

# Constructing Fear and Pride in the Book of Daniel: The Profile of a Second Temple Emotional Community\*

## Abstract

This paper examines the seminal role that emotions, particularly fear and pride, play in the book of Daniel. Drawing upon the idea of “emotional communities,” I view the book’s final redactor as engaged with the views of one such community during the period of the Antiochan persecutions. The redactor’s emotional community responded to the persecutions with fear, an emotion that he simultaneously validated and challenged. The emotions of pride and fear both reflect beliefs about one’s power relative to others. The prideful kings portrayed in the book and the redactor’s fearful emotional community shared what the redactor claimed were unwarranted beliefs about the relative power of each group. In order to jettison the fear of his community, the redactor first had to address the beliefs that supported that emotion. The book constitutes a sustained effort to construct an alternative emotional norm for members of the redactor’s community by providing them with a new way of evaluating their situation: even if redemption has been delayed, faithful Jews who resist Antiochus to the point of martyrdom are in fact the powerful ones.

## I. Introduction

The period of the Antiochan persecutions was a time of great turmoil for Jews in the land of Israel. The desecration of the temple and the ban on Torah observance elicited a range of emotional reactions: hope, courage, zeal, fear, and grief all find expression in the Jewish texts that narrate the events of the 160s B.C.E. For the “social-constructionist” approach to the study of emotion, a perspective that I will outline below, emotions represent evaluative judgments about other people,

---

\* I wish to thank Joseph Angel, Angela Kim Harkins, Chaviva Levin, Gillian Steinberg, and the journal’s anonymous readers for their insightful comments on earlier drafts of this article. All remaining errors are my own. An early version of this article was presented at the Columbia Bible Seminar, May 14, 2014. I thank the participants for the feedback they provided.

objects, or behavior that are shaped by the values and beliefs of a community.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, the broad spectrum of emotions attested in connection with the Antiochan persecutions emerged from different perspectives on the crisis.<sup>2</sup> Jews did not arrive at a consensus on the appropriate emotional response to the persecutions, and Jewish authors advocated on behalf of particular emotional stances. In order to shape the emotional states of their communities, writers turned to the realm of religious belief to clarify what they regarded as more appropriate ways of evaluating contemporary events.<sup>3</sup> For biblical scholars interested in the burgeoning field of the history of emotions, the literature of that time represents a valuable case study for the ways in which emotional styles are products of their historical context.<sup>4</sup>

The book of Daniel is an outstanding example of a text whose redactor lived through the persecutions and in which emotions play a critical role.<sup>5</sup> I read the final version of the book of

---

<sup>1</sup> Claire Armon-Jones, “The Thesis of Constructionism,” in *The Social Construction of Emotions* (ed. Rom Harré; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988), 32–56. For a recent attempt to employ a social-constructionist line of analysis in the context of ancient Judaism, see Ari Mermelstein, “Love and Hate at Qumran: The Social Construction of Sectarian Emotion,” *DSD* 20 (2013): 237–63.

<sup>2</sup> On emotions as evaluative judgments, see Martha C. Nussbaum, *Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

<sup>3</sup> I am not claiming that, in my particular data set, the redactor of Daniel subscribed to the “cognitive” view of emotions championed by Aristotle. Nevertheless, as I hope to show, the book’s redactor did identify certain inappropriate emotional styles, particularly hubristic pride and fear, which he sought to correct. The social-constructionist approach enables us to appreciate that the emotions of the redactor’s community were rooted in certain ways of viewing the world and that the key to emotional change lay in substituting for them a different vantagepoint from which to evaluate the events of their day.

<sup>4</sup> Seminal contributions to the history of emotions include Peter N. Stearns and Carol Z. Stearns, “Emotionology: Clarifying the History of Emotions and Emotional Standards,” *American Historical Review* 90 (1985): 813–36; William M. Reddy, *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); and Barbara H. Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006). For an introduction to the field and a literature survey, see Susan J. Matt, “Current Emotion Research in History: Or, Doing History from the Inside Out,” *Emotion Review* 3 (2011): 117–24. On the social-constructionist methodology in history of emotions research, see Reddy, *Navigation of Feeling*, 34–62. I share Reddy’s concern about the ahistorical nature of much social-constructionist scholarship, though the fundamental premise of that school, namely that emotional life is deeply embedded in culture, accounts well for why emotions evolve over time.

<sup>5</sup> The consensus of scholarship posits a multi-staged redactional process in the creation of the book. In this paper, I focus on the final redactor, who lived sometime after the desecration of the temple in 167 and was responsible for chs. 8–12 and possibly for chs. 1 and 7 as well; for discussion of the book’s redactional

Daniel as embedded within what historians of emotion characterize as an “emotional community,” a group “in which people adhere to the same norms of emotional expression and value—or devalue—the same or related emotions.”<sup>6</sup> Scholars generally identify the members of the redactor’s community as the *maskilim*, a group that figures prominently in the closing chapters of the book.<sup>7</sup> The redactor deploys emotions throughout the book that simultaneously reflect the emotional tenor of, and seek to establish emotional norms for, his community.

Daniel’s emotional community was also a textual community.<sup>8</sup> Such a community will share in common a set of texts that serve as the basis for its practices and beliefs. The emotions of a textual community will likewise be shaped by the emotions that are embedded in its literary tradition.<sup>9</sup> Within what scholars assume was a highly literate community, the redactor of Daniel seeks to produce a work that will dictate the correct emotional reactions to the persecutions of Antiochus. In other words, I propose reading the book of Daniel as both a product of and response to the emotions of a community that used texts as the foundation of its worldview. If we read Daniel carefully, we can reconstruct the emotional mood of his community, the broader worldview that explains the origins of that mood, and the redactor’s own efforts to transform it.

---

history, see below, nn. 10–13, 22. As I will argue, the final redactor created an overarching framework in the book that focused on the primary emotion of his community, namely fear.

<sup>6</sup> Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, 2. The fact that much of our evidence for the redactor’s community comes from the work of the redactor need not prevent us from situating him within an emotional community, a point that Rosenwein argued in studying the writings of Pope Gregory the Great as expressions of an otherwise unknown emotional community, “Gregory allows us to see *his* emotional community ... even though we know about that community from him alone. No individual is isolated from his or her social context” (ibid., 80; emphasis in original).

<sup>7</sup> See John J. Collins, *Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 66–68.

<sup>8</sup> On textual communities, see Brian Stock, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987). On the scribal nature of Daniel’s community and the value that is placed on literacy and writing, see P. R. Davies, “Reading Daniel Sociologically,” in *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings* (ed. A. S. van der Woude; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993), 345–61 (352–55).

<sup>9</sup> See Rosenwein, *Emotional Communities*, 24–25: “An emotional community is a group in which people have a common stake, interests, values, and goals. Thus it is often a social community. But it is also possibly a ‘textual community,’ created and reinforced by ideologies, teachings, and common presuppositions.”

Of course, only portions of the book originated during the period of the Antiochan persecutions.<sup>10</sup> Nevertheless, the theme of emotions spans redactional layers of the book, suggesting that the redactor appropriated earlier texts in order to address the emotional style of his own second-century B.C.E. emotional community. Thus, the emotions that characterize the sections that *were* composed during the persecutions follow from the emotions in chs. 2–6, passages that certainly originated at an earlier date,<sup>11</sup> and the book’s emphasis on the emotions of its protagonists is one way through which the redactor lent coherence to a book whose constituent parts differ in language, theology, genre, and provenance.<sup>12</sup> In particular, pride and fear play central thematic roles in the narratives in chs. 1–6 and the apocalyptic texts in chs. 7–12. The redactor shows his emotional community that in demonstrating excessive pride, Antiochus IV perpetuated the prideful ways of his royal predecessors, who, in chs. 2–6, were punished for failing to learn from past history that pride in their status and accomplishments was unjustified. The redactor thus attached ch. 1 and the apocalyptic portions of the book to the unit comprising chs. 2–6 in order to situate Antiochus’ reign in a wider historical context whose recurring theme is imperial pride and its negative consequences.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Very few scholars advocate the view of H. H. Rowley, who attributed the entire book to one person; see his “The Unity of the Book of Daniel,” in *The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament* (2d ed.; Oxford: Blackwell, 1965), 249–80. Rowley’s argument that the entire book dates to the period following the Antiochan persecutions is problematic; see John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* (HSM 16; Missoula, Mo: Scholars Press, 1977), 8–11. For a more recent iteration of Rowley’s position, see Jan-Wim Wesselijs, “The Writing of Daniel,” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (2 vols.; ed. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint; VTSup 83; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 2:291–310.

<sup>11</sup> This is the near-unanimous view of scholarship, although scholars disagree about the exact date of composition. For a survey of views, see John G. Gammie, “The Classification, Stages of Growth, and Changing Intentions in the Book of Daniel,” *JBL* 95 (1976): 191–204. Scholars further describe the incremental process through which chs. 2–6 themselves came together, though my concerns with the redactional history of the book do not extend that far back; on the possibility that these chapters were originally independent of each other, see Collins, *Daniel*, 29.

<sup>12</sup> For an overview of the book’s diversity, see Collins, *Daniel*, 24–39. For possible ideological distinctions between the tales and apocalyptic sections, see W. Lee Humphreys, “A Life-Style for Diaspora: A Study of the Tales of Esther and Daniel,” *JBL* 92 (1973): 211–23.

<sup>13</sup> I accept the view of most scholars that attributes ch. 1 to the final redactor. Scholars disagree about whether ch. 1 was originally composed in Aramaic and subsequently translated (so Reinhard G. Kratz, “The

As I describe below in sections II and III, the redactor condemns the pride exhibited by a succession of kings because it grows out of an incorrect perception that they are genuinely powerful. This form of pride approximates the ancient concept of *hubris*. According to Aristotle, *hubris* grows out of a sense of superiority.<sup>14</sup> Broadly speaking, “hubris is over-confident violation of universal or divine laws, and so characteristic of successful kings and conquerors.”<sup>15</sup> On numerous occasions, Nebuchadnezzar mistakenly believes that he, and not God, enjoys unsurpassed power; his pride is hubristic. In his own words, he learned too late that God “is able to humble those who walk in pride (מִהֶלְכֵי בְּגִיָּה)” (4:34).<sup>16</sup> Belshazzar falls prey to the same emotion, while Darius learns the lessons of his predecessors and acknowledges divine power. Antiochus’ demise should be inevitable because he, like Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar, failed to acknowledge that he suffered from hubris.<sup>17</sup>

Building upon ancient terminology, contemporary theorists of emotion distinguish “authentic” from “hubristic” pride. “Authentic” pride, illustrated by the statement, “I won because I

---

Visions of Daniel,” in *Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, 91–113 [92]) or else composed in Hebrew at or near the time of the book’s redaction (so Anthea E. Portier-Young, “Languages of Identity and Obligation: Daniel as Bilingual Book,” *VT* 60 [2010]: 98–115 [100–1]). A recent dissenting voice sees chs. 8–12 as comprising the original book; see H. J. M. van Deventer, “Another Look at the Redaction History of the Book of Daniel, or, Reading Daniel from Left to Right,” *JOT* 38 (2013): 239–60.

<sup>14</sup> *Rhetoric* 1378b 23–35.

<sup>15</sup> Kenneth J. Dover, *Greek Homosexuality* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989), 35 n. 15. In his monograph on hubris in the Hebrew Bible, Donald E. Gowan, *When Man Becomes God: Humanism and Hybris in the Old Testament* (Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1975), 4, adopts a similar definition of hubris in the context of the Hebrew Bible, which, according to him, refers to human “efforts at encroachment” on divine “prerogatives.” More recently, John T. Strong, has explored the theme of hubris, which, following Gowan, he defines as “presumption toward the gods,” in the book of Ezekiel; see his “Sitting on the Seat of God: A Study of Pride and Hubris in the Prophetic Corpus of the Hebrew Bible,” *BR* 56 (2011): 55–81.

<sup>16</sup> All translations of biblical texts are based on the NJPS, with modifications.

<sup>17</sup> For a discussion of the importance of humility in biblical texts, see Gary A. Rendsburg, “No Stelae, No Queens: Two Issues Concerning the Kings of Israel and Judah,” in *The Archaeology of Difference: Gender, Ethnicity, Class, and the “Other” in Antiquity: Studies in Honor of Eric M. Meyers* (ed. Douglas R. Edwards and C. Thomas McCullough; Boston: American Schools of Oriental Research, 2007), 95–107 (97–99).

practiced,” may “result from attributions to internal, unstable, controllable causes.”<sup>18</sup> In contrast, “hubristic” pride, illustrated by the statement, “I won because I’m always great,” may “result from attributions to internal, stable, uncontrollable causes.”<sup>19</sup> These two types of pride “are not distinguished by the *kinds* of events that elicit them ... but [rather by] the way in which the event is *appraised*.”<sup>20</sup> Hubris is an unjustified form of pride that occurs when one incorrectly takes credit for one’s accomplishment.<sup>21</sup> In denying God as the ultimate source of authority and power, the kings in Daniel succumb to hubristic pride.

In condemning the hubris of the kings, the redactor responds to his own emotional community’s fear, likewise a product of a belief in the king’s power. As I suggest in section IV, the redactor’s message to them is that, like the hubristic kings, they *should* recognize divine control and jettison their fear. Yet the redactor recognizes that the state of fear gripping members of the redactor’s group will not permit such neat solutions.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Jessica L. Tracy and Richard W. Robins, “The Nature of Pride,” in *The Self-Conscious Emotions: Theory and Research* (ed. Jessica L. Tracy, Richard W. Robins, and June Price Tangney; New York: Guilford Press, 2007), 263–82 (265).

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 267 (emphasis in original).

<sup>21</sup> On the element of self-deception in pride, see Gabriele Taylor, “Pride,” in *Explaining Emotions* (ed. Amélie Oksenberg Rorty; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980), 385–402 (392); eadem, *Pride, Shame, and Guilt: Emotions of Self-Assessment* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 28.

<sup>22</sup> If, as many scholars suggest, ch. 7 was originally the final text of an earlier redaction of the book, then that chapter may well have originally served as reassurance that God would vanquish Antiochus and deliver temporal rule to the holy ones of the Most High. In the context of the present book, however, the fear with which Daniel responds in ch. 7 both to the vision and its interpretation sets the tone for his emotional makeup through chs. 8–12. The fearful Daniel will not be reassured. My interest in ch. 7 is therefore only in the way that it functions in its current redactional context, whether or not it was composed at the same time as chs. 8–12. For the view that ch. 7 was composed or redacted some time before chs. 8–12, see Collins, *Daniel*, 35. Carol A. Newsom has recently suggested that ch. 7 originated in the context of the wars of the Diadochi following the death of Alexander the Great, and was secondarily updated during the period of the Antiochan persecutions; see her *Daniel: A Commentary* (with Brennan W. Breed; OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2014), 215–17. Support for separating their date of composition is only partly based on the linguistic distinction between the Aramaic of ch. 7 and the Hebrew of chs. 8–12. More importantly, the significant ideological differences between ch. 7 and chs. 8–12 complicate the assumption that they were composed by one person. For the view that attributes chs. 7–12 to the same author, see Susan Niditch, *The Symbolic Vision in Biblical Tradition* (HSM 30; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1983), 225–26.

In section V, I suggest that the redactor made three additional attempts through the visionary accounts in chs. 8, 9, and 10–12, respectively, to reassure his fearful emotional community that the prideful king would meet his end. Channeling the fear of the book’s audience, Daniel’s fear climaxes in ch. 10, when the interpreting angel urges him to “have no fear” (vv. 12, 19: אַל־תִּירָא) and “be strong, be strong” (v. 19: חֲזַק וְחֲזַק). In ch. 1, also a product of the redactor, the royal servant expressed fear (1:10: יִרָא אֲנִי) about the king’s reaction if Daniel were to refrain from eating.<sup>23</sup> In response, Daniel assures him that he need not fear so long as Daniel observes the Law. Through the texts in chs. 1, 7–12, as well as in the earlier redactional layers of the book, the redactor projected the fear of his contemporaries onto the protagonists in his book and sought to shape his emotional community’s response to the fear induced by the persecutions and desecration of the temple.

Like pride, fear is bound up in beliefs about power and authority. According to Aristotle, fear “typically involves a judgment of an adverse relationship of power.”<sup>24</sup> People who experience fear conclude that “those who can harm have both opportunity and intention to harm.”<sup>25</sup> Political circumstances suggested to the redactor’s emotional community that Antiochus remained firmly in power, complicating the possibility that God would deal with the hubris of the Seleucid monarch as neatly as he had in the cases of earlier kings. Yet because fear emerges from perceptions and judgments, it can be an especially unreliable or unwarranted emotion, presenting the “potential dissonance between appearance and reality” that we observed in connection with the emotion of

---

<sup>23</sup> On the compositional history of ch. 1, see above, n. 13.

<sup>24</sup> David Konstan, *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007), 142.

<sup>25</sup> Marlene K. Sokolon, *Political Emotions: Aristotle and the Symphony of Reason and Emotion* (DeKalb, Ill.: Northern Illinois University Press, 2006), 92.

pride.<sup>26</sup> We might over- or underestimate the extent to which someone else has the power, opportunity, or intention to harm, as well as our own lack or possession of power.<sup>27</sup> As I argue in sections V and VI, the redactor ultimately sought to communicate to his audience that they need not wait for divine intervention in order to wrest control from Antiochus. In fact, the people could do so through access to divine knowledge and submission to martyrdom, two sources of power to which they had recourse.

In analyzing the emotions of fear and pride in Daniel, I will adopt a social constructionist approach to the study of emotion. This perspective views emotions as evaluative judgments about others that are conditioned by cultural values.<sup>28</sup> In contrast to other forms of belief, the beliefs that comprise emotions do not evaluate “the event per se but rather the event-in-relation-to-self.”<sup>29</sup> Judgments about power that inhere in the emotions of both pride and fear will be the product of cultural beliefs and values, and, as such, both are “persuadable and open to reason.”<sup>30</sup> Those emotions, because they are socially constructed appraisals of specific situations involving power, can change as circumstances shift or as the community’s appraisal of those circumstances evolves: the

---

<sup>26</sup> Martha C. Nussbaum, *The New Religious Intolerance: Overcoming the Politics of Fear in an Anxious Age* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press, 2012), 27.

<sup>27</sup> See *ibid.*, 33-34. That fear is an unreliable emotion is one of the major theses of Nussbaum’s book, which focuses on that aspect of emotion in the context of contemporary Islamophobia.

<sup>28</sup> Armon-Jones, “Thesis of Constructionism.”

<sup>29</sup> Antony S. R. Manstead and Agneta H. Fischer, “Social Appraisal: The Social World as Object of and Influence on Appraisal Processes,” in *Appraisal Processes in Emotion: Theory, Methods, Research* (ed. Klaus R. Scherer, Angela Schorr, and Tom Johnstone; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 221–32 (224).

<sup>30</sup> Sokolon, *Political Emotions*, 89. See also Mary Douglas and Aaron Wildavsky, *Risk and Culture: An Essay on the Selection of Technological and Environmental Dangers* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982), 8: “Common values lead to common fears ... risk taking and risk aversion, shared confidence and shared fears, are part of the dialogue on how best to organize social relations.”

people can learn that they possess *more* or *less* power over the object in question or that it *does* or *does not* have the opportunity or intention to harm them.<sup>31</sup>

In the case of Daniel, emotions can only change—and, according to the redactor, the emotions of the prideful kings and the fearful people *must* change—if their perception of political circumstances changes. In the view of the book’s redactor, the presence of both pride and fear emerges from a mistaken belief in royal control. His primary task, therefore, is to expose an alternate reality, via divine revelation, that will enable the book’s protagonists, and, by extension, his own community, to reappraise the situation, thereby changing their emotions. The redactor’s construction of reality will induce in his community an awareness of royal hubris and an appreciation of Jewish power. According to the redactor, divine knowledge makes this outlook on reality so self-evident that, equipped with this knowledge, the kings will acknowledge their hubris while the redactor’s emotional community will come to appreciate the reality of Jewish power. In the redactor’s view of reality, both royal hubris and Jewish fear are unjustified emotions that must change.

## II. From Pride to Contrition: Royal Emotions in the Nebuchadnezzar Cycle of Narratives

The emotion of pride appears in the narrative for the first time in ch. 2. As we will see, that text lays the foundation for a unit, extending through ch. 6, that chronicles the kings’ chronic lapses into the emotion of pride. God punishes both Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar for failing to learn from past events that royal pride is hubristic. Darius breaks the cycle, demonstrating humility and showing deference to God. The redactor capitalized on the theme of this section when, in ch. 7, he argues

---

<sup>31</sup> See Konstan, *Emotions of the Ancient Greeks*, 141, who remarks that “[s]ince fear depends on an estimation of relative strength, it may be augmented or reduced by arguments for the superiority of one’s own or enemy forces.”

that Antiochus should be punished for overlooking past evidence that royal pride has catastrophic consequences.

Chapter 2, which narrates the account of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, focuses on the theme of royal power, the basis for the emotion of pride. The king wakes up unable to recall the dream's details and sentences to death all of his dream interpreters because they were unable to report for him its contents. He initially assumes that he enjoys supreme power over the bodies of his magicians when he declares that "if you do not tell me both the dream and its interpretation, you shall be torn limb from limb, and your houses shall be laid in ruins" (2:5). This statement is in tension with Nebuchadnezzar's own inability to recall what he saw, an incapacity that highlights the lack of power that he possesses over his own body; the king cannot access the information that he had earlier seen. The text highlights his impairment through repeated use of the verbal root **ח.ז.ה** or the noun **חֲזוֹן**, which appear eight times in connection with the king's dream.<sup>32</sup> Only once, however, do these words emerge from Nebuchadnezzar's mouth, when he tells Daniel that he saw (2:26: **חֲזִיתִּית**) a dream.<sup>33</sup> Otherwise, Daniel alone possesses the ability to perceive what the king's own eyes had earlier seen. He receives his *own* vision (2:19: **חֲזוֹן**) and discloses details of the vision (2:28: **חֲזוֹן רֵאשֶׁד**) that the king had received. In recounting details of the dream, Daniel describes Nebuchadnezzar six times as having "seen" the statue,<sup>34</sup> though, ironically, the king himself cannot recall what he saw. Nebuchadnezzar attempts to demonstrate his supreme power over the bodies of his dream interpreters while failing to perceive his own powerlessness. In fact, Daniel's ability to recount and

---

<sup>32</sup> 2:19, 26, 28, 31, 34, 41 (2x), 43, 45. In 2:8, Nebuchadnezzar says to his dream interpreters that "I know assuredly that you are buying time, because you have seen (**חֲזִיתוֹן**) that the word from me is definitive."

<sup>33</sup> 2:26: "Are you able to make known to me the dream which I saw (**חֲזִיתִּית**) and its interpretation?"

<sup>34</sup> 2:31: **חָזַה הָיוּת**; v. 34: **חָזַה הָיוּת**; v. 41: **וְדִי-חֲזִיתָהּ** (2x); v. 43: **וְדִי-חֲזִיתָהּ**; v. 45: **דִּי-חֲזִיתָהּ**.

interpret the dream saves the lives of all the dream interpreters, enabling him to neutralize Nebuchadnezzar's display of power.<sup>35</sup>

The fact that the dream itself described the empire as a body is in this context significant. The dream symbolically likens a succession of empires to a static, immovable statue. As such, Nebuchadnezzar, the golden head of the statue, as well as the kings who succeed him, do not wield power over the bodies of others, but are themselves subject to the authority of God. Indeed, the statue will eventually be smashed by a simple stone. The king internalizes the message: "Truly, your God is God of gods and Lord of kings and a revealer of mysteries, for you have been able to reveal this mystery!" (2:47). The details of the vision itself open the eyes of the blind to a reality that, according to the redactor, they have overlooked, namely that God possesses authority over bodies. All involved can now evaluate reality correctly and acknowledge divine supremacy. In exploring the question of who enjoys power over bodies, ch. 2 spotlights the issue of power, a theme that will figure prominently in the description of Nebuchadnezzar's pride in ch. 4.

Despite the lesson that he learned in ch. 2, Nebuchadnezzar reverts to his confidence in his own unrivaled power in ch. 3. Although the dream about a statue in ch. 2 had convinced Nebuchadnezzar that God possesses unrivaled power, ch. 3 opens with him building a statue of his god.<sup>36</sup> The central role that a statue plays in these separate narratives highlights the incongruity of Nebuchadnezzar's actions in ch. 3. In his dream, he was the golden head of a statue that was built by God, but we now find him erecting a golden statue that represents his own god (3:12). This parallel highlights his failure to appreciate that he is subordinate to God. In the conclusion to ch. 2, he paid

---

<sup>35</sup> See Daniel Smith-Christopher, "Prayers and Dreams: Power and Diaspora Identities in the Social Setting of the Daniel Tales," in *Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, 2:266–90 (289): "Daniel has 'power' in his connection with God, and therefore his power is lodged in his knowledge." See also Amy C. Merrill Willis, *Dissonance and the Drama of Divine Sovereignty in the Book of Daniel* (London: T&T Clark, 2010), 52–57.

<sup>36</sup> On the appearance of a golden statue in chs. 2 and 3, see Danna Nolan Fewell, *Circle of Sovereignty: Plotting Politics in the Book of Daniel* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1991), 38.

obeisance to Daniel by falling on his face (2:46: **נָפַל עַל אַנְפּוּהִי**), but in ch. 3 he requires his subjects to fall down (3:5: **תִּפְּלוּן**) in the worship of his idol. He once again asserts his unchecked authority over the bodies of his subjects, requiring that they prostrate themselves before his statue. When the three Jews demur, he becomes infuriated with them, repeating his reaction to the dream interpreters in ch. 2, and hurls them into a fiery furnace. As in that earlier passage, he responds to the challenge to his authority by asserting his power over their bodies. Following the rescue of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego from the fire, however, he again affirms the supremacy of their God by issuing the following decree:

(28) Blessed be the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, who sent his angel and rescued his servants who trusted in him and defied the edict of the king and gave their bodies so that they should not serve or worship any god except their own. (29) I have decreed that any people, nation, or language who blaspheme the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego shall be torn limb from limb, and your houses shall be made into a refuse heap (**הַדְּמִין תִּתְּעַבְדוּן וּבְתִיכוֹן נְגָלִי יִתְּשְׁמוּן**), because there is no other god who is able to save like this. (3:28–29)

This edict echoes precisely the threat that Nebuchadnezzar leveled at his dream interpreters in ch. 2, closing the circle that began when Nebuchadnezzar thought that he possessed supreme power over the bodies of his subjects.<sup>37</sup> Based on what he has just witnessed, the king now acknowledges that only God retains sovereignty over his subjects. In 3:29, he pledges to use his own authority to demonstrate that he serves as God’s emissary in controlling bodies—anyone who offends God will be dismembered.

Alongside the theme of power, fear looms large as an important dimension of the narrative in chs. 2 and 3. Fear is an emotion that turns on perceptions of control, and these chapters clarify

---

<sup>37</sup> See 2:5: “This is a public decree: if you do not tell me both the dream and its interpretation, you shall be torn limb from limb, and your houses shall be made into a refuse heap (**הַדְּמִין תִּתְּעַבְדוּן, וּבְתִיכוֹן נְגָלִי יִתְּשְׁמוּן**).”

that the correct object of fear is not the powerless king but rather God. In both chapters, Nebuchadnezzar threatened the lives of those who refused to obey him, imposing the death penalty both on his incompetent dream interpreters in ch. 2 and the three obstinate Jews in ch. 3. The king inspires in his subjects fear, an emotion that seeks to protect important objects from “imminent, significant, and uncontrollable danger.”<sup>38</sup> Those who fear conclude that “those who can harm have both opportunity and intention to harm.”<sup>39</sup> According to the dream vision that Nebuchadnezzar received, the royal body is indeed fearsome (2:31: **דָּחִיל**) to its observers. Yet this perception fails to take account of the book’s construction of reality, within which the king’s power is actually subject to divine control. By clarifying in 3:28–29 that the one who blasphemes God risks bodily harm, Nebuchadnezzar now affirms that God, and not the human king, should be the true object of fear.

Chapter 4 opens with Nebuchadnezzar recounting a vision and its fulfillment. As interpreted by Daniel, Nebuchadnezzar would be removed from his position and transformed into an animal because of his hubristic pride: he took credit for all of his accomplishments rather than attributing them to God. God thus demonstrates one last time his power over bodies by acting now upon the king’s body itself, reducing it to that of an animal.<sup>40</sup>

In ch. 4, Nebuchadnezzar experiences pride even though he had already learned on two previous occasions that God alone possesses authority. A number of linguistic echoes of chs. 2 and 3 in ch. 4 suggest that the events described in the latter chapter reiterate lessons that the king had been taught before. He celebrates the fact that he built Babylon “to be a royal residence (**לְבֵית מַלְכוֹ**)

---

<sup>38</sup> Nussbaum, *Upheavals of Thought*, 28.

<sup>39</sup> Sokolon, *Political Emotions*, 92.

<sup>40</sup> Amy C. Merrill Willis suggests that the restoration of Nebuchadnezzar’s human form in 4:30–33 “signals divine legitimation of the king’s rule”; see her “Heavenly Bodies: God and the Body in the Visions of Daniel,” in *Bodies, Embodiment, and Theology of the Hebrew Bible* (ed. S. Tamar Kamionkowski and Wonil Kim; London: T&T Clark, 2010), 13–37 (23).

by my vast power and for the glory of my majesty (בְּתִקְוֵי חֲסָדַי וְלִיקָר הַדְרִי) (4:27) even though he had already learned in ch. 2 that it was to him that “the God of heaven has given the kingdom, the power, the might, and the glory (מְלִכּוּתָא חֲסָנָא וְתִקְפָּא וְיִקְרָא יְהִיב־לְךָ) (2:37). He had already received the knowledge that God was supreme (הוֹדַע (2:45) yet needed to receive it again (עַד דִּי־תִגְדַּע (4:29).

Nebuchadnezzar saw the three Jews sacrifice their bodies (גִּשְׁמָהוֹן (3:27) rather than obey his word (מְלִתָּא (3:28), and in ch. 4 he gave up his own body (גִּשְׁמָה (4:30) because of the word (מְלִתָּא (4:28) that he spoke. In ch. 3, he sought to harm the bodies (גִּשְׁמָהוֹן) of the three Jews, but, because he persisted in denying the supremacy of God, God acted upon his body in ch. 4 (וּמַטְל שְׁמַיָּא גִּשְׁמָה (4:30) in his dream interpretation, Daniel had told the king that “in your hands he has placed mankind and the beasts of the field (חַיּוֹת בְּרָא) and the wild animals” (2:38); the heavenly voice now informs him that “you will be driven away from people and will live with the wild animals (חַיּוֹת בְּרָא) (4:29) and his “hair grew as long as eagles’ (feathers) and his nails became like birds’ (claws)” (4:30). Nebuchadnezzar expected his subjects to fall down (תִּפְלוּן) when they heard the sound (קָל) of various musical instruments (3:5, 7, 10, 15), while he is condemned in ch. 4 by a voice (קָל מִן־שְׁמַיָּא) that came down (נִפְל) from the heavens (4:28). At the conclusion of ch. 4 (v. 34), Nebuchadnezzar repeats his earlier acclamation of God’s truth (קִשְׁט) (2:47).

In the hands of a redactor who has brought together chapters that may have originated independently, ch. 4 represents the climax of a cycle that began in ch. 2.<sup>41</sup> Nebuchadnezzar had been taught, and had even acknowledged, on two previous occasions—at the end of chs. 2 and 3, respectively—that he owed his successes to God, yet his words in ch. 4 defy that fact. The fate that God decreed for Nebuchadnezzar in ch. 4 confirms divine authority over bodies in especially dramatic fashion. After he recovers from his punishment, the king recognizes that he had suffered from hubris and that God “is able to humble those who walk in pride (מִהַלְכִין בְּגִּוְהָ)” (4:34). The emotion of pride emerges from perceptions concerning the source of power. Nebuchadnezzar originally attributes his power to his own accomplishments and therefore thinks he experiences “authentic pride.” God informs Nebuchadnezzar that, in fact, his power derives from God and hence lies beyond his control. The redactor’s emotional community learns that the king’s pride is hubristic and based on a mistaken evaluation of reality.

In addition to the word גָּוָה, ch. 4 hints at Nebuchadnezzar’s hubris by referring to the “height” (רִימָה) of the tree, which reached the heavens, in the king’s dream (4:7, 8, 17). In ch. 5, when recalling Nebuchadnezzar’s hubris, Daniel explains to Belshazzar that his father was punished when “his heart was lifted up” (רָם לְבָבָה) (5:20). Forms of ג.ו.ג are used elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible to indicate hubris, and, as we will see below, this verbal root resurfaces at numerous points in the description of Antiochus in chs. 7–12.<sup>42</sup> The idea of height to represent hubris appears throughout the Hebrew Bible, which also uses forms of ג.ב.ה and ג.א.ה, verbal roots that refer to

---

<sup>41</sup> For the possibility that chs. 3:31–6:28 originated as a separate document, see Collins, *Daniel*, 37.

<sup>42</sup> On ג.ו.ג as indicating hubris, see, e.g., Isa 2:12, where it is used in apposition to ג.א.ה.

height and appear alongside forms of מ.ג.ר, to convey the sense of hubristic pride.<sup>43</sup> In fact, the Aramaic word גנה in 4:34 is cognate with Hebrew ה.ג.ג.

The Nebuchadnezzar narrative concludes with the king humbling himself. In contrast to his hubris, which was characterized by height, he describes his humility in terms of becoming low.<sup>44</sup> The opposition of high/low reflects a hierarchical mindset that fits well the broader theme of the book: God stands highest in a hierarchy of power, and in raising himself to new heights, Nebuchadnezzar distorts his position relative to God. At the end of his narrative, the king contrasts the lowly stature to which God has reduced him with the elevated position that God occupies, describing his reaction to the deity using the verb מ.ג.ר (“So now I, Nebuchadnezzar ... exalt (ומרום) ... the lord of the heavens”). God has thus restored the proper hierarchy.

The transmission of knowledge is intimately connected with the themes of power and authority throughout the Nebuchadnezzar cycle of stories. Particularly in chs. 2 and 4, Nebuchadnezzar’s outlook changes following the knowledge that he receives via divine revelation. Because, according to the social-constructionist approach, emotions reflect evaluative judgments about the world around us, the king’s hubris could only change with the new knowledge that would alter his perception of reality. False knowledge will lead to incorrect judgments, laying the groundwork for the hubristic pride that Nebuchadnezzar experiences. The king is not the only one

---

<sup>43</sup> See, e.g., Ps 131:1. For examples of ה.ג.ג as indicating pride, see the discussion in *TDOT*, s.v. gābhah, 2:359. On the relationship between “height” and “pride” in biblical Hebrew, see Gowan, *When Man Becomes God*, 20–23. It should be noted that the lexicon of biblical Hebrew does not distinguish between authentic and hubristic pride; thus, for example, ה.ג.ג can be used with reference to God, as in the phrase גאון יעקב in Amos 8:7 (see Joel S. Burnett, “The Pride of Jacob,” in *David and Zion: Biblical Studies in Honor of J. J. M. Roberts* [ed. Bernard F. Batto and Kathryn L. Roberts; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2004], 319–50). Only from context can one infer whether the lexeme for “pride” indicates the authentic or hubristic varieties of that emotion.

<sup>44</sup> The formulation of Job 22:29 approximates that of our verse. For the opposition of רום and שפל as indicating pride and humility, see, e.g., 1 Sam 2:7; Isa 2:12; Ps 18:28.

whose perception changes, however. Equipped with divinely revealed knowledge made available to them by the narrative, the redactor's emotional community can now identify the king's pride *as* hubris, helping them put his power into perspective. The text emphasizes repeatedly that the king possesses false knowledge. Thus, he told the dream-interpreters in ch. 2 that "I know assuredly (מִן־יָצִיב יָדַע) (that you are buying time (עֲדָנָא), because you have seen that the word from me is definitive: if you do not tell me (תְּהוֹדֵעַנִי) the dream, there is but one verdict for you. You have agreed to speak lying and misleading words to me until circumstances change (עַד דִּי עֲדָנָא יִשְׁתַּנָּא)" (2:8–9). On the other hand, in the prayer that he recites after receiving details of the dream and its interpretation, Daniel says as follows concerning God: "He changes times and seasons (וְהוּא מְהַשְׁנֵא) (עֲדָנָא וְזִמְנָא) ... he gives wisdom to the wise and knowledge to those who have understanding (וּמְנַדְעָא לְיָדְעֵי בִינָה)" (2:21). Nebuchadnezzar did not realize that only God possesses knowledge and only he can change time. While Nebuchadnezzar claimed to "know with certainty" (מִן־יָצִיב יָדַע) it turns out that the only thing that is "certain" (יָצִיב) is that which "the great God has informed the king" (אֱלֹהֵי רַב הוֹדַע לְמַלְכָּא ... וְיָצִיב חֻלְמָא) (2:45). In ch. 4, Daniel urges the king to "recognize (תְּנַדְע) that the Most High is sovereign over the kingdom of man and gives it to anyone he wishes" (4:22, 29). In order to achieve this objective, God turned Nebuchadnezzar into an animal, denying him his capacity to reason. Once God had restored his cognitive faculties (4:31: מְנַדְעֵי), Nebuchadnezzar immediately praised God and recognized him as the sovereign king. Access to divine knowledge, according to the redactor, enabled Nebuchadnezzar to reevaluate the situation and express emotions

that appraise the situation anew; he was punished in ch. 4 because he ignored the knowledge that he had received in the previous two chapters.

### III. Internalizing the Lesson of Nebuchadnezzar's Punishment: Pride and Fear in the Narratives of Belshazzar and Darius

The Nebuchadnezzar cycle of stories, in its final form, presents a coherent message.

Nebuchadnezzar was expected to acknowledge divine power based on his past experiences. The emotion of pride thus constitutes the central theme in this section. Yet Nebuchadnezzar was not the last king to succumb to hubris. In ch. 5, Daniel chides Belshazzar for his inflated pride, recalling for the king the excessive arrogance of Belshazzar's father, Nebuchadnezzar:

(18) O king, The Most High God gave kingship, greatness, glory, and majesty to Nebuchadnezzar your father, (19) and because of the greatness that he gave him, all peoples, nations, and languages trembled and feared (זאעין [זיעין] ודחלין) before him. He killed whom he wished (צבא) and let live whom he wished (צבא). He raised high (מרם) whom he wished (צבא) and brought low whom he wished (צבא). (20) When his heart was raised high (רם לבבה) and his spirit was hardened so that he acted proudly, he was deposed from his royal throne and his glory was removed from him. (21) He was driven away from men and his mind was made like that of a beast (ולבבה עם-חיותא שוי [שויו]) ... until he came to know that the Most High God is sovereign over the kingdom of man, and sets over it whom he wishes (יצבא). (5:18–21)

In explaining why God will punish Belshazzar, Daniel alludes to the humbling of Nebuchadnezzar from ch. 4 and contends that the son perpetuated the prideful ways of his father. The redactional history of this text suggests that the redactor regarded the link between the pride of the two kings as critically important to the message of ch. 5. The above passage is not in the Old Greek translation of Daniel, supporting the possibility that the redactor introduced it in the Aramaic text in order to link

ch. 5 with the narrative of Nebuchadnezzar’s fall from grace in ch. 4.<sup>45</sup> This would indicate that the redactor seeks to create an extended section, stretching back to ch. 2, built around the emotion of pride. The kings have already witnessed a reality that, according to the redactor, should dispel the possibility of hubristic pride. The redactor connects Belshazzar’s pride back to that of his father in order to clarify that Belshazzar, through the experiences of Nebuchadnezzar, enjoyed access to a reality in which the kings were subject to divine control. Nebuchadnezzar had been punished for not acquiring the knowledge (4:22, 29: תַּנְדִּיעַ) that should have come with his life experience. Daniel reveals that Belshazzar will be punished for the same reason: “But you, Belshazzar, his son, have not humbled yourself, though you knew all this (תִּדְעָתָּה)” (5:22).

The above verses draw a contrast between מ.ג.ו. as the unjustified emotional posture of hubris and ל.פ.ש. as the appropriate one—a contrast also found in ch. 4, as described above. Nebuchadnezzar’s “heart became exalted (רַם)” (5:20) but Belshazzar, rather than learning his lesson and “lower[ing]” (הִשְׁפִּילָהּ) himself (5:22), instead “exalted” (הִתְרַומַמְתָּ) himself “against the lord of heaven” (5:23).<sup>46</sup> In describing this emotional pair as “high” and “low,” the Belshazzar narrative returns to the theme found in the book’s earlier plotlines, namely the need to recalibrate the actual hierarchy of power.

The contrast between the emotional dispositions of Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar emerges not only from the above verses but also from a set of linguistic parallels between chs. 4 and 5. When he finally experiences humility, Nebuchadnezzar acclaim God as follows: “So now I,

---

<sup>45</sup> So Collins, *Daniel*, 242.

<sup>46</sup> On the pairing of מ.ג.ו. and ל.ב., see, e.g., Jer 48:29; Ezek 31:10, both times paired with forms of ג.ב.ה., indicating height.

Nebuchadnezzar, praise (מְשַׁבַּח), exalt (וּמְרוֹמִים), and glorify (וּמְהַדֵּר) the king of heaven (לְמֶלֶךְ שָׁמַיָא), all of whose works are truth and whose ways (וְאִרְחֻתָּהּ) are justice (דִּין), and who is able to humble (לְהַשְׁפִּילָה) those who behave arrogantly” (4:34). Chapter 5 recycles much of the language in this verse in order to contrast Belshazzar’s hubris with his father’s humility. Belshazzar “praised (וּשְׁבַח) gods of gold and silver, bronze, iron, wood, and stone” (5:4). These are the very same materials out of which the statue that appeared in Nebuchadnezzar’s dream in ch. 2 was constructed. Nebuchadnezzar had not internalized the message of that vision and was punished for his hubris; the same fate will now befall Belshazzar, who also failed to learn the lesson. Further on in the chapter, the text again chides Belshazzar for “prais[ing]” (שְׁבַחְתָּ) these lifeless gods and for not “glorify[ing]” (הִדְרַתָּ) God (5:23). Belshazzar “exalted” (הִתְרוֹמַמְתָּ) himself “against the lord of heaven (מְרַאֲ-שָׁמַיָא)” (5:23) and did not “humble (הַשְׁפִּילָה) your heart” (5:22). In his state of hubris, he failed to appreciate that to God “belong all your ways (אִרְחֻתְךָ)” (5:23), and, in return, he was found wanting on the scales of justice (5:27).<sup>47</sup> These contrasts call attention to Belshazzar’s failure to heed the lesson of his father’s emotional conversion from hubris to humility, enabling the redactor’s emotional community to recognize that the king’s pride was unfounded.

The narrative in ch. 5, as in the Nebuchadnezzar cycle of stories, affirms divine power by demonstrating God’s control of the royal body. Belshazzar’s pride is unfounded because God is the truly powerful one. Belshazzar initially responds to the vision of a disembodied hand writing on the wall with fear: “His face darkened, and his thoughts frightened him; the joints of his loins were

---

<sup>47</sup> One additional echo of ch. 4 in ch. 5: following his punishment, Nebuchadnezzar reports that “my reason (וְדַעַי) was restored to me” (4:33). By contrast, Belshazzar’s face darkened (זִוְהֵי שְׁנוּהֵי) (5:6) when he received the divine vision apprising him of his imminent downfall.

loosened (וְקִטְרֵי תְרִצָּה מִשְׁתַּרְיוֹן) and his knees knocked together” (5:6).<sup>48</sup> Al Wolters understands the loosening of his loins as referring to urination, in which case God has commandeered the most basic functions of the king’s body.<sup>49</sup> This same formulation recurs in the description of Daniel’s divinely-granted ability to “give interpretations and solve problems (קִטְרֵין לְמִשְׂרָא)” (5:16).<sup>50</sup> This parallel calls attention to the tight link between knowledge and power that appeared throughout chs. 2–4: divine knowledge enables Daniel to clarify the significance of Belshazzar’s lack of (bodily) control. The fact that the king relies on Daniel to disclose knowledge about genuine reality confirms that his assessment of reality to date is incorrect. The redactor’s emotional community thus learns that Belshazzar’s unfounded pride—his misguided conviction that he was the source of his own power—depended on a mistaken evaluation of reality. According to the redactor, God will punish Belshazzar because he should have correctly perceived reality following the temporary demise of his father.

God’s control of the royal body appears elsewhere in ch. 5. Michael Segal has recently argued that the writing on the wall was imperceptible to all present, complicating the king’s request for assistance.<sup>51</sup> God thus manipulated the king’s sense perception, allowing him alone to witness mysterious writing which he cannot decode. By contrast, the gods that Belshazzar worshipped, “which neither see nor hear nor know anything” (5:23), lack sense perception entirely. Belshazzar

---

<sup>48</sup> According to Angela Thomas, trembling is a common image of fear in biblical literature; see her “Fear and Trembling: Body Imagery in the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint,” in *The Reception of the Hebrew Bible in the Septuagint and the New Testament: Essays in Memory of Aileen Guilding* (ed. David J. A. Clines and J. Cheryl Exum; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2013), 115–25 (116).

<sup>49</sup> Al Wolters, “Untying the King’s Knots: Physiology and Wordplay in Daniel 5,” *JBL* 110 (1991): 117–22; see also Thomas, “Fear and Trembling,” 124–25. For an attempt to reconstruct the actual experience of fear via the conceptual metaphors used to describe that emotion, see Paul A. Kruger, “A Cognitive Interpretation of the Emotion of Fear in the Hebrew Bible,” *JNSL* 27 (2001): 77–89.

<sup>50</sup> 5:12: קִטְרֵין לְמִשְׂרָא; 5:16: קִטְרֵין לְמִשְׂרָא.

<sup>51</sup> Michael Segal, “Rereading the Writing on the Wall (Daniel 5),” *ZAW* 125 (2013): 161–76 (166–74).

dies that night, a final demonstration that God wields power over bodies. His death (קטיל) recalls Nebuchadnezzar's ability to kill arbitrarily (די-הוּא צָבֵא הָוָה קָטַל), one of the sources of Nebuchadnezzar's hubristic pride.

As in earlier chapters, the Belshazzar narrative connects pride and fear. The capacity of both Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar to inspire fear in their subjects (5:19: [זִיעִין וְדַחְלִין]) serves as the foundation for their prideful sense of control. The fear that Belshazzar experiences in 5:6, however, confirms God's control and hence his ability to induce fear. God, not the king, should be the true object of fear, just as royal pride is an inappropriate emotion.

The cycle of irrational pride that began with Nebuchadnezzar and continued with Belshazzar concludes with Belshazzar's successor, Darius the Mede. For the first time, a foreign king acknowledges divine supremacy without being compelled to do so; Darius is thus the model king who stands as a foil both to his prideful predecessors and to Antiochus, the subject of ch. 7. The linguistic and thematic parallels between chs. 6 and the preceding chapters, to be outlined below, suggest that, according to the redactor, Darius has learned from past history how to evaluate reality correctly. According to 6:1, he received the throne left vacant following Belshazzar's death, and the stark difference in outlook between the two kings suggests that the fate of his predecessor made an impression on Darius.

The narrative in ch. 6 contrasts Darius' humility with the hubristic pride of his two predecessors. God emphasized to both Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar that he has the capacity to remove (4:28: מִלְכוּתָהּ עֲדַת מִנָּד; 5:20: וַיִּקְרָה הָעֲדִיו מִנָּה) kings from their positions. In his prayer in ch. 2, Daniel praised God for possessing this power (2:21: מִהֶעֱדָה מְלָכִין). On the other hand, Darius'

servants convince the king to issue an edict that cannot be revoked (6:9: **דִּי־לָא תַעֲדָא**), as if the king enjoys the sort of definitive power that is reserved for God. Darius' objection to this fact signals that he does not share the prideful ways of his predecessors.

Several other contrasts with previous chapters demonstrate that, unlike his predecessors, Darius perceives reality correctly and disavows hubristic pride. Most obviously, the narratives of chs. 3 and 6 are remarkably similar, as scholars often observe. The resemblances, however, highlight the stark contrast between the attitudes of the two kings in each. Nebuchadnezzar asks the three Jews, “What God will be able to save you (**יְשִׁיבֶנְכוֹן**) from my hand”? (3:15). On the other hand, Darius confidently states, “May your God, whom you serve (**יְשִׁיבֶנְךָ**) so regularly, rescue you!” (6:17). The king's *opportunity* to cause harm depends upon the will of God. Both kings “hurried” (3:24, 6:20: **בְּהִתְבַּהֲלָה**) to the site of the punishment, but while Nebuchadnezzar rushed in a state of shock, Darius did so in the hopes that Daniel had been saved.

The contrast between Darius' humility and Nebuchadnezzar's pride also emerges from the proclamation that Darius issues following Daniel's safe passage:

(26) Then King Darius wrote to all peoples, nations, and languages (**לְכָל עַמֻּמַּיָּא אֲמַיָּא וְלִשְׁנַיָּא**) that inhabit the earth: “May your wellbeing abound! (27) I have issued an edict that throughout my royal domain (**שְׁלֹטֹן מְלָכוּתִי**) people should tremble and fear (**זָאעִין [זִיעִין]**) before the God of Daniel. For he is the living God and one who endures forever. His kingdom is indestructible, and his dominion is to the end.” (6:26–27)

While ch. 5 identifies Nebuchadnezzar's power, including his control over bodies, as the source of the people's fear (**זָאעִין [זִיעִין] וְדַחֲלִין**), ch. 6 demonstrates *God's* control

over bodies, mandating that “all peoples, nations, and languages ... should tremble and fear (לְכָל) before the God of Daniel.” Nebuchadnezzar had not yet learned that the “Most High God is sovereign (שְׁלִיט) over the kingdom of man” (5:21), while Darius proclaims that his subjects “throughout my royal kingdom” (בְּכָל שְׁלֹטֹן מַלְכוּתִי) should recognize that the God of Daniel’s “dominion (וּשְׁלֹטְנָה) is to the end” (6:27). The fact that, in a reversal of fortune, the lions ultimately “overpowered” (6:25: שְׁלֹטוּ) Daniel’s accusers confirms God’s sovereignty.

Finally, animals play a central role in the cases of both Nebuchadnezzar and Darius. In both texts, the offending party was cast down among the animals. By again featuring animals as a central part of the drama in ch. 6, the narrator calls attention to the contrast between the prideful Nebuchadnezzar, who denied divine control and therefore was turned into an animal, and the humble Darius, who affirmed divine control and hoped that God would save Daniel from the animals.

Chapter 6 also reiterates the points about fear that emerged from the earlier narratives. Darius correctly acknowledges God as the appropriate source of fear (6:27), using the same language used to describe human fear of Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar in ch. 5. This is part of a larger trend within the narrative about Darius, who reinforced Daniel’s own belief that “your God, whom you serve so regularly, [will] rescue you” (6:15). Darius recognizes that he does not pose a danger or represent an object of fear to his subject, Daniel, so long as the latter acclaims God as the ultimate source of power.

The contrasts between Darius and his two predecessors suggest that Darius has learned the lesson represented by the downfall of his two predecessors. Chapter 6 continues the emphasis on pride and fear in the previous chapters, with Darius serving as a foil to Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar. Since, according to the redactor, both of those emotions depend on how one perceives reality, Darius has clearly acquired the historical knowledge that enables him to see and internalize the correct values. Likewise, those who are equipped with knowledge—Daniel in chs. 2 and 6, and the three Jews in ch. 3—have no reason to fear the king. The narratives of chs. 2–6 transmit this knowledge to the redactor’s emotional community, which acquires essential information about the character of the kings’ pride and the appropriate object of fear.

#### **IV. The Verdict Against Proud Antiochus IV**

The emphasis on royal pride and human fear in chs. 2–6 sets the stage for ch. 7, which indicts Antiochus for having overlooked the lessons of earlier kings and, like his predecessors, having succumbed to unwarranted pride. The vision of four large beasts surfacing from within the great sea culminates with the description of a “little horn” that sprouts from the fourth animal, the most fearsome of them all. This horn had the eyes of a human and a “mouth that spoke arrogantly.” The reference to the horn’s pride immediately precedes the arrival of the Ancient of Days, who, in the context of a divine courtroom, condemns the little horn to death and transfers his rule to “the one like a human being.” Scholarly consensus identifies the little horn with Antiochus IV, in which case his pride and its repercussions play a central role in this chapter’s divine drama. The narrative indictment of Antiochus’ pride will serve to provide the redactor’s emotional community a window

into a reality in which the Seleucid king is feeble. Their access to this reality will enable them to recognize the king's pride as hubristic and the source of his eventual demise.

The narrative conveys the contrast between the hubristic pride of the little horn and the awesome power of the Ancient of Days is captured in a play on words. Twice the text attributes to the little horn (v. 8: קָרָן זְעִירָה) “arrogant” (v. 8: רְבָרְבָן; v. 11: רְבָרְבָתָא) speech. This formulation is significant considering that in other Aramaic dialects, forms of זעיר and רב are a paired antithesis.<sup>52</sup> The intentional use of this language<sup>53</sup> increases the likelihood that the text seeks to contrast the diminutive Antiochus' outsized self-presentation with the Ancient of Days, who is attended to by “ten thousand times ten thousand” (v. 10: רְבוּ רְבָבָן). This word play<sup>54</sup> makes evident the contrast between the great hubris of the little horn of an animal and the power of the Ancient of Days.

As in previous chapters, ch. 7 emphasizes God's power through its focus on the royal body. Casting Nebuchadnezzar as an animal in ch. 4 had the effect of emphasizing divine control over the king. Chapter 7 likewise underscores divine power by symbolically representing the kings as different species of animals. The body of the fourth animal is more fearsome than the others, but it meets its match in the body of the Ancient of Days.<sup>55</sup> In a vision that characterizes the earthly kings as beasts

---

<sup>52</sup> ר.ז.ע.ר is a biblical *hapax legomenon*, but it appears in later dialects of Aramaic in abundance, often as the opposite of רב. See, e.g., *b. Sukkah* 5b, אפי רברבי ואפי זוטרי; *Tg. Neof.* to Gen 41:43, דרב בחכמתא וזעיר בשפר. Cf. Akkadian *sihir u rabi* (CAD S, s.v. *siḥru* 2c, p. 184).

<sup>53</sup> Forms of the word רב appear three other times in this passage, once to describe the sea out of which the animals emerged (v. 2: ימא רבא), once to characterize the animals themselves (v. 3: חיון רברבן), and a final time to describe the iron teeth of the fourth animal (v. 7: שנין דיפרזל לה רברבן). The text thus indicates a further contrast between Antiochus and the other kings.

<sup>54</sup> רְבוּ רְבָבָן is based on ר.ב.ב, and hence not cognate with רְבָרְבָן.

<sup>55</sup> The fourth beast had “great iron teeth that devoured and crushed and stamped what was left with its feet.” It was different from all the beasts that preceded it, and it had ten horns ... another horn appeared ... there were eyes like human eyes in this horn, and a mouth speaking arrogantly” (7:7–8). The Ancient of Days, on the other hand, wore clothing as “white as snow, and the hair of his head [was] like pure wool” (7:9).

who are subject to the will of God, ascribing to God the form of a grand human body communicates in a striking manner the power that the deity wields over kings.<sup>56</sup>

In condemning Antiochus for his hubris, ch. 7 presents Antiochus as yet another king who failed to evaluate reality correctly. The link joining Antiochus to his proud predecessors emerges from a network of parallels between chs. 2–6 and ch. 7, suggesting that the author of ch. 7 sought to create an overarching, integrated framework that spans chs. 2 through 7.<sup>57</sup> This unit centers upon the nexus between divine power and royal pride: in contrast to Darius, the kings who did not learn the lessons of the past and persisted in their unfounded pride have been (in the cases of Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar) and will continue to be (in the case of Antiochus) punished. By mapping Antiochus onto the cases of three earlier kings, ch. 7 builds upon earlier precedents to demonstrate how God deals with hubristic kings who ignore the lessons of history.

The four-kingdom imagery and the associated belief that the fourth empire will give way to an eternal kingdom (2:44, 7:14: **לֹא תִהְיֶה חִבְּלָה**) recalls Nebuchadnezzar’s dream-vision in ch. 2. In addition, the description of Antiochus’ actions,

(24) And after them another will arise (**יָקוּם**). He will be different from the former ones, and will bring low (**יִהְיֶה שְׁפִיל**) three kings. (25) He will speak words against the Most High, will wear out the holy ones of the Most High, and will think of changing times and laws (**לְהַשְׁנִיחַ זְמַנִּין וְדָת**). They will be given into his power for a time, times, and half a time (**עַד-עֶדְן וְעַד-נֶיִן וּפְלֶגָה**). (26) Then the court will sit in judgment, and his dominion will be taken away (**יִהְיֶה עֲדוֹן**).

---

<sup>56</sup> In a slightly different direction, Willis, points to the links between Daniel 7 and the portrait of El in the Baal Cycle to suggest that “the theophany skillfully uses anthropomorphism to evoke ancient traditions of divine universal power” (“Heavenly Bodies,” 26). On the debt that Daniel 7 owes to Ugaritic literature, see, e.g., John A. Emerton, “The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery,” *JTS* 9 (1958): 225–42; John J. Collins, “Stirring Up the Great Sea: The Religio-Historical Background of Daniel 7,” in *Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*, 121–36.

<sup>57</sup> On the chiasmic structure of chs. 2–7, see A. Lenglet, “La structure littéraire de Daniel 2–7,” *Bib* 53 (1972): 169–90. Links between ch. 7 and the narratives in earlier chapters need not necessitate Lenglet’s attribution of chs. 2–6 to a redactor living during the Antiochan persecutions.

echoes Daniel’s doxology in 2:21 that God “changes times and seasons (מִהַשְׁנָא עֲדֻנְיָא וְזִמְנֵיָא), removes (מִהַעֲדָה) kings and sets up (יְהַקִּים) kings.”<sup>58</sup> In assuming rule by defeating three other men, Antiochus should not take pride in his own achievement, as he seems to do by “speak[ing] words against the Most High.” After all, God is the one who “removes kings and sets up kings,” as the vision in ch. 2 confirmed. Antiochus will learn this when he himself is deposed (7:26: יְהַעֲדוֹן; 2:21: מִהַעֲדָה). In “attempt[ing] to change times and laws”—usually taken as a reference to the Antiochan persecutions—the king overlooked the fact that only God has the capacity to do effect such changes.

The symbolism in ch. 7 echoes other chapters as well. The animal imagery in ch. 7 returns to similar descriptions in chs. 4 and 6. In ch. 4, God transformed Nebuchadnezzar into an animal; that text is clearly in view in 7:4, which mentions that the first animal (=Nebuchadnezzar) was transformed into a human. When he saved Daniel from the lions in ch. 6, God demonstrated his control over animals, a point that is also central in ch. 7.

The forensic context of ch. 7 recalls several earlier passages. Using a written judgment (7:10), the Ancient of Days condemns the little horn in court (אֲדִינָא) for his arrogance, just as Belshazzar, according to Daniel’s interpretation of the written vision, had been “weighed in the scales and found wanting” (5:27).<sup>59</sup> Likewise, following his return to power, Nebuchadnezzar acclaimed that God’s “ways are justice (דִּינָא)” (4:34). Moreover, the sentence imposed on Antiochus is reminiscent of the

---

<sup>58</sup> This parallel and its significance is noted by Michael Segal, “From Joseph to Daniel: The Literary Development of the Narrative in Daniel 2,” *VT* 59 (2009): 123–49 (145–49).

<sup>59</sup> On the importance of writing in chs. 5 and 6, see Donald C. Polaski, “*Mene, Mene, Tekel, Parsin*: Writing and Resistance in Daniel 5 and 6,” *JBL* 123 (2004): 649–69.

fate of the three Jews in ch. 3. In the latter text, someone who ignored the sound (קל) of the call to prostrate to false gods was to be hurled into a blazing fire (3:15: גּוֹרָא יְקַדְתָּא). In ch. 7, the Ancient of Days sentenced the little horn to death by fire (7:11: אֶשְׁא יְקַדְתָּא) because of the sound (קל) of the arrogant words that the horn directed against the true God. Finally, the transfer of temporal rule to the “one like a human being” is described in terms that recall Darius’ description of divine power at the end of ch. 6. Darius wrote a letter addressed “to all peoples, nations, and languages” (6:26: וְכָל עַמְמַיָּא וְלִשְׁנַיָּא) just as “all peoples, nations, and languages will serve” the one like a human being (7:14: וְכָל עַמְמַיָּא וְלִשְׁנַיָּא). In his edict, Darius praised God as “one who endures forever,” whose “kingdom is indestructible,” and “dominion to the end” (6:27: וְקִיָּם לְעַלְמִין וּמְלְכוּתָהּ דִּי-לָא וְקִיָּם לְעַלְמִין וּמְלְכוּתָהּ דִּי-לָא). Similarly, the “dominion” of the one like a human being is “everlasting ... and his kingdom is indestructible” (7:14: וְקִיָּם לְעַלְמִין וּמְלְכוּתָהּ דִּי-לָא וְקִיָּם לְעַלְמִין וּמְלְכוּתָהּ דִּי-לָא). Finally, Darius supported Daniel’s constant worship (6:21: פְּלַח-לֵיהּ בְּתַדְרָא), and “all peoples, nations, and languages will serve (יִפְלְחוּן)” the one like a human being (7:14). Antiochus did not share Darius’ outlook and instead returned to the hubristic ways of Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar. Accordingly, God will delegate the “one like a human being” as his representative on earth rather than Antiochus.

The author of ch. 7 <sup>created</sup> an extensive network of parallels linking it with chs. 2–6 in order to situate Antiochus in a broader historical context. The four-empire scheme in ch. 7 makes clear that setting Antiochus alongside his predecessors was a critical part of the presentation in this chapter. In describing the reigns of three of Antiochus’ predecessors, chs. 2–6 essentially expand upon the point

made in 7:11 and 20, namely that Antiochus' punishment is related to his arrogance. According to the redactor, each king in chs. 2–6 was expected to learn from previous events and divinely revealed knowledge that hubris represented an incorrect appraisal of reality, and they were punished for failing to do so. Chapter 7 therefore condemns Antiochus for pridefully denying that God possesses ultimate control over the world. The vision in that chapter anticipates that, like his predecessors, Antiochus will be punished for exhibiting hubris and not adjusting his evaluation of reality. In expressing hubristic pride, Antiochus overlooked the lessons of history, thus replicating the failings of his predecessors, Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar.

In condemning Antiochus for his hubris, the author of ch. 7 addresses a Jewish audience that shares the king's evaluation of reality. The emphasis on royal pride in general and on Antiochus' pride in particular serves to reassure Jews living through the Antiochan persecutions that, appearances aside, Antiochus is not in control. His demonstrations of pride reflect his appraisal of the situation, namely that he is in charge. The text juxtaposes Antiochus' pride and the persecutions as if to say that the latter is a manifestation of the former (see 7:25). His emotion, however, is a hubristic misinterpretation of reality.

Yet Antiochus is not alone in that view of reality. The fact that Daniel in ch. 7 suddenly cannot see clearly and requires the intervention of a heavenly agent in order to clarify the meaning of the vision suggests that Daniel has trouble envisioning a reality in which Antiochus' power is held in check. Daniel's inability to decipher the vision reminds us of the similar impairment that we observed on the part of the kings in chs. 2–6.

The confident Daniel of chs. 2–6, unfazed by the mortal danger that he confronted in chs. 2 and 6, here gives way to a frightened, imperceptive seer. In response to his vision, his “spirit was troubled within me, and the visions of my head frightened me (יִבְהַלְנִי)” (7:15). The language that

Daniel uses to describe his terror mirrors that used by Nebuchadnezzar to recount his own emotions following the vision in ch. 4 (4:2). The fourth beast in ch. 7 appears to Daniel as “fearsome” (7:7: דְּחִילָה) and “very fearsome” (7:19: דְּחִילָה יַתִּירָה), likely projecting the emotional disposition of Jews of that time toward Antiochus. There is a direct correlation between royal pride and the people’s perception of reality: the king’s pride leads him to act in ways that create a reality in which he possesses unfettered control. Emotion leads to behavior which in turn reinforces the perception of reality that underlies the emotion. When the text condemns Antiochus’ pride as a distortion of reality, it actually seeks to correct the people’s fear, which emerges from the same misguided perception. As unique as the persecutions of the second century B.C.E. might be, Antiochus fits a historical pattern that has always elicited a divine response. Considering the divine treatment of unreasonably prideful kings in the past, the Jews should have no reason to fear Antiochus.

Yet Daniel himself remains unpersuaded by the description of Antiochus’ imminent demise. Even after learning from the heavenly intermediary that God will grant sovereignty to the “holy ones of the Most High,” Daniel’s fear only grows: “My thoughts greatly terrified me, and my face darkened” (7:28). Daniel had been terrified (יִבְהַלְנִי) in the immediate aftermath of the vision (7:15). The explanation of the vision only aggravates his fear; he is no longer simply terrified (יִבְהַלְנִי) but “greatly terrified (יִבְהַלְנִי ... שָׂגִיא)” (7:28).<sup>60</sup> Antiochus’ exceeding fearsomeness (7:19) makes it difficult for Daniel to look to the past as evidence that God intended to punish the prideful king.<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>60</sup> See C. L. Seow, *Daniel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003), 113.

<sup>61</sup> Within the context of the book’s final recension, 7:28 is the first instance of Daniel’s fears, an emotion that grows through the subsequent chapters. However, if, as many scholars assume, ch. 7 was redacted before chs. 8–12, then, in its original context, Daniel’s fear in 7:28 did not indicate his unwillingness to acknowledge Antiochus’ demise; the redactor of this chapter likely assumed that this vision would genuinely ease the

The possibility that God would depose Antiochus, just as he earlier done with Belshazzar and Darius, and replace him with the “holy ones of the Most High” seemed remote. Chapter 7 is an initial, unsuccessful attempt to reduce the fear that characterizes the redactor’s emotional community. Representing that emotional community, the character Daniel cannot embrace the precedents of the past as compelling evidence of the prideful king’s imminent downfall.

## V. Fearlessness and the Power of Faithful Jews in Chapters 8–12

On several occasions, chs. 8–12 clarify why it was so difficult for the redactor’s emotional community to accept a facile comparison between the prideful Antiochus and his predecessors, as if the fate of the former would naturally follow those of the latter. The Seleucid monarch had not simply revoked the charter that allowed the Jews to observe their law but had desecrated the temple confines, an event to which chs. 8–12 refer on several occasions.<sup>62</sup> The redactor’s emotional community experienced fear because they believed that Antiochus’ pride was justified; his outsized fearsomeness suggested that he was very much in control.

The Jews’ fear—the belief that, in the aftermath of the desecration of the temple, they were powerless to stop Antiochus from imposing his will on them—impeded their ability to remain faithful. In order to motivate his emotional community to act differently, the redactor had to address the evaluative beliefs represented by their fear. Antiochus’ audacious acts made it difficult to believe that God would simply dispose of Antiochus the way he had other prideful kings, a fact that

---

anxiety of his contemporaries. Perhaps the fear that Daniel exhibits in 7:28 originally reflected the fact that “the dream and its interpretation still contain a significant reservoir of mystery” (Newsom, *Daniel*, 242). However, as I will argue below, the book’s final redactor did not regard the interpretation of the vision in ch. 7 as a likely outcome, and the frightened Daniel of chs. 8–12 channels the persistent fears of that redactors own community. Even if “the dream is clearly interpreted to have a happy outcome” (Newsom, *ibid.*), for the book’s final redactor, Daniel’s unresolved fear would have reflected his own skeptical outlook on such an outcome.

<sup>62</sup> See 8:11–14; 9:27; 11:31.

Daniel's persistent fear through the end of ch. 7 makes clear. Nevertheless, the redactor remains committed to the proposition that, as in the past, God will eventually punish the prideful king; the visions in chs. 8–12 represent further attempts to understand the circumstances in which proud Antiochus' downfall will occur.

The fear-inducing dream of ch. 7 establishes a new emotional norm for Daniel, whose anxiety mounts with each subsequent vision. He receives two additional visions in chs. 8 and 9. Chapter 8, with its imagery of rams, goats, and horns, resumes the symbolism in ch. 7. Once again, Antiochus (=a little horn) is characterized as unjustifiably proud; he “grew as high (וַתִּגְדַּל) as the host of heaven” (8:10) and “even against the prince of the host it acted arrogantly (הַגְּדִיל)” (8:11); a king “of bold countenance (עֲזֹרָפָנִים)” (8:23), one who “in his own mind shall be great (יִגְדִיל)” (8:25). Like his predecessors, the prideful king will eventually fall. Yet the apocalyptic message of this chapter, according to which the Jews would simply have to wait, failed to satisfy, suggesting the need for a different solution. In contrast to previous chapters, Daniel in ch. 9 adopted a Deuteronomic perspective. The vision in that chapter follows Daniel's long penitential prayer. The people had sinned and must therefore pray, confess their sins, and beg for divine mercy and deliverance. However, the angel Gabriel informs Daniel of the inadequacy of that theological stance; seventy weeks would necessarily elapse before the onset of divine salvation.<sup>63</sup> The Deuteronomic perspective would not suffice to dispel the fear of the redactor's emotional community.<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> The tension between the theology of Daniel's prayer and Gabriel's response has led many to regard the prayer as secondary; see the literature cited in Collins, *Daniel*, 347 nn. 5–6. However, Rodney A. Werline has argued convincingly that the prayer was included as part of the compositional process; see his *Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism: The Development of a Religious Institution* (SBLEJL 13; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 68–82.

<sup>64</sup> By contrast, 2 Maccabees does employ a Deuteronomic framework in order to understand the persecutions; see George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 106–10.

As in ch. 7, each of these visions concludes with Daniel learning that God will eventually bring to an end his people's current troubles. Yet, with each subsequent vision, Daniel grows increasingly apprehensive. After ch. 8, he becomes physically ill and engages in acts of mourning at the beginning of ch. 9. At the outset of ch. 10, his desperation reaches new heights, as he now mourns and fasts for three weeks (10:2–3).<sup>65</sup> Daniel's mood darkens as he learns from chs. 8 and 9 that the Jews could do nothing to accelerate the end of the persecutions. That apocalyptic message accentuated their lack of control in the present and set the stage for the vision in chs. 10–12, which offers a more satisfying approach to the challenges of the Antiochan persecutions.<sup>66</sup> The need to include four separate visions in chs. 7–12, each representing a distinct theological worldview, suggests that the redactor sought to articulate various approaches that could account for the unprecedented threat posed by Antiochus.<sup>67</sup> By manipulating Daniel's mood after each subsequent vision, the redactor communicated the inadequacy of each perspective, paving the way for the vision of chs. 10–12.<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup> Collins, *Daniel*, 372, suggests that Daniel fasts in anticipation of his next vision. While he does indeed receive a vision, it is simpler to see his actions as an intensification of the same behavior in which he engaged at the beginning of the previous chapter. See Seow, *Daniel*, 155–56.

<sup>66</sup> Willis likewise views the message of chs. 10–12 as a response to those offered in the previous visions, though her focus on the dissonance created by divine feebleness differs from mine; see her *Dissonance and the Drama of Divine Sovereignty*, 151–80.

<sup>67</sup> Willis has argued that the three visions in chs. 8–12 reflect an effort to respond to the failed prophecy of ch. 7, a passage that she dates to the period before the desecration of the temple; see her *Dissonance and the Drama of Divine Sovereignty*, 92. While I endorse her analytic framework, I believe that the divide between chs. 7 and 8–12, at least in the final recension of the book, is less dramatic than she supposes. As I mentioned earlier, 7:28 was a pivotal verse for the redactor, who, assuming he did not compose ch. 7, read that verse as indicating Daniel's dissatisfaction with the hopeful message of the vision's interpretation and as establishing his new, fearful emotional state. In the context of the final recension, that is, Daniel never *expected* that the prediction in ch. 7 would materialize.

<sup>68</sup> This approach to the relationship between the four visions in chs. 7–12 should be compared with Karina Martin Hogan's reading of *Fourth Ezra* as a dialogue between three schools of thought over how to respond to the destruction of the Second Temple; see her *Theologies in Conflict in 4 Ezra: Wisdom Debate and Apocalyptic Solution* (JSJSup 130; Leiden: Brill, 2008).

Chapter 10 describes Daniel as plagued by fear. Daniel alone among those standing with him witnesses a vision of a terrifying man. He trembles (v. 11: מִרְעִיד) as he rises to his feet, but an angel reassuringly tells him to “have no fear” (v. 12: אֲל־תִּירָא). Daniel responds that, due to his weakness, he is incapable of speaking (vv. 16–17). The angel further encourages Daniel, reiterating that Daniel should “have no fear” (אֲל־תִּירָא) and should “be strong, be strong” (v. 19: חֲזַק וְחֲזַק).<sup>69</sup> Daniel affirmed that he “was strengthened” (הִתְחַזְּקִיתִי) and consequently instructs his angelic visitor to proceed “for you have strengthened me” (v. 19: חֲזַקְתָּנִי).

As commentators note, Daniel’s reaction resembles those of other recipients of divine revelation. In the parallels that are often adduced, however, the verb א.ר.י does not describe the visionary’s response to the vision itself.<sup>70</sup> The emphasis on the visionary’s fear that we find here, where the verbs א.ר.י and ק.ז.ח are used twice and six times, respectively, is unusual. Daniel’s fear, while embedded in his response to the vision, should also be viewed as part of his growing despondency over the fate of the Jews in the aftermath of the apparent failure of the prophecy in ch.

---

<sup>69</sup> ק.ז.ח frequently serves as an antonym to fear; see, e.g., Josh 1:9, 10:25; Isa 35:4. On ק.ז.ח as indicating courage, see Loren L. Johns, “Identity and Resistance: The Varieties of Competing Models in Early Judaism,” in *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions* (ed. Michael Thomas Davis and Brent A. Strawn; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2007), 254–77 (266–67), who remarks that it “carries connotations of being strong, prevailing, and having courage.”

<sup>70</sup> In Gen 15:1, God appears to Abram and says “Do not be afraid (אֲל־תִּירָא), Abram, I am your shield; your reward shall be very great,” where, as Abram’s response clarifies, the fear relates to his destiny and not to the vision. God encourages Ezekiel not to fear the people to whom God is sending him (אֲל־תִּירָא מֵהֶם) (Ezek 2:6). In the aftermath of his prophetic commission in Isaiah 6, Isaiah is anxious that he is not worthy of the position, but does not use the verb א.ר.י at all. Only in Judg 6:23, following Gideon’s encounter with the divine emissary, do we find א.ר.י function in a similar way to its use in our context: “Peace be to you; do not fear (אֲל־תִּירָא), you shall not die.” Yet the source of Gideon’s fear, namely that he will die following his divine encounter, is not shared by Daniel.

7 and the unsatisfying messages in chs. 8 and 9. Anatheia Portier-Young has argued that “the words of security and reassurance speak also to an audience who experience insecurity, anxiety, and terror as a result of Seleucid domination.”<sup>71</sup> In this regard, Daniel’s mood mirrors that of a second-century B.C.E. Jewish community which did not embrace the narrowly apocalyptic and the Deuteronomic perspectives as explanations of their current condition.

The vision in ch. 11 informs Daniel of the events that will transpire through the second century B.C.E. We find some of the terminology of fear from ch. 10 attested in ch. 11 as well, especially the verb **ק.ז.ח**, suggesting that the redactor did indeed seek to link Daniel’s fear with that of his second-century B.C.E. contemporaries. The angelic visitor informs Daniel that “there is no one with me who contends (**מִתְחַזֵּק**) against these princes except Michael, your prince” (10:21). Forms of the root appear again six times in the next seven verses (11:1, 2, 5 [2x], 6, 7). In each case, the verb refers to a king who enjoyed absolute sovereignty, only to be deposed by a successor. Ptolemy III Euergetes (246 B.C.E.) is the final king who is said to have “prevailed” (**הִתְחַזַּק**) until the appearance of Antiochus IV, who assumed the throne with strength (v. 21: **וְהִתְחַזַּק מְלָכוֹת בְּחֵלְקָלְקוֹת**).<sup>72</sup> The heavy concentration of forms of the verb in ch. 10 in connection with Daniel and at the beginning of ch. 11 in relation to the Hellenistic kings hardly seems a coincidence.

The verb appears again and for the final time in describing “the people who know their God”—the Jewish opponents of Antiochus—who will “stand strong (**יִתְחַזְּקוּ**) and take action”

---

<sup>71</sup> Anatheia E. Portier-Young, *Apocalypse Against Empire: Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2011), 240.

<sup>72</sup> On these identifications, see Collins, *Daniel*, ad loc.

(11:32).<sup>73</sup> The use of this verb, which initially appears in relation to Daniel and finally in connection with the Jews of the second century B.C.E., helps bridge the gap between the two. Both should respond to their fear by standing strong. The second-century B.C.E. Jews who mimic Daniel and, if necessary, sacrifice themselves, will earn eternal life. On the other hand, the strength with which each king ascends the throne is fleeting, as his successor deposes him with the same show of strength. If fear “typically involves a judgment of an adverse relationship of power,” then the people now learn that Antiochus does not wield power over them.<sup>74</sup> Dying at the hands of Antiochus does not have to be the basis for fear but rather a demonstration of “active nonviolent resistance.”<sup>75</sup>

The show of strength that the Jews exhibit in acting fearlessly opposes them to the display of strength with which Antiochus assumed the throne. Antiochus extended that original act in forging an alliance with “those who violate the covenant,” whom the king “shall seduce with intrigue” (בַּחֲלֻקוֹת), echoing the “intrigue” through which Antiochus decisively took hold of the throne (v. 21: וְהַחֲזִיק מַלְכוּת בַּחֲלֻקֵּי לְקוֹת). The redactor immediately contrasts Antiochus’ seduction of the violators of the covenant with the way in which “the people who know God” will “stand strong.” The violators of the covenant believe that they now stand with the powerful party; the redactor’s message is that in fearlessly resisting Antiochus, the faithful Jews are in fact the powerful group.<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>73</sup> In addition to the reference to “the people who know their God,” the text identifies three other groups, the “wise among the people” (מְשֻׁבְּלֵי עַם), whose mission is to instruct (יְבִינוּ) “the masses” (רַבִּים). The verse that refers to “the people who know their God” contrasts that group with “the violators of the covenant” (מְרֻשְׁעֵי בְרִית). That verse distills all Jews into one of two groups, suggesting that “the people who know their God” encompasses all of Antiochus’ opponents, including “the wise among the people” and “the masses.”

<sup>74</sup> Konstan, *Emotions of the Ancient Greeks*, 142.

<sup>75</sup> Johns, “Identity and Resistance,” 266.

<sup>76</sup> See Willis, *Dissonance and the Drama of Divine Sovereignty*, 174–75: “[T]he *maskilim* attain their power by humbling themselves before the divine and suffering debasement and death. The ironic path to power forms its own counter-story to the one of kingly power.”

Nevertheless, Antiochus continues to think of himself as the powerful one. The redactor again condemns Antiochus for his hubris, contrasting it with the fearlessness of the faithful Jews. Antiochus grows in pride until he will “exalt and magnify himself above every god (כָּל־אֱלֹ), and he will speak wondrous things against the God of gods (אֱלֹ אֱלִים)” (11:36). Moreover, “he will not have regard (לֹא יִבִּין) for any god (כָּל אֱלֹהִים) but will magnify himself above all” (11:37). Instead, he “will honor” a “god that his ancestors did not know (יִדְעָהוּ)” (11:38). In contrast, “those who know their God (יִדְעֵי אֱלֹהֵיו)” will “stand strong (יִחַזְקוּ),” and the “wise among the people will instruct (יְבַיְנוּ) the common people.” Using “intrigue,” Antiochus asserts his power over the Jews just as he had seized control of the throne through the same means. In the end, however, his control of both is illusory. The king’s strength serves as the basis for his hubristic pride, which causes him to reject God, and even his own ancestral gods, as feeble. On the other hand, the Jews of the second century B.C.E. will remain strong and show no fear, and, unlike Antiochus, will disseminate knowledge (יְבַיְנוּ) about the true God.

Royal pride plays a significant role in helping the redactor characterize Jewish fearlessness as a source of power. By introducing Antiochus’ hubristic pride immediately after his reference to fearless martyrdom, the redactor implies that the king’s control over their lives contributes to his unwarranted pride. Because that pride will lead to his eventual downfall, the Jews’ fearless act of martyrdom actually helps to condemn the king. An apparently powerless act is actually an extremely powerful one. The redactor did not simply use royal hubris as the basis for jettisoning Jewish fear but rather as the foundation for reconceiving martyrdom as an act of immense power.

By contrasting hubristic pride to Jewish fearlessness, the redactor clarifies that martyrdom is not simply an act but an emotional statement of devotion that emerges from a changed appraisal of the political reality. The difference between fearlessness and pride is a function of how one perceives reality. Antiochus' hubristic pride mistakenly assumes that he is the source of his own power; Jewish fearlessness, on the other hand, denies the king's ability to control or harm them. As a statement of fearlessness rooted in a correct assessment of reality, martyrdom was a "socially dictated performance" of emotion that demonstrated the Jew's commitment to communal norms.<sup>77</sup> There are only two types of Jews: those "who know their God" by displaying fearlessness and those whom Antiochus "seduces with intrigue" whom the redactor labels as "those who violate the covenant" (v. 32). The contours of the community are thus drawn in emotional terms: the fearless ones are insiders, while those who capitulate and display fear are outsiders. Martyrdom was not simply an act but an emotional display through which the martyr demonstrated his or her commitment to the community's value system.

As in the book's earlier chapters, the Jews can only learn how to judge reality correctly if they receive access to the divine knowledge that Daniel had acquired. Only with the knowledge accessible via Daniel's vision and transmitted by the *maskîlîm* can Jewish fear turn into fearlessness as the people realize that the prideful Antiochus does not pose a danger to their wellbeing. Chapters 10–12 underscore that divine knowledge will teach the people that, in resisting Antiochus, they actually exert their power.

## **VI. Introducing Fear into the Book in Chapter 1**

---

<sup>77</sup> John Corrigan, "Introduction: Emotions Research and the Academic Study of Religion," in *Religion and Emotion: Approaches and Interpretations* (ed. John Corrigan; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 3–31 (11).

In responding to the fear of his second-century B.C.E. emotional community, the redactor attached an introduction to the book that likewise focused on fear, thus framing the book with units devoted to that emotion. In a passage that concerns fear of the king, ch. 1 opens with the religious challenges facing Daniel in king Nebuchadnezzar’s court. Daniel’s devotion to biblical dietary law led him to refuse the king’s food. In turn, the royal servant begs him and his companions to eat the royal food because

I fear (יִרָא אָנִי) that my lord the king, who allotted food and drink to you, will see (יִרְאֶה) that you look out of sorts, unlike the other young men of your age, and you will endanger my head with the king. (1:10)

The servant here fears the ramifications if he accedes to Daniel’s request not to feed him kosher food.<sup>78</sup> The alliteration of יִרָא and יִרְאֶה suggests that the servant’s fear reflects how he imagines the king will view the situation. Yet Daniel affirms that the king need not be an object of fear. Forms of the root ה.א.ר appear six more times in the next five verses, extending the association between vision and fear, in order to confirm Daniel’s point: the Jews look perfectly fit.<sup>79</sup> Thus, Daniel, and not the royal servant, knows what the king is capable of seeing. Chapter 1 thus posits two levels of

---

<sup>78</sup> Though ה.א.ר often connotes reverence rather than the emotion of fear, it refers to fear when centering upon an object that poses a danger to the subject, as argued by Mayer I. Gruber, “Fear, Anxiety and Reverence in Akkadian, Biblical Hebrew and Other North-West Semitic Languages,” *VT* 40 (1990): 411–22 (418–19). In this case, the servant fears the implications for his own safety if Nebuchadnezzar is not satisfied with the appearance of Daniel and the other Judahites (“you will endanger my head with the king”). This conclusion is consistent with the general sense of ה.א.ר when used with the king as object; see 2 Sam 12:18; 1 Kgs 1:50; 2 Kgs 10:4; Jer 26:21.

<sup>79</sup> 1:13: וּמִקְצַת יָמִים עֲשֶׂרָה נִרְאָה; 1:15: וַיִּרְאוּ לְפָנָיו, מִרְאֵינוּ וּמִרְאֵה הַיְלָדִים ... וּכְאֲשֶׁר תִּרְאֶה עֲשֶׂה עִם-עַבְדֶּיךָ; מִרְאֵהָם טוֹב וּבְרִיאֵי בָשָׂר.

visual acuity: those who are capable of seeing reality (Daniel) and those who are not (the royal servant).

Only a few verses earlier, the narrator used wordplay to set up a similar contrast between the worldviews of the Babylonians and of Daniel.<sup>80</sup> In v. 7, Nebuchadnezzar's palace master changes the names (וַיִּשְׁם לָהֶם שְׁמוֹת) of Daniel and his three companions, while in v. 8, Daniel resolved (וַיִּשֶׁם) not to defile himself by eating the king's food. Elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, kings rename their subjects as a way of demonstrating their control over them.<sup>81</sup> By using the same formulation to describe Daniel's allegiance to God and his refusal to eat the king's food, the narrator indicates that Daniel denies the Babylonian king's hold over him. The narrator thus communicates the contrast of worldviews between Daniel and the Babylonians through this second example of wordplay.

The emphasis on fear in this passage echoes the closing sections of the book, and there is abundant evidence connecting the Hebrew texts of chs. 8–12 with ch. 1. Daniel 10:1 mentions that Daniel was known as Belteshazzar, a name that he had been given by Nebuchadnezzar in ch. 1 and which to that point had not been mentioned in the second half of the book.<sup>82</sup> Immediately preceding the book's final vision, Daniel is said to have deprived himself of food, just as he does in ch. 1. In both cases, God is impressed by this act of asceticism and piety.<sup>83</sup> Daniel and his colleagues are

---

<sup>80</sup> See Bill T. Arnold, "Word Play and Characterization in Daniel 1," in *Puns and Pundits: Word Plays in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near Eastern Literature* (ed. Scott B. Noegel; Bethesda, Md.: CDL Press, 2000), 231–48. For examples of wordplay later in the book, see idem, "Wordplay and Narrative Techniques in Daniel 5 and 6," *JBL* 112 (1993): 479–85.

<sup>81</sup> See, e.g., Nebuchadnezzar's renaming of his client king, Mattanyah, to Zedekiah in 2 Kgs 24:17.

<sup>82</sup> Seow, *Daniel*, 153–54.

<sup>83</sup> See 10:12, where the divine visitor informs Daniel that God began listening to him "since the first day that you set your mind to gain understanding and to humble yourself (וּלְהִתְעַנּוֹת) before your God." As Collins, *Daniel*, 374, notes, "the verb הִתְעַנּוֹת is often used in connection with fasting."

referred to as *משְׁכִילִים* in 1:4, anticipating the group known as the *משְׁכִילֵי עַם* in 11:33.<sup>84</sup> The profile of the *משְׁכִילִים* in ch. 1, moreover, resembles that of the *משְׁכִילֵי עַם*. In 1:17, God rewards Daniel’s steadfast commitment to observe Torah law even in the face of mortal danger at the hand of the king with an ability to “understand visions (*הַבִּין בְּכָל־חִזּוֹן*) and dreams of all kinds” (1:17). Likewise, the *משְׁכִילֵי עַם* of the second century B.C.E. “instruct” (*יְבִינוּ*) others, presumably with the apocalyptic knowledge that Daniel received in a vision (10:14): *חִזּוֹן*, in spite of the mortal danger posed by the king. They merit this knowledge because they, unlike those “who violated the covenant” (11:32), observe the Torah. A second-century B.C.E. audience who were being forced by the king to eat non-kosher food would certainly have sympathized with Daniel’s plight.<sup>85</sup>

These parallels support the suggestion that the same redactor who made the need to remain fearless a central aspect of chs. 10–12 also included it as an important element of what he decided should be the opening passage in the book. Contrary to the perception of his servant, Nebuchadnezzar does not enjoy control over his subjects and is not properly an object of fear. Instead, power resides with those who obey God’s commandments. Such people merit the divine knowledge which reinforces that conviction. By positioning this message at the book’s beginning, the redactor enables his audience to read the narratives of Daniel through a different emotional lens.

---

<sup>84</sup> See, e.g., John J. Collins, “Daniel and His Social World,” *Int* 39 (1985): 131–43 (134–35). An older view identified the authors of the book as the Hasideans; see, e.g., Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), 1:175–80. An emerging consensus among scholars instead attributes the editing of the book to a group that labeled itself the *maskilim*, though their identity remains obscure; see Collins, “Daniel and His Social World,” 132.

<sup>85</sup> See 1 Macc 1:62–63: “But many in Israel stood firm and were resolved in their hearts not to eat unclean food. They chose to die rather than to be defiled by food or to profane the holy covenant, and they did die.”

The tales in chs. 2–6, with ch. 1 as their backdrop, serve to teach the fearful audience of the second century B.C.E. that, in fact, they need not fear the king.

## VII. Why Fear?

Using the social-constructionist approach to emotion, I have argued that the book of Daniel, at least in its final form, can be profitably read as a product of, and response to, a “textual community [that was] ... the nucleus of an ‘emotional community’.”<sup>86</sup> As the product of a highly literate, scribal community, the final version of the book both reflects and responds to the emotions that define that community. Situated in the midst of the Antiochan persecutions, members of that community responded to the crisis with fear, an emotion that reflected judgments about the power relations between Antiochus and the Jews. In order to jettison what he regarded as an inappropriate emotion, the redactor constructed an alternate reality in which the courageous acts of martyrdom would doom Antiochus to the same fate suffered by his hubristic predecessors.

Analysis of the book allows us not only to profile the emotional makeup of the redactor’s community but also reconstruct the belief system that encouraged a fearful response to the persecutions. The visions in chs. 7–12 focus especially on the idea of divine sovereignty and the possibility that Antiochus’ supremacy signaled divine absence.<sup>87</sup> The loss of control that defines fear and that prevailed in the redactor’s emotional community thus emerged from a sense that God had abandoned them.

The relationship between divine sovereignty and the emotional state of the redactor’s community helps us understand why they responded to the Antiochan persecutions with fear. The

---

<sup>86</sup> Barbara Rosenwein, “Problems and Methods in the History of Emotions,” *Passions in Context* 1 (2010): 1–32 (11–12).

<sup>87</sup> See Willis, *Dissonance and the Drama of Divine Sovereignty*, 61–180.

emotion of fear, while certainly possessing an inborn, reflexive dimension, is not automatically elicited in every threatening situation. This point was argued in detail by historian of emotions Peter Stearns, who traced contemporary American fears of terrorism, which he demonstrates “do not constitute perpetual, inevitable, or purely natural reactions, even given the magnitude of current threats,” to two distinctive legacies of the colonial period, namely the fears associated with race and Christian fears associated with God’s wrath.<sup>88</sup> In doing so, Stearns conducted a historical inquiry into the ideological and cultural conditions that continue to nurture the American emotion of fear. The connection between divine sovereignty and fear in Daniel enables us to address a similar question in the context of the Antiochan persecutions: why did the redactor’s emotional community respond to the persecutions with fear rather than with courage, hope, grief, or zeal, emotional alternatives that we find attested in our sources from that period?

The source of the fear that apparently characterized the redactor’s emotional community grew out of the broader theological crisis of the Second Temple period. The challenges of that era, including the loss of political sovereignty and contentious religious life, led many Jews to conclude that God had severed his relationship with Israel following the destruction of the temple.<sup>89</sup> That outlook apparently predisposed some to react to Antiochus’ persecutions with fear: the existential threat posed by the Seleucid monarch naturally elicited a reaction of fear on the part of those already convinced that God had abandoned them. Increased sensitivity to the role of emotions in Daniel thus illuminates not just the redactor’s emotional community but also the broader theological belief system that supported it.

---

<sup>88</sup> Peter N. Stearns, *American Fear: The Causes and Consequences of High Anxiety* (London: Routledge, 2006). The quote is from p. 8.

<sup>89</sup> See Ari Mermelstein, *Creation, Covenant, and the Beginnings of Judaism: Reconceiving Historical Time in the Second Temple Period* (JSJSup 168; Leiden: Brill, 2014).

