronic issues play a significant role. For the Babylonian era position the most important interpretive issue is that the book is actually connected with the historical persons and events described within its pages. The book then is a collection of biographical and autobiographical texts strung together along a historical timeline. The book becomes primarily prophetic in perspective, but is certainly filled with admirable examples. For the Maccabean era the most important issue is that the book is actually connected with the events in the Maccabean era. The stories in the opening section certainly give an example of how

²⁵⁰ Herbert Niehr, "Das Buch Daniel," in *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, ed. Erich Zenger, 7th. ed. (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2008), 508.

²⁵¹ Niehr, "Das Buch Daniel," 508-509.

²⁵² Niehr, "Das Buch Daniel," 512.

to live in such an apocalyptic time, but they also serve to give credence to the message in the latter half of the book.

The views of von Rad and Childs represent something of a different nature. These views have elements that stem from the Babylonian era and the Maccabean era and even beyond. Further, the book represents a text that has grown through a convergence of reflection on earlier material found in the Old Testament as well as in its own pages, where one can actually locate this convergence of diachronic and synchronic tension. What is interesting is that, though this perspective actually represents a break from both previous positions, both authors give a strong apologetic for connection with the previous positions, including Childs's comments from his preface. The reality of this new phase of understanding is seen in the present state of Daniel research as outlined by Niehr that shows only varied forms of this approach.²⁵³

²⁵³ Niehr, "Das Buch Daniel," 509-511.

3. Canonical Intertextuality: Daniel 1-6

3.1 Introduction

The book of Daniel contains a series of diachronic indicators that from a literary standpoint divide the whole book into smaller scenes. The diachronic indicators serve not as simple chronological indicators wherein the reader is to follow the book through a linear timeline or even to reorganize the book chronologically. Instead these diachronic indicators reveal tension within the text. Why does the text not follow a simple chronological pattern, especially since these indicators clearly separate the text into smaller units? Could the text not be simply rearranged or would this unravel what has been *interpreted* together?

3.2 The Scenes

The book of Daniel is clearly divided into ten discreet scenes.²⁵⁴ Each of these scenes is distinguished from one another through a superscription of sorts that gives the initial setting for what is to follow. In several instances these superscriptions give clear chronological indications:

1:1 בשנת שלוש למלכות יהויקים מלך יהודה בא
נבוכדנאצר מלך בבל ירושלם ויצר עליה:

*In the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim, king of Judah,
Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, went into Jerusalem and
besieged it.*

2:1 ובשנת שתים למלכות נבוכדנאצר חלם
נבוכדנאצר חלמות ותחפצם רוחו ושנתו נהיתה עליו:

*And in the second year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar,
Nebuchadnezzar dreamed dreams and his spirit was disturbed and
his sleep was done upon him.*

6:1 ודריוש מדיא קבל מלכותא פבר
שנין שתין ותרתין:

And Darius the Mede received the kingdom as a son of 62 years.

7:1 בשנת חדה לבלאשצר מלך בבל הניאל חלם
חזה וחזוני ראשה על-משפכה בארין חלמא כתב ראש
מלין אמר:

*In the first year of Belshazzar the king of Babylon, Daniel saw a
dream and the visions of his head upon his bed. Then he wrote the
dream, the sum of the words. He said:*

²⁵⁴ Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Auckland: Doubleday, 1978), 9, Hartman argues: "This book is unique among all the books of the Bible, Old and New Testament, in that each of these sections forms a distinct unit separable from the rest."

8:1 בִּשְׁנַת שְׁלוֹשׁ לְמַלְכוּת בִּלְשַׁצַּר הַמֶּלֶךְ חָזֹן
נִרְאָה אֵלַי אֲנִי דְנִיאֵל אַחֲרֵי הַנִּרְאָה אֵלַי בְּתַחֲלָה:

In the third year of the reign of Belshazzar, the king, a vision appeared to me, I, Daniel, after the one appearing to me in the beginning.

9:1 בִּשְׁנַת אֶחָת לְדָרְיוֹשׁ בֶּן־אַחַשְׁוֶרוֹשׁ מִזֶּרַע מֶדֶי
אֲשֶׁר הָמֶלֶךְ עַל מַלְכוּת כַּשְׁדִּים:

In the first year of Darius, the son of Ahasuerus, from the seed of the Medes, who was made king upon the kingdom of the Chaldeans.

10:1 בִּשְׁנַת שְׁלוֹשׁ לְכוֹרֶשׁ מֶלֶךְ פָּרֶס הָדָבַר נִגְלָה
לְדְנִיאֵל אֲשֶׁר־נִקְרָא שְׁמוֹ בִּלְטַשְׁצַּר וְאִמְתּוֹ הָדָבַר וְצָבָא
נָדוּל וּבִין אֶת־הָדָבַר וּבִינָה לוֹ בְּמִרְאָה:

In the third year of Cyrus, king of Persia, a word was revealed to Daniel, whose name was called Belteshazzar, and the word is truth and is a great war and he considered²⁵⁵ the word and there was understanding to him in the appearance.

With the exception of 6:1 each superscription uses בִּשְׁנַת (in the year of), in Aramaic and Hebrew, with reference to a particular ruler and the year of his rule. What is striking about this list is that the overall narrative of the book does not move in a completely chronological fashion with regard to these changes in scene. When the second set of changes in scene (3:1; 4:1; 5:1) are added this feature is enhanced:

3:1 נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר מֶלֶכָא עָבַד צֶלֶם דִּידֵהּב רֹמְהָ
אֲמִין שְׁתִּין פְּתִיחָא אֲמִין שֵׁשׁ אֲקִימָהּ בְּבִקְעָת דְּוִרָא בְּמִדְינָת
בָּבֶל:

Nebuchadnezzar, the king, made an image of gold. Its height was sixty cubits and its width was six cubits. He set it up in the valley of Dura in the province of Babylon.

4:1 אֲנִי נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר שְׁלָה הָוִית בְּבֵיתִי וּרְעֵנָן
בְּהִיכְלִי:

I, Nebuchadnezzar, was at ease in my house and one flourishing in my palace.

5:1 בִּלְשַׁצַּר מֶלֶכָא עָבַד לֶחֶם רַב לְרַבְרַבְנֹהִי
אֶלְף וְלִקְבֵּל אֶלְפָא חֲמֵרָא שְׁתָּה:

Belshazzar, the king, made a great feast for a thousand of his chiefs and in view of this the thousand was drinking wine.

²⁵⁵ BDB, 106, lists בִּין in this instance as a Qal, perfect, 3 person, masculine singular. GKC, § 73, lists בִּין in this instance as a “shortened” Hiph’il, perfect, 3rd person, masculine, singular. Rudolf Meyer, *Hebräische Grammatik* (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1992), 269, gives a similar explanation to GKC stating, “Die Formengleichheit des Imperf. mit dem Hi. bewirkt mitunter ein sekundäres Perf. Hi., so bei בִּין „bemerken, einsehen“: הִבִּין, das möglicherweise in ובִּין „und er gab acht“ (Da. 10,1) in verkürzter Gestalt vorliegt.”

It is fairly easy to reorder the narrative based on the book's own references to time and inferred narrative connections.²⁵⁶ 1:1 begins with the besieging of Jerusalem. 2:1 moves into the second year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign (presumably over Jerusalem).²⁵⁷ 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's 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's reign in 11:1, the final scene actually begins with the superscription in 10:1 during the third year of Cyrus's reign.

Each of these statements marks a decided break between these scenes in the narrative. Most of these breaks are marked by clear changes in time (1:1; 2:1; 6:1; 7:1; 8:1; 9:1; 10:1) and sometimes these changes are marked by a change of setting: Nebuchadnezzar making a giant image (3:1), an unspecified time when Nebuchadnezzar had a disturbing dream in his palace (4:1-2) and a time at the very end of Belshazzar's reign when he had an idolatrous feast with the vessels from the Jewish temple (5:1-2, 30).

Though one could speak of a general chronological flow of the book, moving from Nebuchadnezzar's besieging of Jerusalem to the third year of the reign of Cyrus, the text does not move in a purely chronological order. These narrative units could be easily reconstructed chronologically based on the above time schema, which would

²⁵⁶ Porteous, *Daniel*, 39, appears to view these superscriptions as meaningless: "The discrepancy between 1.5 and 18 and 2.1 need not be taken seriously, since the dates in this book do not imply a genuine historical context." Regardless of the apparent discrepancy between the "event" and the "text" they are a part of the actual text. See again the discussion in Sailhamer, *Introduction to Old Testament Theology*, 36-85. Michael Hilton, "Babel Reversed—Daniel Chapter 5," in *JSOT* 66 (1995): 103, notes this tendency in distinction to medieval rabbinic commentators, "Modern biblical scholars, who see the Daniel stories as a body of legendary material, are not concerned about the lack of historical accuracy; however, the names of the kings given in Daniel were of great concern to the medieval rabbinic commentators, who discussed in detail how far the accounts given in Daniel could be reconciled with the other sources familiar to them."

²⁵⁷ Rashi states, "**Now in the second year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign** It is impossible to say this, except that [it happened] in the second year after the destruction of the Temple. So it is taught in Seder Olam (ch. 28), and Scripture called it "of Nebuchadnezzar's reign," because he demonstrated his insolence by entering the Inner Sanctum of the Sovereign of the Universe," http://www.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/16485/showrashi/true/jewish/Chapter-2.htm (accessed January 9, 2009).

create an interesting interplay between Aramaic and Hebrew texts. The fact that chapters 2-7 with the exception of 2:1-4a are written in Aramaic suggests that this complex was fixed at an earlier time than the rest of the narrative since it serves as the catalyst for the rest of the book.

However, the striking feature remains that these clear narrative units have been ordered for a purpose other than following a strict chronology to form a larger text. The narrative texts (1-6) have been placed together in chronological order and Daniel's vision texts (7-12) have also been placed together in chronological order. This overall reordering seems to indicate that these narrative scenes existed at one point separate from one another but have been (re)ordered for a purpose other than following a strict chronology, namely grouping thematically similar texts together.²⁵⁸ In the structure of the book there is a built-in tension between time and interpretation, where the time has been retained and yet (re)ordered for a larger thematic purpose.

3.3 Chapter 1

Clearly chapter 1 introduces the key characters and setting from which the rest of the book embarks. The opening verse transitions from the time of the kings of Judah to the reign of Nebuchadnezzar. The holy articles from the temple are moved from “the house of God” (בֵּית־הָאֱלֹהִים) to “the treasure house of his gods” (בֵּית אוֹצָר) with “his” being Nebuchadnezzar, a detail that will be revisited in chapter 5. The key character of the book, Daniel, and his three friends, Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah, are found to be handpicked young men with a particular lineage “from the sons of Israel and from the seed of the royalty and from the nobles” (מִבְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל) and with particular physical and mental characteristics:

²⁵⁸ In Hartman and Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel*, 9, Hartman argues that “[a]ny of one of the ten sections could have existed independently of any of the others” and “the book seems to be a collection of once isolated mini-works brought together.” John J. Collins, “Current Issues in the Study of Daniel,” vol. 1 of *The Book of Daniel*, eds. John J. Collins and Peter Flint (Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 2001), 3, substantiates this argument only in relation to chapters 4-6: “The existence of such variant texts [found in the Old Greek translation of chapters 4-6] suggests that these chapters once circulated apart from the rest of the book, and that the tales may have been transmitted orally for a period.” Edgar Kellenberger, “Überlegungen zur Gleichzeitigkeit von Schriftlicher und Mündlicher Überlieferung,” *Communio Viatorum* 45/3 (2003): 194, sees these differences in chapters 4-6 as a cooperation between oral and written transmission: “Wenn wir hingegen unsere Vorstellung von einer rein schriftlichen Überlieferung verlassen und stattdessen ein Mitwirken mündlichen Erzählens in Variationen annehmen, so wird für mich verständlich, warum sich der Text allen hypothetischen Ausscheidungsversuchen widersetzt. Ich rechne mit einem laufendem Prozess von (kleineren) Hinzufügungen und Weglassungen, wie es beim mündlichen Tradieren natürlich ist.”

⁴ יְלָדִים אֲשֶׁר אֵין-בָּהֶם כָּל-מָאֹם וְטוֹבֵי מַרְאֶה
וּמִשְׁפִּילִים בְּכָל-חִכְמָה וַיְדַעִי דַעַת וּמִבִּינֵי מַדַּע וְאֲשֶׁר כָּח
בָּהֶם לַעֲמֹד בְּהִיכַל הַמֶּלֶךְ וּלְלַמְדָם סֵפֶר וּלְשׁוֹן כַּשְׁדִּים:

Boys in whom there is not any defect and ones good of appearance and ones having insight in all wisdom and knowing knowledge and discerning knowledge and who have strength in them to stand in the palace of the king and to teach them the writing and language of the Chaldeans.

All of these characteristics set the stage for the following encounters that these four will have with Nebuchadnezzar and further Daniel with Belshazzar, as they “stand in the palace of the king.” The rest of the chapter represents a series of contrasts between these four young men and the new kingdom in which they find themselves. They will no longer retain their given names:

⁷ וַיִּשֶׂם לָהֶם שֵׁר הַפָּרִיסִים שְׁמֹטוֹת וַיִּשֶׂם לְדַנְיָאֵל בְּלִטְשַׁאצַּר
וּלְחַנַּנְיָה שְׁדַרְכַּךְ וּלְמִישָׁאֵל מִישַׁךְ וּלְעִזְרִיָּה עֵבֶר נָגוּ:

And the chief of the eunuchs put names to them and he put to Daniel Belshazzar and to Hananiah Shadrach, and to Mishaël Meshach, and to Azariah Abednego.

Rather than eating “the delicacies of the king” (בְּפִתְחֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ) the four are granted permission to eat “from the vegetables” (מִן-הַזֵּרָעִים) and are found after a time of testing to be “fatter in flesh than all the boys” (בְּרִיאֵי בָשָׂר מִן-כָּל-הַיְלָדִים). This is followed by the young men distinguishing themselves at the end of their time of training not just among their “graduating class” but among the key representatives of the kingdom:

¹⁹ וַיְדַבֵּר אִתָּם הַמֶּלֶךְ וְלֹא נִמְצָא מִכֵּלָם כְּדַנְיָאֵל חֲנַנְיָה
מִישָׁאֵל וְעִזְרִיָּה וַיַּעֲמֵדוּ לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ: ²⁰ וְכָל דְּבַר חִכְמָת
בִּינָה אֲשֶׁר-בִּקֵּשׁ מֵהֶם הַמֶּלֶךְ וַיִּמְצְאוּ עֹשֶׂר יָדוֹת עַל
כָּל-הַחֲרָטְמִים הָאֲשָׁפִים אֲשֶׁר בְּכָל-מְלָכוֹתָיו:
²¹ וַיְהִי דַנְיָאֵל עַד-שְׁנַת אַחַת לְכוֹרֶשׁ הַמֶּלֶךְ:

19 And the king spoke to them and there was no one among them like Daniel, Hananiah, Mishaël, and Azariah. And they stood before the king. 20 And every word of wise understanding which the king sought from them and he found them ten hands above all the magicians, the conjurers, who were in all his kingdom. 21 And Daniel existed until the first year of Cyrus, the king.

In no uncertain terms these contrasts are based in their relationship to God. With regard to the exception made in relation to their food the text makes clear:

⁹ וַיִּתֵּן הָאֱלֹהִים אֶת־דָּנִיֵּאל לְחֶסֶד וּלְרַחֲמִים לִפְנֵי שַׂר הַפָּרִסִּים:

And God gave Daniel kindness and compassion before the chief of the eunuchs.

With regard to their extraordinary skill the narrator states:

¹⁷ וַיְהִי־לְדָוִד הָאֱלֹהִים אֲרֻבָּעָתָם נָתַן לָהֶם הָאֱלֹהִים מִדָּע וְהַשְׂפָּל בְּכָל־סֵפֶר וְחִכְמָה וְדָנִיֵּאל הָבִין בְּכָל־חֲזוֹן וַחֲלֻמוֹת:

And God gave to these four boys knowledge and to have insight in every writing and wisdom. And Daniel gave understanding in every vision and dreams.

In these contrasts God is viewed as both the source of their hardship within their new context and also as the one who grants them favor and skill within this very same situation. Further, without their finding favor also with Nebuchadnezzar, there would not be the same potential for peril and need for deliverance. Each of these issues will be revisited within the book: the vessels from the temple of God in the temples of Nebuchadnezzar in chapter 5, Daniel's skill with regards to dreams, visions and interpretation in chapters 2, 5 and 7-12, and the hardship and favor caused by their relationship with God in chapters 2, 3 and 6. With the closing words of chapter 1, a bridge is made to the final chapters of the book, moving us from the time of Nebuchadnezzar to the first year of Cyrus's reign and to Daniel alone as the key character:

²¹ וַיְהִי־דָנִיֵּאל עַד־שָׁנַת אַחַת לְכוֹרֶשׁ הַמֶּלֶךְ:

And Daniel existed until the first year of Cyrus, the king.

However, this narrative detail reveals a tension within the larger text of Daniel. It clearly closes this narrative unit and brings Daniel clear to the time of "the first year of Cyrus" (שָׁנַת אַחַת לְכוֹרֶשׁ), a detail that is different from 10:1 where Daniel is found in "in the third year of Cyrus" (בְּשָׁנַת שְׁלוֹשׁ לְכוֹרֶשׁ). This detail could be viewed as a clumsy compositional mistake but serves rather as a hint that this material is a collection of smaller narrative units that have been intentionally ordered together, retaining at least in this case an indication of their earlier individual purpose as stand-alone narratives.²⁵⁹ The bridge that this verse creates happens through this purposeful collecting and ordering of this text with these other narrative units.

²⁵⁹ James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1927), 137, gives this explanation: "The contradiction with 10¹, acc. to which Dan. had a vision in Cyrus' 3d year, in the Far Orient, is removed by the critical distinction of cc. 1-6 and 7-12 as distinct books." John J. Collins, *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press,

3.4 Chapter 2

The opening verse of chapter 2 sets the scene for the events of chapter 2:

¹ וּבִשְׁנַת שְׁתַּיִם לְמַלְכוּת נְבֻכַדְנֶצַּר חָלַם
 נְבֻכַדְנֶצַּר חֲלֻמוֹת וַתַּחֲפֹעַם רוּחוֹ וּשְׁנָתוֹ נִהְיָה עָלָיו:
*And in the second year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar,
 Nebuchadnezzar dreamed dreams. And his spirit was disturbed and
 his sleep was done upon him.*

Using the diachronic formula, the time is set during the second year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign. The whole of the narrative of chapter 2 is connected with the previous material by means of the conjunction ו "and." Further, the central theme of the chapter, Nebuchadnezzar's disturbing dream, is introduced. The diachronic phrase "the second year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign" (שְׁתַּיִם לְמַלְכוּת נְבֻכַדְנֶצַּר) again reflects the difficulty in trying to understand the book chronologically. Even the apparatus of *BHS* attempts to tackle the issue with this suggestion "שְׁתַּיִם עֶשְׂרֵה רַק" (probably the twelfth) with a desire to harmonize this date with the times given in chapter 1, where at least three years have already elapsed (cf. 1:6,10). However, it must again be noted that chapter 1 spans from Nebuchadnezzar besieging Jerusalem (1:1) to the first of Cyrus's reign (1:21). As there is no clear manuscript evidence to support the harmonistic conjecture,²⁶⁰ the text simply retains this tension.²⁶¹ The opening phrase serves not to move the text chronologically, but to mark the beginning of the narrative scene and also to locate the following scene in the context of what has already been said in the present structure of the text. Though Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah are counted among "the wisemen being killed"²⁶² (חֲכִימָאֵי מִתְקַטְלִין) in 2:13, they are not yet among the official group that stands in the king's presence:

1993), 145, gives this explanation, "The final verse of this introductory chapter indicates the horizon of the tales, where the latest event mentioned is the date of Cyrus at 6:28. Subsequently, Dan 10:1 records a revelation in the third year of Cyrus. Either the author of the later vision overlooked the apparent closure of Daniel's career according to 1:21 or this passage was not taken as indicating his demise."

²⁶⁰ Collins, *Daniel*, 154, lists the Old Greek translation as found in Papyrus 967 as support for "twelfth." Upon further digital review of the Papyrus is question, http://www.uni-koeln.de/phil-fak/ifa/NRWakademie/papyrologie/PTTheol/PT16_10r.jpg (accessed March 25, 2009), it is not so obvious what year the text gives.

²⁶¹ Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, 141, concludes his discussion of this problem, "Of course there may be simple disagreement with the three years of c. 1, that detail with the introductory chap. being on the whole secondary to this story." Collins, *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, 155, concludes his discussion of the same problem, "By far the simplest explanation of the date of chap. 2 is that it was not originally composed to fit the context provided by chap. 1, and that the editor of the tales did not notice the discrepancy."

²⁶² The translation follows Franz Rosenthal, *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic* (6th. ed.; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1995), 59, where the participle is described as indicating "an action that is simultaneous with the main action." Hans Bauer and Pontus Leander, *Grammatik des Biblisch-*

² וַיֹּאמֶר הַמֶּלֶךְ לִקְרֹא לַחֲרָטְמִים וְלַאֲשָׁפִים וְלַמְכַשְׁפִּים
וְלַכַּשְׂדִּים לְהִגִּיד לַמֶּלֶךְ חֲלֻמֹתָיו וַיָּבֹאוּ וַיַּעֲמְדוּ לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ:
*And the king said to call to the magicians and to the conjurers and
to the ones practicing sorcery and to the Chaldeans, to report the
king's dreams to him. And they went in. And they stood before the
king.*

The narrative of chapter 2 serves not as an *isolated* court tale within the present larger narrative, but as an example of how Daniel and his companions distinguished themselves above those who stood before Nebuchadnezzar in 1:20.²⁶³

²⁰ וְכָל דְּבַר חֲכֻמַּת בֵּינָה אֲשֶׁר־בִּקֶּשׁ מֵהֶם הַמֶּלֶךְ וַיִּמְצְאוּ
עֶשֶׂר יָדוֹת עַל כָּל־הַחֲרָטְמִים הָאֲשָׁפִים אֲשֶׁר בְּכָל־מְלָכוֹתָיו:
*And every word of wise understanding which the king sought from
them and he found them ten hands above all the magicians, the
conjurers, who were in all his kingdom.*

In particular Daniel distinguishes himself because “he gave understanding in every vision and dream” (הַבֵּין בְּכָל־חֲזוֹן וְחִלְמוֹת) in 1:17 and in particular when “the secret was revealed in the vision of the night” (בַּחֲזוֹן דִּי־לֵילִיָּא רְזָה גַלִּי) in 2:19. As 1:20 makes clear that God has given this special ability, Daniel in turn makes it clear to Nebuchadnezzar in 2:28:

²⁸ בְּרַם אֵיתִי אֱלֹהַּ בְּשָׁמַיָּא גָּלֵא רְזִין וְהוֹדַע לְמַלְכָּא
נְבוּכַדְרֶצַּר מָה דִּי לְהוּא בְּאַחֲרִית יוֹמֵיָא חֲלֻמָּךְ וְחֲזוֹן רִאשְׁךְ
עַל־מִשְׁכַּבְּךְ דְּנָה הוּא:
*But there is a God in the heavens, one revealing secrets and
making known to the King, Nebuchadnezzar, what will be in the
end of the days. This is it, the dream and the visions of your head
upon your bed.*

Certainly the vision that speaks of “what will be in the end of the days” (מָה דִּי לְהוּא) is important as a part of this scene, but more importantly it shows how Daniel and his friends distinguish themselves, with God’s help, through a precise recounting of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream and its interpretation:

Aramäischen (Hildersheim, Zürich, New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 1995[1927]), 297, translate this same phrase in the subjunctive “und die Weisen sollten getötet werden.”

²⁶³ John J. Collins, “The Court-Tales in Daniel and the Development of Apocalyptic,” *JBL* 94/2 (1975): 234, clearly identifies Daniel 1-6 as court tales. John G. Gammie, “On the Intention of and Sources of Daniel 1-VI,” *VT* 31/3 (1981): 285, states “the stories of Dan. i-vi may be labeled as romances.” David M. Valeta, *Lions and Ovens and Visions: Satirical Reading of Daniel 1-6* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2008), 21, identifies Daniel 1-6 as “prenovilistic Menippean satires that seek, through humor, to resist the oppressive forces of their day.” These chapters are plagued by various genre identifications, which may be due to a larger literary misunderstanding. See Klaus Koch, “Is Daniel Also Among the Prophets?,” *Interpretation* 39/2 (1985): 117-130.

דָּנָה חֲלֹמָא וּפְשָׁרָה נֹאמֵר קִדְם־מֶלֶכָּא: ³⁶

We will speak the dream and its interpretation before the king.

The *contents* of this dream, as peripheral as they are for this scene, become the main points of canonical intertextuality within the rest of the book. צִלָּם (image), which occurs only here in chapters 2-3, binds these two chapters together through the representation of the צִלָּם in chapter 2 and in chapter 3.²⁶⁴ The statement of Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom as the head in 2:37-38 is repeated multiple times in chapter 4, all with a new significance. The four kingdoms become the key theme that is reinterpreted multiple times through the last half of the book. One interesting characteristic found in this first dream is that it is *already* interpreted within the text. This is a key feature that will follow in all of the dream/vision texts in the book of Daniel and is another indicator that these narratives once existed separate from one another. At the close of the chapter, Daniel and his three friends are exalted over Babylon with this confession from Nebuchadnezzar about their God:

עֲנֵה מֶלֶכָּא לְדַנְיָאֵל וְאָמַר מִן־קִשְׁטֵי דִי אֱלֹהִיכֹן הוּא
אֱלֹהֵי אֱלֹהִין וּמַרְאֵי מַלְכִין וְגַלְיָהּ רִזְיוֹן דִּי יִכְלֵת לְמַגְלָא רְזָה
דָּנָה: ⁴⁷

The king answered Daniel and said, "Indeed²⁶⁵ your God, he is the God of gods and the Lord of kings and one revealing secrets, because you were able to reveal this secret."

God is clearly seen as the one who is sovereign, not Nebuchadnezzar. The scene closes with Daniel and his friends in elevated positions over the kingdom—all due to what God has given them (cf. 1:9,17; 2:19,47).

²⁶⁴ Valeta, *Lions and Ovens and Visions*, 78, also notes this connection but uses it in support of his overall genre description of the book of Daniel as Menippean satire, stating, "The dream statue of Daniel 2 and the golden image of Daniel 3 provide together a connecting point for these two stories, and the golden image in Daniel 3 reinforces the overall satiric nature of Daniel 2." Peter Coxon, "Nebuchadnezzar's Hermeneutical Dilemma," *JSOT* 66 (1995): 88, also keys in on this connection, "In the composite image of ch. 2 he is the head of gold, thus symbolizing the noble intelligence of the king chosen by the Most High to exercise sovereignty and ensure stable government over all living creatures. The monumental 90-foot golden statue in ch. 3 constitutes Nebuchadnezzar's logical response to such a lofty status and seems to depict his own imperial majesty."

²⁶⁵ *HALOT*, 5:1919, states "מִן־קִשְׁטֵי דִי" it is in accordance with the truth that, meaning indeed, truly 247."

3.5 Chapter 3

Chapter 3 opens with a clear change in scene:

¹ נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר עָבַד צֶלֶם הַיִּדֶּהָב רֹמֶה
אֲמִין שְׁתֵּין פְּתִיחַ אֲמִין שֵׁשׁ אֲקִימָהּ בְּבִקְעַת דּוּרָא בְּמִדְיַנָּתָא
בְּבֵל:

Nebuchadnezzar, the king, made an image of gold. Its height was sixty cubits and its width was six cubits. He set it up in the valley of Dura in the province of Babylon.

Though there is no clear indication of time in this verse, verse 12 makes clear that this section is to be viewed after the scene from chapter 2 with the repetition of key words from 2:49:

^{3:12} אִתִּי גְבָרִין יְהוּדָאִין דִּי מְנִית יְהוֹנָן עַל־עֲבִידַת מְדִינָתָא
בְּבֵל שְׁדִרְחַךְ מִישְׁחָ וְעֶבְדֵּךְ נְגוּ גְבָרִיא אֱלָךְ לֹא־שָׁמוּ עֲלֶיךָ
מֶלֶךְ טַעַם לֹא־הָיָה לָא פְּלַחִין וְלַצֵּלָם
דְּהָבָא דִּי הִקְיַמְתָּ לֹא סִנְדִּין:

There are men, Jews, you appointed them upon the work of the province of Babylon, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, these men do not pay attention to²⁶⁶ you, the king, they are not serving your gods, and to the image of gold which you set up, they are not paying homage.

^{2:49} וְדַנְיֵאל בְּעָא מִן־מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר וּמְנִי עַל עֲבִידַתָּא דִּי מְדִינָתָא
בְּבֵל לְשְׁדִרְחַךְ מִישְׁחָ וְעֶבְדֵּךְ נְגוּ וְדַנְיֵאל בְּחֶרֶע מֶלֶךְ:

And Daniel requested from the king and he appointed upon the work of the province of Babylon Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego. And Daniel was in the door of the king.

However, the most striking detail in the description of 3:1 is that Nebuchadnezzar made a very large “image of gold” (צֶלֶם הַיִּדֶּהָב). This becomes the first repetition of the details from Nebuchadnezzar’s dream and has curious shifts of meaning from the previous context. Instead of the image representing four different kingdoms through the use of different materials, the entire image is made of gold and all who hear the assortment of instruments and music are given the directive in 3:5:

⁵ תְּפִלּוּן וְתִסְגְּדוּן לְצֶלֶם דְּהָבָא דִּי הִקְיַם נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר מֶלֶךְ:

You will serve and you will pay homage to the image of gold that Nebuchadnezzar, the king, set up.

²⁶⁶ The standard Lexicons agree essentially that the phrase עַל טַעַם should be rendered idiomatically, *HALOT*, 5:1885, “to pay attention to, heed”, *BDB*, 1094, “shew proper deference to,” and Franz Buhl, *Wilhelm Gesenius’ Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament* (Berlin, Göttingen, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 1962), 908, “Rücksicht nehmen auf etwas.”

The punishment for those who will not follow the directive is given in the following verse:

⁶ וּמִן־הַיָּלָא יִפֹּל וְיִסָּגֵד בַּה־שַׁעֲתָא יִתְרַמָּא לְגֹאֲאֵתוֹן נִירָא וְקִדְתָּא:

And whoever will not fall and do homage, in that moment he will be thrown to the midst of the furnace of the burning fire.

All of this stands in rather stark contrast to 2:44:

⁴⁴ וּבְיוֹמֵיהֶוָן הִי מַלְכִּיאָא אֲנוֹן יְקִים אֱלֹהִי שְׁמִיאָא מַלְכוּ דִּי לְעֻלְמִין לֹא תִחַבֵּל וּמַלְכוּתָהּ לְעַם אַחֲרֹן לֹא תִשְׁתַּבֵּק תִּדָּק וְתִסִּיף כָּל־אֲלֵין מַלְכוּתָא וְהִיא תְקִים לְעֻלְמִיא:

And in the days of these kingdoms, God of the heavens will raise up a kingdom that will be forever, it will not be destroyed and it will not be left to another people. It will break in pieces and it will put to an end all these kingdoms and it will be established forever.

Instead of God raising up (יְקִים) a final kingdom that will put an end to all other kingdoms and last for eternity, i.e. destroying the image made of multiple materials/kingdoms, Nebuchadnezzar is raising up (תְקִים) an entire image of gold (he is the head of gold in chapter 2) and all who will not worship it (his kingdom) will be destroyed.²⁶⁷ With these shifts in key terms and phrases (canonical intertextuality), the narrative scene focuses on how Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego (Daniel in the previous chapter) distinguish themselves (3:30; cf. 1:20). After the king's directive is proclaimed it is noted by the "Chaldeans" (כַּשְׂדָּאִין) that particular "Jews" (יְהוּדָאִין) whom the king had appointed over the province of Babylon are paying no regard to the king's judgment concerning the statue. As Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego are brought before the king, the king makes clear the directive and the consequences for their disobedience in 3:15:

¹⁵ כֻּעֵן הֵן אִיתִיכוֹן עֲתִידִין הִי בַעֲדָא דִּי־תִשְׁמַעֲוֹן קֹל קַרְנָא מְשֻׁרוּקִיתָא קִיתָרס שְׁבָכָא פְסִנְתָּרִין וְסוּמְפָנִיָּה וְכָל זִנֵּי זְמָרָא תַפְלִין וְתִסְגְּדוּן לְצִלְמָא דִּי־עֲבַדְתָּ וְהֵן לֹא תִסְגְּדוּן בַּה־שַׁעֲתָה תִתְרַמּוּן לְגֹאֲאֵתוֹן נִירָא וְקִדְתָּא וּמִן־הָא אֱלֹהִי הִי יִשְׁיבְנִכּוֹן מִן־יָדִי:

"Now if you are prepared that in the time that you will hear the sound of the horn, the pipe, a lyre, a trigon, a pesanteyrin, and a bag-pipe and all kinds of music, you will fall down and you will do homage to the image that I have made and if you will not do homage, in this moment you will be thrown to the midst of the

²⁶⁷ Valeta, *Lions and Ovens and Visions*, 80, notes in a similar regard, "Moreover, one cannot help but to notice the connection between this golden statue and the one in Daniel 2, with its head of gold. It is as if Nebuchadnezzar tries to topple the dream by building a statue that is entirely gold."

furnace of the burning fire and who is the god who will save you from my hand?"

With the final statement of this verse, the challenge is not just to these three men, but a challenge to who is more powerful, the God they are serving or Nebuchadnezzar?

The three men answer without hesitation, first in 3:17:

¹⁷ הֵן אִימֵי אֱלֹהֵנָּא דִּי־אֲנַחְנָּא פְּלַחִין יָכֹל לְשִׁיבּוֹתָנָּא
מִן־אַתּוֹן נוֹרָא יִקְדָּתָּא וּמִן־יָדְךָ מַלְכָּא יִשְׁיָב:

If our God, who we are serving, is able to deliver us from the furnace of the burning fire and he will deliver us from your hand.

This is an uncompromising answer to Nebuchadnezzar's challenge to power: their God can save them. The second part of their answer reflects their utter resolve in 3:18:

¹⁸ וְהֵן לֹא יָדִיעַ לְהוֹאֵלְךָ מַלְכָּא דִּי לֹא־אֵיתִינָּא
פְּלַחִין וּלְעֵלָם דְּהִבָּא דִּי תְּקִימָתָּא לֹא נִסְגֵּד:

And if not, it will be known to you, O king, that we are not serving your gods and the image of gold which you set up we will not do homage.

To this uncompromising answer, Nebuchadnezzar goes into a fit of rage (3:19; cf. 2:12). By the king's command the oven is heated seven times hotter than usual. Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego are bound fully clothed by "mighty ones of strength" (נְבָרֵי־חֵיל) and end up falling into the oven because these mighty men who bound them were killed by the flames (3:22-23).²⁶⁸ To Nebuchadnezzar's surprise, not only are the three men alive and walking around in the fire but even more disturbing 3:25 reveals there is also a "fourth one being like a son of the gods" (רְבִיעִיא דְּמָה רְבִיעִיא דְּמָה). Nebuchadnezzar's confession in 2:47 (אֱלֹהֵכֹן "your God") is now put alongside his confession in 3:29 (אֱלֹהֵהוֹן "their God"), which are joined together in 3:31-33:

³¹ נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר מַלְכָּא לְכָל־עַמְמֵיָּא אַמִּיָּא וּלְשָׁנֵיָּא דִּי־דָאֲרִין
בְּכָל־אַרְעָא שְׁלָמְכוֹן יִשְׁנָא: ³² אֲתִיָּא וְתַמְהֵיָּא דִּי עֵבֶד
עִמִּי אֱלֹהָא עָלִיא שְׁפָר קִדְמִי לְהַחְנוּיָּה:
³³ אֲתוּהִי כְּמָה רַבְרַבִּין וְתַמְהוּהִי כְּמָה תְּקִיפִין מְלֻכּוּתָּהּ
מְלָכוֹת עָלָם וְשִׁלְטָנָּה עִם־דָּר וְדָר:

31 Nebuchadnezzar, the king, to all the peoples, nations, and tongues, who are dwelling in all the earth, your peace will be great. 32 Signs and wonders which the Most High God has done to

²⁶⁸ Valeta, *Lions and Ovens and Visions*, 121, notes in similarly, "The fire intended to kill Daniel's companions is so hot that it kills three of the king's guards, but he cares not in his extraordinarily murderous rage (Dan. 3.22)." What is not apparent is how he arrives at the number three.

me, he has been fair to declare before me. 33 How great are his signs and how mighty are his wonders, his kingdom is an eternal kingdom and his dominion is with generation and generation.

To add to this complex connection between the two chapters, the statement of judgment on the king's court for not being able to give the dream and its interpretation in 2:5 is now to be the judgment against those who speak against the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego:

3:29 וּמִנִּי שִׁים טַעַם דֵּי כָל־עַם אָמַר וְלִשָּׁן דִּי־יֹאמַר שְׁלָה
עַל אֱלֹהֵינוּ דִּי־שָׂרְרָךְ מִיִּשְׁךְ וְעֵבֶר נִגּוּא תִּדְמִין
יִתְעַבֵּר וּבֵיתָהּ נִגְלִי וְשִׁתּוּהָ כָל־קַבֵּל דֵּי לֹא אִיתִי אֱלֹה
אַחֵרָן דִּי־יִכָּל לְהַצִּלָּה כְּדָנָה:

And from me was put a judgment that every people, nation, and tongue who will speak neglect upon their God, the one of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, will be dismembered and his house will be made a refuse heap because there is not another god who will be able to deliver like this one.

2:5 עֲנָה מֶלֶכָּא וְאָמַר (לְכַשְׁדִּיא) [לְכַשְׁדִּיאִין] מִלְתָּא מִנִּי אֲזִדָּא
הֵן לֹא תְהוּדְעוּנִי חֲלָמָא וּפְשָׁרָה דְּהִמְיִין תִּתְעַבְדּוּן וּבְחִיכּוֹן
נִגְלִי יִתְשָׁמוּן:

The king answered and said to the Chaldeans: "The word is sure from me. If you will not make known the dream and its interpretation to me, you will be dismembered and your houses will be made a refuse heap."

In the end the king's words are reversed. Those who attempted to put the three men to death, paid with their own lives while Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego live and are again elevated within the kingdom in 3:30:

30 בְּאֲדִינוּ מֶלֶכָּא הִצְלַח לְשָׂרְרָךְ מִיִּשְׁךְ וְעֵבֶר נִגּוּ בְּמִדְיַת
בָּבֶל:

Then the king caused Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego to prosper in the province of Babylon.

God is the source of both their trouble and their salvation.

3.6 Chapter 4

Chapter 4 opens with another change in scene:

1 אָנָּה נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר שְׁלָה הָיִיתָ בְּבֵיתִי וְרַעְנָן
בְּהִיכְלִי:

I, Nebuchadnezzar, was at ease in my house and one flourishing in my palace.

It is difficult to locate this scene with any precision chronologically, other than to say that Daniel has already risen to an exalted station within Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom and has established himself as someone who is a superior interpreter of secrets, visions and dreams:

⁶ בִּלְטַשְׁאֲצַר רֹב חֲרָטְמִיָּא דִּין אֲנִי יָדַעְתָּ דִּי רוּחַ אֱלֹהִין
קִדִּישִׁין בָּךְ וְכָל־רִזְוָא לֹא־אָנֹס לְךָ חֲזוֹן חֲלָמֵי דִּי־חֲזִית
וּפְשָׁרָה אֶמַר:

Belteshazzar, chief of the magicians, who I know that a spirit of the holy gods is in you and every secret does not oppress you, the visions of my dream which I have seen, and speak its interpretation.

The parallels between chapter 2 and 4 are obvious. Nebuchadnezzar has a dream that disturbs him (2:1-3; 4:1-2). Nebuchadnezzar calls in the same group of interpreters:

^{2:2} וַיֹּאמֶר הַמֶּלֶךְ לְקָרָא לְחֲרָטְמִים וּלְאֲשָׁפִים וּלְמַכְשָׁפִים
וּלְכַשְׁדִּים לְהֵגִיד לַמֶּלֶךְ חֲלָמָתִיו וַיָּבֹאוּ וַיַּעֲמֵדוּ לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ:
And the king said to call to the magicians and to the conjurers and to the ones practicing sorcery and to the Chaldeans, to report the king's dreams to him. And they went in. And they stood before the king.

^{4:4} בֹּאֲדִין עַלְלִין חֲרָטְמִיָּא אֲשָׁפִיָּא כַּשְׁדִּיָּא
וְנִזְרִיָּא וְחֲלָמָא אֶמַר אֲנִי קִדְמִיהוֹן וּפְשָׁרָה לֹא־מַהֲוֹדַעִין לִי:
Then the magicians, conjurers, Chaldeans, and the ones determining went in and I spoke the dream before them and they did not make known its interpretation to me.

As is already stated at the end of 4:4, these interpreters are unable to give the interpretation (cf. 2:4-11), Daniel “went in” (עָל; 2:24; 4:3) and is able to give “the interpretation” (פְּשָׁרָה) because of “God” (אֱלֹהֵי) in 2:47 and “a spirit of the holy gods” (רוּחַ־אֱלֹהִין קִדִּישִׁין) in 4:4-6. In distinction to the earlier scene from chapter 2, the king does not require the interpreters also to tell him what his dream was and so with Daniel's entrance, the king tells his vision to Daniel. When 4:7-9 and 2:37-38 are examined together the resemblance is striking:

^{4:7} וְחֲזוֹן רֹאשִׁי עַל־מִשְׁכְּבִי חֲזָה הָיִית וְאֵלֶּן אֵילָן בְּנוֹא אֲרָעָא
וְרוּמָה שְׁגִיָּא: ⁸ רְבָה אֵילָנָא וְתַקְףָּ וְרוּמָה יִמְטָא לְשָׁמַיָּא
וְחִזְיוֹתָהּ לְסוּף כָּל־אֲרָעָא:
⁹ עָפִיָּה שְׁפִיר וְאַנְבָּה שְׁגִיָּא וּמִזֹּון לְכָל־בָּה תַּחְתּוּהִי תַּטְלֵל
חִיּוֹת בְּרָא וּבַעֲנֻפוּהִי יִדְרוֹן צִפְרֵי שָׁמַיָּא וּמִנָּה
יִתְזִין כָּל־בְּשָׂרָא:

7 And the visions of my head upon my bed: I was seeing and behold a tree in the midst of the earth and its height was great. 8 The tree

grew great and **it grew strong** and its height reached to the heavens and its appearance to the end of the whole earth. 9 Its foliage was beautiful and its fruit was great and there was food to all the ones in it, **the beasts of the field** had shade under it and **the birds of the heavens** dwelled in its boughs and all flesh was fed from it.

2:37 אַנְתָּה מֶלֶכָא מֶלֶךְ מַלְכֵיא דִּי אֱלֹהֵי שָׁמַיָא
מַלְכוּתָא חֲסִנָא וְתַקְפָּא וְיִקְרָא יְהִב־לָךְ: 38 וּבְכָל־דִּי דְאֶרְיָן
בְּנִי־אָנְשָׁא חַיִּית בְּרָא וְעוֹף־שָׁמַיָא יִתֵּב בִּידֶךָ
וְהַשְׁלִטְךָ בְּכָל־הוֹן אַנְתָּה־הוּא רֹאשָׁה דִּי רַהֲבָא:

37 You, the king, are the king of kings whom the God of the heavens, the kingdom, the power, **and the might** and the honor, he gave to you. 38 And all the ones who are dwelling, the sons of men, **the beasts of the field and the birds of the heavens**, he gave in your hand and he made you ruler in all of them. You are him, the head of gold.

This portion of the vision is essentially lifted from chapter 2, where Daniel is interpreting Nebuchadnezzar's dream about what "will be in the end of days" (לְהוֹא) (בְּאַחֲרִית יוֹמֵיָא; 2:28). What was once Daniel's interpretation of the head of gold in relation to the four kingdoms is now a portion of Nebuchadnezzar's present dream in chapter 4. In the remainder of Nebuchadnezzar's description of his dream in 4:11-13, a series of bad things happen to the "tree" (אֵילָן) with the purpose of these judgments being found in verse 14:

14 בְּגִזְרַת עִירִין פִּתְנָמָא וּמֵאֲמַר קְדִישִׁין שְׁאַלְתָּא עַד־דְּבִלְתָּ
דִּי יִנְדַּעֲוֹן חַיֵּיָא דִּי־שְׁלִיט עָלֵיָא בְּמַלְכוּת אָנוּשָׁא
וְלִמֹן־דִּי יִצְבָּא יִתְנַנָּה וְשִׁפְלָא אָנְשִׁים יָקִים עָלֵיהּ:

In the decree of the wakeful ones is the matter and a word of holy ones is the affair so that²⁶⁹ the ones living will know that the Most High has mastery in the kingdom of men and to whom he will be pleased, he will give it, and one humble of men, he will raise upon it.

With the conclusion of Nebuchadnezzar's description, Daniel—like Nebuchadnezzar—is alarmed although it is not the dream that disturbs Daniel but rather its interpretation (4:2,16). Daniel states that "the tree" (אֵילָן) which Nebuchadnezzar saw, similar to chapter 2, is in fact Nebuchadnezzar (4:19):

19 אַנְתָּה־הוּא מֶלֶכָא דִּי רַבִּית וְתַקְפָּת וּרְבוּתְךָ רַבָּת
וּמִטָּת לְשָׁמַיָא וְשִׁלְטְנְךָ לְסוֹף אָרְעָא:

You are it, O king, because you grew great and you grew strong and your greatness grew great and it reached to the heavens and your dominion to the ends of the earth.

²⁶⁹ Rosenthal, *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*, 42, offers this translation "so that" for עַד־דְּבִלְתָּ.

Many elements of the vision are literal judgments that Nebuchadnezzar will actually face as verse 22 makes clear (cf. 4:29-30).²⁷⁰

וְלָךְ טָרְדִין מִן־אֲנָשָׁא וְעַסְחִיּוֹת בָּרָא לְהוֹה מִדְרָךְ וְעִשְׂבָּא
כְּתוּרִין לָךְ יִטְעֻמוּן וּמִטֵּל שְׁמַיָּא לָךְ מִצְבָּעִין וְשִׁבְעָה עֲדָנִין
יִחַלְפוּן (עֲלִיד) [עֲלִיד] עַד הִי־תִגְדַּע הִי־שְׁלִיט (עֲלִיא)
[עֲלִיא] בְּמַלְכוּת אֲנָשָׁא וּלְמִדְי יִצְבָּא יִתְנַנֵּה:

*And to you, ones driving from men and with the beasts of the field
will be your dwelling and they will feed you the herbage as
bullocks and from the dew of the heavens to you ones making wet
and seven times will pass by upon you until you will know that the
Most High has mastery in the kingdom of men and to whom he will
be pleased, he will give it.*

One aspect of the judgment that is not to be interpreted literally is found in verse 23:

וְדִי אָמְרוּ לְמִשְׁבָּק עֵקֶר שְׂשׁוּהִי דִי אֵילָנָא מַלְכוּתָךְ לָךְ
קִימָה מִן־דִּי תִגְדַּע דִּי שְׁלִטָן שְׁמַיָּא:

*And what they said “to leave a stock of the roots of the tree” your
kingdom will be one enduring to you, from which you will know the
heavens are the ones having mastery.*

Nebuchadnezzar will after this time of judgment recognize who is really in charge.

Daniel concludes his interpretation with an appeal to Nebuchadnezzar in verse 24:

לָהֵן מַלְכָּא מַלְכִּי יִשְׁפֹּר (עֲלִיד) [עֲלִיד] (וְחִטְיָד) [וְחִטְיָד]
בְּצִדְקָה פִּרְק וְעִנְיָתָךְ בְּמִתָּן עֲנִין הֵן תִּהְיֶה אֲרָכָה לְשִׁלּוּתָךְ:

*Therefore the king, my king, let it be fair to you and tear away your
sin in right doing and answer your iniquity by showing favor,
perhaps there will be a lengthening to your prosperity.*

With the conclusion of the interpretation, the scene continues demonstrating the truth of the dream and its interpretation as everything begins to happen to Nebuchadnezzar

²⁷⁰ Christopher B. Hays, “Chirps from the Dust: The Affliction of Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel 4:30 in Its Ancient Near Eastern Context,” *JBL* 126/2 (2007): 315, views these verses as heavily influenced imagery: “Still, at the time that Judahites went into exile in Babylon, a complex set of images about the world of the dead appears to have been in full flower in Mesopotamia—in canonical myths, in apotropaic spell-prayers, and in private compositions. It is likely that Jewish authors would have been exposed to it and influenced by it, probably via Aramaic. The Daniel cycle in general certainly shows evidence of Babylonian cultural influence, and this is only part of the Hebrew Bible’s broad pattern of adaptation of Mesopotamian traditions, from the primeval history to the Psalms to the wisdom dialogue in Job.” When Hays goes on to argue that the narrative context should not be the primary context in which the imagery should be understood, namely “the reference in Dan 4:31 to the restoration of reason . . . should not be understood to determine the meaning of the imagery in 4:30. Instead, the animal images in 4:30 express suffering, lending detail and poignancy to Nebuchadnezzar’s condition. The madness mentioned in 4:31 (after the fact) is simply a further symptom of the divine affliction, as it sometimes is in Mesopotamian apotropaic incantations” (324). These statements by Hays demonstrate a key difference between broad intertextuality, where Near Eastern Literature is the context in which understanding is found, and canonical intertextuality, where a context has been created to the exclusion of this broader context.

“at the end of twelve months” (לְקֶצֶת יָרֵחַ תְּרִי־עָשָׂר; 4:26) and then concludes “at the end of these days” (וְלִקְצֵת יוֹמֶיהָ; 4:31). In this closing section there is yet again a recounting of the greatness of Nebuchadnezzar’s kingdom (4:27; cf. 2:37), a recounting of his judgment (4:28-30), and not one but two confessions from Nebuchadnezzar’s mouth of who is really in charge (4:31-32; 4:34).²⁷¹ Each of the key sections sit one on top of the other, each interpreting the other. Nebuchadnezzar’s dream is taken section by section and interpreted by Daniel, and the narrative scene that closes the chapter sits on top of these two other texts within the same chapter, allowing Nebuchadnezzar’s confession “to the king of the heavens” (לְמֶלֶךְ שָׁמַיָא) to close the chapter. The statement in relation to Nebuchadnezzar’s kingdom in chapter 2, which was obviously a statement of honor, becomes an indictment and punishable here in chapter 4. God is in charge of the kingdoms of men even before the final kingdom comes to take its indestructible place. Both chapters 3 and 4 find their connection in the reuse of material from chapter 2. Interestingly at the end of this chapter it is Nebuchadnezzar’s confession that causes him to be “saved” or delivered.

3.7 Chapter 5

Chapter 5 begins with a change of scene that chronologically follows chapters 7 and 8:

5:1 בִּלְשַׁאצַּר מֶלֶכָּא עֲבַד לֶחֶם רַב לְרַבְרַבְנֵיהִי
אֵלֶף וְלִקְבֵּל אֶלְפָּא חֲמֹרָא שְׁתֵּה:

*Belshazzar, the king, made a great feast for a thousand of his chiefs
and because of this the thousand was drinking wine.*

7:1 בְּשָׁנָת חֲדָה לְבִלְשַׁאצַּר מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל הִנִּיאֵל חֲלֹם
חֲזֹה וְחֲזוֹן רֵאשִׁיָּה עַל־מִשְׁכַּבָּהּ בְּאֶרְצוֹ חֲלֵמָא כְּתִב רֵאשׁ
מִלִּין אָמַר:

*In the first year of Belshazzar the king of Babylon, Daniel saw a
dream and the visions of his head upon his bed, then he wrote the
dream, the sum of the words. He said:*

8:1 בְּשָׁנָת שְׁלוֹשׁ לְמַלְכוּת בִּלְשַׁאצַּר הַמֶּלֶךְ חֲזוֹן
נִרְאָה אֵלַי אֲנִי הִנִּיאֵל אַחֲרַי הִנִּרְאָה אֵלַי בְּתַחֲלָה

²⁷¹ Herbert Niehr, “Das Buch Daniel,” in *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, ed. Erich Zenger, 7th ed. (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2008), 508, remarks based on the chiasmic structure of the Aramaic chapters and in particular this confession, “Damit ist das thematische Zentrum der aramäischen Danielerzählungen genannt: Es geht um die Aufrichtung der Königsherrschaft Gottes angesichts der einander ablösenden Weltherrschaften menschlicher Machthaber.”

In the third year of the reign of Belshazzar, the king, a vision appeared to me, I, Daniel, after the one appearing to me in the beginning.

This is only transparent when the final verse of the scene is also read in 5:30:

³⁰ בַּלַּיְלָא קָטִיל בֶּלְשַׁצְצַר מֶלֶכָּא כַּשְׂדִּיָּא:
In this very night, Belshazzar, the king of the Chaldeans, was killed.

This detail moves this scene chronologically to a point subsequent to both of the visions in chapters 7 and 8.²⁷² Once this obvious detail of discontinuity is recognized, the organizing strategy can be easily identified by the contents of the chapter.

Belshazzar, Nebuchadnezzar's son (5:2,11,13,18), has a feast that includes a large group of people: "the king and his nobles, his consorts, and his concubines" (מֶלֶכָּא וְרַבְרָבָנֹהֵי שְׁגֻלְתָּהּ וְלַחֲנַנְתָּהּ). The entirety of verse 2 recounts in greater detail the circumstances:

² בֶּלְשַׁצְצַר אָמַר בְּטַעַם חֲמֹר לְהִיחִיָּהּ לְמֵאנֵי דְהַבָּא
וְכֶסֶף דִּי הִנָּפֵק נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר אָבוּהִי מִן־הִיכְלָא דִּי בִירוּשָׁלַם
וַיִּשְׁתּוּן בְּהוֹן מֶלֶכָּא וְרַבְרָבָנֹהֵי שְׁגֻלְתָּהּ וְלַחֲנַנְתָּהּ:
Belshazzar said under the influence of the wine to bring in the vessels of gold and silver which Nebuchadnezzar, his father, had brought out from the temple which was in Jerusalem and the king and his nobles, consorts, and concubines drank from them.

The reader is reminded of the now foreshadowing statement made almost in passing from 1:2:

² וַיִּתֵּן אֲדֹנִי בְיָדוֹ אֶת־הַזִּיקִים מִלְּדִיְהוּדָה וּמִקֶּצֶת כָּל־
בֵּית־הָאֱלֹהִים וַיְבִיֵּאֵם אֶרֶץ־שֹׁנַעַר בֵּית אֱלֹהֵי וְאֶת־הַכֵּלִים
הַבָּיָא בֵּית אוּצַר אֱלֹהֵי:
And the Lord gave in his hand Jehoiakim, the king of Judah, and some of²⁷³ the articles of the house of God and he caused them to go into the land of Shinar, to the house of his gods and he caused the articles to go into the treasure house of his gods.

²⁷² Les P. Bruce, "Discourse Theme and the Narratives of Daniel," in *Bibliotheca Sacra* 160/2 (2003): 178, while arguing for the single authorship of the book of Daniel, notes in relation to the overall literary strategy of the book: "The first six chapters of the book form the historical section. Chapters 5 and 6, later events in the life of Daniel, are taken out of chronological order and placed with the other narratives. All the narratives are grouped together because they form a section based on literary genre, having a mutually reinforcing theme." Though others like Karel van der Toorn, "In the Lions' Den: The Babylonian Background of a Biblical Motif," *CBQ* 60/4 (1998): 629, assume the opposite in relation to historical nature of these narratives, "the story of Daniel's rise, fall, and restoration is that of the fictitious career of a legendary figure," the literary observation in relation to the whole of the book still stands.

²⁷³ BDB, 892, offers this translation of the difficult phrase מִקֶּצֶת.

Belshazzar, who is drunk, has the novel idea of bringing out the vessels (מִאֲנֵי כֶּלִי) that his father had taken from the temple in Jerusalem. Not only do they drink in praise to the gods of which these vessels were made but even to gods of other materials (5:4). “In this moment” (בְּהִשָּׁעָה) a hand appears and writes a message on the wall of the palace (5:5). Belshazzar’s drunken response expresses how disturbing this sight was in 5:6:

⁶ אֲדִין מֶלֶכָּא זִיזְהִי שְׁנוּהִי וְרַעִינְהִי יִבְהִלְנָהּ וְקִטְרֵי חֲרִצָּה מִשְׁתַּרְרִין וְאַרְכָּבְתָּהּ הָא לְרָא נִקְשִׁין:

The king’s brightness was changed and his thoughts alarmed him and the knots of his loins were loosened²⁷⁴ and his knees were knocking one to another.

Just as the vision alarmed Nebuchadnezzar in 4:2 (יִבְהִלְנִי) and Daniel’s thoughts alarmed him about Nebuchadnezzar’s vision in 4:16 (רַעִינְהִי יִבְהִלְנָה), so also Belshazzar’s thoughts alarmed him in 5:6 (רַעִינְהִי יִבְהִלְנָה). Here in verse 6 Belshazzar is comically pictured with the joints of his loins having been loosened (קִטְרֵי חֲרִצָּה) (מִשְׁתַּרְרִין) and later Daniel in verses 12 and 16 is found as someone who loosens mental or metaphorical knots (קִטְרֵי לְמִשְׁרָא; מִשְׁרָא קִטְרִין).²⁷⁵ This obvious contrast between Belshazzar and Daniel through this play on words seems also to be connected with 2:22, where God is pictured using the same verbal root of שָׂרָא as one who dwells (שָׂרָא) in the light. The statement in 2:22 explains how God can reveal the deep and secret things, because “the light dwells with him” (וְנִהְיָרָא עִמָּה שָׂרָא). Belshazzar, just as his father, brings in the normal group of interpreters along with the promise of rewards (5:7; cf. 2:2, 6). The narrator and direct speech from Belshazzar both indicate that these people were not able to interpret the writing (לֹא-כָּהֲלִין; 5:8,15). Daniel is presented this time not by the chief executioner but by the queen as the one who can interpret what the writing means with the aforementioned play on words (5:10-12; cf. 2:24-25). Daniel is escorted into the king’s presence and offered a series of rewards for being able to interpret the writing by Belshazzar in 5:16 similar to what

²⁷⁴ Al Wolters, “Untying the King’s Knots: Physiology and Wordplay in Daniel 5,” *JBL* 110/1 (1991): 119, argues that קִטְרֵי חֲרִצָּה מִשְׁתַּרְרִין should be understood in a technical sense, “The loss of sphincter control would then be described as the ‘loosening of the knots’ situated in the lumbar region of the loins.”

²⁷⁵ Wolters, “Untying the King’s Knots: Physiology and Wordplay in Daniel 5,” 122, further argues because of the repeating use of this phrase: “A modern translation would be well advised to give the literal translation ‘untying knots’ in each case, perhaps with a footnote explaining the different specific references.”

Nebuchadnezzar offered for the successful recounting and interpretation of his dream in 2:6:

5:16 וְאַנְה' שְׁמַעַת עֲלֶיךָ דִּי־תּוּכַל פְּשְׁרִין
לְמַפְשֵׁר וְקִטְרִין לְמַשְׂרָא פֶּעַן הֵן תּוּכַל פְּתָכָא
לְמַקְרָא וּפְשָׁרָהּ לְהוֹדְעָתִי אֲרוּגָנָא חִלְבָּשׁ וְהַמוֹנְכָא
דִּי־רִהַבָּא עַל־צוּאֲרָךְ וְתִלְתָּא בְּמַלְכוּתָא תִּשְׁלֹט:

And I heard concerning you that you are able to interpret interpretations and to loosen knots. Now if you are able to read the writing and its interpretation to make known to me, you will be clothed in purple and the necklace of gold on your neck and you will rule third in the kingdom.

2:6 וְהֵן חֲלָמָא וּפְשָׁרָהּ תְּהִיחִין מִתְּנִן וּנְבוּזַבְנֶשֶׁר וְיִקְרַ שְׁנִיָּא
תְּקַבְּלִין מִן־קִדְמִי לְהֵן חֲלָמָא וּפְשָׁרָהּ תְּהִיחִין:

And if you will declare the dream and its interpretation, gifts and a reward and great honor you will receive from before me. Therefore, you will declare the dream and its interpretation.

Even with Daniel's declining of the gifts and a reward, he agrees to interpret the writing (5:17). Daniel begins his interpretation of the writing not with reading the writing itself but instead by recounting details that are also found in chapters 2 and 4. The statement in 5:18 is parallel to 2:37 in relation to Nebuchadnezzar and his kingdom:

5:18 אַנְתָּה מֶלֶכָא אֱלֹהָא עָלִיא מַלְכוּתָא
וְרִבּוּתָא וְיִקְרָא וְהַדְרָה יִהֵב לְנִבְכַּדְנֶצַּר אָבוּךְ:

You, the king, the Most High God gave the kingdom and the greatness and the honor and the majesty to Nebuchadnezzar, your father.

2:37 אַנְתָּה מֶלֶכָא מֶלֶךְ מַלְכֵיָא דִּי אֱלֹהֵי שְׁמַיָּא
מַלְכוּתָא חֲסִנָּא וְתִקְפָּא וְיִקְרָא יִהֵב־לְךָ:

You, the king, are the king of kings which the God of the heavens gave the kingdom, the power, and the might and the honor to you.

As a matter of fact this exact statement from 2:37 is almost completely found coming out of Nebuchadnezzar's mouth with the addition of "majesty" (הדר) in 4:27:

4:27 עֲנָה מֶלֶכָא וְאָמַר הֲלָא דֵּא־הִיא בָּבֶל רִבּוּתָא דִּי־אַנְה
בְּנִיתָהּ לְבֵית מַלְכוּ בְּתִקְפָּא חֲסִנִּי וְלִיקָר הַדְרִי:

The king answered and said: "Is this not Babylon the great which I have built for a house of the kingdom in the might of my power and for the glory of my splendor?"

The authority that was given by God was then the basis for Nebuchadnezzar's judgment from God when he attributed this power and honor to himself (5:20). For

the fourth time in the narrative of Daniel, first in Nebuchadnezzar's recounting of his dream in 4:7-14, second in Daniel's interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream in 4:22-24, third in the narrative recounting of Nebuchadnezzar's judgment in 4:29-30, and now for the fourth time in 5:21 this judgment narrative is (re)used. This (re)use has also created a series of interpretations with regard to this situation. In chapter 4 these interpretations are somewhat parallel in 4:14, 4:23 and 4:34:

4:14 בְּנֹזֶרֶת עִירִין פִּתְנָמָא וּמֵאמֹר קְדִישִׁין שְׁאַלְתָּא עַד־דְּבַלְתָּ
 דִּי וְנִדְעִין חֵיִיא דִּי־שְׁלִיט עָלֵיא בְּמַלְכוּת אָנוּשָׂא
 וּלְמֹן־דִּי יִצְבֵּא יִתְנַנֵּה וּשְׁפַל אַנְשִׁים יָקִים עָלֶיהָ:

In the decree of the wakeful ones is the matter and a word of holy ones is the affair so that²⁷⁶ the ones living will know that the Most High has mastery in the kingdom of men and to whom he will be pleased, he will give it, and one humble of men, he will raise upon it.

4:23 וְדִי אָמְרוּ לְמִשְׁבֵּק עֵקֶר שְׂרֻשֵׁהִי דִי אֵילָנָא מַלְכוּתָךְ לָךְ
 קִימָה מִן־דִּי תִנְדַּע דִּי שְׁלֹטֵן שְׁמִיָּא:

“And what they said ‘to leave a stock of the roots of the tree’ your kingdom will be one enduring to you, from which you will know that the heavens are the ones having mastery.”²⁷⁷

4:34 בָּעֵן אָנֶה נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר מְשַׁבַּח וּמְרוֹמָם וּמַהֲדֵר לְמַלְךְ שְׁמִיָּא
 דִּי כָל־מַעֲבָדֵהִי קִשְׁט וְאַרְחָתָה דִּין וְדִי מַהֲלָכִין בְּגִיָּה יָכֹל
 לְהַשְׁפִּילָהּ:

Now I, Nebuchadnezzar, praise and exalt and glorify the King of the Heavens, whose whole work is truth and his ways are judgment and ones who walk in pride, he is able to humble them.

As parallel as these passages are, 5:22-23 now applies these passages to Belshazzar and the predicament that he presently finds himself in:

22 וְאַתָּה בְּרַהּ בִּלְשַׁאצָּר לֹא הִשְׁפַּלְתָּ לִבְךָ
 כָּל־קָבֶל דִּי כָל־דְּנָה יָדַעְתָּ: 23 וְעַל מַרְא־שְׁמִיָּא הִתְרוֹמַמְתָּ
 וּלְמֵאנִיָּא דִּי־בֵיתָה הִיתִיו קְדָמֶיךָ וְאַתָּה
 וּרְבִירְבִינֶיךָ שְׁגַלְתָּךְ וּלְחַנְתָּךְ חִמְרָא שְׁתִּין בְּהוֹן
 וְלֹא־לֵהִי כִסְפָּא וְדַהֲבָא נַחְשָׂא פְּרֻזָּא אַעָא וְאַבְנָא דִּי
 לֹא־חֲזִין וְלֹא־שְׁמַעִין וְלֹא יָדְעִין שְׁבַחְתָּ וְלֹא־לֵהִי דִי־נִשְׁמַתָּךְ
 בִּידָהּ וְכָל־אַרְחָתָךְ לֵה לֹא הִדְרַתָּ:

22 And you his son, Belshazzar, did not humble your heart, though you knew all this. 23 And against the Lord of the heavens you raised yourself and to the vessels of his house which were brought before you and you and your nobles, your consorts and your concubines, were drinking wine in them and you praised the gods of silver and gold, bronze, iron, wood, and stone, who do not see

²⁷⁶ Rosenthal, *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*, 42, offers this translation “so that” for עַד־דְּבַלְתָּ.

²⁷⁷ Bauer and Leander, *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen*, 330, translates שְׁלֹטֵן שְׁמִיָּא similarly but in the singular “daß der Himmel mächtig ist.”

and do not hear and do not know and to the God who has your breath in his hand and all your ways, you have not glorified him.

Belshazzar should have learned from the situation with his father²⁷⁸ and instead of humbling himself, he also raised himself against “the Lord of the heavens” (מֶלֶךְ שָׁמַיִם; 5:23; cf. 5:20). Daniel explains that this is why the hand came, and then finally turns to the interpretation of the writing, the proclamation of judgment on Belshazzar, the rewarding and exaltation of Daniel (cf. 2:48), and the slaughter of Belshazzar in the night. Though the narrative is to be seen as chronologically subsequent to later chapters, it has clearly been placed here due to its related reinterpreted content from chapter 4, where the message was not only to be for Nebuchadnezzar but for others because “you knew all this” (כָּל־דָּנָה יָדַעְתָּ; 5:22).

3.8 Chapter 6

As has already been mentioned, chapters 5 and 6 represent a chronological progression with the death of Belshazzar in 5:30 and Darius receiving the kingdom in 6:1. The opening verse of chapter 6 does, however, mark a clear change in scene, identifying a clear shift from Belshazzar “the Chaldean” (כַּשְׁדִּיָּא; 5:30) to Darius who is “the Mede” (מֵדִיָּא; 6:1). The narrative parallels are obvious with material from a variety of earlier chapters. Daniel is elevated to a position of significant authority within Darius’s kingdom in 6:2, just as Daniel, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego were elevated in 2:48-49. In this context Daniel begins to distinguish himself above the satraps and even the other two chiefs in 6:4, just as the four had distinguished themselves in their early training in 1:18-20. Daniel is found to have “a surpassing spirit” (רוּחַ יִתְיָרָא) in 6:4 just as he is described by the queen in 5:12. The other leaders conspire against Daniel, decide to ask Darius to establish an edict that they know is clearly against what is “in the law of his God” (בְּדִת אֱלֹהֵהּ), and convince the king to inscribe just such an edict in 6:8.²⁷⁹

²⁷⁸ This is how the biblical text refers to the relationship between Belshazzar and Nebuchadnezzar (see נְבוּכַדְנֶצְצַר אָבוּהִי “Nebuchadnezzar, his father” in 5:2, two times אָבוּךָ “your father” in verse 11, and וְאַנְתָּה בְּרָהּ בֶּלְשַׁצְצַר “and you his son, Belshazzar” in verse 22).

²⁷⁹ Van der Toorn, “In the Lions’ Den: The Babylonian Background of a Biblical Motif,” 638, believes this whole story to be based on a misunderstanding of *Ludlul*, an Akkadian story: “Our biblical author, however, mistook a metaphor for a literal description. The Mesopotamian authors had intimated that the competition among the king’s scholars was such that life at court was comparable to life in a pit of lions.” Clearly the narrative does indicate a struggle in Darius’s court, as there was in Nebuchadnezzar’s court in chapter 3, but, as noted, the text speaks of both a struggle in the court and an actual lions’ den used for capital punishment, so there is no confusion in the biblical narrative.

⁸ אֲתִיעֲטוּ כָּל סָרְכֵי מַלְכוּתָא סַנְיָא וְאַחַשְׁדַּרפְּנִיא הַדְּבָרִיא
וּפְחֻתָא לְקִימָה קָם מַלְכָא וּלְתַקְפָּה אֶסֶר הִי כָּל־דִּי־יִבְעָה
בָּעוּ מִן־כָּל־אֱלֹהִים וְאִנְשׁ עַד־יוֹמִין תְּלָתִין לְהֵן מִנְּךָ מַלְכָא
יִתְרָמָא לְגַב אַרְיֻתָא:

All the chiefs of the kingdom, the prefects, and the Satraps, the ministers, and the governors took counsel together to establish an edict of the king and to strengthen an interdict that everyone who will seek a request from any god and man until thirty days except from the king will be thrown into the pit of the lions.

Nebuchadnezzar established the worship of his gold image in chapter 3 not per se to trap the three leaders whom he had appointed, but the net result is the same. Daniel goes and makes no effort to be obedient to Darius's decree and this striking description is found in 6:11:

¹¹ וְדַנְיֵאל כְּדִי יָדַע דִּי־רָשִׁים כְּתָבָא עַל לְבֵיתָהּ וְכוּיִן
פְּתִיחֵן לָהּ בְּעִלְיָתָהּ נֶגְדַּיִר וְשָׁלֵם וְזִמְנִין תְּלָתָהּ בְּיוֹמָא הַוָּא
בָּרַךְ עַל־בְּרָכּוּהִי וּמִצְלָא וּמוֹדָא קָרָם אֱלֹהִים כָּל־קָבֵל
דִּי־הָוָא עָבַד מִן־קִרְמַת דִּנְהָ:

And Daniel as he knew that the writing had been inscribed went to his house and his windows in his upperroom being open facing Jerusalem and three times in this day blessing upon his knees and praying and praising before his God all of which he was doing before this.

Daniel changes nothing of his regular habit in relation to prayer even with the clear knowledge of Darius's decree. This effective refusal of Darius's edict is similar to the open defiance shown by Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego to Nebuchadnezzar in 3:16-18:

¹⁶ עֲזֹ שְׂדַרְךָ מִיֶּשֶׁד וְעָבַד נָנוּ וְאַמְרִין לְמַלְכָא נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר
לֹא־חֲשָׁחִין אֲנַחְנָה עַל־דִּנְהָ פִתְנָם לְהַתְּבוּתָךְ: ¹⁷ הֵן אִיתִי
אֱלֹהֵנָא דִּי־אֲנַחְנָא פִלְחִין יָכֹל לְשִׁיבּוּתָנָא מִן־אַתּוֹן נוֹרָא
יִקְדָּתָא וּמִן־יָדְךָ מַלְכָא יִשְׁיֹב:
¹⁸ וְהֵן לֹא יָדִיעַ לְהוּא־לָךְ מַלְכָא דִּי לֹא־הֵיךְ לֹא־אִיתִינָא
פִלְחִין וּלְצִלָם דִּהְבָּא דִּי הִקִּימַתְּ לֹא נִסְגֵּד:

16 Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego answered the king and said to the king, "Nebuchadnezzar, we do not need upon this matter to return to you. 17 If our God, who we are serving, is able to deliver us from the furnace of the burning fire and he will deliver us from your hand 18 and if not it will be known to you, the king, that we are not serving your gods and the image of gold which you set up we will not do homage."

Daniel is accused by "the chiefs and the Satraps" (סָרְכֵי וְאַחַשְׁדַּרפְּנִיא) and Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego are accused by the "Chaldeans" (כַּשְׁדָּאִין), ruling classes from

the respective cultures (6:5; 3:8). However, when King Darius learns who has broken his edict, he does everything in his power to rescue Daniel in 6:15:

¹⁵ אֲדִין מֶלֶכָּא כְּרִי מִלְתָּא שְׁמַע שְׁגִיא בְּאִשׁ עֲלוּהִי וְעַל
דְּנִיָּאל שֵׁם בָּל לְשִׁיבּוּתָהּ וְעַד מַעְלֵי שְׁמַשָּׁא הוּא מִשְׁתַּדֵּר
לְהַצִּלוּתָהּ:

Then the king as he heard the word (it was very evil to him) and he put his mind to deliver him and until the going in of the sun he was struggling to rescue him.

This is all to no avail because in the end the king can do nothing to save him from the punishment found in his own edict (6:16). All this is in contrast to Nebuchadnezzar's response in 3:20-23, where the king does everything in his power to make the punishment as severe as possible. Darius passes the night sleeplessly and comes to the pit of lions where Daniel was left the night before. Darius's question and Daniel's answer in 6:21-23 reveal a significant contrast to chapter 3:

²¹ וּכְמִקְרָבָהּ לִגְבֹּא לְדִנְיָאֵל בְּקֹל עֲצִיב זָעַק עֲנָה מֶלֶכָּא
וְאָמַר לְדִנְיָאֵל דְּנִיָּאל עֲבַד אֱלֹהָא חַיָּא אֱלֹהֶךָ דִּי אַנְתָּה
פִּלַּח-לָהּ בְּתִדְרִיקָא הִיכַל לְשִׁיבּוּתָךְ מִן-אַרְיוֹתָא:
²² אֲדִין דְּנִיָּאל עִם-מֶלֶכָּא מִלַּל מֶלֶכָּא לְעֹלָמִין חַיִּי:
²³ אֱלֹהֵי שְׁלַח מַלְאכָּהּ וְסָגַר פִּם אַרְיוֹתָא וְלֹא חֲבָלוּנִי
כָּל-קָבֵל דִּי קִדְמוּהִי זָכוּ הַשְׁתַּכַּחַת לִי וְאַף קִדְמִיד
מֶלֶכָּא חֲבוּלָה לֹא עֲבַדְתִּי:

21 And as to approach the pit, he cried out in a grieved voice to Daniel. The king answered and said to Daniel, "Daniel, servant of the living God, your God whom you are continually serving, was he able to deliver you from the lions?" 22 Then Daniel spoke to the king, "Let the king live forever! 23 My God sent his messenger and he closed the mouth of the lions and they did not injure me, all on account which before me innocence has been found to me and also before the king I have done no hurtful act."

Darius, though he was powerless to save Daniel from his own edict, had hoped that Daniel's God could save him and indeed he did. Nebuchadnezzar posed the question in relation to Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego in 3:15:

וּמִן-הוּא אֱלֹהֵי דִי יְשִׁיבִנְכוֹן מִן-יָדִי:

"And what God is there who will deliver you from my hand?"

Nebuchadnezzar thought there was no chance that these men could be saved from the impending judgment by any god, only to find out that he was wrong. Those who accused Daniel were thrown with their families into the pit of lions and were killed (6:25) just as the executioners were put to death by the flames of the fire as they

attempted to throw the three men into the furnace of fire (3:22). Daniel is brought up out of the pit with this statement made by the narrator about his condition in 6:24:

וְכָל־חֶבֶל לֹא־הִשְׁתַּכַּח בּוֹ הִי הֵימֶן בְּאֱלֹהֵהּ:
And not any injury was found on him because he had trusted his God.

The only other occurrence of the Aramaic term חֶבֶל (injury) is found in the description of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego in 3:25:

וְחֶבֶל לֹא־אִתִּי בְּהוֹן וְהוּא הִי רְבִיעִיאָ דְמָה
 לְבְרִיאֵלֹהִין:
And there was no injury on them and his appearance of the fourth one was like a son of the gods.

In both situations those who have been rescued are found without injury. In Daniel's case it is made clear that this was because he trusted (!הֵימֶן) in his God. In Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego it is somehow connected with the presence of this fourth person who is similar to a son of the gods, and in the dialogue Nebuchadnezzar gives his explanation of what the meaning of this fourth person was in 3:28:

עֲנָה נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר וַאֲמַר בְּרִיךְ אֱלֹהֵהוֹן דִּי־שָׂדְרָךְ מִשְׁךְ
 וְעַבְדִּי נָגוּ דִּי־שָׁלַח מַלְאָכָה וְשִׁיב לְעַבְדֵּיהִי דִי הִתְרַחֲצוּ
 עֲלֵיהִי וּמַלְתָּ מַלְכָּא שְׁנִי וַיִּתְּבוּ גְשְׁמֵיהֶון דִּי
 לֹא־יִפְלְחוּן וְלֹא־יִסְגְּדוּן לְכָל־אֵלָה לְהֵן לֹא־לֵהֶון:
Nebuchadnezzar answered and said, "Blessed is their God, the one of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, who sent his messenger and he delivered his servants who set their trust upon him and they changed the word of the king and they gave their bodies that they not pay reverence and not do homage to any god except their God."

In both cases it is recognized that it is their God who delivered them without "injury" (חֶבֶל) and further it is connected with the fact that they trusted in God (הֵימֶן; הִתְרַחֲצוּ). Just as in chapters 2, 3 and 4 all this leads to a confession from the king, in this case Darius, found in 6:27-28:

מִן־קִדְמִי שִׁים טַעַם דִּי בְּכָל־שְׁלֵטֹן מַלְכוּתִי לְהֵון
 זָאֲשֵׁן וְדַחְלִין מִן־קִדְמֵי אֱלֹהֵה דִי־דְנִיָּאל דִּי־הוּא
 אֱלֹהָא חָיָא וְקִים לְעַלְמִין וּמַלְכוּתָהּ דִּי־לֹא תִתְחַבֵּל
 וְשְׁלֵטְנָהּ עַד־סוּפָא:
 מְשִׁיב וּמַצֵּל וְעַבְדִּי אֲתִין וְתַמְחִין בְּשִׁמְיָא וּבִאֲרַעָא דִּי
 שִׁיבִיב לְדְנִיָּאל מִן־יַד אֲרִיָּתָא:
27 From before me was put a judgment that in every dominion of my kingdom there will be ones trembling and fearing his God, the

one of Daniel, who is the the living God and enduring forever and his kingdom is that which will never pass away and his dominion is until the end, 28 one delivering and rescuing and doing signs and wonders in the heavens and on the earth with which he saved Daniel from the hand of the lions.

The confession in chapter 2 from Nebuchadnezzar emphasized the superiority of Daniel, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego's God (אֱלֹהֵינוּ) because Daniel was able to reveal "this secret" (רָזָה דְּנֶה; 2:47). The confession in chapter 4, again from Nebuchadnezzar's mouth, reverses his own statements regarding his kingdom in 4:27, where the greatness of his kingdom is attributed to himself. In verses 31 and 34 these statements are completely attributed "to the Most High" (וְלַעֲלִיָּא) and "to the King of the Heavens" (לְמַלְכֵּי שָׁמַיָא), with the obvious realization that he is the one "who is able to humble kings going about in their pride" (דִּי מַהֲלֵכִין בְּגִנְהָה וְכָל לְהַשְׁפִּילָה; 4:34). However, the confession from chapter 3 has several parallels with the confession in chapter 6. Both 6:26 from Darius and 3:31 from Nebuchadnezzar are found in an open address to their subjects:

6:26 בְּאִדְרִין דְּרִינֻשׁ מֶלְכָּא פִתְבִּי לְכָל-עַמְמָא אַמְיָא וְלִשְׁנַיָא דִּירְדָּאִין בְּכָל-אַרְעָא שְׁלָמְכוֹן יִשְׁנָא:

Then Darius, the King, wrote to all the peoples, nations, and tongues, who are dwelling in every land, "May your peace be great!"

3:31 נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר מֶלְכָּא לְכָל-עַמְמָא אַמְיָא וְלִשְׁנַיָא דִּירְדָּאִין בְּכָל-אַרְעָא שְׁלָמְכוֹן יִשְׁנָא:

Nebuchadnezzar, the King, to all the peoples, nations, and the tongues, who are dwelling in every land, may your peace be great.

A statement made in relation to Nebuchadnezzar in 5:19, which Daniel indicates clearly was given by God, is then transformed in the mouth of Darius into a confession about God in 6:27, with the added contrast of the eternal nature of God's kingdom:

5:19 וּמִן-רַבּוּתָא דִּי יִתְבַּלָּה כָּל עַמְמָא אַמְיָא וְלִשְׁנַיָא הָווּ זֹאעִין וְדַחֲלִין מִן-קִדְמוֹתֵי דִי-יְהוָה צְבָא הוּא קָטַל וְדִי-יְהוָה צְבָא הוּא מַחַא וְדִי-יְהוָה צְבָא הוּא מְרִים וְדִי-יְהוָה צְבָא הוּא מַשְׁפִּיל:

And from the greatness which he gave to him, all the peoples, nations, and the tongues were ones trembling and fearing before him, with whom he was pleased he was killing and with whom he was pleased he was striking and with whom he was pleased he was raising and with whom he was pleased he was one making low.

6:27 מִן־קִדְמִי שָׁם טַעַם דִּין בְּכָל־שְׁלֹטָן מַלְכוּתֵי לְהוֹן
זָאֲעִין וְדַחְלִין מִן־קִדְמִי אֱלֹהֵי דִידְנִיאל דִּידְהוּא
אֱלֹהֵא חַיָּא וְקִים לְעַלְמִין וּמַלְכוּתֵהּ דִּי־לֹא תַחֲבַל
וְשִׁלְטְנָהּ עַד־סוּפָא:

From before me was put a judgment that in every dominion of my kingdom there will be ones trembling and fearing his God that of Daniel who is the the living God and enduring forever and his kingdom is that which will never pass away and his dominion is until the end.

This Aramaic collocation זָאֲעִין וְדַחְלִין (trembling and fearing) occurs only in these two verses in the Masoretic text. 6:28 reflects a final similarity between chapter 6 and chapter 3, specifically 3:32-33 with an emphasis on the signs and wonders described within each chapter:

6:28 מְשִׁיב וּמִצִּיל וְעֹבֵד אֲתִין וְתַמְהִין בְּשָׁמַיָא וּבָאֲרֻעָא דִּי
שִׁיבִיב לְדִנְיָאֵל מִן־יַד אַרְיוֹתָא:

One delivering and rescuing and doing signs and wonders in the heavens and on the earth with which he saved Daniel from the hand of the lions.

3:32 אֲתִיָּא וְתַמְהִיָּא דִּי עֹבֵד עֲמִי אֱלֹהֵא עֲלִיא שְׁפֹר
קִדְמִי לְהַחְיוּהִי: 33 אֲתוּהִי כְּמָה כְּבֹרְבִין וְתַמְהוּהִי כְּמָה תְּקִיפִין
מַלְכוּתֵהּ מַלְכוּת עֹלָם וְשִׁלְטְנָהּ עִסְדָּר וְדָר:

The signs and wonders which the Most High God did to me, it seemed good to declare before me. How great are his signs and how mighty are his wonders, his kingdom is an eternal kingdom and his dominion is with each generation.

The Aramaic word collocation אֲתִין וְתַמְהִין (signs and wonders) only occurs in these two passages in the Masoretic text. The confession that concludes chapter 6 carefully weaves together several other elements from the book, but for its own purpose. The whole scene of chapter 6 ends with a statement that summarizes Daniel's prestige for the rest of Darius's reign and then into Cyrus's reign:

6:29 וְדִנְיָאֵל דִּנָּה הִצְלַח בְּמַלְכוּת דָּרְיוֹשׁ וּבְמַלְכוּת כּוֹרֶשׁ
פָּרְסִיָּא:

And this Daniel prospered in the kingdom of Darius and in the kingdom of Cyrus the Persian.

It is interesting that 1:21, as the closing verse of the opening chapter of these narratives scenes, makes a similar statement:

21 וַיְהִי דִנְיָאֵל עַד־שְׁנַת אַחַת לְכוֹרֶשׁ הַמֶּלֶךְ:

And Daniel existed until the first year of Cyrus the king.

Both statements move Daniel from the reign of one king and kingdom to another. However, the closing statement of chapter 1 spans the reigns mentioned in the whole of the book, though not moving the reader to the furthest chronological point within the book, which is “in the third year of Cyrus, king of the Persians” (בִּשְׁנַת שְׁלוֹשׁ מִלְּךְ כּוֹרֶשׁ; 10:1). This opening statement in chapter 1 marks a sort of summary for the whole of the book and the close of the opening scene. The closing verse of chapter 6 marks not only the chronological connection between two reigns and the end of the scene of chapter 6, but also the close of these narrative sketches that form the first portion of the book.

3.9 Summary of Chapters 1-6

Chapter 1-6, though diverse in their narrative material, have served the purpose of illustrating how Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah distinguished themselves under the reigns of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, and Darius.²⁸⁰ The narratives actually reveal two key ways in which these men distinguish themselves. Daniel’s superior abilities in relation to interpreting dreams and visions led to not only his exalted status within the kingdom but also to Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah attaining an exalted status. The four men also exhibit a devotion to God that leads to their own punishment. God is the one who gives them their distinguishing character that leads to their prosperity, which in turn leads to their troubles from which God delivers them. Key to these narratives is the profession from the mouth of the king in relation to God at the end of each chapter (with the exception of chapters 1 and 5). The parallel confessions in chapters 3 and 6 from Nebuchadnezzar and Darius

²⁸⁰ John Goldingay, “The Stories in Daniel: A Narrative Politics,” in *JSOT* 37/F (1987): 100, views these stories in a much more political manner: “Whatever historical value they may have, they are literary artifacts which blend the forms of court contest and court conflict tale, confessor legend and prophetic legend, and (among others) aretology, midrash, peshet, and literary psalmody, into artful narratives which carry a vision of how life in politics may be lived, and on what basis.” Walter Brueggemann, “At the Mercy of Babylon: A Subversive Rereading of the Empire,” *JBL* 110/1 (1991): 13, also sees a political dimension through the typologizing of Babylon: “When we come to the book of Daniel, we see that Israel’s theological reflection cannot finally finish with Babylon. It is clear that by the time of the Daniel texts, we have broken free of historical reference; Nebuchadnezzar now looms on the horizon of Israel as a cipher for a power counter to the Lord.” Valeta, *Lions and Ovens and Visions*, 177, states: “The classical forms and use of many common biblical genres are commandeered and combined by the menippea form of Daniel 1-6 in order to bring scorn upon the king and his kingdom.” J. C. H. Lebram, “Bemerkungen und Gedanken zu Martin Hengels Buch über „Judentum und Hellenismus“,“ in *VT* 20/4 (1970): 515, in his negative assessment of Martin Hengel’s thesis states, “Unsere Analyse hat gezeigt, daß das Buch Daniel eine Deutung politischer Ereignisse von priesterlich-kultischem Standpunkt aus gibt. Von einem Kampf zwischen jüdischen Volksgesetz und „Interpretatio Graeca“ des Judentums ist bei ihm nichts zu erkennen.” Each of these theses seems to presuppose a monolithic *Sitz im Leben*, where the text(s) suggest a much more varied set of contexts.

respectively, though similar in content, reflect the obvious transformation in setting and purpose. Nebuchadnezzar meets God's humbling power which leads to his confession, and Darius's hope is realized through Daniel's deliverance which leads to his confession. The intentional reordering of the material marks the obvious transformation of these opening chapters from chronological scenes to a thematically driven arrangement, that includes the key characteristics already mentioned. The canonical intertextuality is not just found in the recurrent vision material from chapter 2 but through the whole of each narrative, with whole phrases and descriptions being used in another context in a similar and yet distinct purpose through which the text grows. With this complex in place, chapters 7-12 mark as a whole another case of canonical intertextuality as the material from the vision in chapter 2 becomes the springboard for the rest of the book, but for a different purpose than was found in chapter 2 and the complex as a whole.

4. Canonical Intertextuality: Daniel 7-12

4.1 Introduction

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 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.²⁸¹

The closing six chapters of the book repeat many of the key elements that have already been seen in the earlier portion of the book.²⁸² 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 now become the focal point of the narratives. Add to this multiple layers of interpretation within each of these texts, and there is not only canonical intertextuality within the larger strategy of the book itself (the relationship of the chapters 1-6 and 7-12) but even within the narrative scenes themselves, as has already been demonstrated in chapters 1-6.²⁸³

²⁸¹ Bruce, "Discourse Theme and the Narratives of Daniel," 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."

²⁸² H. I. Ginsberg, "The Composition of the book of Daniel," *Vetus Testamentum* 4/3 (1954): 246, in arguing against H. H. Rolwley'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-Epiphinian; and Daniel B, 'The Book of the Apocalypses', comprising chs. vii-xii, which is Epiphinian. 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."

²⁸³ David M. Valeta, "Court or Jester Tales? Resistance and Social Reality in Daniel 1-6," *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 32/3 (2005): 309, views this relationship from a social resistance perspective: "The imaginative use of humor and satire reflects a creative manipulation of the social reality of life in the royal court to resist king and empire, and thus crafts a thematic link with the judgment visions of Dan 7-12."

4.2 Chapter 7

As has already been noted, the opening verse of chapter 7 represents a bold chronological statement that precedes earlier narrative scenes in the book, namely the preceding two chapters of the book that moved from the final days for Belshazzar's kingdom up to Daniel prospering in Cyrus's kingdom:

7:1 בִּשְׁנַת חֹדֶה לְבִלְאֲשַׁצַּר מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל הָיְיָל חֵלֶם
חֹזֶה וְחֻזֵּי רֹאשׁוֹ עַל-מִשְׁכְּבֹהּ בְּאֶרְצוֹ חָלָמָא כְּתַב רֹאשׁ
מִלִּין אָמַר:

In the first year of Belshazzar the king of Babylon, Daniel saw a dream and the visions of his head upon his bed. Then he wrote the dream, the sum of the words. He said:

Though the rest of the chapter comes in the form of a first person narration which recounts the vision and its interpretation, this opening verse reveals a tension within the larger narrative. It is a simple statement giving the setting for the following narrative scene.²⁸⁴ Yet it demonstrates a purposeful break from an otherwise chronological order within the book. This purposeful identification gives not only a retrospective context in which the following text is to be viewed, but also a shift in narrative strategy, as Daniel's visions will be the focus for the rest of the book. Though Daniel has already had another "vision of the night" (חֲזוֹן דִּי-לַיְלָא) in 2:19 (cf. 7:2), this scene represents the first time that Daniel's skill in relation to dreams and visions is not used directly in relation to his service of the king. However, it does appear, through this careful choice of words that occur only in 2:19 and in 7:2, 7:7, and 7:13, that the connection is intentional with the material in chapter 2. The description of the vision is the most extensive that has been seen so far in the book with thirteen verses in 7:2-14 (cf. 2:31-35; 4:7-14). The interpretation is also extensive spanning another twelve verses in 7:17-28 (although cf. 2:37-45; 4:17-23). With the general scene set in 7:1, verses 2-3 give the opening context in which the dream unfolds:

²⁸⁴ Stefan Beyerle, "'Der mit den Wolken des Himmels kommt': Untersuchungen zum Traditionsgefüge 'Menschensohn,'" in *Gottessohn und Menschensohn: Exegetische Studien zu zwei Paradigmen biblischer Intertextualität*, ed. Dieter Sänger (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 2004), 52, notes after an extensive evaluation of Daniel 7: "Kompositorisch erweist sich Dan 7 nicht nur als Einheit, vielmehr sind auch die häufig literarisch angezweifelte Visionen in V.9f und V. 13f fest in den Kontext eingebunden."

² עֲנֵה דָנִיֵּאל וְאָמַר חֹזֶה הָיִית בְּחֻזֵּי עַם-לַיְלָא וְאֵלֹ
אַרְבַּע רוּחֵי שָׁמַיָא מִנִּיחִן לִימָא רַבָּא³ וְאַרְבַּע חֵיּוֹן רַבְרָבִין
סִלְקִין מִן-יָמָא שְׁנִין דָּא מִן-דָּא:

Daniel answered and said: "I was seeing in the visions of the night and behold four winds of the heavens were breaking forth to the Great Sea. And four great beasts were coming up from the sea, each being different from the other.

The number four plays a significant role in the vision. There are "four winds of the heavens" (אַרְבַּע רוּחֵי שָׁמַיָא) in 7:2, "four great beasts" (אַרְבַּע חֵיּוֹן רַבְרָבִין) in 7:3-7, "four wings" (נְפִין אַרְבַּע) to the third beast in 7:6, and the emphasis on "the fourth beast" (חֵיּוֹה רְבִיעִיָּה) in 7:7-8. This emphasis especially on the fourth beast does find an interesting parallel not in the vision from chapter 2 but in the interpretation of the vision from 2:40 on the fourth kingdom. 7:7 and 2:40 viewed side by side represent an interesting comparison:

^{7:7} בְּאַתֵּר דִּנְהָ חֹזֶה הָיִית בְּחֻזֵּי לַיְלָא וְאֵלֹ חֵיּוֹה רְבִיעִיָּה
דְּחִילָה וְאִימְתָנִי וְתִקִּיפָא וְתִירָא וְשִׁנִּין דִּי-פְרוּזָל
לָהּ רַבְרָבִין אֲכֻלָּה וּמַדְקָה וְשֹׂאדָא בְּרַגְלֵיהָ רַפְסָה
וְתִיָּא מִשְׁנֵיהָ מִן-כָּל-חֵיּוֹתָא דִּי קִדְמֶיהָ וְקִרְנֵין עֲשָׂר לָהּ:

In place of this one, I was seeing in the vision of the night and behold a fourth beast, being feared and terrible and exceedingly mighty and teeth of iron, eating many and breaking in pieces and the rest trampling with its feet and it was different from all the beasts which were before it and ten horns were to it.

^{2:40} וּמַלְכוּ רְבִיעִיָּה תְּהוּא תְּקִיפָה כַּפְרוּזָל
כָּל-קִבְלָ דִּי פְרוּזָל מַתְדֵּק וְחָשֵׁל כָּלָא וְכַפְרוּזָל דִּי-מִרְעַע
כָּל-אֵלִין תְּדַק וְתִרְעַ:

And the fourth kingdom will be mighty like iron because iron breaks in pieces and shatters all things and like iron which shatters all of these, it will break [them] in pieces and will shatter[them].

Not only is there an emphasis on the sequence through the use of רְבִיעִיָּה but also the description that follows. Both the kingdom and the beast are "mighty" (תְּקִיפָא), contain "iron" (פְּרוּזָל), that leads to "breaking in pieces" with the use of the feminine participle מַדְקָה in 7:7 and the masculine participle מַתְדֵּק in 2:40. The connection within the present text appears to be more than accidental. The transformation is obvious. The interpretation of chapter 2 through this collection of vocabulary is now being connected with the vision of chapter 7. The image of chapter 2, interpreted as four kingdoms, is now through the description of the fourth beast developing another layer of interpretation within the book of Daniel. The four components of the image and related kingdoms in chapter 2 are not difficult to associate with the four beasts of

chapter 7. However, it is the latter part of the vision that represents the most significant change from the vision and interpretation of chapter 2. After describing the intricacies of the fourth beast, the throne scene of “one Aged of Days” (עתיק יומין), and the destruction of the fourth beast, there is an interesting description of the kingdom that follows. This description is more akin to the interpretation of chapter 2 than the vision that it interprets. 7:13-14 and 2:44 demonstrate yet another comparison:

7:13 חָזָה הָיִיתָ בְּחֻזֵּי לַיְלָא וְאַרְוֹ עִסְעֻנֵּי שָׁמַיָא כְּבַר אֱנֹשׁ
 אֲתָהּ הוּא וְעַד־עֵתִיק יוֹמִיָא מָטָה וְקִרְמוּהִי הַקְרְבוּהִי: 14 וְלֵה
 יְהִיב שְׁלֹטֵן וְיִקָּר וּמַלְכוּ וְכָל עַמְמֵיָא אֲמִיָּא וְלִשְׁנֵיָא לֵה
 יִפְלְחוּן שְׁלֹטְנָה שְׁלֹטֵן עַלְמָּה דִּי־לֹא יַעֲדָהּ וּמַלְכוּתָהּ דִּי־לֹא
 תִּתְחַבֵּל:

13 I was seeing in the vision of the night and behold with the clouds of the heavens *one like a son of man* was coming and until he reached the one Aged of Days and they brought him before him.
 14 And to him was given dominion and honor and a kingdom and all peoples, nations, and tongues were paying reverence to him, his dominion is eternal which will not pass away and his kingdom will not be destroyed.

2:44 וּבְיוֹמֵיהוֹן דִּי מַלְכִּיָּא אֲנוּן יָקִים אֱלֹהִי שָׁמַיָּא מַלְכוּ דִּי
 לְעַלְמִין לֹא תִתְחַבֵּל וּמַלְכוּתָהּ לְעַם אַחֲרֹן לֹא תִשְׁתַּבֵּק
 תִּהְדַּק וְתִסִּיף כָּל־אֲלוֹן מַלְכוּתָא וְהָיָ תְקוּם לְעַלְמִיָּא:

And in the days of these kings, the God of the heavens will set up a kingdom which is eternal, it will not be destroyed and the kingdom will not be left to another people, it will break [them] in pieces and it will put to an end all these kingdoms and it will be established forever.

The interpretation from chapter 2 emphasizes that in the days of the fourth kingdom God will raise up an indestructible eternal kingdom. The vision of chapter 7 also emphasizes a kingdom. This kingdom will come after the destruction of the fourth beast and will also be an indestructible eternal kingdom. The major difference that is found in the vision of chapter 7 is that this kingdom is identified as having a particular ruler over it that is “like a son of man” (כְּבַר אֱנֹשׁ).²⁸⁵ He receives this eternal kingdom

²⁸⁵ Alexander A. Di Lella, “The One in Human Likeness and the Holy Ones of the Most High in Daniel 7,” in *CBQ* 39/1 (1977): 8, argues for a one-to-one correspondence of the imagery in this chapter: “Since, as is generally agreed, the four hideous beasts in 7:3-7 symbolize only the four pagan empires, and ‘the little horn’ symbolizes Antiochus IV, and the ‘Ancient One’ (vv 9, 13, 22) symbolizes the God of Israel, then we must assume that those responsible for this apocalypse meant each of these symbols to have a one-to-one relationship with the respective reality being symbolized.” This argument supports his opening assumption that “one in human likeness” corresponds to “the holy ones of the Most High” (1). The challenge of the present thesis is that these terms do not need to be harmonized with one another but allowed to dialogue with one another, giving a spectrum of interpretation that includes through the vision and interpretation(s) individual and group concepts. Beyerle, “Der mit den Wolken

that will not pass away and will not be destroyed. There is of course “the stone” (אֲבִנֶיָה) from chapter 2 that destroys all the other components. But even this detail creates a further contrast, as there is no mention of destruction in relation to the one who is like a son of man (כְּבֶרֶךְ אִיָּשׁ) in chapter 7. Though it is an important detail in the vision that the one who is like a son of man receives all of this from “one aged of days” (עֶתִיק יוֹמִיָא), even this has its parallel to material in 2:37 and 5:18:

2:37 אַנְתָּה מֶלֶכָא מֶלֶךְ מַלְכֵי דִי אֱלֹהֵי שָׁמַיָא
מַלְכוּתָא חֲסִנָא וְתַקְפָּא וְיִקְרָא יְהִב־לָךְ:
You, the king, are the king of kings which the God of the heavens gave to you the kingdom, the power, and the might and the honor to you.

5:18 אַנְתָּה מֶלֶכָא אֱלֹהָא עֲלִיָא מַלְכוּתָא
וְרִבּוּתָא וְיִקְרָא וְהִדְרָה יְהִב לְנִבְכַּדְנֶצַּר אָבוּךְ:
You, the king, the Most High God gave the kingdom and the greatness and honor and glory to Nebuchadnezzar, your father.

All kingdoms and those who rule over them are recognized to have been given to these rulers by God. The vision has the exact same effect on Daniel in 7:15 as the vision from chapter 4 had on Nebuchadnezzar in 4:2 and is only slightly different from Belshazzar’s response in 5:6.

“and the visions of my head alarmed me”	7:15 וַחֲזוֹנִי רָאִשִׁי יִבְהַלֵּנִי
“and the visions of my head alarmed me”	4:2 וַחֲזוֹנִי רָאִשִׁי יִבְהַלֵּנִי
his thoughts alarmed him	5:6 וְרַעֲיָנָהּ יִבְהַלֵּנָהּ

Now it is not Daniel who sits in the role of interpreter, but rather one of the unidentified ones standing in his vision (חֵד מִן־קְאֻמֵּיָא; 7:16). The vision as a whole is given quite a simple interpretation in 7:17-18:

17 אֵלִין חֵיוֹתָא רַבְרְבָתָא דִּי אַנִּין אַרְבַּע אַרְבַּעָה מַלְכִין
יְקוּמוּן מִן־אַרְעָא: 18 וְיַקְבְּלוּן מַלְכוּתָא קְדִישִׁי עֲלִיוֹנִין וְיַחֲסִנוּן
מַלְכוּתָא עַד־עֲלָמָא וְעַד עָלָם עֲלָמֵיָא:

des Himmels kommt,” 47, concludes in relation to this figure: “Der an Hand von Quellen- und damit Traditionsvergleichen, aber auch durch philologische und kompositionskritische Erwägungen gewonnene Befund zum dan. „Menschensohn“ beschreibt eine im himmlischen Heiligtum lokalisierte Gestalt, Gott wohl untergeordnet, doch zugleich in ausgezeichneter und unvergleichlicher Nähe zum göttlich-königlich Thronenden.”

17 These great beasts of these four are four kingdoms [that] will arise from the earth. 18 The holy ones the Most High²⁸⁶ will receive the kingdom and they will take possession of the kingdom until forever and until forever of the forever.

Distinct from chapter 2 is the use of “kings” (מְלָכִין) instead of “kingdom” (מְלָכוּת).

These four kings are lumped together in the interpretation. The collocation קְדִישֵׁי (the holy ones the Most High) is found only in chapter 7 (vss. 18, 22, 25, 27).

Whereas the vision focused on an individual who will be given the kingdom, “one like a son of man” (כְּבֶר אִנָּשׁ), the interpretation focuses on a group who receives the kingdom, “the holy ones the Most High” (קְדִישֵׁי עֲלִיּוֹנִין). The kingdom is simply eternal; it is emphatically eternal in 7:18 just as was indicated in the vision from 7:14 and in the interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream in 2:44.

“until forever and until forever of the forevers”	7:18 עַד-עַלְמָא וְעַד עַלְמַיָּא עַלְמָא
“eternal dominion”	7:14 שְׁלֹטֹן עַלְמָא
“forever”	2:44 לְעַלְמִין

This simple explanation is further expanded as Daniel, again speaking in the first person, desires “to make certain regarding the fourth beast” (לִיצְבָּא עַל-חִיּוֹתָא רְבִיעִיתָא). Daniel’s recounting of what he would like to make certain in 7:19-22 gives a clear focus on the fourth beast and even reveals further details in relation to what he was seeing:

19 אֲדִין צְבִית לִיצְבָּא עַל-חִיּוֹתָא רְבִיעִיתָא דִּי-חִתּוּת שְׁנִיָּה
מִן-כָּלֵהּ דִּחִלָּה וְחִירָה שְׁנִיָּה דִּי-פְרוּל
וְטַפְרִיָּה דִּי-נִחַשׁ אֲכָלָה מִדָּקָה וְשֹׁאֲרָא בְּרִגְלֵיהָ רַפְסָה:
20 וְעַל-קִרְנָא עֶשֶׂר דִּי בְּרִאשָׁה וְאַחֲרֵי דִי סִלְקַת וְנִפְלוּ
מִן-קִרְמִיָּה תִּלְתָּ וְקִרְנָא דִּפְּנֵי וְעֵינֵין לָהּ
וּפִם מִמְלַל בְּרִבְרֹן וְחִזּוּתָהּ רַב מִן-חִבְרָתָהּ:
21 חִזּוּתָהּ הָוִית וְקִרְנָא דִּפְּנֵי עֲבָדָה קִרְבַּ עִם-קְדִישִׁין וְיִכְלָה
לְהוֹן:

²⁸⁶ The translation of עֲלִיּוֹנִין follows the standard lexicons, *HALOT*, 5:1948, “the most high,” *BDB*, 1106, “pl. of God,” and Buhl, 919, “(wahrsch. ein Doppelpluralis) *die Heiligen des Höchsten*.” John Goldingay, “‘Holy Ones on High’ in Daniel 7:18,” *JBL* 107/3 (1988): 496, argues in distinction that, “The phrase should indeed be taken as an example of the use of a second plural in a construct chain when the expression as a whole is plural, as Bauer and Leander suggest, but the second plural is epexegetical or adjectival, like other instances in GKC §124q. The phrase is equivalent to קְדִישֵׁי עֲלִיּוֹנִין and means ‘high saints,’ ‘holy ones on high.’” However, he does concede in footnote 12 that “Hasel is right that it could be treated as a proper name, so that the whole phrase would be determinate; the translation “the holy ones of [the] Most High” would then be justified” (497).

²² עַד דִּיאֲתָה עִתִּיק יוֹמִיא וְדִינָא יְהִי לְקַדִּישֵׁי עֲלִיּוֹנִין
וְזִמְנָא מְטָה וּמִלְכּוּתָא הֶחֱסֵנוּ קַדִּישֵׁין:

19 Then I desired to make certain concerning the fourth beast which was different from all of them, being feared exceedingly, its teeth of iron and its claws of bronze, eating, breaking in pieces, and the rest trampling with its feet, 20 and concerning the ten horns which were on its head and another that went up and three fell from before it and this horn and eyes to it and a mouth speaking great things and its appearance was greater than its fellows. 21 I was seeing and this horn was making war with the holy ones and was prevailing against them 22 until which the aged of days came and he gave the judgment to the holy ones of the Most High and the time arrived and the holy ones took possession of the kingdom.

The text of 7:19-22 repeats key words and phrases from 7:7-8 and the issue in relation to “the horn” (קַרְנָא) and the “holy ones” (קַדִּישֵׁין) that has not been seen in any form yet in the book of Daniel. Not only is there going to be a prevailing war against the holy ones from the horn, but the kingdom does not come to the holy one from “the one aged of the days” without these difficult circumstances. The detailed interpretation spans 7:23-27:

²³ כֵּן אָמַר חִיּוּתָא רְבִיעִיתָא מַלְכוּתָא רְבִיעִיא
תְּהִינָא בְּאַרְעָא דִּי תִשְׁנָא מִן-כָּל-מַלְכוּתָא וְתֹאכֵל כָּל-אַרְעָא
וְתִדְוֶשְׁנָהּ וְתִדְקֶנָּה:
²⁴ וְקַרְנֵיָא עֲשָׂר מִנָּהּ מַלְכוּתָהּ עֲשָׂרָה מַלְכִין יִקְמוּן וְאַחֲרָן
יָקוּם אַחֲרֵיהֶון וְהוּא יִשְׁנָא מִן-קַדְמֵיָא וְתִלְתָּהּ מַלְכִין יִהְשָׁפֵל:
²⁵ וּמַלְכִין לְצֶדַע עֲלִיא יִמְלֵל וּלְקַדִּישֵׁי עֲלִיּוֹנִין יִבְלֵא
וְיִסְבֵּר לְהִשְׁנִיָּה זְמַנִּין וְדָת וְיִתְיַהֲבֹון בִּידָהּ עַד-עֶדֶן וְעַדְנִין
וּפְלֵג עֶדֶן:
²⁶ וְדִינָא יִתֵּב וְשִׁלְטָנָה יִהְיֶדֶן לְהַשְׁמָדָה וּלְהוֹבְדָה עַד-סוּפָא:
²⁷ וּמִלְכוּתָהּ וְשִׁלְטָנָהּ וְרִבּוּתָא דִּי מַלְכוּת תַּחּוֹת כָּל-שָׁמַיָא
יִהְיִיבֵת לְעַם קַדִּישֵׁי עֲלִיּוֹנִין מַלְכוּתָהּ מַלְכוּת עֶלְמָא וְכָל
שִׁלְטָנֵיָא לָהּ יִפְלַחוּן וְיִשְׁתַּמְעוּן:

23 So he said, “The fourth beast will be the fourth kingdom on the earth which will be different from all the kingdoms and it will eat the whole earth and it will tread it down and it will break it in pieces. 24 And the ten horns from it are ten kingdoms that will arise and another will arise from them and he will be different from the former ones and he will humble three kings 25 and he will speak words against [to the side of] the most high and he will wear out the holy ones of the most high and he will intend to change times and law and they will be given in his hand until a time and times and half a time. 26 And the judgment will be seated and they will take away his dominion to destroy and to cause to perish until the end. 27 And the kingdom and the dominion which the kingdoms under all the heavens were given to the people²⁸⁷ of the holy ones of the Most High, its kingdom is a kingdom of perpetuity and all of

²⁸⁷ The following third person masculine singular suffixes “its” are being translated with “people” (עַם) as their antecedent. Compare with Hartman and Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel*, 207.

the dominions will pay reverence to it and they will show themselves obedient.

The fourth beast is a “kingdom” (מַלְכוּת) as in the interpretation of chapter 2. This kingdom will be different (חֲשֵׁנָא) from the preceding kingdoms (cf. with מַלְכִּין “kings” of 7:17). The difference is found in its destructive nature in relation to the whole earth (כָּל-אַרְעָא). The ten horns of the fourth beast are ten kings (מַלְכִּין) who give way to another king. This king, like the fourth beast/kingdom, is different (חֲשֵׁנָא) from these former ten kings. Again its difference is identified with its power: power to subject three other kings, to speak against (לְצַד “to the side of”; cf. 6:5) the Most High, to wear out the saints, and to intend to change times and law (דָּת), all of which is given a particular time period that will last “until a time and times and half a time” (עַד-עֶדְרָן וּפְלַג עֶדְרָן). The apparent corresponding detail in 7:12 lists a period of time that is “until a time and a time” (עַד-יָמִין וְעַד-יָמִין). This detail, as with this whole interpretation, expands and at the same time gives a level of precision to the previous statement. The statements with regard to time are absent from the vision and interpretation in chapter 2. As in 7:12, the turning point is found when “the judgment will be seated” (דִּינָא יִתְב) and the king’s destructive power is taken away with another time reference “until the end” (עַד-סוּפָא). The interpretation concludes with the statement not that the kingdom is given to the “holy ones of the Most High” (קַדִּישֵׁי) but more specifically “to the people of the holy ones of the Most High” (לְעַם קַדִּישֵׁי). This kingdom is not to be confused with these other temporal kingdoms that have preceded it. This kingdom is “a kingdom of perpetuity” (מַלְכוּת עָלָם). The word עַם (people) becomes the antecedent to the third person singular pronominal suffixes in the last portion of 7:27, so that the people have “a kingdom of perpetuity” מַלְכוּת עָלָם and the עַם is the one to whom “all of the dominions will pay reverence to it and they will show themselves obedient” (כָּל שְׁלֹמְנִיָּא לֵהּ יִפְלָחוּן וְיִשְׁתַּמְעוּן). In the beginning of the chapter, the narrator introduced the material with the phrase “**head**” or “sum of the **words**” (רֵאשׁ מִלִּין) and now the chapter closes in the first person narrative with “until here is **the end** of **the words**” (עַד-כֹּה דִּי-מִלְתָּא סוּפָא). The final half of 7:28, when viewed in relation to other similar passages, indicates much less a conclusion than the expectation of an interpretation yet to come:

²⁸ עַד־כֹּה סוּפָא דִּי־מַלְתָּא אָנָּה דְנִיָּאל שְׂגִיָּא | רַעִיּוֹנִי
יִבְהַלְנִי וְזִיוִי יִשְׁתַּנּוֹן עָלַי וּמַלְתָּא בְּלִבִּי נִטְרַת:
*Until here is the end of the words. I, Daniel, my thoughts alarmed
me exceedingly and my brightness changed upon me and I kept the
word in my heart.*

Nebuchadnezzar has this similar response in 4:2:

² חָלַם חֲזִיָּת וַיִּדְחַלְנִי וַהֲרַהֲרִין עַל־מִשְׁכָּבִי וַחֲזוֹי רֹאשִׁי
יִבְהַלְנִי:
*I saw a vision and it made me afraid and my imaginings on my bed
and the visions of my head alarmed me.*

Belshazzar encounters the writing on the wall and responds, as has already been noted, in a similar manner: “Then the king, his brightness changed and his thoughts alarmed him” (אֲדִין מַלְכָּא זִיוָּהִי שְׂגִיָּא וְרַעִיּוֹנִי יִבְהַלְנִי; 5:6). Just a few verses later a similar description is found: “Then the king Belshazzar was exceedingly alarmed and his brightness changed upon him” (אֲדִין מַלְכָּא בִלְשַׁאצַּר שְׂגִיָּא מִתְבַּהֲל וְזִיוָּהִי שְׂנִין עָלוּהִי; 5:9). The queen encourages the king with similar words in the next verse: “Do not let your thoughts alarm you and let your brightness be changed” (אַל־יִבְהַלְוּךָ רַעִיּוֹנְךָ וְזִיוְךָ; 5:10). What is critical to notice is that these similar responses not only narrate how the characters within the story are reacting to the visions they encounter, but also indicate that an interpretation is to follow. This is even the case in the close of chapter 7; a further interpretation is yet to follow.

Chapter 7 represents a transition within the book from how Daniel and his companions distinguished themselves to the visions of Daniel.²⁸⁸ This move is indicated through the diachronic regression in the opening verse of the chapter and obviously by the content of the chapter. The chapter exhibits canonical intertextuality not only through the connection with the vision and interpretation in chapter 2, but with the whole of the opening six chapters. There is not only a further interpretation of the material from chapter 2, but the chapter itself contains four layers, one on top of

²⁸⁸ Rolf Rendtorff, *Das Alte Testament: Eine Einführung*, 6th. ed. (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2001), 288, remarks on this relationship a little differently: “Kap. 7 bildet zugleich das Bindeglied zu den folgenden Kapiteln; denn während Kap. 1-6 Daniel und seine Freunde stets im Gegenüber zum babylonischen bzw. persischen König zeigen, ist Daniel in Kap. 7 allein mit seiner Vision wie auch in den folgenden Kapiteln. Terminologisch ist die Brücke nach rückwärts durch das Wort „Traum“ in 7,1 geschlagen (vgl. 2,1ff; 4,2f), das in den folgenden Kapiteln nicht vorkommt. Im übrigen ist auch durch die einleitenden Datierungen in 2,1; 7,1; 8,1; 9,1; 10,1 der Zusammenhang hergestellt.”

another, of interpretation. The vision (7:2-14), the short interpretation (7:17-18), Daniel's recounting what he wanted to make certain (7:19-22) and the extended interpretation closing the chapter (7:23-27), represent canonical intertextuality within the chapter itself. All of this points to a further interpretation through the closing words of the chapter in the present macro structure of the book.

4.3 Chapter 8

Chapter 8 opens with another chronological statement that is subsequent to the previous chapter, but is prior to those found in chapters 5 and 6:

8:1
בִּשְׁנַת שְׁלוֹשׁ לְמַלְכוּת בִּלְאֲשַׁצַּר הַמֶּלֶךְ חָזוֹן
נִרְאָה אֵלַי אֲנִי דְנִיֵּאל אַחֲרַי הַנִּרְאָה אֵלַי בְּתַחֲלָה:
*In the third year of the reign of Belshazzar the king, a vision
appeared to me, I, Daniel, after the one appearing to me in the
beginning.*

Without warning the Masoretic text returns to Hebrew for the first time since 2:4. In 2:4 the transition was made as a response from Nebuchadnezzar's normal group of counselors: "And the Chaldeans spoke to the king in Aramaic" (וַיִּדְבְּרוּ הַכַּשְׁדִּים לַמֶּלֶךְ) (אַרְמִיָּה). At the beginning of chapter 8 there is no such transition and no explanation. This very obvious tension is simply retained within the text. As in chapter 7 it is a "vision" (חָזוֹן) that is the main concern, a vision that was "after the one appearing to me in the beginning" (אַחֲרַי הַנִּרְאָה אֵלַי בְּתַחֲלָה). Presumably this statement demonstrates somewhat of a sequence in relation to the material of the previous chapter, whether "in the beginning" (בְּתַחֲלָה) is in reference to the beginning of Belshazzar's reign or the viewing of the first occurrence of this type of vision.²⁸⁹ The opening words found in 8:2 "and I saw in the vision" (וַאֲרָאָה בְּחִזְיוֹן) seem to indicate that the vision is to follow and the verb וַיְהִי (and it came to pass) actually begins the narration of the vision itself rather than giving a secondary description of the setting.²⁹⁰ Daniel sees "in the vision" (בְּחִזְיוֹן) that he is "in the castle Susa which is in the Province Elam" (בְּשׁוּשַׁן הַבִּירָה אֲשֶׁר בְּעִילָם הַמְּדִינָה) and further that he was "on the river Ulai" (עַל-אוּבַל אוּלַי). The first part of the vision focuses on an "ram" (אֵיל) that

²⁸⁹ Collins, *Daniel*, 329, opts for the latter of these two options: "'That which appeared' refers to the vision of chap. 7. The explicit attempt to relate the two visions is understandable if some time elapsed between their composition, whether by the same author or not."

²⁹⁰ *GKC* §111 f, 327, notes: "The introduction of independent narratives, or of a new section of the narrative, by means of an *imperfect consecutive*, likewise aims at a connexion, though again loose and external, with that which has been narrated previously."

is standing in front of the river. This ram has “two horns” (קַרְנִים). One is higher than the other, with the higher of the two “going up afterwards” (עָלָה בְּאַחֲרֶנָּה).²⁹¹ Though there is an obvious change in language between chapters 7 and 8, it is difficult to pass over the use of קַרְנִין (horns) in 7:7 and the description of the ram here in 8:2 also with קַרְנִים (two horns), both dual though קַרְנִין is followed by עָשָׂר (ten) in 7:7.²⁹² This simple grammatical and syntactical connection may represent not only another connection with chapter 7 but a further layer of interpretation in relation to the fourth beast of chapter 7. Daniel narrates with particular clarity in relation to the אֵיל “ram” in 8:4:

⁴ רָאִיתִי אֶת־הָאֵיל מִנֶּגַח יָמָה וְצָפוֹנָה וְנִגְבָּה וְכָל־חַיּוֹת
לֹא־עָמְדוּ לִפְנֵיו וְאֵין מַצִּיל מִיָּדוֹ וְעָשָׂה כְּרָצוֹנוֹ וְהִגְדִּיל:

*I saw the ram thrusting to the sea and to the north and to the south
and all beasts did not stand before him and there was no one
delivering from his hand and he did as his desire and he did great
things.*

The “beast” (חַיָּוָה) from chapter 7 was “being different from all the beasts” (מִשְׁנֵיהֶם מִן־). The ram (הָאֵיל) of chapter 8 demonstrates instead its dominance over “all the beasts” (כָּל־חַיּוֹת). Both are demonstrating their difference/dominance in relation to the other beasts. Daniel’s vision, however, continues in chapter 8 with the appearance of another animal, a “he-goat of the she-goats” (צִפִּירֵה־עֲזִים), who comes “from the west” (מִן־הַמַּעֲרָב) and “was not touching on the earth” (אֵין נֹגֵעַ בָּאָרֶץ). This animal does not have two horns like the ram but has “a horn of conspicuousness between its eyes” (קֶרֶן חֲזוֹת בֵּין עֵינָיו). After this short description of the origin and appearance of

²⁹¹ All of the standard lexicons are understanding בְּאַחֲרֶנָּה adverbially with HALOT, 36, “later on,” BDB, 31, “at the last,” and Buhl, 26, “nachher, zuletzt.”

²⁹² Of course this observation is based on the Masoretic pointing; the consonantal text allows for both dual and plural readings. Marcus Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 2005[1943]), 1422-1423, lists the normal Aramaic plural form as קַרְנִין. Ernestus Vogt, ed., *Lexicon Linguae Aramaicae Veteris Testamenti* (Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1994), 152, also lists the plural form as קַרְנִין, but states that the dual reading in 7:7 is a variant reading of the plural form, “v. l. קַרְנִין.” James Alfred Loader, *Intertextualität in geschichteten Texten des Alten Testaments* (unpublished paper presented at the Winter 2007 Privatissimum for Old Testament at the University of Vienna, 2007 [now published under the editorship of Oda Wischmeyer & Stefan Scholz]), 3-5, argues that even the vowel points demonstrate points of dialogue within the Hebrew Bible, as they are yet another layer of interpretation with regard to the layered biblical text. He notes: “Formalisieren wir unsere Beobachtung noch mehr und betrachten wir das Phänomen der **Punktierung** in der hebräischen Bibel, so weist dieser völlig äußere Aspekt des „vorliegenden“ Textes in die gleiche Richtung. Die Frage, was der „vorliegende“ Text ist, ist nicht so einfach zu beantworten und bekommt heute wieder erneut Aktualität. Der schriftliche hebräische Text ohne Vokale ist ein anderer als der schriftliche hebräische Text mit Vokalen” (3).

the he-goat of the she-goats, the vision turns to the violent interaction between these two animals. 8:6-7 outlines the hopeless situation for the ram:

⁶ וַיָּבֹא עֲדֵה־אֵיל בְּעַל הַקֶּרְנִים אֲשֶׁר רָאִיתִי עֹמֵד לִפְנֵי
הָאֵיל וַיִּרְץ אֵלָיו בַּחֲמַת כָּחוֹ: ⁷ וּרְאִיתִיו מְנִיעַ אֶצֶל הָאֵיל
וַיִּתְמַרְמֶר אֵלָיו וַיִּךְ אֶת־הָאֵיל וַיִּשְׁבֶּר אֶת־שְׁתֵּי קֶרְנָיו
וְלֹא־הָיָה כֹחַ בָּאֵיל לָעֹמֵד לִפְנָיו וַיִּשְׁלִיכֵהוּ אֶרְצָה וַיִּרְמֹסֵהוּ
וְלֹא־הָיָה מִצִּיל לָאֵיל מִיָּדוֹ:

⁶ And he went to the ram, the owner of the two horns, which I saw standing before the river. And he ran to him in the fury of his power. ⁷ And I saw him touching beside the ram. And he embittered himself to him. And he struck the ram. And he broke two of his horns and there was not strength in the ram to stand before him. And he threw him to the ground. And he trampled him and there was no one delivering the ram from his hand.

The ram that had proved itself to be so dominant is violently destroyed by the he-goat of the she-goats. When this text is viewed in relation to the activity of the fourth beast in 7:7 the verbal similarities are striking:

⁷ בְּאַחַר הַנָּה חֹזֶה הָיִיתִי בְּחֻזִּי לֵילִיָּא וְאֶרְו חֲיוֹת רַבִּיעִיָּה
דְּחִילָה וְאִמְתָּנִי וְתִקִּיפָא וְתִירָא וְשִׁנֵּי דִּי־פִרְזִל
לָהּ בְּרִבְבָּן אֲכָלָה וּמִדְּקָה וּשְׂאֲרָא בְּרִנְלִיָּה רַפְסָה
וְהָיָא מְשֻׁנָּה מִן־כָּל־חֲיוֹתָא דִּי קִדְמִיָּה וּקְרִנֵּן עֲשָׂר לָהּ:

In place of this one, I was seeing in the vision of the night and behold a fourth beast, being feared and terrible and exceedingly mighty and teeth of iron, eating many and breaking [them] in pieces and the rest trampling with its feet and it was different from all the beasts which were before it and ten horns were to it.

Their dominance in relation to their predecessors is obvious but further they are shattering (מִדְּקָה; יִשְׁבֶּר) and trampling (רַפְסָה; וַיִּרְמֹסֵהוּ) those before them. With the destruction of the ram the description of the he-goat of the she-goats continues in 8:8:

⁸ וַיִּצְפִּיר הָעֵזִים הַגְּדִיל עַד־מָאֵד וּכְעֲצָמוֹ נִשְׁבְּרָה הַקֶּרֶן
הַגְּדוֹלָה וַתַּעֲלֶנָּה חֲזוֹת אַרְבַּע תַּחְתֶּיהָ לְאַרְבַּע רוּחוֹת
הַשָּׁמַיִם:

And the he-goat of the she-goats did even²⁹³ greater things and as he was mighty, the great horn was broken. And four conspicuous ones went up in its place to the four winds of the heavens.

The description of the vision uses the verb הַגְּדִיל (he did greater things) as in 8:4 but this time to describe the he-goat of the she goats. The one who shattered (וַיִּשְׁבֶּר) the two horns of the ram now at the peak of his power has his horn shattered (נִשְׁבְּרָה).

²⁹³ The standard lexicons agree that עַד־מָאֵד has to do with degree, HALOT, 787, “expresses the measure or degree,” BDB, 724, “[o]f degree, to suggest a higher or the highest,” and Buhl, 564, “v. Grade.”

This shattering of the horn (הַקֶּרֶן) that was earlier described as a “horn of conspicuousness” (קֶרֶן חֲזוּת) is now replaced by “four conspicuous ones” (לְאַרְבַּע רוּחוֹת הַשָּׁמַיִם), a collocation that occurred in the previous chapter in Aramaic in 7:2 (אַרְבַּע רוּחוֹת שָׁמַיָא). 8:9-12 then gives this extended description of one of the horns:

⁹ וּמִן־הָאֶחָת מֵהֶם יֵצֵא קֶרֶן־אֶחָת מִצְעִירָהּ וְתִגְדֹּל־יֵתֶר
אֶל־הַנֶּגֶב וְאֶל־הַמִּזְרָח וְאֶל־הַצֵּבִי:¹⁰ וְתִגְדֹּל עַד־צִבְאָה הַשָּׁמַיִם
וְתִפֹּל אֶרְצָהּ מִן־הַצִּבְאָה וּמִן־הַכּוֹכָבִים וְתִרְמַסֶּם:
¹¹ וְעַד שְׂרֵי־הַצִּבְאָה הַגְּדִיל וּמִמֶּנּוּ הָרִים הַתְּמִיד
וְהַשִּׁלָּךְ מִכּוֹן מִקְדָּשׁוֹ:
¹² וְצִבְאָה תִּתֵּן עַל־הַתְּמִיד בַּפֶּשַׁע וְתִשְׁלַךְ אֶמֶת אֶרְצָהּ וְעִשְׂתָּהּ
וְהִצְלִיחָהּ:

9 And from one of them, one smaller horn went out. And it grew in excess to the south and to the east and to the west. 10 And it grew until the host of the heavens. And it caused to fall to the earth from the host and from the stars. And it trampled them. 11 And until the chief of the host he did great things and he lifted from him the continual offering and the fixed-place of his sanctuary was thrown down. 12 And a host will be given upon the continual offering in transgression and it will throw truth to the earth and it does and it prospers.

In 7:8 “another **small** horn went up from between them” (קֶרֶן אֲחֵרִי זְעִירָה סִלְקָת) and in 8:8 “from one of them a **smaller** one went up” (מִן־הָאֶחָת מֵהֶם יֵצֵא קֶרֶן חֲזוּת). In both cases the smaller horn arises from the larger group and in both cases they distinguish themselves among the others. The horn (קֶרֶן) of chapter 7 distinguishes itself through its grotesque appearance and message: “And behold eyes as the eyes of men were in this horn and a mouth speaking great things” (וְאֵלּוּ עֵינִין). The horn (קֶרֶן) of chapter 8 distinguishes itself in a manner similar to the interpretation of the vision from chapter 7 found in 7:24b-25:

^{24b} וְאַחֲרָן יָקוּם אַחֲרֵיהֶן וְהוּא יִשְׁנָא מִן־קִדְמוּיָא וְתִלְתָּה מַלְכִין
יִהְיֶה־שָׁפֵל:²⁵ וּמִלִּין לְצַד עֲלִיָּא יִמְלֹל וְלִקְדִישִׁי
עֲלִינִין יִכְלָא וְיִסְבֵּר לְהַשְׁנִיָּה זְמַנִּין וְדָת וְיִתְיַבְּבוּן בִּידָה
עַד־עֵדֶן וְעַד־נִין וּפְלַג עֵדֶן:

24b And another will arise after them and he will be different from the former ones and he will humble three kings. 25 And he will speak words against the most high and he will wear out the holy ones of the most high and he will intend to change times and law and they will be given in his hand until a time and times and half a time.

From the four horns in chapter 8, the smaller horn grows to excess and dominates in three different directions initially, to the south, east and west (אֶל־הַנֶּגֶב וְאֶל־הַמִּזְרָח וְאֶל־הַצֵּבִי). The king who arises in chapter 7 who is the interpretation of the little horn from earlier in the same chapter humbles three other kings (תִּלְתָּהּ מְלָכִין יִהְשָׁפֵל). Initially in chapter 7 it is said that the little horn had “a mouth speaking great things” (7:8,20!) (פֶּה מְמַלֵּל רַב־רָבָן) which is further interpreted in 7:25 as “he will speak words against the most high” (מִלִּין לִצַּד עֲלֵיָּא יִמְלֵל) and seems to appear in the vision of 8:10 as “and it grew until the host of the heavens” (וַתִּגְדֵּל עַד־צֶבֶא הַשָּׁמַיִם). The added detail in relation to the vision found in 7:21 is that “this horn was making war with the holy ones and was prevailing against them” (קָרְנָא רַפִּין עֲבָדָה קָרַב עִם־קַדִּישִׁין וַיִּכְלָהּ). The detail is interpreted in 7:25 as “he will wear out the saints of the Most High” (לְקַדִּישֵׁי עֲלִיוֹנִין יִבְלֵא) and then appears in the vision of chapter 8 in 8:10 “and it will cause to fall to the earth from the host and from the stars and it will trample them” (וַתַּפֵּל אֶרְצָה מִן־הַצֶּבֶא וּמִן־הַכּוֹכָבִים וַתִּרְמָסֵם). Again from the interpretation of the vision from chapter 7, 7:25 states “he will intend to change times and law” (יִסְבֵּר) (לְהַשְׁנִיָּה וּמִנִּין וְדָת) and then in 8:11b-12 we find this extended statement:

11b מִמֶּנּוּ הָרִים הַתָּמִיד וְהַשִּׁלָּךְ מִכּוֹן מְקֻדָּשׁוֹ¹² וְצֶבֶא
תִּנְתֵּן עַל־הַתָּמִיד בְּפֶשַׁע וְתַשְׁלֵךְ אֶמֶת אֶרְצָה וְעִשְׂתָּהּ
וְהִצְלִיחָהּ:

11b And he lifted from him the continual offering and the fixed-place of his sanctuary was thrown down. 12 And a host will be given upon the continual offering in transgression and it will throw truth to the earth and it does and it prospers.

At this point in Daniel’s recounting of the vision, the vision itself turns to the interpretation of itself, as Daniel overhears a conversation in 8:13-14:

13 וְאַשְׁמְעָה אֶחָד־קָדוֹשׁ מִדְּבָר וַיֹּאמֶר אֶחָד קָדוֹשׁ לַפְּלִמּוֹנִי
הַמְדַּבֵּר עַד־מָתִי הַחַיּוֹן הַתָּמִיד וְהַפֶּשַׁע שִׁמָּם תֵּת וְקָדֵשׁ
וְצֶבֶא מִרְמָס:
14 וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלַי עַד עָרֵב בִּקְרֵא אֱלֹפִים וּשְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת וּנְצַדֵּק
קָדֵשׁ:

13 And I heard one holy one speaking. And one holy one said to another one, speaking: “Until when is the vision of the continual offering and the transgression causing horror to give both²⁹⁴ the holy place and the host for trampling²⁹⁵?” 14 And he said to me,

²⁹⁴ GKC §154 footnote 1, 484, lists the double use of ו in this instance along with Psalm 76:7 and Daniel 1:3 as examples where the first should be understood as “both” and the second as “and.”

²⁹⁵ The standard lexicons list מִרְמָס as a nominal form, HALOT, 637, “trampling,” BDB, 942, “trampling,” and Buhl, 462, “das, was m.d. Füßen zetreten, niedergetreten w.”

“Until evening-morning two thousand three hundred and the holy place is justified.”

As Daniel hears one holy one speaking to another, a question is asked that also gives a key term for the rest of the book: “Until when is the vision of the continual offering and the transgression **causing horror** to give both the holy place and the host for trampling?” (עַד-מָתַי הַחֲזוֹן הַתָּמִיד וְהַפֶּשַׁע שְׁמָם תַּת וְקֹדֶשׁ וְצִבְיָא מִרְמָס). The answer to this question is not given to one of the holy ones but to Daniel as he is overhearing this whole situation: “**Until evening-morning two thousand three hundred** and the holy place is justified” (עַד עֶרֶב בֶּקָר אֲלָפִים וּשְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת וְנִצְהָק קֹדֶשׁ). This specificity of time was first seen in 7:12 where “a lengthening in life was given to them **until a time and a time**” (עַד-זְמַן וְעַד) and later in the interpretation of 7:25 “and they were given into his hand **until a time and times and half a time**” (וַיִּתְּנֵהוּבֹן) (בִּיָּדָה עַד-עֵדָן וְעַדנִין וּפְלֶג עֵדָן) and now with a much greater level of precision here in 8:14.

“until a time and a time”	עַד-זְמַן וְעַד 7:12
“until a time and times and half a time”	עַד-עֵדָן וְעַדנִין וּפְלֶג עֵדָן 7:25
“until evening-morning two thousand three hundred”	עַד עֶרֶב בֶּקָר אֲלָפִים וּשְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת 8:14

Clearly the details are developing with each layer of interpretation that even includes the visions themselves, where details from each vision are expanding as they are read in context with one another. The verb וַיְהִי (and it came to pass) at the beginning of 8:15 marks a new narrative section within the larger scene.²⁹⁶ Though 8:13-14 marks a decided change within the whole of the vision by Daniel eavesdropping and then receiving the answer, it is here that the vision as a whole turns to Daniel seeking understanding (בִּינָה). One would well note this pattern in the second half of the book where Daniel is receiving both the vision and the interpretation within the same vision. Daniel sees something “like the appearance of a man” (כְּמֵרְאֵה-אִישׁ) in 8:15 and the general scene is realigned with 8:2-3 with a new key character in 8:16:

וַאֲשַׁמַּע קוֹל-אָדָם בֵּין אוּלַי וַיִּקְרָא וַיֹּאמֶר גַּבְרִיאֵל הִבֵּן
לְהֵלֹךְ אֶת-הַמְּרָאָה:

And I heard a voice of a man between the Ulai. And He called. And he said: “Gabriel, give understanding to this one the vision!”

²⁹⁶ Again GKC §111 f, 327, notes: “The introduction of independent narratives, or of a new section of the narrative, by means of an *imperfect consecutive*, likewise aims at a connexion, though again loose and external, with that which has been narrated previously.”

Daniel's vision returns to the Ulai (אֵילַי; cf. 8:2) but instead of seeing a ram, a he-goat of the she-goats, and an unfolding battle, he sees "Gabriel" (גַּבְרִיאֵל), the one similar in appearance to a **man** (בְּמִצְהַת-אִישׁ) and having the voice of **a human** (קוֹל-אָדָם). All of this is a marked contrast to what Daniel had seen (אֲרָאָה) earlier and what he will now hear (אֶשְׁמַע). The explicit purpose of this next portion is found in the command to Gabriel at the end of the verse: "Gabriel, give understanding to this one the vision!" (גַּבְרִיאֵל הֵבֵן לְהֵלֹץ אֶת-הַמְּרָאָה). Daniel was seeking **understanding** (בִּינָה) in 8:15 and Gabriel is being given the command "**give understanding** to this one" (הֵבֵן לְהֵלֹץ). This time Daniel is terrified (נִבְעָתִי) not by the vision at this point but by the one who has come to him (cf. 7:15). The first issue that is discerned is "that the vision is for the time of the end" (כִּי לְעֵת-קֵץ הַחֲזִוִּיּוֹן; 8:17). In particular this time period is "**in the end** of the indignation because it is to an appointed end" (בְּאַחֲרִית הַזֶּעַם כִּי לְמוֹעֵד קֵץ; 8:19). In 2:28 Nebuchadnezzar's dream is said to describe "**in the end** of the days" (בְּאַחֲרִית יוֹמֵיָא). Through the repetition of this key phrase, "in the end" (בְּאַחֲרִית), even across languages, a connection with the material from chapter 2 is being established and transformed to include "the indignation" (הַזֶּעַם). Within this time period the information that follows is in particular being identified. The ram (הָאֵיל) from 8:3-7 is clearly identified as the kingdoms of Media and Persia (מַלְכֵי מֶדִּי וּפָרְסָא) in 8:20. The he-goat of the she-goats (וְהַצִּפּוֹר הַשָּׂעִיר)²⁹⁷ from 8:5-12 is further clearly identified as "a king of Greece" (מֶלֶךְ יוֹון) in 8:21. However, the horns represent different kings/kingdoms. The first king is represented in the vision as "the great horn which was between his eyes" (הַקֶּרֶן הַגְּדוֹלָה אֲשֶׁר בֵּין-עֵינָיו). With the breaking of this horn/king (הַנִּשְׁבָּרָת; cf. 8:8) four other kingdoms (מַלְכוּתוֹת) take his place (תַּחְתָּיהָ; cf. 8:8). These interpretations, still within the vision, represent the first two examples where the countries and kings are identified outside of Nebuchadnezzar as the first kingdom from the vision in chapter 2 (cf. 2:38). It is **in the end** of the reign of these kingdoms (וּבְאַחֲרִית מַלְכוּתָם) that another king arises in the period that was described as "**in the end** of the indignation" (בְּאַחֲרִית הַזֶּעַם) in 8:19 and now "as to complete the transgressions" (כְּהִתָּם הַפְּשָׁעִים) in 8:23. As in 7:24b-26, the focus is more extensive in relation to this king(dom) in 8:23-26:

²⁹⁷ There is a curious use of הַשָּׂעִיר at this point instead of הַזֶּעַם which is used in the earlier portion of the chapter.

²³ וּבִאֲחֶרֶת מַלְכוּתָם כְּהֵתָם הַפְּשָׁעִים יַעֲמֹד מֶלֶךְ עֲזֹפְנִים
וּמִבֵּין חִידוֹת: ²⁴ וְעֵצָם כָּחוֹ וְלֹא כִכְחוֹ וְנִפְלְאוֹת יִשְׁחִית
וְהַצְלִיחַ וְעָשָׂה וְהִשְׁחִית עֲצוּמִים וְעַם־קִדְשִׁים:
²⁵ וְעַל־שִׁכְלוֹ וְהַצְלִיחַ מִרְמָה בִּידּוֹ וּבִלְבָבוֹ יִגְדִּיל וּבִשְׁלוֹהָ
יִשְׁחִית רַבִּים וְעַל־שָׁרִים יַעֲמֹד וּבֶאֱפֶס יָד יִשְׁבֵּר:
²⁶ וּמִרְאֵה הָעֶרֶב וְהַבֹּקֶר אֲשֶׁר נֶאֱמַר אֱמֶת הוּא וְאַתָּה סֹתֵם
הַחֲזוֹן כִּי לַיָּמִים רַבִּים:

23 And in the end of their kingdom, as to complete the transgressions, a king will stand, fierce of face and understanding riddles. 24 And his strength is mighty and not in his strength and he will wonderously ruin and he prospers and he does and he ruins mighty ones and a people of holy ones. 25 And upon his insight and he causes deceit to prosper in his hand and he will make his heart great and in ease he will destroy many and upon the chief of chiefs he will stand and in an end of a hand he will be broken. 26 And a vision of the evening and the morning which it was said is true and you seal up the vision because it is for many days.

It should be noted that the direct correlation that preceded this interpretation is not present at this point. This extended interpretation found in the mouth of Gabriel is just as in need of interpretation as the description in 8:9-12 because there are so many new details and cryptic statements. What does it mean to be “fierce of face” (עֲזֹפְנִים) or “understanding riddles” (מִבֵּין חִידוֹת)?²⁹⁸ How does one reconcile the statement “and his strength is might and not in his strength” (וְעֵצָם כָּחוֹ וְלֹא כִכְחוֹ)? Even more disturbing is the closing statement to Daniel that he is to “seal the vision because it is for many days” (סֹתֵם הַחֲזוֹן כִּי לַיָּמִים רַבִּים). Daniel’s response, just as at the end of chapter 7, pushes toward a further resolution in the present context. The comments of 8:27 are no surprise:

²⁷ וְאֲנִי דָנִיֵּאל נְהִינִי וְנִחַלִּיתִי יָמִים וְאֶקֹּם וְאֶעֱשֶׂה
אֶת־מְלָאכַת הַמֶּלֶךְ וְאֶשְׁתּוּמָם עַל־הַמִּרְאֵה וְאֵין מִבֵּין:

And I, Daniel, I was done and I was sick days and I rose and I did the work of the king and I was appalled upon the vision and there was no understanding.

Again it should be noted that the details, like chapter 7, like the rest of the book, place one interpretation on top of another. The placement of chapter 8 after chapter 7,

²⁹⁸ J. C. H. Lebram, “König Antiochus im Buch Daniel,” *Vetus Testamentum* 25/4 (1975): 737, on the one hand identifies these statements without hesitation with “Antiochus IV. Epiphanes von Syrien,” and “[e]ine zusammenfassende Darstellung von Antiochus’ Wirken finden wir in viii 23-25” (738). On the other hand he sees these descriptions as a type: “Skopus und Formulierung der Darstellung des Antiochus legend as Schwergewicht auf die Tatsache, dass er der apokalyptische Feind des Gottesvolkes ist. Im Grunde wird dies nicht durch Bezugnahme auf den historischen Antiochus und seine Taten erwiesen, sondern durch seine Identifizierung mit einem Typus” (743). The text has only the latter, with no actual mention of Antiochus.

though chronologically correct, also creates an interpretive expectancy because of Daniel's troubled nature in relation to what he has seen. The obvious connection between the details in both chapters has created on the one hand a greater level of detail and even given the specific identification of what countries these king(dom)s will come from. However, there is this reality that the interpretation is still open, the story is not finished. The canonical intertextuality is found again not only in the use of and transformation of other material, but even in the placement of these narrative scenes in sequence with one another.

4.4 Chapter 9

Chapter 9 opens with yet another chronological marker in 9:1:

¹ בִּשְׁנַת אֶחָת לְדָרְיוֹשׁ בֶּן־אֲחַשְׁוֵרֹשׁ מִזֶּרַע מֶדֶי
אֲשֶׁר הָמְלִיךְ עַל מַלְכוּת כַּשְׁדִּים:

In the first year of Darius, the son of Ahasuerus, from the seed of the Medes, who was made king upon the kingdom of the Chaldeans.

Not only does this mark the beginning of a new scene, but also it draws attention to the purposeful ordering of the text. This statement puts what is to follow subsequent to chapters 7 and 8 with chapters 5 and 6 as indicated by the narrative chronological markers intervening between the conclusion of chapter 8 and the beginning of chapter 9. It also puts the prayer that is to follow in the same general time period where Daniel was placed in great danger due to prayer in chapter 6, almost as if the content of Daniel's heroic act of prayer in chapter 6 is being revealed here in chapter 9. By identifying Darius (דָּרְיוֹשׁ) as "from the seed of the Medes" (מִזֶּרַע מֶדֶי) the question is raised whether he is one of the two kingdoms mentioned in 8:20 (מֶדֶי וּכְרַס). This strategy, the ordering of narrative scenes, reinforces the fact that the two halves of the book, though textually intertwined, reflect two different emphases. The first half of the book focuses on how Daniel and his companions distinguished themselves and the second half focuses on these apocalyptic and eschatological visions and their interpretations. 9:2 outlines the narrower context of this narrative scene as a particular moment of understanding in Daniel's life:

² בִּשְׁנַת אֶחָת לְמָלְכוֹ אֲנִי דָנִיֵּאל בִּינְתִי בַסְּפָרִים מִסְפַּר
הַשָּׁנִים אֲשֶׁר הָיָה דְבַר־יְהוָה אֶל־יִרְמְיָה הַנָּבִיא לְמִלְאוֹת
לְחָרְבוֹת יְרוּשָׁלַם שִׁבְעִים שָׁנָה:

2 In the first year he was king, I, Daniel, I understood in the writings the number of years which the word of YHWH was to Jeremiah the Prophet to fulfill the ruins of Jerusalem, seventy years.

The scene finds Daniel observing in the writings (בִּינְתִי בַסְּפָרִים). Among this collection of writings he finds in particular “the word of YHWH to Jeremiah the prophet” (דְּבַר־יְהוָה אֶל־יִרְמְיָה הַנָּבִיא). What was of particular importance to Daniel was that Jerusalem was to fulfill seventy years of ruin (לְחָרְבוֹת יְרוּשָׁלַם שִׁבְעִים שָׁנָה). It appears that Daniel 9:2 has two passages in particular in view from the book of Jeremiah. Jeremiah 25:11-12 gives initially “the word” (הַדְּבָר) in relation to “all the people of Judah” (כָּל־עַם יְהוּדָה) of which the ones dwelling in Jerusalem are included (25:1-2; יוֹשְׁבֵי יְרוּשָׁלַם):

¹¹ וְהָיְתָה כָּל־הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת לְחָרְבָה לְשָׁמָה וְעִבְדוּ הַגּוֹיִם
הָאֵלֶּה אֶת־מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל שִׁבְעִים שָׁנָה: ¹² וְהָיָה כְּמִלְאוֹת שִׁבְעִים
שָׁנָה אֶפְקָד עַל־מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל וְעַל־הַגּוֹי הַהוּא נְאֻם־יְהוָה
אֶת־עֲוֹנָם וְעַל־אֶרֶץ פְּשָׁדִים וְשָׁמָתִי אֲתוּ לְשִׁמְמוֹת עוֹלָם:

11 And all this land is for a ruin, for a waste and the nations serve this one, the king of Babylon, seventy years. 12 And it will be as to fulfill seventy years, I will visit upon the king of Babylon and upon that nation, declaration of YHWH, their iniquity and upon the land of the Chaldeans and I will put him for a continual waste.

Key to the text from Daniel are the use of “a ruin” (לְחָרְבָה) and “seventy years” (שִׁבְעִים שָׁנָה). The text primarily addresses the devastated nature of the land with a particular view toward proclaiming doom to the people of the land. The second text from Jeremiah represents a portion of a letter “writing which Jeremiah the prophet sent from Jerusalem” (מִירוּשָׁלַם יִרְמְיָה הַנָּבִיא 29:1) and is found in 29:10:

¹⁰ כִּי־כֹה אָמַר יְהוָה כִּי לִפִּי מִלְּאֵת לְבָבִל שִׁבְעִים שָׁנָה
אֶפְקָד אֶתְכֶם וְהִקְמַתִּי עֲלֵיכֶם אֶת־דְּבָרִי הַטּוֹב לְהָשִׁיב
אֶתְכֶם אֶל־הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה:

Because thus said YHWH: “As²⁹⁹ to fulfill to Babylon seventy years, I will visit you and I will set up upon you my good word to return you to this place.”

²⁹⁹ HALOT, 916, gives “as” as gloss for the phrase לִפִּי.

This second passage with the introductory phrase includes the key words from Daniel 9:2—“Jeremiah the prophet” (יִרְמְיָה הַנָּבִיא), “to fulfill” (מְלֵאֲתָ), and “seventy years” (שִׁבְעִים שָׁנָה). The point of the text from Jeremiah 29 is the opposite of the first in Jeremiah 25. It is given as a comfort, putting a deadline on the time of captivity and calling the people to live in their new contexts as though they are going to be there a while (29:4-7). What is clear from Daniel’s response beginning in 9:3, however, is that he finds no comfort in these words, corresponding with the negative outlook given in Jeremiah 25:11-12. Semantically “a ruin” (חֲרָבָה) is dependant on Jeremiah 25:11 where as “seventy years” (שִׁבְעִים שָׁנָה) is found in both of these texts. Only “Jeremiah the prophet” (יִרְמְיָה הַנָּבִיא) and “to fulfill” (מְלֵאֲתָ) are unique in this comparison to Jeremiah 29 and Daniel 9:2. Though Daniel’s reading appears to be semantically dependent on both passages from Jeremiah, he has chosen to focus on Jerusalem and not all of Judah as both passages in Jeremiah indicate. Further, the negative aspect of this destruction, which is mainly dependent on Jeremiah 25:11-12, has been retained. This focus on Jerusalem has been present since the opening verses of the book of Daniel where the besieging of Jerusalem is in view (1:1) and in particular where “the articles of the house of God” are taken (כְּלֵי בַיִת־הָאֱלֹהִים; 1:2). This detail becomes a key to understanding chapter 5, where Belshazzar takes “vessels of gold and silver” (כֵּלֵי זָהָב וְכֶסֶף) which came from Jerusalem (5:2-3), “the temple of the house of God” (הַיְכָלָא דִּבְּיַת אֱלֹהָא; 5:3), and begins to idolatrously drink from them (5:3-4). Daniel returns to his home in 6:11 and prays toward Jerusalem, praising before his God (מִזְבֵּחַ קֳדָם אֱלֹהֵהּ). Jerusalem’s importance is tied with the reality that God’s temple is located there as 9:16 makes clear: “from your city Jerusalem, the mountain of your holiness” (מִעִירְךָ יְרוּשָׁלַם הַר־קֹדֶשְׁךָ). One further observation to be made in relation to 9:2 is that for the first time in the book, God’s covenant name “YHWH” (יְהוָה) is used (9:2, 4, 8, 10, 13, 14, 20).³⁰⁰ It is only used in this chapter in the book of Daniel. The use of God’s covenant name is not a

³⁰⁰ Klaus Koch, “Das aramäisch-hebräische Danielbuch Konfrontation zwischen Weltmacht und monotheistischer Religionsgemeinschaft in universalgeschichtlicher Perspektive,” in *Die Geschichte der Daniel-Auslegung in Judentum, Christentum und Islam: Studien zur Kommentierung des Danielbuches in Literatur und Kunst*, eds. Katharina Bracht and David S. du Toit (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), 9-10, understands this as an indication that this text is older than other portions of the book, “Partikulare Begriffe wie das Tetragramm als Gottesname und selbst der Name Israel als Bezeichnung des eigenen Volkes tauchen deshalb nur in dem einer älteren Überlieferung entkommenen psalmartigen Gebet Dan 9,4-16 auf (und in der deuterio-kanonischen Erweiterung 3,36ff.).”

sudden stylistic change, but instead is deeply connected to the material that follows in 9:3-20. 9:3-5 makes this connection clear:

³ וְאַתָּנָה אֶת־פָּנַי אֶל־אֲדֹנָי הָאֱלֹהִים לְבַקֵּשׁ תְּפִלָּה וְתַחֲנוּנִים
בְּצוֹם וּשְׂקָ וְאַפָּרִי: ⁴ וְאֶתְפַּלֵּלָה לִיהוָה אֱלֹהֵי וְאַתּוּדָה וְאֶמְרָה
אֲנִי אֲדֹנָי הָאֵל הַגָּדוֹל וְהַנּוֹרָא שֹׁמֵר הַבְּרִית וְהַחֲסֵד
לְאַהֲבָיו וּלְשֹׂמְרֵי מִצְוֹתָיו:
⁵ חָטְאָנוּ וְעִוְיָנוּ וְהִרְשָׁעָנוּ וּמָרְדָּנוּ וְסוּר מִמִּצְוֹתֶיךָ
וּמִמִּשְׁפָּטֶיךָ:

3 And I gave my face to the Lord God, to seek prayer and supplication for favor, in fasting and sackcloth and ashes. 4 And I prayed to YHWH my God and I confessed and I said: "O! My Lord, the great God and the one being feared, keeping the covenant and the kindness to the ones loving him and to the ones keeping his commandments. 5 We have sinned and we have committed iniquity and we have acted wickedly and we have rebelled and turned away from your commandments and from your judgments.

The ruins of Jerusalem and the seventy years are all connected to this covenant with “YHWH” (יהוה). Daniel, who has been portrayed as nothing other than faithful, whether to God or his responsibilities in the kingdom, now begins to pray and confess. Daniel speaks in the first person plural and confesses that they have not listened “to your servants **the prophets**” (הַנְּבִיאִים; 9:6) and what he gave “in the hand of his servants **the prophets**” (הַנְּבִיאִים; 9:10) and that they now are receiving what was “written **in the Law of Moses**” (בְּתוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה; 9:11, 13). The whole of the prayer reflects the plural nature of Daniel’s observing in the writings (בְּסִפְרֵים) and from 9:2 the prayer as a whole is laced with references in particular to the aforementioned material from “the prophets” (הַנְּבִיאִים) and “the Law of Moses” (בְּתוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה). Further, key words from these other “writings” (סִפְרֵים) will be dealt with more thoroughly in a subsequent chapter. For now the reality is that Daniel is identifying deeply with these texts and is making a supplication for favor before the Lord (תַּחֲנוּנִים in 9:3, 13, 18 and תַּחֲנִית in 9:20). All of which is predicated within the narrative on the understanding of why Jerusalem will be in ruins for seventy years. The prayer as a whole works toward 9:19:

¹⁹ אֲדֹנָי שְׁמָעָה אֲדֹנָי סְלַחָה אֲדֹנָי הַקְּשִׁיבָה וְעֲשֵׂה
אֶל־תְּאַחֲרָ לְמַעַנְךָ אֱלֹהֵי כִּי־שִׁמְךָ נִקְרָא עַל־עִירֶיךָ וְעַל־עַמֶּיךָ:
Lord, listen, Lord, forgive, incline and do not delay, on account of you my God because your name is called upon your city and upon your people.

The appeal is to forgiveness and in particular that the Lord “not delay” (אַל־תִּאַחַר).

What follows in the chapter is a far cry from this request. At this critical point in Daniel’s prayer Gabriel appears (not in a vision) for a second time to Daniel (cf. 8:16) and offers to give insight “in the appearance” (בְּמֵרָאָה; 9:23). This puzzling statement connects the material that has been chronologically reordered within the narrative—chapters 5 and 6 intervene between the close of chapter 8 and the opening of chapter 9 within the narrative—and this appearance becomes the binding material between the two chapters. Gabriel is commanded in 8:16: “Give understanding to this one to discern the appearance” (הִבֵּן לְהֵלֹךְ אֶת־הַמֵּרָאָה). Gabriel makes clear his threefold purpose in 9:23: “To proclaim that you are precious and to discern in the word and to discern in the appearance” (לְהַגִּיד כִּי חֲמוּדוֹת אַתָּה וּבִין בְּדָבָר וְהִבֵּן בְּמֵרָאָה).

- The first purpose is to let Daniel know that he is “precious” (חֲמוּדוֹת).
- The second purpose is encapsulated in the command “to discern in the word” (וּבִין בְּדָבָר). In context this “word” (דָּבָר) is not to be understood as this threefold statement but instead as some sort of response to Daniel’s “supplication for favor” in chapter 9 (תַּחֲנוּנִים; cf. 9:3 and 9:23).
- The third purpose is stated in the final command of 9:23 “to discern in the appearance” (הִבֵּן בְּמֵרָאָה). This “appearance” (מֵרָאָה) is to be understood as the vision from chapter 8. Daniel states in 8:27: “And I was appalled upon the appearance and there was no understanding” (וַאֲשֵׁיתוּמָם עַל־הַמֵּרָאָה).

Through this threefold purpose, Daniel’s prayer in response to “the word of YHWH to Jeremiah the prophet” (דְּבַר־יְהוָה אֶל־יִרְמְיָה הַנָּבִיא) is being connected with the appearance (מֵרָאָה) of chapter 8 and is now going to be discerned here in 9:24-27.

Multiple texts are being *interpreted together* at this point, chapter 8 which contains multiple layers of interpretation, texts from Jeremiah and their interpretation by Daniel in chapter 9, and now the text of 9:24-27. Contrary to Daniel’s passionate request in 9:19 “do not delay” (אַל־תִּאַחַר), Jeremiah’s “seventy years” (שִׁבְעִים שָׁנָה) will now be “seventy weeks” (שִׁבְעִים שָׁבָעִים; 9:24). In connection with 9:2 and the texts from Jeremiah 25 and 29 this is understood as weeks of years, massively expanding what Daniel had already viewed as a horrible situation, especially since these weeks represent what “has been determined” upon your city and upon the city of your holiness” (נִחְתָּם עַל־עַמְּךָ וְעַל־עִיר קִדְשְׁךָ).

With this time frame, people, and city in mind, Gabriel lists what has been determined. First, it has been determined “to bring transgression to an end” (לְכַלֵּא הַפֶּשַׁע). The noun “transgression” (פֶּשַׁע) occurs only three times in the book of Daniel, here in 9:24 and twice in chapter 8, verses 12 and 13 respectively (the verb occurs once in 8:23). The transgression (הַפֶּשַׁע) that is in view is the one described in 8:12-13, where “a host will be given upon the continual offering **in transgression**” (צָבָא תִּנָּתֵן עַל־הַתְּמִיד בַּפֶּשַׁע; 8:12) and the related question: “Until when is the vision of the continual offering **and the transgression** causing horror to give both the holy place and the host for trampling?” (עַד־מָתַי הַחֲזִיוֹן הַתְּמִיד וְהַפֶּשַׁע שָׁמָּה תֵּת וְקֹדֶשׁ וְצָבָא מְרַמָּס; 8:13).

Second, it has been determined either “to seal up sins” (וּלְחַתֵּם חַטָּאוֹת) or “to complete sin” (וּלְחַתֵּם חַטָּאת). The key textual problem is found in the Ketiv “and to seal up” (וּלְחַתֵּם) and the Qere “and to complete” (וּלְחַתֵּם). The Qere reflects an agreement with the first statement that it has been determined “**to complete** the transgression” (לְכַלֵּא הַפֶּשַׁע), which demonstrates an interesting affinity to 8:23 “and in the end of their kingdom **as to complete** the transgressions” (וּבְאַחֲרֵית מַלְכוּתָם כְּהֵתֵם). As such, the second statement would have a similar meaning whether the noun “sin” is read singular as in the Qere reading (חַטָּאת) or plural as in the Ketiv reading (חַטָּאוֹת). The sin/sins in view are the ones Daniel has been confessing in the course of the prayer. This noun is used only here and twice in 9:20. The Ketiv reading “and to seal up” (וּלְחַתֵּם) reflects a verbal connection with the last half of the verse, where it has been further determined “**and to seal up** vision and prophet” (וּלְחַתֵּם חֲזִיוֹן וְנָבִיא). This verbal connection leads to further statements in 12:4 “**and to seal up** the writing until the time of the end” (וּלְחַתֵּם הַסֵּפֶר עַד־עֵת קֵץ) and 12:9 “**and** the words **being sealed up** until the time of the end” (וּלְחַתֵּם הַדְּבָרִים עַד־עֵת קֵץ), where both signify that the document is to be closed or not expanded. In either case some sort of completion is in view during these weeks in relation to sin (חַטָּאת).

Third, it has been determined “to atone iniquity” (וּלְכַפֵּר עֲוֹן). The Hebrew text of Daniel only uses “iniquity” (עֲוֹן) here, in 9:13 “and we did not appease before YHWH our God to return **from our iniquity**” (וְלֹא־חָלֵינוּ אֶת־פָּנֵינוּ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ לְשׁוּבָה מִבְּעֲוֹנוֹנוּ), and in 9:16 “because in our sin **and in the iniquities** of our fathers” (כִּי בַחַטָּאוֹתֵינוּ וּבַעֲוֹנוֹת אֲבוֹתֵינוּ). The iniquity that is going to be atoned for is that of Daniel and the people during these weeks.

Fourth, it has been determined “to cause to go in righteousness of eternity” (וּלְהַבִּיא צֶדֶק עַלְמִים). Though there has been a great preoccupation with eternal things so far in the book, the concept of “righteousness of eternity” (צֶדֶק עַלְמִים) has yet to be discussed.

Fifth, it has been determined together “to seal up vision and prophet” (וּלְחַתֵּם וְנָבִיא). As has been earlier discussed, both of these would be finished in the sense that nothing would be added to them (cf. 12:4,9). The statement from 8:26 “and you seal up the vision because it is for many days” (וְאַתָּה סָתַם הַחֲזוֹן כִּי לְיָמִים רַבִּים) seems also to support this position.

Sixth it has been determined during this time period “to anoint the holy of holies” (וּלְמַשֵּׁחַ קֹדֶשׁ קֳדָשִׁים).

As was the case in 7:12,16, and 8:14, 9:25-27 turns to the particular break down of these seventy weeks (שִׁבְעִים שָׁבָעִים).³⁰¹

25 וְחָדַע וְתִשְׁכַּל מִן-מִצָּא דָבָר לְהָשִׁיב וּלְבִנּוֹת יְרוּשָׁלַם
עַד-מָשִׁיחַ נָגִיד שִׁבְעִים שָׁבָעָה וְשִׁבְעִים וּשְׁנָיִם וּשְׁנָיִם תָּשׁוּב
וְנִבְנְתָה רְחוֹב וְחָרוֹץ וּבְצוֹק הָעֵתִים:
26 וְאַחֲרֵי הַשִּׁבְעִים וּשְׁנָיִם וּשְׁנָיִם יָפֹרֶת מָשִׁיחַ וְאִין לוֹ וְהָעִיר
וְהַקֹּדֶשׁ יִשָּׁחִית עִם נָגִיד הַבָּא וְקָצוּ בְשִׁטָּף וְעַד קֵץ מִלְחָמָה
נִחְרָצָה שְׁמֹמֹת:
27 וְהַנְּבִיר בְּרִית לְרַבִּים שָׁבוּעַ אֶחָד וְחֲצִי הַשָּׁבוּעַ יִשְׁבִּית
זָבַח וּמִנְחָה וְעַל כָּנָף שְׁקֹוצִים מְשֻׁמִּם וְעַד-כָּלָה וְנִחְרָצָה
תִּתֵּן עַל-שָׁמַם:

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.

³⁰¹ Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 482-483, views these weeks as an exegetical reinterpretation “stimulated by 2 Chron. 36:21 which, owing its reuse of Lev. 26:34-5, seems to have understood the seventy years of Jeremiah’s oracle as ten sabbatical cycles. Another influence on Dan. 9:24-7 was undoubtedly the jubilee computation of Lev. 25:1-55 as a whole, wherein it is taught that a jubilee cycle of forty-nine years marked both the maximal period of indentured servitude and the maximal period wherein land may be alienated—due to economic distrains—from its ancestral heirs.” However, this exegetical work seems to be driven by the need to have these statements end in the time of Antiochus IV: “The span of 490 years, or 70 sabbatical cycles, is an attempt to represent the span of ancient Israelite history from the destruction of the first Temple in Jerusalem (in 587 BCE) to the expected destruction of the abominations polluting the rebuilt Temple in the days of the Seleucid Antiochus IV Epiphanes (174-64 BCE)” (483).

Daniel is to know that there will be seven weeks between the command to rebuild Jerusalem and the “anointed prince” (מְשִׁיחַ נָגִיד).³⁰² Sixty-two weeks will encompass the time of rebuilding including “broad place and moat” (רָחֹב וְחָרוֹץ) and this will be “in distress of the times” (בְּצוֹק הָעֵתִים). After these sixty-two weeks of rebuilding “an anointed one will be cut off and there will be nothing to him” (יִכָּרֵת מְשִׁיחַ וְאֵין לוֹ). During this same time Jerusalem and the temple that were rebuilt will be destroyed by “a prince going in” (נָגִיד הַבָּא). Of this prince it is said that “he will cause a covenant to grow great to many” (הַגְּבִיר בְּרִית לְרַבִּים) during the one remaining week. At the halfway point of this remaining week “he will destroy sacrifice and offering and upon the edge of detestable things causing horror and until complete destruction” (וְעַל פֶּנֶף (שְׂקוּצִים מְשַׁמֵּם וְעַד-כָּלָה יִשְׁבִּית וְזָבַח וּמִנְחָה). As it was determined in the opening statement, so also in 9:27—“it is determined it will pour forth upon one causing horror” (תֵּתֵן עַל-שָׂמָם וְנִחְרָצָה). The participle from the vision of chapter 8 “causing horror” (שָׂמָם; 8:13) and its related verbal form “causing horror” (מְשַׁמֵּם; 9:27) link together three elements:

- the vision of chapter 8,
- the seventy years of Jeremiah and the prayer of Daniel in chapter 9,
- and the interpretation of these seventy weeks.³⁰³

Far from Daniel finding comfort, it has been determined that there will be further destruction and “causing horror” (שָׂמָם). The whole of the chapter again is one

³⁰² Montgomery, *The Book of Daniel*, 379, due to the ambiguity of the terms raised gives the three normal suggestions as to whom this person may be: “Hence both terms are ambiguous, and their combination does not assist identification, for which three candidates have been proposed: Cyrus, the ‘Anointed’ of Is. 45¹; Zerubbabel, the acclaimed Messiah of the Restoration; and his contemporary the high priest Joshua b. Josedek.”

³⁰³ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 617, comments in relation to this connection: “In his prayer Daniel combines the prophecy of Jeremiah with the punishment of disobedience which the law of Moses (Dan. 9.11) had threatened. The land would lie fallow to make up for the Sabbaths which had been disregarded. Then the writer is made to understand that the exile was only a foreshadowing of the final period of indignation. Not seventy years, but seventy weeks of years were intended. The point of this reinterpretation is not that Jeremiah was mistaken in his prophecy, but that which he correctly envisioned was further clarified by a fresh illumination of scripture through the spirit.” John F. Walvoord, *Daniel: The Key to Prophetic Revelation* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1971), 236, summarizes these seventy weeks from a very different perspective: “In summary, it may be concluded that Daniel’s great prophecy of the seventy sevens comprehends the total history of Israel from the time of Nehemiah in 445 B.C. until the second coming of Jesus Christ. In the first period of seven sevens, the city and the streets are rebuilt. In the second period of sixty-two sevens which follows, the Messiah appears and is living at the conclusion of the period. In the parenthesis between the sixty-ninth seven and the seventieth seven, at least two major events take place: the cutting off of the Messiah (the death of Christ) and the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. Actually, the whole present age intervenes.”

layer of interpretation on top of another. Daniel begins by understanding Jeremiah's word in relation to his own situation, this is then linked with the vision of chapter 8 through the understanding given by Gabriel into the seventy years becoming seventy weeks of years that will again entail "causing horror" (שָׁמָם).

4.5 Chapters 10-12

The final scene is found in chapters 10-12. Though 11:1 also contains another chronological marker it is found in the dialogue of the larger scene. As such 10:1 records the final chronological marker for the scenes of the book of Daniel:

¹ בְּשָׁנָת שְׁלוֹשׁ לְכוֹרֶשׁ מֶלֶךְ פָּרֶס דָּבָר נִגְלָה
לְדָנְיָאֵל אֲשֶׁר־נִקְרָא שְׁמוֹ בִּלְטִישַׁאצַּר וְאִמְתּוֹ הַדָּבָר וְצָבָא
גָּדוֹל וּבִין אֶת־הַדָּבָר וּבִינָה לוֹ בַּמְרָאָה:

In the third year of Cyrus, king of Persia, a word was revealed to Daniel, whose name was called Belteshazzar, and the word is truth and is a great war and he considered³⁰⁴ the word and there was understanding to him in the appearance.

By the designation "in the third year of Cyrus, king of Persia" (בְּשָׁנָת שְׁלוֹשׁ לְכוֹרֶשׁ) the furthest point in the chronology of the narrative has been reached. The reign of Cyrus (לְכוֹרֶשׁ) has been anticipated since 1:21 where the text states: "And Daniel existed until the first year of Cyrus" (וַיְהִי דָנְיָאֵל עַד־שָׁנָת אֶחָת לְכוֹרֶשׁ הַמֶּלֶךְ). Daniel's role within this kingdom is also alluded to in 6:29:

²⁹ וַדָּנְיָאֵל הָיָה הַצֶּלֶחַ בְּמַלְכוּת דָּרְיוֹשׁ וּבְמַלְכוּת כּוֹרֶשׁ
פָּרְסִיָּא:

And this Daniel prospered in the kingdom of Darius and in the kingdom of Cyrus, the Persian.

In this verse there is also a connection made with the first half of the book through the use of Daniel's other name "Belteshazzar" (בִּלְטִישַׁאצַּר). This was given by the "chief of the eunuchs" (שַׂר הַפְּרִיסִים) in 1:7 along with other names for Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, though all four retain their Hebrew names through the rest of the scene. When Daniel is presented before Nebuchadnezzar by Arioch (אַרְיוֹךְ) the narrator introduces the response from Nebuchadnezzar with the formulaic quote introduction

³⁰⁴ BDB, 106, lists בִּין in this instance as a Qal, perfect, third person, masculine, singular. GKC, § 73, lists בִּין in this instance as a "shortened" Hiph'il, perfect, third person, masculine, singular. Meyer, *Hebräische Grammatik*, 269, gives a similar explanation to GKC stating, "Die Formengleichheit des Imperf. mit dem Hi. bewirkt mitunter ein sekundäres Perf. Hi., so bei בִּין „bemerken, einsehen“: הִבִּין, das möglicherweise in וּבִין „und er gab acht“ (Da. 10,1) in verkürzter Gestalt vorliegt."

and this explanatory comment in relation to Daniel's name in 2:26: "The king answering and saying **to Daniel, whose name** is Belteshazzar" (ענה מלכא ואמר) (לדניאל די שמה בלמשאצר). The collocation "to Daniel, whose name" (לדניאל די שמה) minus the prefixed "to" (ל) is found in the first person description of Daniel by Nebuchadnezzar in 4:5 "**Daniel whose name** is Belteshazzar" (דניאל די שמה) (בלמשאצר) and he is further directly addressed in 4:6 as "Belteshazzar, chief of the magicians" (בלמשאצר רב חרטמא). As is the case with each of these examples, 10:1 seeks to make this double name clear with a verbal clause that gives the main theme of the next chapters: "a word was revealed **to Daniel**" (דבר נגלה לדניאל), which is explained by the relative clause "**whose name** is called Belteshazzar" (אשר נקרא שמו) (בלמשאצר). This redundant explanation could be viewed as a clumsy compositional strategy, mimicking earlier portions of the book, but it seems more plausible that it speaks along with the chronological indicators at the head of each chapter of the independent nature that these scenes had at one point from one another.

The last half of 10:1 sets a series of clauses together to identify what follows: "And the word is truth and is a great war and he considered the word and there was understanding to him in the appearance" (ואמת הדבר וצבא גדול ובין אתהדבר ובנה) (לו במראה).

- The first clause "and the word is truth" (ואמת הדבר) confirms the quality of the content of chapters 10-12.
- The second clause "and is a great war" (וצבא גדול) gives the main theme of what follows.
- The third and fourth clauses "**and** he considered the word **and** there was understanding to him in the appearance" (ובין אתהדבר ובנה לו במראה) explain the purpose of what follows.

10:2, as has been the case with each scene since chapter 7, marks the return to the first person narration from Daniel. "In these days" (בימים ההם) at the beginning of 10:2 appears to be in reference to "in the third year of Cyrus, king of Persia, **a word** was revealed to Daniel" (בשנת שלוש לכורש מלך פרס דבר נגלה לדניאל) of 10:1. This "word" (דבר) leads Daniel to mourn for three weeks (שבעים ימים). This interpretation is supported by the statement to Daniel in 10:12:

¹² וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלַי אֱלֹהֵי־תִרְאָה דָּנִיֵּאל כִּי מִן־הַיּוֹם הָרִאשׁוֹן אֲשֶׁר
נָתַתְּ אֶת־לִבְךָ לְהִבִּין וּלְהַתְעַנּוֹת לִפְנֵי אֱלֹהֶיךָ נִשְׁמָעוּ דְּבָרֶיךָ
וָאֲנִי־בָאתִי בְּדִבְרֶיךָ:

And he said to me, "Do not be afraid, Daniel, because the first day which you gave your heart to understand and to humble yourself before your God, your words were heard and I have come in your words."

Daniel's "mourning" (מִתְאַבֵּל) in 10:2 is understood as "to humble yourself" (לְהַתְעַנּוֹת) in 10:12 and is connected with his activity where "he considered the word" (בֵּין אֶת־הַדָּבָר) in 10:1. The word (דָּבָר) revealed to Daniel in 10:1 is further described in the nominal clause through the statement that "the word is truth" (וְהַדָּבָר וְאֱמֶת); 10:1). It then becomes the word in the mouth of one "as the appearance of a human" (כְּמֵרְאָה אָדָם). This description appears in 10:21 right before the explanation begins in chapter 11:

²¹ אָבֵל אֲנִיד לָךְ אֶת־הַרְשׁוֹם בְּכַתָּב אֱמֶת וְאִין אַחֵר מִתְחַזֵּק
עִמִּי עַל־אֱלֹהַ כִּי אִם־מִיכָאֵל שְׂרָכָם:

Verily, I will report to you the one having been inscribed in writing of truth and there is not one holding strong with me upon these but Michael, your chief.

All of this creates an interesting comparison between chapters 9 and 10. Daniel's understanding (בִּינְתִי) of "the word of YHWH to Jeremiah" (דְּבַר־יְהוָה אֶל־) in chapter 9 leads him to this response in 9:3 "to seek prayer and supplication for favor in fasting and sackcloth and ashes" (לְבַקֵּשׁ תְּפִלָּה וְתַחֲנוּנִים בְּצוֹם וְשָׂק וְאַפֶּר), which leads to a response from "the man Gabriel" (וְהָאִישׁ גַּבְרִיאֵל; 9:21) that Daniel "perceive in the word and understand in the appearance" (בֵּין בְּדָבָר וְהִבִּין בְּמֵרְאָה); 9:23). In chapter 10 "a word was revealed to Daniel in the appearance" (דָּבָר נִגְלָה); 10:1), which leads Daniel to "mourning three weeks of days" (מִתְאַבֵּל שְׁלֹשָׁה; 10:2), to which one "as the appearance of a human" (כְּמֵרְאָה אָדָם; 10:18; cf. with אִנֵּשׁ of 7:13) comes in response to Daniel's desire "to understand" (לְהִבִּין; 10:12). In these cases this pattern is completed through explanation with 9:24-27 and chapters 11-12 respectively.

With regard to other verbal connections, Daniel is told that the word (דָּבָר) has gone out in 9:23 "because you are preciousness" (כִּי חֲמוּדוֹת אַתָּה). This expression is similarly used in 10:11 and 10:19 when Daniel is described as "a man of

preciousness” (אִישׁ-חֲמֹדוֹת). In a further reach 10:14 gives this explanation in relation to this “vision” (חֲזוֹן; cf. 7:1 and 8:1):

¹⁴ וּבֹאֲתִי לְהַבִּינְךָ אֶת אֲשֶׁר-יִקְרָה לְעַמֶּךָ בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים
פִּי-עוֹד חֲזוֹן לַיָּמִים:

And I have come to give you understanding with what will happen to your people in the end of the days because it is still a vision for the days.

It was in Daniel’s explanation to Nebuchadnezzar in 2:28 that a similar statement was made:

²⁸ בָּרַם אִתִּי אֱלֹהִים בְּשִׁמְיָאֵל גָּלַא רִזִּין וְהוֹרַע לְמַלְכָּא
נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר מַה דִּי לְהוּא בְּאַחֲרֵית יוֹמָיָא חֲלָמָא וְחֲזוֹן רֵאשֵׁי
עַל-מִשְׁכַּבְךָ דִּנְהָ הוּא:

But there is a God in the heavens, one revealing secrets and making known to the King, Nebuchadnezzar, what will be in the end of the days. This is it, the dream and the visions of your head upon your bed.

The Hebrew and Aramaic collocations “in the end of the days” (בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים; בְּאַחֲרֵית יוֹמָיָא) demonstrate a verbal connection between these two texts that both concern this particular time period.

According to Daniel 2, there were to be four kingdoms with Nebuchadnezzar’s as “the head of gold” (רֵאשֶׁה דִּי דְהַבָּא), which begins the sequence of these kingdoms as indicated by the first portion of 2:39 “and in your place will rise another kingdom to the earth from you” (מִנְךָ וּבְתַרְךָ תִּקּוּם מַלְכוּת אַחֲרֵי אַרְעָא).

By chapter 10 Daniel has lived through the reigns of “Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon” (1:1; 2:1; cf. 3:1), Nebuchadnezzar’s “son” Belshazzar (5:1 and 5:11; 7:1; 8:1), “Darius, the Mede” (6:1; cf. 6:1; cf. 6:1; cf. 6:1), and Cyrus, the king of Persia (9:1; cf. 1:21).

Two kingdoms were particularly identified in 8:20 as the “kings of Media and Persia” (מַלְכֵי מֶדִּי וּפָרְס) with a third king being identified in 8:21 as the “king of Greece” (מֶלֶךְ יוֹן).

In the chronological note, chapter 10 locates the scene “in the third year to Cyrus, King of Persia” (בְּשָׁנָה שְׁלֹשׁ לְכוֹרֶשׁ מֶלֶךְ פָּרְס). Further, 10:13 gives the reasoning for Daniel’s delayed response:

13 וַיֵּשֶׁר מַלְכוּת פָּרְס עִמָּד לְנִגְדֵי עֲשָׂרִים וְאַחַד יוֹם וַהֲנֵה
מִיכָאֵל אֶחָד הָעֲשָׂרִים הָרִאשֹׁנִים בָּא לְעֻזְרָנִי וְאֲנִי נֹתַרְתִּי שָׁם
אַצֵּל מַלְכֵי פָּרְס:

And the chief of the kingdom of Persia was standing in front of me twenty-one days and behold Michael one of the head chiefs came to help me and I was left there beside the kings of Persia.

The collocation that connects chapters 10 and 2, the identification of Daniel under the reigns of multiple kings and kingdoms, the identification of the order and correspondence of these various scenes with this order, puts Daniel on the dawn of “the end of the days” (בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים) where the “king of Greece” (מֶלֶךְ יוֹן) will rise. But just as expectations were delayed with the transition from seventy years to seventy weeks of years in chapter 9, so this expectation will be delayed. With regard to this connection, the curious chronological reference within the dialogue found in 11:1 gives concrete grounds for this relationship when viewed with the chronological scene marker of 9:1:

11:1 וְאֲנִי בִשְׁנַת אֶחָת לְדָרְיוֹשׁ הַמֶּדֶי עָמַדְתִּי
לְמַחְזִיק וּלְמַעֲזוֹת לוֹ:

And I, in the first year to Darius the Mede, I was standing to strengthen and for protection to him.

9:1 בִּשְׁנַת אֶחָת לְדָרְיוֹשׁ בֶּן־אַחַשְׁוֵרוֹשׁ מִזֶּרַע מֶדֶי
אֲשֶׁר הָמְלִיךְ עַל מַלְכוּת כַּשְׁדִּים:

In the first year to Darius, son of Ahasuerus, from the seed of the Medes, who was made king upon the kingdom of the Chaldeans.

In particular this delay is made transparent with the clear statement of 11:2:

2 וְעַתָּה אֵמֶת אֲנִיד לָךְ הִנֵּה־עוֹד שְׁלֹשָׁה מַלְכִּים עֹמְדִים
לְפָנֶיךָ וְהָרְבִיעִי יַעֲשֶׂיךָ עֲשֶׂר־גְּדוֹל מְכַל וּכְחֻזְקָתוֹ בְּעֶשְׂרֵי
יָעִיר הַכֹּל אֶת מַלְכוּת יוֹן:

And now I will proclaim the truth to you. Behold there are still three kings standing to Persia and the fourth will gain great riches from everyone and as his strength in his riches he will excite the whole kingdom of Greece.

Rather than being at the dawn of “the end of the days” there will be a further delay because “there are still three kings standing to Persia” (הִנֵּה־עוֹד שְׁלֹשָׁה מַלְכִּים עֹמְדִים) (לְפָנֶיךָ). It is only during the reign of a fourth Persian kingdom that the “kingdom of Greece” (מַלְכוּת יוֹן) will even enter the picture. Again, as with the seventy years turning into seventy weeks of years, the expectation of “the end of the days” is still delayed for at least four reigns.

As with the material from chapter 9:24-27, 11:2b-12:7 comes more in the form of an explanation as opposed to the symbolic visions of chapters 7 and 8. It is important to note that the explanation that follows gives only one more clue in relation to ethnicity when presumably a person who only has the designation “from the shoot of her roots” (מִנְצֵר שְׂרָשִׁיהָ), with the feminine pronominal suffix in relation to the “daughter of the king of the south” (בֵּת מֶלֶךְ-הַנֶּגֶב), will cause to bring in certain items to “Egypt” (מִצְרַיִם; 11:8). As a whole one must be content with titles of “a mighty king” (מֶלֶךְ גָּבוֹר; 11:3), “the king of the south” (מֶלֶךְ-הַנֶּגֶב; 11:5, 6, 9, 11, 14, 25, 40), and “the king of the north” (מֶלֶךְ הַצָּפוֹן; 11:6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 15, 40). The mighty king comes during the reign of the fourth king to Persia. Presumably this mighty king represents the “kingdom of Greece” (מַלְכוּת יוֹן). It is said in 11:4 about this kingdom that “as he stood, his kingdom was broken and it was divided to the four winds of the heavens” (וּכְעָמְדוֹ תִשָּׁבֵר מַלְכוּתוֹ וְתָחִץ לְאַרְבַּע רוּחוֹת הַשָּׁמַיִם). A strikingly similar description is found in the vision of the “he-goat of the she goats” (צִפְּרִי הָעִזִּים) in 8:8:

⁸ וּצִפְּרִי הָעִזִּים הַגָּדוֹל עָד־מְאֹד וּכְעָצְמוֹ נִשְׁבְּרָה תִקְרֹן
הַגָּדוֹלָה וְתַעֲלֶנָּה חֲזוֹת אַרְבַּע תַּחְתִּיהָ לְאַרְבַּע רוּחוֹת
הַשָּׁמַיִם:

And the he-goat of the she-goats did even greater things and as he was mighty the great horn was broken. And four conspicuous ones went up in its place to the four winds of the heavens.

In the interpretation of this portion of the vision in 8:22, this further statement is made:

²² וְהַנִּשְׁבָּרָה וְתַעֲמִדְנָה אַרְבַּע תַּחְתִּיהָ אַרְבַּע מַלְכוּתִּים מִגּוֹי
יַעֲמִדְנָה וְלֹא בִכְחוֹ:

And the one being broken and four will stand in its place, four kingdoms from a nation will stand and not in his strength.

A third layer of interpretation is now being added to what has already been said in chapter 8 about this particular kingdom. Though chapter 8 indicates there will be four kingdoms that come from this mighty king, chapter 11 focuses on only two of these kingdoms. Starting with chapter 8, verse 22b states “four kingdoms from a nation will stand and not in his strength” (אַרְבַּע מַלְכוּתִּים מִגּוֹי יַעֲמִדְנָה וְלֹא בִכְחוֹ) in relation to these kingdoms. 8:23a elaborates a little more “in the end of their kingdom as to complete the transgressions” (וּבְאַחֲרֵית מַלְכוּתָם כְּהֵתֵם הַפְּשָׁעִים). However, chapter 11 is concerned only with the king of the south and the king of the north. The verbal imagery of the struggle between the ram and the he-goat of the she-goats in chapter 8,

representing the struggle between the “kings of Media and Persia” (מַלְכֵי מֶדִּי ופָּרְסִי) and the “king of Greece” (מֶלֶךְ יוֹן; 8:20-21), now plays a prominent role in the struggle between the king of the south and the king of the north of chapter 11. 8:7 records that the he-goat of the she-goats “embitters himself” (וַיִּתְמַרְמֶר) against the ram, so also 11:11 records that the king of the south “embitters himself” against the king of the north (וַיִּתְמַרְמֶר). In 8:4 the ram is “thrusting” (מְנַגֵּחַ) in multiple directions, so also 11:40 states that the king of the south “will engage in thrusting” (וַיִּתְנַגֵּחַ) with the king of the north. In 8:6 the he-goat of the she-goats runs to the ram “in the rage of his strength” (בְּחֵמַת כֹּחַ), so also in 11:44 the king of the south will go out “in great rage” (בְּחֵמָא גְדֹלָה). The he-goat of the she-goats shattered (וַיִּשְׁבֵּר) the horn of the ram in 8:7, so also in 11:26 the companions of the king of the south will shatter him (וַיִּשְׁבְּרוּהוּ). 8:8 states that horn of the he-goat of the she-goats was shattered (נִשְׁבְּרָה) during a time of his strength, so also in 11:20 the king of the north will be shattered (וַיִּשְׁבֹּר). Each of these examples provide parallels between these two chapters, where the verbal imagery has been shifted from the vision of the ram (הָאֵיל) and the he-goat of the she-goats (הַשְּׂעִיר הַשָּׂעִיר), which was understood to be the “kings of Media and Persia” (מַלְכֵי מֶדִּי ופָּרְסִי; 8:20) and the “king of Greece” (מֶלֶךְ יוֹן; 8:21) respectively, to a vision that has two kings primarily in view, “the king of the south” (מֶלֶךְ-הַנֶּגֶב) and “the king of north” (מֶלֶךְ-הַצִּפוֹן), that are both pictured as being somehow derived from “the kingdom of Greece” (מַלְכוּת יוֹן; 11:2-4). However, even these two kings are not static referents but show a succession with use once of the phrase “he stood ... his place” (וַעֲמַד . . . כְּנֻ) (11:7) and twice “he stood upon his place” (וַעֲמַד עַל-כְּנֻ) (11:20, 21).³⁰⁵ 11:7 makes reference to the king of the south and 11:20-21 make double reference to the king of the north. Though the king of the north will prevail over the king of the south (11:40-43), he too will perish and “there is no one helping him” (וַאֲיֵן כָּל-הַנִּמְצָא כְּתוּב בְּסִפְרִי; 11:45).

With 12:1 Daniel finally gets an answer to his petition from chapter 9:

¹ וּבִעֲתָהּ הָיָא יַעֲמֹד מִיכָאֵל הַשָּׂר הַגָּדוֹל
הָעֹמֵד עַל-כְּנֻ עֲמֹד וְהָיְתָה עֵת צָרָה אֲשֶׁר לֹא-נִהְיְתָה
מִהָיוֹת גּוֹי עַד הָעֵת הַהִיא וּבִעֲתָהּ הָיָא יִמְלֹט עֲמֹד
כָּל-הַנִּמְצָא כְּתוּב בְּסִפְרִי:

³⁰⁵ BDB, 487, notes in relation to עַל-כְּנֻ “i.e. in his stead, as his successor, cf. Germ. *an seiner Stelle*.”

And in this time, Michael, the great chief, the one standing upon the sons of your people, will stand and there will be a time of distress which has not been done from to exist a nation until this time and in this time your people will escape, everyone being found written in the writing.

Comfort is given to Daniel in that “your people will escape, everyone being found written in the writing” (יִמְלֹט עַמּוֹךְ כָּל־הַנִּמְצָא כָּתוּב בַּסֵּפֶר) 7:10 describes a time when “writings were opened” (סִפְרֵינָּה פְּתִיחוּ). In chapter 7 this statement is followed by the destruction of the horn which was speaking “great words” (מִן־קֶל מְלִיא רַב־רִבְתָּא הִי) (7:11) and in chapter 12 was preceded by the destruction of the one who “will speak wonderful things” (יִדְבֵּר נִפְלְאוֹת) (11:36). In chapter 7 when the “writings were opened” (סִפְרֵינָּה פְּתִיחוּ) judgment follows. In chapter 12 “everyone being found written in the writing” (כָּל־הַנִּמְצָא כָּתוּב בַּסֵּפֶר) represents those of Daniel’s people who “will be delivered” (יִמְלֹט).³⁰⁶ Though the judgment of chapter 7 gives way to the eternal kingdom of the one “like a son of man” (כְּבֶר אֱנוֹשׁ) (7:13-14) through the kingdom being given “to a people, the holy ones of the Most High” (לְעָם קְדִישִׁי) (7:27), chapter 12 transforms this victory into a picture of resurrecting the dead either to eternal life (לְחַיֵּי עוֹלָם) or in verse 2 “to reproach, to abhorrence of eternity” (עוֹלָם לַחֲרָפוֹת לְדָרְאוֹן). With this hope, the pattern again returns to that of chapter 8 and Daniel (similar to 8:26) is given this command in 12:4:

וְאַתָּה דָּנִיֵּאל סֵתֵם הַדְּבָרִים וַחֲתֵם הַסֵּפֶר עַד־עֵת קֵץ
יִשְׁטָטוּ רַבִּים וְתִרְבֶּה הַדָּעַת:

And you, Daniel, shut up the words and seal up the writing until the time of the end, many will go eagerly and knowledge will grow great.

Daniel was to seal the vision in 8:26 “because it is for many day” (כִּי לְיָמִים רַבִּים) and now Daniel is to seal “the writing until the time of the end” (הַסֵּפֶר עַד־עֵת קֵץ). Like 9:2, where Daniel was discerning “in the writings” (בַּסִּפְרִים) in relation to Jerusalem, so now this vision has become “the writing” (הַסֵּפֶר), that can be read and understand “until the time of the end” (עַד־עֵת קֵץ). Even with the commands of 12:4, Daniel overhears a further description (וְאַשְׁמַע 12:7; cf. 8:13) giving particular information in relation to the question of 12:6 “until when is the end of the wonderful things” (עַד־מָתַי קֵץ הַנִּפְלְאוֹת) in 12:7:

³⁰⁶ BDB, 572, notes this late passive use of יִמְלֹט.

⁷ וַאֲשַׁמְעֵ אֶת־הָאִישׁ לְבוּשׁ הַבְּדִים אֲשֶׁר מִמַּעַל לְמִימֵי הַיָּאֵר וְיִרְם יָמִינוֹ וּשְׂמָאלוֹ אֶל־הַשָּׁמַיִם וַיִּשָּׁבַע בְּחֵי הָעוֹלָם כִּי לְמוֹעֵד מוֹעֲדִים וְחִצִּי וּכְכֹלֹת נַפְיָן יִדְעִם־קֹדֶשׁ תִּכְלֶינָה כָּל־אֵלֶּה:

And I heard the man being clothed with the white linen who was above the waters of the river and he lifted his right hand and his left hand to the heavens and he swore in the one living of the eternity that to an appointed time, appointed times and a half and as to come to an end dashing to pieces the hand of a people of holiness, all these things will come to an end.

The answer “to an appointed time, appointed times and a half” (לְמוֹעֵד מוֹעֲדִים וְחִצִּי) gives the similar period of time as found in 7:25:

^{7:25} וּמִלִּין לְצַד (עֲלִיא) נְעֻלָּה וְלִקְדִישֵׁי עֲלִיוֹנִין יִבְלֹא וְיִסְבֵּר לְהַשְׁנִיָּה זְמַנּוֹן וְדָת וְיִתְּיָהֲבֹן בִּידָה עַד־עֶדֶן וְעַד־נֶגֶן וּפְלַג עֶדֶן:

And he will speak words against [to the side off] the Most High and he will wear out the holy ones of the Most High and he will intend to change times and law and they will be given into his hand until a time and times and half a time.

The assumed sum in both cases is three and a half. Though the Araramaic text of Daniel 7 has a slightly different syntax, “until a time and times and half a time” (עַד־עֶדֶן וְעַד־נֶגֶן וּפְלַג עֶדֶן), than the Hebrew text of chapter 12, “to an appointed time, appointed times and a half” (לְמוֹעֵד מוֹעֲדִים וְחִצִּי), the assumed numerical value remains the same. In this same regard the text of 9:27 makes reference to the same period of time:

²⁷ וְהִנְבִּיר בְּרִית לְרַבִּים שָׁבוּעַ אַחֵר וְחִצִּי הַשָּׁבוּעַ יִשְׁבִּית וְזָבַח וּמִנְחָה וְעַל כָּנָף שְׂקוּצִים מִשְׁמֵם וְעַד־כָּלָה וְנִחְרָצָה תֵּתֵן עַל־שָׁמַם:

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.

Though the terminology is different, “half a week” (וְחִצִּי הַשָּׁבוּעַ), the assumed time period has the same value as three and a half. This similarity is of course dependent on whether “times” (עֲדָנִין) from 7:25 and “appointed times” (מוֹעֲדִים) from 12:7 are to

be understood in the definite sense of “two times.” By further extension, the time periods described in two further passages describe a similar period of time. In similar fashion to chapter 12, 8:14 has Daniel overhearing a conversation in which particular times are being discussed (cf. 12:7):

14 וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלַי עַד עֶרֶב בֶּקֶר אֲלָפִים וּשְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת וְנִצְדָּק קֹדֶשׁ:

And he said to me, “Until evening morning two-thousand and three-hundred and the holiness is justified.”

This particular time designation of “evening morning two-thousand and three-hundred” (עֶרֶב בֶּקֶר אֲלָפִים וּשְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת) equals about three and a half years or 1,150 days if an individual count is to be given to each evening and morning.³⁰⁷ 12:11-12 gives two further times:

11 וּמֵעַתָּה הוֹסֵר הַתָּמִיד וְלִתֵּת שְׁקוּץ שָׁמַיִם יָמִים אֶלֶף מֵאָתָּים וְחֲשָׁעִים: 12 אֲשֶׁרִי הַמַּחֲכָה וַיָּגִיעַ לְיָמִים אֶלֶף שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת שְׁלֹשִׁים וַחֲמִשָּׁה:

11 And from the time of the continual offering being turned aside and to give the abomination causing horror, one-thousand two-hundred and ninety days. 12 Blessed is the one waiting for and he will arrive to one-thousand three-hundred thirty and five days.

Each verse gives a different amount. 12:11 has “one-thousand two-hundred and ninety days” (יָמִים אֶלֶף מֵאָתָּים וְחֲשָׁעִים; 1,290 days) and 12:12 has “one-thousand three-hundred thirty and five days” (יָמִים אֶלֶף שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת שְׁלֹשִׁים וַחֲמִשָּׁה; 1,335 days). In both cases the time period approximates a three-and-a-half-year period.³⁰⁸ On concrete verbal grounds, chapters 7, 8, 9 and now 10-12 (with 12 being the closing section of 10-11) are now being drawn together through these time periods with no real desire or effort to completely harmonize each passage with one another.³⁰⁹ The verbal

³⁰⁷ Montgomery, *The Book of Daniel*, 342-343.

³⁰⁸ Montgomery, *The Book of Daniel*, 477.

³⁰⁹ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 621, views this differently, “The numbers in ch. 12 represent attempts by a later hand to make more precise the nature of the three-and-a-half year period which played such a central role within the apocalyptic scheme of Daniel (7.25; 9.27; 12.7).” However, he goes on to say, “In the final shape of the book, the numbers were allowed to stand uninterpreted without a clear indication of their significance.” John J. Collins, *Daniel* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 400, comments, “Both numbers differ from the 1,150 days mentioned in 8:14. The earlier figure, however, is specified as the time until the sanctuary is set right, which is not necessarily identical with the end as envisaged in chap. 12.” However, because he views these visions as being harmonized with one another, he goes on to say, “When one predicted number of days had elapsed, a glossator revised the prediction with a higher number. It is a well-known fact that groups who make exact predictions do not just give up when the prediction fails to be fulfilled. Instead they find ways to explain the delay. One such way was to make a revised (presumably more precise) calculation. The recalculation, however, had to be elicited by something, most notably by the

connection is further strengthened between chapters 9 and 12 through this time period being marked by a “detestable thing causing horror” (שְׁקוּצִים מְשֻׁמִּים) in 9:27 and by a “detestable thing causing horror” (שְׁקוּץ שֹׁמֵם) in 12:11 (cf. הַשְׁקוּץ מְשֻׁמֵּם in 11:31). But to what end are these passages being drawn together in chapters 10-12? The closing verse of this final section and the closing verse of the book anticipate this question in the mind of Daniel and the reader:

וְאַתָּה לֵךְ לְגֵן וְתָנוּחַ וְתַעֲמֹד לְגֵן הַיָּמִין:¹³
And you, go to the end and you will rest and you will stand for your lot to the end of days.

All of the loose ends will not be tied up. The discrepancies between these chapters will stand, including the numerical differences.

4.6 Summary of Chapters 7-12

What is obvious in relation to chapters 7-12 is that the actual visions of Daniel are the focal point of interpretation. Daniel 7 with its concrete verbal connections with chapter 2 serves as a key pivot point for the book as a whole. However, each vision narrative in 7, 8, 9, and 10-12, with its opening diachronic marker, still represents a separate text within this larger text. The visions themselves are each interpreted at least once within each scene, but through the ordering of these texts together a further layer of interpretation is added with each scene.

The vision of chapter 2 with the statue of four components and its interpretation of four kingdoms of which Nebuchadnezzar was the first is now read in context with the vision of chapter 7, which has four beasts and is interpreted as also four kingdoms with the fourth being particularly violent and giving way to further kingdoms. Though both chapters have interpretations of their own visions, a further interpretation of the vision of chapter 2 is now created through the addition of the vision and interpretation in chapter 7, where the role of the fourth kingdom is

uneventful passage of the first predicted date,”(401). Walvoord, *Daniel: The Key to Prophetic Revelation*, 295-296, states in relation to these differing numbers, “Although Daniel does not explain these varying durations, it is obvious that the second coming of Christ and the establishment of His millennial kingdom requires time. The 1,260 day period or precisely forty-two months of thirty days each, can be regarded as culminating with the second advent itself. This is followed by several divine judgments such as the judgment of the nations (Mt 25:31-46), and the regathering and judgment of Israel (Eze 20:34-38). These great judgments beginning with the living on earth and purging out of the unbelievers who have worshiped the beast, although handled quickly, will require time. By the 1,335 days, or seventy-five days after the second advent, these great judgments will have been accomplished and the millennial kingdom formally launched. Those who attain to this period are obviously those who have been judged worthy to enter the kingdom. Hence, they are called ‘blessed.’”

expanded. In one way this expansion is exegetical. The material of chapter 7 further explains chapter 2. However, if the integrity of each scene remains intact, the exegetical expansion comes through the ordering of this material together and not through mechanical rewriting of portions within each scene to cause agreement.

Surface verbal agreement between chapters has been shown again and again to shift in meaning between chapters; although sharing verbal similarity they do not refer to the same thing. This should not be understood as an argument for complete discontinuity, for the visions certainly have many aspects in common, especially their eschatological perspectives. Rather, each vision—when viewed in context with one another—gives a picture that would not have been possible with any single scene by itself. Chapter 2 has a general frame work that identifies Nebuchadnezzar as the beginning historical referent for the four kingdoms. Chapter 7 follows the four kingdoms, massively expanding the fourth kingdom's description. Chapter 8 expands on the transition between the third and fourth kingdom and historically locates the further kingdoms as Media, Persia and Greece. Chapter 9 expands the time period from the third to the fourth kingdom. Chapters 10-12 focus in great detail on the era of the fourth kingdom. However, this scheme is possible only as these individual scenes come together and build this larger picture. The scene from chapter 2 used to demonstrate how Daniel distinguished himself in the court of Nebuchadnezzar now becomes part of a larger eschatological matrix. Even the seemingly insignificant diachronic details with nationalities and years become statements of movement toward the fulfillment of this larger eschatological picture.

5. Canonical Intertextuality and the Book of Daniel in the Old Testament

5.1 Introduction

Based on work done in the whole of the Masoretic Text of Daniel, my application of canonical intertextuality argues that the discreet narrative units (chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10-12) exegete one another through their ordering and overall placement together. This of course infers that these texts had some sort of individual life, whether written or oral, but were collected or written in this particular arrangement.³¹⁰ Though the book moves in a particular exegetical direction, the exegetical work does not appear to be harmonistic in nature as many difficulties are simply left in the text. The intertextuality is found through the shift as texts are interpreted within each discreet unit, as these units are ordered in relation to one another, and as they retain obvious shifts in relation to key terms and expectations, giving an overall picture that would have not been possible if these texts were simply left by themselves.

However, the book of Daniel through this intentional ordering has become a larger discreet text that has been included as a text among other texts in the Hebrew Bible. It has been placed alongside of other textual units not only in the sense of a particular group or body of literature, but also in particular *orders* as is the case with the Hebrew Bible or Old Testament; these texts exegete one another not only through their overall placement together, but also in their actual ordering as a part of this larger textual unit.³¹¹ Again there is a dialogue that reflects points of continuity, where there are similar terms, phrases, and values, and also points of discontinuity where

³¹⁰ Some sort of collective process in relation to the composition of Daniel is of course an ancient position. *Baba Batra* 15a, states “the men of the great assembly wrote Ezekiel and the Twelve, Daniel and the scroll of Esther” (אנשי כנסת הגדולה כתבו יחזקאל ושנים עשר דניאל ומגילת אסתר), for the Hebrew text see <http://www.mechon-mamre.org/b/1/14301.htm> (accessed December 24, 2008).

³¹¹ James Alfred Loader, “Das Alte Testament—ein Geschichtsbuch?,” in *Das Alte Testament und die Kunst*, eds. John Barton, J. Cheryl Exum and Manfred Oeming (Münster: LIT Verlag, 2005), 31-50, makes this observation in particular in relation to the Greek tradition, stating, “In der griechischen Tradition, die in der Septuaginta dominant wurde, wird eine völlig andere Anordnung der Bücher und damit auch eine völlig andere theologische Absicht angetroffen. Dem Pentateuch folgen nämlich die historischen, die auch noch Klagelieder und Daniel sowie einige nicht in die hebräische Bibel aufgenommenen Bücher einschließen. Das Schema in dieser Tradition ist also nicht: gesetzliche Grundlage – deren historisch-prophetische Interpretation – sonstige Lieder, Weisheit und Erzählungen, sondern:

Pentateuch: Uroffenbarung

Historische Bücher: Vergangenheit

Poetische Bücher: das Religiöse Leben in der Gegenwart

Prophetische Bücher: Erwartungen für die Zukunft Gottes”(46-47).

these terms, phrases, and values have shifted in meaning. Again, what may be of secondary importance in one context becomes of primary importance in another context, where a term or phrase in one context is used in a different way in another context, all of which reflects not static textual units but a dialogue between smaller texts and a larger context.

5.2 Dan 6 and Dan 9 (Ezra 7; Deut; Exod)

The book of Daniel offers a few examples where its text is clearly being connected with other texts. One such example is found in Daniel 6:6-10:

⁶ אָדִין גְּבֵרִיא אֱלֹד־אֶמְרִין דִּי לֹא נִתְשַׁכַּח לְדִנְיָאֵל דְּנָה
כָּל־עֲלָא לְהֵן הַשְׁכַּחְנָה עֲלוּהִי בְּדַת אֱלֹהֵהּ: ס' אָדִין סָרְכִיָּא
וְאַחַשְׁדֶּרְפִּנְיָ אֶלֶן הִרְגִּשׁוּ עַל־מִלְכָּא וְכֵן אֶמְרִין לֵה דְרִיּוֹשׁ
מִלְכָּא לְעֵלְמִין חַיִּי:
⁸ אֲתִיעֲשׂוּ כָּל סָרְכֵי מַלְכוּתָא סִנְיָא וְאַחַשְׁדֶּרְפִּנְיָ הַדְּבָרִיא
וּפְחֻתָא לְקִיּוּמָה קִיּוּם מִלְכָּא וּלְחַקְפָּה אִסְרֵי דִּי כָּל־דִּי־יִבְעָה
בְּעוּ מִן־כָּל־אַלֹּה וְאִנְשׁ עַד־יוֹמִין תִּלְתִּין לְהֵן מִנְּךָ מִלְכָּא
יִתְרַמָּא לְגַב אֲרִיּוֹתָא:
⁹ כְּעֵן מִלְכָּא תְּקִים אִסְרָא וְתִרְשֵׁם כְּתָבָא דִּי לֹא לְהַשְׁנִיָּה
כְּדַת־מְדֵי וּפְרִס דִּי־לֹא תַעֲבָא:
¹⁰ כָּל־קַבְלֵי דְּנָה מִלְכָּא דְרִיּוֹשׁ רִשָּׁם כְּתָבָא וְאַסְרָא:

6 Then these men were saying that “we have not found to this Daniel any matter, therefore, let us find upon him in the Law of his God.” 7 Then the overseers and the satraps came thronging upon the king and so saying to him, “Darius, the king, live!” 8 (The overseers of the kingdom, the prefects and the satraps, the ministers, and the governors, took counsel together to establish a statute of the king and to make strong an interdict that all who will seek a request from any god and man until thirty days except from the king, he will be thrown into the pit of the lions.) 9 “Now the king, you will establish an interdict and you will inscribe the writing that is not to be changed as the decree of the Medes and Persians which will not pass away.” 10 All on account of this, the king, Darius, inscribed the writing and the interdict.

In particular this group of leaders is seeking something “in the Law of his [Daniel’s] God” (בְּדַת אֱלֹהֵהּ). What they find “in the Law of his God” leads them to the conclusion that this statement from 6:8 will be a fatal stumbling block for Daniel:

דִּי כָּל־דִּי־יִבְעָה בְּעוּ מִן־כָּל־אַלֹּה וְאִנְשׁ עַד־יוֹמִין תִּלְתִּין
לְהֵן מִנְּךָ מִלְכָּא יִתְרַמָּא לְגַב אֲרִיּוֹתָא:

that all who will seek a request from any God and man until thirty days except from the king, he will be thrown into the pit of the lions.

The focus of the text is to bring Daniel in conflict with the Law of his God, which the narrative assumes to be a definable text that can be searched and exploited by these officials.

In Aramaic the book of Ezra becomes a key point of dialogue in relation to this concept and terminology when Ezra is addressed in Aramaic in 7:12 “to Ezra, the priest, scribe of the Law of the God of the heavens” (לְעֶזְרָא כְהֵנָא סֹפֵר דְּתָא דִּי־אַלְהָ) (שְׂמִיָּא) and referred to in the same way in 7:21 as “Ezra, the priest, scribe of the Law of the God of the heavens” (עֶזְרָא כְהֵנָה סֹפֵר דְּתָא דִּי־אַלְהָ שְׂמִיָּא). Further, we see this in 7:14 when Ezra is ordered to return to Judah and Jerusalem and bring things into accordance with what is “in the Law of your God which is in your hand” (בְּרֵת אֱלֹהֶךָ) (דִּי בִיךָ) and in 7:26 where consequences are being spelled out in relation to what will happen if “the Law of your God” (דְּתָא דִּי־אַלְהָ) is not heeded. The texts use this phrase in a similar way in Daniel and Ezra, which speak of what is “in the Law of his God” (בְּרֵת אֱלֹהֵהּ) and again of “the Law of God” (דְּתָא דִּי־אַלְהָ). It is a definable written text that can be searched and used to ascertain what God desires. However, what is used in an attempt to condemn Daniel to death through the decree of the king in Daniel becomes the blueprint for rebuilding Judah and Jerusalem from the decree of the king in Ezra.

The Hebrew Text in Daniel 9 also creates another point of dialogue through direct speech in Daniel’s prayer. As Daniel is praying, confessing, and seeking supplication for favor from YHWH, he makes this statement in 9:11:

11 וְכָל־יִשְׂרָאֵל עָבְרוּ אֶת־תּוֹרַתְךָ וְסֹר לְבַלְתִּי שְׁמוֹעַ בְּקוֹלְךָ
וַתִּתֵּן עָלֵינוּ הָאָלָה וְהַשְׁבַּעַתָּ אֲשֶׁר כְּתוּבָה בְּתוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה
עַבְדְּהָאֱלֹהִים כִּי חָטְאוּנוּ לָךְ:

And all of Israel has passed over your Law and turned aside so as not to listen in your voice and you gave upon us the oath and the curse which is written in the Law of Moses, the servant of God, because we have sinned to him.

Similarly, 9:13 states:

13 כַּאֲשֶׁר כְּתוּב בְּתוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה אֶת כָּל־הָרָעָה הַזֹּאת בָּאָה
עָלֵינוּ וְלֹא־חָלִינוּ אֶת־פָּנֶיךָ יְיָהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ לָשׁוּב מֵעֲוֹנוֹנוּ
וְלִהְיוֹת שָׂפִיל בְּאִמְתְּךָ:

Just as is written in the Law of Moses, with all this disaster going in upon us and we have not appeased before YHWH our God, to return from our iniquity and to give attention in your truth.

In particular “your Law” (תּוֹרַתְךָ) is connected with God’s covenant name, “YHWH” (יהוה; 9:10), which is used only in chapter 9 within the book of Daniel. Further, this Law is identified with clarity as that “which is written in the Law of Moses, the servant of God” (אֲשֶׁר כְּתוּבָהּ בְּתוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה עַבְד־הָאֱלֹהִים). This written document is distinct from but somehow connected to what is described in the plural (בְּתוֹרָתָיו) in 9:10:

¹⁰ וְלֹא שָׁמַעְנוּ בְּקוֹל יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ לִלְכֹּת בְּתוֹרָתָיו אֲשֶׁר
נָתַן לְפָנֵינוּ בְּיַד עֲבָדָיו הַנְּבִיאִים:

*And we did not listen in the voice of YHWH our God, to go **in his instructions** which he gave before us in the hand of his servants, the prophets.*

Though this could be thought of as reflecting some sort of oral tradition, 9:2 has already given to a certain extent a particular context even for this further category, which is “in his instructions which he gave before us in the hand of his servants, the prophets” (בְּתוֹרָתָיו אֲשֶׁר נָתַן לְפָנֵינוּ בְּיַד עֲבָדָיו הַנְּבִיאִים):

² בְּשָׁנָה אֶחָת לְמַלְכוֹ אֲנִי הִנֵּי־אֵל בִּינְתִי בַּסְּפָרִים מִסְפַּר
הַשָּׁנִים אֲשֶׁר הָיָה דְּבַר־יְהוָה אֶל־יִרְמְיָה הַנְּבִיא לְמַלְאוֹת
לְחָרְבוֹת יְרוּשָׁלַם שִׁבְעִים שָׁנָה:

In the first year he was king, I, Daniel, I understood in the writings the number of years which the word of YHWH was to Jeremiah the Prophet to fulfill the ruins of Jerusalem, seventy years.

Daniel perceived “in the writings” (בַּסְּפָרִים) which included “the word of YHWH to Jeremiah the prophet” (דְּבַר־יְהוָה אֶל־יִרְמְיָה הַנְּבִיא) about what would befall Jerusalem. In chapter 9 the Law (תּוֹרַתְךָ) and the instructions (בְּתוֹרָתָיו) explain why “the oath and the curse” (הָאֲלָהָה וְהַשְׁבָּעָה) and “all this disaster” (כָּל־הָרָעָה הַזֹּאת) has come on them, namely because they did not listen (וְלֹא שָׁמַעְנוּ). This is all is in contrast to chapter 6, where living “in the Law of his God” (בְּדַת אֱלֹהָהּ) is hoped to bring about Daniel’s death in a pit of lions.

What is clear through these references is that Daniel 6, Ezra 7, and Daniel 9 are all making reference to other texts distinct from themselves and that the contents of these texts are playing a role in each of these narrative scenes.³¹² In Daniel 6 and

³¹² Frank Crüsemann, *Kanon und Sozialgeschichte: Beiträge zum Alten Testament* (Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2003), 241, comments to a certain extent on the significance of these passages when he notes speaking of Ezra, Chronicles and Daniel, in relation to the canonization of the Writings, “Esra berichtet Entscheidendes über die Kanonisierung der Tora; die Chronik schreibt die

Ezra 7, a text is being referenced in Aramaic that has a title of sorts, “in the Law of his God” (בְּדִת אֱלֹהֵהּ) and “in the Law of your God” (דִּתְאָ דִּי־אַלְהֵךְ). The equivalent Hebrew phrase is used in Daniel 9, again in the singular, except this time a clear connection is being made between “your law” (תּוֹרַתְךָ) with the pronominal suffix referencing “YHWH” (יהוה) and “which is written in the Law of Moses, the servant of God” (אֲשֶׁר כְּתוּבָהּ בְּתוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה עֶבְד־הָאֱלֹהִים). The plural use of “in his instructions” (בְּתוֹרָתוֹ) speaks of another group of writings that includes “the word of YHWH to Jeremiah the prophet” (דְּבַר־יְהוָה אֶל־יִרְמְיָה הַנָּבִיא) and other writings (בְּסִפְרִים) that speak “in his instructions which he gave before us in the hand of his servants, the prophets” (בְּתוֹרָתוֹ אֲשֶׁר נָתַן לְפָנֵינוּ בְּיַד עֲבָדָיו הַנְּבִיאִים).

With this larger picture, Daniel 6 references the first of these two texts/collections. The officials are looking “in the Law of his God” (בְּדִת אֱלֹהֵהּ), that is “in the Law of Moses, the servant of God” (בְּתוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה עֶבְד־הָאֱלֹהִים). From a purely textual standpoint, this is at least in reference to major portions of the book of Deuteronomy as stated in Deuteronomy 31:9:

⁹ וַיִּכְתֹּב מֹשֶׁה אֶת־הַתּוֹרָה הַזֹּאת וַיַּתְּנָהּ אֶל־הַכֹּהֲנִים בְּנֵי לֵוִי
הַנֹּשְׂאִים אֶת־אֲרוֹן בְּרִית יְהוָה וְאֶל־כָּל־זִקְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל:
And Moses wrote this Law and he gave it to the priests, the sons of Levi, the ones carrying the ark of the covenant of YHWH and to all the elders of Israel.

Again from a textual standpoint, at least this text is included with another text that was in the “ark of the covenant of YHWH” (אֲרוֹן בְּרִית יְהוָה). Exodus 20-23 records a series of “the words” (הַדְּבָרִים; 20:1) and “the commandments” (הַמִּשְׁפָּטִים; 21:1) given by God to Moses for the people of Israel. Exodus 24:4 then states: “And Moses wrote all these words of YHWH” (וַיִּכְתֹּב מֹשֶׁה אֶת כָּל־דְּבָרֵי יְהוָה) and further this text is called “the writing of the covenant” (סֵפֶר הַבְּרִית) in 24:7. In Exodus 25, instructions are given for building an “ark” (אֲרוֹן). 25:16 makes clear what the purpose of this ark is:

¹⁶ וְנָתַתָּ אֶל־הָאֲרוֹן אֶת הָעֵדוּת אֲשֶׁר אֶתֶּן אֵלֶיךָ
And you give to the ark the testimony which I will give to you.

However, both of these texts indicate a particular *Sitz im Leben*, with the Deuteronomy text being given to a people preparing to enter the Promised Land and

deuteronomistischen Königsbücher neu und um; Daniel liest im Jeremiabuch und empfängt visionär die entscheide Schriftdeutung (Kap. 9).”

the Exodus text being given to a people having just been rescued from bondage in Egypt. The Exodus text establishes the covenant with the initial generation (24:1-8) and the Deuteronomy text reestablishes the covenant with a new generation (1:1-5, 32; 2:1). This last observation becomes of particular importance in relation to canonical intertextuality as it is clear that these texts have now been turned into a text, that includes not only these texts, but the text of Genesis through Deuteronomy, regardless of which canon is used.

In returning to Daniel 6, it appears that within this Law there is something in particular that the officials could use for their purpose that they might find something “upon him in the Law of his God” (עֲלֹהֵי בְרַת אֱלֹהֵיהֶם). In particular the texts from Deuteronomy 5:6-10 and Exodus 20:2-6 seem to correspond to the officials’ plan in Daniel 6:8:

הִי כָל־דֹּרִיבֶּהָ בָּעוֹ מִן־כָּל־אֱלֹהִים וְאִנֹּשׁ עַד־יִמּוֹן תְּלָתִין
לְהֵן מִנֶּה מִלֶּפָא יִתְרָמָא לְגַב אֲרִיֹתָא:

that all who will seek a request from any God and man until thirty days except from the king, he will be thrown into the pit of the lions.

Deuteronomy 5:6-10 states:

⁶ אֲנִכִּי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֲשֶׁר הוֹצֵאתִיךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם מִבֵּית
עַבְדִּים: ⁷ לֹא יִהְיֶה־לְךָ אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים עַל־פָּנַי:
⁸ לֹא־תַעֲשֶׂה־לְךָ פֶסֶל כָּל־תְּמוּנָה אֲשֶׁר בַּשָּׁמַיִם מִמַּעַל
וְאֲשֶׁר בָּאָרֶץ מִתַּחַת וְאֲשֶׁר בַּמַּיִם מִתַּחַת לָאָרֶץ:
⁹ לֹא־תִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לָהֶם וְלֹא תַעֲבֹדֵם כִּי אֲנִכִּי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֵל
קָנָא פֶקֶד עוֹן אֲבוֹת עַל־בָּנִים וְעַל־שְׂלִשִׁים וְעַל־רִבְעִים
לְשָׁנָאִי:
¹⁰ וַעֲשֵׂה חֶסֶד לְאֵלֶפִים לְאַהֲבִי וּלְשֹׂמְרֵי (מִצְוֹתָי) [מִצְוֹתַי]:

6 I am YHWH your God who I caused you to go out from the land of Egypt from the house of slaves. 7 There will not be to you other gods before me. 8 You will not make for you an image of any likeness which is in the heavens from above and which is on the earth below and which is in the waters below the earth. 9 You will not prostrate yourselves to them and you will not serve them because I am YHWH your God, a jealous God, visiting iniquity of the fathers upon the sons and upon the third and the fourth [generations] to the ones hating me 10 and making kindness to thousands, to the ones loving me and to ones keeping his³¹³ commandments.

³¹³ The interplay between the Ketiv/Qere reading is interesting at this point where in this restatement of the Exodus passage the Ketiv (מִצְוֹתָי) narrates this statement through the third person singular pronominal suffix and the qere (מִצְוֹתִי) makes the reading parallel to the Exodus passage through the first person common singular pronominal suffix.

Similarly, Exodus 20:2-6 states:

אֲנִכִּי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֲשֶׁר הוֹצֵאתִיךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם מִבֵּית
 עֲבָדִים: ³ לֹא יִהְיֶה לְךָ אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים עַל-פָּנָי:
⁴ לֹא תַעֲשֶׂה לְךָ פֶסֶל וְכָל-תְּמוּנָה אֲשֶׁר בַּשָּׁמַיִם וּבָאָרֶץ
 וְאֲשֶׁר בַּמַּיִם וְאֲשֶׁר בָּאָרֶץ מִתַּחַת וְאֲשֶׁר בַּמַּיִם
⁵ לֹא-תִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לָהֶם וְלֹא תַעֲבָדֵם כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ
 אֵל קָנָא פֶקֶד עֵינָי אֶבֶת עַל-בָּנָיִם עַל-שָׁלֹשִׁים וְעַל-רִבְעִים
 לְשָׁנָיִם:
⁶ וַעֲשֵׂה חֶסֶד לְאֵלֶיךָ וְלִשְׁמֵרֵי מִצְוֹתַי:

2 I am YHWH your God who I caused you to go out from the land of Egypt from the house of slaves. 3 There will not be to you other gods before me. 4 You will not make for you an image of any likeness which is in the heavens from above and which is on the earth below and which is in the waters below the earth. 5 You will not prostrate yourself to them and you will not serve them because I am YHWH your God, a jealous God, visiting iniquity of the fathers upon the sons and upon the third and the fourth [generations] to the ones hating me 6 and making kindness to thousands, to the ones loving me and to ones keeping my commandments.

Of course these are parallel passages, interestingly taken from both of the concrete passages in relation to what was “written in the Law of Moses, the servant of God” (אֲשֶׁר כָּתוּבָה בְּחֻרְתִּי מֹשֶׁה עֲבָדֵי-אֱלֹהִים). Though these are parallel passages, it must be emphasized that both arise from and are applied to different situations within the Law.³¹⁴ Again, the Exodus text establishes the covenant with the initial generation coming out of Egypt and the Deuteronomy text reestablishes the covenant with a new generation.³¹⁵ These texts provide a perfect opportunity to find something “upon him in the Law of his God” (עָלָיו בְּדֵת אֱלֹהֵה), where Daniel would have to make his request not to God but to the king. This would put the king in the idolatrous place of worship, breaking the foundational command “you will not prostrate yourself to them” (לֹא-תִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לָהֶם). To make this connection clear, Daniel goes home in Daniel 6:11 in response to the interdict and is found “blessing upon his knees and praying and praising before his God” (בָּרַךְ עַל-בְּרָכוּתִי וּמְצִלָּא וּמוֹרָא קֳדָם אֱלֹהֵה)! Further as Daniel is rescued from the pit of lions, Daniel makes this statement in 6:23:

³¹⁴ Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*, 215, states in this regard, “Rather chs. 5-11 present an extended homiletical address which again reviews elements of Israel’s past history and each time focuses on an appeal for new commitment to the covenant.”

³¹⁵ Timo Veijola, *Das 5. Buch Mose: Deuteronomium Kapitel 1,1-16,17* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 128, describes this relationship similarly, “Es handelt sich bei dem Bericht des Dtn über die Mitteilung des Dekalogs um eine *rekapitulierende* Moserede, die ihrer erzählerischen Logik nach die frühere Sinaioffenbarung (Ex 19*) in ihren Grundzügen voraussetzt und literarisch auf ihren Schultern steht.”

²³ אֱלֹהֵי שְׁלַח מַלְאָכָה וַסַּגְר פֶּם אֲרִיּוֹתָא וְלֹא חֲבִלּוּנִי
כָּל־קָבֵל דִּי קְדָמוּהִי זָכוּ הַשְׁתַּכַּחַח לִי וְאַף קְדָמֶיךָ
מִלְפָּא חֲבוּלָה לֹא עֲבַדְתִּי:

My God sent his angel and he closed the mouth of the lions and they did not injure me, all on account that innocence was found to me before him and also before you and also I have done no injury before you, the king.

Clearly God is being pictured as “making kindness to thousands, to the ones loving me and to ones keeping my commandments” (עֲשֵׂה חֶסֶד לְאַלְפִים לְאַהֲבֵי וּלְשֹׁמְרֵי מִצְוֹתַי). This command that has already been used in two different ways within the Law is now being used in the context of the exile (reaping the consequences of not listening to the Law) where obedience to God’s command brings deliverance from the king’s command.

Daniel 9:13 was used to help provide points of dialogue in relation to what “in the Law of his God” (בְּדֶת אֱלֹהֵהּ) of chapter 6 was in reference to, so it also provides another concrete example of canonical intertextuality:

¹¹ וְכָל־יִשְׂרָאֵל עָבְרוּ אֶת־תּוֹרָתְךָ וְסֹר לְבַלְתִּי שְׁמוֹעַ בְּקִלְךָ
וַתִּתֵּן עָלֵינוּ הָאֱלֹהִי וְהַשְׁבַּעַה אֲשֶׁר כְּתוּבָה בְּתוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה
עֲבַד־הָאֱלֹהִים כִּי חָטְאוּנוּ לוֹ:

And all of Israel has passed over your Law and turned aside so as not to listen in your voice and you gave upon us the oath and the curse which is written in the Law of Moses, the servant of God, because we have sinned to him.

Daniel is identifying something in particular, “the oath and the curse” (הָאֱלֹהִי וְהַשְׁבַּעַה), that was “written in the Law of Moses, the servant of God” (כְּתוּבָה בְּתוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה עֲבַד־). Without repeating the material from the previous example, the same foundational observations are applicable in relation to the text(s) that is/are being referenced. Clear verbal connections are found in Deuteronomy 29:19-20:

¹⁹ לֹא־יִאֱבֹה יְהוָה סִלַּח לוֹ כִּי אִזּוּ יַעֲשֶׂן אֶפְי־יְהוָה וְקִנְאוֹתוֹ
בְּאִישׁ הָהוּא וּרְבִצָּה בּוֹ כָּל־הָאֱלֹהִי הַכְּתוּבָה בַּסֵּפֶר הַזֶּה
וּמַחַח יְהוָה אֶת־שְׁמוֹ מִתַּחַת הַשָּׁמַיִם:
²⁰ וְהִבְדִּילוּ יְהוָה לְרַעָה מִכָּל שְׁבִטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל כָּכֹל אֱלֹתֵי
הַבְּרִית הַכְּתוּבָה בַּסֵּפֶר הַתּוֹרָה הַזֶּה:

19 YHWH will not be willing to forgive you because the anger of YHWH will smoke and his jealousy in each man and every oath being written in this writing will lie down on him and YHWH will wipe out his name from below the heavens 20 and YHWH will separate him for disaster from all the tribes of Israel as all the

oaths of the covenant, the one being written³¹⁶ in the writing of this Law.

From 29:1 it is clear that Moses is speaking (וַיִּקְרָא מֹשֶׁה). The whole of the chapter serves as a conclusion to the extended discourse of the book and gives a strong warning to those who are about to enter the land. The warning is in relation to “every oath being written in this writing” (כָּל־הָאָלָה הַכְּתוּבָה בַּסֵּפֶר הַזֶּה) in 29:19 and “as all the oaths of the covenant, the one being written in the writing of this law” (כָּל־אֲלוֹת) (29:20). In fact, Deuteronomy 28 serves as an extensive list of what will happen “if you will listen in the voice of YHWH your God to keep, to do all his commandments” (אִם־שָׁמַעְתֶּם תִּשְׁמַע בְּקוֹל יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיךָ לְשָׁמֹר לַעֲשׂוֹת) (אִם־לֹא; 28:1-14) as well as what will happen “if you will not listen in the voice of YHWH your God to keep, to do all his commandments and his statutes” (אִם־לֹא; 28:15-68). These texts are now being referenced not as a warning before entering the land but as referring to the end of a disaster history. This text that was a warning in Deuteronomy is a statement of realized history in the text of Daniel. However, in the context of Daniel 9 there is a collective force, in that these words are viewed as a part of a larger context that includes “the prophets” (הַנְּבִיאִים). Accordingly, 9:6 states:

⁶ וְלֹא שָׁמַעְנוּ אֶל־עֲבָדֶיךָ הַנְּבִיאִים אֲשֶׁר דִּבְּרוּ בְּשִׁמְךָ אֶל־מַלְכֵינוּ שָׂרֵינוּ וְאֲבֹתֵינוּ וְאֵל כָּל־עַם הָאָרֶץ:
And we did not listen to your servants the prophets who spoke in your name to our kings, officials, and our fathers and to all the people of the land.

Similarly 9:10 states:

¹⁰ וְלֹא שָׁמַעְנוּ בְּקוֹל יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ לָלֶכֶת בְּתוֹרֹתָיו אֲשֶׁר נָתַן לְפָנֵינוּ בְּיַד עֲבָדָיו הַנְּבִיאִים:
And we did not listen in the voice of YHWH our God, to go in his instructions which he gave before us in the hand of his servants the prophets.

All of this culminates with the summary “and we did not listen to his voice” (וְלֹא שָׁמַעְנוּ; 9:15). Earlier work in chapter 9 unfolded the connection with at least one of the prophets, Jeremiah, and made clear the warning given to the people who were in the land. The warning to the people before they went into the land (Deuteronomy),

³¹⁶ The antecedent to הַכְּתוּבָה “the one being written” (feminine singular) is not אֲלוֹת “oaths” (feminine plural) but לְרָעָה “for disaster” (feminine singular).

that was also a warning to the people in the land (Jeremiah), has now become a prayer of confession and a supplication for one who is outside of the land (Daniel).

These examples plus what has already been discussed under chapter 9 in the previous chapter serve as concrete examples where the text is clearly making reference to another text, yet the reference is not attempting to give some sort of exegetical harmony. Instead, the reference exhibits a transformation as it is being referenced as a part of this context. They do exegete one another, but through their placement in a larger corpus and actual ordering together within the canon, they give a larger picture that would not be possible if any of these texts were left by themselves. In relation to these particular examples, regardless of which canon is used, Deuteronomy gives a foundation upon which Jeremiah builds and Daniel brings together. It is important to note that these examples are actually referencing other texts that are themselves smaller units within a larger text.

5.3 Canonical Placements of Daniel

The underlying presupposition of this entire dissertation 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
*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.*³¹⁷

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* 1.8, 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 τῇ ἀναγραφῇ, τὰ

³¹⁷ For the Hebrew text see <http://www.mechron-mamre.org/b/1/14301.htm> (accessed December 24, 2008).

δικαίως πεπιστευμένα. καὶ τούτων πέντε μὲν ἐστὶ τὰ Μωυσέως, ἃ τοὺς τε νόμους περιέχει καὶ τὴν ἀπ’ ἀνθρωπογονίας παράδοσιν μέχρι τῆς αὐτοῦ τελευτῆς· οὗτος ὁ χρόνος ἀπολείπει τρισχιλίων ὀλίγον ἐτῶν. ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς Μωυσέως τελευτῆς μέχρις Ἀρταξέρξου τοῦ μετὰ Ξέρξην Περσῶν βασιλέως οἱ μετὰ Μωυσὴν προφῆται 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, πίστεως δ’ οὐχ ὁμοίας ἡξίωται τοῖς πρὸ αὐτῶν διὰ τὸ μὴ γενέσθαι τὴν τῶν προφητῶν ἀκριβῆ διαδοχὴν.

*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 Artaxerxes, 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 Artaxerxes 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.*³¹⁸

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.³¹⁹ He further suggests that the third section is probably composed of: Psalms, Song of Songs, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes.³²⁰ 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.”³²¹ 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.³²² The opening line states “many and great things have been given

³¹⁸ For the Greek text see H. St. J. Thackeray, *Josephus: The Life and Against Apion*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1926), 178.

³¹⁹ Thackeray, *Josephus: The Life and Against Apion*, 179.

³²⁰ Thackeray, *Josephus: The Life and Against Apion*, 179.

³²¹ Klaus Koch, “Is Daniel Also Among the Prophets?,” 122.

³²² J. C. H. Lebram, “Aspekte der Alttestamentliche Kanonbildung,” *VT* 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 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“.

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 νομοῦ καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πατρῶν βιβλίων) only reinforces the tripartite division, giving no further clarity into what books in particular are included in the second two divisions.³²³ 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.³²⁴

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 24:44.³²⁵

⁴⁴ Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς· οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι μου οὓς ἐλάλησα πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔτι ὢν 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.”

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:

²⁷ καὶ ἀρχάμενος ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν διερμήνευσεν αὐτοῖς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς τὰ περὶ ἐαυτοῦ.
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:

³²³ For the Greek text to Ecclesiasticus see Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta* (2 Volumes; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935 and 1979), 2:377.

³²⁴ James A. Sanders, *Torah and Canon*, 94.

³²⁵ Walter Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*, ed. Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, 6th. ed. (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1988), 1099, list Mt 5:17, 7:12, 11:13, 22:40, Lk 16:16, Acts 13:15, 24:14, 28:23, Ro 3:21 in relation to the normal title in the New Testament.

¹⁵ 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. 4Q Florilegium II,3 (4Q174) states “being written in the writing of Daniel, the prophet” (כתוב בספר דניאל הנביא).³²⁶

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^etubim* is to be placed somewhere between the fifth and eighth centuries A.D.³²⁷

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.³²⁸

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 בְּעֶשְׂרִים וָחֹמֶשׁ שָׁנָה

³²⁶ For the observation see Koch, “Is Daniel Also Among the Prophets?,” 122. For the Hebrew text see Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, vol. 1 (Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill, 1997), 354.

³²⁷ 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.”

³²⁸ 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.

לְלִלְיֹתֵנוּ “in the twenty-fifth year to our exile” and 29:17 בְּעֶשְׂרִים וְשֶׁבַע שָׁנָה “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).”³²⁹ Fishbane notes in relation to Daniel 11-12 and Isaiah, “As repeatedly observed, the preceding references to מְשִׁכִּילִים, to ‘vindication’, and to ‘the many’ allude to and even reinterpret the great ‘servant’ passage of Isa. 52:13-53:12.”³³⁰ 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.”³³¹ The relationship between Jeremiah and Daniel has already been explored, but is further solidified as Koch notes through the already mentioned Qumran quote (4Q174) where “Daniel is explicitly quoted as a prophet along the same line as the prophets Isaiah and Ezekiel.”³³² 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.³³³ 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

³²⁹ Beyerle, “Der mit den Wolken des Himmels kommt,” 43.

³³⁰ Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 493. H. L. Ginsberg, “The Oldest Interpretation of the Suffering Servant,” *VT* 3/4 (1953): 400-404, unfolds this observation in greater detail.

³³¹ Finley, “The Book of Daniel in the Canon of Scripture,” 206 and 207.

³³² 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.

³³³ Roger Beckwith, *The Old Testament of the New Testament Church* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1986), 160, in summary of his earlier arguments 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.”

stories in Esther and Daniel.³³⁴ 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). The interpretive tension arises from the book itself. As has already been demonstrated in the 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.

5.4 Conclusion

What is clear from the examples given in this chapter is that Daniel is a text that makes reference to other texts. The references are not attempts to recreate the past, but they play a significant role in the narrative present of the text. Even the other texts demonstrate not a static relationship but a dialogue, as they are texts within a much larger text. Though 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.

Through the macro example, even the dialogue in relation to the particular arrangement of these books is evident. The example again does 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*. Again, 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).

³³⁴ Von Rad, *Theologie des Alten Testaments Band 2*, 324-326. Rolf Rendtorff, *Theologie des Alten Testaments, Ein kanonischer Entwurf Band 1: Kanonische Grudlegung* (Neukirchen: Neukirchner Verlag, 1999), 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."

6. Canonical Intertextuality and the Book of Daniel in the New Testament

6.1 Introduction

My dissertation began with the observation from Michael Fishbane that what is found in the Talmud and New Testament is not something that began in the post-biblical era, but instead comes from the biblical era.³³⁵ Through careful examination of the text of Daniel, the argument was made that several smaller texts were placed together to give a larger picture that would not have been possible if these texts had remained in their individual context. The work was not harmonistic, trying to make all the pieces fit together. Difficulties were left in the text and shifts in terms and concepts bring an internal dialogue in the larger text. Examples were taken from the larger context of the Hebrew Bible, where these texts reflected their own shifts in the Torah and Jeremiah and then were applied to the text of Daniel, resulting in the same kind of intertextuality dialogue except on a larger level. A dialogue was also found even in the placement of Daniel within the canon itself. To bring the examination of the concept of canonical intertextuality full circle, the same exploration will be applied to the handful of quotes from Daniel in the New Testament.

The *Loci Citati Vel Allegati Ex Vetere Testamento* lists 203 different references to the book of Daniel in the New Testament.³³⁶ From these 203 examples only 12 are listed as quotes. All of the quotes are found in Gospels, are from the mouth of Jesus (with the exception of Revelation 1:7), and are from only five verses in the book of Daniel (3:6; 7:13; 9:27; 11:31; 12:11). From Daniel 3:6 there are two quotes (Mt 13:42, 50). From Daniel 7:13 there are six quotes (Mt 24:30; 26:64; Mk 13:26; 14:62; Lk 21:27; Rev 1:7). From Daniel 9:27 there is one quote (Mt 24:15). From Daniel 11:31 there are two quotes (Mt 24:15; Mk 13:14). From Daniel 12:11 there is one quote (Mk 13:14).

³³⁵ Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 2.

³³⁶ Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 27th ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993), 796-798.

6.2 Dan 3:6 (Mt 13:42,50)

The first example is Daniel 3:6. The whole verse states in the Masoretic Aramaic text:

וּמִן־דִּי־לֹא יִפֹּל וְיִסְגֵּד בְּהִשְׁתַּחֲוִיָּתָא לְגִזְלֵי־אֱתוֹן נִירָא
יִקְרָתָא:

And whoever will not fall and do homage, in this moment he will be thrown to the midst of the furnace of the burning fire.

Of particular importance is the phrase “he will be thrown to the midst of the furnace of the fire” (יִתְרַמָּא לְגִזְלֵי־אֱתוֹן נִירָא). When one looks at this phrase in context, one finds that it is only one part of a larger story that lasts from 3:1-33. In this story Nebuchadnezzar builds an “image” (צִלָּם) in the valley or plateau of Dura. When the people hear the music of the different instruments, they are to fall down before the large statue and worship. Those who do not follow the command will be thrown into the middle of the oven of fire or, as our section states, “he will be thrown into the middle of the furnace of fire” (3:5-6). Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, who we first met as Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah (1:7), decide not to obey the command. When they are brought before Nebuchadnezzar, they decide without any further consideration that their God can save them and they especially emphasize that even if he does not, they will not worship the statue (3:17-18). Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego receive their punishment seven times hotter. They are not thrown “into the middle of the oven of fire,” although Nebuchadnezzar had commanded it (לְמִרְמָא “to throw” in 3:20). Instead, they fell into the middle of the furnace of fire because the men who were supposed to lead them to their death were killed by the flames intended for them. Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego receive no injury from the whole situation (3:27) and Nebuchadnezzar ends up worshipping not the statue he created but “the most high God” (אֱלֹהֵא עֲלִיָּא), presumably the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego (3:31-33). The section under consideration functions in the story as a punishment from the mouth of the king for those who will not fall before and worship his statue. However, there is only one group who receives the punishment, namely the men who attempted to put Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego to death. Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego obeyed the first commandment (from God) and were saved. The men who attempted to put these obedient men to death instead received the punishment.

This first quote from Daniel 3:6 is found in Matthew 13:42 “and they will throw them into the furnace of fire: there, there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth” (καὶ βαλοῦσιν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρός· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων). The quote, “they will throw them into the furnace of fire” (βαλοῦσιν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρός), is marked in the Nestle-Aland text with italics³³⁷ and Eduard Schweitzer comments simply “der Ausdruck „Feuerofen“ stammt aus Dan. 3,6.”³³⁸ The sentence is found in an explanation to the disciples in 13:36-43 of what a particular parable in 13:24-30 meant. The whole chapter marks a turning point in the Gospel of Matthew. Jesus directs his words to the crowds (13:1-2) and speaks in parables (13:3) so that they would not understand (13:13-14). As Jesus explains the parable of “the tares of the field” (13:36), he makes everything clear in relation to what the parable meant in distinction to what was not clear to the crowds. The Son of Man sows the good seed (13:37). The field is the world, the good seed is the sons of the kingdom and the tares are the sons of the evil one (13:38). The enemy is the devil, the harvest is the end of the age and the harvesters are angels (13:39). In this explanation “the oven of fire” is an eschatological punishment for “all that gives offense and the ones doing the lawlessness” (πάντα τὰ σκάνδαλα καὶ τοὺς ποιοῦντας τὴν ἀνομίαν) where the angels throw the sons of the evil one into “the furnace of fire” (τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρός).

This exact expression is found just a few verses later in 13:50 “and they will throw them into the furnace of fire: there, there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth” (καὶ βαλοῦσιν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρός· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων). After the explanation regarding the tares of the field, Jesus gives three parables in a row. The disciples and not the crowds are the intended audience. All of the parables have the description of the kingdom of God as their goal. The first two parables describe the precious value of the kingdom and the third parable speaks of the kingdom as a net. The net is thrown into the sea and gathers different types of fish (13:48). When the net is full it is brought onto the shore, the good fish are gathered together in containers and the bad are thrown away (13:48). Jesus explains only this parable of the three in the story. In the end of the age the angels sort out the evil from the righteous and “they will throw them into the furnace

³³⁷ Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 36.

³³⁸ Eduard Schweitzer, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (Göttingen and Zürich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 202.

of fire” (βαλοῦσιν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρός). Again, the explanation is an eschatological punishment for those who are evil.

When these three passages are viewed together, both similarities and differences are evident. There is similar vocabulary: throw (רמא; βάλλω), oven (אֶתֹן; κάμινος), and fire (נִיר; πῦρ). Each time the sentence is a punishment. A key difference is found, as in the Septuagint and not in Theodotion, in that the construction has been changed from active to passive, but the vocabulary probably follows the Aramaic Masoretic text (βάλλω and not ἐμβάλλω). The punishment changes from temporal punishment from a human king in Daniel to an eschatological punishment from God’s angels for those who are evil in Matthew. Although Jesus in the narrative takes the words from Daniel, they are interpreted anew. They receive an eschatological meaning and the story is reversed. The angels, who probably saved the righteous Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego from the oven of fire (cf. Daniel 6:23), are now the angels who will throw those who are evil in the similar “oven of fire.” In these details another case of exegetical insights from canonical intertextuality is demonstrated.

6.3 Dan 7:13 (Mt 24:30; 26:64; Mk 13:26; 14:62; Lk 21:27; Rev 1:7)

Daniel 7:13 is probably the best known verse of the book of Daniel. It reads in the Aramaic Masoretic text:

חֲזָה הָיִיתִי בְּחֻזִּי לַיְלִיָּא וְאֶרֶוּ עַם־עֲנָנִי שְׁמִיָּא כְּבָר אֱנִשׁ
 אֲתָהּ הָיָה וְעַד־עֲתִיק יוֹמִיָּא מָטָה וְקִדְמוֹהִי הִקְרִבוּהִי:
*I was seeing in the vision of the night and behold with the clouds of
 the heavens one like a son of man was coming and until he reached
 the one aged of days and they brought him before him.*

Especially important is “behold with the clouds of the heavens one like a son of man was coming” (אֶרֶוּ עַם־עֲנָנִי שְׁמִיָּא כְּבָר אֱנִשׁ אֲתָהּ הָיָה). This section comes in the narrative as a vision of the night that Daniel saw in the “first year of Belshazzar, king of Babylon” (7:1). This narrative lasts from 7:15-27 and gives the vision (7:2-14) and the interpretation of the vision (7:15-27) in a similar style as the similar vision and interpretation in chapter 2 (2:31-45). Daniel saw in the vision of the night four animals following one after another (7:2-7). With the last animal there was something especially frightening because it was so violent and strong. It had ten horns, a new horn grew among them and three were torn out. This horn had eyes and a mouth that

spoke great words (7:8). Then comes the scene where thrones were set out and the “aged of days” (עֲתִיק יוֹמִין) sat down. Before the Aged of Days there is myriad of myriads and books were opened in judgment (7:9-10). Then the last animal was killed and the earlier animals were given a lengthening of life “until a time and a time” (עַד-זְמַן וְעַד; 7:12). At the climax of the story comes the quoted passage, where one like a son of man comes. He comes “until the Aged of the Days” (עַד-עֲתִיק יוֹמִיָא), and was given all authority and glory of the world and his kingdom is the kingdom that will never pass away and will never be destroyed (7:13-14). The simple interpretation is twofold. First, the four animals are four kings who will come from the world. Second, the holy ones of the Most High will receive the kingdom for eternity (7:17-18). The exact details of the fourth animal are further interpreted. The fourth animal is a kingdom from the world that will destroy all the other kingdoms (7:23). The ten horns are ten kingdoms that come from the fourth kingdom. Another kingdom will come from these ten kingdoms and will humble three of them (7:24). It will speak against what is good, will wear out the saints, and attempt to chant times and laws “until a time and half a time” (7:25). Then comes the kingdom of the holy ones of the Most High that remains for eternity (7:26-27). The section “behold with the clouds of the heavens one like a son of man was coming” (אֲרֹו עִם-עַנְנֵי שָׁמַיָא כְּבָר אִנְשׁ אֲתָהּ הֵנָּה) functions as the climax sign of the beginning of the eternal eschatological kingdom of the saints.

Although the differences in the synoptic gospels are their own study in intertextuality, the similar sections will be examined at the same time because although the texts are different, the quotes function in a very similar way in the different narratives. Matthew 26:64 and Mark 14:62 read:

Mt 26:64 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· σὺ εἶπας. πλὴν λέγω ὑμῖν· ἂπ’ ἄρτι ὄψεσθε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθήμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

Jesus says to him, “You say. But I say to you, from now on you will see the Son of Man being seated from the right hand of power and coming upon the clouds of heaven.”

Mk 14:62 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· ἐγώ εἰμι, καὶ ὄψεσθε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ δεξιῶν καθήμενον τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ἐρχόμενον μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

But Jesus said, “I am, and you will see the Son of Man being seated from the right hand of power and coming with the clouds of heaven.”

The quotes are “you will see the Son of Man . . . coming upon the clouds of heaven” (ὄψεσθε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου . . . ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) and “you will see the Son of Man . . . coming with the clouds of heaven” (ὄψεσθε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου . . . ἐρχόμενον μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ). In both narratives (Mt 26:57-86; Mk 14:53-65) Jesus is before the high priest and the whole Sanhedrin. They were seeking false witness against Jesus and finally they found two who gave testimony about the destruction and rebuilding of the temple in three days. Jesus is silent and the high priest is angered and says “say to us if you are the Anointed One, the Son of God” (ἡμῖν εἰπὲς εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ) in Matthew and “if you are the Anointed One, the Son of the Blessed One” (σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ) in Mark. Then comes the answer from Jesus that comes from Psalm 110:1 and Daniel 7:13. With these words the high priest tears his clothes, says further that Jesus has blasphemed, and the council decides that Jesus was liable to death. The quote functions in the sections in connection with the question from the high priest and Psalm 110 as a sign that he is the Anointed One and God’s Son. When Jesus identifies in the narratives with this eschatological verse, he is saying that he is the recipient of the eternal kingdom.

Matthew 24:30, Mark 13:26, and Luke 21:27 also have a similar context and read:

Mt 24:30 καὶ τότε φανήσεται τὸ σημεῖον τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ τότε κόψονται πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς·

And then the sign of the Son of Man will appear in heaven, and then all the tribes of the earth will mourn and they will see the Son of Man coming upon the clouds of heaven with power and much glory.

Mk 13:26 καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλαις μετὰ δυνάμεως πολλῆς καὶ δόξης.

And then they will see the Son of Man coming in clouds with much power and glory.

Lk 21:27 καὶ τότε ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλῃ μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς.

And then they will see the Son of Man coming in a cloud with power and much glory.

The quotes are “they will see the Son of Man coming upon the clouds of heaven” (ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) from Matthew, “they will see the Son of Man coming in clouds” (ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλαις) from Mark, and “they will see the Son of Man

coming in a cloud” (ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν νεφέλῃ) from Luke. The particular context is very obvious in the synoptic gospels. The disciples remarked about something in relation to the temple and Jesus answered that the whole temple would be destroyed. The disciples came to him a little while later and asked him when this would happen and what the sign of the end of the age/his coming would be. Jesus then gives several bad signs that must happen first. But when everyone in the world will see the sign “the Son of Man coming upon the clouds” (τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ), they will know that the angels of God will gather “his elect” (τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ; ἡ ἀπολύτρωσις ὑμῶν “your redemption” in Luke). The quote functions in these narratives as a sign of hope for “the elect” (τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς) of the Son of Man. Although everything is very bad, there is the eschatological hope in the arrival of the Son of Man for his “the elect” (τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς), whom we should certainly identify as Christians.³³⁹

Revelation 1:7 gives the only quote that does not come from the synoptic gospels and from the mouth of Jesus: “Behold, he comes with the clouds, and every eye will see him and all those who pierced him, and all the tribes of the earth will mourn upon him” (Ἴδοὺ ἔρχεται μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν, καὶ ὄψεται αὐτὸν πᾶς ὀφθαλμὸς καὶ οἵτινες αὐτὸν ἐξεκέντησαν, καὶ κόψονται ἐπ’ αὐτὸν πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς. ναί, ἀμήν). This section comes in the introduction and connects Daniel 7:13 with Zechariah 12:10, which we have already seen in Matthew 24:30.³⁴⁰ This time the quote stands almost completely by itself with only the confirmation in the following verse, “I am the Alpha and the Omega . . . says the Lord God, the one being and the one who was and the one coming, the Almighty” (Ἐγὼ εἰμι τὸ ἄλφα καὶ τὸ ὦ, λέγει κύριος ὁ θεός, ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ὁ παντοκράτωρ). In 1:7 the subject is missing and should probably be identified with the speaker in 1:8. The one who comes in the clouds and was pierced is “the Alpha and the Omega . . . the one being and the one who was and the one coming, the Almighty” (τὸ ἄλφα καὶ τὸ ὦ . . . ὁ ὢν

³³⁹ R. T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2007), 928, in footnote 110 comments on Matthew 24:29-31 and a general trend in Matthew, “We have noted that the OT allusions in these verses consistently take prophetic language concerning Israel’s triumph and restoration and reverse its application so that it is now Jesus and his people who are the beneficiaries of God’s climactic acts of judgment and salvation, while the existing Jerusalem establishment centered on the temple takes over the role of Israel’s pagan enemies in the OT. The consistency of this bold reinterpetive strategy throughout the passage speaks in favor of the exegesis here adopted.”

³⁴⁰ G. K. Beale, *The Book of Revelation* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1999), 196, comments in relation to these three texts, “The use of Daniel 7 and Zechariah 12 in Matt. 24:30 may have influenced John to use the same combination here.”

καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ὁ παντοκράτωρ). The quote gives an eschatological warning and also a hope as in the other verses, but what is missing in this quote (the Son of Man) is particularly important because the quote is a full identification with God (cf. Ex 3:14).

This example shows further similarities and differences. The vocabulary is similar: son (בר; υἱός), man (אִישׁ; ἄνθρωπος), to come (אתה; ἔρχομαι), and cloud (ענן; νεφέλη). Almost all of the quotes have followed the Aramaic text with a participle (אתה is ἐρχόμενον and only once in Revelation 1:7 ἔρχεται). All of the sections have an eschatological meaning. Matthew 26:64 and Mark 14:62 put the quote in the mouth of Jesus as a statement about his identity as God’s Son, which will be clear in his arrival. Matthew 24:30, Mark 13:26, and Luke 21:27 put the quote in the mouth of Jesus speaking about hope for Christians, whether they are Jews or Gentiles. Revelation 1:7 takes the quote minus “the Son of Man” and makes it a statement about the deity of Jesus. Each time the quote’s meaning is changed in a different context.

6.4 Dan 9:27 (Mt 24:15; Mk 13:14)

Although the quote could be from Daniel 11:31 and 12:11, only the first section from which the quote comes will be examined. Dan 9:27 reads:

וְהַגְבִּיר בְּרִית לְרַבִּים שָׁבוּעַ אֶחָד וְחֲצִי הַשָּׁבוּעַ יִשְׁבֵּית
זֶבַח וּמִנְחָה וְעַל כִּנֹּף שְׂקוּצִים מְשֻׁמִּים וְעַד-כָּלָה וְנִחְרָצָה
תִּתֵּן עַל-שָׁמַיִם:

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.

Of particular importance is the expression “the detestable things causing horror” (שְׂקוּצִים מְשֻׁמִּים) or in the singular in 11:31 and 12:11 “the detestable thing causing horror” (הַשְּׂקוּץ מְשֻׁמֵּם). Daniel recognizes probably from Jeremiah 25:11 that Jerusalem will remain in ruins for seventy years (9:2). Then he confessed his own sin and the sin of his fathers (9:3-19). As he is still praying, Gabriel comes and gives understanding concerning the vision (probably the vision from Daniel 8). Although the chapter begins with the seventy years of Jerusalem’s ruin, there is now a new seventy for his people and his home city. This time there are seventy weeks (probably

seventy weeks of years). These weeks come “to finish the transgression, to put an end to sin, and to atone for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness” (9:24). There are sixty-nine weeks and then comes another leader in the last week whose people will destroy Jerusalem along with the temple. In the middle of this week he will cause sacrifices and offerings to stop and the sign that they are in this time are abominations that desolate (or the abomination that desolates; cf. 11:31 and 12:11). This is a terrible sign because the people must go through this time, but it speaks of the nearness of the time of the eternal righteousness.

Matthew and Mark take this quote from “Daniel, the prophet” (Matthew 24:15) in the same chapters (Matthew 24; Mark 13) that have already been considered. Matthew 24:15 and Mark 13:14 state:

Mt 24:15 Ὅταν οὖν ἴδῃτε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως τὸ ρηθὲν διὰ Δανιήλ τοῦ προφήτου ἐστὸς ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ, ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω,
Therefore when you see the abomination of desolation, the one spoken through Daniel the prophet, standing in the holy place, let the one reading know.

Mk 13:14 Ὅταν δὲ ἴδῃτε τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως ἐστηκότα ὅπου οὐ δεῖ, ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω, τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φευγέτωσαν εἰς τὰ ὄρη,
But when you see the abomination of desolation standing where it is not necessary, let the one reading know, then the ones in Judea will flee into the mountains.

It comes as a preparing sign of the destruction of the temple and the arrival of Jesus. Both emphasize that the reader should flee from Judea when they see this sign. Although this sign means difficult times, it also speaks about the arrival of Jesus and the salvation of his “the elect” (τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς; Matthew 24:31; Mark 13:27).

The vocabulary is similar: abomination (γῆρשׁ; βδέλυγμα) and devastation (מַשְׁמַד; ἐρήμωσις). Both sections speak about a difficult time when the people are under foreign rule. They speak about the destruction of the temple and both mean that the time of salvation is near. A difference is that these quotes speak about *the arrival of Jesus* as the Son of Man.

6.5 Summary

Although it is clear from a literary perspective that each quote from the book of Daniel in the New Testament creates something that is at the same time similar and new, there is more to say about intertextuality when the particular historical situations and developments that these quoted texts represent in the book of Daniel are examined.

As has been seen, Daniel 3:6 comes from a larger narrative that lasts from 3:1-33. It is often commented that the absence of Daniel from this narrative gives evidence to a circulation of this story separate from the rest of the Daniel narratives.³⁴¹ As such, a normal approach to reading this story in connection with the larger context of the book of Daniel is to point to the connecting material at the end of chapter 2 where Daniel petitions the king for the elevation of his three friends (2:48-49). Then from a form critical perspective this particular narrative is found to be of the genre of the martyr story, where “[e]ither the martyr is faithful unto death and the reward is reserved for another world or a miracle takes place and the martyr’s faith is visibly justified.”³⁴² Again from earlier analysis the story from this form critical perspective takes on the latter of the two options. The three men are delivered by one who looks “like a son of the gods” (3:25) and they come unharmed from the midst of the furnace (3:26-27). In fact it is Nebuchadnezzar who declares that the three men were justified in their faith (3:28) and further gives the command that anyone who “will speak neglect against their God . . . will be dismembered and his house will be made a refuse heap” (3:29; cf. 2:5).

Without detracting from the aforementioned observations, there appears to be a much more basic connection between the two chapters on a lexical level. Of the seventeen occurrences of “image” (צִלָּם) in the Aramaic portions of the Hebrew Bible, all are found in Daniel chapters 2 and 3 (2:31x2, 32, 34, 35; 3:1, 2, 3x2, 5, 7, 10, 12, 15, 18, 19). In Daniel chapter 2, King Nebuchadnezzar has a disturbing dream and calls together his group of trained interpreters “to the magicians and to the conjurers and to the ones practicing sorcery and to the Chaldeans” (לְחַרְטָּמִּים וְלְאַשְׁפִּים וְלְמַכְשָׁפִים) (2:1-3). The only catch is that they are not only to give an interpretation, but also the dream itself to insure the accuracy of the interpretation (2:9). The king’s choice interpreters challenge the king’s request two times and end in the exclamation that “what the king is asking is difficult and there is not another who will declare it before the king” (2:11). This leads to an edict from the king “to destroy all the wise

³⁴¹ Porteous, *Daniel*, 55, states, “The very fact that Daniel is not mentioned suggests that it was originally independent of the cycle of stories about Daniel, and has been somewhat artificially united with them, though, of course, to bring Daniel into this chapter as worthy of punishment for loyalty to God whom Nebuchadnezzar, according to the previous chapter, had acknowledged so handsomely, would have seemed very strange.” Towner, *Daniel*, 47, also comments, “The lead characters of this story carry on from the previous two chapters, with the puzzling exception that Daniel is now absent. (Most commentators take this fact as evidence that the story originated and circulated independently of the Daniel cycle.)”

³⁴² Porteous, *Daniel*, 55.

ones of Babylon” (2:12). Of course this includes “Daniel and his comrades” (דְּנִיֵּאל וְחֲבֵרָוּהִי; 2:13). Daniel petitions the king for time and he along with Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah “seek compassion from before the God of the heavens that they not be destroyed” (2:16-18). In distinction to all the choice interpreters of the king, Daniel has “in the vision of the night the secret was revealed” (בַּחֲזוֹן דִּי־לַיְלִיָּא רְזָה) (גְּלִי; 2:19). After an extended section of praise given to God, Daniel returns to the king to testify:

בְּרַם אִיתִי אֱלֹהִי בְּשָׁמַיָא גָּלָא רִזִּין וְהוֹדִיעַ לְמַלְכָּא²⁸
נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר מָה דִּי לְהוּא בְּאַחֲרִית יוֹמָיָא חֲלָמָא וְחֲזוֹן רֵאשִׁי
עַל־מִשְׁכַּבְּךָ דִּנָּה הוּא:

But there is a God in the heavens, one revealing secrets and making known to the King, Nebuchadnezzar, what will be in the end of days. This is it, the dream and the visions of your head upon your bed.

God, not Daniel, is the one revealing secrets and further God has made known to Nebuchadnezzar “what will be in the end of the days” (דִּי לְהוּא בְּאַחֲרִית יוֹמָיָא).

Further developments of the prohibition against idolatry from Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5 are found in Daniel 3 and 6. Daniel 7 is a further development and interpretation of chapter 2 that is even further developed and interpreted in chapters 8, 9, and 10-12.³⁴³ Daniel 9, then, is already a third development of the earlier vision and interpretation.

With historical considerations the book of Daniel goes in at least two different directions. The whole book attempts to put itself at the same time into the Babylonian Exile (Daniel 1:1; 2:1; 3:1; 4:1; 5:1; 6:1; 7:1; 8:1; 9:1-2; 10:1; 11:1) and also through the exact description from the Babylonian Exile until the Hellenistic time perhaps to put itself into the Hellenistic era.³⁴⁴ There are from these two perspectives two goals. One is connected with salvation from the Babylonian Exile and the other with salvation from the time of Antiochus Epiphanes.

When one reads in the New Testament and finds things connected with the past through a quote that are further developed and interpreted, one does not find anything radically new. When one finds in the synoptic gospels that Jesus interprets a quote from Daniel 9:27 applying to the present temple and not to the historical situation from the Hellenistic era (as is seen in 1 Maccabees 1:54 and 6:7), it is not a

³⁴³ Montgomery, *The Book of Daniel*, 16.

³⁴⁴ Montgomery, *The Book of Daniel*, 59.

radical break with the Old Testament. Rather he follows the pattern that is already found in the development of the Old Testament and is also active in the development of the New Testament, where revelation and interpretation continually work together.

Bibliography

- Archer, Jr., Gleason L. *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction*. Revised ed. Chicago: Moody Press, 1974.
- Barr, James. *The Concept of Biblical Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999.
- Barton, John. *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1984.
- Bauer, Hans and Pontus Leander. *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen*. Hildersheim, Zürich, New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 1995[1927].
- Bauer, Walter. *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*. Edited by Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland. 6th. ed. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1988.
- Beal, Timothy K. "Glossary." In *Reading Between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible*. Edited by Danna Nolan Fewell, 21-24. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992.
- Beale, G. K. *The Book of Revelation*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Beckwith, Roger. *The Old Testament of the New Testament Church*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Beyerle, Stefan. "'Der mit den Wolken des Himmels kommt': Untersuchungen zum Traditionsgefüge 'Meschenson.'" In *Gottessohn und Menschensohn: Exegetische Studien zu zwei Paradigmen biblischer Intertextualität*, edited by Dieter Sänger (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner, 2004), 1-52.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Prophecy and Canon*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1977.
- Bruce, Les P. "Discourse Theme and the Narratives of Daniel." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 160/2 (2003): 174-186.
- Brueggemann, Walter. "At the Mercy of Babylon: A Subversive Rereading of the Empire." *JBL* 110/1 (1991): 3-22.
- Buhl, Franz. *Wilhelm Gesenius' Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*. Berlin, Göttingen, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 1962.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- Childs, Brevard S. "Critique of Recent Intertextual Canonical Interpretation." *ZAW* 115/2 (2003): 173-184.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.

Collin, John J. *Encounters with Biblical Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.

Collins, John J. "Current Issues in the Study of Daniel." Vol. 1 of *The Book of Daniel*, edited by John J. Collins and Peter Flint, 1-15. Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 2001.

Collins, John J. *Daniel*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

Collins, John J. "The Court-Tales in Daniel and the Development of Apocalyptic." *JBL* 94/2 (1975): 218-234.

Coxon, Peter. "Nebuchadnezzar's Hermeneutical Dilemma." *JSOT* 66 (1995): 87-97.

Crüsemann, Frank. *Kanon und Sozialgeschichte: Beiträge zum Alten Testament*. Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2003.

Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology*. Translated by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.

Di Lella, Alexander A. "The One in Human Likeness and the Holy Ones of the Most High in Daniel 7." *CBQ* 39/1 (1977): 1-19.

Finley, Thomas J. "The Book of Daniel in the Canon of Scripture." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 165/2 (2008): 195-208.

Fishbane, Michael. *The Garments of Torah: Essays in Biblical Hermeneutics*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1992.

Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

Fishbane, Michael. "Revelation and Tradition: Aspects of Inner-Biblical Exegesis." *JBL* 99 (1980): 343-361.

France, R. T. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2007.

Gamme, John G. "On the Intention of and Sources of Daniel I-VI." *VT* 31/3 (1981): 282-292.

Ginsberg, H. L. "The Composition of the book of Daniel." *VT* 4/3 (1954): 246-275.

Ginsberg, H. L. "The Oldest Interpretation of the Suffering Servant." *VT* 3/4 (1953): 400-404.

Godard, Barbara. "Intertextuality." In *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory: Approaches, Scholars, Terms*, 568-572, edited by Irena R. Makaryk. Toronto, Buffalo, London: University of Toronto Press, 1993.

Goldingay, John. "'Holy Ones on High' in Daniel 7:18." *JBL* 107/3 (1988): 495-497.

Goldingay, John. "The Stories in Daniel: A Narrative Politics." *JSOT* 37/F (1987): 99-116.

Harrison, R. K. *Introduction to the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1969.

Hartman, Louis F. and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Book of Daniel: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Auckland: Doubleday, 1978.

Hays, Christopher B. "Chirps from the Dust: The Affliction of Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel 4:30 in Its Ancient Near Eastern Context." *JBL* 126/2 (2007): 305-325.

Hilton, Michael. "Babel Reversed—Daniel Chapter 5." *JSOT* 66 (1995): 99-112

Jastrow, Marcus. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 2005[1943].

Kellenberger, Edgar. "Überlegungen zur Gleichzeitigkeit von Schriftlicher und Mündlicher Überlieferung." *Communio Viatorum* 45/3 (2003): 182-197.

Koch, Klaus. "Das aramäisch-hebräische Danielbuch Konfrontation zwischen Weltmach und monotheistischer Religionsgemeinschaft in universalgeschichtlicher Perspektive." In *Die Geschichte der Daniel-Auslegung in Judentum, Christentum und Islam: Studien zur Kommentierung des Danielbuches in Literatur und Kunst*, edited by Katharina Bracht and David S. du Toit, 3-27. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007.

Koch, Klaus. "Is Daniel Also Among the Prophets?" *Interpretation* 39/2 (1985): 117-130.

Koch, Klaus. "Stages in the Canonization of the Book of Daniel." In vol. 2 of *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, edited by John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint, 421-446. Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill, 2001.

Kristeva, Julia. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. Translated by Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine, and Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.

Kristeva, Julia. *Revolution in Poetic Language*. Translated by Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1984.

Lebram, J. C. H. "Aspekte der Altestamentliche Kanonbildung." *VT* 18 (1968): 173-189.

Lebram, J. C. H. "Bemerkungen und Gedanken zu Martin Hengels Buch über 'Judentum und Hellenismus.'" *VT* 20/4 (1970): 503-524.

Lebram, J. C. H. "König Antiochus im Buch Daniel." *Vetus Testamentum* 25/4 (1975): 737-772.

Levenson, Jon D. *The Hebrew Bible, the Old Testament and Historical Criticism*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993.

Lindbeck, George. "Atonement and Hermeneutics of Intratextual Social Embodiment." In *The Nature of Confession: Evangelicals and Postliberals in Conversation*. Edited by Timothy R. Philips and Dennis L. Ockholm. Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1996.

Lindbeck, George. *The Nature of Doctrine: Religion and Theology in a Postliberal Age*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1984.

Loader, James Alfred. "Das Alte Testament—*ein* Geschichtsbuch?" In *Das Alte Testament und die Kunst*, edited by John Barton, J. Cheryl Exum and Manfred Oeming, 31-50. Münster: LIT Verlag, 2005, 31-50.

Loader, James Alfred. "Intertextualität in geschichteten Texten des Alten Testaments." Presented at the Winter 2007 Privatissimum for Old Testament at the University of Vienna [now published under the editorship of Oda Wischmeyer & Stefan Scholz], 2007, 1-18.

Martinez, Floretino Garcia and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, vol. 1. Leiden, Boston, and Köln: Brill, 1997.

Meyer, Rudolf. *Hebräische Grammatik*. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1992.

Montgomery, James A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1927.

Moore, Michael S. Review of *Circle of Sovereignty: A Story of Stories in Daniel 1-6* by Danna Nolan Fewell. *CBQ* 53/2 (1991): 283-284.

Nestle-Aland. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 27th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993.

Neusner, Jacob. *Tractate Baba Batra*. Vol. 15 of *The Babylonian Talmud: A Translation and Commentary*. Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 2005.

Niehr, Herbert. "Das Buch Daniel." In *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, edited by Erich Zenger, 7th ed., 507-516. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2008.

Porteous, Norman W. *Daniel: A Commentary*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965.

Rahlfs, Alfred. *Septuaginta*, 2 vol. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935 and 1979.

Rendtorff, Rolf. *Das Alte Testament: Eine Einführung*. 6th. ed. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2001.

Rendtorff, Rolf. *Der Text in Seiner Endgestalt*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner, 2001.

Rendtorff, Rolf. *Theologie des Alten Testaments, Ein kanonischer Entwurf Band 1: Kanonische Grundlegung*. Neukirchen: Neukirchner Verlag, 1999.

Rosenthal, Franz. *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*. 6th. ed. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1995.

Roudiez, Leon S. "Introduction." In *Desire in Laungauge*, by Julia Kristeva, edited by Leon S. Roudiez, translated by Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine and Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.

Sailhamer, John. *Introduction to Old Testament Theology: A Canonical Approach*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1995.

Sanders, James A. *Canon and Community: A Guide to Canonical Criticism*. Philadelphia: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1984.

Sanders, James A. "Text and Canon: Concepts and Method." *JBL* 98 (1979): 5-29.

Sanders, James A. *Torah and Canon*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. *A Course in General Linguistics*. Edited by Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye. Translated by Roy Harris (Chicago and La Salle, Illinois: Open Court, 1986.

Schmidt, Werner H. *Old Testament Introduction*. Translated by Matthew J. O'Connell. New York: Crossroad, 1990.

Schweitzer, Eduard. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. Göttingen and Zürich: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

Seitz, Christopher. *Prophecy and Hermeneutics: Toward a New Introduction to the Prophets*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2007.

Sheppard, Gerald T. "Canon Criticism." In vol. 1 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, edited by David Noel Freedman, 861-866. New York: Double Day, 1992.

Steins, Georg. *Die „Bindung Isaaks“ im Kanon (Gen 22): Grundlegungen und Programm einer Kanonisch-Intertextuellen, Lektüre mit einer Spezialbibliographie zu Gen 22*. Freiburg, Basel, Wien, Barcelona, Rom, New York: Herder, 1999.

Stemberger, Günter. *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch*. 8th. ed. München: C. H. Beck, 1992.

Sundberg, Albert C. *Harvard Theological Studies XX: The Old Testament of the Early Church*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964.

Thackery, H. St. J. *Josephus: The Life and Against Apion vol. 1*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1926.

Towner, W. Sibley. *Daniel: Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1984.

Valeta, David M. "Court or Jester Tales? Resistance and Social Reality in Daniel 1-6." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 32/3 (2005): 309-324.

Valeta, David M. *Lions and Ovens and Visions: Satirical Reading of Daniel 1-6*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2008.

Van der Toorn, Karel. "In the Lions' Den: The Babylonian Background of a Biblical Motif." *CBQ* 60/4 (1998): 626-640.

Veijola, Timo. *Das 5. Buch Mose: Deuteronomium Kapitel 1,1-16,17*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.

Vogt, Ernestus, ed. *Lexicon Linguae Aramaicae Veteris Testamenti*. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1994.

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

Wellhausen, Julius. *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*. Translated by Black and Menzies. New York: Meridian Books, 1957.

Wilson, R. Dick. "The Book of Daniel." In *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia: Volume II Clement-Heresh*. Edited by James Orr. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957.

Walvoord, John F. *Daniel: The Key to Prophetic Revelation*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1971.

Wolters, Al. "Untying the King's Knots: Physiology and Wordplay in Daniel 5." *JBL* 110/1 (1991): 117-122.

Author Index

- Archer, Jr., Gleason L. 40
Bauer, Hans and Pontus Leander 57, 71
Bauer, Walter 128
Barr, James 24-25, 29
Barton, John 25-26, 35
Beale, G. K. 138
Beal, Timothy K. 8
Beckwith, Roger 130
Beyerle, Stefan 81, 83, 130
Blenkinsopp, Joseph 12, 36
Bruce, Les P. 68, 80
Brueggemann, Walter 78
Buhl, Franz 60, 93
Childs, Brevard S. 6, 13, 18-22, 23, 34, 36, 47-48, 104, 114, 123
Collins, John J. 27-28, 54, 56, 57, 58, 89, 114
Coxon, Peter 59
Crüsemann, Frank 120
Di Lella, Alexander A. 83, 86
Derrida, Jacques 6, 10, 35
Finley, Thomas J. 129, 130,
Fishbane, Michael 7, 14-16, 23, 37, 103, 130, 132
France, R. T. 138
Gammie, John G. 58
Ginsberg, H. I. 80, 130
Godard, Barbara 8, 10
Goldingay, John 78, 84
Harrison, R. K. 40-41
Hartman, Louis F. 51, 54
Hays, Christopher B. 66
Hilton, Michael 53
Jastrow, Marcus 90
Kellenberger, Edgar 54
Koch, Klaus 58, 99, 127, 129, 130
Kristeva, Julia 6, 8-12, 36, 37
Lebram, J. C. H. 78, 96, 127
Levenson, Jon D. 12, 36
Lindbeck, George 29-32, 37
Loader, James Alfred 90, 117
Meyer, Rudolf 52, 105
Montgomery, James A. 56, 57, 104, 114, 142
Moore, Michael S. 35
Niehr, Herbert 49, 50, 67
Porteous, Norman W. 41-43, 53, 141
Rashi 53
Rendtorff, Rolf 13, 37, 88
Rosenthal, Franz 57, 65, 71
Roudiez, Leon S. 8
Sailhamer, John 37
Sanders, James A. 7, 13, 16-18, 22-24, 37, 128
de Saussure, Ferdinand 9
Schmidt, Werner H. 44-45
Schweitzer, Eduard 134
Seitz, Christopher 39
Sheppard, Gerald T. 13, 16
Steins, Georg 32-35
Stemberger, Günter 129
Sundberg, Albert C. 36
Thackeray, H. St. J. 127
Towner, W. Sibley 43-44, 141
Valeta, David M. 58, 59, 61, 62, 78, 80
van der Toorn, Karel 68, 72
Veijola, Timo 123
Vogt, Ernestus 90
Von Rad, Gerhard 45-47, 131
Walvoord, John F. 104, 114
Wellhausen, Julius 7, 37
Wilson, R. Dick 39-40
Wolters, Al 69

Biblical and Ancient Text Index

Hebrew Bible

Exodus

3:14 139
19 123
20 142
20:1 121
20:2-6 122, 123
20-23 121
21:1 121
24 21
24:1-8 122
24:1-11 21
24:4 121
25 121
25:16 121

Deuteronomy

1:1-5 122
1:32 122
2:1 122
5 142
5-11 123
5:6-10 122
28 125
28:1-14 125
28:15-68 125
29:1 125
29:19 125
29:19-20 124-125
31 21
31:9 121
31:24 21

Leviticus

25:1-55 103
26:34-35 103

2 Kings

22 21

Nehemiah

8:13-18 21

Isaiah

8:16 21
8:16f 21
24-27 44, 130
45:1 104

52:13-53:12 130

Jeremiah

25 99, 101
25:1-2 98
25:11 99, 139
25:11-12 98, 99
29 99, 101
29:1 98
29:4-7 99
29:10 98
36:1ff 21

Ezekiel

1 130
1:13 130
14:14 42, 43
14:20 42, 43
20:34-38 115
28:3 42, 43
29:17 130
38-39 130
40-48 129
40:1 129-130

Joel

2:28-3:21 44

Zechariah

1-6 130
1:4ff 21
9-14 44
12 138
12:10 138

Psalms

76:7 93
110 137
110:1 137

Esther 43

Daniel

1 46, 54-56, 56, 78, 117
1-6 39, 42, 43, 45, 46, 48, 51-79, 54, 56, 58, 78-79, 80, 88, 131

1:1 51, 53, 57, 99, 108, 142

1:1-2:4a 49

1:2 68, 99

1:3 93

1:4 55

1:5 53

1:6 57

1:7 55, 105, 133

1:9 56, 59

1:10 57

1:17 56, 58, 59

1:18 53

1:18-20 72

1:19-20 55

1:20 58, 61

1:21 56, 77, 105, 108

2 40, 41, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 53, 56, 57-59, 57, 58, 59, 61, 64, 67, 75, 76, 79, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 87, 88, 95, 109, 115, 116, 117, 135, 141, 142

2-3 59

2-7 49, 54,

2:1 51, 53, 57, 88, 108, 142

2:2 58, 64, 69

2:1-3 64, 141

2:1-4a 54

2:4ff 44, 89

2:4-11 64

2:4b-7:28 49

2:5 63, 141

2:6 69, 70

2:9 141

2:11 141

2:12 62, 142

2:13 57, 142

2:16-18 142

2:19 58, 59, 81, 142

2:22 69

2:24 64

2:24-25 69

2:26 106

2:28 58, 65, 95, 108

2:31 141	3:29 62, 63, 141	5:8 69
2:31-35 81	3:30 61, 63	5:9 88
2:31-45 135	3:31 76	5:10 88
2:32 141	3:31-33 62, 133	5:10-12 69
2:34 141		5:11 68, 72, 108
2:35 141	4 49, 59, 63-67, 64, 65,	5:12 69, 72
2:36 59	67, 71, 75, 76, 84, 117	5:13 68
2:37 67, 70, 84	4-6 54	5:15 69
2:37-38 59, 64	4:1 52, 53, 63, 142	5:16 69, 70
2:37-45 81	4:1-2 53, 64	5:17 70
2:38 95	4:2 65, 69, 84, 88	5:18 68, 70, 84
2:39 108,	4:3 64	5:19 76
2:40 82	4:4 64	5:20 70, 72
2:44 61, 83, 85	4:4-6 64	5:21 71
2:47 59, 62, 64, 76	4:5 106	5:22 72
2:48 72	4:6 64, 106	5:22-23 71
2:48-49 72, 141	4:7-9 64	5:23 72
2:49 53, 60	4:7-14 71, 81	5:30 53, 68, 72
	4:11-13 65	
3 49, 56, 59, 60-63, 67,	4:14 65, 71	6 49, 56, 68, 72-78, 72,
72, 75, 76, 77, 78, 117,	4:16 65, 69	76, 77, 78, 89, 97, 101,
141, 142	4:17-23 81	117, 120, 121, 124, 142
3-6 46,	4:19 65	6:1 51, 52, 53, 72, 108,
3:1 52, 53, 60, 108,	4:22 66	142
141, 142	4:22-24 71	6:2 72
3:1-33 133, 141	4:23 66, 71	6:4 72
3:2 141	4:24 66	6:5 74, 87
3:3 141	4:26 67	6:6-10 118
3:5 60, 141	4:27 67, 70, 76	6:8 72, 73, 118, 122
3:5-6 133	4:28-30 67	6:11 73, 99, 123, 124
3:6 61, 132, 133, 134,	4:29-30 66, 71	6:15 74
141	4:30 66	6:16 74
3:7 141	4:31 66, 67, 76	6:21-23 74
3:8 74	4:31-32 49, 67	6:23 123-124, 135
3:10 141	4:34 67, 71, 76	6:24 75
3:12 60, 141		6:25 74
3:15 61, 74, 141	5 49, 54, 56, 67-72, 67,	6:26 76
3:16-18 73	68, 72, 78, 89, 97, 101,	6:27 76
3:17 62	117	6:27-28 75
3:17-18 133	5:1 52, 53, 67, 108,	6:28 57, 77
3:18 62, 141	142	6:29 77, 105
3:19 62, 141	5:1-2 53	
3:20 133	5:2 68, 72	7 40, 41, 42, 44, 46, 48,
3:20-23 74	5:2-3 99	67, 68, 81-89, 81, 82,
3:22 75	5:3 99	83, 84, 88, 89, 90, 92,
3:22-23 62, 77	5:3-4 99	93, 96, 97, 110, 112,
3:25 62, 75, 141	5:4 69	113, 114, 115, 116,
3:26-27 141	5:5 69	117, 138, 142
3:27 133	5:6 69, 84, 88	7-9 48, 130
3:28 75, 141	5:7 69	

7-12 43, 44, 45, 46, 48, 49, 54, 56, 79, 80, 115, 130, 131	8:1 52, 53, 67, 89, 108, 142	9:3 99, 100, 101, 107
7:1 51, 53, 67, 81, 88, 108, 135, 142	8:2 89, 90, 95	9:3-5 100
7:2 81, 82, 92	8:2-3 94	9:3-20 100
7:2-3 81	8:3-7 95	9:4 99
7:2-7 135	8:4 90, 91, 111	9:4-16 99
7:2-14 81, 88, 135	8:5-12 95	9:6 100, 125
7:3-7 82, 83	8:6 111	9:8 99
7:6 82	8:6-7 91	9:10 99, 100, 120, 125
7:7 81, 82, 90, 91	8:7 111	9:11 100, 104, 119
7:7-8 82, 86	8:8 91, 92, 95, 110, 111,	9:13 99, 100, 102, 119, 124
7:8 44, 92, 93, 136	8:9ff 44	9:13-19 139
7:9 81, 83	8:9-12 92, 96	9:14 99
7:9-10 136	8:10 93	9:15 125
7:10 112	8:11b-12 93	9:16 99, 102
7:11 112	8:12 102	9:18 100
7:12 87, 94, 103, 136	8:12-13 102	9:19 100
7:13 44, 81, 83, 107, 132, 135, 137, 138	8:12ff 44,	9:20 99, 100, 102
7:13-14 83, 112, 136	8:13 102, 104, 112	9:21 107
7:14 85	8:13-14 93-94	9:23 101, 107
7:15 84, 95	8:14 44, 94, 103, 114	9:24 101, 102, 140
7:15-27 135	8:15 94, 95	9:24ff 44
7:16 84, 103	8:16 94, 101	9:24-27 101, 107, 110
7:17-18 88, 136	8:17 95	9:25-27 103
7:17-28 81, 84	8:19 95	9:26ff 44
7:18 85, 87	8:20 95, 97, 108, 111	9:27 44, 113, 114, 115, 132, 139, 142
7:19-22 85, 86, 88	8:20-21 111	10 107, 108, 109,
7:20 93	8:21 95, 108, 111	10-11 48, 114
7:20ff 44	8:21-22 110	10-12 48, 105-115, 105, 106, 114, 115, 116, 117, 142
7:22 83, 85	8:22 110	10:1 52, 53, 56, 57, 78, 88, 105, 106, 107, 142
7:23 136	8:22b 110	10:2 106, 107
7:23-27 86, 89	8:23 95, 102	10:3 107
7:24 136	8:23a 110	10:11 107
7:24b-25 92	8:23ff 44	10:12 106-107
7:24b-26 95	8:23-25 96	10:13 108-109
7:25 44, 85, 93, 94, 113, 114, 136	8:23-26 95-96	10:14 108
7:26-27 136	8:26 112	10:18 107
7:27 85, 87, 104, 112	8:27 96, 101	10:19 107-108
7:28 87-88		10:21 107,
	9 46, 48, 97-105, 97, 101, 107, 109, 111, 114, 115, 116, 117, 119, 120, 121, 125, 126, 142	11 107, 110, 111
8 40, 46, 48, 67, 68, 89-97, 89, 90, 92, 93, 97, 101, 110, 110, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 139, 142	9:1 52, 53, 88, 97, 108, 109	11-12 107, 130
	9:1-2 142	11:1 53, 105, 109, 142
	9:2 22, 97-98, 99, 100, 101, 112, 120, 139	11:2 109
		11:2-4 111
		11:2b-12:7 110

11:3 110
11:4 110
11:5 110
11:6 110
11:7 110, 111
11:8 110
11:9 110,
11:11 110, 111
11:13 110
11:14 110
11:15 110
11:20 111
11:20-21 111
11:21 111
11:21ff 44
11:25 110
11:26 111
11:31 44, 115, 132,
139, 140
11:36 112
11:36f 44
11:40 110, 111
11:40-43 111
11:40-45 40
11:40 40, 110
11:40ff 44
11:44 111
11:45 111

12 48, 112, 113, 114,
115
12:1 111
12:2 112
12:4 102, 103, 112
12:6 112
12:7 44, 112-113, 114
12:9 102, 103
12:11 114, 115, 132,
139, 140
12:11f 44
12:11-12 114
12:12 114
12:13 115

Ezra
7 120, 121
7:12 119
7:14 119
7:21 119
7:26 119

2 Chronicles
36:21 103

New Testament
Matthew
5:17 128
7:12 128
11:13 128
13:1-2 134
13:3 134
13:13-14 134
13:24-30 134
13:36-43 134
13:37 134
13:38 134
13:39 134
13:42 132, 133, 134
13:48 134
13:50 132, 133, 134
22:40 128
24 140
24:15 42, 128-129,
132, 139, 140
24:29-31 138
24:30 132, 135, 137,
138, 139
24:31 140
25:31-46 115
26:57-86 137
26:64 132, 135, 136,
139

Mark
13 140
13:14 132, 139, 140
13:26 132, 135, 137,
139
13:27 140
14:53-65 137
14:62 132, 135, 136,
139

Luke
16:16 128
21:27 132, 135, 137,
139
24:27 128
24:44 128

Acts
13:15 128
24:14 128
28:23 128

Romans
3:21 128

Revelation
1:7 132, 135, 138, 139
1:8 138

Apocrypha
Baruch 42, 45

1 Esdras
3-4 43

2 Esdras 42
14:44 19

Judith 43

Tobit 43

Sirach/Ecclesiasticus
Prologue 127-128
48:22-49:12 18, 19,
128

1 Maccabees
1:54 142
2:42 43
6:7 142
7:13-17 43

2 Maccabees
2:13 19

Old Testament
Pseudepigrapha
Ahiqar 43

Ascension of Isaiah 42

Assumption of Moses
42

Enoch 42

**the Testament of the
Twelve Patriarchs 42**

Dead Sea Scroll
4Q174 *Florilegium*
II, 3 129, 130

Josephus
Contra Apionem
I.8 22, 126-127, 131

Antiquitates judaicae
XII.7.6 42

Talmud
Baba Batra
14b 126, 129
14b-15a 1, 130
15a 117

Abstract

The Concept of Canonical Intertextuality is an attempt to bring clarity to the concepts of intertextuality and canon criticism in the field of biblical studies. This dissertation combines an examination of the theories of intertextuality (Julia Kristeva), canon criticism (Brevard Childs, James Sanders), inner-biblical exegesis (Michael Fishbane), intratextuality (George Lindbeck), and *kanonische intertextuelle Lektüre* (Georg Steins) with an inductive study of the Masoretic text of Daniel, its concrete relationship with other texts in the Hebrew Bible, and finally with quotations in the Greek text of the New Testament. The Masoretic text of Daniel serves as an excellent test ground, through its multilingual character (Hebrew and Aramaic), differing placement in various biblical canons, and clear quotation in a limited number of New Testament texts. The end result is a theory of canonical intertextuality that is unique in its definition in relation to the theories investigated as well as its application to an entire biblical book and other texts in the Old and New Testaments.

The Concept of Canonical Intertextuality ist ein Versuch, Klarheit bezüglich der Begriffe Intertextualität und Kanonkritik auf dem Gebiet biblischer Studien zu schaffen. Diese Dissertation kombiniert eine Untersuchung von Theorien der Intertextualität (Julia Kristeva), Kanonkritik (Brevard Childs, James Sanders), innerbiblischen Exegese (Michael Fishbane), Intratextualität (George Lindbeck) und der kanonischen intertextuellen Lektüre (Georg Steins) mit einer induktiven Untersuchung vom masoretischen Text des Danielbuches, von seiner konkreten Beziehung zu anderen Texten in der hebräischen Bibel und schließlich zu Zitaten im griechischen Text des Neuen Testaments. Der masoretische Text des Danielbuches dient aufgrund seines mehrsprachigen Charakters (Hebräisch und Aramäisch), seiner unterschiedlichen Platzierung in verschiedenen Kanons und seiner eindeutigen Zitierung in einer begrenzten Anzahl von Texten des Neuen Testaments als hervorragendes Untersuchungsfeld. Das Schlussergebnis ist eine Theorie kanonischer Intertextualität, welche in ihrer Definition relativ zu den untersuchten Theorien einzigartig ist, aber auch in ihrer Anwendung auf ein ganzes Bibelbuch und weitere Texte des Alten und Neuen Testaments.

CV

Jordan Scheetz

Windestraat 8
1171 KA Badhoevedorp
The Netherlands
Home Phone (020) 337-6486

PERSONAL

My driving passion in life is to make disciples of Jesus Christ. In this pursuit the Lord has given me a specific passion for teaching that is based on careful research both within and outside the Bible. This driving passion has led my family and me to ministry in the US as well as Europe.

EDUCATION

1989-1992	High School Diploma, Centennial High School
1992-1993	Portland State University
1993-1996	Bachelor of Science in Biblical Education, Multnomah Bible College
1996-2001	Master of Arts in Exegetical Theology with High Honors, Western Seminary
2004-	Doctoral Candidate in Theology, University of Vienna

EMPLOYMENT

1995, 1996	<i>S.T.A.R. Director, Eagle Fern Youth Camp</i> For eight weeks of each summer a colleague and I directed this Christian leadership training program. I developed and taught Bible and Theology classes covering key skills and characteristics necessary for Christian leadership, as well as leading by example in the completion of the physical care of the youth camp.
1996-2001	<i>Youth Minister, Eastgate Bible Chapel</i> For over five years I led all of the ministries for those between the ages of 11-20 at Eastgate Bible Chapel. The responsibilities included were: recruiting and training volunteer staff, developing, implementing and teaching biblical and theological curriculum, organizing, implementing and leading weekly, weekend long, and week long youth events, personally mentoring youth, working in conjunction with other pastors, youth pastors and ministers.
2001	<i>Grad-Fellow at Western Seminary, Portland</i> I worked during the fall semester of 2001 for Dr. Greg Allison grading papers and doing research on modern approaches to Christology.
2001-2004	<i>Missionary</i> For three years I lived with my family in Baden, Austria. I worked with the youth ministry in an evangelical church in Baden, taught various Bible classes at Vienna Christian High School, lead an evangelistic outreach to refugee teenagers, and was involved in several music projects. One key goal was to provide serious biblical education in German for evangelical church leaders in Austria.
2004-2008	<i>Staff Minister, Eastgate Bible Chapel</i> I worked with Eastgate Bible Chapel as Full Time Staff Minister which included all aspects of church ministry: regular preaching, pastoral care for all ages of people, recruiting and training volunteer staff, overseeing the youth ministry, organizing all-church activities, theological and biblical teaching in various contexts, evangelism, etc.
2005	<i>Adjunct Teaching at Western Seminary, Portland</i> In an independent study course during the fall semester of 2005 I taught one student to read theological German.
2007	<i>Adjunct Teaching at Multnomah University, Portland</i> I taught two sections of PHL 302, Introduction to Ethics, which is "[a]n introduction to basic ethical theories and related contemporary moral issues with particular emphasis on the student being able to formulate and articulate a Christian approach to moral decision-making."
2008-	<i>Assistant Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature at Tyndale Theological Seminary, The Netherlands</i>

TEACHING AREAS, EXPERIENCE AND STRENGTHS

Teaching areas could include: Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, exegetical courses, Old or New Testament survey, text and canon, hermeneutics, Ethics, Christology.

I have taught courses in high school/college/seminary settings that include: ethics, Christology, the Epistle to the Romans, the Gospel of John, the Book of Daniel, Old Testament survey, New Testament Survey, theological German.

I have taught in church or para-church settings: Genesis, Exodus, Joshua, Obadiah, Jonah, Haggai, Malachi, Matthew, Mark, John, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, James, 1 John, 2 John, 3 John, Revelation, Bible study methods, preaching, youth ministry development, evangelism, theology proper, Christology, the development of the biblical canon, sanctification, various themes from the writings of John, spiritual growth.

The strengths and skills of my teaching experience include: a broad range of biblical and theological training, experience in multicultural and religious settings, experience with broad age groups, the ability to connect academics with practical experience, a passion for teaching/preaching.

CURRENT AREAS OF RESEARCH

Presently I am researching intertextuality, canonical criticism and their intersection in the Hebrew Bible to complete my doctoral work at the University of Vienna. As such, the Bible in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek, exegesis of the biblical texts, and their continual revitalization through preaching and personal application are particular areas of passion, both academically and pastorally. Through my academic research and ministry responsibilities, I find continual opportunities to exercise these passions and hope to continue this partnership in further teaching/ministry.

PROFESSIONAL BODIES AND LEARNED SOCIETIES

Society of Biblical Literature (2003-present)

Evangelical Theological Society (2003-present)

OTHER RELEVANT INFORMATION

The end of this academic year should mark the completion of my doctorate from the University of Vienna. With this end now in sight a transition in ministry has happened. What has been primarily a pastoral ministry with teaching as part of it has now transitioned to primarily a teaching ministry with pastoring as part of it. Rather than a complete paradigm shift this is more a matter of reemphasis.

One peculiar issue to our family is not only that we have five children but further that my second daughter, Hannah, is severely handicapped. We have lived in the US, Austria and The Netherlands and have found each of these situations to be a challenge. With that said, she has also been an extreme source of God's grace in our lives, teaching us to live more and more for the glory of God.

LANGUAGES

As well as being skilled in biblical Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek, I am fluent in English and German and have rudimentary skills in Dutch, Latin, and French.

PUBLICATIONS

Jordan M. Scheetz, review of David Valeta, *Lions and Ovens and Visions: A Satirical Reading of Daniel 1-6*, *Review of Biblical Literature* [<http://www.bookreviews.org>] (2009).