Title
Animals, Creatures, and Monsters: A Study of Animality and Foreignness in the Danielic Corpora

Author
Remington, Megan

Publication Date
2021

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

Animals, Creatures, and Monsters:

A Study of Animality and Foreignness in the Danielic Corpora

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in

Near Eastern Languages and Cultures

by

Megan Ryder Remington

2021

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Animals, Creatures, and Monsters:

A Study of Animality and Foreignness in the Danielic Corpora

by

Megan Ryder Remington

Doctor of Philosophy in Near Eastern Languages and Cultures

University of California, Los Angeles, 2021

Professor Carol Ann Bakhos, Chair

The nonhuman animals and creatures featured in what may be called the Danielic corpora are some of the most memorable and influential in early Jewish literature. The collection presents episodes of a king's theriomorphic transformation, violent confrontations with lions and serpents, the judgment of mythic-hybrid monsters, and domestic animals in conflict, each of which this study examines. With attention to the unique expressions of animality and foreignness of each episode—how animality reflects foreignness and foreignness reflects animality—this investigation demonstrates the diverse ways in which early Jewish communities negotiated identity and worked out their conceptions of self and other. The diversity of these expressions is a reflection of the heterogeneity found in the Danielic corpora, which remains a complex and

palimpsetic set of traditions that preserves linguistic, generic, and compositional distinctions which cannot be reduced to the categories often applied to them. In the same way, this investigation maintains that the animals, creatures, and monsters who often portray foreign others in the Danielic texts cannot be simplified into one understanding of foreign kings, empires, and gods as bestial aggressors and monsters of chaos. Moreover, this study argues that the instability and malleability of the human-nonhuman binary is evinced in how Jewish literary imagination of the early centuries BCE employed and interacted with nonhuman interlocutors, and provided a mirror in which Jewish groups could view and review themselves, foreign others, and divine sovereignties.

The dissertation of Megan Ryder Remington is approved.

Beth Berkowitz

Catherine E. Bonesho

William M. Schniedewind

Carol Ann Bakhos, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2021

Dedicated to תורא די חיי

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEGEMENTS

When I dreamt of Frankenstein walking toward me down a dark alleyway and I stood there unafraid, I knew the end of this project was nigh. Some weeks later, I submitted the final draft to my committee and set the zoo loose. I'm sure, however, that the animals, monsters, and creatures that have strolled (and trolled) through my conscious and subconscious mind these last months will continue to do so in their uniquely nonhuman ways for years to come. Without their constant and (mostly) quiet companionship in my dreams and musings, this journey would have been a much slower and arduous one.

I would first like to extend immense gratitude to my committee members who provided generous support at my prospectus defense and throughout the revisions phase. I am grateful to Beth Berkowitz for her expertise and consistently thoughtful feedback, which have proved formative for this work and will continue to impact me in my efforts to continue growing as an articulate, kind, and conscious scholar. I am also grateful to Bill Schniedewind for his mentorship during my time at UCLA and providing many of the benefits of being in a small department: small seminars, spontaneous office chats, and of course, pizza nights. I have also had the privilege of learning from Catherine Bonesho in seminars and conversations, as well as gleaning from her example as a pedagogue, researcher, and mentor. Moreover, without her encouragement and constructive critique, this project would have remained indefinitely as one of the "visions of my head." Finally, I am grateful to my adviser Carol Bakhos for taking a chance on an enthusiastic and inexperienced student who showed up in her office one day. Throughout my program, my expectations have been continually exceeded by the support and exhortation she has extended to me in the form of conversations (including processing the rise and fall of Game

of Thrones), personal advocacy, and professional enrichment. I would not be the same emerging scholar as I am today without her guidance.

I am also grateful to each of the faculty members from whom I have had the honor of learning during my time at UCLA, especially Yona Sabar and Jeremy Smoak. Outside of the sphere of UCLA, I also wish to express gratitude for the mentorship and friendship of Pinchas Giller who welcomed me as a *bat bayit* during and after my time at the American Jewish University, and whose example as a scholar has taught me to fuel an unquenchable curiosity. The months of lockdown would have been significantly more bleak (and less nerdy) without our weekly Aramaic wanderings.

I am also greatly indebted to each of my friends and colleagues in NELC for the bonds that are entirely unique to a doctoral cohort; there are too many to name here and too many conversations to cite with fondness. I wish to express gratitude especially to Marilyn Love, Julianna Smith, and Elizabeth Van Dyke. The invaluable hours of texting, zoom calls, and feedback on written work throughout the pandemic—and even in spite of time zone scheduling—have been one of the greatest sources of support, solidarity, and laughter.

As odd as it may sound, I am also grateful for the academic Twitter community from whom I have learned a great deal, and who have helped me feel connected during the dark days of quarantine and closed libraries. Of these virtual acquaintances, I am particularly grateful to Maia Kotrosits for her wisdom on navigating the forest that is the writing process, as well as her intuitively-timed emails at pivotal moments of this work.

I am also grateful to my family for their continued investment in me: to my Dad for buying me my first Strong's concordance and giving me room to find my path; my Mom for "loving my brain" and keeping me positive on the long commutes home; Sean and Jess for

calling me “Dr. Meg” way too early and always cheering me on; and Madison for reading my prospectus and loving animals more than any of us. I have also been shaped by the love of my late-grandmother, Elaine, and her love of learning and reading, as well as my Auntie’s gift of poetic verse. I thank Ray and Suzanne, too, for their love shown in book sets, conversations, and keen interest in my studies. I am also grateful for my second parents, Mark and Pam, for offering their roof, ever-stimulating dinner conversation, and unending support throughout Taylor’s and my graduate programs. Their generosity is a foundation stone of who we are in the world. This gratefulness extends further to Juan and Carolyn (Grandma and Papa), without whose support and love I would not be the same person I am today.

Finally, if I wrote out what I want to say in thanks to my spouse Taylor, this dissertation might reach three hundred pages. Researching software programs, buying computer monitors, enabling my insatiable book (and Nespresso) addiction, and helping me stave off debilitating perfectionism are only a few of his interventions over the last five years. He has taught me how to think of this dissertation as a true “study,” a sketch in preparation for a real painting, and how to truly make my work my play. In bearing the burden of a partner in graduate school, he has shown more strength and support than I could have fathomed. To you, Taylor, I dedicate this study. Finally, Team Remington has made it to the fourth quarter and—I can’t believe I’m concluding with a sports metaphor—you are the smile in my heart as I shoot my buzzer-beating, three-pointer.

VITA

M.A. Near Eastern Languages and Cultures 2019

University of California, Los Angeles

B.A. Jewish Studies 2015

American Jewish University, Los Angeles

Social Media Coordinator 2020-present

Currents in Biblical Research Journal

Researcher 2016-2020

Posen Foundation

Book Review 2020

Humor, Resistance, and Jewish Cultural Persistence in the Book of Revelation: Roasting Rome

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020. *Ancient Jew Review.*

Presentation 2020

"Embodied Touch: The Human Body and Sensorial Participation in Daniel 8-12"

What the Body Knows Symposium: Sheffield Institute for Interdisciplinary Biblical Studies

Presentation 2020

“From Ezekiel to Daniel: Reworking Hybrid Creatures in Visionary Literature”

Society of Biblical Literature Virtual Annual Meeting

Presentation 2018

“Liminal Space and the Agency of Writing in the Burial of Incantation Vessels”

Society of Biblical Literature Regional Meeting: Fullerton, CA

Presentation 2018

“Faustina's Masks: Roman and Jewish Intersectionality on a Fragmented Sarcophagus”

European Association for Jewish Studies: Krakow, Poland

Co-coordinator of the 4th Annual Graduate Conference on Religion 2018

University of California, Los Angeles

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

"It should not be believed that all the beings exist for the sake of the existence of man [sic]. *On the contrary, all the other beings too have been intended for their own sakes and not for the sake of something else."*

Rabbi Moses ben Maimon, *The Guide of the Perplexed* 24b[1]

1.1 Daniel's Apocalyptic Interlocutors

In the first line of her introduction to Daniel 7-12, Carol Newsom states that the book "as a whole can be characterized as an extended meditation on the relation between divine and human—especially Gentile—sovereignties."[2] That meditation, however, is incomplete without its nonhuman mediators: an array of real and symbolic animals, creatures, and monsters. As one of the earliest examples of so-called apocalyptic literature, the Danielic corpora played a significant role in the development of apocalyptic imagery, style, and metaphor for ancient authors.[3] No study yet, however, has been solely dedicated to its nonhuman figures without whose presence the corpora would be scarcely populated. The range of nonhumans just mentioned I have deemed "apocalyptic interlocutors," a term used to describe the discursive

[1] Maimonides, Moses, *The Guide of the Perplexed Volume Two: Translated and with an Introduction and Notes by Shlomo Pines* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1974), 452.

[2] Carol A. Newsom with Brennan W. Breed, *Daniel: A Commentary*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014), 211.

[3] In understanding the genre of apocalypse which will be discussed at length below, John J. Collins has asserted the prominence of Daniel in scholarship of the last half century as a paradigmatic apocalypse but also the genre's disadvantages. See *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), 85. Others, however, such as Paolo Sacchi and Gabriele Boccaccini, have sought to disentangle Daniel from the apocalyptic genre altogether. See Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History* (Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1990), 17; and Boccaccini, *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism: An Intellectual History from Ezekiel to Daniel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), 151-201.

participation of animals in the broader Danielic traditions.[4] The attestations of Daniel include the Masoretic text, Old Greek and Theodotion versions, and Qumranic material.[5] Although the nonhumans in Daniel rarely speak, they have much to say on behalf of their authors and traditions. What exactly they are saying, however, is not always clear. The nonhuman figures of the dreams and visions in Daniel, for instance, often leave those who behold them in stunned silence and in need of an interpreter. Still the interpretations provided rarely offer complete clarification, leaving voids of unexplained imagery. As such, Danielic nonhumans simultaneously demand *and* resist interpretation, categorization, and classification.[6]

The approach taken here argues that animals throughout the Danielic corpora, whether real or metaphorical, shed light on how diverse ancient Jewish communities saw themselves, the divine, and the other reflected in the natural world of nonhuman species.[7] Situated in the imperial contexts in which they sought to find their place, the animals in Danielic literature are not limited

[4] The term "apocalyptic interlocutors" does not refer to the generic relationship between Danielic nonhumans and their place in the formal category "apocalyptic literature." Instead, I invoke the etymological basis for "apocalyptic" here, that is, its basis in the Greek αποχάλυψις, meaning to "unveil" or "reveal." By highlighting the revelatory effect of Daniel's nonhumans as well as their participation as dialogic interlocutors, I aim to encapsulate their roles as both interpretable symbols and active subjects. On the revelatory effect of monsters, see Kobi Kabalek, "Monsters in the Testimonies of Holocaust Survivors" in *Monsters and Monstrosity in Jewish History: From the Middle Ages to Modernity*, Iris Idelson-Shein and Christian Wiese, eds. (London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic: 2019), 134-5. On the dialogical nature of social discourse in Second Temple Judaism, in which I include nonhumans as participants, see Carol A. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 3-6.

[5] The present investigation focuses primarily on the OG and MT, and includes Theodotion and DSS material when relevant for specific analyses.

[6] As Asa Simon Mittman states regarding "the monstrous," I expand her statement to include the entire range of animals in the Danielic corpora: they prompt us "to acknowledge the failures of our systems of categorization." "Introduction: The Impact of Monsters and Monster Studies" in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Monsters and the Monstrous*, eds. Asa Simon Mittman and Peter J. Dendle (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2012), 8.

[7] Paul A. Porter's *Metaphors and Monsters: A Literary-Critical Analysis of Daniel 7 and 8* (Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1983) applies the interactionist metaphor theory of Max Black (*Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy* [Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1962]) to Daniel's two most *animalisch* apocalypses and will be discussed in later chapters of this dissertation.

only to descriptions of Gentile kings or foreign empires—they are also used to describe themselves, "others" in their own communities, angelic bodies, liminal guardians, and even shadows of divinity itself. The primary question of my dissertation is thus how animality and nonhuman figures function in the identity negotiations of ancient Jewish communities with special attention to the concept of "foreignness."[8]

There are two threads woven through each chapter, which eventually reflect the findings of my interrogation: the expressions of animality—therefore, "animalities"—in Daniel are diverse, as are the interactions between animalities and foreignness. The first depends on the way animals and nonhumans function as apocalyptic (or revelatory) interlocutors in each of the sections of the Danielic corpora I examine.[9] I argue that animals participate in the process of identity negotiation where self and other are worked out, and as mirrors in which the collective anxieties of Jewish communities are reflected back at them.[10] Most importantly, I demonstrate

[8] At what point one can start using the term "Jewish" in relation to ancient texts is a point of debate among those specializing in the Second Temple period. The discourse revolves around when "Judaism" as a religion became a separate category from "Judean" ethnicity. From one perspective, there are those who argue the term "Jewish" can reasonably be projected back as far as the origins of so-called early Israelite religion and who identify a continuity between Israelite, Judeans, and Jews. For this view see Marc Z. Brettler, "Judaism in the Hebrew Bible? The Transition from Ancient Israelite Religion to Judaism," *Catholic Bible Quarterly* 61 (1999): 429-47. From another perspective, there are those who argue that scholars cannot accurately speak of "Jewish" writings until at least late antiquity, and deem the term "Judean" more appropriate for Second Temple contexts. For this view see Steve Mason, "Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History," *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods* 38 (2007): 457-512. Cynthia Baker challenges the standard terms of the debate and argues, based on terminological grounds, that one can understand the ethnic and religious overtones of ancient terms (*yehud-*, *ioud-*) by how they are employed, each in their own contexts ("A Jew By Any Other Name?" *Journal of Ancient Judaism* 2 (2011): 151-78). See also Baker's monograph, *Jew*. Key Word Series in Jewish Studies (London: Rutgers University Press, 2017), 13-14. I employ the term "Jewish" throughout my analysis recognizing the issues surrounding its multivalence and historical contingencies.

[9] Angels and divine intermediary beings (almost always andromorphic ones) are often the interlocutors most discussed in apocalyptic-type literature. See, for example, Anathea Portier-Young, "Daniel and Apocalyptic Imagination," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Prophets* (Carolyn J. Sharp, ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 224-240.

[10] There are a number of facets the "Jewish communities" to which I refer throughout this investigation, some geographical (Alexandrian and Palestinian), some linguistic (Aramaic, Greek, Hebrew), and some social (scribal groups with varying concerns). The most pervasive, and still most elusive, are the "interpretive communities," a concept I draw on from the work of Stanley Fish. He contends that "interpretive communities are made up of those

that there is not a singular, uniform way that animality, in tandem with foreignness, is expressed and employed by the texts' authors. As I present in the chapters ahead, scholarship on the animals in Daniel has led to an understanding of animality and nonhumans as solely threatening and frightening. I argue, however, that the presentations of Danielic animalities are more complicated and are expressed throughout the corpora in the following ways. For Daniel 4, animality negotiates the blurry boundaries between foreigner-Jew and animal-human. Daniel 6 and *Bel and the Serpent* situate nonhumans in hierarchies of animacy—that is, what it means to be "living"—and in narratives centered around eating and fraught with violence. Animality and nonhumans in Daniel 7 are indeed expressed as frightening monsters but also as "living creatures" that reflect the anxieties of social instability and divine sovereignty. In contrast to chapter 7's anomalous hybrids, the animalities of Daniel 8 take the form of domesticated animals in conflict with one another rather than the divine court. These diverse expressions are facilitated by the non-uniformity of the compositions of the Danielic corpora, highlighting the limitations, perhaps even futility, of working with "the book of Daniel" as a single-authored, unified composition.

The second thread of my argument is an attention to notions of "foreignness" in the Danielic corpora and how its animalities interact with the explorations of foreign others. For Danielic texts and their socio-historical contexts, otherness and foreignness go hand in hand, and

---

who share interpretive strategies not for reading (in the conventional sense) but for writing texts, for constituting their properties and assigning their intentions" (*Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities* [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980], 171). For a Second Temple Jewish context then, the interpretive communities of the Danielic corpora refer to a variety of scribal groups with concerns determined by their varying locations, languages, and interpretive strategies. Contributing further to the context of Second Temple scribes, Amy C. Merrill Willis states that "this dialogical process [between writers and redactors of the Danielic corpora] may have emerged out of a social network in which members had access to each other's work. However, it is not necessary to stipulate social gatherings and circles. The 'community' in question may have been even more loosely gathered than this, connected to one another through the sharing of manuscripts, literary conventions, and ideological convictions." *Dissonance and the Drama of Divine Sovereignty in the Book of Daniel* (LHB/OTS, 520; New York: T. & T. Clark, 2010), 92.

extend to humans and nonhumans (including divine figures) alike. The factors that qualify such "others," however, are not stable by any means. Moreover, I emphasize that there was not a normative way that second Temple Jews viewed the foreigner or empire, a particular species of animal or nonhuman, or their own selves.[11] With this in mind, I demonstrate the varietal, non-normative ways that animals and nonhumans functioned in Danielic literature. Varying in expression from chapter to chapter, the nonhumans in the Danielic corpora are just as complex as the compositional history of the text itself, a summary to which I now turn.

1.2 The Danielic Corpora

Throughout my investigation, I employ the term "Danielic corpora" in lieu of the traditional "book of Daniel" with two primary purposes in mind. The first is a farewell nod to the increasingly cumbersome and historically misleading categories of "canonical" and "non-canonical."[12] Moreover, it is the scholarly consensus that "even in the late Second Temple period, the book of Daniel existed in a variety of forms."[13] Despite this knowledge, most treatments of the Danielic corpora do not reflect this ancient reality, I suspect, out of habit and

[11] See Beth Berkowitz, *Defining Jewish Difference: From Antiquity to the Present* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012). For Berkowitz, the identity boundary between Jew and gentile (and ultimately between self and other) is mutable, and is expressed in varying degrees of permeability based on texts and their contexts (23, 240-44).

[12] In a similar vein, another nod might be extended to "biblical" and "non-biblical" categories in light of the growing number of studies addressing the term "biblical," which assumes a fixed canon that did not exist at the time of the composition of the material under investigation. That said, the term 'biblical' remains a clear descriptor for the collection of 'books' found in the Masoretic text. Recognizing the challenges with the term, I employ it throughout my analysis with caution. For more on issues of canon during the Second Temple period see Eva Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), and Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008).

[13] Newsom, *Daniel,* 30. There is, of course, nothing damning about prioritizing the MT if one properly notes their position as one among many and, as Newsom succinctly articulates, in an acknowledgment that "any construal of the text demands that the reader pick a place," a place from which to read, interpret, and understand Danielic literature.

convention. In an attempt to move beyond the prioritization of the now-canonical Masoretic book of Daniel, I include the different bodies of tales and collections that, as more research has been devoted to them, were likely circulated as autonomous booklets.[14] If one grants this first assumption of potentially autonomous sections or collections, then such independent circulations require individual treatments of Danielic texts that acknowledge their autonomy without being dictated by their role in the Masoretic Text (MT)'s final form of Daniel.[15] I have avoided, to the best of my ability, letting my expectations take the reins and aimed to leave space for difference—linguistic, ideological, and thematic—wherever it may be found. My thesis reflects the combination of my methodological choices and the parameters set by the Danielic texts themselves, and highlights the diverse treatments of animals and animality in Dan. 4, 6, 7, and 8 with an integration of the Old Greek (OG) and the so-called Greek addition *Bel and the Serpent.*

The present investigation focuses only on Danielic chapters in which animals play a central role in the narrative, that is, Dan. 4, 6, 7, 8, and *Bel and the Serpent.* While Dan. 1-3 addresses concerns of otherness and foreign rulership, the chapters do not feature animal interlocutors and thus will not be treated here to any significant extent. The same applies to ch. 5 as well as chs. 9-12, the latter of which takes a markedly anthropocentric turn, a topic I discuss in the conclusion of this dissertation. Despite my only partial treatment of the Danielic corpora, the selected chapters that feature animals in central roles do in fact participate in each of the major genre and language divisions usually ascribed to Danielic works including court tales,

[14] Although the shaping of a Maccabean redactor is most obvious in Dan. 1 and even chs. 2-3, other chapters reflect different priorities, emphases, and views. For a recent summary on the scholarship regarding the versions with particular emphasis on the OG and its recognition as equal with the MT, see Amanda M. Davis Bledsoe, "The Relationship of the Different Editions of Daniel: A History of Scholarship," *Currents in Biblical Research* 13.2 (2015): 175-190.

[15] *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception, Volume 1* (ed. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint; Leiden: Brill, 2002); *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception, Volume 2* (ed. John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint; Leiden: Brill, 2014).

apocalypses, Aramaic, Hebrew, and Greek.[16] Thus, the widespread presence of animal interlocutors in each of these main divisions is notable and, as I demonstrate throughout my argumentation, show the integrality of animals and nonhumans for understanding foreignness and otherness in the Danielic corpora.

The complete OG or the Septuagint (LXX) versions of the Danielic corpora are preserved in two main sources: the Chisian MS and the Syrohexaplar.[17] Another important source that only preserves parts of the text include the Chester Beatty-Cologne Papyrus 967 which provides a witness to unique material that dates prior to the Syriac translation. The later Theodotion (Th) version is generally consistent with the MT version, especially in regard to the unit comprised of chs. 4-6, whereas the OG stands distinct. Complicating things further, the Th and OG are generally in agreement when it comes to the "expansions" of the *Prayer of Azariah and the Three Youths*, *Susanna*, and *Bel and the Serpent*, which are altogether absent from the MT.[18] As one can imagine, due to the complexity of the corpora as well as the breadth of disciplinary knowledge one must possess in order to engage the range of scholarship, there is very little consensus on the exact relationship between the versions of Daniel. As Amanda M. Davis

[16] The polyglossia of Danielic works has drawn much attention from scholars and theories on their purposes, functions, and modes of transmission. For a selection of recent approaches, see Daniel A. Machiela, "Situating the Aramaic Texts from Qumran: Reconsidering Their Language and Socio-Historical Settings" in *Apocalyptic Thinking in Early Judaism* (Cecilia Wassen and Sidnie White Crawford, eds.; Leiden: Brill, 2018), 88-109; Anathea E. Portier-Young, "Languages of Identity and Obligation: Daniel as Bilingual Book," *VT* 60 (2010): 98-115; David M. Valeta, "Polyglossia and Parody: Language in Daniel 1-6," in *Bakhtin and Genre Theory in Biblical Studies* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2007), 91-108.

[17] Chisian is dated to sometime between the ninth and eleventh centuries, and the Syrohexaplar to the seventh century. J. Ziegler's *Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco*, Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum, Auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Gottingensis editum 16/2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954) remains the foremost edition of the LXX, reflected by the consistent use of his numbering system in OG citations.

[18] For a recent summary of the versions, see Bledsoe, "The Relationship of the Different Editions of Daniel." 181-184. Bledsoe's survey of early approaches to the relationship between the OG and MT are especially useful for my investigation. In the LXX, the *Prayer of Azariah* is found between Dan. 3:23 and 3:24; *Susanna* is ch. 13 in the LXX and ch. 1 in the Th; *Bel and the Serpent* is ch. 14 in both Greek versions.

Bledsoe notes, "the majority of recent commentators, however, judge as too simplistic an approach that designates one edition as 'original' and the other derivative."[19] Nevertheless, even if the hold of this simplistic binary is weakening, the opinions on which section of Daniel precedes which and for whom these versions were authoritative are legion.

Although the Danielic corpora is a compositional "kaleidoscope," my selection of chapters partake of the two classic divisions of the corpora: language and genre.[20] The chapters I examine are Daniel 4 (court tale; Aramaic, Greek), Daniel 6 (court tale; Aramaic, Greek), Daniel 7 (visionary account; Aramaic, Greek), and Daniel 8 (visionary account; Hebrew, Greek). Furthermore, the Greek tales of *Bel and the Serpent* are also examined alongside the MT of Dan. 6. Although the selection reflects a sampling of the generally held categories that determine the corpora's organization, they were not chosen with this in mind. Instead, the range of centrally situated animal figures reflects their prevalence across boundaries rather than a careful curation on my part in attempts to adhere to preset categorizations. The roles that animals play in the dialogues of the Danielic corpora, therefore, are not limited to a singular language or genre division. Furthermore, each of the chapters in this dissertation devotes a small section to the composition history of the Danielic texts being examined. Instead of providing only a broad summary in the introduction to the dissertation, I aim to highlight the independence of each portion of the Danielic corpora, both in their composition and transmission, as well as their unique and sometimes disparate approaches to animals and animality.

Prior to the twentieth century, the Danielic corpora were generally considered a unified

[19] Bledsoe, "Relationship of the Different Editions," 183.

[20] See Jan-Wim Wesselius, "The Literary Nature of the Book of Daniel and the Linguistic Character of its Aramaic," Aramaic Studies 3.2 (2005): 241-274. Despite Wesselius' description of the book as a kaleidoscope and as a "literary dossier," he argues that it is intentionally so, and thus a unified work.

work. An exception to this view is that of Porphyry (ca. 234-305 CE) who surmised that the work was not composed in the Babylonian period as the book claims, but during the reign of Antiochus Epiphanies IV.[21] Apart from Porphyry, the coherence of the "book of Daniel" as a unified whole went largely unquestioned until the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century. It was at this point that scholars took greater note of the book's bilingualism, Hebrew and Aramaic, its two primary genres of narrativized court tales and dream-visions relayed in the first-person, and how the division of these categories do not exactly correspond with one another. That is, the Hebrew portions of the book (chs. 1; 8-12) do not entirely coincide with the dream-visions portion (chs. 7-12).[22] Furthermore, the chronologies of the reigns of kings are inconsistent, both in the superscripts that introduce many of the chapters as well as the arrangement of the chapters themselves. Matthias Henze notes that the third-century CE Papyrus 967 sought to remedy the inconsistency by placing Dan. 7 and 8 before chs. 5 and 6.[23] But along with the shift in the early nineteenth and twentieth centuries arose questions beyond the unity and sixth-century BCE dating of MT Daniel, which fueled a discussion around Daniel's

[21] Porphyry's critiques are preserved by the fourth century church father Jerome in his prologue to the book of Daniel. According to Jerome, Porphyry posited that the text was not composed by Daniel during the Babylonian Exile but by someone "living in Judaea at the time of the Antiochus who was surnamed Epiphanes" (*Jerome's Commentary on Daniel: Translated by Gleason L. Archer.* Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock, 2009) 15-17. Interestingly, Jerome's rebuttal does not address any content pertaining to the details of Antiochene history but rather one of the ways that Porphyry draws his conclusion, namely by a Greek expression found in the tale of Susanna and the elders which is only preserved in the OG. Thus to delegitimize Porphyry, Jerome turns to scriptural authority and the fact that the story of Susanna and the elders was not original to the Hebrew compositions.

[22] Other suggestions on the formation of Daniel include Naama Golan's recent argument that, after the addition of ch. 1, Dan. 1-6 circulated independently and demonstrates a chiastic structure built on the dynamics of the Jewish courtier's identity conflicts. Thus, she argues, the conflicting attitudes of and towards the kings in chs. 1-6 can be attributed to the dilemma of where to place one's loyalty: with the earthly sovereignty or the heavenly one. Her presentation is expressly dependent on the advanced arrangement of a redactor and does not account for any circulation or composition prior to what she views as a the "court tale" unit. See "The Daniel Narratives (Dan 1-6): Structure and Meaning," *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures,* Vol. 19 (2019).

[23] Matthias Henze, *The Madness of King Nebuchadnezzar: The Ancient Near Eastern Origins and Early History of Interpretation of Daniel 4* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 13.

"historicity." Scholars began to question—if Daniel is not a unified work, perhaps it is not historical either. Such concerns, however, were not of priority for the communities who composed and redacted the Danielic corpora. Whether it be the "historicity" of the foreign kings and the timeframes given to their reigns, or the attempt (or lack thereof) to match the sequential narratives of the first half with the visions of second, the interests of the final redactors were clearly elsewhere.[24]

The move away from historicist concerns is a new one for scholarship, especially as they pertain to the "book of Daniel." In her recent article of the history of Danielic scholarship, Amy C. Merrill Willis concludes her survey with the reflection that,

> …much of Daniel scholarship in the last century has been overshadowed by the fall-out from the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy with its unrelenting concern for historicity, a concern that made the tales and the visions look inauthentic, fraudulent, and embarrassingly nonhistorical. Released from that burden, scholarship is now in a better position to discover what Daniel, in its Hebrew/Aramaic form and in its OG form, *can do to and for its readers*.[25]

The examples of new directions of the last few decades to which Willis has drawn attention include accommodation and resistance, post-colonial studies, the ancient Near Eastern context of

[24] The histories of literary apocalypses, although concerned with time, progression, and remembering, are much less concerned with modern conceptions of providing "accurate histories." We can see a prime example of this alternate type of concern in the redactor's hand who shaped the MT of Daniel. Although a sense of time, progression, and location is central to the arch of the narratives, our definitions of historical accuracy are much less important.

[25] Amy C. Merrill Willis, "A Reversal of Fortunes: Daniel among the Scholars," *Currents in Biblical Research* (2018) Vol. 16.2, 123. Emphasis mine. See also Tawny Holm's citation of Merrill Willis, commenting that "scholarship of Daniel has benefited from not only new theoretical approaches but a shift from evaluating the historicity of the book." "Book of Daniel," in *The Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019) 13.

Danielic themes, Danielic literary reception, and political theologies.[26] By pointing to decreasingly relevant historicist approaches, which have been central to the work's understanding and position within biblical studies, Willis makes clear that the landscape of studies in Daniel continues to change. Such shifts are perhaps more apparent and receive more "resistance," not in the least due to Daniel's theological importance for Christian messianism and as prophetic bulwark, but also because of the large role that historicism has played in Daniel studies.[27]

In line with the observations summarized above, Michael Segal aptly states: "[w]ith the knowledge available to us today, it is abundantly clear that the authors of Daniel were not offering firsthand, eyewitness accounts of the events in question, but were rather describing how they perceived the past or, more precisely, how they wanted their readers to perceive this past."[28] The primary interests of this dissertation therefore are not in reconstructing historical backgrounds or decoding symbolic representations but are, rather, in addressing the literary,

[26] Willis, "Reversal of Fortunes," 112-22.

[27] Perhaps, however, the so-called methods of "historicism" that have been applied to Daniel in the past may be better termed "pseudo-historicism," as presented by Benjamin D. Sommer in his essay, "Dating Pentateuchal Texts and Perils of Pseudo-Historicism," in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*, Thomas B. Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch J. Schwartz (eds.) Forschungen zum Alten Testament 78 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011) 85-108. To briefly summarize Sommer's argument, he says: "A core difference between historicism and pseudo-historicism as I define them is that historicism is a method of explaining and evaluating that all humanistic scholars need to embrace as one tool among many in their bag of tricks, while pseudo-historicism is a universalizing fallacy all too common among humanistic scholars" (103). Sommer goes on to describe an alternative that applies well to the enduring nature and reapplication of apocalyptic-type literature, and Daniel in particular of which certain parts can be dated with some degree of certainty: "Even when we can date a text with some confidence, there is no reason to limit our interpretation of that text by seeing it exclusively or primarily as a response to social, economic, or political factors. Literature that endures for millennia does so precisely because it transcends its setting, because it presents insights into the human condition that remain relevant long after the historical or social conditions from which it emerged have disappeared" (106). The relevance of the animals and nonhumans in the Danielic corpora clearly transcends their immediate social-political-historical settings, highlighting the potency of Sommer's observation beyond its application to Pentateuchal texts and motifs.

[28] Michael Segal, *Dreams, Riddles, and Visions: Textual, Contextual, and Intertextual Approaches to the Book of Daniel* (Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2016), 2.

social, and ideological functions of animality and the apocalyptic interlocutors in the Danielic corpora.[29] In some cases, the possible historical backgrounds (textual and cultural) of the Danielic traditions are relevant for either their literary or ideological import, but their immediate historical accuracies, based in a tradition based on historicism, are not essential to my approaches or arguments.[30] What remains of greater interest are their literary function and social expression for the Danielic authors and redactors, particularly in regard to identity negotiations within their communities and with the Other. Inadvertently highlighting the overlap between these approaches, Ingvild Sælid Gilhus states, "the idea that animal representations, which may be literary or social constructions, reveal something about the way living animals are perceived and treated is not uncontroversial."[31] Thus, the conversation between historical (less so historicism) and living animals, and the literary constructions of their animality are not altogether unrelated.

In any study dedicated to the human imagination of animals, especially as symbolic and allegorical referents, it runs the risk of losing sight of "actual animals" in favor of their human-conceived mirages. In his introduction to the edited volume on *Animals and the Human Imagination,* Aaron Gross begins with an affirmation of "the significant role animals play in the process of human self-conception," which is worth repeating at the outset of this dissertation for

[29] Although David Bryan (*Cosmos, Chaos and the Kosher Mentality* [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995]) has suggested reading zoomorphic imagery as "'expressive' or 'depth language' rather than 'steno-symbolism,'" his analysis of the *Anim. Apoc.,* Testament of Naphtali, and Dan. 7 nevertheless defaults to a decoding process according to kosher laws of Leviticus and Deuteronomy (29-31, 249).

[30] In her discussion of making meaning of John's Apocalypse, Adela Yarbro Collins highlights that although "historical methods are essential," they are not "fully adequate to the task of exploring the mystery of the meaning of a text." Alongside social and anthropological approaches, Collins turns to "the unconscious functions of human behavior and language," an important perspective I take throughout my investigation especially in regard to the ways that nonhuman animals and monsters provide space for the often unconscious working out of prejudices and anxieties. See *Crisis and Catharsis: The Power of the Apocalypse* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1984) 21.

[31] *Animals, Gods and Humans: Changing Attitudes to Animals in Greek, Roman and Early Christian Ideas* (London and New York: Routledge, 2006) 6.

similar reasons that Gross presents for his own.[32] And while this remains (or should remain) a concern for any critical study of animals or animality, Gross optimistically states that a "human self-conception through animals could be deployed both to render animals absent and to make them present."[33] In her articulation of Donna Haraway's critique of Jacques Derrida's inadvertent sidelining of the "realness" of his cat "in favor of 'his textual canon of Western philosophy and literature,'" Hannah M. Strømmen admits how analysis of a textual canon can keep one focused on creaturely constructions instead of actual creatures.[34] But in the conclusion to her book, Strømmen returns to the urgent and pressing nature of Haraway's question—"the hideous reality of the material conditions for millions of animals outside…the cozy enclave of animal studies"—and situates the biblical archive as a powerful force in the negotiations of religion and culture that produce the violence that they do.[35] I do not intend to argue that the Bible is *solely* responsible for the mistreatment and subjugation of nonhuman animals, although many studies have suggested as much.[36] Like Strømmen, I find the biblical blame game not

[32] "Introduction and Overview: Animal Others and Animal Studies," in *Animals and the Human Imagination: A Companion to Animal Studies,* Aaron Gross and Anne Vallely (eds.) (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), 1. For his and Anne Vallely's volume as a whole, Gross imagines it as a developmental piece in the move toward "animal hermeneutics," which is certainly compatible with the aims of this investigation. (5)

[33] Gross, "Introduction," 15.

[34] Hannah M. Strømmen, *Biblical Animality After Jacques Derrida* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2018) 33-4. She quotes Haraway's statement from her work, *When Species Meet* (Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press, 2007), 20.

[35] Strømmen, *Biblical,* 140-4.

[36] See Carol A. Bakhos' summary of some of these sources that hold the Bible and the Abrahamic traditions responsible for violence against animals: "Jewish, Christian, and Muslim attitudes toward Animals," *Comparative Islamic Studies* 5.2 (2009) 177-219, especially pp. 179-80, f.n. 4 and 6. Much of Bakhos' corrective aims to address the influential scholar-activists such as Peter Singer and Lynn White Jr. who emerged from disciplines based on animal rights. She writes of the "disservice to the three traditions if we assume a monochromatic vision of the relationship between humans and other animals, one that either readily indicts or flippantly exonerates them" (189). For perspectives that do not assume the primacy of Aristotelian thought on animals for early Jewish literature, see Margo DeMello's essay "Modification: Blurring the Divide: Human and Animal Body Modifications" in *A Companion to the Anthropology of the Body and Embodiment*. (Frances E. Mascia-Lees, editor. Oxford: Blackwell

entirely helpful and agree that biblical scholars "would be better off turning *toward* the textual body, responding to it, and going through its pockets anew, and reviewing the strange and fantastical, domestic, and divine character that inhabit its spaces."[37] It is my aim and hope that the diverse expressions of animals, monsters, and other creatures as unpacked in the following chapters, which reflect the diversity and multivocality of Jewish communities, have the potential to make new ripples in the pond of interacting with "actual animals" among whom ancient Jewish groups also lived.[38]

1.3 Methodologies

Daniel's Animals in Biblical and Animal Studies

In light of what is known as the "animal turn" in the humanities and postmodern approaches over the last two decades, the time is ripe for an in-depth study of Danielic animals

Publishing, 2011), 341-2. She who views the Aristotle's *Scala Naturae* primarily emerging during the early Medieval period, at least as the structured hierarchy as we know it today. Nonetheless, she does acknowledge the import of Greek thought on early Judaism and the inferiority of animals. Furthermore, Newsom, highlights alt-Aristotelian perspectives among the Qumran community in *Self as Symbolic Space*, 286. Hannah Strømmen also provides a summary of selected works that have been particularly influential in this regard, such as Cary Wolfe, (ed.) *Zoontologies: The Question of the Animal* (Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press, 2003); Stephen R. L. Clark, *The Political Animal: Biology, Ethics, and the Politics* (London: Routledge, 1999); Paola Cavalieri, (ed.) *The Death of the Animal: A Dialogue* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2009); Marc R. Fellenz, *The Moral Menagerie: Philosophy and Animal Rights* (Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2007).

[37] Strømmen, *Biblical*, 14. Emphasis mine.

[38] In her essay on monsters and animals in 4 Ezra, Rebecca Raphael notes that "ancient monsters tend to be animal-human hybrids that embody fear of reversion to the animal. In the postmodern world, anxiety fixates instead on the human-machine boundary. The cyborg, a machine-human hybrid, becomes the paradigmatic monster. This anxiety probably arises from the conflict between our high valuation of individuality and our great dependance on machines." "Monsters and the Crippled Cosmos: Construction of the Other in Fourth Ezra," in *The "Other" in Second Temple Judaism: Essays in Honor of John J. Collins*, eds. Daniel C. Harlow, et al. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing Co., 2011), 283, fn. 19. Likewise, the often fear-inducing presence of animals in either hybrid or symbolic settings may allude to ancient societies' great dependence on nonhuman animals and their cultural embeddedness, pointing to the "actual animals" within the symbolic referents.

and animality.[39] Although the term may appear to concern only animals, it is in fact a varied and sometimes contradictory set of approaches, methodologies, and conversations involving humans, nonhumans, and their varying gradations. Indeed, each of the approaches have "animals" in common but differ greatly in their histories and motivations. The bourgeoning fields emerging from this "turn"— animal and animality studies, critical animal studies, human-animal studies, to name a few—are wide-ranging with a variety of approaches, specialties, and foci.[40] Their interdisciplinarity interests overlap with feminist, gender, and postmodern studies, thus exponentially multiplying their faces as each year passes. Originating in critiques of anthropocentrism from a twentieth-century posthumanist position, Berkowitz articulates that such studies make "it possible to encounter [animals] as characters in their own right even as they are trapped in human perspectives and products of them."[41] Such multiplicity—and the overwhelming amount of scholarship and sources—requires a study like my own to identify its place within this broader conversation.

In line with the turn to animals, the trend might also be described as a shift of gaze or

[39] The way that postmodern approaches facilitate and engage with complex identities is well-suited for the diversity found among Danielic animals and nonhuman. In the words of Mira Beth Wasserman regarding recent approaches to the Talmud, she writes: "Postmodern sensibilities promote expressions of cultural diversity and cosmopolitanism in which impulses toward particularism and universalism are not seen as mutually exclusive, but rather can be embraced as complementary aspects of complex identities." *Jews, Gentiles, and Other Animals: The Talmud After the Humanities* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017).

[40] See the edited volume, *French Thinking about Animals, The Animal Turn*. Mackenzie, Louisa and Stephanie Posthumus, eds. (East Lansing: Michigan State Press, 2015).

[41] Beth A. Berkowitz, *Animals and Animality in the Babylonian Talmud* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 8. She summarizes the field of critical animal studies, beginning most notably with Peter Singer's monograph *Animal Liberation* (New York: Harper Collins, 1975) and Jacques Derrida's publication of *The Animal that I Am* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2008) based on his ten-hour lecture series in 1997. Matthew Calarco's work in animal studies draws on philosophy and ethics, and most innovatively moves away from two previous approaches: that of identity theorists (such as Singer) and of difference theorists (such as Derrida. Of his approach, Berkowitz highlights Calarco's notion of "'indistinction'[which] aims to recover sameness but along new lines, so that instead of seeing the ways that animals are like us, we notice how we are like them." *Thinking Through Animals: Identity, Difference, Indistinction* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2015), 11.

attention. At the introduction of his chapter on undomesticated animals and perceptions of wildness in the Hebrew Bible, Ken Stone employs the notion of "the zoological gaze" according to sociologist Adrian Franklin.[42] Stone summarizes that the zoological gaze is a turning of attention directed toward animal and nonhuman creatures and their interactions with humans. The term "gaze" highlights the perceptibility, subjectivity, and positionality of a particular viewpoint, that is, literally a point of viewing, as well as the space between the viewer and the viewed. As Gross articulates, he does "not wish to make animals more central but rather to make their centrality more conscious, more just, and more interpretively productive."[43] Unavoidably anthropos-oriented since the gaze emerges from a human subject to a zoological other, one's turn of attention functions primarily as a mirror for the gazer and reflects back that which it beholds. Such a gaze makes most sense in dialogues surrounding human-animal relationships rather than other subfields of animal studies that emphasize animal agency and subjectivity above all else. By extension, and relevant to my own investigation, Stone points to the strata of human relationships into which the zoological gaze seeps and becomes operative.[44] The wildness and exoticism—as well as violence towards and a desire to subjugate—associated with animal others can be used to fuel similar views of human others perceived as foreign, exotic, or uncivilized. Such extensions and their implications are evident in the Danielic corpora, topics to which I return in the pages ahead.

Recent studies of animals and animality in biblical studies have demonstrated a number of important points, the most central of which is the diversity of views exhibited in biblical

[42] Ken E. Stone, *Reading the Hebrew Bible with Animal Studies* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2018), 119.

[43] Aaron S. Gross, *The Question of the Animal and Religion* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2015), 61.

[44] Stone, *Reading the Hebrew Bible,* 120.

literature.[45] By looking at a large swath of texts, genres, time periods, and contexts, it becomes clear that there is no singular view expressed by biblical authors. Moreover, as Patricia Cox Miller has highlighted in early Christian literary traditions, one may even find contradicting views of animals, animality, and human exceptionalism in a single text.[46] Valuable studies such as Ken Stone's *Reading Animal Studies with the Hebrew Bible,* and Hannah Strømmen's *Biblical Animality after Jacques Derrida,* follow a trend towards thematization, that is, choosing texts that reflect certain themes and/or organizing one's findings based on their thematic similarities.[47]

What a thematic approach facilitates is the privileged position of zooming in and zooming out. One can zoom in to identify a particular detail of a particular text, and then only a moment later zoom out and identify a similar detail in another text from an altogether different time and place. Differences between texts and expressions of animality are also made apparent by their comparison, and just as easily can be explained by their different textual concerns and contexts. What a thematic approach limits in this regard are the insights of a what a collected set of stories, such as the Danielic corpora, that was assembled by ancient Jewish communities might tell us about these same differences. Instead of being explained away by vast lengths of

[45] Worth noting, at the same time, is the lack of engagement of critical animal studies in studies of ancient Judaism, as Berkowitz notes in her recent survey of scholarship on the topic. See Beth Berkowitz, "Animal Studies and Ancient Judaism," *Currents in Biblical Research* (2019) Vol. 18.1, 80-111. For Hebrew Bible, see Paul Sherman, "The Hebrew Bible and the 'Animal Turn,'" in *Currents in Biblical Research* (2020) Vol. 19.1, 36-63.
For animals and religion more broadly, see Aaron S. Gross's summary and bibliography, "Religion and Animals," published online in 2017 in *Oxford Handbooks Online,* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.

[46] Patricia Cox Miller, *In the Eye of the Animal: Zoological Imagination in Ancient Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018).

[47] Whereas Stone's study surveys a large range of texts from the Hebrew Bible, Strømmen's only focuses on four texts that span both the Hebrew Bible and New Testament. Strømmen considers Gen. 9, the book of Daniel, Acts 10, and Rev. 19 in her study, and acknowledges that her selection is "not representative of the Bible or as exhaustive of the theme Bible and animality" but that she aims to "tease out the particular themes of killability and sovereignty as they relate to animality" (*Biblical Animality,* 34-5). The notion of "killability" emerges from Derrida's reflections in *The Animal That Therefore I Am* on sacrificial practices, especially those that substitute nonhumans for human transgressions. Haraway expands this concept in *When Species Meet,* articulating a type of ethic that abandons the attempt to determine who or what can killed and instead suggests that the "thou shalt not kill" commandment of Exodus be altogether changed to "thou shalt not make killable" (77-80).

time and a seemingly lack of association by any number of factors, one can look to the Danielic corpora and find similar sets of diverse views and expressions of animals and animality. Despite Daniel's chronological (and even thematic) complexities and incongruencies, ancient redactors still preserved them in a corpus linked by, at in the very least, their relationship to the figure Daniel. In my investigation, I approach each of the Danielic chapters that feature animals and animality individually and showcase the diversity of how Jewish communities negotiated their social identities. By this focus, I highlight the nuances found in the Danielic primary sources, one that would not be yielded by a survey based solely on thematization.[48]

The only study at the intersection of biblical studies and animal studies, to my knowledge, that has examined all of the animals in the Danielic corpora is an essay by Jennifer L. Koosed and Robert Paul Seesengood titled, "Daniel's Animal Apocalypse."[49] The piece is important in its attempt to consider the whole of the Danielic discussion without homogenizing the passages as one cohesive perspective on animals and animality. The authors' emphasis on the connection between Daniel's expression of animals and animality and the communities who produced this "animalogic" is also a key point of analysis, and one that the present investigation shares.[50] At the same time, my study diverges from theirs and argues for an even more nuanced view of animals and animality in the Danielic corpora. In their view, Daniel falls under the same spell as the Seleucid empire it aims to resist and employs the same oppressive rhetoric of

[48] I am grateful to my committee during my prospectus defense for prompting me to question my original thematic approach and organize my investigation according to the primary sources, which facilitated more salient results than what might have become lost in thematic containers.

[49] Koosed, Jennifer L. and Robert Paul Seesengood, "Daniel's Animal Apocalypse" in *Divinanimality: Animal Theory, Creaturely Theology* (Stephen D. Moore, ed. Pp. 182-195: New York: Fordham University Press, 2014).

[50] Ibid., 190.

otherness.[51] In so doing, Koosed and Seesengood assume that Dan. 7-8 are purely negative portrayals of "the savage humans who are really, cosmically, apocalyptic animals."[52] Such a statement, however, does not account for the significant variations in the ways that the nonhumans in these passages act and are acted upon. For example, although one of the four monstrous creatures of Dan. 7 is destroyed by fire, the lives of the other three animals are extended and seemingly protected for a certain amount of time. Moreover, in Dan. 8, the "apocalyptic animals" who are supposed to represent savage empires are not destroyed at all. Rather, they perform acts that would have been considered largely normal behaviors for domestic animals and do not undergo any type of judgment for their actions. Each of these matters are discussed in depth in the chapters ahead.

The Danielic corpora provides a rich landscape for animal studies, not only because of its prevalence of animal figures—both "real" and metaphorical—but also its composite and complex textual history. In his commentary on Dan. 4, André Lacocque digresses to comment the following: "There is a sort of visceral fear of animality in the Book of Daniel. Beasts play a considerable role, always to the detriment of man's [*sic*] integrity."[53] The animals throughout the Danielic corpora are not simply "animals" for Lacocque, nor for the many other studies that fall in step with his view: animals are beasts and brutes.[54] As Lacocque goes on to explain, a bestial

[51] Ibid., 191-2. The authors state: "To achieve its end Daniel co-opts the logic and language of the very system it opposes. Daniel mimics the rhetoric of the oppressor mockingly to articulate a counter epistemological and ontological claim. Yet in its own hybridization, in the uncritical adoption of the ideology of the "killable" animal, it becomes what it opposes." For more on this phenomenon in apocalyptic literature, see Sarah Emanuel, *Humor, Resistance, and Cultural Persistence in the Book of Revelation: Roasting Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020).

[52] "Daniel's Animal Apocalypse," 193.

[53] André Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel* (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1979), 86.

[54] I address "beast" terminology more in depth in chapter four of this dissertation, specifically the term has affected understandings of the so-called "four beasts" of Daniel 7.

existence further represents the "fall of man," and even the temptation of sin itself by the deception of the serpent, "the representative *par excellence* of the animals of the fields," who wishes to pull us down to the earth as one of its mere creatures.[55] One need not go so far back in Danielic scholarship, such as nineteenth and early twentieth studies, to find blatant Protestant—and therefore anthropological—exceptionalism, the primary burden of which falls on the nonhuman figures in Daniel. What was initially composed as Jewish "othering" of foreign rulers and nations in animal bodies has since been adapted as Protestant supersessionist "othering" of Jewish, and by extension nonhuman-animal, bodies and institutions. But as this dissertation aims to demonstrate, the Danielic corpora offers anything but clean, unified perspectives on the issues it addresses, let alone on animality or human-animal relationships. Indeed, Danielic texts do not concede easily to any single category. What might a close examination of Daniel's animals reveal, devoid of the "visceral fear of animality" inherited by exceptionalist views of the last few centuries?[56]

Animality

Throughout my survey and interaction with the Danielic corpora, and as included in the tile of this project, "animality" and "animalities" remain central concerns. I define "animality" as simply "animal-ness" as expressed by Matthew Calarco.[57] Other definitions range from more specific, such as animal-personality and animal-autonomy, to more broad understandings such as the one I employ. For Berkowitz, the term animality is a way of speaking about "personality"

[55] Lacocque, *Daniel,* 87

[56] The exceptionalism I highlight here is multifaceted and might apply to a number of spheres reflected in Lacocque's sentiments including human exceptionalism, patriarchal exceptionalism, Protestant exceptionalism, and even the exceptionalism of whiteness.

[57] Calarco, *Thinking Through Animals*, 25-6.

that provides "distinctiveness, agency, and subjectivity for individuals who belong to a species other than human."[58] Hannah Strømmen considers animality a conceptual space "where notions of self and other are worked out."[59] Both perspectives are useful for Danielic texts. The agency and subjectivity of nonhuman animals emphasized in Berkowitz's approach apply primarily to the "real" animals throughout the Danielic corpora. At the same time, Strømmen's more abstract approach finds its home in Daniel's creaturely discourses that overflow from the symbolic imagination, that is, from the prevalence of dreams and visions. In retaining a broader definition, I intend to make room for the variety of animal expressions in Danielic literature. The "animal-ness" of Nebuchadnezzar is certainly distinct from but not without similarity to the "animal-ness" of the four monstrous creatures in Dan. 7's vision. So, too, the reality of the "animal-ness" of the lions that never leave the pits of Dan. 6 or *Bel and the Serpent* are not altogether the same as that of the kings of Media, Persia, and Greece in Dan. 8 who are, in fact, portrayed as equivalent to rams and goats—but nor are they devoid of similarity. In my presentation, therefore, Danielic animality could be described more accurately as "Danielic animalities," a combination of expressions of animal-ness that are intertwined and yet distinct.

The term animality has also been employed to describe "the animality of humans," that is, whatever qualities makes a human animal-like. Depending on the context of that conversation, the animality of humans is often—but not always—understood as "bestial" in a negative sense, such as the aggression, wildness, and "untamed" propensities of humans.[60] In this case, often

[58] Berkowitz, *Animals and Animality*, 13.

[59] Strømmen, *Biblical*, 33.

[60] For a discussion of the romanticized "noble savage" figure who is both wild and in harmony with nature, see Isaac Rooks, "No Place for Waltzing Matilda: Uncanny Australian Swamps and Crocodiles in *Rogue, Black Water*, and *Dark Age*," in *Postcolonial Animalities*, eds. Suvadip Sinha and Amit R. Baishya (New York: Routledge, 2019), 128-46, especially 140-142.

animality is altogether replaced with the adjective "bestial," or the beastly aspects of human behavior. Mira Beth Wasserman emphasizes this notion in her discussion of the human-animal boundary in rabbinic literature: "So long as humanity is set in opposition to the rest of the animal world, identifying any human individual or group with animals is necessarily pejorative."[61] When applied to modern scholarship on Danielic animalities, Wasserman's statement is substantiated in the way that foreigners who are depicted as animals or animal-like in Daniel are interpreted as negative, oppressive, wild, or agents of chaos. Furthermore, attributions of human animality are used to "reproduce an entire world that rotates around the privilege of those most fully associated with 'the human,' a grouping that has never included the entire human species."[62] In this case, the human-animal divide is clearly defined, and yet some humans are more "human" than others. Human animality in a neutral or positive sense, as is found in more recent works of critical animal studies, may be associated with creatureliness, embodiedness, and humanity's connection with the rest of the created world.[63] Creaturely discourse then circles back to include a particular emphasis on the creatureliness, "realized" embodiedness, and

[61] Wasserman, *Jews, Gentiles, and Other Animals,* 77.

[62] Calarco, *Thinking Through Animals,* 64. Here and elsewhere, Calarco draws on Giorgio Agamben's work that aims to halt what he calls the "anthropological machine" and argues for "the *indistinction* of human and animal life, prior to their separation." Calarco's emphasis, 54.

[63] Previous approaches have built on and diverged from Mary Douglas' monograph, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (New York: Routledge, 1966), including some studies that examine animals and animality. David Bryan, for example, depends on Douglas for his investigation of the so-called "kosher mentality" in 1 Enoch 85-90, known as the *Animal Apocalypse* (*Cosmos, Chaos, and the Kosher Mentality*). Douglas' ideas are also applied in Howard Eilberg-Schwartz, "The Problem of the Body for People of the Book," in *Reading Bibles, Writing Bodies* (ed. Timothy K. Beal and David Gunn; New York: Routledge, 1997). See also R. F. Newbold, "Boundaries and Bodies in Late Antiquity," *Arethusa* 12, no. 1, 1979: 93-114. More recent and focused on Danielic literature, see Amy C. Merrill Willis, "Heavenly Bodies: God and the Body in the Visions of Daniel" in *Bodies, Embodiment, and Theology of the Hebrew Bible,* eds. Kamionkowski, S. Tamar and Wonil Kim (New York: T & T Clark, 2010).

interdependence of lived experiences.[64] "Reading through a creaturely prism," Anat Pick writes, "consigns culture to contexts that are not exclusively human, contexts beyond an anthropocentric perspective. It recognizes in culture more than the cliched expression of the 'human condition' but an expression of something *in*human as well."[65]

By integrating understandings of creatureliness in lieu of beastliness in Daniel, therefore, I argue for a more nuanced reading that reflects the diverse animalities present in the Danielic corpora. This creaturely reading undergirds my engagement of the Danielic corpora, which goes against the grain in some ways since the corpora is comprised of a number of texts that many deem "disembodied," "otherworldly," and even "escapist." In this dance of discourse with its varied animal interlocutors, I draw attention to how descriptions of human and nonhuman bodies both limit and expand the ways that we understand how Jewish communities lived, interacted, and imagined their relationships with the Other.

Foreignness

The concepts of foreignness and otherness are closely related in the Danielic corpora. In addition to its literary setting in the foreign courts and lands, large portions of the Danielic corpora were composed in a particularly oppressive imperial context: under Seleucid rule and the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanies IV.[66] As a result, most, if not all, of the texts have

[64] See Anat Pick, *Creaturely Poetics: Animality and Vulnerability in Literature and Film* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011). She writes: "The creature, then, is first and foremost a living body—material, temporal, and vulnerable." 5

[65] Pick, *Creaturely*, 5.

[66] For the Seleucid context of Dan. 7-12 and final redaction of the MT, see Paul J. Kosmin, *Time and Its Adversaries in the Seleucid Empire* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2018), 137-63; Portier-Young, *Apocalypse Against Empire*, 223-79.

something to say about otherness, and especially gentile rule and foreignness.[67] In her essay discussing foreign kings and divine sovereignty, Carol Newsom summarizes a discussion of what qualifies her notion of the "other."[68] Newsom does not use the term in the same way as Jacques Lacan, that is, as the "mirror stage of human development, the other that embodies the elusive image of wholeness that persons both desire and fear," nor is Lacan's linguistic and symbolic other that "structures our subjectivity."[69] Instead, Newsom employs the term in line with anthropologists who describe "others" in group settings in order to construct "a boundary for the self or for one's group."[70] Such an approach also informs that of poststructuralist theories like those of Judith Butler and Jacques Derrida who see the other as the inherently devalued of the two subjects. But, as Newsom points out, foreign kings in ancient Israelite and Jewish literature do not fit cleanly into any of these descriptions. Like animals and animality, gentile rulers and portrayals of foreignness in general resist inflexible classification in the Danielic

---

[67] Following Debra Scoggins Ballentine, I maintain the term "foreign" as a subcategory of "Other." ("Foreignization in Ancient Competition," *Journal of Religious Competition in Antiquity*: Vol. 1, Article 2: 2019, 18). Ballentine expands the term to a process she calls "foreignization," a polemical strategy intended to distinguish between "us" and "them" (22). Where I can, I opt for the term "foreignness" in attempts to describe a phenomenon rather than ascribe to groups what Ballentine calls "mis-foreignization." In addition to this terminological choice, I also use both the terms "gentile" and "foreign" as adjectives, and determine which each use based on its context. I hold that "foreign" is often more compatible than "gentile" in my engagement with animals and other nonhumans, especially in Second Temple contexts. But in rabbinic literature, for example, "gentile" is often a more suitable term because of the reification of the word and its consistent use in traditions and sources.

[68] Carol A. Newsom, "God's Other: The Intractable Problem of the Gentile King in Judean and Early Jewish Literature," in *The "Other" in Second Temple Judaism: Essays in Honor of John J. Collins,* Daniel C. Harlow, et al. (eds.) (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing Co., 2011), 31-48.

[69] Newsom, "God's Other," 33-4.

[70] Ibid, 34. I do not intend to imply, as Patricia Cox Miller articulates regarding the late antique oneiric imagination, that ancient communities "conceptualized the self as a stable essence beyond the reach of cultural construction," or "were just like contemporary theorists, preoccupied with dismantling a centuries-long construct of a unitary, objectifying ego that blinks its own vulnerability to change." We can, however, acknowledge a sense of "interiority" in early Jewish literature, especially in the dream-visions in the Danielic corpora. Thus, how interior and exterior senses of identity are negotiated in the midst of the imaginal (that is, image-based) narratives clearly lean on expressions of animals and animality for their formational work. Miller, *Dreams in Late Antiquity: Studies in the Imagination of a Culture* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1994) 127.

corpora.

Turning to the concept of foreign empires more broadly, Alexandria Frisch's discussion of the different views of empire in Dan. 2 and 7 explains that Dan. 2 (and the court tales, chs. 1-6, by extension) affirms a "continuous and singular nature of empire."[71] That is to say, the kingdom that is "received" by one king after the next appears to be the same kingdom but passed down by way of divinely determined succession. In contrast with, or perhaps on a trajectory of development from Dan. 2, Dan. 7 presents several empires, multiplicitous and in conflict. On whether the "universal empire" in Dan. 1-6 is an expressly "foreign" one, Frisch insists that it is, contrary to the assertions of Davies and Collins who see it as a "divine" one, sovereignly given by deity and passively received by each successive king.[72] I highlight this discussion on variations of how empire, let alone their "foreignness" and "otherness," are understood to be multiplicitous and distinct applies, perhaps even more apparently, to the individual foreign rulers throughout the Danielic corpora.

Another function of foreignness and otherness in Danielic texts is their role in community self-identity formation and negotiation. On this topic, Joel S. Kaminsky discusses the different ways that ancient Israelite and Jewish identity interacted with conceptions of the "other" in light of their own election and covenantal status.[73] He observes that much of the scholarship's work is influenced by early an Christian worldview that see only those who are saved and those who are

[71] Frisch, *The Danielic Discourse on Empire in Second Temple Literature,* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 97.

[72] See ibid., fn. 57 for Frisch's brief summary and citation of Davies and Collins' arguments.

[73] Joel S. Kaminsky, "Israel's Election and the Other in Biblical, Second Temple, and Rabbinic Thought," in *The "Other" in Second Temple Judaism: Essays in Honor of John J. Collins,* Daniel C. Harlow, et al. (eds.) (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing Co., 2011), 17-30. Much of what this essay argues is expanded in Kaminsky's monograph, *Yet, I Have Loved Jacob: Reclaiming the Biblical Concept of Election* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2007).

not, resulting in a strikingly dualistic perspective of both humanity and divinity, and, for the purposes of this investigation, animality.[74] In contrast to this Christian-influenced view, Kaminksy argues that ancient Israelite and later early Jewish communities retained two broad categories for the "other": the anti-elect and the non-elect. And while this may have shifted with the hyper-sectarian groups who composed texts such as the Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Rule of the Community, most Jewish groups maintained these categories through to the rabbinic period. Since apocalypticism and literary apocalypses are often fallaciously associated with over-simplified versions of a dualistic worldview, so too have apocalypses absorbed the simplistic bipartite division of how Jewish communities viewed the Other.

For the Danielic corpora, the view of the Other is much more akin to the nuanced picture that Kaminksy paints than the stark binaries presented in sectarian, or perhaps it is more helpful to deem them "hyper-elective," groups that have apocalyptic tendencies. These nuances are expressed and worked out between human and nonhuman interlocutors in Danielic texts, ultimately portraying a positively nonbinary set of earthly and supra earthly realties.[75] I refrain from using the earth/heaven pairing to highlight the in-between-ness of the spaces described

[74] "Israel's Election," 17-18. A similar parallel may be drawn to the rise of the study of "apocalyptic" in the twentieth century spearheaded by Johannes Weiss and Albert Schweitzer, both of whom aimed to situate the worldview as a "background" for early Christianity and the New Testament. For brief summaries on this phenomenon, see Edith M. Humphrey, *The Ladies and the Cities: Transformation and Apocalyptic Identity in Joseph and Aseneth, 4 Ezra, the Apocalypse and the Shepherd of Hermas* (Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1995) 13-18; Klaus Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic: A Polemical Work on a Neglected Area of Biblical Studies and Its Damaging Effects on Theology and Philosophy* (London: SCM Press, 1972), 57-58.

[75] Portier-Young also highlights the breakdown of binaries in regard to how empire and the oppressed interact. In the context of resistance to imperial power, as is the basis of her monograph, she proposes that the binary itself "also creates the possibility for resistance hegemony through critical inversion, wherein categories are retained but the hierarchy of values or assignment of value is turned upside down." See *Apocalypse Against Empire: Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2011), 14. And although Portier-Young's point is well-taken in the context of empire studies, I suggest that the category of human and animal itself—not just its application or evaluation—is, upon closer examination, more malleable and nuanced than the presentation she provides. See also Alexandria Frisch's use of Portier-Young's argument in her essay, "The Four (Animal) Kingdoms: Understanding Empires as Beastly Bodies," in *Four Kingdom Motifs before and beyond the Book of Daniel*, Andrew B. Perrin and Loren T. Stuckenbruck (eds.) (Leiden: Brill, 2021) 77.

throughout the Danielic corpora, and their overall resistance to the limiting categories presumed by modern minds.

In sum, the mutability of foreignness and otherness pair well with the multiplicitous ways that animals and animalities are expressed and how they function in Danielic texts. I do not intend to say that animality and nonhuman imagery are the *only* ways that foreignness is expressed and mediated in Jewish literature of the Second Temple period. They are, however, influential forces in texts and for communities, highlighted further by their receptions, reworkings, and reimaginations in the early centuries of the common era and into late antiquity. Moreover, the complexities of such categories—human, nonhuman, other, animal, foreigner, insider—are exponentialized by interactions with other such categories, creating, in effect, a truly swarming set of corpora.

1.4 Apocalyptic Animals and Their Discontents

The Danielic corpora does not only contain literary apocalypses.[76] Only the second half (chs. 7-12) checks the required boxes of the dominant definition in order to be a part of the genre which I outline below. Daniel's apocalyptic associations, however, have dictated much of the way that animals and animality are understood throughout the corpora. Thus, the topic is worth addressing in order to disentangle Daniel's creatures, monsters, and animals from yet another restrictive category. The two primary genres of the Danielic corpora are largely accepted as the

[76] Jin Hee Han argues, however, that chs. 1-6's "place in the redaction of the book of Daniel plays a crucial role in the apocalyptist's showcasing of apocalyptic wisdom." *Daniel's Spiel: Apocalyptic Literacy in the Book of Daniel* (Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 2008) 105. From the perspective of the MT's final form, one could argue for a presentation accomplishing something along these lines especially if one begins to blur the lines between apocalyptic, prophetic, and wisdom literature. See Hindy Najman, "The Inheritance of Prophecy in Apocalypse," in *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature* (ed. John J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 36–51; Harold H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic: A Study of Jewish and Christian Apocalypses from Daniel to the Revelation* (London: Lutterworth, 1963).

court tales (chs. 1-6) and the apocalypses (chs. 7-12). Their distinction might be understood as being fundamentally based on the literary and narrative context of the interactions between Daniel and the foreign rulers.[77] While the two genres provide a helpful frame to divide commentaries, analyses, and (mostly) language differences, their assumption has taken a toll.

While it is true that the discussion of apocalypses has been significantly clarified over the last half century, the matter has certainly not been simplified nor is there a unified position on the distinctions or limits of the terms.[78] The development of scholarship on apocalypses has been summarized by a number of studies including that of Edith M. Humphrey which highlights the varying strands of emphases and the schools that adhere to and perpetuate their methods.[79] Between Klaus Koch's helpful list of characteristics early on which "distinguished between the genre, the historical movements and the theology (especially eschatology) associated with the term 'apocalyptic'" and Christopher Rowland's redirection to the visionary-revelatory qualities reminiscent of prophetic literature, the 1970s and 1980s produced some of the most influential works on apocalypses.[80] In a nuanced discussion of literary apocalypses, one must emphasize

[77] For the court tales genre, see W.L. Humphreys, "A Life-style for Diaspora: A Study of the Tales of Esther and Daniel," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 92 (1973), 211-23; John J. Collins, "The Court Tales in Daniel and the Development of Apocalyptic," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 94 (1975), 218-34. Influentially, Humphreys distinguished further between the tales two types: the court contest and the court conflict. On the change of the figure of Daniel from the two genres, Elias J. Bickerman emphasizes the change in the character of Daniel himself, noting "the contrast between the wizard of the narratives and the passive medium of the visions." See *Four Strange Books of the Bible: Daniel, Jonah, Koheleth, Esther* (New York: Schocken Books, 1968), 54.

[78] A recent online conference in May 2021, "The 11th Enoch Seminar/LMU Munich Congress on Apocalypticism in Antiquity," demonstrated the extent of the debates of the field in sessions addressing definitions, methods, history of scholarship, future trends, and limits of the sub-field. Evidenced in the range of scholars (well-established and early career) and disciplines (Hebrew Bible to Islam in late antiquity), one would have been hard-pressed to find a term or topic upon which everyone agreed, apart from their shared interest in apocalyptic or apocalyptic-adjacent studies.

[79] Humphrey, *Ladies and the Cities* 13-18. See also John J. Collins, "What is Apocalyptic Literature?" in *The Oxford* Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature (2014), 1-16; Adela Yarbro Collins, "Apocalypse Now: The State of Apocalyptic Studies Near the End of the First Decade of the Twenty-First Century," *The Harvard Theological Review* 104, no. 4 (2011): 447-57.

[80] See Koch, *Rediscovery of* Apocalyptic; Christopher Rowland, "The Visions of God in Apocalyptic Literature,"

their literary, social, and ideological functions, as noted first by Paul Hanson when he distinguished between the terms "apocalypse," "apocalypticism," and "apocalyptic eschatology." The first refers to a literary genre, the second to a social movement, and the lattermost to a class of themes and motifs.[81] Perhaps most prominent among these works is that of the Society of Biblical Literature Genres project, spearheaded by John Collins, and published in *Semeia* 14. In it, Collins proposes a central definition of the genre of literary apocalypses as well as several subcategories that break up the monolithic structure. This monolith, although subject to more nuanced classifications, presents a simplified paradigm with five major aspects:

> 'Apocalypse' is a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world.[82]

Addressing its literary structure, mode of mediation, transcendent content, and concerns of temporal and spatial planes, Collins' definition has been deemed both too narrow and too broad by other scholars' application of the definition.[83] The two primary elements are the genre's

Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period 10, no. 2 (1979): 137-54. See also Rowland's monograph and his exclusive focus on the "direct communication of heavenly mysteries" rather than any eschatological structures. *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (London: SPCK Publishing, 1982.), 14.

[81] Paul D. Hanson, "Apocalypse, Genre," and "Apocalypticism" in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible Supplementary Volume* (ed. Keith Crim; Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1976), 28-34.

[82] John J. Collins, *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre. Semeia* 14 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979), 1-51.

[83] For Portier-Young, for example, elements of the literary apocalypse genre play a key role in resistance for early Jewish communities under Seleucid rule. See *Apocalypse Against Empire*, 217-22.

emphasis on "angelic mediation and the prophetic view of history."[84] Whatever such adjustments to Collins entail, however, the majority of studies still situate themselves around the *Semeia* definition, either promoting adherence to or divergence from its propositions.[85]

In her innovative commentary on the book of Job, Carol Newsom brings the concept of genre to the forefront of her analysis and methodological approach which can be helpfully applied to the Danielic corpora, as well as the ever-problematic "apocalypse" genre.[86] Instead of seeing texts as "belonging" to one or more genres, she suggests we adjust our view to understanding how texts "participate in them, invoke them, gesture to them, play in and out of them, and in doing so continually change them."[87] And although a noble aim, the way that genre functions for most biblical scholarship is quite the opposite. Instead of providing a (presumably broad) "horizon of expectation" for the reader, as Newsom imagines, genre more often functions as a systematic checklist of features that a text either possesses or does not. Based on how many checked boxes a text has, it is then decided if it has enough to "make it" or not into the categorization. Although many scholars and studies try to avoid this approach, it remains prevalent and sets the bar for the status quo in many examinations of apocalyptic literature.

---

[84] See Frisch's summary, *Danielic Discourse,* 13-4 as well as Collins' comparison of Portier-Young's work and that of Horsley in "Apocalypse and Empire," *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 76 (2011): 1-19.

[85] See Humphrey's summary of the views, which includes her own comments in *Ladies and the Cities,* 17-18.

[86] Carol A. Newsom, *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations* (Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2009). See also Newsom, "Spying Out the Land: A Report from Genology," in Roland Boer, (ed.) *Bakhtin and Genre Theory in Biblical Studies,* Semeia Studies 63 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005) 19–30, for further critique of the apocalypse genre. Of Newsom's critique of the genres project, Collins acknowledges it as "the most intelligent and helpful" (25) in that it addresses the time and trends of when the Semeia group developed their definition. John J. Collins, "The Genre Apocalypse Reconsidered," *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum/Journal of Ancient Christianity* 2016; 20(1): 21-40.

[87] Newsom, *Job,* 12. From Bakhtinian circles, as Newsom points out, "genres are forms of moral imagination" and therefore may playing a role in framing and *forming* social and political perspectives to the same degree that they *are formed* by them (12-13).

Just as the terms of genre can be negotiated, scholars of animality and biblical texts have noted the variety of ways that animal-human interaction is also responsive, transitory, and often category resistant. In her article on classifications in the study of religion, Monika Amsler notes that "the most fundamental modern dichotomy is the one between the human and the non-human."[88] Such dichotomies, she suggests, emerge from classifications that are inherently based on modern methods of generating knowledge, and have plagued the study of religion despite fervent attempts to break the habit. Over the last few decades, new ways of addressing these problematic dichotomies have emerged at the intersection between animal studies and biblical studies. Ken Stone, for example, observes that "while biblical texts do make distinctions between humans and animals, they also blur those distinctions" and "undermine the existence of any single category."[89] Indeed, the Danielic corpora undermine most dichotomous and binarized categories altogether and manage to complicate our notions of genre, language, species, and identity. And while the MT in its final form might be read as a unified document as many scholars have done and continue to argue for, the Greek versions of Daniel swiftly undermine the facade of homogenization.

Since the agency of Daniel's animal interlocutors is fundamentally literary, they function primarily within, on behalf of, and in dialogue with their textual settings. Ingvild Sælid Gilhus distinguishes between two types of animal groups in apocalyptic literature, which she deems eschatological and apocalyptic. The first group are "real" animals, tame and wild, that are able to live together in harmony in the eschatological age. The second category features the apocalyptic

[88] Monika Amsler, "How Could Religion Become A Category ? Accounting for Classical and Fuzzy Logic in the Conceptualization of Religion," *ASDIWAL Revue genevoise d'anthropologieet d'histoire des religions*, No. 12 (2017), 40.

[89] Stone, *Reading the Hebrew Bible with Animal Studies* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2018), 63.

creatures, including those in Dan. 7 and 1 Enoch's *Animal Apocalypse,* "fantastic beasts" that serve as both symbols and stock images for the literature of Jewish and Christian apocalypticists.[90] More often than not, these stock images and symbolic referents are reduced to one-to-one correspondence, which, as Holger Gzella notes, "cannot be solved like a riddle."[91] Expanding this sense of literary agency of apocalyptic animals, Susan McHugh includes viewing "agency as more than simply a property of the human subject form," acknowledging "the spectrum of agency forms represented in a variety of cultural traditions," and bridging "the representational forms and material conditions of species life."[92] McHugh's third imperative is perhaps the most daunting in dealing with metaphorical and allegorical texts since we run the risk of "losing" animals to their symbolic function or representation, as discussed above, thereby abandoning the "embodiments in space and time" which remain of central concern for scholars in animal studies, as well as the intersections of apocalyptic studies.[93]

Decentralizing then the emphasis on the classification of literary apocalypses and the impending expectations of "meaning" placed on the animals, creatures, and monsters who roamed Jewish imaginations of the second Temple period, we can instead turn toward the nonhumans of the Danielic corpora and engage them as essential members of the dialogue. The literary apocalypses in the Danielic corpora do not simply feature definitional items on a

---

[90] Gilhus, *Animals, Gods and Humans,* 163-4.

[91] Gzella, *Cosmic Battle and Political Conflict: Studies in Verbal Syntax and Contextual Interpretation of Daniel 8* (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2003), 5.

[92] McHugh, Susan. "Literary Animal Agents," *PMLA* 124, no. 2 (2009): 489-90.

[93] McHugh, "Literary Animal Agents," 490. See Loren T. Stuckenbruck essay as a model perspective of reinterpreting the apocalyptic (including animals) toward integration. "Images of Dealing with Social Injustice from Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition: A Resource for Renewed Reflection," in *Turning to the World: Social Justice and the Common Good Since Vatican II*. (Carl N. Still and Rompré Gertrude, eds.; Montreal; Kingston; London; Chicago: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2018), especially 98.

checklist of what counts as an "apocalypse," but rather participate in a genre of that is instead defined by malleability and resistance to classification. In the same way, and as interlocutors in their own right, animals and nonhumans *participate* in the Danielic corpora as much as they are *portrayed* in them. Thus, it is the aim of this dissertation to explore these dynamics in the following chapters, and argue for the multivocality and diversity of the Jewish communities who composed and facilitated such dialogues.

1.5 Summary of Chapters

The project overall focuses on the Danielic corpora and the ways that nonhuman animals participate in the texts' negotiations of a variety of "others." Recent studies have shown the many benefits of placing animal studies in dialogue with ancient Jewish literature but none have devoted their attentions to the Danielic corpora, collections of texts that feature some of the most well-known animalic encounters in early Jewish literature. Each of the subsequent four chapters in this dissertation focuses on a set of Danielic texts.

Following the introduction to this project, chapter two examines Daniel 4 and tale of Nebuchadnezzar's transformation. Usually presented as an arrogant king's descent into animalized "madness," I begin my analysis by reorienting the terminology usually employed in studies of Dan. 4 and present more neutral terms that reflect the presentation of the text and its narrative arc, hence the title of the chapter: "Transforming Nebuchadnezzar." Next, I summarize the composition history of Dan. 4 and its versions, focusing primarily on the OG and MT. I then proceed to a close reading of the chapter, highlighting how the versions approach Nebuchadnezzar's theriomorphic transformation and how the distinct emphases and interests of the MT and OG are reflected in both the familiarity and foreignness of the king's character.

Following my conclusion that finds Nebuchadnezzar as a complex, contested, and boundary blurring figure even between the versions of Daniel, I present a selection of ancient Near Eastern influences to which scholars have turned to account for the animal descriptions of Nebuchadnezzar's transformation. Ultimately finding these explanations unsatisfying and limited in their scopes, I examine to the relationship of Jeremiah's Nebuchadnezzar with the Nebuchadnezzar of Dan. 4, including his role as servant of the Jewish God and association with nonhuman animals. I argue that Dan. 4's image of Nebuchadnezzar contains elements of both continuity and inversion of Jeremiah's Nebuchadnezzar's, which makes him a unique figure of foreign familiarity who is bound up in Jewish identity as well as restoration. Furthermore, I argue that the complexities and malleability of the human-animal boundary in Dan. 4 become ideal sites of identity negotiation for ancient Jewish communities to work out their notions of self and Other.

Chapter three examines the narratives of Daniel 6 and the Greek tale of *Bel and the Serpent.* With attention to themes of eating and animacy, I first provide a framework for a hierarchy of animacy among the nonhuman interlocutors in the two texts, and present the importance of "living" for its gods, humans, and nonhumans. These nonhumans include statues, serpents, and lions, with particular attention to the lions who are shared by both Danielic tales. After providing close readings with these themes in mind as well as compositional backgrounds for each selection, I turn to a comparison of Dan. 6 and *Bel*, and demonstrate the ways in which they approach sovereignties (of both human and divine actors) and portrayals of violence. For Dan. 6, Daniel's role is distinctly passive amidst the violence around him, and the implicit prescription for the text's audience is that same passivity. With the intervention of divine sovereignty in a situation where the human sovereign is incapable of asserting his rule, Daniel is

saved and the lions become instruments of violence against Daniel's conspirers. In stark contrast, Daniel is an initiator of violence against the statue Bel and the serpent-god, which results in his vulnerability and punishment to the lion's pit. Both stories end with gruesome conclusions but map out very different routes of arriving at their destinations. Furthermore, I argue that the texts provide exemplars to which their communities can aspire and prescribe distinct modes of approaching foreigners and foreignness mediated by nonhuman interlocutors.

Shifting away from the very real animals in Dan. 6 and *Bel,* chapter four turns to the four mythic monsters of Daniel 7 and engages studies in monster theory to help understand *how* Daniel's creatures do what they do. Although large, frightening, and hybrid creatures, what makes the four monsters truly monstrous is how they embody and de-*monstrate* a society's insecurities, anxieties, and self-reflections. Since the four creatures are interpreted within the vision as "four kings," Daniel's creatures have been traditionally understood as foreign beasts who are made subject to the anthropomorphs who succeed and judge them. My analysis argues against the approach that looks exclusively to ANE *chaoskampf* motifs that depict a deity's victory over chaos in attempts to find an "origin" for the chapter's imagery, and instead brings Dan. 7 into dialogue with the living creatures of Ezekiel 1. By first establishing Ezekiel's literary influence on Daniel as a whole, I highlight two particular aspects of Ezekiel's import to Dan. 7: the importance of their hybrid and anomalous bodies and their role in the revelation of throne-room scenes. After evidencing this relationship, I show how Dan. 7 reworks elements of Ezek. 1 to reflect the social and religious tensions of the second-century BCE in Judea. Ultimately, the instability evoked by the presence of deviant monsters in the throne room provides a reflection on Jewish anxiety surrounding divine sovereignty in both transcendent and historical planes.

Chapter five turns to the second of Daniel's visions in Daniel 8. Often understated in

scholarship because both visions feature nonhuman animals, Dan. 8 diverges from Dan. 7 in significant ways including the linguistic shift to Hebrew. Daniel 8 presents an animal-vision with non-hybrid, non-monstrous, and altogether domesticated animals who are interpreted as foreign empires by the andromorph Gabriel, and introduces a number of distinct motifs to the Danielic corpora including a shift away from mythic themes. Since most studies point to bestial animality (usually portrayed by wild predators) as the typical depictions of foreigners and foreignness, Dan. 8's domestic and relatively "normal" animals problematize this widely-held generalization. After presenting a close reading of the chapter and pointing to these distinctions, I then bring Dan. 8 into dialogue with 1 Enoch 85-90, often termed the *Animal Apocalypse* or *Animal Vision.* The two texts share three categories of nonhumans—rams, horns, and stars—but employ and understand them in entirely contrasting ways. As roughly contemporary compositions, I argue that the different applications and understandings of nonhumans by Dan. 8 and the 1 En. 85-90 demonstrate the diverse ways that Jewish communities interacted with their literary nonhuman interlocutors. These approaches reflect the malleability and wide range of categories that could be engaged in order to draw up and break down borders of animality and foreignness as expressed in the Danielic corpora as a whole.

In my concluding chapter, I present the arguments of each of the previous chapters and emphasize their significance for the study of animality and foreignness in Danielic works. Furthermore, I highlight areas of research that would benefit from paying attention to these concepts, as well as some of the questions and avenues of research I have not been able to pursue in the present study. The diversity of Danielic animalities, I argue, reflects the diverse ways that Second Temple Jewish communities negotiated their identities in light of the social, political, and ideological uncertainties of their unique contexts. Just as foreignness was a malleable

category that blurred and blended boundaries, so too were the Danielic animalities that mediated their discourses of human and nonhuman, Jew and foreigner.

CHAPTER TWO: TRANSFORMING NEBUCHADNEZZAR

Have you forgotten your scripture, the thirteenth scroll? "And Proteus brought the upright beast into the garden and chained him to a tree and the children did make sport of him."

Dr. Zaius, *The Planet of the Apes* (1968)

2.1 Introduction

The narrative of Nebuchadnezzar's dream and transformation into a hybrid creature in Daniel 4 is arguably the most well-known encounter with animality in the Danielic traditions.[94] With Nebuchadnezzar's character arc as the focus of the narrative, the text embraces ambivalence in a number of ways. On one hand, Nebuchadnezzar is a foreign king who destroyed the First Temple, and he is often interpreted as an emblem of imperial oppression and dominance.[95] On the other hand, the king is a servant and instrument of the divine will, from whom Jewish communities cannot be parted in either memory or identity.[96] The Danielic corpora, and Dan. 4 in particular, as well as broader sources in the Second Temple period reflect

[94] A number of works within and without biblical studies have been devoted to the figure of Nebuchadnezzar, such as Ronald W. Sack, *Images of Nebuchadnezzar: The Emergence of a Legend, Second Revised and Expanded Edition* (Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press; London and Toronto: Associated University Press, 2004); Jay Rubenstein, *Nebuchadnezzar's Dream: The Crusades, Apocalyptic History, and the End of History* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019).

[95] Although the monarch is historically Nebuchadnezzar II who ruled from 605-562 BCE, I refer to this figure as Nebuchadnezzar throughout.

[96] Newsom acknowledges that "Nebuchadnezzar had left a wound of memory in the consciousness of Jews in the Diaspora and in Judea," and that the king's "belated recognition of the power of the Most High was a means of redressing that memory." Furthermore, she argues that the monarch "served as a symbol for all Gentile rulers," an assertion which needs to be further investigated in the context of the Danielic corpora's variety of foreign kings and empires. *Daniel,* 130.

and rework this tension surrounding the figure of Nebuchadnezzar. The uncertainties of the relationship between Second Temple Jewish communities and the Babylonian monarch are worked out, I suggest, in the blurry discourse of animal imagery and animality in Dan. 4.

As a disputed and controversial figure, Nebuchadnezzar has a complicated place in the identify formation of Jewish communities in the Second Temple period, who lean on animal and other nonhuman figures as sites of his negotiation. Akin to the approach taken by Patricia Cox Miller, I attempt to maintain the tension of "anthropocentrism and its discontents" throughout my investigation.[97] Originally proposed by Gary Steiner in his monograph titled as such, he describes the phenomenon as "the sense of self-satisfaction we [humans] have derived from representing ourselves as superior to animals [which] has been inseparable from an underlying discontent about the fundamental limits of this sense of superiority."[98] Put another way, Aaron Gross suggests that this tension serves to speak to the human anxiety regarding the human-animal binary, a dichotomy that "has always been and remains unstable, disputed, and negotiated."[99] I bring to light a number of "discontents" in the following analysis including the nuanced views of animality between the versions of Dan. 4 and attempt to provide, as Miller does, a more fluid and relational hermeneutic of animals and nonhumans "even when those relations are paradoxically presented as both positive and negative in the same text."[100] I argue that the character of Nebuchadnezzar functions as an extension of this instability in two primary ways: the king's ambivalent position as a divinely ordained ruler and yet distinctly foreign, and

[97] Miller, *In the Eye of the Animal,* 212-3.

[98] Steiner, *Anthropocentrism and Its Discontents,* 2.

[99] Aaron Gross, *The Question of the Animal and Religion: Theoretical Stakes, Practical Implications* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2015), 1.

[100] Miller, *Eye of the Animal,* 192.

as a boundary-crossing figure between human and animal.

The following analysis first provides a close reading of Nebuchadnezzar's transformation with particular attention to animal imagery and its influence on Daniel traditions, including how it differs from other examples of animality in the Danielic corpora. My reading includes the OG alongside the MT and places the two versions in dialogue as independent equals, highlighting both the variations and affinities between them.[101] I also incorporate a discussion of Dan. 2, a text often compared to Dan. 4 because of its dream interpretation narrative set in the king's court, but one that has distinct concerns from Nebuchadnezzar's dream and transformation. Second, I present a selection of textual and iconographical sources from the ancient Near East (ANE) that are cited most often as bearing some influence on the details of Nebuchadnezzar's animalic features, such as his long hair or extended claws. My approach here is less interested in "pinpointing precise moments" of textual influence or identifying a tradition's "single set of events and circumstances."[102] Instead, this study emphasizes that texts such as Dan. 4 "may be a palimpsest of multiple contexts" and looks to the "continuous flows of discourse" which provide a more helpful, albeit more fluid, mode of engagement with ancient literary traditions.[103] The analysis then extends to animal and nonhuman imagery employed in the prophetic oracles of Jeremiah, and how the animal-associated character of Nebuchadnezzar becomes a site of interpretation, as well as prophetic speculation, on the topic of exile and restoration for the

[101] Although a fairly new general consensus agrees that the OG and MT "are independent developments from an earlier Aramaic *Vorlage* that is no longer extant," the MT is still expressly preferred. In studies that do treat both versions, the OG is still engaged as secondary. Newsom, *Daniel*, 128.

[102] Seth L. Sanders, *The Invention of Hebrew*, Traditions (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2009) 166-7.

[103] Sanders is reflecting on written tradition and the emergence of scribalism but the same outlook is helpful for the Danielic corpora (167). For my analysis, I suggest "animal discourse" as one of these palimpsetic layers and lean into tracing the *how* of the discourse as much as its *explanatory* value.

Jewish communities living in Egypt and Palestine in first few centuries BCE.

In focusing on the conceptions of animality and animal imagery in Dan. 4, I argue that the boundary between human and animal is a blurry site (and sight) of Jewish identity negotiations. This is evident in both the literary structure of the versions of Dan. 4 and embedded within the narratives themselves.[104] In highlighting the portrayal of the complicated and unstable character of Nebuchadnezzar, the tradition makes clear that the king is in need of a reorientation to divine sovereignty, a feature which scholarship often centralizes. However, his humbling process is described as a temporary one and the king reemerges from his animal transformation in a better position than he was before, both in terms of his orientation to the Divine and the prosperity of his kingdom. Furthermore, Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom is preserved in similar terms as the Jewish remnant and its promised (and fulfilled) its restoration. Thus, the conception of Nebuchadnezzar in the versions of Dan. 4 is complex and even at times conflicting. To grapple with the simultaneously imperialized otherness and creaturely commonality of the figure of Nebuchadnezzar, Dan. 4 utilizes the unstable category of the animal to navigate the evolving social, political, and theological uncertainties of Jewish communities in the Second Temple period.

2.2 Terminology: Nebuchadnezzar's "Madness"

Across biblical disciplines, the most common terms used to discuss Nebuchadnezzar's transformation include "madness," "afflictions," "insanity," and even "mental illness."[105] Such

[104] See Porter, *Metaphors and Monsters,* 111-2.

[105] See Henze, *The Madness of King Nebuchadnezzar;* Hector Avalos, "Nebuchadnezzar's Affliction: New Mesopotamian Parallels for Daniel 4," *Journal of Biblical Literature,* 133, no. 3 (2014): 497–507; Alexandria Frisch describes Dan. 4 as the king's "insane, animalistic behavior and return to sanity/humanity" (*Danielic Discourse,* 87);

terminology is problematic for my analysis of animality in Dan. 4 in two primary ways. First, the use of such terms emerges from a distinctly modern context, which poses questions as to their relevance to and congruence with historical approaches to ancient sources. The lack of comparable terminology in Dan. 4 for any of these terms and what is implied in their usage makes it difficult to justify their centrality for describing Nebuchadnezzar's incident. A second issue is how the terms are associated with medical conditions, whether mental or physical. Jared Beverly has recently argued against this terminology, highlighting how "the vast majority of scholars continue to uncritically employ…medicalizing language" to the animal-mind temporarily attributed to Nebuchadnezzar.[106] He argues that such language has dangerous ramifications on the treatment of and attitudes toward those with mental disabilities, especially considering the not-so-distant history of how mental conditions have been associated with animality and beastliness. He also addresses the "anthropocentric hierarchy that this logic assumes."[107] Instead of using anachronistic terms with unsettling implications, Beverly's study

For the terminology of both "mental illness" and "disability," see T.S. Cason, "Confessions of an Impotent Potentate: Reading Daniel 4 through the Lens of Ritual Punishment Theory," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 39: (2014) 79–100.

[106] Jared Beverly, "Nebuchadnezzar and the Animal Mind," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 39: (2020), 3. For a related discussion on madness, Jewishness, and animalization, see Noam Pines, *The Infrahuman: Animality in Modern Jewish Literature* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2018) 16-18. Although Pines does not mention Nebuchadnezzar, his comparison of Charles Baudelaire's prideful doctor who goes mad and becomes like one of "the beasts of the street" with Heinrich Heine's portrayal of the Jewish dog presents a number of parallels to Nebuchadnezzar's transformation. The main difference lies in the fact that the Babylonian monarch is restored to his "humanity" whereas the other figures Pines presents are not.

[107] Beverly, "Nebuchadnezzar," 3-5. See also Avalos' footnote on 503: "Typically, such approaches seek to diagnose a condition mentioned in the Bible in precise modern medical terms. In the case of Nebuchadnezzar, Henze (*Madness of King Nebuchadnezzar*, 92–93) discusses the long tradition in biblical commentaries of diagnosing Nebuchadnezzar with a medical condition known as 'zooanthropy.' For a more a systematic application of a retro-diagnostic approach to ancient Mesopotamia, see JoAnn Scurlock and Burton R. Andersen, *Diagnoses in Assyrian and Babylonian Medicine: Ancient Sources, Translations, and Modern Medical Analyses* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2005). Critiques of retro-diagnostic approaches are now numerous, and these include Hector Avalos, "Illness and Health Care in the Ancient Near East: The Role of the Temple in Greece, Mesopotamia, and Israel," (HSM 54; Atlanta: Scholars Press,1995); Joel S. Baden and Candida R. Moss, "The Origin and Interpretation of ṣāraat in Leviticus 13–14," JBL 130 (2011): 643–62, esp. 659 n. 55.

uses the more neutral term "transformation" to describe Nebuchadnezzar's experience, since the notion of "change" is the only consistent descriptor in the text.[108] By using the more flexible and linguistically accurate term "transformation," I aim to provide space for the range of nuanced interpretations of the king's animal-becoming as evidenced within the texts themselves. I argue that this small adjustment to terminology used consistently in my analysis carries significant weight for how scholars read and interpret Nebuchadnezzar, his animality, and ancient Jewish understandings of the human-animal boundary.

2.3 Composition

As discussed in the introduction to the dissertation, each of the Danielic chapters I examine receives an individual treatment of its composition history in order to showcase its distinct trajectory and development prior to the MT redactor's final form. To understand the extent of Dan. 4's development, one must first consider the differences between the OG and MT of the text. Of the four sources for the Danielic corpora—the MT, OG, Th, and Qumran fragments—the MT and OG make for the most stark comparison.[109] The relationship between the versions, especially their redaction history, remains contested.[110] Apart from small

[108] A rare example of non-derogatory language to describe Nebuchadnezzar's transformation is mentioned briefly by James R. Hamrick in his discussion of the humanization of the first creature in Dan. 7: "…it refers to what happened to Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel 4 when he dwelt with wild animals." See "Conflicting Traditions: The Interpretation of Daniel's Four Kingdoms in the Ethiopic Commentary (Tergwāmē) Tradition," in *Four Kingdom Motifs before and beyond the Book of Daniel,* Andrew B. Perrin and Loren T. Stuckenbruck (eds.) (Leiden: Brill, 2021) 284.

[109] It is generally agreed that Th was revised from the OG with the influence of a Semitic *Vorlage* since it bears great similarity to the MT. The fragments of the book of Daniel discovered at Qumran also agree with the MT and, based on the number of copies preserved among the scrolls, seem to have been well-circulated among reading communities. The eight fragmentary manuscripts also confirm the antiquity of texts, the earliest of which dates to the end of the second century BCE.

[110] The majority of differences between the two versions occur in chs. 4-6, excluding the additional stories of the *Prayer of Azariah and the Hymn of the Three Youths*, *Bel and the Snake*, and *Susanna and the Elders*. See Timothy R. McLay, "The Old Greek Translation of Daniel IV-VI and the Formation of the Book of Daniel," *VT* 55 (2005): 304-323.

differences, the OG is largely similar to Dan. 1-3 and 7-12 in the MT but is significantly different in chs. 4-6. Daniel 4-6 is also markedly different between the Greek versions, the OG and Th, which normally run largely parallel to one another. Instead of agreeing with the OG, the Th follows the MT almost exactly which has led some scholars to speculate on a common Semitic *Vorlage.* A logical conclusion then might be to surmise that OG Dan. 4-6 circulated as an "extended edition" set of traditions as some studies have speculated. But the issue arises in the redaction styles of the OG's Dan. 4-6, since Dan. 4 and 6 expand far beyond the MT, whereas Dan. 5 is significantly shorter than the MT. Thus, instead of pigeonholing the discussion into the "which came first" dilemma,[111] it is more helpful, and now largely the consensus, to view Dan. 4-6 in the MT and OG traditions as independently developed and circulated corpora that likely never crossed paths but interacted with similar textual traditions.[112]

How and why the story of Nebuchadnezzar's transformation became important to and prevalent in Jewish communities is still a topic of debate. It is widely held that the episode of the king's theriomorphism was influenced by an independent circulating tradition based on the last king of the Neo-Babylonian empire, Nabonidus, a relationship which I discuss more extensively below.[113] Moreover, an Aramaic text known as the *Prayer for Nabonidus* was discovered among

[111] In the last half century, views have been divided on the topic. For a few influential studies that view the OG as more original, see Lawrence M. Wills, *The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King: Ancient Jewish Court Legends,* HDR 26 (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990) and Rainer Albertz, "The Social Setting of the Aramaic and Hebrew Book of Daniel," pp. 171-204 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception, Vol. 1,* John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint (eds.), SVT 83.1 (Leiden: Brill, 2001). In favor of the MT's originality, see David Satran, "Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation of the Fourth Chapter of the Book of Daniel," (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1985). For further discussion, see also Newsom's summary in *Daniel,* 127-8.

[112] As summarized by Collins, the potential redactor exchanges between the OG and MT versions of ch. 4 suggest an independent development of the traditions based on a "common story" instead of one being a *Vorlage* to the other. See Collins, *Daniel,* 221.

[113] Collins, *Daniel,* 217-19; Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel,* 74-75; Hartman, Louis F., and Alexander A. DiLella, *The Book of Daniel,* AB 23 (Garden City: Doubleday, 1978), 178-80; John J. Collins, "Prayer of Nabonidus," in G. Brooke et al., eds., *Qumran Cave 4-XVII. Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD 22; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996) 83-93.

the scrolls of Qumran.[114] In short, both the OG and the MT appear to have drawn on a shared tradition, although not likely as direct textual relationships but rather adaptations of major themes paired with innovations that reflected their own social, political, and theological purposes.

Likely originating in the Jewish communities in Alexandria, the OG of Dan. 4-6 exhibits differences regarding Nebuchadnezzar's transformation that are unique to the Alexandrian communities, which I examine in the sections ahead.[115] It is generally agreed that OG Daniel dates to the second century BCE with some opinions leaning toward the end and others toward the middle of the century. Based on 1 Maccabees' use of OG Daniel, its similarity to 1 Esdras, and possible textual allusion in the Sibylline Oracles, Henze emphasizes that wherever one prefers to place it within the second century, it emerges in its final form "in immediate proximity to the date of the final redaction of the biblical book during the Maccabean Revolt (167-164 BCE)."[116] In ways distinct from the OG, the MT also presents a different image of the character of Nebuchadnezzar that reflects the literary culture of Jewish communities in Palestine during the same time period that the OG was being circulated.[117]

The distinct compositional and social settings of the OG and MT of Dan. 4 underscore

---

[114] 4Q242. See discussions from J. T. Milik, "Prière de Nabonide' et autres écrits d'un cycle de Daniel," RB 63 (1956) 407-15; R. Meyer, *Das Gebet des Nabonid* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962).

[115] James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel,* ICC (Edinburgh: Clark, 1950), 38; Hartman and DiLella, *Book of Daniel,* 78.

[116] Henze, *Madness,* 23.

[117] Of the two collections of chs. 4-6, both McLay and Newsom consider the OG "the best witness of the *Vorlage* of the original collection," a position which I retain throughout my investigation. McLay, "Old Greek Translation," 319. See also Newsom: "It may be that the version of chs. 4-6 now present in the OG is actually older than that translation as a whole and originally circulated as a booklet. When the complete MT was translated into what we now know as the OG, that translator apparently preferred the older and more familiar version of chs. 4-6" (*Daniel,* 5).

how animality mediates and negotiates foreignness differently for Jewish communities in Alexandria and Palestine. And although the Danielic corpora's broader composition history is complex as a whole, it is amplified all the more so in Dan. 4. By reflecting on the importance of the text's versions, especially regarding Nebuchadnezzar animal transformation, I draw attention to the varied nature of both the content and preservation of its traditions. In order to integrate the narrative outlines of the chapter, the following analysis simultaneously acknowledges Dan. 4 as an independently circulated episode, as well as a narrative shaped within the broader context of and closer to the final form of the work.

2.4 The Texts of Daniel 4

In Peace and Prosperity (Dan 4:1-6 [4:1])[118]

The introduction to Nebuchadnezzar's dream begins with ease and leisure, only to be jolted by a disturbing set of visions which the king is unable to decipher. Both the OG and MT are composed partly in the first-person and partly in third-person. The MT narrative of Nebuchadnezzar's transformation has four distinct sections indicated by the change in narrator's voice, according to which the following analysis is structured. This includes the epistolary doxologies that bookend the MT.[119] In contrast, the beginning of the OG lacks the prescript and instead introduces the tale similar to that of previous chapters: "In the eighteenth year of his rule, Nebuchadnezzar said…" Excluding the MT's prescript, the first section begins by introducing

[118] Primary numbering follows the Aramaic MT and secondary numbering follows the verse numbers in Ziegler's edition of the OG.

[119] Medieval commentators mistook the first three verses of Dan. 4 for the concluding verses of Dan. 3, thus the discrepancy between the Aramaic MT and modern editions' verse numbering. The latter adjust Dan. 3:31-33 to the beginning of Dan. 4. See Montgomery's analysis in which he also includes a full list of versions that indicate correct chapter division (*Daniel,* 223).

the setting of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, followed by the failure of the king's court to interpret, and finally the summoning of Daniel. Common between the MT and OG, Nebuchadnezzar narrates that he was at peace and in prosperity only to be interrupted by a disturbing dream.[120] The OG launches directly into the description of the dream, whereas the MT provides a court setting wherein the king summons the sages of Babylon and is disappointed by their failure to provide "the interpretation of the dream."

Here, the MT narrative shares the so-called "court contest" pattern with Dan. 2 in which the king has a dream and no one in his court is able to interpret it. In the case of ch. 2, however, the stakes are much higher since the court must both tell the king his dream, as well as provide its interpretation. But because the motif of the failure of the king's court bears no real weight to the arc of ch. 4 and is absent from the OG,[121] Newsom considers it an MT redactor's addition in order to liken it to the king's earlier dream in Dan. 2.[122] Although this "addition" does draw a thematic parallel to ch. 2 and that both chapters are similar in that they contain dreams of Nebuchadnezzar which need interpreting, the role of Daniel in the two stories differs significantly and sets Dan. 4 apart from other typical court dramas.

The difference in Daniel's roles in chs. 2 and 4 make the passages distinct from one another despite their frequent pairing by scholars. Daniel 2 sets the stage for a court contest, an occasion to which even Daniel himself struggles to rise. Although ultimately Daniel is

[120] The MT narrates the effect of the dream-vision upon Nebuchadnezzar's emotional state in first-person: "I beheld a dream and it frightened me; and the mirages upon my bed and the visions of my head disturbed me." The OG's version is shorter: "I saw a dream, and I was alarmed, and fear fell upon me."

[121] The court contest motif is absent from the OG but Nebuchadnezzar does still call Daniel to interpret in 4:18 (MT 15). There is, however, no competitive element or stakes in the sense that Daniel is the king's final attempt at acquiring an interpretation or that lives are hanging in the balance if he does not perform.

[122] Newsom, *Daniel*, 136.

distinguished among the court officials and rewarded for both his revelation of the dream and its interpretation, the emphasis is given to the divine revealer of mysteries for whom Daniel is a revelatory conduit (2:28-29). In contrast, the focus of Dan. 4 is Nebuchadnezzar himself and the development of his narrative in which Daniel only makes a guest appearance.[123] Daniel's role, however, does become significant in that it points to his close relationship with and genuine care for the king's well-being as will be discussed in the sections ahead. By evoking sympathy in Daniel who stands as the obvious protagonist in the Danielic traditions, the king's dilemma evokes sympathy in the reader and looks to Daniel as a model of response. His sympathetic response, however, does not appear to be intended for all foreign kings since this is the only occurrence of Daniel's sympathy to the king but should instead be understood as specific to Nebuchadnezzar and the context of Dan. 4.

In sum, the first section of Dan. 4 makes clear the importance of Nebuchadnezzar for the narrative. Moreover, the king is depicted as a sympathetic character to whom the less than secondary figure, Daniel, relates and for whom he offers genuine care.

Dreaming of Trees and Animals (4:7-15 [4:2-15])

The second section of ch. 4 continues in first-person and presents the MT's description of the dream-vision in the form of direct speech from Nebuchadnezzar to Belteshazzar-Daniel, whereas the OG is a continuous, general narration with no clear audience. Focused on a great tree in the midst of the earth, the king recounts its initial height and subsequent growth that reaches heaven. At the descriptive climax of the dream, the tree is the epitome of admiration and functions as the source of nourishment and protection to the animals of the earth or field (τὰ

[123] Daniel is also entirely absent from ch. 3, the tale in which his three friends are thrown into the flaming furnace. Since no mention is made of him whatsoever, one may wonder what makes this story "Danielic" at all except for the exilic setting under a foreign king.

θηρία τῆς γῆς; חיות ברא), the birds of the sky (τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ; צפרי שמיא), and all living things (τοῖς ζῴοις; כל בשרא). Similarly, Nebuchadnezzar's first dream and its interpretation in ch. 2 also includes the animals of the field and birds of the air (חיות ברא ועוף שמיא) to emphasize the extent of the king's rulership and those who benefit from his prosperity. In contrast to Dan. 4, however, the animals and birds in Dan. 2's dream are not a part of the symbolic structure of the dream but of the interpretation, the actualized expression of the dream language. That is to say, in Dan. 2 the height of the statue and the gold head are symbolic of Nebuchadnezzar's rule, whereas the very "real" humans, animals, and birds are only mentioned in Daniel's interpretation.[124] The differences between the two chapters—although often compared as similar dream-based, court-contest tales—highlight their distinct contexts and the uniqueness of Dan 4.'s understandings of animality.[125]

The creatures of the animal world in Nebuchadnezzar's second dream in Dan. 4 exist as both metaphors in the visions of his head (בחזוי ראשי) *and* actualized in his waking state.[126] In other words, the animal world is representative of those who benefit from the greatness of the great tree that is Nebuchadnezzar, as well as the king's very real companions among whom he

[124] In their commentary to Dan. 2, Hartman and DiLella draw attention to the passage's allusion to Jeremiah's oracles that speak of Nebuchadnezzar's "dominion even over the wild animals" but do not speculate on either the reason for its inclusion in Dan. 2 or its connection to Dan. 4 (*Daniel,* 147). More will be said on Jeremiah's influence on Dan. 4 below.

[125] As will be seen in the interpretation and fulfillment of Nebuchadnezzar's dream, the world of plants, animals, birds, and other nonhumans throughout the Danielic corpora are dynamic and active, and flow between both the symbolic and interpreted space. See Bennie H. Reynolds III, *Between Symbolism and Realism: The Use of Symbolic and Non-Symbolic Language in Ancient Jewish Apocalypses 333-63 B.C.E.* Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements, Band 8 (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co, 2011), especially pp. 93-110 for this discussion on Dan. 2.

[126] Frances Flannery-Dailey notes that "the visual nature of symbolic dreams allows audiences to concretize abstract ideas such as evil, thereby enabling the expression and formulation of the apocalyptic worldview" (*Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests: Jewish Dreams in the Hellenistic and Roman Eras* [Leiden: Brill, 2004], 222). Although this may sometimes be case as with the creatures of Dan. 7, this does not apply to the animals of Dan. 4. What is thought to the be abstract (the great tree, etc.) is actually more digestible than the concretized hybrid creature into which Nebuchadnezzar is temporarily transformed.

dwells and eats.[127] As his dream-vision continues in vv. 10-11, Nebuchadnezzar describes the descent of an angel or "a watcher and a holy one" (ἄγγελος, עיר וקדיש) from heaven and the decree to "cut down the tree and chop off its branches, strip its foliage and scatter its fruit," which results also in the animals and birds fleeing from the shade and protection of the tree.[128] Despite the tree's disassemblage, the watcher decrees the stump of its roots to be spared, albeit restricted by a bond of iron and bronze amidst the grass of the field.[129] The stump, according to the decree, will then be immersed in the dew of heaven and its portion among the animals of the field. In the OG's longer description of the tree's destruction and restriction, it includes its deliverance to prison (φυλακὴν) and binding by shackles and bronze fetters (πέδαις, χειροπέδαις χαλκαῖς). In both versions, however, the restrictions imposed on the tree place it in closer proximity to the grass of the earth and its inhabitants. Thus, the creatures for whom he previously provided shade and sustenance become his peers in regard to their now mutual position. Furthermore, as Newsom points out, "the masculine [singular] gender of both 'tree' and 'Nebuchadnezzar' would permit one to translate 'it' throughout the passage, thus leaving the imagery as fluid as dreams often are."[130] It is unclear whether "it" or "he" is best suited for the tree and Nebuchadnezzar. In both the chapter's use of metaphor and linguistic construction,

[127] The shift of animals from possessions or servants to companions is a significant theme in animal studies instigated by Donna Haraway, *The Companion Species Manifesto* (Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press, 2003) and has been developed by her own work and others in the last two decades. See also Donna Haraway, *When Species Meet*; and Kari Weil, *Thinking Animals: Why Animal Studies Now?* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), especially 53-62.

[128] Dan. 4:10 is the only passage in the HB that the noun עיר occurs, whereas the OG uses the common word for an angelic messenger. The Aramaic literally reads, "a watcher and a holy one" but most translations understand it as a hendiadys, "a holy watcher." See Newsom, *Daniel,*139 and Collins, *Daniel*, 226.

[129] See Henze, *Madness,* 84-90 on the use of metal fetters on trees in Assyrian literature and iconographical sources.

[130] Newsom, *Daniel,* 141. For example, 4:11b in the MT could be translated: "Let the wild animal flee from beneath him/it and the birds from his/its branches."

Nebuchadnezzar, the tree, and his animality are indistinguishable, which demonstrates the significance of the boundary blurring between human, animal, and nonhuman in Dan. 4.

The final element of the watcher's decree in the MT pertains to the king's "mind" (לבב), which is the point in the narrative where the consistency of the dream-vision metaphor of the tree breaks down entirely. The watcher declares in v. 13, "Let his mind be changed from human (לבבה מן אנושא ישנון) and the mind of an animal be given to him (ולבב חיוה יתיהב לה)." The figure Nebuchadnezzar loses any arboreal association and is acknowledged as having a human mind, which is to be replaced by that of an animal. Not only does the tree metaphor dissolve, all metaphors and representations at this point in the watcher's dream-decree cease almost completely. The change of Nebuchadnezzar's mind, duration of his transformation, and purpose of the decree can be read as one-to-one statements, meaning that they require no interpretation and have no symbolic sheen. By the narrative's dissolution of its metaphors, it underscores the malleability of Nebuchadnezzar's figure in his animal transformation evinced in the literary text.

The boundary between what Nebuchadnezzar's dream depicts and what actually occurs becomes almost nonexistent. One could also suggest that the de-metaphorization begins with the statement, "Let him be wetted with the dew of heaven…" (ובטל שמיא יצטבע) in v. 12b as Collins does, posting "that the author was here combining two sources with different imagery" and "slips over to speaking explicitly of the human subject."[131] The most immediate implication of this shift is the growing irrelevance of the expertise of Daniel, the king's prized dream-teller and interpreter. Instead, Daniel's value is emphasized in his concern and counsel for the king, and perhaps his recommendations of how to delay the fulfillment of the dream's manifestation.

In contrast to the MT, the OG describes Nebuchadnezzar's transformation in more

[131] Collins, *Daniel*, 227. He further cites Wills, *Jew in the Court*, 108–9 to support this reading.

physically embodied terms rather than abstractions of mind or reason. Where the MT emphasizes the mind or heart in the initial decree, v. 16 in the OG reads "…and his body may be changed (τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ἀλλοιωθῇ) from the dew of heaven." Any inner transformation such as that of the heart or mind does not occur until later in the fulfillment of the king's transformation until after the full description of his bodily changes: "My flesh and my heart were changed (ἠλλοιώθη ἡ σάρξ μου καὶ ἡ καρδία μου)." The OG's focus on the bodily transformation of Nebuchadnezzar versus the MT's emphasis on a change of the mind or shift in rationale is important for parsing the perspectives of the two traditions.

Because studies of the MT are more prevalent and often held as superior, it has yielded limited understandings of the passage that are subtly (or not so subtly) anthropocentric, such as the assumption that "to have [Nebuchadnezzar's] human mind replaced by an animal mind removes him from a nearly superhuman status to a subhuman rank."[132] But the OG offers an alternate yet contemporaneous interpretation of the tradition that is less concerned with Nebuchadnezzar's mind and more with the creatureliness of his body and behavioral experience. Thus, the ambivalence of the category of the animal is evidenced differently even among Jewish communities. Communities in Alexandria from whom the OG emerged and those in Palestine from whom the MT emerged both preserved distinct traditions regarding a contested and unstable figure: the king of Babylon.

Interpretation, Transformation, and Exile (4:16-30 [4:16-30])

Returning to the MT and Daniel's interpretation in the third section of the chapter (vv. 16-30), the first-person narration is paused and does not resume until the final four verses of the

[132] Newsom, *Daniel*, 141. I only use Newsom's commentary as an example because it is the most recent Daniel commentary publication (2014). Earlier commentaries, as one might expect, reveal views with even thicker layers of human exceptionalism and superiority.

tale. The third-person narrator describes Daniel's distress at hearing the king's dream, which is met by Nebuchadnezzar's encouragement to not be afraid of either the dream or its interpretation. Daniel then expresses the reason for his distress and laments that "the dream should be for those who hate you, and the interpretation for your adversaries!" (חלמא לשנאיך ופשרה לעריך) and that the king is indeed the great tree. Daniel's distress at the king's dream is also present in the OG and, like the emphasis on the king's embodied transformation, so too Daniel's physical state is given more attention. In addition to being frightened and astonished at what Nebuchadnezzar shared, "trembling seized him (τρόμου λαβόντος αὐτὸν) and his appearance changed (ἀλλοιωθείσης τῆς ὁράσεως αὐτοῦ)."[133] As described above, the physical and emotional details of Daniel's distress are likely intended to evoke sympathy in the reader regarding the king's situation, as well as his relationship with the king.[134]

Another significant difference between the versions is the OG's citation of Nebuchadnezzar's exaggerated hubris and destruction of the Temple as reasons for the watcher's decree: "You, O king, have been exalted over all humanity that is on the face of all the earth. Your heart was raised up in arrogance and power with regard to the holy one and his angels. Your deeds were seen, how you desolated the house of the living God, on the occasion of the sins of the holy people."[135] In stark contrast, the MT makes no mention of either the Temple's destruction or Nebuchadnezzar's pride apart from his becoming "great and strong." Newsom attributes the discrepancy to the MT's concern "only with the relationship between

[133] Nebuchadnezzar's face is also "changed" by anger toward the three youths in OG Dan. 3:19 (ἡ μορφὴ τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἠλλοιώθη); Belshazzar's appearance is also changed in OG 5:6 when he sees the writing on the wall (ἡ ὅρασις αὐτοῦ ἠλλοιώθη).

[134] Thus suggests Newsom, *Daniel,* 143.

[135] Collins, *Daniel,* 211.

Nebuchadnezzar and the Most High," likely based upon the MT's emphasis on the king coming to an awareness that "the Most High is ruler over the kingdom of humans."[136] Whereas the OG sees Nebuchadnezzar's transformation as a necessary atonement for the Temple's destruction and hubris, the MT only invokes the all-sovereignty of the Most High and the necessity of Nebuchadnezzar's acknowledgement. Thus, however much one imagines that Nebuchadnezzar "deserves" his sentence either based on his violence in previous chapters, incurable hubris, or destruction of the First Temple, I argue that the model provided for the reader of Dan. 4 in both versions is one of care, concern, and the promise of restoration for Nebuchadnezzar and the complex relationship with foreignness he represents.[137]

Daniel then recounts a portion of the dream back to the king and does not formally introduce the interpretation (פשרא) until v. 21 in the MT. Instead of reaffirming that the decree (גזרת) is from the watchers as described in v. 14, Daniel attributes it to that of the Most High (עליא). It is unclear here whether the watchers function as a metaphorical representation of the Most High, or should be understood as simply equivalent. In the fulfillment of the dream-vision in v. 28, there is an additional variation or perhaps assimilation of these two concepts. The decree is communicated by way of a "voice from heaven (קל מן שמיא)" and, as Collins points out, may function similarly as the *bat kol* in rabbinic literature.[138] Such an example—the uncertainty around who and what the watcher figures are—illustrates again the fluidity of metaphorical

[136] Newsom, *Daniel,* 145 and Dan. 4:22.

[137] The concern expressed by Daniel has given rise to various interpretations of his actions by both ancient and modern commentators. Other literary interpretations have been applied to this story, including those that understand it as sarcastic rhetoric and is therefore insincere. See Sarah Emanuel's brief summary of the humorous parody of Nebuchadnezzar's animal transformation (*Humor, Resistance, and Cultural Persistence*, 138-40), and especially her discussion of David M. Valeta's "tragic-comic" interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's "humiliation" ("Polyglossia and Parody," 139).

[138] Collins, *Daniel,* 230-1.

language in the Danielic corpora, resisting the limits of one-to-one interpretive models for dream-visions or otherwise.

The MT interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream begins with a brief explanation of the tree imagery. Daniel responds directly to the king in v. 21: "You have grown great and strong, and your greatness has grown and reached the heavens and your rulership to the end of the earth." Presented as a statement of fact and without any evaluation and, as mentioned above, the MT provides no clear reason for the king's sentence until after the "punishment" is restated in the same general formula as the dream itself. The difference, however, is that the decree in the dream (v. 14) is so that "all living things will know (ינדעון חייא) that the Most High is sovereign over the kingdom of humans," whereas Daniel's interpretation pertains to only the king's acquisition of this knowledge, "until *you know* (תנדע)." The decree, then, is presented first as being a responsibility of the collective of all living things and later restated that the lesson is for Nebuchadnezzar alone.[139]

Turning now to the time-frame of the king's sentence, the seven (year) time span was already allotted for Nebuchadnezzar's animal hiatus at the declaration of the angelic watcher. So although Daniel encourages the king to engage in merciful acts to the poor and participate in almsgiving to "prolong" either his time on his throne or his happiness in the OG and MT respectively,[140] it appears that the time span was non-negotiable even if the transformation could be delayed in some way.[141] Because of the dream's fulfillment twelve months later, Newsom

[139] This distinction between the dream and the interpretation does not occur in the OG. In both instances, the OG emphasizes that the decree is for a masculine-singular subject, i.e. the king/tree.

[140] OG (πολυήμερος γένῃ ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου) MT (תהוא ארכה לשלותך).

[141] This is further emphasized in the OG's longer narrative which includes Nebuchadnezzar's first-person description of how he was "shackled for seven years" and "eventually a great sleep overcame me and drowsiness fell upon me." He narrates that it was only at the completion of the seven years that "my sins and my ignorance were

suggests that perhaps Nebuchadnezzar did heed Daniel's advice and "so delayed the judgment."[142] Regardless of this speculation, the time-frame of the exile itself appears to be set.

The final verse of this section in the MT depicts the fulfillment of the decree (מלתא ספת) and differs slightly from both the dream decree and Daniel's interpretation. Regarding the immersion of Nebuchadnezzar in the dew of heaven, the actualization of the decree in v. 30 specifies that it was "his body" (גשמה) that was immersed. The added emphasis on the body of Nebuchadnezzar is different from what we have seen in the MT thus far, and reiterates the OG's emphasis on king's bodily, animal transformation beyond that of only his human mind. This added detail of mentioning Nebuchadnezzar's body, however, seems to accompany the description of the growth of the king's hair and nails, which are likened to those of an eagle or vulture. For the MT,

Whereas the MT limits the king's physical transformation to avian features, the OG combines avian and leonine descriptors:[143] "My hair became like the wings of an eagle (ὡς πτέρυγες ἀετοῦ), and my nails like those of a lion (οἱ ὄνυχές μου ὡσεὶ λέοντος)" (4:30b).[144] In any case, both versions make additions to the fulfillment of the decree fully disambiguate whether Nebuchadnezzar's animality was metaphorical or realized. In body, mind, and behavior,

fulfilled before the God of Heaven." Nebuchadnezzar's humility then could perhaps be understood as a fair or just sentence. See also Newsom, *Daniel,* 148: "…[Nebuchadnezzar's] suffering endures for a set period of time, and when that time is completed, he is restored."

[142] Newsom, *Daniel,* 145.

[143] The Th. also describes the lion-eagle mixture but switches the metaphors to instead say that "his hair lengthened like that of lions and his nails like those of birds."

[144] The MT of Daniel 7 also implements eagle and lion features to describe Nebuchadnezzar prior to his humanization process. If ch. 7 was working with the MT's rendition of the Semitic *Vorlage*, we would expect a description of Nebuchadnezzar as having solely ox and eagle features since those are the animals associated with his transformation in the MT. It is possible then, that ch. 7 is either interacting with the OG or more likely that their shared Semitic *Vorlage* originally described Nebuchadnezzar's transformation as having lion-eagle features.

the king has been transformed to that of a hybrid-animal existence.[145]

In addition to the OG's more detailed version of the king's transformation, it also emphasizes different elements not present in the MT. Henze asserts that the OG's emphasis on Nebuchadnezzar's "geographical isolation rather than on his corporeal transformation and mental derangement."[146] Although Henze is right to point to the king's physical locale as more prominent than in the MT or Th, Henze extends his argument to conclude that "the details of [Nebuchadnezzar's] physical changes are 'more likely the natural result of his prolonged sojourn in the wilderness.'"[147] This assumption, however, is difficult to demonstrate based on the OG text as it stands. The suddenness of the king's physical metamorphosis is emphasized in the OG's first iteration of the dream: "[The tree] was cut down before me in one day, and its destruction was in one hour of the day. And its branches were given to every wind, and it was dragged and thrown away. He (it) ate grass with the animals of the earth" (4:14a). As such, the timing is ambiguous in the fulfillment of the decree, therefore making it difficult to assume that the king's physical transformation happened over a prolonged period. This notion of a sudden change exemplified in the OG solidifies the Nebuchadnezzar incident as a theriomorphic transformation event, rather than a gradual one as a result of solitary, wilderness living.

The suddenness of Nebuchadnezzar's transformation is first described in terms of animal-like behavior. He has transitioned into the day-to-day life of nonhuman existence, barred from the luxury of his palace-enclosed lifestyle. In the OG, this "barring" is quite literal and his

[145] Some have suggested that Nebuchadnezzar's animality makes him more dangerous and brutish, while others interpret his transformation as the opposite. As an example of the latter, Strømmen suggests that Nebuchadnezzar's animal-likeness makes him "vulnerable and mortal rather than an infinitely powerful (human) ruler." Strømmen, *Biblical,* 96.

[146] Henze, *Madness,* 30.

[147] Here Henze is quoting David Satran, "Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation," chapter 2 (*Madness,* 30).

angelic companions keep him from being seen by or speaking to anyone. The MT, in contrast, remains a bit more general and simply says that he "will be driven (טרדין) from human society." As discussed above, the king's transformation has been described as an "exile in insanity," "bestial transformation," and "mental derangement," as well as an implied solitude resulting in mental and physical deterioration. But according to the declaration of the voice of heaven when Nebuchadnezzar exalts himself in the OG, the king is in the company of angels during his exile: "The angels will pursue you for seven years, and you will never be seen, nor will you ever speak with any person" (4:29). Furthermore, Nebuchadnezzar's angelic companions are described as feeding the king grass and playing an active role in Nebuchadnezzar's seven-year sentence, even though he is restricted from human contact.[148] So while the MT situates Nebuchadnezzar only in the company of the animals of the field during his separation, the OG includes the attention of intermediary, divine beings simultaneously imposing restriction (being bound for seven years) and bestowing divinely-ordained sustenance (being fed grass like an ox) on him. The king's exile in the wilderness among the animals and as one of the animals, I argue, is complex one that depicts elements of both punishment and divine-attention.

Approaching the narrative from another perspective, a number of scholars have identified the liminal features of Nebuchadnezzar's incident. In Goldingay's commentary, he describes the events of Dan. 4 as narrating "a kind of liminal experience as the king straddles the territory between human and animal before he can be reassimilated to the sphere of order."[149] Although

[148] A number of parallels can be drawn to Nebuchadnezzar as a type of "Adam." The first indication is shown in the Hebrew equivalency to טרד is גרש, meaning to expel or drive out, a verb that takes a prominent role in the Genesis 3 narrative. Although there are certainly markers that indicate an animal-like immersion for Nebuchadnezzar, Adam is also told that he shall "eat the grass of the field (ואכלת את עשב השדה)". *Esav* is the shared word in both narratives, whereas in Dan. 4:12's case the grass is of the earth, ארעא, rather than the field.

[149] John Goldingay, *Daniel, Revised Edition*, World Biblical Commentary 30 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic, 1996, 2019), 263.

liminality can be a helpful model, it nevertheless enforces strict binaries and the boundaries they set up. To say something is "liminal" is to say that it is neither here nor there, and it does not abide by the rules of either side of the boundary. His perspective leans heavily on the idea that ancient societies viewed their world as a binarized systems of proper order that dictated the health, safety, and overall well-being of the community. According to many theories on liminality, the boundaries that determined what was domestic/wild, civilized/uncivilized, urban/rural kept the community safe from the "dangerous, inauspicious, or polluting" of "liminal situations and roles."[150] Similar to the method employed by Goldingay, Newsom likens Nebuchadnezzar's tale to a rite of passage with a tripartite structure of separation, liminalization, and reassimilation.[151] T.S. Cason has also argued for a "rite of passage" interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's incident but instead as a type of ritual hazing intended to strip the king of both his humanity and masculinity through castration, feminization, and victimization.[152] Although these models are each useful in their own right, I argue below that Nebuchadnezzar's designation as a servant of God and his association with wild animals evinced in Jeremiah 25-29 provide an essential context for the traditions about the king and his place in the Jewish imagination.

Knowledge and Kingdom Restored (Dan 4:31-34 [4:30a-34b])

Turning to the fourth section and final of Dan. 4, the narrative turns a plot corner and returns to the first-person narration by Nebuchadnezzar. At the conclusion of the allotted time, the king raises his eyes to heaven and says, "And my knowledge returned to me" (ומנדעי עלי

[150] Goldingay, *Daniel*, 263.

[151] Newsom, *Daniel*, 149.

[152] Cason, "Confessions of an Impotent Potentate," 88-96. Cason's analysis is based on ritual punishment theory examined by modern cultural anthropologists and highlights gender dynamics of the chapter that are not often brought to the forefront.

יתוב).[153] Some commentators translate מנדעas "reason" or "wits," and point out that the word occurs two other times in Daniel. In 2:21 and 5:12, מנדעis translated "knowledge," which seems best suited to its contexts of nonspecific and more general knowledge imparted to worthy individuals. This knowledge, however, is specific to Nebuchadnezzar as Beverly notes and is better understood as a faculty of reason designated to the human species. That is not to say that Nebuchadnezzar was devoid of rationality during his animalization but rather that he had possessed an "animal rationality" while living as an animal and was now being reinstated with a "human rationality" in his transition back to humanity.[154] Beverly's overarching point is that Nebuchadnezzar's animal transformation imparted a specific type of understanding that allowed him to lift his eyes heavenward, thus granting "him an understanding of the divine he otherwise would not have known."[155] In this understanding, the animal mind does not imply an innately inferior state but one in which the king gains a unique type of knowledge only accessible to him by animalization.

The exact point when Nebuchadnezzar returns to his humanity also showcases the importance of the king's animality for his restorative process. Newsom agrees that Nebuchadnezzar "receives a new understanding" but duly notes the differences between the MT and OG on the timing of the king's restoration. In the OG, Nebuchadnezzar makes his supplication prior to his human reason returning to him. The MT, on the other hand, states: "At the end of the time, I, Nebuchadnezzar, lifted my eyes to heaven and my knowledge returned to me." Newsom asserts that the passage "describes the event in ways more in keeping with the

[153] This is the first of two occurrences of the same event in Dan. 4, the second of which in v. 33 appears to be a redactional marker, or repetitive resumption. Both Newsom and Collins note this.

[154] Beverly, "Nebuchadnezzar," 9.

[155] Ibid.

king's animalistic state" and "signals [his acknowledgment of the divine] as an animal might" since "he cannot speak."[156] Despite the fact that lifting one's eyes is a recurrent trope in biblical literature and one that often precedes a theophanic experience, because Nebuchadnezzar is in animal form when he "lifts his eyes," the passage provokes a different—and more anthropocentric—explanation from scholars than if he was in human form.[157] Although expressed in different ways, both the OG and MT narratives make sure to situate the king's moment of enlightenment firmly in his animality.

In addition to the restoration of Nebuchadnezzar's human reason, he is also reinstated to the splendor of his kingdom and the glory and his countenance are returned to him. What is made clear is how the Danielic authors view such qualities of splendor, glory, and majesty; they are not intrinsically good or bad but rather neutral factors that are determined by one's attitude toward or relationship with them. Rulership and all that comes with it are not problems for Dan. 4, nor for the rest of the Danielic corpora wherein Daniel himself is afforded similar glory and privilege because of his proper relationship to divine authority. Articulated similarly, Newsom emphasizes that such qualities only became problematic because of "Nebuchadnezzar's failure to understand their true source."[158] After this reinstatement, the king is also reintegrated into human interactions when his counselors and entourage seek after him.

It is also noteworthy that Daniel is not included in Nebuchadnezzar's reunion with humanity in any way, as either celebrating Nebuchadnezzar's return or to function as the "I told you so" figure. Daniel is instead entirely absent, thus emphasizing the tale's disinterest in the

[156] Newsom, *Daniel*, 148.

[157] For select examples, see Gen. 18:2; 22:13; Josh. 5:13; 1 Chron. 21:16; Dan. 8:3; 10:5; Zec. 2:1; 5:1, 9; 6:1.

[158] Ibid. This explanation is only applicable to the MT, however, and does not address the nuances of the OG's emphasis on atonement and restoration.

dream, its interpretation, and the reward of the interpreter as is the case in Dan. 2. Instead of Daniel's exaltation in the foreign court, the king himself is restored to all that he had before his transformation—and then some. Further distinguishing Dan. 4 from Dan. 2, I argue that the narrative is concerned with the broader arc of the figure of Nebuchadnezzar and unconcerned with providing resolution for the court contest that Daniel is said to have "won." Instead, how the king's animal transformation affects the orientation of the Nebuchadnezzar himself as well as his participation in a theophanic experience points to the ways that Jewish communities looked to both foreign *and* animal figures to work out their conceptions of self and other.

Verse 34 concludes section four of the chapter and closes the doxology with an exaltation and praise of the king of heaven. Nebuchadnezzar's acknowledgment has epistolary elements as noted at the beginning of my analysis. The final discussion worth commenting on is the notion of the figure of the divine king being able to humble or bring low those who walk in arrogance, although as we have seen, the emphasis on pride is more explicit in the OG than in the MT. The problem of pride and the promise of restoration are concepts familiar to both the Hebrew Bible and contemporary Persian and Hellenistic literature. Newsom identifies this as "a broader interest in…the moral psychology of arrogance and the transformed understanding" and draws comparative material from Job, 2 Chronicles, 1 and 2 Maccabees, and Jeremiah.[159] Prophetic literature may be the best parallel for this concept especially since Dan. 4 draws significantly on Ezekiel, Jeremiah, and Isaiah. Oracles, warnings, and prophecies directed toward leaders, whether they be Israelite, Judahite, or foreign rulers, have the potential to shed new light on Nebuchadnezzar's tale and how the communities who authored it viewed the scope of its

[159] Newsom, *Daniel*, 149.

impact.[160] This dynamic, especially as it is expressed in Jeremiah, is one that I take up in the subsequent sections to account for how Jewish communities worked with figures like Nebuchadnezzar as sites of malleability and identity negotiation.

Conclusion

In the conclusion of this section, allow me to offer a few thoughts in light of my analysis of Dan. 4. As I discussed in the composition section of this chapter, I maintain that the MT and OG versions of Dan. 4 were circulated at the same time among the Jewish communities in Palestine and Alexandria respectively. And in my analysis of the versions, it is clear that they paint different portraits of Nebuchadnezzar especially in the nuances of his animal transformation. One of the most striking differences is the OG's inclusion of Nebuchadnezzar's destruction of the temple ("how you made desolate the house of the living God" ἐξερήμωσας τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος) as the reason for his sentence and animal transformation. One might think that the Aramaic version, with its circulation likely in Palestine, would consider this a compelling detail to include for an audience eager for the temple's restoration and judgment of its oppressors. But the opposite is evidenced—the MT is more sanguine toward the king and includes little of his punishment, suffering, or sins that needed atonement, all of which the OG emphasizes in vibrant detail. One possible explanation for the absence of negative language toward Nebuchadnezzar in the MT of Dan. 4 is its work as a resistance strategy of sarcasm and ironic flattery.[161] The reasons for divine punishment of the king who destroyed the first temple

[160] Most scholars limit this warning to only gentile rulers, such as Collins' comment that Dan. 4 functions as " a more specific warning to rulers and, more realistically, a reassurance to Jews that their gentile masters do not have absolute power" (*Daniel,* 232-3).

[161] Much of this explanation hinges on other portrayals of Nebuchadnezzar as volatile villain as in Dan. 2-3 and the faithful's resistance to his violence. Moreover, the temple and its vessels seem of greater concern to the final redactor of MT Daniel who emphasizes Nebuchadnezzar's looting of the temple in Dan. 1's opening lines but is more likely alluding to Antiochus IV's desecration of the Jerusalem in the mid-first century BCE. See Portier-

and was responsible for the exile of Judah are obvious and almost go without saying. One significant complication, however, with this explanation is the chapter's relationship to the other chapters that focus on Nebuchadnezzar and emphasize his violence toward the Jewish exiles and emotional volatility.[162] The MT of Dan. 4 would stand quite alone in its silent sarcasm toward the king, at least in the final form of the work.

As an alternative explanation—one that problematizes the boundary between "the Jew" and "the foreign ruler"—I suggest that Nebuchadnezzar held a more complicated role for the Jewish communities in Palestine than in Alexandria at the time of Dan. 4's circulation. The complexities are rooted in both Nebuchadnezzar's clearly destructive actions against Jewish communities in the sixth century *and* his divinely-ordained role in Judah's exile and promised restoration, a topic to which I devote significant attention below in subsequent sections when I integrate a reading of Jeremiah 25-29. Furthermore, the anxieties the author(s) of Dan. 4 had regarding the figure of Nebuchadnezzar and his role in Jewish tradition are explicitly expressed in the nuances of his animal transformation.[163] By the king's journey into and emergence from the animal world as a foreigner in an already "foreign" category, the poignant discomfort and yet creaturely familiarity with Nebuchadnezzar is explored and negotiated in Dan. 4, with the realization of promised restoration.

Young, *Apocalypse,* 259-61.

[162] Newsom sees this as intentional on the part of the MT redactor. She explains, "chs. 1-4 have been carefully edited together to provide an extended account of the gradual transformation of Nebuchadnezzar's consciousness from a king who considers himself to be the most powerful figure in his kingdom to one who recognizes that his extraordinary greatness is but a gift from the Most High God" (*Daniel,* 127).

[163] Although the particularities of these anxieties vary between the MT and OG, they are nevertheless present and worked out in Nebuchadnezzar's transformation.

2.5 Ancient Near Eastern Influence

In the following section, I summarize a selection of textual and iconographical sources from the ANE and Levant that have been cited in previous scholarship as relevant to the backdrop of the animal imagery employed in Dan. 4.[164] Some scholars dismiss the animal imagery altogether and find the focus on Nebuchadnezzar's animality unnecessary, presupposing that "anyone's hair and nails will grow long in the wild"[165] And while this may be true for studies exclusively focused on theological concerns, the approaches examined below summarize a number of prevailing viewpoints on some possible historical and literary influences on Dan. 4. Although each have their independent contributions to make in specific literary-historical moments of transmission or influence, each are also limited in their ability to address broader themes in the narrative as a whole, and especially how certain types of animal imagery and animality function in Nebuchadnezzar's transformation.

Nebuchadnezzar or Nabonidus?

The character of Nebuchadnezzar poses a number of problems in the Danielic corpora, two of which I briefly discuss here. The first is the issue of chronological coherence. Discussed extensively by some of Daniel's earliest commentators, including John Chrystosom and Jerome, the prescripts which set a date for most of the chapters in Daniel are irreconcilably jumbled. Papyrus 967, for example, opted to make changes where necessary in order to make sense of the chronology.[166] The second issue, as discussed above, is Daniel's sympathetic manner toward the king who destroyed Solomon's temple. Daniel's concern for Nebuchadnezzar's well-being and

[164] Other scholars look outside of Mesopotamia to understand the literary contexts of the Danielic corpora, such as Tawny L. Holm's attention to Egyptian influence. See "The Fiery Furnace in the Book of Daniel and the Ancient Near East," *JOAS* 128, 2008: 85-104.

[165] Goldingay, *Daniel*, 90.

[166] See Henze, *Madness*, 51-7.

distress at the dream-omen is clear in his initial shock at hearing the dream's details, exclamation that the dream should rather be for the king's adversaries, and attempt to stall the fulfillment of the dream or mitigate it altogether by almsgiving. As one might expect, Daniel's response to Nebuchadnezzar causes pause for later rabbinic commentators and invites a number of interpretive solutions including utter disregard, disapproval, and some even defensive on Daniel's behalf. Modern scholars are also troubled by both of these issues and have sought to limit their ramifications. One way to explain these problems is to look to Nabonidus, the last monarch of the Neo-Babylonian empire. In the same way that Nabonidus was a complex and contested figure among Babylonians during and after his reign, I argue that this makes him a suitable figure with whom Jewish communities could blend their uncertainties concerning Nebuchadnezzar, as well as their added innovation of animality.[167]

Nabonidus reigned from 556-539 BCE and was known for his association and preoccupation with dreams.[168] For reasons that are not entirely clear but extensively speculated about in scholarship, much of what is known about the reign of Nabonidus was ascribed to Nebuchadnezzar and synthesized in Danielic traditions. It is known that Nabonidus was a usurper to the throne and not in the dynastic lineage, and that he attempted to replace or at least compete with the worship of Marduk with the exclusive veneration of the moon-god Sin. For

[167] Carol Newsom has proposed an argument along these lines, suggesting that just as the Babylonian communities were divided regarding Nabonidus and the subsequent reign of Cyrus, perhaps so were the Jewish communities of the same monarchs. And with the evidence provided by Isa. 44-45 promoting Cyrus as "the anointed one," it is possible that similar traditions circulated in support of Nabonidus. Newsom does not extend her argument, however, to explain why Nebuchadnezzar became the mediating figure in Daniel 4. Newsom, "Why Nabonidus? Excavating Traditions from Qumran, the Hebrew Bible, and Neo- Babylonian Sources," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts*, ed. Sarianna Metso, Hindy Najman, and Eileen M. Schuller. STDJ 92 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 57–79.

[168] See the monograph by Paul-Alain Beaulieu, *The Reign of Nabonidus, King of Babylon, 556–539 B.C.* (Yale Near Eastern Researches 10; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), especially 218-20 for his association with revelatory dreams.

reasons that are unclear, Nabonidus self-exiled to the remote city of Teima where he established the worship of Sin and left his co-regent and son, Belshazzar, to rule in Babylon. Whether the king's exile was as a result of his own volition or of those loyal to the Marduk priesthood, it is well-attested that he did indeed spend a decade of his reign there.[169]

The earliest source of Nabonidus' unique trajectory are the Harran inscriptions found on basalt steles that were commissioned by Nabonidus himself after returning from Teima, therefore dating the inscriptions to the middle of the sixth century BCE. The temple building inscriptions emphasize the monarch's relationship with the moon-god Sin and his self-imposed ten-year hiatus from rulership in Babylon.[170] Newsom and Breed highlight the structural similarities between the Harran B inscription and Dan. 4, suggesting "that the author of the *Vorlage* of Dan. 4 MT was aware of this Harran inscription and shaped his own composition in light of it."[171] What impact, then, does this inscription bear on the analysis of Nebuchadnezzar's animal transformation? First, according to the inscription, Nabonidus' "exile" was indeed a cooperative effort between the god Sin and the monarch and revealed to Nabonidus in a revelatory dream. During his exile, the king was protected and cared for by various Babylonian deities as outlined in Column I, lines 27-45. The inscription says that "at the command of Sin the god Adda, lockkeeper of heavens and earth, waters of rain gave [the people of Akkad] to drink, their

[169] See Henze, *Madness*, 42-43; Kosmin, *Time and Its Adversaries*, 140, 172-77.

[170] Cyril J. Gadd suggests that "the king withdrew before a mutiny of his subjects dwelling in the great cities of Babylonia, led by their priests," and it was he "who separated himself [from the people] with indignation" ("The Harran Inscriptions of Nabonidus," *Anatolian Studies* 8:35-92 [1958]) 88. For a more recent discussion, see Paul-Alain Beaulieu, "Nabonidus the Mad King: A Reconsideration of His Steles from Harran and Babylon," in *Representations of Political Power: Case Histories from Times of Change and Dissolving Order in the Ancient Near East*, Marlies Heinz and Marian H. Feldman (eds.), (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 2007) pp. 137-166.

[171] Newsom, *Daniel*, 130. See also Florentino Garcia Martinez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), especially ch. 4, "The Prayer of Nabonidus: A New Synthesis," pp. 116-136.

property and possessions in peace they brought before me."[172] Thus Nabonidus' retreat from rulership was one of divine ordainment and supernatural sustenance for both himself and the inhabitants of the land where he resided. Moreover, their sustenance consisted of "waters of rain," which may be akin to the decree of the watcher for Nebuchadnezzar in Dan. 4:12: "Let him be bathed with the dew of heaven." As Newsom and Breed note, "one can only speculate as to why Jewish authors would have been interested in composing stories in which Nabonidus recognizes the supremacy of the God of Israel," and why such traditions would be reassigned to the king who destroyed the Jerusalem Temple.[173] Thus, the Harran B inscription and Dan. 4 bear similarities in both content and structure, but in order to understand how and why these similarities came to be, we must consider the possibility of their confluence in the Persian and Hellenistic periods under different trends of literary production.

After Nabonidus' death and the fall of the Neo-Babylonian empire to Achaemenid Persia, a number of polemical texts were composed and circulated regarding the supposed incompetencies of Nabonidus, the controversial king. From this literary surge surrounding Nabonidus, the prehistory and Babylonian traditions of Dan. 4. emerged. A likely remnant of these traditions was discovered among the Qumran scrolls and is known as the Prayer of Nabonidus (4Q242).[174] Also composed in Aramaic and in first-person like Dan. 4, the

[172] Col. I, 3608. Gadd, "Harran Inscriptions," 59.

[173] Newsom, *Daniel,* 129. See also Newsom's argument for

[174] A number of other texts found at Qumran including "Pseudo-Daniel" 4Q243-5, Aramaic Apocalypse 4Q246, Four Kingdoms 4Q552-3, and Book of Giants 4Q203; 4Q530-32 have been placed in discussion with the Danielic corpora. For a summary see, Peter W. Flint, "The Daniel Tradition at Qumran," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (VTSup 83/2; eds. J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 329–67. Similar themes, including the succession of kingdoms, modes of revelation, and the Aramaic language, are all points of interest and fruitful research. See Ryan E. Stokes, "The Throne Visions of Daniel 7, 1 'Enoch' 14, and the Qumran 'Book of Giants' (4Q530): An Analysis of Their Literary Relationship," DSD 15 (2008): 340-358.

fragmentary text tells of Nabonidus' seven years in Teima due to a severe sickness instead of a self-imposed hiatus for ten years attested in the Harran B inscriptions.[175] Most relevant for Danielic traditions is the figure to whom the king's healing is attributed: a Jewish diviner (גזר יהודי {גבר} והוא) who encourages him to exalt the Most High God.[176] Neither the extant version of the *Prayer of Nabonidus* nor the Harran B inscription, however, mention any animal imagery or transformation of the king, making Dan. 4 unique among its contemporaries. Loren Stuckenbruck speculates that the lacunae in 4Q242 may have included a description of the king's "theriomanic, animal-like existence," but there is no further evidence to support this beyond speculation.[177] Furthermore, the proposed dating of the *Prayer* to the sixth century is based on its polemicizing nature that attempts to explain Nabonidus' hiatus from Babylon (although his name is spelled נבני) and simultaneously provide a critique of his worship of his gods, even though the manuscript of 4Q242 dates to the Herodian period. The text's general agreement with Neo-Babylonian sources, like Harran B, also prompts an earlier dating.[178]

In sum, general consensus holds that Dan. 4 is likely based on Nabonidan traditions, such as Harran B and something like the *Prayer of Nabonidus* preserved at Qumran, which were later glossed with the character Nebuchadnezzar. In seeing them as textual influences, scholars attempt to provide an explanation for the aforementioned chronological and thematic issues in

---

[175] As Newsom cites ("Why Nabonidus?" 61-62), see Susan Ackerman's analysis on the importance of the particular affliction Nabonidus is said to have endured, which she translates "grievous boils." Ackerman, "The Prayer of Nabonidus, Elijah on Mount Carmel, and the Development of Monotheism in Israel," in The Echoes of Many Texts (ed. W. G. Dever and J. E. Wright; BJS 313; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 60.

[176] The phrase "He pardoned my sin (חטאי שבק לה)" is preserved (frag. 1, 4), as well as אחלמת, which may be translated "I was made well," or "I consulted a dream interpreter" (frag. 4, 1).

[177] Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "The Formation and Re-formation of Daniel in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (James H. Charlesworth, ed.; Baylor University Press, 2006), 105.

[178] See Stuckenbruck, "Formation," 105-6, for a summary of both of these points.

the Danielic corpora more broadly. As to why Nabonidus became an important figure in early Jewish literary sources, Newsom has provided the most compelling explanation by seeing Jewish communities participating in a larger Babylonian trend that was divided between support of Nabonidus and Cyrus.[179] I extend this argument of Nabonidus being a figure of complexity and divisiveness for Jewish communities to explain why Nebuchadnezzar—an equally complex and unstable monarch of intrigue—became the mediating figure for Dan. 4. The Danielic authors innovated upon the Nabonidan stories by blending them with an animal transformation, one that features distinct nuances in the MT and OG. But because of other answered questions and the uncertainties of the transmission of Nabonidan traditions, scholars have turned to Mesopotamian sources, both textual and iconographical, in hopes of providing further context for or source of influence for Nebuchadnezzar's memorable transformation.

Epic of Gilgamesh

Turning now to parallels to Dan. 4 in the ANE, the first proposition submitted by scholars is the possible relationship between Nebuchadnezzar's transformation and the "wild man" motif preserved most famously in the *Epic of Gilgamesh* in the character Enkidu.[180] In his monograph dedicated to Dan. 4, Matthias Henze argues that the wild man trope is what most influenced the emergence of the legend of Nebuchadnezzar. Ultimately based in a tradition that intends to compare urbanized civilization with primordial times, Enkidu is described as roaming in the mountains and outside the bounds of the urban center, eating alongside cattle, and with long hair compared to that of a woman's. His metamorphosis is an evolution of sorts that brings him in

[179] Newsom, "Why Nabonidus?" 75-76.

[180] See Susan Niditch, "My Brother Esau is a Hairy Man": Hair and Identity in Ancient Israel (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008); and Gregory Mobley, "The Wild Man in the Bible and the Ancient Near East," JBL 116/2 1997 217-33.

from the fringes of society and into the experiences of a civilized and fully developed man, including his intercourse with Shamhat and battle with Gilgamesh. Henze's excerpts are as follows:

> "There was a young man who came from the mountain […]
>
> He ever walks about on the mountains […]
>
> All the time he eats herbs with cattle,
>
> All the time he sets his feet at the water-place.
>
> Shaggy with hair his whole body,
>
> He is furnished with tresses like a woman.
>
> His locks of hair grew luxuriant like Nisaba.
>
> He knows neither people nor country.
>
> He is dressed like Sumuqan.[181]

Nebuchadnezzar's transformation, Henze argues, is built upon these same plot points — being driven from civilization and contact with humans, eating grass among the animals of the field, and long hair — and thus represents a devolution to a more primordial state, one that "reverses the gradual development of humankind."[182] The connection, Henze emphasizes, is not a literary one so as to imply that the authors of Dan. 4 possessed a copy of the Gilgamesh Epic but is instead a more flexible sharing of similar traditions.

One of the more compelling aspects that can be drawn from Henze's proposition is Dan. 4's negotiation of "wild" and "domestic." For Henze and his exploration of the Gilgamesh Epic, the difference between wildness and domestication is managed by only a few categories,

[181] Gilgamesh I iii 29.32; I iii 33-34; I ii 36-38. (Henze, *Madness*, 98).

[182] Henze, *Madness*, 98.

including social location, eating habits, and physical characteristics. Without identifying the categories as such, Henze maps out the textual parallels side by side; I am hesitant to agree, however, that "each…finds an *exact* counterpart."[183] Instead, the wild-domestic dynamic being explored in Dan. 4, I suggest, is not one of precise counterparts but of blending. Although often set against each other as opposing and incompatible categories, Daniel's portrayal of the pair exhibits yet another illustration of hybridity, boundary blurring, and mixture. This resistance to classification recurs throughout the Danielic corpora, but is especially evident in Dan.4 and evidences the flexibility of the modes of Jewish identity negotiation with animality as one of those modes.

On the wild and domestic expressions of animality, Ken Stone, for example, devotes an entire chapter to a discussion of wild animals and the distinctions (and indistinctions) between domesticated and undomesticated spaces in his recent work.[184] The "zoological gaze" Stone describes is not a singularized or static conception of wild animals in the HB but a multiplicitous and diverse one that blends danger, divinity, awe, and relationality. In the same way, the description of Nebuchadnezzar's transformation purports a complex mixture of wildness *and* domestication. The king, although sent beyond the civilized boundaries of human urbanization and into "the wild," is indeed made to eat grass alongside the wild animals of the field (חיות ברא) but in the manner of domesticated oxen (כתורין).[185] His behavior, then, is quite domestic whereas his social location and physical transformation (likened to that of a lion and an eagle) lean toward the wild. Thus, relegating the Nebuchadnezzar incident to purely a denigration into

[183] Emphasis mine. Henze, *Madness*, 98

[184] Ken Stone, *Reading the Hebrew Bible*, 116-139.

[185] Daniel's interpretation and the dream's fulfillment (4:22, 29) have both parts of the expression, whereas the watcher's decree in Nebuchadnezzar's description does not mention oxen.

wildness does not present the entirety of the picture the narrative presents.

Returning to the "wild man" motif exhibited in the Epic of Gilgamesh and elsewhere, Patricia Cox Miller discusses human-animal hybrid creatures such as the centaur who represents the classic "wild man" and explains:

> The wild man held in a tensive balance two contrary views of the relation of the human to the nature and the animal: on the one hand, identifying with the wild man signified a regressive return to bestiality, while on the other, sympathizing with him signaled a radical rejection of the values, norms, and institutions of a civilization now viewed as cramping and corrupt.[186]

Although Nebuchadnezzar's transformation does not meld with all aspects of the "wild man" motif, it does share the "tensive balance" in its portrayal of wildness. The danger and liminality of wildness is simultaneously held in the same container with reverence and respect for the critique that wildness offers of civilization. In sum, the king's engagement with wild things or wildness is something to be feared (as demonstrated by Daniel's response) and at the same time is perceived as providing an experience toward his betterment and restored state.

Kummaya's Dream Vision of the Netherworld

In the early 1980s, Helge S. Kvanvig was the first to draw the connection between the four hybrid creatures in Dan. 7 with the composite animals found in a text known as *Kummaya's Dream Vision of the Netherworld,* or *The Netherworld Vision of an Assyrian Prince*.[187] The seventh century BCE Akkadian text was likely composed as a politically motivated document

[186] Miller, *Eye of the Animal,* 118.

[187] See Kvanvig, Helge S. "An Akkadian Vision as Background for Daniel 7," ST 35 (1981) 85-89. and *Roots of Apocalypticism: The Mesopotamian Background for the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man.* WMANT 61; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988.

intended to encourage Neo-Assyrian royalty to remain true to Assyria's policies instead of the influence of pro-Babylonia supporters. The content of the dream-vision is rife with part-human, part-animal creatures that an Assyrian prince named Kummaya encounters during his otherworldly journey, culminating in a throne-vision of the god Nergal. More recently on the same text, Christopher Hays has argued that the Babylonian dream-vision bears more affinity to Nebuchadnezzar's animal transformation in Dan. 4 than ch. 7.[188] Hays' argument depends on the association of the bird-features of Nebuchadnezzar's transformation with Mesopotamian underworld creatures, especially eagles and vultures.[189] His argument also rests on how that same bird-like imagery reflects the extent of the king's suffering during his transformation and the assault of demonic powers. In both aspects of Hays' presentation, the parallels with Dan. 4:30 are only ever partially present, a limitation for which he accounts saying, "Comprehensive fidelity to a set of images is not to be expected, since each text moves within certain literary constraints."[190] Hector Avalos and others have pointed out that such bird-like creatures are not restricted to underworld settings[191] and thus deem the connection made by Hays a tenuous one.

For my analysis of Dan. 4, I argue that the entirety of the chapter be examined, including the character arc of Nebuchadnezzar from his hubris to transformation, and finally his restoration. In the sources Hays presents, there is no return from the underworld or reinstatement

[188] Hays notes that Kvanvig's claim that Daniel had access to Mesopotamian texts, a leap that Hays never makes in terms of literary dependance. Christopher B. Hays, "Chirps from the Dust: The Affliction of Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel 4:30 in Its Ancient near Eastern Context," *Journal of Biblical Literature,* Vol. 126, No. 2 (Summer, 2007), pp. 305-325. For further discussion of underworld imagery in Mesopotamia, see Hays' citation of Thorkild Jacobsen, *The Treasures of Darkness: A History of Mesopotamian Religion* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976).

[189] Hays, "Chirps," 308-18.

[190] Ibid. 324.

[191] See Avalos, "Nebuchadnezzar's Affliction," 500.

after the sufferer is met by bird-like hybrids. For Dan. 4, however, the preservation of the king's rulership is present in each aspect of the dream-vision. While Nebuchadnezzar is exiled for "seven times" or years, his preservation is exhibited by the leaving of the stump and roots of the tree, the interpretation of which is provided by Daniel most clearly in v. 23. There is no doubt in the narrative, either from the reader's perspective nor to Daniel as interpreter, that Nebuchadnezzar will be restored to his former position. Furthermore, although Hays makes the comparison to the psalmist's cycle of affliction, salvation, and thanksgiving, there is nothing to indicate physical suffering during the course of Nebuchadnezzar's transformation in the MT. The king's removal from society may be viewed as a type of punishment, to be sure, but the physical torment evidenced in Kummaya's Dream Vision to which Hays likens Nebuchadnezzar's suffering is not reflected in the MT.[192]

In sum, Hays' argument is compelling, on the one hand, in both the variety of source texts he presents (albeit often only loosely connected), and his analysis of how hybrid creatures associated with death and torment are portrayed in those sources. On the other hand, to only consider Dan. 4:30 in his discussion obscures other aspects of the narrative that remain central to the both the character arc of Nebuchadnezzar and the pericope as a whole. If a study depends on linguistic parallels only, those parallels must be convincing. Whereas if they are not comprehensive or even complete, perhaps a broader perspective of the narrative or text should be engaged. My analysis emphasizes the full arc of Nebuchadnezzar's narrative represented in the text, climaxing with his reintegration and reemergence into society.

[192] An exception is found in the OG's account of Daniel's interpretation that the angels will pursue Nebuchadnezzar and whip him in order to execute the full extent of his sentence upon him (4:23). The whippings, however, are not mentioned in the fulfillment of the decree and only a sense of imprisonment is indicated by the king's shackles and repentance.

Dingir.šà.dib.ba incantations

In an attempt to synthesize aspects of both Henze's and Hays' arguments, Hector Avalos suggests that both perspectives show important contributions but are also incomplete. Avalos then introduces the seventh century BCE Mesopotamian dingir.šà.dib.ba incantations to the conversation and highlights some possible parallels between Nebuchadnezzar's "curse" and the magico-medical curse afflictions therein.[193] If the reader understands Nebuchadnezzar's transformation as strictly divine punishment, and if the incantations he introduces are indeed "curses," then the associations that Avalos makes are worthwhile. I argue, however, that neither of these assumptions can be firmly evidenced in the text of Dan. 4 Avalos' argument leans heavily on the following incantation:

> I am an ox, I do not know the plants I eat
>
> I am a sheep, I do not know the absolution rite in which I take part
>
> I am river water, I do not know where I am going
>
> I am a ship, [I do not know] at which quay I put in
>
> the iniquities of mankind are more numerous than the hairs on his head
>
> I have trodden on my iniquities, sins, and transgressions, [which] were heaped
>
> up [like leaves]
>
> On this day let them be released and absolved …[194]

Based on this passage, Avalos concludes that "an individual could be cursed as an earthly animal in order to illustrate a lack of common sense." However, the statements made in the incantation

[193] Avalos, "Nebuchadnezzar's Affliction," 503-7. For more on the incantations, see Avalos, *Illness and Health Care in the Ancient Near East,* 137-141.

[194] Avalos ("Nebuchadnezzar's Affliction," 503) cites Wilfred G. Lambert's translation of the incantation, which I utilize here. Lambert, "dingir.šà.dib.ba Incantations," *JNES* 33 (1974): 267.

are declared in first-person and do not recount an actual curse that occurred, making a iterary relationship to Dan. 4 less than convincing. Furthermore, the final line of the incantation is clear in its purpose: the incantation is not a curse from a deity but a magico-medical remedy intended to absolve oneself from transgressive acts and in order to avoid punishment in the future.

The incantation's connection is, I suggest, better suited in dialogue with literature adjacent to Dan. 4 concerning Nabonidus such as the Harran inscriptions and *Prayer of Nabonidus* discussed above. But this is not the argument that Avalos presents, and requires one to take significant leaps. As the presentation stands, the incantations do not shed much light on the text of Dan. 4 nor on Nebuchadnezzar's transformation as the Danielic corpora preserves it.

The Heroic Encounter

In addition to the number of texts that can be brought into dialogue with Dan. 4, visual and iconographical evidence also plays a role in how ideological frameworks are communicated. One of these visual motifs is the Persian Heroic Encounter, a prevalent relief occurring throughout the Persian empire in monumental settings as well as seals and coins. Brian Charles DiPalma has recently compared Nebuchadnezzar's transformation with the Heroic Encounter and suggested that, based on the similar hybrid creature featured in both media, the former may have drawn upon the latter.[195] The Heroic Encounter relief depicts a man, usually the specific Persian king or archetype for Persian kingship in general, standing next to a hybrid creature on its hind legs and over whom the hero is seen to exert dominance. DiPalma suggests that, in the motif's application in Dan. 4, the king or hero represents YHWH and the hybrid creature represents Nebuchadnezzar. Two versions of the relief are extant: the "control encounter," which

[195] Brian Charles DiPalma, "The Animalistic Nebuchadnezzar and the Heroic Encounter: Daniel 4:30 Iconographically Revisited." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 139, no. 3 (2020): 499-520

depicts the hero subordinating the hybrid creature with his hand, is extant exclusively in stamp seals, and the "combat encounter," which depicts the hero subduing the hybrid creature with one hand and stabbing it with the other, occurs primarily in monumental reliefs.

In sum, DiPalma shows that, on the one hand, Nebuchadnezzar's animalistic descriptions and the Heroic Encounter share both bovine and avian features as described in Dan. 4:30, which is a helpful comparison considering the hybridity of both descriptions. On the other hand, DiPalma struggles to bring parallels between the role of the hero who represents YHWH, and how YHWH is portrayed in the Dan. 4. To account for this difficulty, DiPalma looks to an argument of imperial resistance and proposes the following: "Rather than suggesting that YHWH and the king [the hero] are equivalent, the text creates a hierarchical ruling structure wherein Nebuchadnezzar's sovereignty depends on what YHWH permits in YHWH's greater and more encompassing sovereignty over all."[196] In other words, Dan. 4 utilizes and simultaneously subverts the imagery of the Heroic Encounter and its meaning for Achaemenid imperialism by using a similar, basic framework and yet adjusting it enough so as to subtly challenge the empire's visual propaganda.

Although a valuable study of hybrid creatures in visual media during the Achaemenid period and their possible influence on biblical literature, DiPalma's argument has serious limitations. Apart from hybrid animal imagery, which is a widespread phenomenon in ANE imperial settings that is well attested in biblical literature, the Heroic Encounter motif and Dan. 4:30 share no other common elements. The narrative arch of Nebuchadnezzar's transformation does not conclude with his subordination as hybrid animal, defeated by the superior imperialism of YHWH. Rather, the king is restored to his former status, prestige, and role as sovereign

[196] DiPalma, "Animalistic," 519.

having acknowledged the supreme governance of the King of Heaven. So while the complexities of negotiating Jewish identity under imperial rule are indeed present and might be observed at the intersection of iconography and text, as DiPalma so suggests, one must be careful to not excise one textual snippet from its whole at the expense of the broader literary arch.

In conclusion of the sources summarized above, the ANE examples brought into dialogue with Dan. 4 come from a variety of eras, locations, and genres. While each example is claimed by scholars to have influence on Nebuchadnezzar's transformation, each has its respective limitations as a primary inspiration for the narrative. What is common among between them, however, is a concern for boundaries and the inevitability, albeit danger, of transgressing such boundaries. Whether blending domestic and wild as seen in the *Epic of Gilgamesh*, or the realms of the living and the dead in the *Dream-Vision of the Netherworld*, the anxieties of boundary blurring are expressly portrayed in Nebuchadnezzar's transformation. My review of the above arguments that attempt to find ANE sources of influence for or parallels to Dan. 4 underscore the limitations of the approaches, especially in their often only partial examination of the chapter and the drastic differences between the intended functions of the sources. Although the notion of "influence" need not be exact for there to be a connection, the nature of the influence must be specified. For Dan. 4, as I have demonstrated in the previous two sections with my analysis of Dan. 4 and the summary of ANE sources above, I argue that the complex and boundary-blurring character of Nebuchadnezzar in his animality and foreignness is the central concern of the chapter and in Jewish identity formation.

2.6 Prophetic Influence: Jeremiah 25-29

The oracles of Jeremiah have played a significant role on the formation of the Danielic

corpora,[197] and I argue in the following section that this is especially evident in Dan. 4 and the story of Nebuchadnezzar's transformation. Scholarship often places Dan. 9 as the center point of discussion of Jeremiah's influence on the Danielic corpora since it hearkens to a version of Jeremiah's seventy years prophecy, reinterpreting it as "seventy weeks of years."[198] Jeremiah's influence on Daniel is also evident in the chronology set up by Dan. 1, the concern with the temple vessels in Dan. 5, and the overall character arch of Nebuchadnezzar. To the character development of Nebuchadnezzar, Newsom affirms that "Dan. 1-6 is indebted to Jeremiah for its characterization of Nebuchadnezzar and his divinely sanctioned role in world events."[199] In agreement with Newsom's observation, I draw attention to three expressions of this influence within Dan. 4 in the following section: the king's role as ordained servant of God, Daniel's inversion of the "set time" framework inspired by Jeremiah, and Nebuchadnezzar's association with the nonhuman animal world. Each of these characteristics facilitate, I argue, threads of seemingly contradictory familiarity and foreignness, a narrative tension made clear in Nebuchadnezzar's animal transformation.

Nebuchadnezzar, My Servant

Despite the accounts of the king's destruction of Jerusalem described in biblical texts (2

[197] For Dan. 2, see Michael Segal, "From Joseph to Daniel: The Literary Development of the Narrative in Daniel 2." VT 59 (2009): 123-49. For Dan. 9, see Lester L. Grabbe, "The End of the Desolations of Jerusalem: From Jeremiah's 70 years to Daniel's 70 Weeks of Years." In *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee,* ed. Craig A. Evans and William F. Stinespring. Homage series 10. Atlanta: Scholars, 1987, 67-72

[198] See Walter Brueggemann, *The Theology of the Book of Jeremiah* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007) 183-4. Jer. 25:11-12; 29:10. Some have understood this statement as proving the reification of the book of Jeremiah prior to the Maccabean Revolt, such as John Hill in *Friend of Foe?: The Figure of Babylon in the Book of Jeremiah MT* (Leiden: Brill, 1999) 211. For a recent argument against this assumption, see Seth Sanders' "Daniel and the Origins of Biblical Interpretation," *Prooftexts* 37: 2018, 1-55.

[199] Newsom, *Daniel,* 41. Also Werner E. Lemke, "Nebukadrezzar, my servant," CBQ 28 (1966): 49; Arie Van der Kooij, "Jeremiah 27:5–15: How do MT and LXX relate to each other?" JNSL 20/1 (1994): 77.

Kgs 24:10-16; 25:1-21; Jer. 39:10), the image of Nebuchadnezzar for ancient Jewish communities is far from simple.[200] Throughout Jeremiah's oracles, Nebuchadnezzar is ascribed the epithet "my servant," that is, the servant of Judah's deity, a total of three times.[201] The second instance, Jer. 27:5-6 and its recapitulation to Hannaniah in 28:14 are most relevant for our discussion. Beginning in 27:5-6, the divine oracle comes to Jeremiah saying:

> I myself have made the earth and the human and the animal (הבהמה) which are on the face of the earth by my great power and my outstretched arm. I have given them to whomever is upright in my eyes. And now I have given all of these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, my servant (עבדי). And also the animals of the field (חית השדה) I have given him to serve him.

The designation עבדיis concerning to ancient and modern commentators, and begs the question why a foreign king responsible for the destruction of the First Temple would be allowed a title that, as Smelik and others have noted, is only given to Jacob, David, and the prophets of Israel.[202] Furthermore, the designation only occurs in the MT and is entirely absent from the LXX, highlighting once more the subtle discrepancies between the Greek and Palestinian Jewish

[200] To account for this conflicted image, Wesselius implies that the court tales originate in the displacement of the Jewish exiles prior to the destruction of the temple, thus accounting for " a view which can be compared to the rather positive [image of Nebuchadnezzar] in the book of Jeremiah." ("The Literary Nature," 248) This fits into Wesselius' overall presentation which argues for the unity of the "book," its composition during the earliest Babylonian exiles, and its compositional difficulties having exact parallels in Genesis and Ezra. His broad (and narrow) argument is not convincing, however, and, in his discussion of Dan. 3, admits that his proposal conveniently "avoids all theological traps which could be involved in the idea of doubting or postulating God's existence or his ability or willingness to save his followers," a betrayal of his underlying theological motivations. (262)

[201] Contra Lemke, Overholt finds Nebuchadnezzar's designation as "my servant" in line with the sovereign divine will of chastising Judah for her erring. See Thomas W. Overholt, "King Nebuchadnezzar in the Jeremiah Tradition, CBQ 30 (1968): 39-48, as well as Anneli Aejelaeus, "'Nebuchadnezzar, My Servant': Redaction History and Textual Development in Jer. 27," *in Interpreting Translation*, ed. F. Garcia Martinez and M. Vervenne (Leuven: University Press, 2005), 1-18.

[202] Klaas A.D. Smelik, "My Servant Nebuchadnezzar: The Use of the Epithet 'My Servant' for the Babylonian King Nebuchadnezzar in the Book of Jeremiah," *Vetus Testamentum* 64, no. 1 (2014), 112.

communities' views of Nebuchadnezzar.[203] Thus, the passage explains why Nebuchadnezzar is given the lands as well as the wild animals: he has been deemed upright, or worthy in some way. Unsurprisingly, we know that Jeremiah's oracle is not received well by the king and rather met with great hostility, which ultimately results in his imprisonment and punishment. Already in the initial context of Jeremiah's presentation of the *davar*, the role of Nebuchadnezzar is fraught with anxiety for both the prophet and the Judah's monarch.

"Until That Time"

Jeremiah's oracles are not only positive, however, and they limit the scope of time allotted for Nebuchadnezzar's sovereignty over the nations and its animals.[204] In 27:7, Jeremiah continues: "All the nations will serve him and his son and his grandson *until the time* (עד בא עת) of his own land comes; then many nations and great kings will make him their slave." Thus, from the beginning of Nebuchadnezzar's decree as "my servant," the passage provides a timestamp, which is articulated elsewhere as "seventy years" (Jer. 25:11-12; 29:10).[205] Jeremiah presents the decree of exaltation to the title "my servant" and declares Nebuchadnezzar's reign over the surrounding nations, including Judah. He is reminded at the outset, however, the limits of this reign and that he shall be subjugated by the same methods he subjugated others. As an inversion of Jeremiah's "set time" framework, Daniel 4's timeline of the king's transformation

[203] Smelik summarizes a number of scholars' attempts to explain these differences by way of text critical hypotheses including those of Werner Lemke, Thomas Overholt, and Emanuel Tov ("My Servant Nebuchadnezzar," 117-121).

[204] Jeremiah 50-51 is explicit in its oracle for the destruction of Babylon and its inhabitants. The chapters teem with domestic animals and creatures of the wilderness, and weave between metaphors and realities that are difficult to discern. A similar and yet distinct parallel can be made of the animalization, even monstrous, personification of Egypt in Ezekiel's oracles. See Safwat Marzouk, *Egypt as Monster in the Book of Ezekiel* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), and especially p. 41 for his brief discussion and comparison with Jeremiah 51's oracle against Babylon.

[205] Isaiah's oracle to Tyre also limits her time of desolation to seventy years. The Chaldeans are also cited as playing in role in their demise, "establishing them among ציים," which may be translated as a group of wild creatures or even demons (Isa. 23:13-17).

results in a different conclusion. When Nebuchadnezzar has his dream, the peak of his power is disrupted by the decree of the watcher regarding his impending future: the removal of his imperial reach (his branches) and his stature among the nations (his trunk). He is told, however, that the time is limited to "seven times," or until he acknowledges the God of Heaven. He then remains among the animals of the field, eating grass, and being bathed with the dew of heaven until the designated time frame is complete. And with the same swiftness that the decree was effectuated in the first place, Nebuchadnezzar is restored to his former prosperity and then some. Thus, whereas Jeremiah's oracle sets a countdown for Babylon's destruction, the time limit in Dan. 4 culminates in promised restoration. I argue that Dan. 4 potently exhibits how the divinely appointed times of both destruction and restoration between Judah and Nebuchadnezzar are interwoven with one another, and highlight the complexities of the Jew-foreigner binary that are not altogether distinct.

As Wild Animals

Turning now to the nonhuman animals in the passage, Jer. 27:5-6 first presents a tripartite structure of that which has been made by the divine: the earth (הארץ), the human (האדם), and the animal (הבהמה). The divisions of the created world are God's to give to the one whom he deems "upright," similar to but distinct from the trope in Dan. 4:14, the kingdoms that are given to "whomever he wishes" (ולמן די יצבא יתננה). While Jer. 27 provides some rationale for why a king is given authority over the created world, Dan. 4 presents it as an issue of pure volition. In other words, rulership is given by God to "whomever he wishes" and no reason is provided to justify it. Both the human and nonhuman might be perceived as being lumped together, exhibiting a similar status as subjected to the divine sovereign.[206] Although it may be tempting to make broad

[206] See Strømmen, *Biblical,* 102-5. She concludes of Nebuchadnezzar's transformation: "God is the only and

strokes, the passage in Jeremiah is not without nuance in its attention to the nonhuman animal world. It makes a distinction first between what has been created and what Nebuchadnezzar receives, as well as between the type of animal given to him as servants. Although God has made and rules over "the animal," it is only the "creatures of the field" (חית השדה) who are given to serve Nebuchadnezzar.[207]

Nebuchadnezzar's association with wild animals is reiterated in Jer. 28:14 in a recapitulation of Jeremiah's oracle intended for Hananiah: "Thus says YHWH of armies, the God of Israel. A yoke of iron I have put upon the neck of all these nations to serve Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon and serve him they will. And also the animals of the field (וגם את חית השדה) I have given to him." Newsom points to this verse as the possible allusion behind Dan. 2:38 which includes the animals of the field (חיות בראּ) as those under the rulership of the gold head, Nebuchadnezzar, but does not bring Dan. 4:12 [Ar. 4:9] into the discussion with Jeremiah.[208] Collins, however, does note it, albeit briefly, deeming Dan. 4:12 "an ironic reversal of the king's status." In Jeremiah, according to Collins, Nebuchadnezzar is lord over the wild animals and in Daniel he becomes one. But the reversal is not so simple, as I have highlighted throughout my analysis. The narrative of Nebuchadnezzar's punishment in Jeremiah is not synonymous with the narrative presented in either the MT or OG Daniel, primarily in the

ultimate sovereign master—all the living are his pets or prey. The proper hierarchy is that between divine and animal, not human and nonhuman" (105).

[207] חית השדה is often translated as "beasts of the field." "Wild animals" or even "undomesticated animals" better captures the meaning and context of the term.

[208] Later in her discussion, Newsom does mention Jeremiah 27-28's influence on the characterization of Nebuchadnezzar, especially Dan. 4's presentation of the king's sovereignty and the "mythic" themes that might be associated with his rule over the created world vis-á-vis neo-Assyrian and Babylonian motifs of human domination over animals (*Daniel*, 77-78).

monarch's restoration to his former, divinely-ordained status.[209]

An additional point of connection between Jer. 28:14 and Dan. 4 is the presence of physical bonds or restrictions. In the second articulation of the oracle in 28:14 where the yoke (על) plays a central role in Jeremiah's confrontation with Hananiah. The passage highlights the forced servitude placed not only upon the nations, but also the wild animals. It is unclear whether the yoke of iron (על ברזל) in 28:14 should be applied to only the nations or the animals as well, but in either case, both groups are given over to the restrictive possession of Nebuchadnezzar. Likewise in Nebuchadnezzar's dream in Dan. 4:15 (Ar. 4:12), the cut-down stump and roots (the king himself) is restricted by a bond or shackle of iron and bronze (אסור די פרזל ונחש), and is relegated to the natural world: the grass of the field, the dew of heaven, and wild animals in the grass of the earth. The king's portion (חלקה) then becomes shared *with* the wild animals (חיותא) instead of his domination over them. The significance of the reversal in Dan. 4 shows the text's reworking of animalic themes central to Jeremiah, and reflects a more unstable and complex view of both Nebuchadnezzar as a character and divinely-ordained sovereignty for the authors of Dan. 4.

As both a fulfillment *and* inversion of the oracle received by Jeremiah, I argue that Dan. 4 maintains the aspect of punishment prophesied regarding Babylon and simultaneously overturns it to situate Nebuchadnezzar's restoration within his animal transformation.

2.7 Conclusion: Nebuchadnezzar, the Familiar Other

The character of Nebuchadnezzar, despite the efforts of ancient and modern interpreters,

[209] Collins, *Daniel*, 227. Indeed, the OG does emphasize the notion of Nebuchadnezzar's punishment in his transformation but nevertheless makes sure to restore the king to a glorified position and status after his "sentence" has been fulfilled.

does not cooperate with any categories either in the Hebrew Bible or Danielic corpora. His foreignness is softened by his designation as "my servant," but his integral role in Judah's history is tainted with painful memories of destruction and violence. And although the oracles concerning Babylon's demise are clearly articulated, they remain a site of reinterpretation and adaptation for the authors of both the MT and OG of Dan. 4, as though a mirror for Judah's own journey and desire for restoration.[210] Although studies have sought to explain Nebuchadnezzar's transformation in light of ANE texts and motifs, which no doubt played a part in the framework presented in the chapter, they are ultimately unsatisfying in their attempt to reinforce binaries that Dan. 4 is intentionally inverting and reimagining. By reintegrating an already animal-associated Nebuchadnezzar, and imagining a restoration against the grain of the demise of empires, Dan. 4 constructs a Nebuchadnezzar who reflects the tangled anxieties of its authors.

In Hannah Strømmen's study of animality and the intersections of biblical literature, she discusses the animals in Daniel—including Nebuchadnezzar—in terms of their political functions. Like mine, her analysis also focuses on boundary blending and dissolving the distinctions between human and animal, but in the process trades one hierarchy for another. Like other traditional interpretations of Daniel, Strømmen sees animality as ontologically reductive, understanding Nebuchadnezzar's transformation as a demotion to the animal world. "The proper hierarchy," according to Strømmen's view of the book of Daniel (for her, that "book" is the MT),

[210] The story of the restoration of Nebuchadnezzar may be similarly categorized with Manasseh's repentance episode in 2 Chron. 33:1-20 which describes his capture by the king of Assyria and exile to Babylon. Although the "wicked" king's restoration is absent from the Kings narrative, it is an important part of 2 Chronicles' telling of the Assyrian exile, as well as the rebuilding of Jerusalem's outer wall, the construction of which Manasseh is accredited (33:14). Mattias Henze draws attention to the parallel between Manasseh and Nebuchadnezzar saying that the similarities were based on a "popular conversion motif according to which a biblical villain repents and turns into a zealous follower of the God of Israel" (*Madness,* 104 fn. 4).

is "between divine and animal, not human and nonhuman."[211] Furthermore, she asserts that divine sovereignty is fundamentally volatile and a potentially "carnivorous machine that can kill and eat what is thus presented as its rightful prey."[212] The hierarchy proposed by Strømmen then is not really one between divine and animal but rather between a dominant animal (God) and less dominant animals (human and nonhuman animals). In light of my analysis of Dan. 4 and the complex views of both the animality and foreign "otherness" of Nebuchadnezzar, I suggest that arguing for the replacement of one binary with another is counterproductive and does not provide the necessary nuance between specific texts in the Danielic corpora.

In review, Nebuchadnezzar's "otherness" is explored in two primary ways in Dan. 4. For one, the figure of Nebuchadnezzar acts as a particularized expression of Gentile or foreign otherness. As seen in Jeremiah, however, the otherness of foreign kings is more complex than simply being "for" or "against" Judah. In the divine's instrumentalization of foreign rulers to chastise Israel and Judah in prophetic literature, especially Babylon, their futures are inevitably bound up with one another. Daniel 4 takes this a step further and inverts Babylon's countdown, not culminating in destruction but restoration. Furthermore, Nebuchadnezzar's position of kingship and sovereignty only exaggerate this otherness even more, especially in his role in the destruction of the temple and confiscation of its vessels. And although he may be portrayed as a volatile and violent figure in other stories of Daniel, in both the OG and MT of Dan. 4 he is presented as quite the opposite. For the OG, Nebuchadnezzar receives extensive divine attention during the course of his sentence and comes to a realized knowledge of the divine sovereign despite his animal transformation being framed as atonement for destruction of the temple. The

[211] Strømmen, *Biblical*, 105.

[212] Ibid, 108.

MT, perhaps counterintuitively, is more ambivalent regarding Nebuchadnezzar's role in the destruction of the temple. As I have argued, I suggest that this absence of anti-Nebuchadnezzar rhetoric in Dan. 4 reflects the author(s) anxieties in the king's simultaneous divinely-ordained rule and his destruction of the temple in Jewish cultural memory.

The second element of Nebuchadnezzar's otherness is in his familiarity with and exposure to the animal world. The king was already associated with animals, as shown in Jeremiah, which I argue was a key literary influence on Dan. 4 in particular, and thus Nebuchadnezzar's further acquaintance with animals *as* one of them amplifies this relationship even more. In addition, the king's transformation is that of a hybrid creature and one that participated in a range of nonhuman experiences including being likened to a tree, ox, eagle, and lion. The emphasis, then, lies in the fluidity of these boundaries and the attempt of Jewish communities to come to terms with these boundaries (or lack thereof) in a most contested figure of Nebuchadnezzar.

Other fields such as ecological studies in philosophy and constructive theology have latched onto Nebuchadnezzar as one of the ultimate transformation stories. If one takes the final form of the MT at face value, the stages of composition are of less concern and thus the character arc of Nebuchadnezzar might be interpreted as one unit beginning in ch. 1 and concluding in ch. 4, or even arguably in ch. 7.[213] The king's journey, in this light, is a drastic one and remains the most compelling character development in the Danielic corpora. In this vein, Eric Daryl Meyer has recently argued that in Dan. 4, "becoming animal has a salutary effect on Nebuchadnezzar's character" and provides a narratival example of what Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari describe

[213] My analysis does not hold to this understanding of the MT but it nevertheless remains an influential, if not dominant, view in many theological studies.

as "the becoming animal of the human being."[214] Going against the grain of biblical studies, Meyer makes the case that Nebuchadnezzar's transformation functioned "rehabilitatively" toward "the melting away of Nebuchadnezzar's sovereign difference — his autocratic rule over Babylon and his anthropological exceptionalism."[215]Although there are clear textual bases for Meyer's interpretive strokes, the context of Nebuchadnezzar's transformation cannot be separated from the notion of judgment for hubris, which remains the side of the coin most emphasized by biblical scholars. Importantly, however, the transformational judgment of Nebuchadnezzar results in his restoration, indicating that his animalic transformation played a role in his "spiritual ascent." After the restoration of his human mind, perhaps the king retained the memory of his embodied animality, as the lion-eagle-human figure in Dan. 7 seems to imply. If we accept the creature and its transformation in Dan. 7 as an allusion to the Babylonian monarch, then Nebuchadnezzar's return to humanity, as well as his imperial sovereignty, involved the giving of a human mind and the plucking of his eagle wings. Apart from being made to stand on two legs, nothing is said of the removal of his leonine features. It is in this blended matrix of human-animality, the lion-man with wings plucked whose kingdom is restored to him, that the tradition surrounding Nebuchadnezzar is exemplified—the ever-familiar Other.

Returning to the quote at the beginning of this chapter from the film *The Planet of the Apes*, perhaps a parallel might be drawn between George Taylor's space travels that bring him some two thousand years into Earth's future and Nebuchadnezzar's forced relocation among the animals of the field. The human, played by Charlton Heston, is portrayed as going on a journey,

[214] Eric Daryl Meyer, *Inner Animalities: Theology and the End of the Human* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2018) 100-1. Meyer's places the story of Nebuchadnezzar in dialogue with Gen. 1:26's presentation of the *imago dei,* which he calls "the theological lynchpin of anthropological exceptionalism" (99).

[215] Ibid, 102.

in which he is convinced that "there must be a creature superior to man." As he undergoes the psychological, physical, and cultural transformations of being treated as and living in the conditions of "an upright beast" at the hands of the apes, he is faced with the final vestiges of his own narcissism and hubris—his anthropocentric exceptionalism. Moreover, in the same way that the *imago dei* of Gen. 1:26 is invoked (and the exceptionalist understanding of which Meyer aims to destabilize), the primordial garden is also invoked by the ape, Dr. Zaius, to legitimate his maltreatment and ontological inferiority of humans. Although the film has its shortcomings and enforces the human-animal binary in many ways, Taylor's transformative experience of living as a "man-beast" becomes the catalyst for his rebirth in a "new" world, just as Nebuchadnezzar's transformation defines his reentry into a restored existence and reorientation to the Jewish deity.

CHAPTER THREE: LIVING LIONS, SERPENTS, AND STATUES

These violent delights have violent ends.

- Friar Laurence, *Romeo and Juliet*[216]

3.1 Introduction

Rife with violence and infused with a dialectic on what it means to be "living," the tales of Daniel 6 and *Bel and the Serpent* situate animals and nonhumans as central interlocutors for their negotiations of foreignness. The chapter at hand examines the concept of "animacy," that is, what it means to be "alive" and how eating, not eating, and sovereignty designate one's status among the "living." Although both Dan. 6 and *Bel and the Serpent* (henceforth *Bel*) have these concerns in common, they address them in distinct ways. [217] In the OG and MT versions of Dan. 6 and the Greek tales of *Bel,* I draw attention to the ways that humans and nonhumans are portrayed in these literary examples and how their treatment is measured according to their connection with or opposition to a "living god." Similar to and yet distinct from other examples in the Daniel corpora, nonhumans participate as types of revelatory interlocutors in Dan. 6 and *Bel* in early Jewish literature and reveal the tensions of "living" in hierarchy in their religio-

[216] William Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet: The New Cambridge Shakespeare,* ed. G. Blakemore Evans (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 133. This quote also plays a significant role in HBO's science-fiction TV series *Westworld* (2016-).

[217] See Claudia Bergmann, "The Ability/Inability to Eat: Determining Life and Death in "Bel et Draco," *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period* (2004) Vol. 35.3, pp. 262-283. Bergmann's article dedicated to eating in *Bel* is a helpful one. She notes that previous commentators identify the connective theme of eating in Bel and the Serpent but do not examine it further. I build upon Bergmann's analysis here with the integration of the MT and OG of Dan. 6, as well as a special attention to the animality of eating/not eating.

political contexts.[218] The present chapter argues that the questions of central concern to these Danielic authors revolve, in many ways, around the uniqueness of the "living God" and how other living creatures are placed on a gradation scale of "animacy," a placement that often determines their life or death. The texts utilize portrayals of violence against both nonhumans and humans, interwoven with discussions of sovereignty, to exemplify the authors views and the behavioral recommendations for their readers. Using similar themes and figures to present their narratives, Dan. 6 and *Bel* arrive at very different conclusions for their communities.

The tales of Dan. 6 and *Bel* portray nonhuman animals that are markedly different from those discussed in the other sections of this dissertation. The animals' appearances are not initiated by (Dan. 4) or perceived in (Dan. 7-8) dream-visions but are experienced on the same spatial and temporal planes as the kings, courtiers, and challenges of foreign settings. The actions, or inactions, of these animal interlocutors are portrayed without an intermediary plane or implied altered state, and are present in the "real time" of the narratives to a degree that the others in the Danielic corpora are not. With perhaps the exception of Nebuchadnezzar's transformation which takes place in both a dream-vision setting as well as "real time," the nonhumans in Dan. 6 and *Bel* are, at least in the plain reading of the texts, portrayed as non-metaphorical animals without the need of immediate interpretation.[219]

In addition to their shared narrative reality in space and time and their overarching theme of animacy, the animals and nonhumans in Dan. 6 and *Bel* are linked by the striking motif of

[218] Scholars debate which text influenced which, much like the conversations on the versions of Dan. 4. Collins suggests that the lion's pit motif reflects an "old layer of tradition that was developed in different ways" (*Daniel,* 263-4), whereas Wills identifies sections in which *Bel* influenced Dan. 6, suggesting a contemporary circulation of the texts (Wills, *Jew in the Court,* 134-8).

[219] It is worth noting, however, that a central part of Nebuchadnezzar's theriomorphic transformation is what he eats. His realm of consumption is changed from that of humans to "eating grass like oxen," a recurring phrase that emphasizes both the content of his consumption and his location.

eating and commensality.[220] The contest of eating or not eating food, the threat of becoming food, abstaining from eating to achieve a desired goal, catching corrupt clergy in deceitful eating, feeding explosive food to religious competitors, and being fed by supernatural meal delivery are each Danielic examples featuring the different types of anxieties around eating, foreignness, and nonhumans.[221] Moreover, the politics of consumption in the Danielic corpora are not limited to humans only but are also extended to nonhumans based on their status among the "living."[222] I use the term "nonhumans" here to include the statuary revered as Bel, the fantastic serpent-

[220] A number of scholars have highlighted this connection including Malka Z. Simkovich in her commentary to *Bel and the Dragon* in the *Jewish Annotated Apocrypha* but have not examined the theme with attention to eating and animality. *The Jewish Annotated Apocrypha* (Jonathan Klawans and Lawrence M. Wills, eds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021) 342 n. 27. For recent works on the subject in Judaism more broadly, see Jordan D. Rosenblum, *The Jewish Dietary Laws in the Ancient World* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017); David Kraemer, *Jewish Eating and Identity throughout the Ages* (New York: Routledge, 2007); John Cooper, *Eat and Be Satisfied: A Social History of Jewish Food* (Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, 1993). The only episode of eating not addressed in this chapter, "the contest of eating," is Dan. 1, which describes the refusal of Daniel and his friends to consume the food and wine of the king, and his bet that they will be stronger and wiser with their limited diet than the other young men of the court. Because it begins the MT book of Daniel, it often sets the tone for the remaining eating episodes in the corpora and obscures their differences.

[221] Anxiety regarding themes of eating and food appear in a number of Second Temple Jewish literary works. For Judith, see Thomas Hieke, "Torah in Judith: Dietary Laws, Purity and Other Torah Issues in the Book of Judith," in *A Pious Seductress* (Géza G. Xeravits ed. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 2012), 97-110; For Tobit, see Nathan MacDonald, "Food and Drink in Tobit and Other 'Diaspora Novellas,'" in *Studies in the Book of Tobit: A Multidisciplinary Approach* (Mark Bredin, ed. London and New York: T&T Clark, 2006) pp. 165-176. For a summary of other works such as the *Letter of Aristeas,* writings of Philo of Alexandria, and others, see David M. Freidenreich's monograph, *Foreigners and Their Food: Constructing Otherness in Jewish, Christian, and Islamic Law* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2011) especially pp. 31-46.

[222] In broader conversations around consumption in early Judaism which sometimes overlap with studies in Daniel, scholars often focus on either the laws of kashrut and priestly emphases on ritual cleanliness and uncleanliness, or approach eating as a marker of insider/outsider boundary distinction. David Bryan argues for "a world-view behind the kosher laws" based on Mary Douglas' theory (1993) that "that the kosher legislation symbolizes boundaries of the Israelite world by means of analogies between the unclean the Gentile, the clean and Israel…" and so on (*Cosmos*, 251-2). Bryan sees these strictly enforced boundaries in the *Anim. Apoc*, Testament of Naphtali, and Daniel 7. With this in mind, studies have pointed to Daniel's abstention from the king's delicacies in Dan. 1 as evidence for his obedience to "kosher laws" although the resistance may have cost him his life. As an example of this assumption of kosher laws in Dan. 1, Koosed and Seesengood claim that Daniel "decides not to eat meat rather than violate kosher regulations" ("Daniel's Animal Apocalypse," 183). Other studies have sharply disagreed with these notions. See, for instance, Freidenreich's assertion that "there is no indication in *Daniel* that the food in question is impure, and no reason to assume that Daniel is worried about the impurity of its gentile preparers either" (*Foreigners and Their Food,* 36). Furthermore, on the same page, he points to the arguments proposed by Christine Hayes and Jonathan Klawans that "neither biblical nor Hellenistic Jewish sources express concern regarding the circumstantial impurity of gentiles." See Christine Elizabeth Hayes, *Gentile impurities and Jewish identities: Intermarriage and conversion from the Bible to the Talmud* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002) 19–22, 47–54; and Jonathan Klawans, "Notions of gentile impurity in ancient Judaism." *AJS review* 20 (1995): 285–312.

dragon housed in the Persian temple, and both groups of lions in Dan. 6 and *Bel*. Identity distinctions are drawn, blurred, and redrawn among the categories of humans and nonhumans, especially in the social hierarchies of the religio-political spheres in which Daniel acts. As Koosed and Seesengood note, the whole of Danielic literature might be understood as being concerned with all "the living" and what it means to be alive.[223] However, I argue that Dan. 6 and *Bel's* exclusive invocation and discussion of living gods—whether statues, serpents, or the God of Daniel—sets these texts apart from other Danielic works and warrants a closer investigation of their nonhuman interlocutors. Whereas Dan. 6 portrays indirect confrontation and nonviolent response to life-threatening situations, *Bel* depicts violent confrontation and even antagonism as the appropriate and ultimately successful course of action. And although the tale of Daniel in the lion's den is one of the most iconic of animal stories within Jewish scripture, Dan. 6 and *Bel* have much to contribute to the discussion of animals and nonhumans as the mediating forces of foreignness. I argue that Dan. 6 and *Bel* both demonstrate the ambivalence regarding the stability of the relationship between animality, the Other, and what it means to be "living."

3.2 Animacy and "Living"

Without going too far afoot from my present task, it is important to note the socially constructed distinction between the animate and inanimate, and how this in turn affects how

[223] Koosed and Seesengood "Daniel's Animal Apocalypse," 183. In her monograph on Joseph and Aseneth, Jill Hicks-Keeton argues that the language of "life" and "living" function "as a means of marking out who belongs—and who *can* belong—to such a God" (*Arguing with Aseneth: Gentile Access to Israel's Living God in Jewish Antiquity* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018], 5).

"certain lives are seen to matter more than others, or not at all."[224] To help inform my reading of the gradations of "aliveness" of the humans and nonhumans in Dan. 6 and *Bel,* I incorporate Mel Y. Chen's study of "animacy," which considers the hierarchies of what constitutes someone (or something) as living, animate, and ultimately human.[225] "Animacy" is a term primarily used by linguists of both the past and present to distinguish the "aliveness" of nouns and the degree to which they can or cannot perform certain actions. For Chen, the concept has proven useful beyond its grammatical significance and highlighted the fixations of language that are thus reflected in collective cultural understanding. In their monograph on the topic, Chen places animacy in dialogue with disability studies, queer studies, and critical animal studies, and concludes that, like many hierarchies that appear to be quite fixed, the hierarchy of animacies is ultimately only certain in its uncertainty. The questions that concern what makes something "alive" (its *anima*-quality), are entangled with "the animation of things unknown in their proximity to humanness, by their uneven agency, by their uncertain capacity to affect, by their unlikelihood of being 'the effector of,' [and] by their uncertain possession of (human) life."[226] In other words, just as there is no singular "animal," there is neither a singular "animacy," but

[224] Maia Kotrosits, *The Lives of Objects: Material Culture, Experience, and the Real in the History of Early Christianity* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2020), 14. For Kotrosits, this animacy is worked out in the objectification of the body, as well as other objects who "take on a life of their own."

[225] Mel. Y Chen, *Animacies: Biopolitics, Racial Mattering, and Queer Affect* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2012). Drawing on and reworking discussions leading back to the primacy of speech as the indicator of separation between humans and animals posed by Aristotle, Chen necessarily turns to Heidegger who asserts and expands this separation based on the capacity for language and aliveness. To untangle this concept, Chen depends on the work of Giorgio Agamben (*The Open: Man and Animal*, translated by Kevin Attell [Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004]). By using the term "animacy" which was initially employed in linguistic contexts, Chen challenges the notion of human exceptionalism without needing to devote an in-depth study of the evidence for animal language and communication. See 90-2; 119.

[226] Chen, *Animacies,* 236. The reach of Chen's questions touches the most touchy of modern issues, including abortion, food politics, racism, and sexuality, to only name a few. For Chen's work applied to Talmudic literature, see Mira Beth Wasserman, *Jews, Gentiles, and Other Animals,* 73-78.

rather "animacies," and this plurality is what allows for the permeability of ontological, and sometimes hierarchical, boundaries.

Studies that work with cultural and religious boundaries of animism are also naturally relevant for the concerns highlighted here. Similarly prompted by grammatical categories, anthropologist Tim Ingold recalls the now well-known statement from the Ojibwa elder who, when asked whether all stones were alive, answered "No! But *some* are."[227] In his summation, Ingold posits that "animacy…is not a property of stones *as such,* but of their positioning within a relational field which includes persons as a foci of power."[228] So while animacy, at least grammatically, is ascribed to the nominative stone itself, it cannot be separated from its relationality with persons (or powers) in its proximity. The shifting degrees of permeability between animacy categories are, as I aim to demonstrate in the sections ahead, a defining feature of Danielic literature, especially Dan. 6 and *Bel.*[229] For Dan. 6, I consider how the epithet "living god" is contrasted with "others" who are unable to determine their status among the living, namely gods, kings, and animals. Darius determines, however, after a night devoid of both sleeping and eating, that Daniel is a "servant of the living god" as he calls to him from the mouth of the lion's pit, privileging him with special access to and perhaps resembling features of the living god he serves. The animacy dialogue is more explicit in the tales of *Bel* in its presentation

[227] Here, Ingold is quoting Irving Hallowell's conversation with an elder from the Ojibwa tribe in the twentieth century. Tim Ingold, *The Perception of the Environment: Essays on Livelihood, Dwelling and Skill* (London and New York: Routledge, 2000) 95-8. See also Mary B. Black "Ojibwa Taxonomy and Percept Ambiguity." *Ethos* 5, no. 1 (1977): 90-118, whom Ingold cites, as well as Irving A. Hallowell, "Ojibwa Ontology, Behavior, and World View," in *Culture in History: Essays in Honor of Paul Radin* (Stanley Diamond (ed.). New York: Columbia University Press, 1960), 19-52.

[228] Ingold, *Perception of the Environment,* 97. Emphasis original.

[229] Beth Berkowitz highlights degrees of permeability between the categories of Jew and gentile, as negotiated by the textual reception of Leviticus 18:3, and the diverse ways that texts of different times and places enforce their interpretations (*Defining Jewish Difference,* 33; 236-247).

of the conversation between the king and Daniel about what makes a god a "living god." Signaled and mediated by the expressions of its eating (or not eating) habits, the nonhumans in *Bel*—the statue and the serpent—are evaluated and treated according to this status, a course of judgment in which Daniel plays a central, if not solitary, role in executing. With this in mind, each text is first examined individually and then in dialogue with each other, beginning with Dan. 6.

3.3 Analysis of Daniel 6

In discussions of Dan. 6, most studies point to a similar set of themes: the incompetence of human sovereignty,[230] mortal danger in the foreign court,[231] and the necessity of divine intervention. Some of these snapshots, such as Darius' inability to reverse his own decree, are thought to reflect actual circumstances (or at least memories) of being in the Persian royal courts.[232] Another concept often central in scholars' discussion of Dan. 6. is the chapter's relationship to Dan. 3 and its role in concluding the "court tales" sequence for the book as a whole.[233] The similarities can be observed in a number of shared themes, including the suffering of Jewish exiles, resistance in worship/not worshipping, and extreme punishment at the hands of foreign empire, as well as a linguistic parallels. Moreover, the "conspiracy" in the court against

[230] Scholars generally understand Dan. 6 portraying Darius as an incapable and even ignorant king. Not only is he unable to see through the mischievous plans of the members of his court, he is entrapped by the rules of his own imperial structures, that is, the binding nature of the decree according to "the law of the Medes and Persians." Furthermore, some studies include a comparison between Belshazzar and Darius since the two narratives seem closely connected both in their literary structure and content. See Newsom, 189-90.

[231] See Daniel L. Smith-Christopher's discussion of foreign rule and the responses of resistance. See "Gandhi on Daniel 6: Some Thoughts on a 'Cultural Exegesis' of the Bible," Biblical Interpretation 1, 3 (1993), 330-7.

[232] See Erich S. Gruen, *Constructs of Identity in Hellenistic Judaism: Essays on Early Jewish Literature and History* (Berlin and Boston: Walter de Gruyter GmbH, 2016) 237-9.

[233] Collins notes the parallels in "theme and structure" (*Daniel*, 262).

the Jewish individuals is coordinated by jealous and corrupt court officials, hearkening to Humphrey's distinction between "court contests" and "court conflicts."[234] Of this relationship between Dan. 3 and 6, Wills affirms the connection and sees a direct literary link between them.[235] Such an emphasis, however, minimizes the story's likely circulation as an independent tale, excludes the role of the OG, and over-privileges the final redactor's shaping of the text. Segal, on the other hand, provides a more balanced view and interprets the similarities between the chapters as a product of later harmonization by an MT redactor, which leads him to assert the originality of the OG of Dan. 6. However, the OG's originality, Segal stresses, is not unilateral and is only the case in some instances, which imagines a contemporary composition of the versions without needing to determine one as totally preeminent.[236] As discussed in the previous chapter, Dan. 4-6 are generally thought to have circulated, at the very least, as an independent unit, which thereby makes overstating its connections with ch. 3 an unnecessary diversion. The preservation and distinctness of Dan. 4-6 in the OG show a distinguishable tradition at work with ch. 4 maintaining the most textual differences, whereas the variations in 5-6 are less prominent.[237]

Decrees and Leonine Threats (6:1-10)

[234] W. Lee Humphreys, "A Life-style for Diaspora: A Study of the Tales of Esther and Daniel," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92 (1973), 211-23.

[235] Wills, *Jew in the Court,* 142-44.

[236] Michael Segal, "Harmonization and Rewriting of Daniel 6 from the Bible to Qumran," in *HĀ-ʾISH MŌSHE: Studies in Scriptural Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature in Honor of Moshe J. Bernstein,* Binyamin Y. Goldstein, et al (eds.) (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 269. See Also Marti J. Steussy, *Gardens in Babylon: Narrative and Faith in the Greek Legends of Daniel* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), especially 25-48 on a summary of the understandings of *Bel* and its ancient and modern interpretations.

[237] Between the versions, OG ch. 4 has additions of sequences and content, as well as a different ordering of the narrative. Daniel 5 in the OG, however, is shorter rather than extended. Chapter 6, distinct from both tendencies we would expect, retains the same length and narrative style as the MT but nevertheless with a number of variants. See Collins, *Daniel,* 262-3.

The narrative of Dan. 6 is guided by a third-person, omniscient narrator and does not change throughout the story. Both the MT and OG versions follow the same narrative structure and divide the story into four major acts.[238] The narrative structure is based on scene changes beginning with the first act (6:1-10) which presents the initial setting and Daniel's success in the court under "Darius the Mede." As we observed Nebuchadnezzar's likely conflation with Nabonidus in ch. 4, the figure of Darius the Mede is a likely a convolution of Darius the Persian.[239] Daniel 6 weaves the story of Daniel with yet another sympathetic relationship with a foreign king, this time a very unhistorical "Darius the Mede." The readers then learn of the conflict in the king's court and the jealousy of Daniel's courtiers because of Daniel's promotion as head over the other administrators, including their plan to ensnare Daniel (6:5-10). Herein lies the main set of differences between the MT and OG versions in this section. The OG envisions 127 satraps with three head administrators, whereas the MT posits 120 although with the same three administrators (סרכין).[240] In the plot against Daniel, however, the MT hyperbolizes the number of individuals involved and includes the entirety of the court (the satraps and the other two heads) compared to the OG which only includes the two other administrators.

As mentioned above, Dan. 6 is oft compared to Dan. 3 but it is worth digressing briefly to survey how the reasons for and circumstances of the plot against Daniel in ch. 6 are quite distinct from that of the three youths (his friends) from ch. 3. In the case of Shadrach, Meshach, and

[238] For the sake of simplicity, I use the numbering according to the OG/Th for this section which is reflected in most English translations. The Aramaic MT places v. 1 at the end of ch. 5, which describes Darius' reception of the kingdom at 62 years old.

[239] As noted by a number of scholars, the autonomous Median empire fell at least twelve years before the Babylonians, emphasizing the Danielic corpora's emphasis on a different way of remembering "history."

[240] See Collins' summary of this topic and Montgomery's suggestion that the OG's numerical differences come from 1 Esdras. Collins, *Daniel,* 262-4 and Montgomery, *Daniel,* 316-7.

Abednego, the youths are implicated by their unwillingness to adhere to the decree required for all "peoples, nations, and languages," a matter concerned with public displays of worship, and their refusal to obey is addressed directly to the king himself. Furthermore, their promotion within Nebuchadnezzar's kingdom only occurs after the display of their god's superiority in the fiery furnace and the king's equally violent decree prohibiting blasphemy against their god with the punishment of death. The situation of Daniel in ch. 6, however, could not be more different. First, Daniel's promotion to the highest rank in the kingdom occurs prior to any display of his god's superiority and is solely attributed to the "excellent spirit in him." Second, the context of his disobedience is artificial in the sense that it is contrived by his jealous peers (whether it be 127 or two) and was only concerned with the worship—that is, private worship instead of the public defiance of the three youths—of his god because there was no other way to implicate him in terms of the kingdom (מצד מלכותא). Finally, Darius is entirely unaware of the administrators' plots and Daniel's disregard for the decree whereas Nebuchadnezzar is directly refused, publicly humiliated, and his authority intentionally undermined. As demonstrated by briefly comparing the two chapters, their similarities are overstated and much is missed in their conflation within the generalizations facilitated by the court tale genre.

After the formulation of their plan, the courtiers present the decree to Darius (v. 8), including the punishment for violation—being thrown into a pit of lions (יתרמא לגב אריותא; ῥιφήσεται εἰς τὸν λάκκον τῶν λεόντων).[241] Although the historicity of lion-capture in the ancient Near East is not the central concern of this investigation, it is worth addressing as a literary motif

[241] On whether such "pits" were historical, see Hartman and DiLella, *Daniel,* 199; Collins, *Daniel,* 267; Karl van der Toorn, "In the Lion's Den: The Babylonian Background of a Biblical Motif," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 60 (1998), 637.

presented as reality.[242] There are traditions of Assyrian and Babylonian lion-hunts, which served to glorify the king or ruler and perhaps had some ritual function.[243] Whether these practices made their way into cultures closer to the composition of the Danielic corpora is inconsequential for my argument. More importantly, the tradition of captured lions being used as a punishment for wrongdoing against the empire served a literary purpose and was effective as a narrative in both the MT and OG versions of the story, as well as the tales of *Bel.*

Beyond the historicity of a lion pit used as a punishment for dissidents, a number of studies have emphasized the qualities associated with lions in their natural habitats, and their possible relevance to Daniel 6. One of the most thorough of these studies is the revised dissertation of Brent A. Strawn in which he surveys leonine imagery in ancient Near Eastern sources as well as those of the Hebrew Bible. Of Daniel's lions, he notes that although they are associated with "predatory dominance," "the behavior of the lions of Daniel 6 is quite unexpected: they do not hurt Daniel (6:23). Only later do they behave as lions do, by harming and devouring Daniel's enemies who are presented to them as food."[244] Thus, Strawn implies, Daniel was either not seen or accepted as being appropriate food, whereas the courtiers who attempted to murder Daniel are indeed devoured by the lions as one might expect. There is, however, is a sense of enforced behavior upon the lions with the angel portrayed as actively closing the mouth of the lions, a topic to which I will return below.

A Lion Digression

[242] See Collins' summary of the topic, as well as a few notes on their presence in biblical sources (*Daniel,* 267*).*

[243] See Brent A. Strawn on how images of lion-hunts were employed in biblical literature with an emphasis that the examples show "*hunting* a lion, however, not *maintaining* one." Emphasis original, *What is Stronger than a Lion? Leonine Image and Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near East* (Paulusverlag Fribourg, Switzerland: Academic Press Fribourg; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2005), 39.

[244] Strawn, *What is Stronger,* 36; 45.

Before continuing with the next act of the Dan. 6 narrative, it is worth expanding further on Daniel's lions, who remain some of the most well-known animals in the Hebrew Bible both in antiquity and modernity. They are variously interpreted as negative figures, as "powers of chaos"[245] and unclean creatures,[246] and simultaneously as representations of kings, kingship, and strength.[247] Ken Stone he presents a more nuanced approach of Daniel's lions and avoids binary evaluative terms such as "positive and negative," thereby allowing for different if not sometimes conflicting presentations of animals.[248] Thus, the so-called "expected" behavior of lions—devouring its prey—is simultaneously subdued and affirmed in both the MT and OG of Dan. 6.

As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, the analysis here is unique from the others in this dissertation in the fact that its nonhumans and animals are not experienced in the format of or overlap with a dream-vision. The lions of Dan. 6 (and Bel) are intended to be understood as "real" lions. Darius' lions participate in a broader dialogue pertaining to animality in Dan. 6, one that focuses on the role that eating and not eating plays in one's identity and alliances, as well as establishing Daniel's god as the "living god." And in comparison with the symbolic and mythic creatures who appear elsewhere in the Danielic corpora, the lions in Dan. 6 are altogether voiceless and do not play any symbolic or representative role beyond their portrayal as instruments (and victims) of imperial violence.

---

[245] Lacocque, *Daniel,* 113.

[246] Bryan, *Cosmos,* 103.

[247] Ibid, 105-6.

[248] In his discussion of exceptional animals, Stone quotes Strawn's study of lions saying, "'the fearsome aspects of the lion—its roar, killing, rending, devouring, and so forth,' tend to dominate such symbolism" (Stone, *Reading the Hebrew Bible,* 103). See also Stone's indebtedness to anthropologist Barbara J. King: "King herself calls attention to 'the complex treatment of animals in the Bible' (80) [*Being with Animals: Why We are Obsessed with the Furry, Scaly, Feathered Creatures who Populate Our World* (New York: Doubleday, 2010)], where animals are sometimes held in high regard and at other time subordinated explicitly to humans" (Stone, *Reading,* 2).

In Hannah Strømmen's recent study of biblical animality, Daniel's lions are discussed at length with eating, permissible killing, and political powers in mind.[249] According to her reading, Daniel's lions are "representations of the carnivorous sovereign force of the human political order that sentences Daniel to death," as well as creatures that "are clearly associated with human wickedness."[250] In some way, then, the narrative invites a type of resistance by portraying the structures of foreign rule "beastly," and therefore subject to animal mortality. Later in Strømmen's analysis, however, her argument—the proper hierarchy of Divine over all animals (human and nonhuman)—hinges on the notion of Daniel's solidarity with the lions in their shared imprisonment and deprivation of food.[251] So, while the lions are carnivorous beasts in their own right, they are also intended to mirror the ferocity of imperial power, at whose hands they are also exploited alongside Daniel. It is here, in the assertion that the imperial beasts are mutual sufferers with Daniel, that Strømmen's argument becomes discontinuous with her previous claims. Still, moreover, Strømmen asserts that in Daniel's shared living space with the lions, "the possibility of a nonhuman alliance between the animal and the divine, an alliance with the God who destabilizes human powers of subjection."[252] In sum, in her attempt to blur the lines of human, animal and divine in Dan. 6, Strømmen's reading of Daniel's lions loses its internal

[249] Strømmen, *Biblical Animality*, 91-108. Central to her argument are the concepts of what she names "killability" and "edibility." The former term, which Strømmen understands as a status applied to animals allowing for their divinely-permissible killing, she examines in dialogue with the Noahide covenant in Gen. 9 (37-66). Also woven into the narrative of Gen. 9 but extended to her subsequent discussion of Peter's "universalizing" vision in Acts 10, the term "edibility" is applied all animals in its New Testament context (67-89). But, Strømmen reiterates, although "Peter's vision is seemingly not about animals; they are merely figures that signify the lack of distinctions between *humans,"* perhaps "Acts 10 could be read otherwise, namely as a radical opening of hospitality to animals as fellow creatures" (84).

[250] Strømmen, *Biblical Animality*, 96.

[251] Ibid. 100.

[252] Ibid. 102-3.

consistency and adherence to the boundaries the text itself asserts.

Although both real and symbolic lions were present on a variety of registers in ANE culture, it is still unclear if and how the punishment of being thrown into the pit of lions functioned in royal courts.[253] Since both Dan. 6 and *Bel* utilize this motif, it was at least a compelling addition to any "fantastic story." As Newsom notes, it remains debated where the tradition originated and the relationship between the two stories, although ultimately she is content to understand Daniel's lions as "tropes for royal power…[and] as a metonym of the terrifying sovereign power of the king."[254] Other ways of understanding Daniel's lions include Karel van der Toorn's interpretation that lions in Babylonian traditions are metaphors for "hostility and competition among the court sages."[255] Difficulties with this simple explanation arise, however, when one looks more closely at how the animality of the lions functions in the scopes of the two stories and the very real threats they pose, as well as the role they play in the judgment of Daniel's conspirators.

There is room, however, for a nuanced perspective of lions in the Danielic corpora that encompasses a number of the views presented above. In light of the evidence presented above of lions and other wild animals being captured and confined to pits for imperial hunts in Assyria, it was thought that the king would slay his "enemy" either in the confined space or in pursuit of the animal in the "wild." In this ceremony, the king and empire publicly cast themselves as victors over the natural world, subduing it with the violence of both humanity's more general technological superiority and the specific power expressed in the specific empire. With this

[253] Newsom, *Daniel,* 195-6.

[254] Ibid. 196.

[255] Van der Toorn, "In the Lion's Den," 627.

background in mind, the lions in the Danielic corpora occupy two worlds. On the one hand, the lions are symbols of the strength and violence of the empire, and a primary aspect of the foreign king's dominating persona. By placing Daniel in the lion pit, he is subjected to the empire's carnivorous consumption. On the other hand, however, the lions can just as easily be understood as mutually victimized by the king's power. Thus, when Daniel is sent to the pit, he is set on the same social register as the lions and, in the case of *Bel'*s version of the story, both parties are fed by divine intervention: Daniel by Habakkuk's supernatural journey and the lions by the inhabitants of Persia who sought to do Daniel wrong. Without needing to limit the animals to a strict either/or explanation, Daniel's lions become a part of the blurry discourse surrounding the politics of eating, living, and violence in Dan. 6 and *Bel.*

Daniel's Indictment and the King's Fast (6:11-19)

Following the courtiers' manipulation of the king to enact their plan by issuing an irreversible edict, even by the king himself, the second act of the narrative begins with the deceptive courtiers setting their trap and successfully "catching" Daniel in prayer.[256] When the courtiers report Daniel to the king, the versions describe him in different ways. The MT, in line with previous descriptions of Daniel and his friends in Dan. 1-5, calls Daniel "one of the exiles of Judah" (בני גלותא די יהוד) a designation that is further reflected in the Theodotion. In contrast, the OG portrays the courtiers referring to Daniel as "your friend" (τὸν φίλον σου) that is, the friend of the king. Collins considers this a redactional change on the part of the OG, however the address is the same in the tales of *Bel.* Although neither death nor being eaten are mentioned explicitly, both are implied with the punishment of being thrown into the pit of lions, hence

[256] On whether Daniel intended to be seen through his windows or not, see my discussion below in the final section of this chapter on the differences between Daniel as totally passive or as passive resistor.

Darius' distress at Daniel's indictment. Also in a rare instance, 6:13 (MT) explicitly mentions divine, human, and animal in the same sentence. Humans and gods are figures to whom one prays, whereas animals are instrumentalized at whose hand (or mouth) an individual is punished. The king, however, bound by the constraints of his own law, nevertheless attempts to save Daniel until the last possible moment but ultimately fails under the burden of the law of the Medes and Persians. Although Daniel is accused of not paying attention to the king's decree (לא שם עליך מלכא טעם), the king pays attention to Daniel's welfare (שם בל לשיזבותה).

When Daniel is seized, the king abstains from eating, as well as his other "diversions" while Daniel is at risk of being eaten in the pit of lions overnight. [257] This act of non-eating is a positive one, highlighting the king's sovereignty in his freedom to eat or not to eat. In both the OG and MT, Darius performs his fast but his emotional state is emphasized in the OG in its description that "[Darius] was grieving for Daniel,"[258] whereas the Th and MT say that the king's "sleep fled from him." Set in contrast with Belshazzar who eats and drinks with the temple vessels in Dan. 5, Darius is presented as a man of personal restraint and one who cares for his administrator enough to not eat, drink, or be entertained.[259] In this comparison, the politics of consumption highlight once more the nonuniformity of positive and negative depictions of foreign kings in the Danielic corpora. With Darius anxiously anticipating the news of Daniel, the MT weaves a sense of suspense into the story as seen at the climax of the tale when the MT narrator intentionally obscures whether Daniel was harmed in the lion pit or not. The reader then

[257] Newsom notes the lack of clarity on the word "diversions," one over which ancient and modern commentators still stumble. (*Daniel*, 189)

[258] Dan. 6:19: "τότε ὑπέστρεψεν ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰς τὰ βασίλεια αὐτοῦ καὶ ηὐλίσθη νῆστις καὶ ἦν λυπούμενος περὶ τοῦ Δανιηλ"

[259] Emphasizing this friendship, Daniel's competitors in the OG call Daniel "your Friend" in their accusation presented to Darius (6:13), whereas the MT (6:13) Daniel is described to the king as "one of the exiles of Judah."

discovers Daniel's safekeeping at the "same time" as Darius, hearing Daniel's voice from the midst of the pit. In contrast, the OG assures its readers that while Darius was fasting through the night and grieving on his friend's behalf, God had shut the mouths of the lions and Daniel was indeed being looked after.

Daniel, Servant of the God Who Decides Who Lives (6:20-25)

At the climax of the story, the king rises early and calls out desperately to Daniel with an epithet attached: "O, Daniel, servant of the living god! (דניאל עבד אלהא חיא)." Occurring only once in the MT, Collins considers this a "confessional statement" on Darius' part and one that he deems likely a later redaction.[260] Along similar lines and almost with a touch of irony, Daniel's response to Darius from within the cave consists of the familiar kingly address prevalent throughout Danielic texts: "O, king, live forever!" Darius, although sovereign of the Median empire and seen as the possessor of eternal life, does not have the power to mete out life and death even in his own court. He is thus set in contrast with Daniel, one in alliance with and under the protection of the deity who does—אלהא חיא. In the MT Dan. 6, the concept of the "living god" is not set in a polemic against idolatry, as Collins notes is common with the epithet's use in the Hebrew Bible, but rather in a broader dialogue of what it means to be alive, or the supremacy of the one who doles out life and death.

With a slightly different emphasis, the OG does not have either of the attributions that are present in the MT but rather a simple dialogue between the king and Daniel. From the mouth of the cave, Darius calls out: "O, Daniel, are you alive? (εἰ ἄρα ζῇς)." In a response without the kingly attribution, Daniel merely replies: "O king, I am still alive (ἔτι εἰμὶ ζῶν)." Compared to the MT, OG Daniel is bolder with the king in his summary of events and includes the detail that

[260] Collins, *Daniel,* 270. Collins does not note this singular occurrence of the attribution but focuses instead on the familiarity of the divine epithet, "Living God."

Darius did indeed listen "to people who deceive kings," which resulted in Daniel being thrown into the lion's pit (6:22). Once Darius discovers Daniel unharmed, he immediately throws the conniving courtiers and their families into the pit of lions (6:25). Presumably with Daniel's safe removal from the pit, the angel of God opens the mouths of the lions once more and the courtiers, their children, and their wives are devoured before they reach the bottom of the pit. Described with a particularly violent, final image, the lions then "crushed all of their bones (כל גרמוהון הדקו)."

Living God, Live Forever (6:26-29)

Both the MT and OG conclude with an epistolary doxology from the king to the surrounding peoples, announcing the enduring kingdom of the "living God." The ascription and blessing of living forever, which was previously given to Darius as the king, is now placed in tandem with the attribution to Daniel's god: "Living god, existing forever (אלהא חיא וקים לעלמין);" "He is an enduring and living god (αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστι θεὸς μένων καὶ ζῶν)." The doxology bears similarities to Nebuchadnezzar's decrees to the nations in chs. 3-4, and may or may not be drawing on typical epistolary forms to describe the supremacy of a god and, in association, the king. To account for the phrase and its context in Dan. 6, Newsom looks to the biblical archive such as Jer. 10:10 and its pronouncement on the inefficacy of foreign idols.[261] In Dan. 6, however, the anxieties and conflicts of the passage are not in regards to idol worship or competition between Daniel and Darius' gods. Idols are never mentioned, nor is false worship. The only vague reference to an adjacent topic is Daniel's worship of his own god against the decree intended to entrap him by those in the court. Therefore, it is difficult to maintain the "living god" trope as one only occurring in reference to idols and the falsities of inanimate idols.

[261] Newsom, *Daniel*, 201.

This connection between the phrase and idols is certainly front and center in the *Bel* tales, as we shall see in the discussion ahead, but this understanding of the "living god" motif being incorporated into Dan. 6 does not bear the weight of its assumptions.

As an epithet of Daniel's god, the phrase "living god" occurs twice at pivotal moments in the MT.[262] The first is in 6:21 (discussed above) when Darius calls to Daniel after his night in the lion pit saying, "Daniel, servant of the living god (אלהא חיא)!" The second occurs in Darius' decree, which also functions as a type of confessional statement and admission of the supremacy of "the god of Daniel, who is a living god (די הוא אלהא חיא)." For the OG of Dan. 6:25-7, the title is the central component of Darius' epistolary confession: "All the people in my kingdom should adore and worship the god of Daniel, for he is a living god who endures for generations and generations, forever (αὐτὸς γάρ ἐστι θεὸς μένων καὶ ζῶν εἰς γενεὰς γενεῶν ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος,)."[263] In the MT, the devious courtiers preface their manipulation with the phrase "O King, live forever!" (6:7); in contrast, Daniel addresses the king with the same greeting from the pit of the lions (6:22). The impact of the phrase is felt in its juxtaposition: the king lives forever and Daniel is the servant of the living god. Whether intended to be understood ironically or not, the narrative makes it clear that the king's epithet pales in comparison to that of Daniel's god despite Daniel's

[262] Throughout the biblical tradition, invocation of "the living God" appears in a small number of contexts. Such occurrences have been distinguished based on their function, such as in an oath formula ("As the Lord lives"). Used primarily in contexts to assert the God of Israel over foreign peoples and their gods, the epithet "living god" appears also to be an invocation or affirmation for a demonstrable sign of divine power and intervention. In Josh. 3:10 and 1 Sam. 17:26, the demonstration is being sought in the form of military victory. Similarly, 2 Kgs. 19:4, 16 describes the Rabshakeh's mocking assault against the "living god," whereas Jer. 10:10 is simply an ascription of praise which precedes an oracle against the gods of foreign nations who "have no breath."

Hartman and DiLella do not comment on the epithet at all, whereas Collins briefly notes its importance to both Daniel, *Bel,* and the tale of Susanna (*Daniel,* 270-1). Newsom also notes the phrase and connects it to Jer. 10:10, stating that the epithet "in biblical discourse distinguishes the God of Israel from the ineffective gods of the nations and especially their representation as lifeless idols (*Daniel,* 201).

[263] In his commentary to the OG of 6:26, Collins notes the slight difference in translation for "living god" and the possibility of "a god who lives."

deference to the king. As Holger Gzella articulates, "whoever reveres [the living god] shares in his life."[264] The importance of the negotiations of the phrase "the living god" as both an epithet and an epistolary adjective is evident in both the OG and MT of Dan. 6, and remains as such for the *Bel* tales to which I now turn.

3.4 Analysis of *Bel and the Serpent*

Introduction

The tales of *Bel and the Serpent* are the lattermost of the so-called Greek "additions," or non-Masoretic traditions, which include *Susanna, The Song of Azariah,* and *the Prayer of the Three Youths.* As far as their place in the Danielic corpora, the tales of *Bel and the Serpent* are located at the conclusion of the Danielic corpora in both the OG and Th. as chapter 14. An exception to this organization is Papyrus 967 dated to the third century CE which preserves *Bel* as the penultimate tale followed by *Susanna.* Generally, the consensus agrees that the OG version of *Bel* was composed sometime in the first century BCE but likely contains earlier motifs that is either contemporaneous with or influenced by the narrative of Dan. 6.[265] Further complications arise when the OG and Th are placed side by side, which bear narratival divergences significant enough to give scholars reason to suggest their independence and even

[264] Gzella, "חיי," *TDOT*, 269.

[265] In contrast to this consensus, Jonathan R. Trotter argues that the OG preserves a more modified version of the *Bel* story and concludes that "both the OG and Th underwent a period of independent development with the fortunate result that each narrative still retains elements of a shared earlier story from which to base these conclusions" (483). The primary differences that Trotter highlights are the emphases on polemic against foreign priests and the focus on Daniel as central actor. See "Another Stage in the Redactional History of the Bel Story (Dan 14:1-22): The Evidence of Polemic against Foreign Priests and the Focus on Daniel in the Old Greek," *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period,* Vol. 44.4/5 (2013), 481-96.

distinct (albeit speculative) Semitic *Vorlage.*[266] A Semitic original became slightly less speculative at the turn of the twentieth century, however, with Moses Gaster's translation and publication of the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel* which included the second half of *Bel* preserved in Aramaic.[267] And while this version may preserve threads of a Semitic *Vorlage* for the Greek versions of *Bel,* it is not entirely clear what the nature of the relationship and transmission is between the works. Still, other studies continue to assert the Greek-folkloric quality of *Bel* and consider it a second-century BCE collection of legends formed in response to a more cohesive version emerging from an earlier period.[268]

Generally classified as a classic polemic against idolatry,[269] *Bel* consists of three distinct yet intertwined stories in which Daniel actively dialogues with and confronts the king, the foreign gods, and the people.[270] In terms of literary setting, the three tales are placed at the interchange between Babylon and Persia.[271] And although the king is devoted to Bel and the role of the Babylonians is prominent, the tale should be understood as being situated "between

---

[266] For this argument of two different Semitic "originals," see Carey A. Moore, *Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah: The Additions* (New York: Doubleday, 1977). Trotter agrees with Moore's "plausible explanation" but focuses on "indications of reworking" which he argues are most evident in the OG. "Another Stage," 484.

[267] See Collins' summary of Gaster's argument as well as Klaus Koch's response in 1987. See Collins, *Daniel,* 410.

[268] Gruen, *Constructs of Identity,* 51-3.

[269] On the discussion of idols and idol worship in Danielic literature, Newsom connects the futility of Belshazzar's worship of idols of wood, bronze, and other "inanimate" materials in Dan. 5 with the operative polemic in the *Bel* tales (*Daniel,* 168). See also George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 24-26. For an excellent and nuanced study on idolatry in the Danielic corpora that demonstrates the multivocality in both Danielic sources and contemporary literature, see Jennie Grillo, "Worship and Idolatry in the Book of Daniel through the Lens of Tertullian's *De idololatria,*" in *Monotheism in Late Prophetic and Early Apocalyptic Literature: Studies of the Sofja Kovalevskaja Research Group on Early Jewish Monothesism,* Vol. III (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 247-262.

[270] In comparison to Dan. 6, Collins understands *Bel* as "primarily a polemic against idol worship, [in which] Daniel deliberately provokes the confrontation." (*Daniel,* 263-4). See also David A. deSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance, Second Editions* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 2002).

[271] This interchange is poignantly reflected in the king's identification. The OG calls the monarch an anonymous "King of Babylon" whereas the Th identifies him as Cyrus of Persia.

empires." In other words, the immediate historical referent for the imperial powers mentioned does not seem to be the text's primary concern. The most obvious connection between *Bel's* set of tales and Dan. 6 is the lion episode, and the pit into which Daniel is thrown as a result of his offense against the Persia population and the Median courtiers respectively. But there are further connections between these stories that go beyond their leonine characters. In the sections ahead, I place the *Bel* stories in dialogue with Dan. 6 based on the themes of eating and animacy. Although the stories have these concerns in common, they address them in distinct ways, namely in regard to their uses of violence and highlight the similarities and differences between their approaches to animality and their nonhuman interlocutors.

The Inanimate Bel (1-22)

There are three primary acts—and actors—in the *Bel* narrative arc: the statue episode, the serpent episode, and the lion episode. Act one (14:1-22) begins with the introduction of the Babylonian statue, Bel, to whom the people would present a number of daily offerings consisting of food and drink.[272] A contrast is drawn between the king who goes to worship Bel each day and Daniel who worships his own god, prompting the king to ask why Daniel does not worship Bel. Unlike Dan. 6 where Daniel is implicated by the active worship of his own god, the king in the *Bel* tales seems indifferent to Daniel's own practices of worship and instead is simply curious about why he does not worship Bel as well. The king's inquiry—"Why do you not worship Bel?"—initiates the central dialogue of the *Bel* tales based on Daniel's answer in v. 5: "Because I revere no one but the lord god (the living god),[273] who created heaven and the earth and has

[272] In this brief overview, I provide a summary of both the OG and Th, and highlight key differences wherever relevant. The Th is maintained in the main line of the text whereas any OG differences are set in parentheses.

[273] The OG reads "lord god (κύριον τὸν θεὸν)" whereas the Th reads "living god." Collins suggests that the OG, presumably working with a Semitic *Vorlage* misread חי as the tetragrammaton. Based on the king's follow up question, "living god" makes more sense here.

sovereignty over all flesh." The king follows up with a challenge question: "Do you not think that Bel is a living (real) god? Or do you not see how much he eats (is expended on him) every day?" Daniel replies that the king should not be misled; the statue is made of clay and bronze, and has never eaten or drunk. The response Daniel provides is the core piece of evidence cited by scholarship on the *Bel* tales that see the central concern of the tale as an idolatry polemic. Bergmann argues that Bel's value is decided by its inability to eat the food provided by the king and his court.[274] But the statue's inability to eat goes beyond its designation as a mere idol; it is the statue's inanimacy that is implicated by its inability to eat.[275] Although the motif of inanimate idols is present throughout prophetic literature, the inability to eat, and perhaps even the punishment for eating is less common. It is not altogether absent, however, and is portrayed in Jeremiah 51's vicious oracle against Babylon, a source to which some scholars look for the origin of the *Bel* tales.[276]

The king is shocked and angry, calls immediately for his priests to account for the food offered to Bel, and presents an ultimatum of life and death based on who is responsible for the

[274] Bergman, "Ability/Inability," 270. In fact, she states, "the idol's inability to eat is the one and only factor necessary to show that Bel is powerless and worthless."

[275] For a discussion on the animacy of statues in the classical period and late antiquity, especially in dream settings, see Patricia Cox Miller, *Dreams in Late Antiquity,* 14-35. Statues were considered figurations, reflections, and mimetic realities of the gods and held particular importance beyond "mere magic." Summarizing Plotinus, albeit a few centuries after the *Bel* tales, Miller states: "the statue as mimetic object provides a sympathetic space for the presencing of the gods. The animate world of soul can be reflected in the inanimate world of matter when the latter is formed aesthetically" (31-32). Expanding Miller's presentation into her own analysis of Tertullian's relationship to Roman rule, Maia Kotrosits explains: "it is clear that the liveliness of statues and the discourses negotiating the truthfulness of images suggest not just active inner lives, but a *fluidity and constant negotiation of what is real.* These ancient negotiations invite comparisons with later and more contemporary experiences of reckonings with the hazy boundaries of subjects and objects, animate and inanimate" (emphasis original, *The Lives of Objects: Materiality, Experience, and the Real in the History of Early Christianity,* [Chicago and London: Chicago University Press, 2020), 8.

[276] John C. Reeves and Lu Waggoner briefly note, "Jeremiah 51:44 may well be the biblical core from which the entire 'Bel and the Dragon story developed, given the linkage of the verse and the Dragon episode in this *derash.*" See "An Illustration from the Apocrypha in an Eighteenth Century Passover Haggadah," *HUCA* (1988) 59:262, fn 32.

eating. If the priests cannot account for the eating, they die; and if Bel does indeed eat, Daniel dies. The tale then describes the clever plan through which Daniel exposes the deceptive eating of the priests, as well as the futility of their god, Bel. Sprinkling the floor of Bel's temple with ashes unbeknownst to anyone, Daniel then reveals the footprints of the priests and their families to the king as well as their greedy consumption of the food and wine laid out before Bel. In the two versions of the conclusion of act one, the OG describes the king's admission of defeat by him handing over the people to Daniel (presumably to be killed), whereas the Th portrays the king killing the priests and their families himself. In both versions, however, the fate of Bel is handed to Daniel, who completely destroys the statue.[277]

The Killable Serpent (23-29)

Act two is the shortest of the three acts and picks up where the Bel story leaves off. Following the success of Daniel's plan to expose the corrupt priests of Bel and their families, the king challenges his Jewish courtier with an introduction of another nonhuman revered by the Babylonians: the revered serpent, also referred to as a dragon or snake.[278] Beginning immediately in v. 24 with the dialogue initiated by the king in the first act, the king proposes a follow-up statement that challenges Daniel and a direct order, likely an attempt to recover from his ego-crushing incident with the Bel statue. The Th phrases it as such: "You cannot say that this [the serpent] is not a living god, so worship him." Similarly but distinctly, the OG states: "Will you also say this one is bronze? Behold, he eats and drinks. Worship him." In both versions, the king intends to defeat Daniel in their battle of logic. Surely there is no room for

[277] The Th. also includes Daniel's destruction of Bel's temple.

[278] Like Bergmann, I prefer the term "serpent" since it lies somewhere between the mythic (dragon) and the mundane (snake), and accommodates a concept of reverence as well as reality.

disputing the serpent's "aliveness" in the same way that the bronze statue of Bel was proven false. The OG emphasizes the serpent's ability to eat and drink, which constitutes its worthiness of worship, whereas the Th moves straight to the punchline and declares the serpent "a living god."[279] Daniel's response to the king's direct order is recklessly bold and proposes a follow-up challenge saying: "Give me authority, O king, and I will kill the serpent without sword (iron) or rod." Surprisingly, the king grants Daniel's request. With very little build-up like that of the first act and the entrapment of the deceptive priests, the text describes Daniel's actions briefly and simply as taking pitch, fat, and hair, boiling them together and making cakes. After feeding the serpent his concoction, the versions say that the serpent died either by being torn open (OG) or bursting (Th). Daniel's strategy of killing the serpent, as well as the violent result of his plan, continues to perplex scholars. In Collins' view, he is sure of Daniel's understanding "of the explosive quality of the mixture, even if it is obscure to us," and apparently to other ancient interpreters as well, citing the well-known example from *Bereshit Rabbah* 68 that portrays Daniel adding nails to the mixture to somehow make sense of the creature's strange death.[280]

The serpent's death has been understood in other ways, too, Bergmann and others understand the serpent's destruction as "a humorous and interesting twist of the story" but downplay the violence and recklessness of Daniel's actions, which only invites more violence from the Babylonian people.[281] Acknowledging both aspects of humor and violence, Michael J.

---

[279] Bergmann, "Ability/Inability," 273. In the Th. calling the serpent "a living god," Bergmann notes that it "goes beyond OG but never states on what this argument is based. [For the Th.] 'eating and drinking' are not pointed out as signs of its aliveness."

[280] Collins' commentary provides a helpful summary of the discussion, citing how texts from antiquity try to make sense of the narrative. (Collins, *Daniel,* 415). He also cites the Chronicles of Jerahmeel which includes iron combs.

[281] For another analysis of *Bel* as ancient humor and irony, see Erich S. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 167-177.

Chan, for instance, has argued that the humorous exaggerations of stories like that of *Bel* should be engaged as expressions of resistance, and as what he calls "aggressive humor" that challenges "centers of power by depriving them of their dignity, and thus authority."[282] After the serpent's "cartoonish" death, both the king and Daniel are threatened by the Babylonian people as a result.[283] Accused of becoming a Jew or like a Jew[284] (v. 28), the king is then pressured to hand Daniel over to the mob as an appropriate punishment for destroying both Bel and the revered serpent, a request to which he concedes.

Feeding and Not Feeding Lions (30-42)

The third and final act in the *Bel* tales begins with the king's concession to the demands of the Babylonian people and Daniel being thrown into the lion's den for six days. Providing a number of additional (and hyperbolic) details to the story compared to Dan. 6, *Bel* notes the number of lions in the pit (seven) and what they were normally fed (Th has two humans and two sheep; OG has two humans).[285] Furthermore, the Th notes how the lions were not fed that day to ensure Daniel's death at their starving mouths. Thus, Daniel's situation is portrayed as quite dire and no mention is made of the king's power or authority over his people, or his ability to save Daniel from their hands. The narrative itself is structured as simple and straightforward, and with

[282] Michael J. Chan, "Ira Regis: Comedic Inflections of Royal Rage in Jewish Court Tales," in *The Jewish Quarterly Review* (Winter 2013) Vol. 103.1, 23.

[283] Newsom, *Daniel*, 170.

[284] OG: "Ιουδαῖος γέγονεν ὁ βασιλεύς." See John J. Collins, "The King has Become a Jew: The Perspective on the Gentile World in Bel and the Snake," in *Diaspora Jews and Judaism: Essays in Honor of, and in Dialogue with, A. Thomas Kraabel* (ed. Robert S. MacLennan and J. Andrew Overman; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992). For a discussion of the "Ioudaios" issue in which the *Bel* example is included, see the brief summary in Frisch, *Danielic Discourse*, 4-6.

[285] Van der Toorn understands the embellishments on the lion story in *Bel* as evidence for the insertion of the lion time altogether, seeing the *Bel* tales as a "mosaic of loosely related narrative themes" ("In the Lion's Den," 263). See also Newsom (*Daniel*, 195-6) for her summary of Van der Toorn's argument as a whole.

little elaboration on what transpired during the lion's den those six days of Daniel's captivity.

Rather abruptly, the story jumps to prophet Habakkuk (Αμβακουμ) whom the Th describes as being located in Judea.[286] Following the tale's consistent thread of eating and consumption, the reader is informed of the meal Habakkuk is preparing: a boiled stew and bread[287] which he was preparing to bring to the harvesters in the field. The prophet is visited by an angel of the Lord and is taken by the crown of his head/hair to Babylon where he delivers the meal prepared for Daniel. Daniel responds with a prayer of thanks: "You have remembered me, O God, and have not abandoned those who love you." After consuming the meal and seemingly leaving Habakkuk unacknowledged, the angel returns the prophet to Judea and nothing else is said of the incident. When the king arrives at the den presumably to mourn Daniel's death, he sees Daniel sitting in the pit. Unlike Darius in Dan. 6, the king does not cry out to Daniel with distress nor is there a stone covering the mouth of the den ensuring its security. The king simply exclaims of the greatness of Daniel's god, and does not reference the "living god" epithet, which would seem like a natural inclusion considering the concerns of the previous two episodes. Instead, the narrative concludes with Daniel's retrieval from the den and the condemnation of those who were responsible for Daniel's punishment. They, like the courtiers of Dan. 6, are thrown into the pit and devoured violently before their eyes.

3.5 Comparison of Daniel 6 and *Bel*

[286] The introduction to the OG of the *Bel* tales designates the text "from the prophecy of Habakkuk, son of Joshua, of the tribe of Levi," therefore bookending the composition with mention of the minor prophet. This introduction is absent from the Theodotion, which instead introduces the tales with the death of King Astyages and the rise of Cyrus the Persian. For a brief discussion of the book of Habakkuk's relationship to Dan. 8, see Hartman and DiLella, *Daniel,* 231.

[287] The OG also adds a jar of wine to Habakkuk's meal.

The similarities and differences between Dan. 6 and *Bel* have been examined in previous studies, many of which point to idolatry as the central theme of the Greek tales and its absence in Dan. 6.[288] Furthermore, the common themes of eating, animacy, and, of course, the presence of the lion pit episode, are also important for the comparison of the narratives. Despite having eating and lions in common, however, the texts engage these concepts in distinct ways.[289] And what these differences demonstrate is the malleability of the categories of foreignness and animality between the Danielic tales. By decentering the threat of foreign worship and the polemic against foreign gods, we can observe *how* the concepts of foreignness and animality serve as negotiation sites for Dan. 6 and *Bel.*

Of the relationship between *Bel* and the court tales of Dan. 1-6, Carol Newsom observes the Greek stories bear similarity to the canonical tales but also diverge in two key ways.[290] The first divergence is the stories' focus on exposing the powerlessness of Babylon's deities, either as inanimate idols as with the statue of Bel or as mere animals, like that of the revered serpent. Unlike Dan. 3 and 6, *Bel* portrays Daniel as clever victor over the foreign gods. The element of contest is still present but is less emphatic about the threat of the foreign courtiers. Instead, those responsible for Daniel's week in the lion pit are the Babylonian people who demand the king to "hand Daniel over." The second primary divergence between the Dan. 6 and *Bel* is the former's "non-aggressive refusal to obey authority" versus the latter's outright confrontation with and

[288] Breed, *Daniel*, 207. Other studies find it more fruitful to consider the slightly different emphases between the Greek versions, such as Trotter's analysis of the deception of the priests of Bel and Daniel's cunning, and their centrality to the OG version. He argues that this emphasis in the OG indicates its hyper-modification compared to the Theodotion, and affirms the two versions dependence on two different Semitic Vorlage as well as their independent circulation and redaction. See "Another Stage in the Redactional History," 481-83.

[289] On the surface, these differences are more palatable to biblical scholars than differences internal to the MT court tales since *Bel* is considered a part of the Greek additions and does not have the same centrality as the MT.

[290] Newsom, *Daniel*, 6 & Breed, *Daniel*, 207.

attack of the gods of the foreign court.[291] Daniel's confrontational attitude is expressed in the violence of his actions, which is significantly intensified in *Bel.* Whether we view *Bel* as a story contemporary with Dan. 6 (thus an independent composition) or a tale influenced by Dan. 6 (thus innovating upon it), the difference between the stories is nevertheless apparent.

Temple and Court Settings

In addition to Newsom's observations, I argue that the two texts bear additional key differences that affect the ways that foreignness and animality are presented and perceived. The first significant difference is between the narrative settings in which the tensions unfold. The temple settings of *Bel*—first in the temple of Bel and then in the temple of the revered serpent—paint a very different picture than Dan. 6's generic court drama that includes the court and Daniel's domestic setting. In the *Bel* tales, Daniel first invades the space of the foreign and nonhuman by confronting the king about both of the supposed "living gods." He is familiar with and has the acumen not only to navigate the foreign spaces of two foreign gods, but also to assert his dominance over both of them. Responding to the king's proposed animacies of both Bel and the revered serpent, Daniel responds with a blend of cleverness and violence, resulting in the demise of both nonhumans. Thus, the "contest" in *Bel* is initiated entirely by Daniel and not out of necessity as in the other Danielic court tales. In other words, there is no threat against his life instigated by his mere presence in the foreign court. Finally, the domain of the animals into which Daniel is thrust appears to be threatening but, in fact, there is no confrontation with the lions whatsoever. In sum, the *Bel* tales present the intersection of foreignness and the nonhuman

[291] As a part of the "tension" that Breed observes between the accounts of Dan. 6 and *Bel*, he calls the Dan. 6 incident "private" whereas that of *Bel* is "public." However, the exact mode of resistance in Dan. 6 may be more complex than merely a private non-compliance since Daniel is said to open his windows toward Jerusalem, implying the less-than-discreet nature of his disobedience (Breed, *Daniel,* 207).

something to be conquered and outwitted, qualities that Daniel is portrayed to exemplify. Such an example may have inspired its Jewish readers to act similarly with boldness and confrontation toward opposing groups, affirming a different authorial and cultural setting than Dan. 6.

In contrast, Dan. 6 presents Daniel's mere presence in the court as innately threatening to the foreign courtiers, which results in a type of invasion into his domestic space by way of their entrapping decree. No action on Daniel's part is antagonistic, nor is he portrayed as resisting the accusation of his conspirers. On the other hand, while the foreign court is hostile to Daniel's presence, the king himself is quite benevolent towards Daniel, albeit powerless to protect him. The mixed representation of the threat of foreignness combined with Daniel's passivity is unique in the Danielic corpora. It is set in stark contrast with Nebuchadnezzar and the antagonistic courtiers in Dan. 3, the court tale with which Dan. 6 is often compared, and is also distinct from the *Bel* tales that portray foreignness and its nonhumans as necessitating confrontation by an emboldened Daniel.

Divine and Kingly Interventions

There are also notable differences in the ways that sovereignty is portrayed in the two narratives, and the ways in which the deity intervenes on Daniel's behalf. For Dan. 6, the immediate threat is the lions and remains so until the resolution of the tale. To overcome this threat, the angel of God closes the mouths of the lions to preserve Daniel's life. In this way, the lions are acted upon directly and have no agency of their own in this regard. They do act on their own, however, when the conspiring courtiers and their families are thrown in the pit and the lions devour them before they even hit the ground. Here, both the animacy and the autonomy of the lions play a role in the divine plan. The captive lions act as "normal" lions would and are indeed animated creatures. Nevertheless, they are still subject to a greater animate being—the living

god—who retains the right to overpower their autonomy according to its will by a direct intervention. This divine act is recognized by Darius as one performed by a "living god," therefore rising to supremacy beyond just being "Daniel's god." The explanation for this sovereign act is found in Daniel's statement in MT 6:23: "God sent his angel (אלהי שלח מלאכה) and closed the mouth of the lion, and they did not destroy me because before him I was found innocent; also before you, O king, I have done no crime." The OG 6:22 differs slightly, adding that Daniel was found "righteous" before God and without ignorance or sin before the king, and also adds fault to the king for being misled by "those who deceive kings (ἀνθρώπων πλανώντων βασιλεῖς)."[292] Thus, in the versions of Dan. 6, the act of deliverance is accredited to Daniel's innocence, both before God and the king.

Sovereign intervention is expressed differently in *Bel.* Instead of being eaten by lions, the immediate threat for the *Bel* tales is apparently Daniel's own lack of food while in the pit for six days. Strangely, the text is more specific about its leonine characters than Dan. 6 even though they play a minor role in the deliverance portion of the story. The readers are told that there are seven lions and in fact, the animals are starving themselves since normally they are fed at least two "condemned" human bodies. The Th. adds that two sheep were provided in addition to the humans. But after these details are provided, the lions are not mentioned again apart from their implied consumption of the crowd who condemned Daniel. The leonine threat in the narrative, then, is usurped by the threat of starvation, which is remedied by the meal delivered by Habakkuk. The prophet is sovereignly approached by and transported to Babylon in 14:34 by an angel of the Lord (ἄγγελος κυρίου), and then back to Judea after Daniel receives his meal. In further contrast to Dan. 6, Daniel's prayer of thanks, and therefore his accreditation of his

[292] Daniel's statement of fault against the king is absent in the Th and follows the structure of the MT.

deliverance, declares that God remembered him because he does not abandon those who love him. Thus, unlike Dan. 6, Daniel's deliverance is not attributed to his blamelessness in *Bel* but rather his position as beloved.

In addition to the differences of divine sovereignty, the sovereignty of foreign rulers is also portrayed in disparate ways. Darius the Mede of Dan. 6 is presented as a compassionate king who genuinely cares for his favored courtier but is easily duped by the more clever actors in his court. Perhaps likened to the concern that Nebuchadnezzar receives from Daniel in ch. 4, Daniel now receives a similar care from the imperial throne. Just as Daniel is unable to intervene on Nebuchadnezzar's behalf so as to defer or absolve his sentence, so too Darius is unable to save Daniel even with the resources of the empire at his disposal. In contrast, Cyrus the Persian ruling over Babylon is volatile like Nebuchadnezzar and willing to make bets on Daniel's life or readily dispose of him at the behest of the people. Still, however, Cyrus "bewails" Daniel like Darius before he realizes that he was indeed spared whilst in the lion pit.

Dialogues on Animacy

The dialogues with each foreign king also convey distinct attitudes toward human sovereignties. In *Bel,* the reader is entertained by an ongoing conversation between Daniel and the king rather than being dominated by the courtiers' conspiracy. *Bel's* court officials are largely passive and are only brought into the story as deceptive antagonists after Daniel proposes his challenge to show the king who is really consuming the statue's food. The dialogue between Daniel and the king, which might mirror a philosophical debate of sorts, is based on the question of "what makes something 'living,' especially a 'living god?'" In *Bel,* foreignness is wrapped up in the notion of animacy. The perception of how alive something is has an impact on its value, not only in its worthiness to be worshipped but also those who associate with it, resulting in the

determination of their life or death. In the case of the priests who associate with and eat on the behalf of Bel, they are killed because of their association with the inanimate statue. Similarly, the Babylonians who are responsible for throwing Daniel in the lion's den because of his disrespect to both Bel and the death of the serpent are "devoured" by the lions intended for Daniel's demise. Their association with gods who are not "living gods"—that is, lower on the scale of animacy—becomes the catalyst for their destruction.

3.6 Zoolatry: Reflections on Foreignness and Animacy

Before concluding this chapter, I now turn to a topic that a number of studies on *Bel and the Serpent* discuss and which holds particular relevance to my discussion of foreign identities and notions of animacy: zoolatry. Zoolatry, or the worship of animals, was not uncommon in the ancient world, especially Egypt, nor in the socio-religious contexts of ancient Jewish communities.[293] While texts that address the foolishness of inanimate "idols" and statues of gods are prevalent, especially since the tradition builds on a wide selection of scriptural texts from the prophetic corpora, less often is the worship of "live idols" or nonhumans addressed, let alone serpents.[294] But that does not mean there is no evidence at all. A number of studies have investigated the phenomenon of "othering" Egyptians in the Second Temple period, to which I

[293] See David A. DeSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002) 260-2. DeSilva does not see zoolatry as reason to assume *Bel's* composition in Egypt but rather "that idolatry and zoolatry simply are attacked [in *Bel*] as two well-known forms of Gentile (im)piety" (260). See also Collins, *Daniel*, 414-420. For a broader survey of zoolatry in early Judaism, see the entry on "Animal Worship," by Jed Wyrick in *The Eerdman's Dictionary of Early Judaism*, eds. Daniel C. Harlow and John J. Collins (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010), 331-33. Wyrick's entry does not, however, discuss *Bel and the Serpent.*

[294] For a discussion on the development of the serpent-dragon traditions in biblical as well as Greek and Roman contexts, see Phil Senter, Uta Mattox, and Eid. E. Haddad, "Snake to Monster: Conrad Gessner's Schlangenbuch and the Evolution of the Dragon in the Literature of Natural History," *Journal of Folklore Research* 53, no. 1 (2016), especially 80; 99; 106-7.

aim to highlight the animality associated with their foreignness.[295] Two works that show interest in both foreignness and animacy—the *Letter of Aristeas* and Philo's *De Decalogo*—comment on foreigners' worship of animals, both of which I briefly examine here.[296]

Originating in Alexandria, Egypt, in the second century BCE, the *Letter of Aristeas* is of a "legendary and propagandistic nature," telling the story of the translation of the Greek Pentateuch.[297] The passage that interests us is found in the midst of a broader discussion of the dietary laws and restrictions of clean and unclean animals instructed by Moses, the "Lawgiver," and the singularity of the God whose existence Moses demonstrated. Framed as an explanation from the high priest Eleazar, the *Letter* then considers the concept of polytheism which prompts a mention of zoolatry, also called theriolatry:

> Therefore, having made this beginning, he also demonstrated that "all the rest of humanity, except us, think that there are many gods, being themselves more powerful by far than those gods whom they worship in vain. For they make statues out of stone and wood, asserting that the images are of those who have made certain inventions useful to them for their lives, which they worship, whose lack of consciousness is obvious. For if anyone should be divinized in that way, due to an invention, this is completely silly. For such people, taking certain things that were in creation, put them together and showed further their utility. They

[295] Emily A. Hemelrijk and Klaas A., D. Smelik, "Who Knows Not What Monsters Demented Egyptians Worship? Opinions on Egyptian Animal Worship in Antiquity as Part of the Ancient Conception of Egypt," ANRW 2/17.4 (1984): 1852–2000; Meyer Reinhold, "Roman Attitudes Toward Egyptians," Ancient World 3 (1980): 97–103.

[296] There are, of course, other works that provide insight on this dynamic of Jewish perceptions of animal worship. See also, for example, Wisdom of Solomon 12:23-27 and the *Sibylline Oralces* 3.29-34.

[297] Timothy Lim. *The Formation of the Jewish Canon* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), 74. On the relationship between Danielic literature and the *Letter*, see Sara Raup Johnson, *Historical Fictions and Hellenistic Jewish Identity: Third Maccabees in its Cultural Context,* Vol. 43 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004) 45-6; 130-2; 141-6.

> themselves did not create the original state. Thus it is empty and vain to deify those who are the same as themselves. For yet even still there are many who are more inventive and more learned than people of old, but they would not be quick to worship them. And those who form these things and invent fables, they consider them to be the wisest of the Greeks. Is it even necessary to speak of other quite vain people, like the Egyptians and those like them, who rely upon wild beasts and most serpents and animals, and they worship these, and they sacrifice to them, both alive and dead?[298]

The primary focus of the *Letter* is the worship of especially renowned humans to whom inventions are attributed, and of whom statues of wood and stone are created. To the former point, the *Letter* argues that since such humans did not "create the original state" they supposedly invented and merely devised a new way of applying its use, they are not worthy of worship. To the second issue regarding statues, the crux is the statue's *lack of consciousness* rather than the inability to speak or hear that one might expect. These two points are in relation to the statuary, like Bel who, according to Daniel, is not a living god because of its inability to eat and drink. In his commentary on the *Letter,* Wright suggests that the view expressed in this section is quite distinct from other Jewish condemnations of idol worship, a list of texts in which he includes *Bel and the Serpent.*[299] And although he is right in distinguishing the utilitarian purpose of idols in the *Letter* versus the inanimate statue of Bel, he does not extend his discussion of the worship of the serpent to the *Letter's* statements about theriolatry that concludes the passage.

---

[298] *Letter of Aristeas* 134-138 translated by Benjamin G. Wright III, *The Letter of Aristeas: 'Aristeas to Philocrates' or 'On the Translation of the Law of the Jews.'* (Berlin-Boston: Walter de Gruyter GmbH, 2015), 256-57.

[299] Wright, *Aristeas,* 259-60.

In its final lines, the *Letter* mentions in passing the practices of peoples such as the Egyptians in worshipping a number of different animals. These include species that are domestic and wild, as well as alive and dead. To explain this critique attributed to the high priest Eleazar, M.A.L. Beavis proposes an underlying anti-Egyptian polemic at the heart of this section of the *Letter.* The author points to the strange practices of Egyptians as part of an "ethnic hierarchy" that is not concerned with the ritual impurity of such animals, as one might expect in a section on dietary regulations, but rather on the creatures' "loathsome qualities."[300] In contrast with this notion of superiority of Jewish practices to those of foreigners, Wright proposes a more nuanced approach and argues that the statements about the reasonings for dietary laws and those against animal worship were intended for a Jewish audience: "[the author of the *Letter*] is trying to provide for his fellow Jews a rationale for maintaining distinctly Jewish practices while at the same time living in the larger Hellenistic environment."[301] Even if the *Letter* is not a direct polemic as Beavis seems to suggest, there are polemical tones embedded in the *Letter's* identity negotiations that Wright highlights. Although not particularly overt, the tensions associated with foreigners and their animals are clearly woven into the discussions of Jewish groups in the early centuries BCE not only in Palestine but Jewish-Egyptian scribal circles as well.

Keeping in line with the *Letter's* perspectives on the topic of animal cults in Egypt, Philo of Alexandria remains one of the more intriguing commentators and is of particular interest to the serpent-cult described in *Bel.*[302] In her essay on *De Decalogo,* Philo's treatise on the ten

[300] M.A.L. Beavis, "Anti-Egyptian Polemic in the Letter of Aristeas 130-165 (The High Priest's Discourse)," *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period* 18, no. 2 (1987): 150-1. Erich S. Gruen makes a similar argument but on the basis of the superiority of Jewish practices and tradition. See *Heritage and Hellenism,* 216.

[301] Wright, *Aristeas* 68-9.

[302] See Pearce's monograph, in which she dedicates a chapter to Philo's perspective on Egyptian animal worship. *The Land of the Body: Studies in Philo's Representations of Egypt* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 241-76; 282-

commandments, as well as her monograph on Philo's representations of Egypt, Sarah Pearce has extensively examined how Philo perceived and struggled with Egyptian others.[303] Here, Philo elaborates on the second commandment concerning the prohibition of worshipping other images:

> Let no one therefore of those beings who are endowed with souls, worship anything that is devoid of a soul; for it would be one of the most absurd things possible for the works of nature to be diverted to the service of those things which are made by hand; and against Egypt, not only is that common accusation brought, to which the whole country is liable, but another charge also, which is of a more special character, and with great fitness; for besides falling down to statues, and images they have also introduced irrational animals, to the honors due to the gods, such as bulls, and rams, and goats, inventing some prodigious fiction with regard to each of them; and as to these particular animals, they have indeed some reason for what they do, for they are the most domestic, and the most useful to life…But as it is they go beyond these animals, and select the most fierce, and untamable of all wild animals, honoring lions, and crocodiles, and of reptiles the poisonous asp, with temples, and sacred precincts, and sacrifices, and assemblies in their honor, and solemn processions, and things of that kind…They have also deified many other animals, dogs, ichneumons, wolves, birds, ibises, and hawks, and even fish, taking sometimes the whole, and sometimes only a part; and what can be more ridiculous than this conduct?... Therefore, God, removing out of his

308. Philo's broader perspectives on animals (and their inferior irrationality) stem from the influences of the Stoics and Aristotle, and can be found in his work *De Animalibus* (Pearce, *Land of the Body*, 22). Philo's comments in *De Decalogo* are particularly relevant since they intersect with worship, conceptions of divinity, and foreign practices.

[303] Sarah Pearce, "Philo of Alexandria on the Second Commandment," in *The Image and its Prohibition in Jewish Antiquity*, Journal of Jewish Studies Supplement Series 2; ed. Sarah Pearce (Oxford: Journal of Jewish Studies, 2013), 49-76.

> sacred legislation all such impious deification of undeserving objects, has invited men to the honor of the one true and living God (ἀλήθειαν ὄντος θεοῦ).[304]

Philo's discussion begins with addressing the utilitarian perspective of animal worship, that is, animals which are useful to humans are understandably worshipped by foreigners since they provide some benefit to human society and are worthy (to some degree) of being honored. He does in any way condone this view but rather attempts to find a purpose or reason in it. When it comes to creatures that are not domestic staples to Egyptian life or serve an honorable purpose—a category in which Philo places lions, crocodiles, and venomous asps—Philo cannot imagine what would inspire someone to worship them. The matter becomes quite serious when Philo discusses the effects of worshipping such "beasts." Just as those who worship idols "become like them," so too those who worship animal-brutes—their worshippers are transformed into their image and become beastly creatures. As Wright summarizes regarding Philo's statement, the passage is more severe than the *Letter's* depiction of theriolatry; Wright, however, does not go beyond this observation.[305] In Philo's reasoning, animal worship is one of the most perverted violations of the second commandment. In Pearce's summary, "Animal worship is unjust and impious because it makes rational human beings worship the irrational, a characteristically Egyptian reversal of the proper order of things."[306] Ultimately, that which has a rational soul (humans) should not worship that which does not (nonhuman animals) since it goes against their nature.

---

[304] Philo, *De Decalogo*, 76-81. Adapted translation from C. D. Yonge, *The Works of Philo: Complete and Unabridged* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995), 524-525. Philo also discusses animal worship elsewhere. Of the Ptolemies, he states they are "a people who look upon dogs, and wolves, and lions, and crocodiles, and numerous other beasts, both terrestrial and aquatic, and numerous birds, as gods." *Legatio ad Gaium* 138-9 (Yonge, 769).

[305] Wright, *Aristeas*, 263.

[306] Pearce, *Land of the Body*, 308.

In both of the discourses in the *Letter* and *De Decalogo*, zoolatry or theriolatry are intimately linked with Egyptian foreignness. In the *Letter,* the critique is not as severe and is not of central concern to the passage's discussion but added as a sort of afterthought polemic against Egyptian practices. For Philo, however, the critique is much harsher. Both passages also contrast theriolatry with the usefulness or utilitarian aspect of worship. In other words, there is a logic behind whom or what one worships. A similar theme can be observed in *Bel* in the dialogue between the king and Daniel. In response to Daniel's disregard for the inanimate Bel, the king shows him the revered serpent and challenges his logic: how can Daniel say that the serpent is not a living god since he can observe its animacy, as well as its ability to eat? Herein, Daniel reveals another layer to his logic. It is not simply a matter of eating and drinking that makes one a living god but its imperishability.[307] Thus, the serpent's ability to be killed—its killability—is ultimately what sets it apart from and inferior to the Jewish God who imparts that same imperishability to Daniel by preserving his life in the lion pit.

3.7 Violent Conclusions

Both Dan. 6 and *Bel* retain their narrative value with the threat and, ultimately, execution of violence against humans and nonhumans. As I have demonstrated, the two tales have much in common such as the dangers of consumption, the negotiation of foreignness expressed by what constitutes a "living" god, and the climax of deliverance from the lion pit. They also bear significant differences in their approaches to these themes including their literary settings, expressions of divine sovereignty and of foreign rulers, and distinct dialogues. The final set of

[307] One might be reminded of Heidegger's assertion that "animals live but do not exist." See Kelly Oliver, *Animal Lessons: How They Teach Us to Be Human* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2009) 236.

differences I turn to here are the passages' portrayals of violence, and how violent actions are mediated between human and nonhuman subjects. Two models of exemplary behavior are expressed by the texts: one of non-confrontation leading to deliverance (Dan. 6) and one of antagonism resulting in a show of victory (*Bel*). Entangled in these exemplars are differing views of violence that should be undertaken by the Jewish audience.

In Dan. 6, Daniel is a nonviolent and largely passive figure who, despite his favor and sense of security in his relationship with the king Darius, becomes a victim of the conspiracies devised against him. His passive role is understood in different ways, but in any interpretation, his responses are uniquely non-violent. In Daniel L. Smith-Christopher's study of Mahatma Gandhi's cultural exegesis of Dan. 6, for example, he demonstrates how Daniel's passivity is interpreted as resistor against the oppressive power rather than solely as victim.[308] The crux of Gandhi's understanding lay in his reading of Daniel's "defiance" in throwing open the windows of whilst praying, and in full knowledge of the decree that forbade it. In his presentation, Smith-Christopher shows how Gandhi's reading preserves the active form of the verb used to open Daniel's windows, which is reflected in the OG, Vulgate, and Ethiopic versions. In contrast, the MT and Theodotion preserve the passive form of the verb, highlighting that Daniel did nothing to initiate his arrest but that his windows were merely "opened."[309] The most explicit violent incident of Dan. 6 is the long-awaited meal of lions, and the deaths of the Median courtiers along with their wives and children. Perhaps the gruesomeness of their deaths seems slightly justified since they attempted to inflict the same measure upon Daniel, a reversal of their plan that backfired miserably. As shown in the differing interpretations of Daniel's open windows, and in

[308] Smith-Christopher, 326.

[309] Ibid. 328-9.

conjunction with other readings I have summarized previously, the OG and MT versions are generally consistent in their approaches to outward resistance. The OG is more comfortable denigrating foreign powers and providing its protagonists an active role in critiquing or resisting them, whereas the MT is more subtle, and even passive, in its critique of the powers that be.

In the Greek tale *Bel,* however, Daniel's passivity and nonviolence dissolves entirely and he becomes instead a primary agent whose actions have both direct and indirect consequences enmeshed with eating, violence, and settings of ritual sacrifice in foreign temples. In her article on sacrifice and the concept of the slaughterhouse, Annette Yoshiko Reed presents the varying perceptions of sacrifice in Vedic writings and ancient Israelite tradition, two of the more developed systems of ritual sacrifice in the ancient world.[310] After her summary of Vedic understandings, Reed concludes that "sacrificial eating can become—often simultaneously—cosmological and devotional acts, works of social differentiation, and embodied expressions of communal identity and ideals."[311] Concluding the same of the prescriptions in the Torah/Pentateuch that "sacrifice and 'civilization' are coterminous," Reed observes the dissolution of the Western human-animal binary and a mutual creaturely subordination under a shared creator.[312] While this dissolution may indeed be observed in the relationship between and mutual preservation of Daniel and the lions under one "living god," *Bel* portrays a much different perspective.[313] For the *Bel* tales, there are animacy-based hierarchical structures wherein life and

[310] Annette Yoshiko Reed, "From Sacrifice to the Slaughterhouse: Ancient and Modern Approaches to Meat, Animals, and Civilization," *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion,* Vol. 26.2 (2014), 111-158.

[311] Ibid. 128-9.

[312] Ibid. 134. Hannah Strømmen comes to a similar conclusion in her studies of animality and sovereignty in the biblical archive, especially in the Danielic corpora.

[313] Strømmen, *Biblical,* 102-3. She states: "Sharing a space with the lions points to the way [Daniel] too is an 'animal' captive under foreign rule, brought into foreign court, and made subject to the rule of a king who feeds and keeps him, as pet or prey."

death are meted out by both a "living god" and its zealous representative, Daniel. Ultimately, Daniel is not invincible despite his reckless actions and eventually requires the assistance of his god when the violence goes too far and he is apprehended by the Babylonian mob.

As seen in the discussions of "real" animals in *Bel and the Serpent,* understandings of animals, foreignness, and foreigners are connected to and embedded with propensities for and actualizations of violence mediated through depictions of eating. The repercussions of these portrayals of violence on an individual or a community subtly (or not subtly) show an exemplar who can "kill" a foreigner's god in order to prove it is not truly "living." The versions of Dan. 6, in comparison, temper their portrayals of violence and focus instead on the tensions that lay just below the surface; the threat against Daniel's life, the necessity of intervention by the "living god," and the release of these tensions with the destruction of the courtiers and their families at the mouths of the king's lions. In both tales, eating and animacy serve as negotiation points for violence against and at the hands of foreign gods and kings, and both result in similarly violent ends.

CHAPTER FOUR: FOUR "OTHER" LIVING CREATURES

"I started from my sleep with horror; a cold dew covered my forehead, my teeth chattered And every limb became convulsed; when, by the dim and yellow light of the moon, as it forced its way through the window-shutters, I beheld the wretch—the miserable monster whom I had created."

Mary W. Shelley, *Frankenstein, or the Modern Prometheus*[314]

4.1 Introduction

The unforgettable creatures that emerge from the sea in Daniel 7 have inspired over two millennia of interpretation and literary reworking. They served as one of the primary influences for arguably the most famous literary apocalypse, the Apocalypse of John, and have remained very much alive in the imaginations of scholars and laypeople alike today.[315] The *nachleben* of Daniel's four creatures is well-studied but the texts and visual culture on which Dan. 7 depends are still very much debated. Scholarship has produced a number of studies on the text's affinities with Ugaritic and Babylonian combat mythologies, and emphasized themes such as order's victory over chaos, humanity's supremacy over animals, and the Jewish deity's sovereignty over gentile nations.[316] Although much can be said to support these parallels, this analysis takes an alternate approach. Looking instead to the underlying cultural anxieties that constructed these creatures, I examine Daniel's four hybrid animals through the lens of monster theory and place

[314] *Frankenstein: Or the Modern Prometheus,* first published in 1818 (Online: The Floating Press, 2009), 73.

[315] For the relationship between Dan. 7 and Rev. 13, see Adela Yarbro-Collins, *Crisis and Catharsis,* 146. See also Collins' dissertation on Revelation and combat myths more broadly, which informs her later work on the topic. Adela Yarbro Collins, *The Combat Myth in the Book of Revelation*, Harvard Theological Review, Volume 9 (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1976).

[316] For an overview of these efforts, see Jürg Eggler, *Influences and Traditions Underlying the Vision of Daniel 7:1-14: The Research History from the End of the 19th Century to the Present* (Fribourg: Fribourg University Press, 2000).

the visionary account in literary dialogue with the four living creatures described in Ezekiel 1.[317] As such, few studies have directly examined the relationship between Ezekiel's four living creatures (חיות) and Daniel's four "other" living creatures (חיון). Ezekiel's four creatures, each of them four-faced and unified in their purpose, form the base of the mobile divine throne, and are revealed to Ezekiel in a post-exilic, foreign land. Daniel's four creatures are also revealed in a post-exilic context under foreign empire but each hybrid creature is different from the other and presented before thrones in the divine court for judgment. Because of the chapters' differences and especially the lack of exact parallels between the physical appearances of the creatures, most studies do not link the two texts. Furthermore, most scholars tend to focus on what the hybrid creatures represent, what their underlying "codes" are, and what their historical referents might be. Turning my investigation instead to how the creatures in Dan. 7 function on their own terms, I argue that the monstrosity of the hybrid creatures of Daniel's vision reflects the insecurities of the community surrounding their collective identity under foreign rule. Furthermore, I argue that the creatures' depiction in a throne-room vision is modeled after Ezek. 1, revealing the community's uncertainties of the divine structure itself.

Continuing the dialogue from the previous two chapters which analyzed animality and its animal interlocutors in Nebuchadnezzar's transformation, and the violence of consumption in Dan. 6 and *Bel,* the present chapter examines Dan. 7 with specific attention to its Ezekielian influences based on what might be called the visions' shared "living creatureliness." Before diving into this textual dialogue, I provide a brief introduction to monster theory and its utility for Dan. 7, followed by a review of previous approaches to Daniel's so-called "beasts." Moving

[317] A portion of this chapter was presented at the Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting 2020. I thank the organizers, presenters, and attendees of the panel for their questions and feedback, and especially Jillian Stinchcomb who suggested to me the usefulness of monster theory for my discussion.

to a closer examination of Ezek. 1 and Dan. 7, and to show the relationship between them, I discuss Ezekiel's wide-ranging influence on Daniel's creatures, and highlight how both sets of creatures have functional parallels in throne theophanies and the mediation of divine revelation. In the process, I approach the חיות and חיון as "monsters," creatures that are often hybrid in form and liminal in their locale, and as reflective of societal anxieties that are simultaneously familiar and foreign "other." Like many of the animal interlocutors in the Danielic corpora, how monstrous creatures are portrayed in early Jewish texts and traditions like Dan. 7 demonstrates their significant role in identity formation and negotiation, especially how they interact with foreignness. By reworking the concept of the *Mischwesen* (or mixed beings) from Ezek. 1 and emphasizing the interpretability and malleability of hybrid creatures, I conclude that Dan. 7 provides a social and theological reflection on the stability and efficacy (and lack thereof) of the structures of the divine throne-room.

4.2 Thinking with Monster Theory

While boundary blurring can be understood in a variety of ways, the burgeoning field of monster theory is a promising avenue for discussion on some of the most important expressions of animality in Daniel. It provides a helpful heuristic for mapping out the strange, fantastical, otherworldly, and transmundane creatures and circumstances presented throughout the corpora, especially the creatures of Dan. 7.[318] In her analysis of the human and nonhuman creatures of 4

[318] Monster theory may prove beneficial to more texts in the Danielic corpora, but Dan. 7 provides the most promising test-case. Although my analysis argues for a different conclusion than Heather Macumber's essay on Dan. 7's fourth beast as a monstrous Antiochus Epiphanes IV, it is nevertheless a helpful resource. See Heather Macumber, "A Monster without a Name: Creating the Beast Known as Antiochus IV in Daniel 7," *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* Vol. 15.9 (2015) 1-26. For a recent summary of the intersections between studies of the Hebrew Bible and monster theory, see Brandon R. Grafius, "Text and Terror: Monster Theory and the Hebrew Bible," *Currents in Biblical Research* Vol. 16(1) (2017) 34-49. See, too, his monograph *Reading the Bible with Horror* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2019).

Ezra, Rebecca Raphael asserts that "images of anomalous bodies provide a major means by which the text [of 4 Ezra] constructs the Other"[319] In many ways, this statement holds true for the majority of the animal interlocutors in the Danielic corpora but especially so for the famous four in Dan. 7. In the following section, I summarize and highlight a select number of helpful studies at the intersection of monster theory and apocalyptic-adjacent literature, and identify two ways that such approaches enlighten the social and literary functions of Daniel's creatures in connection with Ezekiel's: their physical hybridity and role as interlocutors of divine revelation.

Before looking more closely at selected studies, we must address the question of how one should define a "monster."[320] Monsters are not simply fearsome creatures with grotesque or repulsive features, nor just agents of violence and seemingly senseless, perverted malice, as many past studies of Dan. 7 have spoken of the "four beasts" and their monstrosity.[321] In his essay on postcolonial readings of apocalyptic literature and its "mixed monsters," Daniel Smith-Christopher helpfully outlines the seven theses of Jeffrey J. Cohen, who was one of the pioneers of monster studies at the end of the twentieth century.[322] Smith-Christopher outlines the theses as

---

[319] Rebecca Raphael, "Monsters and the Crippled Cosmos: Construction of the Other in Fourth Ezra," in *The "Other" in Second Temple Judaism: Essays in Honor of John J. Collins,* eds. Daniel C. Harlow, et al. (Grand Rapids, Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing Co.: 2011), 280. Raphael's approach blends monster theory and disability studies, both of which engage the "ideological construction of bodies, 'normal' and not" (281). My study focuses on the former because of the prevalence of scholarship's consistent reference to Daniel's creatures as "beasts," "freaks," and "monsters."

[320] There are too many studies to cite here who have formulated and responded to how monsters should be defined and according to which criteria. Jeffrey J. Cohen, whose definition we will work with below, is only one of many ways to approach monsters. For a brief summary of other options, see David D. Gilmore, *Monsters: Evil Beings, Mythical Beasts, and All Manner of Imaginary Terrors* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), 6-9; 15-22.

[321] As a few examples: "The fourth [beast] the most fearsome of all, a dreadful monster with iron teeth and bronze claws…" (Gruen, *Construct of Identity,* 42); "These [four] beasts are grotesque and unnatural monsters…" (Andrew Remington Rillera, "A Call to Resistance: The Exhortative Function of Daniel 7," *Journal of Biblical Literature* Vol. 138.4 (2019) 769).

[322] Daniel L. Smith-Christopher, "A Postcolonial Reading of Apocalyptic Literature," in *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature,* John J. Collins, ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014) 180-198. For his quotations of

follows: 1) "The monster's body is a cultural body," and one that both reveals and warns; 2) "The monster always escapes" and manages to remain a shifting, elusive creature or system; 3) "The monster is the harbinger of category crisis," which is to say that the monster challenges and disrupts any attempt to systematize or categorize it; 4) "The monster dwells at the gates of difference" and is often the epitome of the altogether strange other; 5) "The monster polices the borders of the possible," which describes the sense of limitation felt by either the physical or emotional borders set by the monster's presence; 6) "Fear of the monster is really a kind of desire" and highlights the reader or viewer's vicarious experience of the monster's aggressive or violent acts; 7) "The monster stands at the threshold of becoming," that is, monsters interrogate the reader or viewer of their own world-building, structures, and self-images.[323] Each of these theses, as I present in my reading of Dan. 7 below, bear out in the text depicting Daniel's creatures and provide a helpful set of malleable ways to view their functions as interlocutors of both animality and foreignness.

Emerging with vibrancy over the last four decades, studies in monster theory have much to say about the balance between the social order and cosmic order.[324] Monsters often emerge at pivotal moments of crisis, transition, and community upheaval.[325] Although these social settings do not reflect the contexts of all literary apocalypses, they certainly do for Dan. 7, as well as its prophetic predecessor, Ezek. 1, and provide a framework with which the community in crisis can

---

Cohen, see Jeffrey J. Cohen, "Monster Culture (Seven Theses)," in *Monster Theory: Reading Culture* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996) 7-8.

[323] Smith-Christopher, "A Postcolonial Reading of Apocalyptic Literature," 185-6.

[324] For a relevant selection, see Jeffrey J. Cohen, *Monster Theory: Reading Culture* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996); George Aichele and Tina Pippin, eds., *The Monstrous and the Unspeakable: the Bible as Fantastic Literature* (Playing the Texts 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997); Timothy K. Beal, *Religion and Its Monsters* (New York: Routledge, 2002); and Gilmore, *Monsters*.

[325] Cohen, "Monster Culture (Seven Theses)," 7.

articulate its anxieties regarding self and other.[326] As succinctly summarized by Raphael, "with due attention to cultural specificity, *monsters are ourselves*."[327] Furthermore, if there are already borderline-monsters in the structures of the divine order—such as those in Ezekiel's first vision—the reworking of such creatures becomes a fruitful site of reinterpretation and social commentary on perceptions of and anxieties surrounding the Divine itself.

In her examination of the boundary-threatening monsters in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Heather Macumber summarizes monster theory as "a way of understanding a culture by examining the monsters it produces," especially those who operate in ultra-mundane or liminal spaces.[328] By definition, monsters do not cooperate with or abide by the constructed boundaries of good and evil, order and chaos, and insider and outsider. Thus, because of their inherent instability as boundary-crossers, monstrous creatures "both disturb the normal order of society and simultaneously reveal the deepest insecurities of a culture."[329] At the same time, because of their liminal status, the neutrality of such beings is fitted for both maintaining and guarding social and divine order, as well as holding the greatest potential to cause chaos in the world. And although the aim of the present study is not to come to a conclusion on the historical-symbolic origins of Ezekiel's or Daniel's creatures, the order-chaos dynamic is evident in the textual and

[326] For Dan. 7, the chapter's final form was redacted during the Antiochene crisis and sometime before Antiochus Epiphanes IV's death in 164 BCE. Ezekiel 1's upheaval is likely contemporaneous with the first exile of Jewish elites to Babylon, occurring in 597 BCE.

[327] Raphael, "Monsters," 283 (emphasis mine).

[328] Heather Macumber, "The Threat of the Monstrous in the Scrolls," in *New Methods and Perspectives*, eds. Carmen Palmer, et al., (Georgia: Society of Biblical Literature Press, 2020), 145. Macumber's approach in her 2020 article has different emphases than that of her 2015 article on Daniel's fourth creature. For the monstrous other in the DSS, she focuses on the social insecurities revealed by the descriptions of outsider-others, whereas in Dan. 7, she argues that the hybrid-beasts are creatures of horror according to the definitions set by Noël Carroll: 1) as "dangerous or threatening;" 2) as "impure beings;" 3) and as originating "on the periphery of society" (Macumber, "Monster Without a Name," 5).

[329] Macumber, "Threat of the Monstrous," 147.

iconographical sources that most certainly played a role in shaping the literary bodies of the "four creatures" motif.[330] As both guardians of chaos and potential propagators of it, we can continue to understand, with the help of monster theory, the very real creatures in the Jewish imagination according to their "function in society as indicators of a community's fears and prejudices."[331] We may then be able to formulate a lens through which we can view Daniel's creatures as not altogether negative depictions of foreign rulers or oppressive empires, but as complex reflections of societal discomfort, anxiety, and self-reflection.

As noted, monsters already have a connotation with "revealing," "warning," or "demonstrating" some higher reality. This association puts them in close proximity to divine power and revelation, and even purpose. David Gilmore describes this paradox as follows:

> Promiscuously combining incongruent organic elements, the monster also unified the moral opposites that comprise human comprehension. Ugly and malevolent, the monster is demonic of course, but it is also paradoxically divine: in its mystery and power, god-like and unfathomable, an object of reverence, and of admiration—even of identification—as well as of fear and loathing.[332]

Signaled by their monstrous and hybrid forms, the creatures of both Ezek. 1 and Dan. 7 participate in the processes of revelatory knowledge in each of the visionary's throne-room

[330] As Safwat Marzouk notes, "one must contend with the point that in various literary texts the divine against the powers of chaos and its embodiment as a monster, according to the ancient Near Eastern worldview, is interrelated with political situations and historical events." *Egypt as a Monster in the Book of Ezekiel* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015) 19-20. Here, Marzouk addresses the stark distinctions scholars attempt to make between ANE depictions of myth and history, and suggests instead that they cannot be so easily disentangled.

[331] Macumber, "Threat of the Monstrous," 147.

[332] Gilmore, *Monsters,* 192.

theophanies.[333] Although Daniel reworks aspects of the Ezekelian creatures by associating them with destruction in order necessitate dominance over them, they are nevertheless retained as integral figures in the divine entourage and as animal (albeit monstrous) interlocutors in Daniel's cosmic revelation.

4.3 Previous Approaches to Daniel's "Beasts"

Beastly Terminology

The contrasts between humans and nonhumans in Dan. 7 has been a cause for much of the derogatory terminology assigned the perceptions of animals in Danielic scholarship. The animalization of empires compares the hostility and degraded status of gentile kingdoms with that of the animal world, drawing a contrast between the literally "humane" dominion of the "ancient of days" and "human-like one" and that of the bestial nature of the hybrid creatures who emerge from the sea.[334] Some of these issues are related to translation choices, while others are based on oversimplifications and over-appropriations of "apocalyptic dualism." At first glance, one might be stuck by the contrast between the "bad" monsters who also conveniently symbolize the outsider-Gentile-imperial figures versus the "good" man-gods who exercise their andro-domination over the violent beasts, thus acquiring the kingdom for the "holy ones of the Most High."[335] But with a closer look, especially without the importations of what we expect to be

[333] For a discussion of nonhuman animals as revelatory agents of the deity, as expressed by the speech acts of the serpent and Eve and the she-donkey and Balaam, see Cameron B. R. Howard, "Animal Speech as Revelation in Genesis 3 and Numbers 22," in N.C. Habel and P. Trudinger (eds.), *Exploring Ecological Hermeneutics* (SBL Symposium Series; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008) 21-30.

[334] Most studies on Dan. 7 translate חיון as "beasts." An exception to this is Lacocque who most often translates the word as "animals" (*Book of Daniel*, 122-55).

[335] This is even more apparent in the Danielic corpora, especially Dan. 4 wherein Nebuchadnezzar—Gentile king *par excellence*—is not a negative figure but one who experiences divine attention and restoration.

there, the human, nonhumans, and divine figures cannot be simplified with such clean boundaries.[336]

In her discussion introducing "the monstrosity of imperial rule," Anathea Portier-Young utilizes "monster" language to emphasize the perceived mutation of the Hellenistic empires ruling over Judea.[337] Building on earlier arguments on "the centrality of symbols in apocalyptic counter-discourse," she claims that that the hybrid, nonhuman depictions of the four kings in Dan. 7 reflect the authors experience of the massacres and terrorization inflicted by Antiochus IV's persecutions in 169-168 BCE.[338] And although she provides footnotes with works that provide a more nuanced view of the "monstrous," Portier-Young's use of the term does not reflect this complexity.[339] Her characterization of what is humane and inhumane depends largely on commentaries and translations of 2 Maccabees that depict the violence of Antiochus IV in animalistic terms. Composed sometime in the half-century following the rededication of the temple in 164 BCE, 2 Macc. reflects a very different prescription for its readers than Dan. 7 in terms of its "resistance strategy" or exemplary recommendations. Martyrdom, in contrast to the violent and "beastly" behavior of the Seleucids, is the act revered by the authors of 2 Macc., a type of "sympathetic history" which stands in stark contrast with the theophanic visions of Dan. 7, as well as Dan. 8-12.[340] Thus, the presentation of animal imagery and animality in Dan. 7

[336] I do not intend to assert that the creatures of Dan. 7 are altogether "positive" either, but rather to problematize the reductionist binaries that result in pigeon-holed discussions of how animals and foreigners are perceived throughout Danielic texts.

[337] Portier-Young, *Apocalypse*, 170-1.

[338] Ibid., 171, fn. 110.

[339] See, for example, Tina Pippin, *Apocalyptic Bodies: The Biblical End of the World in Text and Image* (London: Routledge, 1999); Christopher A. Frilingos, *Spectacles of Empire: Monsters, Martyrs, and the Book of Revelation* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004).

[340] The recommended behaviors of Dan. 7-12 are devoid of confrontation, violent resistance, or self-sacrifice.

might be better read in light of such distinctions and without the importation of pro-Maccabean literature intended to glorify the martyrdom of Jewish individuals against their Seleucid "beastly" predators.[341]

Between Biblical and Animal Studies

Between biblical studies and animal studies, a number of scholars have included Dan. 7 in their discussions but have not devoted particular attention to the text, especially in the context of the Danielic corpus as a whole. One of the more recent and thorough discussions is Hannah Strømmen's analysis of Dan. 7 and what she calls its "political animals," which are made up of foreign kings and kingdoms over whom the Deity must assert itself and their sovereignty. In this case and according to Strømmen's argument, Dan. 7 aims to reorient the hierarchy between human, divine, and animal toward divine order, which means that human and animal become equals of sorts beneath the Divine Sovereign's will.[342] In this, "human sovereignty is critiqued…and the human/animal binary is radically destabilized." For Strømmen, however, the Danielic authors replace the human/animal binary with a new hierarchy: that of the divine/animal

Instead, the ideal behavior prescribed by the *maskilim* are oriented around one's epistemology, the wisdom one possesses, and revelatory access, and not necessarily direct intervention either in a passive or active sense.

[341] As the reader may have already noticed, I abstain from translating Daniel's חיון as "beasts" throughout my investigation and opt instead for "creatures," "living creatures," or "animals." In this choice, I aim to highlight the implicit derogatory associations with the term "beast," an observation that is anything but unfamiliar to animal studies. Derrida, for example, makes a number of linguistic puns regarding the French word *bête.* In a translator's note (p. 3, fn. 6) of *the Animal that Therefore I Am,* he observes that *bête* means "stupid" or "asinine" when used as an adjective. See also Mary Midgley, *Beast and Man: The Roots of Human Nature* (London: Routledge, 2002), 24-5. My translation is, in part, experimental and questions how we might understand gentile empires and foreignness in Daniel 7 differently without the linguistic burden of "beast."

[342] As Carol Bakhos notes in her article, "Jewish, Christian, and Muslim Attitudes toward Animals," the notion of a hierarchical relationship between human and animal "does not perforce lead to unmitigated subjugation" (185). For an alternative view that traces the development of Aristotelian thought regarding the human-animal hierarchy and the irrationality of animals, see Gary Steiner, *Anthropocentrism and its Discontents,* 53-92. Steiner presents Aristotle's view as received by the Stoics, despite its dominance in Western traditions via Augustinian thought, as only one among many in classical Greek thought on the rationality of nonhumans.

where humans and animals share subservience to their master.[343] In agreement with this destabilization evident in Daniel, Jennifer Koosed and Robert Seesengood challenge the notion proposed by Collins and others that gentile kings are presented as volatile but benevolent in the first half of the book and altogether monstrous in the second half. By bringing attention to the animal, they argue, "the distinction between the beast and the sovereign is unstable in both parts of Daniel, and…is maintained by God."[344] Like Strømmen, Koosed and Seesengood consider the divine immune to the destabilizing wiles of what they might deem beastly sovereigns and sovereign (or not) beasts. Thus with this replacement hierarchy, there is no room left to discuss the anxieties of Jewish communities who, according to my argument, incorporate animal interlocutors not as altogether antagonistic, but instead as sites of identity negotiation.

Other recent approaches include considering Dan. 7's emphasis on the succession of foreign kingdoms, which has led scholars to point to Dan. 2 as a precursor with its so-called "four kingdom schema" depicted by the composite statue in Nebuchadnezzar's dream which is made up of at least four distinct materials. Recently, Alexandria Frisch has argued for the dissimilarity of these motifs by pointing to the array of major differences between the two schemas. Alexandria Frisch takes a similar stance to Strømmen on the matter but without the focus on animality. She maintains a binary of Jew-foreigner and points to its consistency in Dan. 2 and 7, although it is indeed reversed and reinscribed. She argues there will always be rulers and subjects but the pendulum will swing; "the first four [kingdoms] were foreign whereas the fifth kingdom is given to the Jewish people."[345] In short, Dan. 2's view of empire is one of totality

[343] Strømmen, *Biblical*, 91-2.

[344] Koosed and Seesengood, "Daniel's Animal Apocalypse," 187.

[345] Frisch, *Danielic*, 100-1.

and unity as exhibited by the distinct parts of a single "body," and a common fate of destruction is meted to each of the empires by a singular strike. In contrast, the emphasis of Dan. 7's empires is that they are "each different from one another," act with distinct characteristics, and are given different judgments.[346]

Ugaritic and Babylonian Mythologies

The chapter of Dan. 7 has long been discussed in the context of ANE cosmogonic myths including those of Ugarit and Canaan, as well as the succession of kingdoms motif by way of Persia. In order to explain and find meaning in the creatures in Dan. 7, previous scholarship has looked to the *chaoskampf* motifs in of the Ba'al cycle, as well as Babylonian creation myths.[347] Throughout the ancient Near East, guardian creatures are considered liminal beings. The images of their bodies in iconography and those described in texts are often blended, using features and functions of a number of animal species. Part of their affect is fear-inducing and may cause trembling or terror in those who behold them. Whether at the entrance to a temple or the base of a flaming throne, such creatures alert the viewer to his proximity to the divine. Of such hybrid species like those that appear in Dan. 7, Newsom agrees that "composite animals…connote supernatural power, whether for good or ill," however she considers the four-animal sequence reflective of two traditions at work in the Danielic chapter: the cosmogonic conflict and a political historiography.[348] Along similar lines, André Lacocque identified a shift from the purely

[346] Frisch, *Danielic* 82-85

[347] See Martin Noth, "The Understanding of History in O.T. Apocalyptic," in *The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Essays* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967); and Adela Yarbro Collins, *Combat Myth.* Emma Wasserman has recently challenged the role that the "rebellion in divine council" motif has played in apocalyptic thought, arguing that the threat of chaos in Second Temple Jewish literature was only a used as a prop for displaying the all-sovereign power of the Jewish God. See *Apocalypse as Holy War: Divine Politics and Polemics in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018).

[348] Newsom, *Daniel,* 222-3. She also likens the broader mythic imagery to the Mesopotamian *Enuma Elish,* whereas the specific animals she looks to intrabiblical allusions such as Hos. 13:7-8.

"'Götterkampfmythus' to 'Völkerkampfmythus,'" that is, from cosmic conflict among the gods to historical conflict, albeit retaining an Israelite "mythopoetic framework."[349] Including the initial setting of the chaotic sea that births the nations, Lacocque (like most commentators) briefly summarizes the text's possible allusions to the battle in *Enuma Elish* and Canaanite myths of Baal-Hadad and Yam but without any particular certainty. For Dan. 7's monsters, however, he is forthright with the lack of parallels and admits that "the other monsters which emerge from [Tiamat's] depths have nothing to do with the incredible animals in Daniel. The question as to their origin has not received any convincing solution."[350] Thus, although the text's general themes are loosely compatible with Mesopotamian myths of creation, chaos, and wars among the gods, such approaches have not shed much light on the creatures "origins" (which, in any case, is not the focus of this investigation) nor on their function in the social dialogue that Dan. 7 presents. They have nevertheless remained dominant views in studies of Dan. 7, especially as it pertains to Daniel's "beasts" and their function in the narrative.

Other explanations for the creatures include Paul Porter's thesis, which looks to mantic Mesopotamian traditions to provide context and meaning for the hybrid bodies that Daniel beholds.[351] His argument rests on the creatures being ill omens, as indicated by interpretations of anomalous bodily features in humans and animals. Although he does not mention monstrosity

[349] Lacocque, *Book of Daniel,* 129.

[350] Ibid, 139. Collins articulates a similar hesitancy with interpreting the animals in Dan. 7 and 8 and states: "[The animals] are complex metaphors, it is true, with mythic associations. But their primary function is to say something about an earthly reality by pointing out its cosmic or ultimate significance." Later in her argument, however, Collins affirms the transmission of the combat myth to Revelation by way of Daniel's creatures, especially their "origin in water chaos and the acts of rebellion." *Combat Myth,* 132; 163.

[351] *Metaphors and Monsters,* 15-29. Although Porter makes a compelling argument to consider the mantic-wisdom-prophetic context of Daniel's visions, the direct influence of birth omens is not altogether convincing. See also E.C. Lucas, "Daniel: Resolving the Enigma," *Vetus Testamentum* 50, no. 1 (2000): 66-80, who argues further for the influence of the Akkadian Prophecies on Dan. 7-8.

directly, Porter's argument looks to understand Daniel's "monsters" according to their function as warning signs, or omens, which is embedded in the Latin term *monstrare,* meaning to show or demonstrate.[352] In this way, he emphasizes their "evocative power" over their "literal absurdity," and in many ways attempts to dethrone the centrality of the concern for historical parallels in Daniel's visions.[353] Without embracing the totality of Porter's argument, which relies heavily on the birth-omen tablets of *Summa izbu,* his attention to *how* the hybridity of the creatures do their work in Dan. 7 is in and of itself a useful endeavor, and innovates beyond the overly simplistic decoding methods.[354]

In sum, although ANE *chaoskampf* motifs are commonplace in discussions of Dan. 7, there are very few substantive parallels between the function of the creatures in such cosmogonic myths. Although a very loose definition of "influence" may be cited to indicate a broad range of ANE traditions from which the authors of Dan. 7 drew, I argue that more concrete relationships can be observed from Ezek. 1 and how the creatures function in throne-room settings.

Greek Imagery

Another collection of source to which studies look as influences on the imagery of Dan. 7

[352] See Iris Idelson-Shein, "Introduction: Writing a History of Horror, or What Happens When Monsters Stare Back," in *Monsters and Monstrosity in Jewish History*. Idelson-Shein goes on to say that "from antiquity and into modern times, monsters have served as omens of impending doom, and as revealers of secrets, whether divine or familial, communal or individual. In the medieval and early modern periods, for instance, it was widely assumed that the birth of a monster was evidence of the sins, the impure thoughts, or the unclean desires of its parents, particularly its mother. The appearance of monsters was also perceived as an omen of divine wrath…" (1).

[353] Porter, *Monsters,* 29. He combines his analysis of Dan. 7 and 8, seeing both sets of creatures as anomalous omens of doom to varying degrees.

[354] See Gzella's monograph *Cosmic Battle* that examines Dan. 8 not "as a historical *allegory* which provides a symbolic representation of the forces of particular history. Instead, [Dan. 8] will be treated as a 'mimetic' representation of reality, not as a theoretical construction" (3). There are indeed limits to Gzella's approach but it is worthwhile as an exercise in order to show alternate ways of working with Daniel's visions, especially since it is clear that the texts are not altogether concerned with providing complete interpretations of their supposed allegorical presentations.

are classical and Hellenistic Greek texts and iconography.[355] Of the monsters in Hesiod's *Theogony,* for example, Emma Aston highlights two criteria based on the Greek terms *thera* and *pelor*. The first pertains to unnatural birth or liminal status, whereas the second refers to some type of morphological excess.[356] Aston provides two further categories from the *Theogony* of creatures who are defeated in some way, such the battle between Zeus and Typhoios, versus those who cannot be defeated and thus "become subordinate." Furthermore, the creatures from the second group often "help to ward off the chaos they inherently represent," performing an almost apotropaic function against similarly dangerous monster-foes.[357] With this model in mind, the creatures of Dan. 7 provide an intriguing test case for Hellenic-inspired monster figures in the Second Temple period. Since we have already demonstrated that there is no simple binary of interpreting the four creatures, Aston's categories help to nuance and provide additional literary and cultural contexts of hybrid nonhumans.

Further Hellenistic motifs that may have influenced the authors of Dan. 7 include 1 Enoch's "Myth of the Watchers," which Anathea Portier-Young argues is a reconfiguration of the Hellenistic concept of gigantomachy, or battle between giants.[358] In the Greek context, the

[355] Othmar Keel, for example, sees the imagery rooted in such sources. See "Die Tiere und der Mensch in Daniel 7," *Hellenismus und Judentum. Vier Studien zu Daniel 7 und zur Religionsnot unter Antiochus IV,* Othmar Keel and Urs Staub (eds.) 1-35 (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000).

[356] Emma Aston, *Mixanthropoi: Animal-human hybrid deities in Greek religion* (Liége: Presses Universitaires de Liége, 2011). In critical commentaries of Daniel, Hesiod's *Works and Days* is often invoked to provide a backdrop for the four-kingdom schema of Dan. 2. Less often, is *Theogony* considered a part of the soup from which Dan. 7 was stewed. As Newsom states of *Works and Days* and Dan. 2, "Whether the author [of Daniel] was directly aware of any of these is a question that cannot be answered with certainty. More likely, such symbolic schemas were widely distributed" (*Daniel,* 76). See also Annette Yoshiko Reed's essay which proposes that in the same way the model of Hesiod's *Works and Days* was taken up by the third-century poet and philosopher Aratus (and would eventually make its way to Jewish readership), Aramaic Enochic literature took up Genesis and sought to establish itself among astronomical traditions of the day ("Writing Jewish Astronomy in the Early Hellenistic Age: The Enochic *Astronomical Book* as Aramaic Wisdom and Archival Impulse," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 24 (2017) 1-37).

[357] Aston, *Mixanthropoi*, 5.3

[358] Portier-Young, *Apocalypse,* 18-23.

giants are the Titans who threaten the order of the Olympian hierarchy whereas for the *Book of the Watchers*, the giants are the offspring of the fallen watchers who perhaps represent the invasion of Hellenistic culture. In a complex inversion, the monstrous figures come in the guise of a wise and orderly system that threatens the true order and stability of the Jewish theocratic structure. Portier-Young interprets the application of this myth-inversion as resistance literature against Hellenism, and argues for a straightforward binary of Jew versus non-Jew, and hybrid-offspring versus "pure" progeny. And while this division is indeed expressed in many texts and many studies continue to uphold the strict binaries of apocalyptic understandings of otherness, the notion does not apply unilaterally to texts that are classified as literary apocalypses nor to their internal systems of logic that are anything but simple.[359] For Dan. 7's creatures, moreover, there is no explicit battle between the monsters themselves as might be implied by gigantomachy. I assert that the judgment of the fourth creature, while indeed framed as punishment for the sins of the little horn, occurs in the throne-room court and therefore alters the function of the creatures for the chapter as a whole.

4.4 Composition History and Analysis of Daniel 7

Composition

Like other members of the Danielic corpora, the dating of Dan. 7 is complex and widely debated. While some hold that the entirety of the Aramaic chapter was composed around 167

[359] As an example of this approach, see Lorenzo DiTommaso's essay in which he states: "The [apocalyptic] worldview's ability to propose a simplistic yet global explanation for human destiny, which depends in part on its conception of otherness, forms a major part of its historical persistence, which is to say its ability to express ideas from different ages and diverse cultures and societies." Here, DiTommaso applies a set "worldview" to texts, cultures, and societies across time and space that depends on a "pervasive dualism" in which "there is not much middle ground…and none at all in apocalypticism." "The Apocalyptic Other," in *The "Other" in Second Temple Judaism: Essays in Honor of John J. Collins*, Daniel C. Harlow, et al. (eds.) (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing Co., 2011), 223-4.

BCE near the death of Antiochus Epiphanes IV, others argue that the majority of the work be dated to the third century BCE or even late fourth, being "only lightly updated to reflect the events of the Antiochene crisis."[360] Daniel 7 also begins what is known as the "apocalyptic visions" section of the book (7-12) and concludes the group of chapters in Aramaic (2-7).[361] Thus, it partakes of the two major divisions of the MT Daniel: language and genre. In the history of scholarship, as Collins summarizes, "there is a sharp division of scholarly opinion on the subject of the unity of Daniel 7."[362] The chapter's unity is questioned because it bears a number of sudden changes in style and syntax signaling to many scholars evidence of redaction and interpolation, including the interjection of the "little horn" tangent and the significant, and perhaps intrusive, role of the *angelus interpres.*[363] I maintain a position somewhere between the two primary views and acknowledge both the redactional layers of the chapter indicating stages

[360] Newsom, *Daniel*, 256.

[361] As with the rest of the Danielic corpora, Dan. 7 is preserved in the OG and Th. In general, it bears very few differences from the MT and thus, my analysis ahead does not incorporate it in my reading.

[362] Collins, *Daniel*, 278. In David Bryan's summary of the debate, he highlights the number of literary and structural issues that lead some scholars to perform "drastic surgery" on the text's integrity, an approach with which he does not find convincing. For Bryan, the crux of the unity of the chapter and thus its fully Maccabean context lies in the "overt hostility in the beast imagery," and the stark contrast between the beasts and the Son of Man (*Cosmos, Chaos, and the Kosher Mentality*, 214-5).

[363] As an additional example of such disagreements, Hartman and DiLella's commentary suggests that the descriptions of the first (king of Babylon) and second (king of Media) animals are convoluted and assigns the two-legged stance of the lion to the bear instead. Beyond the fact that the proposed emendation "results in a picture of the animals that is much truer to their nature," they also cite Revelation 13's creature from the sea which associates its leg-features with a bear and its mouth-features with the lion. (Hartman and DiLella, *Daniel*, 209). Their argument follows Harold L. Ginsberg's *Studies in Daniel* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1948). In contrast, Collins' commentary disagrees sharply with Ginsberg as well as Hartman and DiLella's support of his thesis and calls the transpositions "drastic textual surgery" informed by Ginsberg's "desire find precise historical allusions" (Collins, *Daniel*, 297). This study agrees with Collins and assumes the integrity of the vision of the four animals, at least until the likely interpolation in v. 8 which discusses the "other small horn (קרן אחרי זעירה). Collins' observation highlights the trend in scholarship devoted to proving the historicity of Daniel, a trend that had only begun to wane in the 1970s with Klaus Koch's *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*. Despite the shift away from historicity concerns on a broad scale, many facets of Daniel scholarship still remain entangled in attempts to decipher what Danielic texts *mean* rather than how they do what they do. See Brennan Breed, *Daniel*, 32. Also Willis' discussion, "A Reversal of Fortunes," 123.

of composition that go beyond a light update, as well as its final redaction occurring firmly within an Antiochene context.

"Four Great Living Creatures" (7:1-8)

Turning now to my analysis of Dan. 7, the entirety of the chapter is composed from the first-person perspective of the visionary Daniel apart from the introductory statement in 7:1. Daniel 7:1-8 in the MT describes the four creatures as follows:

> In the first year of Belshazzar, king of Babylon, Daniel saw a dream and the visions of his head on his bed. Then he wrote down the dream. Thus he said from the beginning: I, Daniel, said (while watching in the visions of the night) and behold, four winds of heaven were stirring up the great sea! Four great living creatures came up out from the sea, differing this one from that one. The first was like a lion and it had wings of an eagle. I kept watching until its wings were stripped and it was lifted up from the earth and set upon legs like a human, and a human mind was given to it. Behold, another living creature, second, in the form of a bear! And it was raised up on one side with three ribs in its mouth between its teeth. Thus it was told: "Arise! Devour much flesh!" And after this I kept watching in the visions of the night and, behold, another like a leopard! And it had four wings of a bird on its back and four heads. Rulership was given to the living creature. After this I kept watching in the visions of the night and behold, a fourth living creature that was fearsome and terrible and exceedingly strong! It had great iron teeth. It was devouring and crushing, and what was left it was trampling with its feet. It was different from all the living creatures that were before it, and it had ten horns. As I was contemplating the horns, behold, another

horn, small had come up in the midst of them! Three of the previous horns were uprooted before it, and behold, eyes like the eyes of a human on that horn! And a mouth speaking greatly…

The introduction situates the vision in the first year of King Belshazzar and so disrupts a seemingly chronological arrangement of the court tales which follows the narratives of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, and, as discussed in the previous chapter of this dissertation, a very unhistorical Darius the Mede. Initiated by the change to the first-person beginning in v. 2, the dream-vision is led by participle forms, such as חזה, "I was watching" or "beholding," and reiterations of the interjection וארו "and behold."[364] The first scene Daniel beholds are four winds of heaven that begin rousing or stirring the great sea, which is then followed by four great creatures (ארבע חיון רברבן), which are initially only described as differing (שנין) one from the other. Most emphasized in the early stage of Daniel's vision is the large size of the creatures, a description also attributed to the statue in Nebuchadnezzar's first dream (Dan. 2:31). The large, distinct creatures are not only different among their own species in their deviation from a "normal" lion or a "normal" leopard, but they are from the start described as differing one from the other. As Cohen articulates, "this refusal to participate in the classificatory 'order of things' is true of monsters generally," and it is certainly on the forefront of Daniel's description.[365] They are dissimilar from all other species in their own right, as well as dissimilar from the other creatures birthed from the same writhing sea.

Moving to the description of the first creature, 4:4 introduces it as "like a lion, and it had

[364] Newsom translates the participle "I kept watching," and the interjection as "suddenly," which she asserts "mimics the actual dynamism of a dream in which different images succeed one another in rapid succession." *Daniel*, 220-1.

[365] Cohen, "Monster Culture," 6.

wings of an eagle." Using Newsom's translation, Daniel "kept watching" until the creature's wings were plucked out, and it was lifted up from the earth. The dream continues to change as Daniel beholds the now wingless lion made to stand on its legs like a human (כאנש) and also given the mind of a human. The transformation undergone by the first creature is one of humanization, one that Newsom describes as "startling positive" amidst the descriptions of the subsequent creatures.[366] I maintain that the creature's transformation does indeed allude to Nebuchadnezzar's experience in Dan. 4, and thus it poses a complex blending of symbol and perceived reality between Dan. 4 and 7. The first creature that Daniel beholds in his vision is generally understood to be purely symbolic, whereas in Dan. 4, Nebuchadnezzar's transformation is fulfilled in the king's actual life. Where, then, should the line be drawn between the symbolic representation of the first creature, and the very real transformation and restoration that the king undergoes? The blurred lines between represented animals and actualized animals, therefore, are showcased in this relationship between chs. 4 and 7. In Dan. 7, the first monster, who is Nebuchadnezzar, evades its own monstrosity and shifts into a not altogether human form, whilst still retaining its animality.[367] The first creature, in sum, undergoes a process of change before Daniel's eyes, a positive one that distinguishes it from the others and retains the tradition of restoration of Nebuchadnezzar.

Signaled by Daniel's "behold," the second creature enters his purview in v. 5 and resembles a bear set on one side. This "side" (שטר) might be referring to a horizontal side, meaning a paw raised, or a vertical side, indicating a stance on its hind legs. The bear-like creature also has three "tusks" or "ribs" in its mouth, situated between its teeth. Since its teeth

[366] Newsom, *Daniel*, 223.

[367] One might consider this evasiveness as reflective of Cohen's second thesis, that monsters are "connected by a logic that always threatens to shift; [they are] invigorated by change and escape" ("Monster Culture, 7).

are identified as separate from the עלעין, I accept the translation "ribs," which may indicate the remains of another creature it has recently consumed.[368] This is supported by the final remark regarding the second creature where Daniel hears a voice telling it to "Arise, devour much flesh."[369] Here it is clear that the bear-like creature is not its own master despite its terrifying appearance, and the terror it evokes by its devouring capacities. A voice commands it to do what it does, and to do its flesh-devouring. There is a sense of movement behind the scenes, an underlying order in the midst of the descriptions of the monsters reminiscent of the foreign powers who rise and fall under the eye of Israel's deity.

As Daniel continues to watch, he "beholds" in v. 6 another creatures like a leopard with four wings of a bird on its back, as well as four heads. The creature's wings are of a generic bird (די עוף) whereas the wings of the first creature were that of an eagle (די נשר). The focus on "fourness" on the third monster points to its universal power and sense of far-reaching rule, likely alluding to the four cardinal directions. Even more boundaries are broken by the compounded fourness of its anomalous body, implying perhaps the way "the monster prevents mobility" of other creatures under its sphere of influence.[370] In other words, like the four winds that stirred the sea, the four wings and heads of the leopard-like creature set it as distinct among the other creatures and give the sense that its scope of rulership is particularly vast. Although it is indeed hybrid, exotic, and impressive, rulership or dominion is *given* (יהיב) to it rather than it taking it of its own accord. The verbal forms that pertain to the first three creatures are passive

[368] "Tusks" is also a possible translation, which may indicate the hybrid nature of the second creature, perhaps combining a bear with an elephant or large pachyderm.

[369] This is the only instance of one of the creatures being spoken to, presumably by the divine sovereign, which highlights the lack of autonomy the creatures have.

[370] Cohen, "Monster Culture," 12.

forms almost exclusively in the pe'il and hophal perfect. By these passive forms of actions be done to or for the creatures, their passivity of the role in Dan. 7 is emphasized and gives the impression that their sovereignties are divinely orchestrated and ordained. The exception is made obvious with the appearance of the most monstrous and fearsome fourth creature who acts of its own accord, marked with active verbal forms.

Once more indicated by Daniel's continuous watching in v. 7, the visionary is shown the fourth creature (חיוה רביעיה), which is described in a string of participles and adjectives that include emotional affect (frightening and terrible, דחילה ואימתני) and physical characteristics (exceedingly strong, (תקיפה יתירא). Like the second creature, its teeth are described but this time in more detail (made of iron and large, די פרזל לה רברבן). It is actively eating of its own volition, as opposed to being told to "devour," and crushing (מדקה) the remainder of what it does not eat, trampling (רפסה) with its feet.[371] And if the reader was not sure about the uniqueness of this creature yet, Daniel's account makes sure to emphasize that this חיוה was different from all the creatures that came before it, most notably by the presence of its ten horns (כרנין עשר). The fourth creature's massive aberration from the rest of the creatures emphasizes its uniquely monstrous monstrosity. While Daniel is contemplating the ten horns, he suddenly beholds another small horn emerging from the midst of them, which causes three of the previous horns to be uprooted (אתעקרו). And with another startling interjection Daniel beholds eyes, like the eyes of a human (כעיני אנשא), on this small horn accompanied by a mouth speaking "greatly" or "arrogantly" (ממלל רברבן). Like the first creature, the fourth monster bears humanlike features—its eyes and

[371] Macumber ("Monster Without a Name," 6-7) suggests that the fourth creature's devouring implies "cultural cannibalism," and that the beast is intentionally dehumanized by the authors of Dan. 7 for their readership. This "dehumanization" and interpretation of cannibalism are difficult assertions to uphold since the creature is performing such acts not as a human but as an animal, nor does the text specify what exactly it is devouring.

speaking mouth—and seems, in fact, to be the most anthropomorphized out of them all. While other commentators may see the fourth creature as wholly bestial, a simple reading of its description shows it to be quite the opposite.

Anthropomorphic Others (7:9-14)

Without breaking the visionary stride, Daniel continues to behold until thrones are placed[372] and an ancient of days sat.[373] After briefly describing his humanlike clothing and hair, features that the previous creatures did not possess, Daniel beholds his throne in almost completely fire-related imagery including the wheels and the river of fire flowing before it. Adding to the overall grandeur, the ancient of days is surrounded by an exaggerated number of unnamed servants and attendants. The scene concludes abruptly at the end of v. 10 with a laconic sense of finality: "The court sat and books were opened (דינא יתב וספרין פתיחו)."

Jolted back from the throne room by Daniel's preoccupation with sound of the arrogant words of the small horn, he continues watching until the fourth creature is killed (קטילת חיותא), its body destroyed, and given to be burned by fire. No mention is made of the particular suffering or death of the small and arrogant horn, but only the creature upon whose head it sat. In contrast to this harsh and immediate judgment of the fourth creature, the other three creatures receive a much lighter sentence with only their rulership taken away (העדין שלטנהון). In a way, the fourth living creature is destroyed on multiple levels; one "death" is not enough to destroy a monster. The possibility of its resurgence, however, is not made explicit as is often the case with the

[372] Used elsewhere in Daniel nearly a dozen times (see a comparable passive form in 3:21), the passive of רמה is usually translated as "cast" or "thrown," as in into the fiery furnace or lion pit.

[373] André Lacocque translates עתיק יומין as "He-Who-Endures," but maintains the traditional "son of man" for בר אנש. *Book of Daniel,* xxiii. He cites 1 Enoch's use of "Head of Days" as a similar title and other influences on the throne theophany. (142-3)

defeat of a monster.[374] Furthermore, and as a positive sentence, they are given an extension of life until a time and a season (עד זמן ועדן). The amount of time that their lives should be extended is unknown, but it serves as a marked contrast between the immediate destruction of the fourth creature. Again, as with the first creature's evasion of being entirely humanized, parts of the monstrous seems to have eluded death as their judgment and continue to live without their previous allotments of rulership. There is a sense that there are tiers of monstrosity, some of which are addressed with severity and others with moderation. The significance of these tiers supports my argument of the malleability of animality in the Danielic corpora, which is evidenced even in monstrous expressions of animal and nonhuman figures.

As Daniel continues to watch the scene unfold, he beholds a second anthropomorphic being in addition to the ancient of days: the appearance of a humanlike one (כבר אנש) coming with clouds of heaven. The two things most distinct about this one's appearance compared to the previous creatures are its emergence from the sky and clouds versus a stormy sea, and its non-hybrid, human-likeness. Notably, its form is still described as approximate (like each of the living creatures) using the preposition "like," and should not be interpreted as purely human.[375] Both the ancient one and the humanlike one are unique creatures, beings with primarily anthropomorphic descriptions but not altogether "normal" humans.[376] The ancient one, for

[374] Safwat Marzouk notes of ANE combat myths that often "the combat ends with a paradoxical affirmation that the monster still exists" (*Egypt as a Monster*, 71). Daniel's narrative does not express this feature in regard to the fourth creature, however, the first three creatures do indeed remain and continue to endure for an undetermined amount of time.

[375] The humanlike one seated on the throne in Ezek. 1 is described slightly differently as "a form like an appearance of a human" (כמראה אדם דמות). Closer to Ezekiel's description, albeit in Aramaic, is the apparition of a divine one in the furnace with the three youths, דמה לבר עלהין, literally "a form of a son of the gods" (Dan. 3:25 [Ar.]).

[376] In fact, if speech is the faculty of rationality we are attuned to see, then the small horn is the only rational creature in the chapter except for Daniel and the attendant.

example, who possesses clothing, hair, and a head is primarily associated with the element of fire and white materials (snow and wool). With a briefer description, the humanlike one arrives with a meteorological phenomenon and provides no further physical identifiers. Most importantly, the humanlike one is *like* a human (כבר אנש), not simply a human.[377] In sum, although very un-animal and not hybrid in the same way that the living creatures are, I argue that the two anthropomorphic beings are nevertheless *nonhuman.*[378]

After being presented before the ancient one, the humanlike one is given rulership (שלתן), glory (יקר), and sovereignty (מלכו), each of which recur as central themes throughout the Danielic corpora. Throughout the Danielic corpora, these terms are prevalent and are sometimes ascribed to kings by the deity, ascribed to kings by their own word, ascribed to the deity by the mouths of kings, or ascribed to the faithful ones of the deity such as Daniel. What remains clear is that such concepts are constantly being negotiated between humans, deities, and nonhumans–including the monstrous.

Interpretation in Part (7:15-28)

With the conclusion of the kingdom given to the humanlike one, the text returns to the physical and emotional well-being of the visionary and his distress at what he has beheld. As an active agent and lucid in his vision, Daniel turns to one of the "standing ones" (חד מן קאמיא) and inquires as to the reliability of his vision, a request which the attendant grants and made known

[377] For simple humans, Dan. 2:38 has בני אנשא; and in Dan. 8:17, Gabriel addresses Daniel as a בן אדם.

[378] Just because a being in described in partly anthropomorphic terms, we are quick to read in "humans" without nuancing how the text is communicating its descriptions. Of such figures in dream-visions and in discussion with Collins' definition of a literary apocalypse, Frances Flannery-Dailey notes that "human may exist along a gradient of ontological purity culminating in angelic-status, [and] language about 'human recipients' may be misleading if interpreters assume that recipients of revelation are fully 'humans,' just as interpreters must not think only of nonhuman angels as 'otherworldly mediators' ("Lessons on Early Jewish Apocalypticism and Mysticism from Dream Literature," in *Paradise Now*: *Essays on Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism,* Vol. 6, Part 2 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 242.

the "interpretation of the matters" (פשר מליא). The central piece of the interpretation, at least most important to the attendant, is the meaning of "the great living creatures that are four." Using imperfect verbal forms instead of perfects and participles that dominated the previous sections, the attendant says: "Four kings will rise up from the earth" (ארבעה מלכין יקומון מן ארעא). The attendant then introduces a hitherto unmentioned group, "the holy ones of the Most High" (קדישי עליונין) who will come to possess the kingdom forever and ever.

The remainder of the chapter proceeds to sate Daniel's curiosity about the fourth living creature, whom he redescribes nearly word for word, including the array of horns that culminate with the small horn. Daniel then sees anew ("I kept looking" חזה הוית) a number of details about how this horn was making war with these same "holy ones" and was prevailing over them.[379] Once again, the ancient one is said to have arrived and judgment (justice?) was given for the holy ones of the Most High; it is at this time that the holy ones were to gain possession of the kingdom. Following this visionary interlude that many commentators see as an interpolation for understandable reasons, the text returns to the attendant's interpretation in which he explains how the fourth living creature, described afresh as a "kingdom" (מלכו) instead of a "king" (מלכא), is a different type of monster from the rest. From the kingdom, ten kings will arise (a return to the imperfect), and will be succeeded by the small horn who shall humiliate the three other king-horns.

Finally, the content of the small horn's speech is made known: this king will utilize his faculty of speech against the Most High and "wear out" (יבלא) the holy ones of this same Most High God. Of equal concern is the king's attempt to "change the times and the law" (להשניה זמנין ודת). Here, this horn is not only causing disruption through the monstrous body of the creature-

[379] Note the return to the use of participles as Daniel's vision is portrayed as unfolding before his eyes.

empire upon whom he rose to power but also his own attempts ("he intended" ויסבר) to transgress the things that were previously set up as boundaries.[380] In other words, by making the most denigrated figure of Dan. 7 a horn, it makes the monster creature a type of proxy upon which the horn effectuates his disturbances and destruction. Moreover, this fourth king-horn "stands at the threshold of becoming," and literally the comings and goings of set times and processes that govern the world.[381] As an extension from the living creature itself, the horn can extend itself beyond the other horns in height and greatness, and occupy a threshold-type "between" space. With this attempt at monstrous aberration, he succeeds for a designated amount of time ("until a time and times and a half of a time" עד עדן ועדנין ופלג עדן) until he is finally destroyed at the hands of the divine court. Here, the text's sense of temporality is anything but linear and folds in upon itself, portraying the future destruction of the monster that Daniel "saw" destroyed and burned by fire in v. 11. Once more, and with a final culminating description, the *people* of the holy ones of the Most High God (לעם קדישי עליונין) will be given this coveted kingdom, and be given the service and obedience of all the dominions.

With a literary sigh, the account returns to Daniel and his absolute terror at what he has beheld, expressed in his pallor and inability to speak about the revelatory monsters of his vision. While the understandings of Daniel's creatures have been often identified as "monsters" in the sense that they are frightening, hybrid, and destructive, they are more complex than this as I

[380] Newsom summarizes the dominant interpretations of this phrase, including those that think it pertains to the cult services of the Temple such as sacrifices and festivals. But because the phrase is clear that the king "tried" or "intended" to change such things, she does not think it refers to the restrictions set by Antiochus IV on Jewish observance and Temple defilement since he did actually accomplish these ends. Instead, she proposes that "these matters have to do with the issue of who controls the historical process and in particular the determination of sovereign power." I find Newsom's suggestion more convincing in that it reflects a more general anxiety about change, instability in claims to sovereignty, and transgression boundaries. See Newsom, *Daniel*, 240-1.

[381] Smith-Christopher, "Postcolonial Reading," 186.

demonstrate in the following section. I examine the monstrous living creatures of Ezekiel's first vision and demonstrate how the shared living creatureliness between them and Daniel's may help us understand the underlying anxieties of the Jewish communities who imaged these creature-monsters.[382]

4.5 Ezekiel's Influence on Daniel 7

An Ezekielian Inheritance

As a whole, Daniel scholars acknowledge the wide-ranging influence of Ezekiel on the visions of Daniel, especially ch. 7.[383] The mode of transmission for Ezekiel's living creatures falls into the category of a shared motif or concept without explicit reference to or citation of the text. As Popović explains, compositions in the Second Temple period, especially those preserved at Qumran "did not simply borrow from Ezekiel, but actively reused and transformed specific Ezekiel traditions in new texts with new meanings."[384] Furthermore, Ezekiel's authority, although perhaps unclear which aspects of such authority, seems to be "primarily interpreted from an eschatological perspective."[385] For Daniel more broadly, these include concepts of

[382] I use the term "imaged" here to avoid the overuse of "imagined." Social and cultural anxieties are not "imagined" in the sense that they are false or fictionalized. They are rather put to image as their mode of expression.

[383] Ezekiel's general influence (Newsom, *Daniel*, 20), Daniel's visions in proximity to rivers and canals (Ibid. 330), and the role of Ezek. 1-3 and 8-10 on throne-room scenes and angelophanies (Ibid. 227, 330-1). See also Lacocque, *Book of Daniel*, 124-5. Like Ezek. 1 and 8-11, Lacocque deems the Temple as the central concern of Dan. 7 although "the text does not expressly say this anywhere."

[384] Mladen Popović, "Ezekiel (Book and Person)," in Second Temple and Hellenistic Judaism, *EBR* 8 (2014) 592-604.

[385] See Mladen Popović, "Prophet, Books and Texts: Ezekiel, *Pseudo-Ezekiel*, and the Authoritativeness of Ezekiel Traditions in Early Judaism," in M. Popvić (ed.), *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism* (JSJSup 141; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 229. Underscoring that the "biblical" book of Ezekiel was much in flux during the Second Temple period, including up until and perhaps even later than the final form of the Book of Daniel, the figure and concept of a tradition of Ezekiel should be recognized as authoritative in a variety of ways.

bodily resurrection, bodily descriptions of semi-divine angelic messengers, and perhaps the descriptor- turned-title "בן אדם" or "בר אנש" assigned to the figure given dominion by the Ancient of Days. In the words of Carol Newsom: "the various sensuous elements of [Ezekiel's] description were treated like mosaic tiles that could be recombined in various ways to depict a variety of heavenly realia."[386] Ezekiel's creatures, I suggest, are one of the central parts of the text's inheritance, especially in throne-room scenes, and which Dan. 7 integrates and reworks.

The vision of Ezek. 1 describes the first vision of the priest Ezekiel at the river Chebar. He beholds a stormy wind in the north, which gives rise to a bright and flashing cloud. As the text zooms further in, we are told that in the midst of the cloud's fire was something like "gleaming amber," and in the midst of that was "the form of four living creatures" (דמות ארבע חיות). Each creature is a mixture of human and animal, domestic and wild, singularized and multiple. Comprised of four faces and four wings each, their human, lion, eagle, and ox facial features intermingle with human hands and ox feet. Of the role of animals in Ezekiel as a whole, Julie Galambush notes that "animals function as surprisingly complex signifiers," which include wild animals and other "living creatures" who may belong to realms of divine and earthly limits.[387] The passivity of Daniel's four creatures, as discussed above, is also present with Ezekiel's חיות. Not able to move of their own accord, the four creatures move as one and move according to the spirit.

Due to the dissimilarity between the physical forms of Ezekiel's creatures and Daniel's,

[386] Newsom, *Daniel*, 331.

[387] Julie Galambush, "God's Land and Mine: Creation as Property in the Book of Ezekiel," in *Ezekiel's Hierarchical World: Wrestling with a Tiered Reality*, Stephen L. Cook and Corrine L. Patton (eds.), Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 31 (Leiden: Brill, 2004) 92. Her section on animals continues through p. 95.

very rarely are these two traditions placed in dialogue with one another.[388] Ezekiel's four animals are identical in appearance and seamlessly unified in their actions, "acting as one," with four faces like that of a lion, ox, human, and eagle. In contrast, each of the animals Daniel beholds are different from one another, a fact that the text emphasizes especially pertaining to the fourth creature which "was different from all the rest." Their combinations include lion-eagle, bear with fangs or tusks, leopard with wings, and an unnamed creature whose description consists of only its actions and the emotions evoked by it. Straddling the boundaries of perfect symmetry and untamable wildness, the descriptions of the animals that Ezekiel beholds may seem for some altogether unrelated to those of Daniel's dream-vision. One might surmise that nothing connects these two groups of creatures beyond their polyform bodies and four-ness if only the physical descriptions of their appearances are considered. However, by reframing the two sets of creatures as awe-full hybrid monsters and how their descriptions function as emotive and visual forces in both texts, their integrality to both throne-visions might be better understood.[389] Furthermore, their shared monstrosity is first exhibited by their anomalous bodies and second by their role as apocalyptic interlocutors, that is, revelatory participants in the divine structure.[390]

Further solidifying the relationship between Dan. 7 and Ezek. 1, Christopher Rowland

[388] Smith-Christopher cites both passages at the beginning of his analysis of "mixed monsters" in apocalyptic literature, although he notes that Ezekiel might be considered "proto-apocalyptic" rather than apocalyptic-proper. Surprisingly, however, and despite his citation of Ezek. 1, the author asserts that "*positive figures are rarely mixed creatures*" and says nothing more on the matter. "Postcolonial Reading," 186-8.

[389] For a formidable study of the portrayal of monsters in Ezekiel as a whole, see Safwat Marzouk, *Egypt as Monster.* With attention to Egypt's foreignness as mediated by its descriptions as various types of monsters, Marzouk argues that Ezekiel's monstrification of Egypt is an expression of Israel's societal anxieties surrounding assimilation. As he notes, these expressions are often paradoxical and have as much to do with difference as they have to do with sameness.

[390] For Ezekiel, the divine structure is the mobile throne itself wherein the חיות are inseparable from its revelatory presence. The divine structure for Daniel's חיון, in contrast, is the divine court in which the subduing of the four monsters demonstrates the sovereignty the ancient one.

states that Dan 7 "owes much of its imagery to Ezekiel 1" including the throne, four winds, and four animals.[391] Other scholars are more cautious, such as John Collins, who briefly acknowledges that Ezek. 1 "provides a biblical precedent" for the hybrid animals but says no further as to what this implies for the understanding of Dan. 7.[392] Further elements influenced by Ezek. 1, noted by Newsom, include the theophanic description of the ancient one "and the overwhelming fiery strangeness of his throne" as well as "the seated figure, the presence of fiery phenomena, the wheels and the creatures of the throne."[393] Thus, according to the primary commentators, Ezekiel's imagery has influenced Dan. 7 in terms of the revelation of heavenly activities and central visual features of the throne-room scene.

Much more rarely, however, do studies engage the direct connection between the two texts' creatures. Amy C. Merrill Willis, as a recent example, suggests in a footnote that "Daniel's beasts appear as mirror images of Ezekiel's theophany in some respects."[394] She draws attention to the repeated use of the number four and points to the text's linguistic cognates, but does not linger on the point and returns instead to her discussion of anthropomorphic descriptions of the deity. Nevertheless, the overlap between Dan. 7 and Ezek. 1 is striking upon closer examination. And like many texts in the Danielic corpora, especially ch. 7, the exilic prophet directs his concern to the fates of empires, visions of the future, and the dynamics of the throne-room scene.

Other Biblical Influences

To be sure, the book of Ezekiel is not the only text bearing influence on Daniel's four

[391] Rowland, *Open Heaven,* 97.

[392] Collins, *Daniel,* 296. He also notes that the four-headed leopard is reminiscent of the Ezekiel's four-faced creatures (298).

[393] Newsom, *Daniel*, 227.

[394] Willis, *Dissonance and Drama*, 74-5 footnote

creatures.[395] One of the most striking texts cited by scholars is Hosea 13:4-11, which may have been a possible textual influence on Dan. 7.[396] The text describes threats of the Deity's violence according to a selection of wild animals:

> Yet I have been the Lord your God ever since the land of Egypt; you know no God but me, and besides me there is no savior. It was I who fed you in the wilderness, in the land of drought. When I fed them, they were satisfied; they were satisfied, and their heart was proud; therefore they forgot me. So I will become like a lion (שחל) to them, like a leopard (נמר) I will lurk beside the way. I will fall upon them like a bear (דב) robbed of her cubs, and will tear open the covering of their heart; there I will devour them like a lion (לביא), as a wild animal (חית השדה) would mangle them. I will destroy you, O Israel; who can help you? Where now is your king, that he may save you? Where in all your cities are your rulers, of whom you said, "Give me a king and rulers"? I gave you a king in my anger, and I took him away in my wrath.

Emphasizing the deity's anger at Ephraim's unfaithfulness, the animals described are all associated with violence, eating, and predatory behavior, each of which find their expression in Dan 7. Furthermore, the critique of kingship and human rulership is closely intertwined with the destruction brought upon the people by way of sovereign, divine punishment. This "intertextual echo" retained in Dan. 7 is noted by Newsom, of which she thinks "suggests that the events of

[395] For example, in line with Dan. 7's "symbolizing of the heathen powers with rapacious beasts or with mythological monsters," Montgomery also cites Ezek. 29:3; Isa. 27:1; Ps. 68:31, 74:13, 80:14 (*Daniel*, 286). Smith-Christopher also suggests the influence of Isa. 11:6-9 that might demonstrate "*the opposite of peaceful coexistence of these same creatures,"* including the dangerous leopard, lion, and bear ("Postcolonial Reading, 193, emphasis original).

[396] For an analysis of lion imagery in the book of Hosea, see Yisca Zimran, "The Notion of God Reflected in the Lion Imagery of the Book of Hosea," *Vetus Testamentum* 68.1: 149-67.

history are in some way expressions of YHWH's intentionality."[397] In other words, the ups and downs of both Israelite and gentile kings may be seen as directly connected to Israel's disloyalty resulting in divine violence, which is poignantly likened to animal predators.[398] The gentile kings in Daniel could be understood as agents of divine violence, or at least divine sovereignty.

For Collins, Hosea 13 stands as one of three primary influencers on Dan. 7 and offers the biblical precedent "for the description of the individual beasts."[399] By descriptions, Collins is referring to the choice of the four creatures (lion, bear, leopard, and an undisclosed wild animal). He admits, however, that the hybridity of the creatures emerges from an unknown source and leaves this aspect open to speculation. But there remain important differences between Hosea's animals and those of Dan. 7. Most obviously, Hosea's animals are "normal" and very un-monstrous creatures. They are violent, to be sure, but not beyond what would be expected of wild predators. Moreover, the animals are employed as pure similes and invoked only to convey their qualities or actions to which Israel's deity may be likened. Since it is one of the most cited biblical passages to have an influence on Dan. 7, it is worth examining what is useful and what is not. Although a valuable passage for examining the relationship between animality and divinity more broadly, especially on the limits of divine sovereignty, Hosea 13 does not offer much to a discussion of the hybrid creatures of Dan. 7.

Explaining the Disconnect

Having demonstrated the ways that Ezekiel's influence weighs heavily on Daniel as a

[397] Newsom, *Daniel*, 223.

[398] As Frisch notes, a further link between Dan. 7 and Hos. 13 is its shared wild animals, which she emphasizes them as "a metaphor for God's punishment" and highlights the lived reality of threats posed by wild animals against Israel's domestic cattle. See "Four (Animal) Kingdoms," 63.

[399] Collins, *Daniel,* 296. The other two factors in Collins schema are the depiction of Israel's enemies as wild animals and the influence of hybrid creatures in Near Eastern literature and visual sources.

whole and specifically ch. 7, the question remains as to why the two groups of creatures have remained so separate in scholarship. The first reason for this disassociation is the fact that the creatures of Ezek. 1, only therein named as חיות, are identified as כרובים later in Ezek. 10:15, 20. The author of Ezek. 10 repeats twice: "This was the living creature I saw…(היא החיה אשר ראיתי)," affirming that "I knew that they were kerubim (ואדע כי כרובים המה)." Despite small differences between the creatures of Ezek. 1 and 10—the ox face being replaced by the face of a "כרוב" in ch. 10, as well as the general disparities between the description of Ezekiel's חיות compared to other כרובים in the Hebrew Bible—the living creatures have been nevertheless almost totally absorbed into the category of כרובים.[400] To explain this phenomenon that occurs between Ezek. 1 and 10, the absorption of the חיות to the כרובים is almost always accepted as the visionary's clarification on his own vision. As an answer, Alice Wood proposes that Ezek. 10 is a part of a second and separate vision concerned with the temple and its accessories, hence the inclusion of the more familiar כרובים and their attribution to the חיות, who function as the base and locomotor of the mobile throne.[401] She concludes that חיות should be translated instead as "beasts" like its Aramaic cognate חיון of Dan. 7, thus emphasizing the linguistic connection between the accounts. Although I do not employ Wood's translation choice because of the negative connotations with "beast," her thesis regarding Ezekiel's visions provides an explanation for the disparate animal descriptions and, most importantly, draws attention to the translation inconsistency between

[400] For example, Daniel I. Block accepts the disparities between the accounts as Ezekiel's inattention to detail. He states that "Ezekiel seems not to have made this connection," that is, between the likenesses of the creatures to the kerubim. Block continues: "Instead of identifying them as *kerubim*, "cherubim," as he does in ch. 10, he refers to them by the vague expression *living creatures* (*hayyot*). *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 1-24*, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1997), 97.

[401] Alice Wood, *Of Wings and Wheels: A Synthetic Study of Biblical Cherubim* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH, 2008) 134-5.

Ezek. 1 and Dan. 7.

This small translation preference has greatly impacted scholars' view of the two passages and obscured an aspect of the visionary tradition transmitted from Ezekiel to Daniel, which leads to the second reason for the disassociation between the two groups of monsters. Almost always, Ezekiel's חיות are translated as "living creatures" whereas Daniel's חיון are translated as "beasts."[402] By terming the creatures "beasts," they become exclusively associated with primordial "chaos monsters" and the irretrievable "other" who stand in as foreign nations. How and why Daniel's monsters—and indeed monsters they are—function in the vision and throne scene have been limited by an arbitrary translation choice with disparaging undertones. But when translated and understood as creatures (even living creatures) both, the hybrids can be understood beyond their foreign otherness, and as key components of the throne room scene.

When it comes to throne room visions, some type of heavenly creature is nearly always in close proximity to the throne. Outside of Ezek. 1, two examples can be seen in Isaiah 6 with its six-winged flaming seraphim and 1 Enoch 14 and its fiery guardian cherubim; both feature the creatures that attend or support the divine throne, although Ezekiel's description is certainly the most extensive. If Dan. 7 is read as it is normally read where the four creatures are not connected to the throne-room scene, the vision is devoid of any such hybrid creatures or guardian figures. The other participants in the vision are limited to the nonspecific "thousands upon thousands" serving the ancient one, the humanlike one, and perhaps the undiscussed occupants of the other thrones that were set up in the court. Rowland rightly notes the absence of the living creatures or

[402] For a thorough discussion of the Aramaic noun חיוה, see Holger Gzella's entry: *TDOT,* s.v. "חיי," p. 270. Based on the term's usage in Daniel, Gzella notes that when used in the plural, it is associated with the wide extent of the king's rule, except for its occurrences in Dan. 7. In the latter examples, the author states that "the repeated use of this word emphasizes [the four creatures'] nonhumanity and monstrosity." Also worth noting is Gzella's summary: "The Aramaic texts from Qumran utilize the word both as a generic term in distinction from human beings and together with human beings for all living beings: the determined state in the plural 'the animals' as an expression of totality and the combination, known from Daniel, 'the animals of the field' as a collective singular."

keruvim in Dan. 7 that may be similar to Ezekiel's but does not comment further on the fact.[403] Without the acknowledgment of the relationship between Daniel's חיון and other similarly monstrous throne creatures, especially those of Ezek. 1, the throne-scene in Dan. 7 is missing a key component of its theatrical setting.

Such hybrid creatures were likely originally depicted in throne-room settings as types of guardian figures in ancient Near Eastern traditions.[404] With their fearsome appearances and expanded perceptions, hybrid creatures are often placed at the doors, gates, and thresholds that usually represent a transition from one type of space to another.[405] The polyform bodies of guardian creatures may be composed of a number of animals, and often both domesticated and undomesticated animals in the same body. Their expanded perceptions are represented by additional heads, eyes, and sometimes limbs, which firstly signal to the viewer that they belong to a certain environ, and secondly indicate their wide range of their supra-perception. Margaret Odell comments on the Assyrian import of iconographical and monumental sources for the four living creatures,[406] relating them to Mesopotamian hybrid creatures which she calls "demons" or supernatural beings who "had come to be understood as spirits who stood ready to enact the will

[403] Rowland, *Open Heaven,* 256.

[404] In temples, for example, Wood suggests that "the cherubim depicted on the walls of the temple may represent guardian figures that protect the sacred space from contamination" (*Of Wings and Wheels,* 33); See Gilmore on sphinxes as guardian figures who could be benevolent or dangerously hostile (*Monsters,* 27); Also on the guardian role of the hybrid cherubim, see, Dale Launderville, "Ezekiel's Cherub: A Promising Symbol or a Dangerous Idol?" *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 65, no. 2 (2003), especially pp. 167-170 in both ANE iconography and biblical sources.

[405] Walther Eichrodt describes these as "throne-bearers or guardians of temple or palace thresholds" and that their "half-human, half-bestial shape and attributes load them with all the powers of both species, and express how awe-inspiring such guardians of holy things must be." See *Ezekiel: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 2003), 55.

[406]Austen Henry Layard, *Nineveh and Its Remains*, (New York: George P. Putnam, 1849); James Smith, *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1931); Crawford H. Toy, *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel* (New York: Dodd, 1899).

of the gods."[407] Odell understands the function of the creatures as still bound up with the *chaoskampf* motif, holding that their hybrid features address various aspects of natural forces over which they exerted control or order-keeping on behalf of the deity they served. Thus, the function of such creatures is more instrumental than threatening. So while this is certainly the case in Ezekiel's vision with its definitively otherworldly but subservient tetramorphic living creatures, when we turn to Daniel's living creatures, it is clear that the חיון are related but distinct. In the following section, I argue that the authors of Dan. 7 reworked and repurposed Ezekiel's living creatures with other emphases beyond that of subservience or cooperation with the dynamics of the divine throne-room.

4.6 Daniel's Reworking

Before addressing two points of Daniel's reworking of Ezekiel's living creatures, it is necessary first to address the scholarly assumption that Dan. 7 unequivocally depicts an anthropomorphic kingdom victorious over the theriomorphic, that is, humanity's dominion over animality. To make this argument, scholars point to the contrast between the four creatures and the human-like figures in Dan. 7, which we discussed briefly above. In speaking of the humanlike one who comes among the clouds, David Bryan comments that "the human form of this angel is set in stark contrast to the *monstrous beasts* which arise from the 'Great Sea'."[408] As should be clear by my previous presentation, Bryan's designation of Daniel's creatures as "monstrous beasts" have quite a different connotation than the monsters of this chapter's

[407] Margaret Odell, *Ezekiel,* Vol. 16 of Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary (Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys Pub., 2005), 27.

[408] Bryan, *Cosmos,* 46. Emphasis mine.

argument. Furthermore, Bryan attributes Daniel's anthropomorphisms to the influence of Ezek. 1 and the description of the human-like one seated upon the mobile throne, as stands the scholarly consensus. He rejects, however, the literary import of animal imagery from Ezekiel to Daniel and sees "the *Mischwesen* imagery of the two texts [as] only distantly related," as further demonstrated by the differences he sees in the function of the creatures: In Bryan's view, the living creatures support the divine throne and cooperate with the divine will, whereas the "monstrous beasts" are "enemies of God."[409] In contrast to this widely held view today, Andre Feuillet proposed in his 1953 monograph on the "son of man" that the animal imagery of Dan. 7 was not intended to convey the foreignness of "empires païens," that is, pagan empires, but is rather a part of the approximating language of visions and dreams common to both Ezekiel and Daniel.[410] Furthermore, he cites the mixture of animal and human qualities attributed to both the first and fourth creatures which are thought to represent Nebuchadnezzar and Antiochus Epiphanes IV, thereby complicating the human-animal binary for Dan. 7.[411] Feuillet's approach is thus more similar to Gzella's who looks to both the generic bounds of the texts as well as their syntactical and literary styles. Although neither Feuillet nor Gzella point to the creatures of Ezekiel for any ideological or literary influence, their approaches facilitate understandings of Daniel's monsters as more than simply horrible and beastly foreign nations that must be subdued

[409] Ibid, 222.

[410] Andre Feuillet, *Le Fils de l'homme de Daniel et la tradition biblique* (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1953),187. By this he means the language of likeness or approximating words.

[411] Feuillet, *Le Fils de l'homme*, 192. He also notes that in Dan. 2, the mountain that prevails is not made by human hands. Feuillet is hesitant, thus, to assign stark binaries to a text that clearly dialogues with less firm boundaries. On this topic, I would take Feuillet's argument still further and incorporate it with Daniel's court scene, and highlight that in fact the anthropomorphic attributes of the first and fourth creatures serve as catalysts for the creaturely kings' fates: Nebuchadnezzar toward a sense of restoration (since he is restored to the full splendor of his kingdom after his transformation and worship of the God of heaven in Dan. 4, and Antiochus, with his human eyes and arrogant mouth, toward his judgment and ultimate death by fire.

by the anthropomorphic overlords.

The first element of Daniel's reworking includes the court scene where the monsters, primarily the fourth, are brought to judgment based on the arrogant words of the little horn on its head.[412] By presenting the four living creatures as necessary components of the throne room scene—since without them the theophanic throne scene would be lacking its nonhuman accompaniment—and then asserting the sovereignty of the deity over their rulership as kings on the earth, the creatures' "difference" evokes a sense of uncertainty in the heavenly court. As Safwat Marzouk notes of monsters in Ezekiel more broadly, "the monster's challenge to the divine order and subsequent and recurrent subjugation are indispensable narrative elements through which the patron god's sovereignty can be demonstrated. Yet, this system of binary opposites…is an unstable reality, because the structure of the norm hinges on the monster being a monster."[413] Thus, building on Marzouk's work, I argue that in Daniel's reworking of Ezek. 1, the presence of the four monsters that evoke the fundamental features of the heavenly throne indicate the latent anxieties of Jewish communities regarding the sovereign space of the divine itself.[414] And although the "other" living creatures are ultimately portrayed as subservient, the revelation of their presence and Daniel's fear as a result of this revelation affirm reading Daniel's

[412] Depending on how one views the composition history of Ezek. 1 and the theophany's relationship to book's subsequent chapters, one could argue that Ezekiel's monsters are also expressed in a judgment context. See Smith-Christopher, "Postcolonial Reading," 189. He suggests as much, implying that the uncertainty and ambiguity of the vision inspire both "terror and wonder" in the text's reader.

[413] Marzouk, *Egypt as a Monster,* 71. Marzouk does not examine Ezek. 1 at any length or extend his analysis of monsters to the living creatures.

[414] Furthermore, as I have noted previously, fourness is generally understood as a universalizing number, such as the four winds and four corners of the earth. And so Daniel's vision of four living creatures which he later finds out are four kings on the earth speaks to the same universalizing principle, but this time a reflection of the widespread instability that Danielic authors perceived to be occurring in the throne room itself.

monsters are reflections of societal insecurity rather than certainty.[415] In other words, the four monsters of Dan. 7 take up the throne-room space that hybrid guardians normally would but they are deviant, different, and not in step with the divine sovereign. Therefore, their monstrous presence in a sacred space imagined to be stable, sovereign, and orderly reflects the Jewish uncertainty regarding the efficacy of that space and the divine structures it depicts.

The creatures' relationship to the throne is also a key component in their judgment. In his discussion of the hybrid cherubim throughout Ezekiel, Dale Launderville summarizes the functions of intermediate beings that are composed of human and animal features in Mesopotamian sources. He states: "These composite beings were orderly when associated with a particular god; but when separated from a god and operating independently, they were rebels that could upset the order of the inhabited world."[416] Although Launderville does not distinguish between the חיות and כרובים in Ezekiel as the current investigation does, his observation remains applicable. The creatures envisioned by Dan 7 are not judged because of their hybrid animal-bodies, supernatural powers, or even their presence in the throne room. This is clear because Ezek. 1's creatures embody these characteristics but are rather enmeshed in and an integral part of the divine will and throne-room structure. Daniel 7's creatures are judged—with different measures, I might add—based on their frayed connection with perceived divine order, manifested in their differences from one another and the little horn's deviant behavior.[417]

A second element of Daniel's reworking is the presence of an interpretation in the vision

[415] Embracing the "foreignness" of the relationship between the mixed monsters of Ezek. 1 and Dan. 7, Smith-Christopher reads Daniel's creatures as reflections of "the threat of hybrid identities of exiles (diasporas and abroad) and overwhelmed Judeans in their own homelands under Hellenistic and Roman overlords ("Postcolonial Reading, 195-6).

[416] Launderville, "Ezekiel's Cherub," 168.

[417] See also Anthony Green, "Beneficent Spirits and Malevolent Demons: The Iconography of Good and Evil in Ancient Assyria and Babylonia," *Visible Religion* 3 (1984) 80-105.

itself and the need for understanding, a feature that is not influenced by Ezekiel's vision. Ezekiel's is more akin to a prophetic-call vision, like that of Isaiah, and thus no interpretation by an attendant or angel is requested within the vision. Ezekiel 1 does differ, however, from other prophetic-call scenes in that the description of the creatures, thrones, and theophanic phenomena are ekphrastic, explaining in vivid detail the scene and its agents, a technique that does make its way to Dan. 7. In contrast to Ezek. 1, Daniel's vision does require understanding and some version of, however partial, an interpretation provided by an attendant in the court scene (7:16): "I inquired from him the trueness regarding all this, and he spoke to me and made known to me the interpretation of the matter." Note that the explanation is almost entirely focused on the most "different" of the creatures and its very noisy (and humanlike) horn (4:23-26). Daniel's uncertainty of the vision, especially the sense of disorder and "difference" amidst the throne scene, requires an explanation from an attendant in the divine throne-court itself. To be sure, many students apocalyptic literature would immediately peg this *angelus interpres* as one of the defining features of literary apocalypses, and I do not intend to argue with this. But it is not the only way of understanding Daniel's request for the vision's פשר. Monsters and visions of monstrosity also beg for interpretation, and have the potential to spark both horror and curiosity—even desire.[418] Hence, Daniel's request for understanding, particularly regarding the fourth monster, may be understood as a potent cocktail of fear, desire, anxiety, and curiosity.

4.7 Conclusion

As I have demonstrated, Ezekiel's living creatures are intimately linked, not diametrically opposed, to the monsters that Daniel sees emerging from the sea. Daniel's four "other" living

[418] Cohen's seventh theses highlight this "simultaneity of anxiety and desire, [which] ensures that the monster will always dangerously entice" ("Monster Culture," 19).

creatures have been interpreted as chaos symbols of gentile kingdoms—monstrous, mixed, and in need of total subjugation. But Daniel's reworking of Ezekiel's monsters, as I have argued, including the instability and sense of chaos felt among the four monsters vis à vis the throne reflects a social anxiety not only about foreign rulers but also regarding the uncertainty of the structure of divine sovereignty itself. Although Dan. 7's creatures are largely passive, with the exception of the fourth creature and its little horn, they are monsters that demonstrate the misgivings of Jewish communities' perception of the stability of divine order. If the creatures are an extension of divine sovereignty on earth—determined, numbered, and kept in check by heavenly order—their divergence from order appears to be a problem that only the heavenly court can manage.

After considering Ezek. 1's general and specific influence on the vision in Dan. 7 and putting the two texts in dialogue as throne room theophanies, both the centrality of hybrid creatures and the significance of Daniel's adjustments of the four creatures are made apparent. Moreover, because of the approximating language found in the descriptions of the ancient one and the humanlike one, such as the use of "like," "as," and "in the form of," the assumption that a human kingdom stands victorious over the bestial is not altogether clear.[419] In both texts, the hybrid monsters are creatures of unharnessed power over which the deity exerts his authority, throne, and will. But Daniel's reworking exhibits a greater sense of instability and uncertainty in the heavenly throne room than Ezekiel's, wherein the four universalizing figures who would normally uphold the symmetry and unity of divine rule are destabilized and "different from each other." The significance is in Dan. 7's use of similar monsters in the throne room, and his reworking of them to communicate a different type of monstrosity in a new context.

[419] See Porter, *Monsters*, 28, and his citation of Morna Hooker, *The Son of Man in Mark.* (Montreal: McGill University Press, 1967) 11-13.

Despite the recent discussions of Dan. 7 and monster theory, the premise that "monsters are ourselves" has not been engaged thoroughly enough. I have suggested that this is primarily a result of the imagined clarity that we imagine ancient Jewish communities had regarding foreignness and even animality. Instead of this merely being a reflection of the bestial nature of gentile kingdoms or the brutality of empire, Dan. 7 portrays this destabilization in the context of the divine structure itself, requiring a judgment and sovereign management of the universalizing rule effectuated on the earthly plane. By proposing a reorientation by way of an alternate translation, the beastly foreigners of Daniel's visions might be understood as more familiar hybrids than initially imagined. Ezekiel's חיות, when read in light of Daniel's reworked חיון therefore reflect an anxiety about the extent and effectiveness of divine sovereignty itself, a question indeed fueled by the socio-historical context of the chapter's compilation. As creatures and monsters both—much like Frankenstein's creature-monster—Daniel's four hybrid animals continue to be a deep well of fear, curiosity, foreignness, and reflection:

"At first I started back, unable to believe that it was indeed I who was reflected in the mirror; and when I became fully convinced that I was in reality the monster that I am, I was filled with the bitterest sensations of despondence and mortification."[420]

[420] *Frankenstein: Or the Modern Prometheus,* first published in 1818 (Online: The Floating Press, 2009), 164.

CHAPTER FIVE: DOMESTICATING DIFFERENCE

"*All animals are equal but some animals are more equal than others."*

George Orwell, *Animal Farm*[421]

5.1 Introduction

Set in a vision by a river in a foreign land, the domestic animals of Dan. 8 evoke a very different sense than that of the monstrous and hybrid creatures of Dan. 7, its literary predecessor.[422] The animals who take centerstage in the chapter, a ram and a he-goat, are less fantastic and eye-catching than those of Dan. 7, and even the semi-hybrid creature of Nebuchadnezzar's transformation in Dan. 4. Apart from an excess of horns, apparent floating capabilities, and exceptional strength, the ram and he-goat are not hybridized in any way and do not seem to have supernatural qualities that would draw attention to their otherworldliness. Although a similar autonomous and emboldened horn is still present like that of Dan. 7, the vision of Dan. 8 includes additional nonhumans—the host and stars—all of whom have received less attention than the other more exotic creatures who roam the Danielic corpora.

The present chapter first presents an analysis of Dan. 8 and provides a brief comparison with the animals and animality portrayed in Dan. 7, highlighting how the animals of Dan. 8 are domestic, non-anomalous, and stripped of their mythological import, and therefore do not evoke the same sense of shock as Daniel's previous vision.[423] Moreover, the creatures of Dan. 8 are not

[421] George Orwell, *Animal Farm: A Fairy Story* (New York: Infobase Publishing, 2009 [1984]), 76.

[422] On the relationship between the chapters, Carol Newsom states: "Though [ch. 8 is] clearly alluding to Daniel's dream vision in ch. 7, [it] recasts the symbolism and uses a new pattern by which to understand history—the ironic structure of power being most vulnerable at the point of its apparently most triumphant moment." Newsom, *Daniel, 212.*

[423] On the other hand, their animal bodies are no less potent as symbolic actors. According to Dan Sperber's work on

described as being "like" rams and goats using simile-like language like Dan. 7. They are fully immersed in their narrative setting and are described as simply "being" rams and goats in both their description and interpretation. In order to further highlight Dan. 8's distinct way of negotiating foreignness and animality, I place the chapter in dialogue with the animal allegories in 1 Enoch 85-90 (known as the *Animal Apocalypse* or *Animal Vision,* henceforth *Anim. Apoc.)* which are similarly neither hybrid nor fantastic in any apparent way. Although the texts are similar in their allegorical framework, the fact that the domestic, kosher, and ritually pure animals of Dan. 8 portray gentile empires problematizes many scholarly approaches to and analyses of the *Anim. Apoc.* Such studies assume that since domestic, kosher, and ritually pure animals are reserved for the biblical patriarchs and other positive figures in the allegory, representations of animals that are wild, non-kosher, and ritually impure are symbolic of gentile others and outsiders.[424] As I argue in the pages ahead, the text of Dan. 8 questions this assumption of wild animals as foreigners in its portrayal of the Median, Persian, and Greek empires as goats and rams.

In my comparison of Dan. 8 and the *Anim. Apoc.* I demonstrate that, although emerging from contemporary socio-historical contexts, the two texts employ and express domestic

---

animal symbolism, "anomaly is not a necessary condition" and "perfect or paradigmatic animals also take on symbolic value." Dan Sperber, "Why are perfect animals, hybrids, and monsters food for symbolic thought?" *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion,* 1996, Vol. 8.2 (143-169). Here, on pp. 151-3, Sperber's aim is to challenge Mary Douglas' claim that "any given system of classification must give rise to anomalies," especially in systems of ritual, sacrifice, and religious taxonomies of animals. Douglas' work on kosher laws in Leviticus have also been employed by David Bryan, a model with which I take up a number of issues.

[424] As an example, see Goldingay's commentary: "Ram and goat…are both clean animals; contrast the unclean hybrids and fierce predators that represent nations in Dan 7 and in 1 En. 89-90. So ram and goat are less fearful or objectionable symbols of authority and power" (*Daniel,* 419). To make sense of the assumed binary of clean-domestic-kosher-insider versus unclean-wild-unkosher-outsider and the varying presentations in Daniel, Goldingay implies that the authors of Dan. 8 imagined its gentile empires as less threatening or authoritative. There is, however, no reason in trying to harmonize the visions of Dan. 7 and 8. The most straightforward explanation (and the one I maintain here) is that the varying expressions of animality and foreignness reflect multivocality among Jewish communities interested in the Danielic corpora.

animality in distinct ways. If the categories of domestic-wild, clean-unclean, Jew-Gentile, and insider-outsider are taken as static, the different approaches of these two sources are difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile. Instead of inflexible, static categories, I demonstrate the malleability of such categories, and the diverse approaches, voices, and expressions of Jewish communities that are mediated by animal interlocutors. By nuancing how the domestic animalities of the ram and goat function in Daniel's vision and *Anim. Apoc.* and how they impact our conceptions of foreignness in the Second Temple period, I aim to add another layer of difference to the ways that the Danielic corpora employ, portray, and interact with animals and nonhumans.

5.2 Composition and Social Setting of Daniel 8

Language and Setting

While Daniel 8 narrates the reported second vision of Daniel while in exile and bears similarities to Dan. 7, the text stands alone in a number of ways. From an aerial perspective of the MT's final form, Dan. 8 returns the reader to the Hebrew language after six chapters of Aramaic.[425] Thus, the fact that the second of Daniel's vision is preserved in a different language sets it as distinct from its supposed literary predecessor. Less work has been done on the relationship of the OG and Th to the MT since there are only minor variants between the versions. But what qualifies as minor depends on one's approach and criteria for such differences. As an example of work being done on the OG of Dan. 8 on its own terms, Ian Young

[425] As noted by many studies, the language switching does not conform to the apparent genre divisions of the corpora which, prior to the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, might have prompted scholars to think these switches as the later work of a lazy redactor. But both of the language changes from Hebrew to Aramaic in 2:4b and then back to Hebrew with the beginning of ch. 8 are preserved in fragments from cave four at Qumran, thus situating the MT's polyglossia earlier than one might have expected For a brief summary of these fragments, see Bledsoe, "Relationship," 177. See also Eugene Ulrich's essay, "The Text of Daniel in the Qumran Scrolls," in Collins and Flint (eds.) 2002: 573-85, as well as his earlier publications on the fragments from cave four: "Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran, Part 1: A Preliminary Edition of 4QDana," *BASOR* 268: 1987, 17-37; "Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran, Part 2: Preliminary Editions of 4QDanb and 4QDanc," *BASOR* 274: 1989, 3-26.

has recently argued that the OG version reflects a different set of traditions than that of the MT based on the differences in their descriptions of the "little horn," whereas the OG speaks of a "strong horn."[426] This is discussed in greater length below in my analysis of the chapter. Even in setting the Greek versions aside, however, the compositional history of the MT bears a number of complexities on its own. Issues surrounding the unity of the chapter[427] and the original language of composition[428] continue to impact debates in critical editions and commentaries on the Danielic corpora.[429]

In terms of the chapter's dating and social setting, Dan. 7 and 8 overlap in a significant way namely with the focus on the final horn, a stand-in for Antiochus Epiphanes IV. As noted by Newsom, Dan. 8 does not seem to know of the rededication of the temple in 164 BCE just three years after the peak of the Antiochene crisis in 167 BCE,[430] providing quite a small window of when the text was likely composed.[431] Life under Seleucid rule during this period was, as described by Portier-Young, one of violence, cognitive dissonance, and terror.[432] Pointing to the

[426] Ian Young, "What is Old Greek Daniel chapter 8 about?" *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, 2020, Vol. 44(4), 693-710.

[427] See Collins' summary of the views surrounding the unity of the chapter (*Daniel,* 328). In his view, the instances that others argue as redactions seem like textual corruptions and dittography rather than intentional changes.

[428] Hartman and DiLella, for example, base their translation of Dan. 8 on a reconstructed Aramaic rather than the corrupted Hebrew text preserved. *Daniel,* 232.

[429] See Goldingay's summarization of how commentaries have approached the difficulty of Dan. 8's Hebrew. Explanations range from the author's poor Hebrew to an intentionally convoluted presentation intended to reflect the tumultuous circumstances during which the text was composed (*Daniel,* 418).

[430] As described in detail in 1 Macc. 1 and 2 Macc. 5-6. See Newsom's summary, *Daniel,* 257.

[431] Newsom, *Daniel,* 256.

[432] Portier-Young, *Apocalypse,* 140-75. In her chapter examining the "state of terror" enacted by the Seleucid authority after Jason's revolt (ca. 169-8 BCE), the author distinguishes between fear, anxiety and terror, arguing that "state terror" was the preferred mode "for social control" (142). Her primary sources for this argumentation are 1 and 2 Macc., which she admits in a footnote reflect their "own guiding interests and aims," as is the difficulty with any presentations of history (140, fn. 1)

edict of Antiochus IV, she also argues that the vision's return to Hebrew was meant "to underscore the change in situation and call an end to cooperation and accommodation."[433] While Newsom has argued that the communities who authored ancient apocalypses were on the margins of society, Davies and Portier-Young maintain that the authors' involvement was invested in the social centers of administration, priesthood, and scribal elite circles.[434] It seems in either case that the *maskilim,* the group mentioned in chs. 11-12, played some role in the final formation of the MT Daniel or at least in the redaction processes leading up to it.[435] While this may be true for chs. 11-12 and perhaps even ch. 1 which is also composed in Hebrew, the vision presented in ch. 8 is of a different persuasion, utilizes different sets of images, and features distinct approaches to the relationship between human, animal, and divine agents. The social setting of Dan. 8 is significant for my argument in its similarity to Dan. 7. Although the two chapters were either redacted (Dan. 7) or composed (Dan. 8) within a half of a decade of one another, the ways they utilize animality to portray gentile kingdoms are altogether distinct, thereby demonstrating the multivocality within Jewish communities in Palestine during the Antiochene crisis.

Shifting Away from the Mythic

Whereas Dan. 7 invokes mythic themes with broad symbolic strokes, painting the victory of the holy ones over the taunts of the fourth animal's little horn, Dan. 8 focuses more intently on

[433] Portier-Young, *Apocalypse,* 228. See also Portier-Young's article on the matter, "Languages of Identity and Obligation."

[434] See Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space*. Contra Newsom, see Philip 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).

[435] For a thorough summary of scholarship on this view and how it relates to the Qumran community, see Charlotte Hempel, "Maskil(im) and Rabbim: From Daniel to Qumran," in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honor of Michael A. Knibb,* Charlotte Hempel and S.N.C. Lieu (eds.) (Leiden: Brill, 2006) 133-156.

the desecration of the temple and its cosmic implications. In the introduction to his monograph on Dan. 8, Holger Gzella points to this lack of mythological import as the reason why many studies are less interested in the chapter as a whole and, if the chapter is addressed to any considerable extent, the downsides of many approaches.[436] He explains regarding the preference for Dan. 7:

> Such [Ancient Near Eastern] material almost automatically attracts many scholars who are more interested in identifying a particularly mythological "background" than in understanding the text of Daniel 7 itself…Daniel 8 appears to be much less appealing than many other texts, simply because its frame of reference, including the correspondence between image and meaning, seems to be all too obvious to merit an in-depth study, especially when the narrative as such does not strike the reader as particularly interesting.[437]

Here Gzella summarizes that the lack of mythic themes in Dan. 8 has earned it a secondary place in comparison to Dan. 7. Indeed, the vision has even been described as "inferior" because it "shows a less vivid imagination" than the creatures, ancient of days, and humanlike-one of ch. 7.[438] As a result of this lesser ranking, I argue that many examinations of the chapter's nonhumans and animalities have been haphazardly clumped with those of ch. 7 and led to unnuanced misunderstandings and misattributions.

The form and function of the visions in Dan. 8, although similar in their concern for gentile kings personified as animals and understanding of the vision provided by a semi-divine

---

[436] Holger Gzella, *Cosmic Battle and Political Conflict: Studies in Verbal Syntax and Contextual Interpretation of Daniel 8* (BibOr, 47; Roma: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 2003).

[437] *Cosmic Battle*, 1-3.

[438] Hartman and DiLella, *Daniel,* 230. Also Goldingay, *Daniel,* 409-11.

being, are quite different from other revelations in the Danielic corpora. The authors who composed Dan. 8 and the community for whom it was important did not concern themselves with hybrid creatures or follow the tradition of Dan. 7 and the centrality of its four creatures. It diverges altogether, in fact, from the four-kingdom schema and reduces its historiographical scope to only two creatures. The first animal, the ram, hosts two empires in its two horns. The second animal, a he-goat, bears a series of horns starting with one between the goat's eyes, which is broken and leaves room for four more to spring up. Finally, a smaller horn emerges from the midst of the four and becomes distinct among them.

In addition to reducing the number of creatures, Dan. 8 is further distinct from the visions in chs. 7 and 10, which both place emphasis on theophanic-type appearances of both anthropomorphic and non-anthropomorphic beings. Bearing no ekphrastic-style descriptors of otherworldly creatures—human, nonhuman, or any combination of such—the chapter even abstains from describing the variety of holy ones, semi-divine humans, and even the first appearance of the man-like being, Gabriel.[439] Instead, the chapter's focus is significantly narrowed and is devoted to the recounting of the vision of the two animals, their horns, and its meaning elucidated by Gabriel. These differences have remarkable impacts on how Dan. 8 is understood as a vision and its meaning for Jewish communities in the first century BCE. If the hybrid creatures in Dan. 7 reflect the underlying anxieties of Jewish groups' relationships with self, Other, empire, and Divine, what do the largely "normal" creatures in Dan. 8 reveal about these same relationships?

[439] Gabriel's role in the visions of Daniel expands after ch. 8, seen in his ministration to Daniel in ch. 9, in which he is described in 9:21 as "האיש גבריאל." In ch. 8, however, Gabriel is man-like but not so certainly or clearly a human. Although some assume the "איש עחד" in 10:5 to be Gabriel as well since he is similarly described as "a man," the being is unnamed and centralizes the newly introduced Michael into the transmundane drama. For further discussion, see Matthew L. Walsh, "Sectarian Identity and Angels Associated with Israel: A Comparison of Daniel 7-12 with 1QS, 11QMelchizedek, and 1QM," in *Dead Sea Scrolls, Revise and Repeat: New Methods and Perspectives*, (eds.) Carmen Palmer, et al. (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2020), 171-81.

As demonstrated in the previous chapter of this dissertation, the imperial anxieties of Dan. 7 are expressed through hybrid monstrosity and enmeshed with the stability and instability of the divine throne-room dynamic. In contrast, the discomfort with foreign empires in Dan. 8 is expressed through domesticated and ritually pure animals, and the threat of their animality is primarily directed to one another in their power struggle for succession of the kingdom.[440] Unlike the motif of the sovereign establishment of one kingdom over another in Dan. 7 and their seemingly smooth succession that seems to be devoid of direct conflict and yet rife with instability, the aggressive head-butting and trampling of the creatures in Dan. 8 has a direct effect on other earthly rulers (animals and horns), as well as heavenly ones (stars and the host). The cosmology of Dan. 8, although less mythically oriented than its literary predecessor, conveys a reality that cannot be separated from its animal and nonhuman interlocutors, and roots its depictions of foreignness in creatures of familiarity for its first-century BCE Jewish communities.

5.3 Analysis of Daniel 8

A Ram, a Goat, and Some Stars (Don't Forget the Horns) (8:1-14)

The vision of Dan. 8 is introduced by a short statement similar to ch. 7 dating the account to the third year of the reign of Belshazzar, and then moves into first-person narration throughout the remainder of the chapter. But unlike Dan. 7 which takes place in a dream-vision, Dan. 8 is an open-eyed vision with no sleep, bed, or nighttime implied. In fact, the introduction to the chapter

[440] Derrida suggests two possible associations. The first is the positive association, which is only effective when held in contrast with "the wild." His second suggestion is a type of diminished power associated with domesticity, which might be perceived as a less-threatening gentile power. The move toward animality that is closer with civilization may depict a socialization of sorts (Derrida, *Animal*, 96-7).

features the common biblical phrase "I lifted my eyes" (ואשה עיני).[441] Unlike ch. 7, Dan. 8 provides a location and immediate setting for the experience. Reminiscent of Ezekiel's vision next to the river Chebar, Daniel explains that he saw himself next to the Ulai canal in the Susa citadel, a prominent Persian capital during the Babylonian exile.[442] After he lifts his eyes, Daniel beholds a ram with two horns (איל אחד...ולו קרנים) standing next to the same canal in v. 3. The length of the two horns is emphasized, as well as an indication that the longer of the two grew after the first. Presumably emerging from the east, Daniel sees the ram charging towards the west, north, and south, highlighting the breadth of its power and sense of universal sovereignty.[443] The differences present in the first few verses of Dan. 8 make it distinct from Dan. 7, indicating to the reader early on that the two visionary accounts should not be seen as parallel.

Adding further to the ram's supremacy, other animals (חיות) are unable to come up against the ram and it exhibits an active will of its own, which is expressed by the passage's consistent use of active participles.[444] The other animals over whom the ram exerts dominance, to my knowledge, have not been discussed in Danielic scholarship to any notable extent. What these other animals do is extend the allegory of Dan. 8 beyond its two primary creatures to

[441] See Nebuchadnezzar's revelation in 4:41 when he "lifts his eyes" אנה נבוכדנצר עיני לשמיא נטלת.

[442] The book of Esther is exclusively set in Susa, and the city is also mentioned in Ezra-Nehemiah. See Newsom, *Daniel*, 260; Gzella, *Cosmic*, 69-70.

[443] See Scott B. Noegel, "On the Wings of the Wind: Towards an Understanding of Winged Mischwesen in the Ancient Near East," KASKAL: Rivista di Storia, ambiente e culture del Vicino Oriente antico 14 (2017), 15-54. Noegel points to the relationship between cardinal directions and universality, as well as the "totality of power" ascribed to the creatures associated with "four-ness" (19).

[444] Another function of participles is their use in visionary accounts, which brings the reader into the unfolding of the narrative and gives a sense that the vision is appearing before their eyes. Recall that the only creature in Dan. 7 with active agency was the fourth creature; each of the other three monsters were "acted up" by strings of passive participles.

include other entities who are represented by animals. Although the identities of these entities are unknown, the possibilities include other empires, nations, or individual kings or princes. Such an inclusion likens Dan. 8 with the extended allegory found in the *Anim. Apoc.* In contrast to this extended allegory, the four creatures in Dan. 7 are the only "symbolic" animals featured and there is no mention of the allegory extending beyond these four. In other words, the four creatures of Dan. 7 are not merely four animal actors in an all-animal universe—they are distinctly monstrous in their animality. Their distinction is in line with the evidence presented in the previous chapter which argued for Dan. 7's four creatures as evocations and inversions of Ezek. 1's living creatures. The presentation of the animals portraying foreign empires in Dan. 8, therefore, are distinctly un-monstrous and not even necessarily fear-inducing. Although they do possess power and are even threatening in their ability to battle one another, they are not monstrous in the same way as those of Dan. 7.

Of the animals' active wills and independent agency, Dan. 8 reflects a different perspective of divine sovereignty than that of Dan. 7. Instead of being "acted upon" and having their actions imposed on them by an outside divine force, the ram and the he-goat act of their own volition. To explain this shift from Dan. 7, Newsom argues that Dan. 8 was composed in the midst of the Antiochene persecutions hence its "more somber" tone, whereas Dan. 7 was composed much earlier and appends a brief commentary on the little horn and its destruction as a secondary adaptation.[445] Further complicating the figures of divine sovereignty (God and his hosts), ch. 8 is devoid of a throne-room description or any divine intervention at all. In her monograph devoted to the theme of divine sovereignty in Daniel, Amy C. Merrill Willis describes this "sequel" to Dan. 7 as "a profound experience of divine absence," a concept

[445] Newsom, *Daniel*, 256.

supported by largely passive role of the divine in Dan. 8.[446] The absence of divine intervention might be explained by chapter's concern historical presentation rather than ekphrastic theophany, as well as the later composition of the chapter that may signal a more dire or hopeless situation than that of Dan. 7. The emphasis, thus, is shifted to the autonomy of the ram and he-goat, and of course, their many horns.

As the visionary continues to observe the present scene, it takes a turn indicated by a first-person participle paired with הנה.[447] The next scene introduces the second animal of the vision: the male goat (צפיר העזים). This time emerging from the west, the author makes sure to note that the goat crossed a vast distance without ever touching the ground and possesses a single horn, which is situated between its eyes. Of the strange phrasing, "the he-goat of goats," Holger Gzella poses two possible explanations. The first may be to distinguish more clearly between the ram and the goat; the second suggests an association with a goat-demoniac of sorts.[448] While I agree that the phrasing is distinct and draws attention, especially in its likely Aramaic influence, one must be cautious in assuming this association over the connection between male goats and the sacrificial cult. This association is even more tenuous in the narrative's lack of any direct judgment or evaluative statement on the he-goat.

After the he-goat's introduction, the narrative turns to the interaction between the two animals in v. 6 and the ram is also given a slightly different description: the ram, owner of the two horns (האיל בעל הקרנים). This description does not appear again until v. 20 in Gabriel's

[446] Willis, *Dissonance and Divine Sovereignty*, 92.

[447] Compare with ch. 7's use of the Aramaic interjection ארו.

[448] Gzella, *Cosmic Battle*, 135-6. This is based on the handful of passages that allude to שעיר as a "goat-demon" or "satyr," who shares company with other liminal and threatening creatures. See Lev. 17:7; Is. 13:21; 34:14; 2 Chron. 11:15. Although צפיר and שעיר are likely etymologically connected, as seen in the textual corruption in v. 21 which refers to the he-goat as "הצפיר השעיר," it would be difficult to follow Gzella's argument through on this example alone.

interpretation of the vision and seems to be offered as a parenthetical clarifier, as seen in the phrasing: "The ram that you saw (the one with the two horns) (האיל אשר ראית בעל הקרנים)…" In both distinct descriptions of the animals, they emphasize the features to which the narratives wishes to draw attention. The ram's two horns, its two primary powers, are what sets it as unique and it is these two horns that are broken by the he-goat in the following section. The emphasized feature of the he-goat, on the other hand, is its maleness and possibly its superiority over other goats if one follows Gzella's translation, "the he-goat of goats." But the power of the he-goat even falls to wayside with the appearance and dominance of the little horn.

What ensues next is a violent struggle between the ram and the goat, which results in the defeat of the ram and the breaking of its two horns.[449] It is worth noting here that although a "succession of kingdoms" theme is invoked throughout Daniel, this is the only instance wherein the succession of power involves an explicit battle.[450] The succession between kingdoms in Dan. 2, although concluding with the un-hewn stone breaking all other materials to pieces, does not imply violence *between* the kingdoms themselves. The materials are described as simply lined up one after the other in the statue, moving from one sovereign to the next. Similarly, the "succession" in Dan. 7 is not a violent one between the hybrid creatures. All four creatures seem to exist at the same time with their distinct roles, excepting the emphasis on the fourth beast and

[449] For an anthropological discussion of honor and shame in Mediterranean society pertaining to these two animals, see Anton Blok, "Rams and Billy-Goats: A Key to Mediterranean Code of Honour," in *Religion, Power and Protest in Local Communities, The Northern Shore of the Mediterranean* (ed.) Eric R. Wolf (Berlin; New York; Amsterdam;: Mouton, 1984). Blok argues that the ram and goat served as two poles, the former of honor and the latter of shame. He also presents an argument for the role of horns in expressing the strength and virility of the ram versus the wily and unrestrained sexual escapades of the he-goat.

[450] See Frisch, *Danielic Discourse*, 96-8. Compared to an earlier perspective of "inheritance" of the unified kingdom from one party to the next, Frisch notes the passing of power "through battle and defeat" 98.

his "difference" from the rest.[451] Moreover, the four king-creatures in Dan. 7 each maintain dominion simultaneously, and even their judgment appears to be executed out of the historical order that modern readers would expect. So too the historiographical elements are of greatest concern to most studies of Daniel 8, although other studies have searched for other layered meanings in the chapter's animal symbolism, such as the zodiacal referents as stand-ins for each nation.[452] The clear succession by way of violence, however, is clear in Dan. 8.

Following the violent struggle between the animals and the defeat of the ram, the he-goat grows in power and possibly physical size until its single horn is broken (v. 8). This single, strong horn is Alexander of Macedon. Although horns were In its place, four additional horns rise up (תעלנה) toward the four winds of heaven.[453] It is from the midst of these horns that the infamous "little horn" emerges, growing great in every direction including heavenward toward the "hosts of heaven" (צבא השמים). The following clause prompts a notable difference between the versions[454] and is a primary focus of Ian Young's recent article on the OG of Dan. 8.[455] In the MT, 8:10b reads: "…and it caused some of the host and some of the stars to fall earthward and trampled them (ותפל ארצה מן הצבא ומן הכוכבים ותרמסם)." The causative of נפלis used here, distinguishing it from other instances (8:7, 12) where a subject is "throwing down" (the causative

[451] The only sense of "succession" is hinted in the chronological beholding of each creature after the other, beginning with the earliest empire and concluding with the most recent.

[452] Elias J. Bickerman, along with others before him, posits the ram as zodiacal symbol for Iran and the he-goat as a stand-in for Syria but no further explanation is provided. (*Four Strange Books*, 108). Gzella summarizes these views but does not mention Bickerman, and concludes that the suggestion is problematic at best and totally unsustainable at worst (*Cosmiic Battle*, 130-3).

[453] Collins translates לארבע רוחות השמיםas "corresponding to the four winds of heaven."

[454] It is not the focus here to summarize all the variants between the versions but only those that have some bearing on the animal and nonhuman imagery in Dan. 8.

[455] See Young, "What is Old Greek Daniel chapter 8 about?" Of the features that distinguish MT Dan. 8 from Dan. 7 (no divine judgment or intervention, the success of the little horn, and very little resolution to the little horn's display of power and persecution), the OG Dan. 8 "does not share *any* of these features" (694, emphasis original).

of שלך) something or someone earthward.[456] In contrast, the OG of 8:10b reads: "And it was thrown down upon the earth by the stars and by them was trodden down (καὶ ἐρράχθη ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀστρων καὶ ἀπὸ αὐτῶν κατεπατήθη)."[457] The primary difference between the passages is the subject of the verb, that is, who is doing the "throwing down." For the MT, it is Antiochus the small horn who causes the host and stars to fall earthward. In contrast, the OG presents the stars as the ones who throw down Antiochus the horn and trample him.[458]

Young presents a number of other variants between the MT and OG of Dan. 8, which ultimately lead him to conclude that the divine presence is anything but absent in the OG and actively succeeds in keeping the Antiochus horn at bay, especially from heavenly positions of power. Although the earthly reality may present a discouraging situation where Antiochus appears to have the privileged position, the OG emphasizes his lack of access to the realm of the "stars" and implies that it's only a matter of time before the earthly reality follows in line with the heavenly.[459]

Returning to MT's narrative, the little horn successfully tramples on both the stars and the host, and eventually rises up so high that he even becomes a threat to the prince of the host (v. 11). The little horn's actions, primarily defined with the verb "to grow" (גדל) in the causative, have detrimental consequences and he succeeds in removing the twice-daily offering from the

[456] The verb is also used in 8:11 but in the hophal. The first verb, נפל, appears later in Dan. 11:12 in the causative, discussing the king of the north's "overthrowing of tens of thousands."

[457] Young, "Old Greek," 698.

[458] Another difference Young points out between the MT and OG is their descriptions of the Antiochus horn: the MT describes him as a "little horn" (קרן אחת מצעירה), whereas the OG describes him as a "strong horn" (κέρας ἰσχυρὸν). "Young" or "younger" are also acceptable translations for מצירה, which are still diminutive terms.

[459] Whereas the 8:11a in the MT suggests the horn rises up to challenge the prince of the host and succeeds, the OG says "until the prince of the host delivers the captives." Young wonders if this "prince of the host" may refer to Judas Maccabaeus, perhaps implying a later redaction of the OG since its "presentation is influenced by knowledge of the later events of the era." (698-702)

prince of the host (שר הצבא) and throwing down the place of his sanctuary (מכון מקדשו). The identity of the prince of the host has prompted a number of opinions ranging from the God of Israel, the high priest, an angelic ruler, or a combination of such.[460] In any case, the MT of the passage depicts the little horn as a legitimate threat against, and possessing temporary victory over, both the heavenly and earthly spheres of divine sovereignty.

In the midst of the vision, Daniel overhears a conversation between a certain holy one (אחד קדוש) and someone else (פלמוני), wherein the former enquires about the time frame of the things Daniel has just beheld. The most concerning issues are those that pertain to the temple cult, namely the daily burnt offering (התמיד), the desolating transgression (הפשע שמם), the giving and holy place (תת וקדש), and the trampling of the host (צבא מרמס).[461] The somewhat opaque and yet specific answer provided is two thousand and three hundred evenings and mornings; after this time, the holy place will be reestablished.[462]

Reading Between the Horns (8:15-27)

After overhearing this mysterious heavenly conversation, Daniel returns to a sense of himself and requested understanding (בינה) of the vision. Unlike the narrative of the previous chapter, Daniel is unafraid of what he beholds, whether the ram and the he-goat, the battle between the host and the horn, and the troubled state of the temple and its cult. When he asks to

[460] Hartman and DiLella understand the prince as the God of Israel (*Daniel,* 236); Collins agrees and brings support Dan. 8:25 which identifies this prince as the "prince of princes," whom he understands as God, but also acknowledges the trickiness of the representation similar to the humanlike one of Dan. 7 (*Daniel,* 333).

[461] The text is almost certainly corrupt and poses a number of difficulties, especially the list of things that the holy one asks about. See Gzella (*Cosmic Battle,* 144) for the most focused analysis and comprehensive summary of scholarship of the last half century.

[462] Paul J. Kosmin sees this answer to the questions "for how long?" as "the [Dan. 8's] key concern and central contribution" to Daniel's visions. See *Time and Its Adversaries in the Seleucid Empire* (Cambridge; London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2018), 154-5.

understand the vision, the chapter takes a decidedly anthropomorphic turn. Something like the apparition of a man (כמראה גבר) appears standing before him, and a human voice (קול אדם) calls out from the midst of the canal: "Gabriel, cause this one to understand the vision!"[463] It is only in Gabriel's approach and before he even speaks that Daniel then becomes frightened and falls on his face. When Gabriel addresses Daniel to help him understand (v. 17), he identifies him as a human (בן אדם) and states that the vision is for an end time (עת כין). Thus, the vision has fully transitioned from distinctly nonhuman images to human-adjacent actors: something like a man's apparition, the human voice from the canal, the "man of God" (Gabriel), and the human Daniel.

Following Gabriel's brief explanation to Daniel, the visionary is unable to function and falls on his face in a stunned trance (נרדמתי) and can only be restored by Gabriel's touch. Daniel learns that what he saw is for a future time of wrath (באחרית הזעם) and is finally provided an explanation for the animals and nonhumans that consumed the first half of the chapter. Verse 20 interprets the ram with two horns with brevity as "the kings of Media and Persia," and moves immediately to the he-goat as "the king of Greece." The horn between its eyes, Gabriel explains, is "the first king (הוא המלך הראשון)" and refers to it as "the broken one (הנשברת)," which is Alexander of Macedon.[464] Alternating between feminine and masculine nouns and pronouns since the horn is feminine and the king is masculine, the text is not overly concerned with retaining the grammatical integrity of its allegory. After the "broken one," four kingdoms rise up under it, which are described as being four within one nation but devoid of the power of the first king. Herein the discussion of the horns lies another key difference between the visions of Dan. 7

[463] The words used for vision change throughout the chapter between חזון and מראה.

[464] The "broken one" is generally understood as Alexander of Macedon, after whom follow the wars of the Diadochi and the four divisions of his empire under Seleucus Nicanor, Antigonus, Philip Aridaeus, and Ptolemy Lagus.

and 8. In Dan. 7, the fourth creature is described as having ten horns, out of which the small, speaking horn arises and displaces three other horns, causing them to be "plucked up by the roots."[465] However, in Dan. 8, there are four clear divisions made before the rising up of the Antiochene horn, and there appears to be no explicit conflict or usurping indicated in the narrative. Thus, even though Dan. 8 depicts violent succession between the empires indicated by the battle between the ram and the he-goat, the dynamic amidst the horns is not seen as violent or even competitive. This may, of course, be due to the fact that the details were simply unimportant to the author, but if the literary goal was to portray conflict between earthly rulers, presenting some type of battle or at least tension among the he-goat's horn would be a natural place to insert it.

Finally, Gabriel interprets the significance of the final horn and describes him as a מלך עז פנים, that is, a king of "strong countenance," or "bold-faced," and מבין חידות, that is, "understanding riddles." The second attribution is less clear and has been translated as "skilled in intrigue" or "adept in duplicity," but is in any case a fairly positive description and is reminiscent of Daniel's abilities described in the court tales as understanding riddles and untangling knots. The following details provided on the final horn are fairly vague, unclear, and likely corrupt:

> He shall become mighty in power, but not with his own power; he will destroy fearfully and succeed in what he does; he will destroy the mighty and the people of the holy ones. And by his intellect, treachery will succeed in his hand; and in his mind, he will become great; with ease he will destroy the many. Against the prince of princes, he will arise; but without a hand he will be broken.

[465] It is unclear to whom or what the ten horns refer. Propositions range from a number of Greek kings more broadly, as well as the more common view which views them each as successive rulers of the Seleucid empire. For a full summary, see Collins, *Daniel,* 320.

The interpretation concludes by returning to "the vision of the evenings and the mornings," which was discussed in the conversation Daniel overheard between the holy ones. Gabriel affirms that "what was said is true (אשר נאמר אמת)," thus implying that no interpretation is necessary. Instead, he instructs the visionary to seal up the vision because it is for many days, presumably for the future. After its conclusion, Daniel describes in first-person how he was sick for many days and then was able to rise, despite being devastated by the vision and without any understanding.

Responding to Daniel 7

Of the imagery of Dan. 8, Collins states that it is "clearly related to that of ch. 7, but its structure is less complex."[466] As shown in the summary above, however, there are actually very few direct similarities. Although many would point to the nonhuman depiction of foreign empires as the main point of overlap, the animals in Dan. 7 and 8 could not be more different. As described, the animals of Dan. 8 are non-hybrid and non-monstrous, and do not even evoke fear in Daniel who beholds them. Second, the ram and he-goat are domestic and fairly "normal" animals, which stand in contrast to the primarily exotic and "wild" animals who make up the bodies of Dan. 7's creatures. The presence of horns—especially the autonomous, trouble-making horn—are really the only direct parallel between the visions. Finally, the ram and he-goat are never judged, punished, or destroyed by divine sovereignty. There is indeed conflict between them, much more so than in Dan. 7, but the independent horn is the only one who seems to suffer negative consequences. Even then, his destruction is vague and brief, and only loosely implies a divine role: "Without a hand he will be broken (באפס יד ישבר)."[467] These important differences

[466] Collins, *Daniel*. 328.

[467] To highlight a divine intervention, this phrase is often translated "He will be broken but not with human hands."

contribute to an altogether distinct presentation of animality and foreignness in Dan. 8.

5.4 Between Animal Apocalypses

Turning now to a likely contemporary animal-allegory with Dan. 8, what is known as the "Animal Apocalypse" or the "Animal Vision" provides a fruitful comparison for the different ways that Jewish communities worked with and reworked concepts of foreignness with animal interlocutors.[468]

Introduction and Approaches to the *Animal Apocalypse*

The text is situated within the fourth section of 1 Enoch, titled the *Book of Dreams*. The dream is set as the second of two dream-visions as recounted by Enoch in his transmission of them to his son Methusaleh. Both the *Book of Dreams* and the *Apocalypse of Weeks*, the latter of which is tucked in the fifth and final section of 1 Enoch in the *Epistle of Enoch*, are thought to provide a contemporary literary milieu for Daniel 8-12.[469] However, just as "we cannot with certainty locate the writers and tradents of the early Enochic literature with a discrete social or religious group, we can—as with the writers of Daniel— venture a few remarks as to their social profile."[470] Although uncertain which set of passages influenced which, the two Enochic texts

[468] For an introduction to the animals of 1 En. 85-90, see Ida Fröhlich, "The Symbolical Language of the Animal Apocalypse of Enoch ('1 Enoch' 85-90)." *Revue De Qumrân* 14, no. 4 (56) (1990): 629-36; Gore-Jones, "Animals, Human, Angels and God;" Holger Gzella, *Cosmic Battle*. The most recent critical commentaries include Daniel C. Olson, *A New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch "All Nations Shall be Blessed,"* Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 24 (Danvers, MA: Brill, 2013); George E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012); and Patrick A. Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993).

[469] In her recent and unpublished dissertation, Elena Dugan has proposed an alternative dating for the "seventy shepherd schema" in the *Anim. Apoc.*, which has significant implications for the text as a whole, understandings of its animal imagery, and the social setting of its authors. I am grateful to the author for allowing me to read her dissertation and have the opportunity to discuss it with her. (Elena Dugan, "The Nature of the Beast: The Animal Apocalypse(s) of Enoch," [Unpublished Dissertation: Princeton University, 2021]).

[470] Portier-Young, *Apocalypse*, 309. See Portier-Young's fn. 112 on the same page for the settings of 1 Enoch; for Dan. 8, see Rainer Albertz, "The Social Setting of the Aramaic and Hebrew Book of Daniel," in *The Book of Daniel,*

emerged from the social, religious, and political upheaval in the middle of the second century under the rule of Antiochus IV.[471]

Worth comparing is their shared animal and nonhuman imagery—primarily rams, horns, and stars—and the function of the animals in the dream-vision.[472] Nickelsburg comments that the ram and he-goat in Dan. 8 "symbols for warring military powers," and, as discussed above, are interpreted by Gabriel for Daniel. Furthermore, Nickelsburg emphasizes the allegorical similarity between the texts, he does go further into detail on what this implies of their composition or how early Jewish communities might have understood them. The only aspect of the allegory to which he draws attention is the "one-to-one nature of the representation [which] often leads the reader to think not of the symbol but of what it symbolizes."[473] And while this may be true for modern commentators in their historical attempts to decode symbolic representations, the associative power of symbols, especially those as memorable as butting rams and trampled stars, first interacts between other symbols.

In his observations of the animals in the *Anim. Apoc.* and as the main thrust of his argument, David Bryan upholds a number of stark categories and states:

> The world for the seer [of the *Anim. Apoc.*] was one in which key boundaries existed between the wild and the domestic, the wilderness and the civilized land, the Gentle and the Jew, the profane and the divine. As anomalies in the created

Volume 1 Composition and Reception, Collins and Flint (eds.) (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 171-204; Stefan Beyerle, "The Book of Daniel and its Social Setting," in *The Book of Daniel, Volume 1 Composition and Reception,* Collins and Flint (eds.) (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 205-228.

[471] Influenced by the third-century Book of the Watchers, "the worldview of these two writers and their responses to the crisis faced by Judeans between the years 175 and 164 BCE" (Portier-Young, *Apocalypse,* 280-1).

[472] There are no goats in 1 Enoch's *Animal Vision.* For a summary of the animals and traditionally symbolic interpretations, see Gore-Jones, "Animals, Humans, Angels and God."

[473] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch,* 357.

> order the unclean animals symbolize, indeed embody, the power inimical to God which seek to bring chaos into his world. On the other hand, the clean animal conforms to the created order and represents those persons which are allied with God against the forces of chaos.[474]

The outlook that Bryan describes here is what he calls a "kosher mentality," one that he admits may or may not have been consciously employed by the author of the *Anim. Apoc.* but that nevertheless reflects the concerns of Jews during the Antiochene persecutions regarding dietary laws and temple purity.[475] To support his argument by extending it to *Mischwesen*, he includes analyses of the Testament of Naphtali 5 and Dan. 7. In the first text, he suggests that the vision's winged-bull with horns represents the Samaritans in its older version, and Rome in its later rendition. Thus, as symbol for chaos and mixture, the composite creature was formed by a priestly author consciously or subconsciously concerned with ritual purity to show how abominable their opposers really were. In Bryan's second example, a topic which I addressed in the previous chapter on Dan. 7, he argues similarly that the hybrid creatures who emerge from the sea epitomize chaos and uncleanness for "conservative Jews" and represent "extreme forms of the unclean creatures…[and] heathen empires that oppressed Israel."[476] In both textual examples, Bryan attempts to extend his "kosher mentality" theory in the *Anim, Apoc.* to another set of creatures, that is, hybrid beings in visionary settings. But in the conclusion of his book, Bryan admits the shortcomings of this extension to the *Mischwesen* imagery and the critiques he has received based on his approach, including the holy, hybrid creatures of Ezek. 1 who provide

[474] Bryan, *Cosmos,* 170.

[475] Ibid. 183-4.

[476] Bryan, *Cosmos,* 247.

a significant impediment to his argument.[477]

Another obstacle to Bryan's argument which he does not address, nor have I seen others do so, is the vision of Dan. 8 as a contemporary and yet altogether distinct example of animality in the Antiochene context. As seen in most examples thus far, animals and animality in the Danielic visions have been interpreted as forces of chaos, uncleanness, and bestial foreignness. But Dan. 8 presents two creatures who, apart from their anomalous horns, are arguably the most kosher and divinely approved creatures in early Jewish literature.

Rams

In contrast to the animals of Dan. 8 who are interpreted by Gabriel as nations or empires, the *Anim. Apoc.* portrays individuals in history as individual animals. Most relevant to this discussion are the vision's rams who each correspond to kings in the biblical narratives. Five figures are allotted the status of "ram" in the *Anim. Apoc.* The first is Jacob, a linguistically problematic attribution that conflicts with the Ge'ez text.[478] Considering Jacob's lack of association with military activities, his identification with a ram might very well be dubious. In any case, the most certain attributions are Saul, David, and Solomon, as well as a fifth ram that may refer to Judas Maccabaeus or another figure, depending on how one dates the *Anim. Apoc.* The first ram is the one who represents Saul, first appearing in 1 En. 89:42-43:

> And the dogs began to devour the sheep, and the wild boars and the foxes were devouring them, until the Lord of the sheep raised up a ram from among the sheep, which led them. And this ram began to butt and pursue with its horns. And

[477] Ibid. 255-6.

[478] See Dugan, "The Nature of the Beast," 277 fn. 536. Although the fragmentary Aramaic text may preserve Jacob as a דכר, as Dugan notes, no versions mention Jacob's horns.

> it hurled itself against the foxes, and, after them, against the wild boars; and it destroyed many wild boars. And after them it struck the dogs.[479]

Here, the dogs, wild boars, and foxes are typically understood as the nations who fought with the Israelite tribes in Canaan. Important to note here is the aggressive actions of the ram that included butting and pursuing with its horns. The "animalization" of Saul's suppression of the Philistines and other Canaanite tribes is an entirely positive portrayal and even contributes to the sheep's "open eyes, " at least until Saul strays from "its path." The notion of the "open eyes" of the sheep is generally understood as righteous religious observance, or an upholding of Israel's covenant with the divine.[480] After Saul's straying, however, a new function of the ram symbol is presented in 89:45-46 in the narration of Samuel's appointment of David as king:

> And the Lord of the sheep sent this sheep another sheep to appoint it to be ram, to rule the sheep instead of the ram that had forsaken its way. And it went to it and spoke with it secretly, alone, and appointed it to be ram and ruler and leader of the sheep. And during all these things, the dogs were oppressing the sheep.

In this description of Israelite history, Samuel (the sheep) is sent to David (another sheep) in order to appoint him as king (ram) in secret. Most significant about this allegory, especially in light of its contemporary composition with Dan. 8, is that the animal whom David is presented as changes from a sheep to a ram, from one species to another.

Transformation from one type of body to another is not altogether uncommon in

[479] All translations are from Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, unless otherwise noted.

[480] On this notion of the blindness or vision of the sheep, see Eyal Regev, "Sin, Atonement, and Israelite Identity in the Words of the Luminaries in Relation to 1 Enoch's Animal Apocalypse," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 84-85 (2014): 1-23.

the *Anim. Apoc.*, a topic which requires further study as a topic on its own. In their descent to earth (86:3), the stars who represent the watchers, for example, transform into bulls in order to have intercourse with the daughters of humankind. Their transformation results in a negative course of action, highlighting the boundary crossing that the watchers engage in that results in violence among human women (represented by heifers) and the watchers' giant offspring. But transformation as a concept is not altogether negative in the *Anim. Apoc*. Noah, as another example, transforms from the figure of a bull to a man (89:1), a change which the texts draws explicit attention: "And one of those four [men][481] went to one of the white bulls and taught it a mystery—trembling as it was. *It was born a bull but became a man."*[482] Here, the body with which Noah was born was transformed into that of a man based on a status change: his acquisition of heavenly mysteries. The figure of Moses also is transformed from a sheep to a man (89:36) when he when he "built a house for the Lord of the sheep and made all the sheep stand in that house."

Therefore, the figure of a ram for the *Anim, Apoc.*, therefore, is not an ontological category where when one is a ram, one is always a ram. David *becomes* a ram and thus takes on the ability to be "ram-like" in his newly appointed position. Once his position as ram was initiated, the first ram (Saul) pursued the second ram (David), depicting similar imagery of Dan. 8 in the interaction between the ram and the he-goat. Moreover, the language surrounding "raising up a ram" is similar to Dan. 8. Like Saul, David also "butted and killed all the beasts, and those beasts did not prevail again among the sheep,

[481] The "the four men" in this pericope are four angelic figures sent to judge the stars.

[482] Emphasis mine. Noah's bull-to-man change is noted again in 89:9.

nor did they snatch anything at all away from them" (89:49). Thus, the appropriate activity of being a ram is portrayed as the same between the *Anim. Apoc.* and Dan. 8, whether one is foreign ruler or an Israelite ruler. Animalization, and even "destructive" or "aggressive" animal behavior, is not negative in and of itself and does not only apply to the foreign "beastly" empires.[483] To further concretize this demonstration, it is likely that Dan. 8 and 1 En. 85-89:58 were in circulation in the same time period and proposing animal allegories as social commentary on past and current events.[484] The multivocality of Jewish communities as presented by these two examples, and the malleability of their animal interlocutors, cannot be understated.

Horns

Apart from rams, there remain two additional differences in the approaches of Dan. 8 and the *Anim. Vision* that expressed in their depictions of nonhuman interlocutors. The first category of nonhumans are horns, which for Danielic imagery, are quite active in that they are portrayed as speaking, rising up, growing, and trampling. Based on the Danielic narratives, the horns never detach from the body of the animal but nevertheless act autonomously from other horns, and are held responsible for their actions. In Dan. 7, however, it is not only the horn that is punished for its arrogance but the whole creature-monster. The creature and the horns all suffer the consequences as one unit when they are killed and burned with fire. In contrast, the he-goat of

[483] In Dugan's survey of the Ge'ez translations of Dan. 8 in comparison with 1 En. 90:10-19, she observes a similarity in their representation of important figures such as the king of Greece (Alexander) and the hero of the seventy-shepherd schema. However, this similarity should not be confused as the same meaning or authorial context. In the former, the ram (*dabela*) is a foreign and violent ruler, whereas in the latter, it is a heroic figure portrayed as victorious over its oppressors ("Nature of the Beast," 232).

[484] Of the lattermost portion of the *Anim. Apoc.* which is initiated by the seventy shepherds given governance over the sheep, Dugan persuasively proposes a dating around the First Jewish Revolt. This alternative context does not affect my argument since the imagery of the rams as Israelite kings is within what she terms the "Simple Allegory" ("Nature of the Beast," 317-20).

Dan. 8 is never punished for the actions of its horn. There is a clear succession of the horns, especially clear in the first horn (Alexander) who is broken at peak of the he-goat's power. The large horn is then succeeded by four others, and from among them rises the horn who ascends to the host and tramples them (Antiochus Epiphanes IV). This horn, too, is eventually broken. Thus, it is only the horns who are "broken" while the he-goat is not addressed again nor punished for hosting the deviant horn(s).

Unlike the *Anim. Apoc.*, individuals are represented by horns in Dan. 8 rather than individual animals.[485] The two horns of the ram in Dan. 8, for example, are applied to the kings of Media and Persia, whereas the ram as an individual is left unapplied and unexplained. Similarly, the initial and conspicuous horn of the he-goat is applied to the first king of Greece, and the he-goat as an entity is applied loosely to Greece. In contrast, the primary animals that are given horns in the *Anim. Apoc.* are kingly figures who act toward the well-being of the sheep. Although the stars-turned-bulls in 86:5 do indeed "gore [the other bulls] with their horns" after their rape of the heifers, this is the only mention of their horns. Horns are also used in a positive way, as Gzella observes with the example of Saul goring his enemies preserved in the Aramaic of 4Q205.[486] Thus, based on these applications, the animals in Dan. 8 are either best understood in their general associations with rulership and royal ideology, as Gzella notes, or they may each be understood as a collective from which certain individuals rise to prominence and serve as the military aggressors on behalf of the collective.[487]

[485] In Dan. 7, individuals are represented by both. Each of the four creatures are understood as "kings," and yet the fourth creature bears a number of autonomous horns who grow at different times, are plucked out, and are finally overshadowed by the little horn who outshines them all. Regardless, the fourth creature is punished for the lot of them and it is killed, its body burned by fire.

[486] Gzella, *qrn* in TDOT, 687.

[487] Gzella, *Cosmic*, 30, 138-9.

In the Hebrew Bible, rams depicting powerful military leaders is a familiar phenomenon.[488] The ram (איל) is not limited to one type of ruler, however, and is applied to both Israelite (often Davidic) as well as foreign rulers.[489] Furthermore, horns often accompany the rams as an expression of their strength or particular military prowess. In his discussion of the most popular ram in the *Anim. Apoc.,* Eyal Regev contextualizes the ram's symbolism in the sectarian writings of Qumran and argues against the consensus that the "messianic-like" figure alludes to Judas Maccabee. Although his presentation is convincing, especially of decentralizing the figure of Judah from the narrative, his discussion of the horn of the great ram does not acknowledge the text's earlier presence of horns in their non-messianic contexts. He says, "No horns appear in the survey of biblical history [of the *Animal Apocalypse*]. The fact is that only the ram, the bull, and the big unidentified animal have such horns (that are not cut down)."[490] However, the passage cited above (89:43) describes clearly the ram who was first raised up (Saul) as one who "began to butt and pursue with its horns." Moreover, the second ram (David) is also described according to his ability to charge: "And that ram butted and killed all the beasts…" Although the second ram's horns are not explicitly mentioned, it would be difficult to imagine a ram successful at butting who lacked the necessary armor. Thus, the horns described in the *Anim. Apoc.* accompany Israelite figures and are used in the same way as Dan. 8—as both defensive and offensive military symbols.

Horns were also important in Seleucid royal and military propaganda, which most certainly factored into Daniel's application of horns as gentile rulers. As Portier-Young notes,

[488] See Bryan, *Cosmos,* 70-1;

[489] "Rams of Moab" (Ex. 15:15); "The ram of the nation" (Ezek. 31:11); "The mighty rams" (Ezek. 32:21).

[490] Eyal Regev, "The Ram and Qumran,"190.

early Seleucid coinage depicted portraiture of their revered figures (whether the image is of Alexander, Seleucus I, or Dionysus is debated) as horned.[491] In line with horns being associated with foreignness and gentile rulership like that of the Seleucids, the horns of Dan. 7-8 are individual rulers who rise and fall, and can be broken as the horns of domestic animals. The *Anim. Apoc.,* in contrast, implements horn imagery in line with biblical texts that associate horns with the Davidic dynasty. The significance of these differences, therefore, lies in their distinct application of the same imagery. While both texts preserve the depiction of horns as symbols of military power and dominance, horns as nonhuman and animal-associated images are complex, variegated, and malleable.

Stars

The final group of nonhumans that are shared between Dan. 8 and the *Anim. Apoc.* are stars. In his piece on the relationship between 1 Enoch 85-90 and Revelation 9, Ian Boxall includes a summary of the role of stars in the two texts.[492] The *Anim. Apoc.* portrays stars as the fallen watchers who then take on animal characteristics (bulls) when they initiate their boundary-crossing intercourse with the cows of the bulls (human women). The stars are said to "let out their members like stallions," a metaphor also found in Ezek. 23 in speaking of the Egyptians with whom Israel joined herself.[493] As such, illicit progeny (elephants, camels, and wild asses) are borne from the intercourse of the stars-turned-bulls and the heifers, highlighting the

[491] Portier-Young, *Apocalypse*, 52-54.

[492] Ian Boxall, "The Animal Apocalypse and Revelation 9:1-21: Creaturely Images During the Great Tribulation," in *Reading Revelation in Context: John's Apocalypse and Second Temple Judaism*, Ben C. Blackwell et al (eds.) (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic, 2018), 88-90.

[493] "Yet she increased her whorings, remembering the days of her youth, when she played the whore in the land of Egypt 20 and lusted after her paramours there, whose members were like those of donkeys, and whose emission was like that of stallions" (Ezek. 23:19-20).

foreignness that emerges from the stars' transgression. Therefore, the stars in the *Anim. Apoc.* are portrayed as unequivocally deviant and are held in contrast to the other presumably angelic figures who are represented by distinctly anthropomorphic "white men."

Instead of the stars committing acts of violation as they do in the *Anim. Apoc*, the nonhuman stars in Dan. 8 are they themselves violated by the transgression of the little horn. Their roles are entirely reversed and portray the stars as victims rather than aggressors. Along with the host or army, some of the stars are even thrown down and trampled. Furthermore, the trajectory of the transgression is the same, although reversed in their direction. In other words, the transgressive stars *descend* in the *Anim, Apoc.* to violate the heifers, whereas the horn *ascends* towards the stars and violates the spheres of heaven. This difference in the portrayal of stars embedded in animal-narratives shows at least two distinct ways that Jewish communities under Seleucid rule worked with nonhumans in their identity negotiations of both self and Other.

In my comparison of Dan. 8 and 1 En. 85-89:58, I have demonstrated how two roughly contemporary sources employ the exact same imagery (rams, horns, and stars) in similar contexts (Seleucid rule), but with entirety different meanings. Considered a classic apocalypse with a strong polemic against empire and its oppressive forces, Dan. 8 portrays foreign kings as rams and goats with large and powerful horns, and one of those horns poses a direct threat to the stars and host of the heavenly domain. The *Anim. Apoc.,* on the other hand, portrays Israel's most beloved and powerful kings as rams with horns that accomplish their military victories against foreign animals. Moreover, the stars in the narrative are deviant and transgressive—(literally) seeding violence into the world—and are judged according to their violence, whereas the stars of Dan. 8 are themselves violated and transgressed upon by the boundary-crossing horn. These different applications demonstrate the malleability of animals, nonhumans, and animality in the

Jewish literary imagination, especially when negotiating with and exploring the tensions of foreignness and foreigners.

5.5 A Domestic Conclusion

In conclusion of this chapter, I return to the concept of domestication. As one of the most striking differences between the creatures of Dan. 7 and 8, the domestication of the ram and he-goat problematizes the "wild-animals-as-foreigners" premise as one that could be applied to Second Temple Jewish literature on a broad scale. And although it is true that most of the examples of wild animals in the Hebrew Bible are viewed as negative, threatening, or foreign, there are still enough exceptions to advise against generalizations.[494] I argue that Daniel 8 is one of those striking exceptions, and one that turns the "empire-as-wild-beast" trope upside down.

Of the domestication of the two creatures in Dan. 8, Koosed and Seesengood acknowledge the importance of their domesticity and this different compared to Daniel's vision in ch. 7.[495] They further point to the viability of the creatures for both sacrifice and consumption, and how this dynamic strikes a contrast between the creatures and the improper sacrifice alluded to in 8:11-14. Their conclusion, however, argues that "beasts cannot designate appropriate sacrifice. Tyrants, in their arrogance becomes beasts and can only offer desecration, not

[494] See Ken Stone's chapter on wild animals in *Reading the Hebrew Bible*, 116-39. Of the dynamic between domestic and wild animals for ancient Israel, he states: "The Israelites lived most intimately with sheep, goats, cattle, donkeys, and other domesticated animals, but they were also familiar with wild animals, and interacted with them in various ways. The Bible's writers may not have seen wild animals as often as they saw domesticated animals, but they saw them frequently enough to mention them many times, sometimes even describing their habits. Those animals were also companion species. Or, since their relations with the Israelites were not quite as close as those of goats, sheep, cattle, and dogs, perhaps it would be better to consider them 'neighbor species,' to borrow a phrase from the ecological philosopher Timothy Morton…And although numerous texts…represent wild animals as frightening, some passages do adopt alternative perspectives" (117).

[495] "Daniel's Animal Apocalypse," 189.

sanctification."[496] Thus, their interpretation of domesticity is conflated with the same bestial quality of Dan. 7's creatures and they interpret it all under the same umbrella of negative expression, that is, of tyrannical, gentilic rule. I maintain that the animalities of Dan. 7 and Dan. 8 should not be conflated in this way and argue that their differences demonstrate the permeability of the wild-domestic category. This is supported by my presentation yet another distinct way of expressing animal-imagery under Seleucid rule: the rams, stars, and horns of the *Anim. Apoc.*, 1 En. 85-90, wherein the same imagery expresses entirely different meaning.

It is not to say, however, that the expressions of animality and foreignness in Dan. 8 do *not* depict tyrants or empires or oppression under a foreign regime. Indeed, the aggressive animals and the conflict that ensues because of their violence—and especially the escapades of the horn who disrupts even the "army of heaven" and the stars—are clearly portrayed as antagonists to Jewish social and religious life. But the *way* that their aggression is expressed is distinct. If clumped together with general notions of bestial foreignness, we miss the nuance of Dan. 8's nonhuman interlocutors, as well as the how and why they do what they do. As domesticated others, the ram and he-goat communicate a more familiar expression of foreignness, and perhaps even a normalization of imperial conflict for Jewish communities of the second century BCE. The felt tension of the Seleucid empire is threatening and made explicit with the transgression of the arrogant horn, but Dan. 8 extends the tension to in-fighting among the empires themselves. Although it may be portrayed as domestic and without monstrosity, conflict on the so-called "farm" is nevertheless conflict, and shows the extent of Danielic animalities.

[496] "Daniel's Animal Apocalypse," 189.

CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION

"And the maskilim will shine like the brightness of the firmament, and those who bring righteousness to the many like the stars forever and ever."

Daniel 12:3

It is fitting to turn to the final chapter of MT Daniel for my conclusion, and to offer a final nuance to Danielic animalities before reviewing the previous chapters I have presented. Despite the androcentric currents in the Danielic corpora's later visions, Daniel 12:3 concludes with the well-known statement and site of interpretation for Jewish communities for centuries to come: "And the *maskilim* will shine like the brightness (כזהר) of the firmament, and those who bring righteousness to the many like the stars (ככוכבים) forever and ever." Here the aspirations of the authors, likely the *maskilim* themselves, are poetically expressed and framed as decidedly nonhuman. Thus, the negotiations of identity extend to nonhumans embedded within Jewish discourse of belonging and aspirational identity, just as those negotiations I have demonstrated in the Danielic corpora between conceptions of animalities and foreignness.

In chapter one of the present study, I introduced my data set which I designated the "Danielic corpora," and highlighted the variety of bodies of texts layered between its versions, redactions, and interpolations. The intersection of biblical studies and animal studies, which is where I have methodologically situated my investigation, has offered a fruitful starting point for exploring the presence and impact of nonhumans in ancient Jewish literature. The diverse and multivocal texts in the Danielic traditions have proven worthy of such attention. In line with the complex nature of Danielic composition, I also presented the limitations of genre expressed in

the apocalyptic features assigned to Daniel and demonstrated how animals and nonhumans serve as "apocalyptic interlocutors" in both the so-called court tales and literary apocalypses that usually divide the canonical work. In providing space for the participation of nonhuman animals and other creatures in each of the Danielic texts, I argue that the differences in the ways of negotiating Jewish identity in the early centuries BCE can be better spotlighted. I examined four types of such negotiations as they are exemplified in the sources of the Danielic corpora.

Chapter two focused on the versions of Dan. 4 and the theriomorphic transformation of Nebuchadnezzar. After presenting an analysis of both the MT and OG versions of the text, I presented the primary arguments of the field that look to ANE textual and iconographical sources as influences on king's journey into animality. Since such explanations were ultimately limited in their "origins" approach and were always partial in their scope, I turned instead to the oracles of Jeremiah and the anxieties surrounding the role of foreign kings in the Jewish story. Moreover, foreign kings and empires such as Nebuchadnezzar and Babylon are intimately linked with the animal world whether in domination, participation, or transformation. Nebuchadnezzar's transformation, I conclude, is not an innately negative *or* positive depiction of gentile rule or even arrogant human sovereignty. It is rather a tale laden with the tensions of foreignness and familiarity for Jewish communities in the Second Temple Levant, both in Palestine and Alexandria. Finally, the story in all of its versions is altogether dependent upon its nonhuman interlocutors who simultaneously subvert and affirm human exceptionalism, and fail to offer a definitive conclusion of Nebuchadnezzar's character arc. Instead, his fate is bound up with that of Jewish communities navigating a range of socio-cultural uncertainties, resulting in an expression of Nebuchadnezzar emerging from his animalic transformation restored and prosperous.

Chapter three analyzed Dan. 6 and the Greek tales of *Bel and the Serpent.* By focusing on the themes of animacy what it means to be "living," I demonstrated the similarities and differences of the texts' approaches to eating, violence, and sovereignty. What it means to be "living" is negotiated in significantly different ways in Dan. 6 and *Bel.* I argued that although similar motifs are shared in the narratives, such as eating, the concept of the "living god," and Daniel's encounter with the lions, how the texts employ these themes reveal the differences of their prescriptions for their readers. The passivity of Daniel in Dan. 6 nevertheless resulted in violence against him, as well as ultimately against the courtiers who sought to destroy him. Moreover, the sovereignty of his living god was starkly contrasted with the sovereignty of the human ruler, Darius, who was powerless in his agency to either change his own decree or deliver Daniel himself from the lion's pit. The tale of *Bel and the Serpent* portrayed a very different character of Daniel. Instead of defined by his passivity, Daniel is antagonistic and bold, and even directly violent against the nonhuman gods of the Babylonians. By destroying the statue Bel as well as killing the serpent, Daniel himself makes assertion as to the animacy hierarchy and deems them lower on the scale and thus undeserving of existence. His actions, however, have violent repercussions and he is punished by equally violent means. He is delivered, however, by sovereign meal provision and both Daniel and his god are ultimately victorious over the Babylonian mob who sought to kill him. Although Dan. 6 and *Bel* share key motifs in the Danielic corpora—such as eating, animacy, and the imprisoned lions— I argue that their distinct approaches to violence and divine sovereignty result in drastically different behavioral and social recommendations for their literary audiences. Passivity is the prescription for Jews in Palestine, whereas *Bel and the Serpent* reveres an antagonistic Daniel who challenges the king outright, and even kills the Babylonian gods proving their inferiority as gods who are not truly "living."

Chapter four examined Dan. 7 and brought Ezekiel 1's four living creatures in direct dialogue with four "other" living creatures: the four beasts who emerge from the sea. I also argue that recent studies in monster theory can highlight the ways that Daniel's creatures become mirrors for Jewish social anxiety surrounding the stability of foreign empires as well as the stability of divine governance itself. Moving away again from "origins" approaches that seek to identify exact parallels in Ugaritic, Babylonian, or Greek *chaoskampf* tales, I argue instead that Dan. 7 is better understood by the model offered by Ezek. 1 and its four creatures. In seeing the two groups of creatures as culturally-constructed monsters, the ways that mythic and hybrid creatures are portrayed become a site for negotiating the tensions of Jewish communities in Palestine in the mid-second century under Seleucid rule. The binaries I aimed to problematize in Nebuchadnezzar's transformation—such as Jew-Gentile, human-animal, human ruler-divine ruler—come up again in addressing the unnuanced way that Daniel's four creatures have been examined in scholarship. Even by setting aside strict applications of positive and negative representations, as has been already trailblazed in animal studies and other areas of biblical studies, the boundary-walking nonhumans of Dan. 7 suggest a much more fraught relationship with the "other" than our strict categories allow them. As culturally-constructed monsters that reflect Jewish anxiety surrounding the disruption of divine order, I argue that Daniel's four creatures are the "other" living creatures in the throne room that are both integral to the divine structure and simultaneously subdued by it.

Finally, chapter five turns to the second vision of the Danielic corpora. Although the animals of Dan. 8 are often grouped with those of Dan. 7, taking on the same monstrous associations that the four hybrid creatures invoke, they are instead presented as domestic animals performing largely "normal" animal-behaviors. My analysis of Dan. 8, which is in line with the

approach taken through the entirety of this project, aimed to consider Dan. 8 on its own terms and demonstrate how distinct its nonhuman interlocutors really are. Without needing to "fit" into the final form of MT Daniel, or even the progression of Daniel's visions, the ram, he-goat, horns, and stars express a unique negotiation of foreignness—a very domestic one—amidst the Danielic corpora. Furthermore, the consensus understandings of animals and foreigners as exotic and chaotic simply do not transfer over from Dan. 7 to ch. 8. To amplify these differences even more, I placed Dan. 8 in dialogue with the *Animal Vision* of 1 Enoch 85-90. The texts share three categories of nonhumans: rams, horns, and stars. But each of them are employed in entirely distinct ways and in nearly opposite portrayals of foreigners. I argue that these contemporary texts composed under Seleucid rule feature distinct ways of working with nonhumans and animality. Moreover, such differences reflect the diversity of Jewish communities of the period, as well as their distinct approaches to the malleable categories of Jew-Gentile and human-nonhuman.

Each of these chapters has focused on the animals, creatures, and monsters in selections of the Danielic corpora, and considered each of them in their own texts and contexts. In leaving room for difference, difference was certainly found among the ways that nonhumans contribute to and participate in ancient Jewish literary imagination. As I have demonstrated, animals and animality are deeply entangled with notions of both foreignness and familiarity in Danielic texts, and they are not easily tamed by categories of literary genre, language, thematic, or even theological distinctions. These demonstrations first point to the importance of paying attention to nonhumans for the sake of nonhumans, and second for the sake of humans. As seen in the discussions of "real" animals in *Bel and the Serpent,* understandings of animals, foreignness, and foreigners are connected to and embedded with propensities for violence toward both humans

and nonhumans. By considering the impact on an individual or a community to be subtly (or not subtly) shown an exemplar who can "kill" a foreigner's god in order to prove it is not truly "living" has real repercussions for Jewish communities of the early centuries BCE and beyond.

After reading through the chapters of this study, I hope that it is clear to the reader how many questions still remain and how much work is yet to be done. The first, and perhaps most obvious, avenue of research is to extend the examination of animalities and foreignness into other Jewish literary corpora of the Second Temple period and the early centuries of the common era. Similar approaches may be brought to in-depth studies of other apocalyptic animals in texts such as the Sibylline Oracles, 4 Ezra, and 2 Baruch. The Apocalypse of John is surely to be included in this list of animal-laden Jewish literature, however much more work has been on this text as of the last few decades. What would be useful for the Apocalypse, however, is a reception study of Danielic animalities and animal imagery since so many of Revelation's images are applications and reworkings of Daniel's creatures and monsters.

Another fruitful study would be the impact of the anthropocentrism, and especially its androcentrism, that comes to the center of the stage in Daniel 9-12 (although it could certainly be extended to all of Daniel's visions). The constant imprinting of the human—that is, male—image on divine bodies in Daniel's visions is strikingly visceral and embodied. This discussion of androcentrism and concern for the male body in the so-called apocalyptic Daniel has overlap with studies in masculinity and gender that may fruitfully extend to the whole of the Danielic corpora, including the court tales and *Susanna.*[497] As many scholars in gender and animal studies have observed, the concerns of a group on the "margins" affect other marginalized groups, and

[497] As a breakthrough study in this conversation, see Brian Charles DiPalma, *Masculinities in the Court Tales of Daniel: Advancing Gender Studies in the Hebrew Bible* (London and New York: Routledge, 2018).

likewise for the Danielic corpora and its concerns for a variety of "others"—human, nonhuman, foreign, and familiar.

In the course my investigation, I have also argued that while the apocalypse genre and decoding methods that often accompany biblical studies have the propensity to impose restrictions on animals and animality, the growing interdisciplinarity of the field has made room for the wealth of new studies on nonhuman animals in other disciplines such as eco-philosophy and theology.[498] As Eric Daryl Meyer describes, "'becoming animal' approaches the threshold of theological discourse as the apocalyptic undoing of humanity."[499] Here, Meyer is placing Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari in dialogue with Jacques Derrida's well-known encounter with his cat: "…under the gaze of the animal, everything can happen to me, I am like a child ready for the apocalypse, *I am (following) the apocalypse itself.*"[500] Derrida's intimate moment with an animal other prompted an "unveiling," a beginning and an end, and an evocation of apocalyptic animal bodies that is both imminent and immanent. In this way, alongside Deleuze and Guattari's "becoming animal," the apocalyptic pulses of animality have a "positive valence" for these authors and their philosophical disciplines and theological interlocutors.[501]

I have discussed a selection of lenses through which we can view apocalyptic, or revelatory, animalities developed in other fields outside of biblical studies, I have aimed to "let the animals out of their pens"—animals, monsters, and creatures alike. The revelations offered

[498] See Sam Mickey's philosophical exploration of integral ecology, especially pp. 161-72. *On the Verge of a Planetary Civilization: A Philosophy of Integral Ecology* (London & New York: Rowman & Littlefield International, 2014).

[499] Eric Daryl Meyer, *Inner Animalities,* 91.

[500] Derrida, *Animal,* 12. Emphasis original.

[501] Meyer, *Inner Animalities,* 91.

by an attention to animalities are especially evident in the Danielic corpora and appear in the forms of transformation, animacy, monstrosity, and domesticity. Like Mel Chen's plural "animacies," the animalities of Daniel are "what keep it vital," and "upon which it depends."[502] If the diverse animalities in the Danielic corpora are homogenized and reduced to binary simplifications as has been the case in the past, the multivocality of Jewish communities in the Second Temple period are also at risk of the same oversimplifications.

In the course of this investigation, I have demonstrated that Danielic differences—including its images, languages, versions, and nonhuman agents—make all the difference. The majority of these differences are mediated and molded by threads of foreignness and animality, weaving narratives together and fraying them at the seams. Plurality, too, can offer opportunities for connection in a way that homogenization cannot. As Donna Haraway articulates: "The differences matter—in ecologies, economies, species, lives."[503] For the Danielic corpora, when one reaches a perceived moment of certainty, uniformity, and singularity of a concept or perspective, the doors of the zoo are all simultaneously unhinged. And the creatures, animals, monsters who sat dormant as simple allegories or symbols are set loose on the pages, bringing their complexities, contradictions, and untamable nuance.

[502] Chen, *Animacies*, 236.

[503] Donna J. Haraway, *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2016), 29.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackerman, Susan. "The Prayer of Nabonidus, Elijah on Mount Carmel, and the Development of Monotheism in Israel." Pages 51-65 in *The Echoes of Many Texts: Reflections on Jewish and Christian Traditions: Essays in Honor of Lou H. Silberman*, edited by William. G. Dever and J. Edward Wright. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.

Aejelaeus, Anneli. "'Nebuchadnezzar, My Servant': Redaction History and Textual Development in Jer 27." Pages 1-18 in *Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust*, edited by F. Garcia Martinez and M. Vervenne. Leuven: University Press, 2005.

Agamben, Giorgio. *The Open: Man and Animal*, translated by Kevin Attell. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004.

Aichele, George and Tina Pippin. Editors. *The Monstrous and the Unspeakable: The Bible as Fantastic Literature.* Playing the Texts 1. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.

Albertz, Rainer. "The Social Setting of the Aramaic and Hebrew Book of Daniel." Pages 171-204 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception, Vol. 1*. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint. SVT 83.1. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Amsler, Monika. "How Could Religion Become A Category? Accounting for Classical and Fuzzy Logic in the Conceptualization of Religion." *ASDIWAL Revue genevoise d'anthropologieet d'histoire des religions*, No. 12 (2017): 37-52.

Aston, Emma. *Mixanthropoi: Animal-human Hybrid Deities in Greek Religion.* Liége: Presses Universitaires de Liége, 2011.

Avalos, Hector. "Nebuchadnezzar's Affliction: New Mesopotamian Parallels for Daniel 4." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 133, no. 3 (2014): 497–507.

---. *Illness and Health Care in the Ancient Near East: The Role of the Temple in Greece, Mesopotamia, and Israel*. HSM 54. Atlanta: Scholars Press,1995.

Baden, Joel S. and Candida R. Moss. "The Origin and Interpretation of ṣāraat in Leviticus 13–14." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 130 (2011): 643-662.

Baker, Cynthia. "A Jew By Any Other Name?" *Journal of Ancient Judaism* 2 (2011): 151-78.

---. *Jew*. Key Word Series in Jewish Studies. London: Rutgers University Press, 2017.

Bakhos, Carol A. "Jewish, Christian, and Muslim Attitudes Toward Animals." *Comparative Islamic Studies* 5.2 (2009): 177-219.

Ballentine, Debra Scoggins. "Foreignization in Ancient Competition." *Journal of Religious Competition in Antiquity*: Vol. 1, Article 2: 2019.

Beal, Timothy K. *Religion and Its Monsters*. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Beavis, M.A.L. "Anti-Egyptian Polemic in the Letter of Aristeas 130-165 (The High Priest's Discourse)." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period* 18, no. 2 (1987): 150-1.

Beaulieu, Paul-Alain. "Nabonidus the Mad King: A Reconsideration of His Steles from Harran and Babylon." Pages 137-166 in *Representations of Political Power: Case Histories from Times of Change and Dissolving Order in the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Marlies Heinz and Marian H. Feldman. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007.

---. *The Reign of Nabonidus, King of Babylon, 556–539 B.C.* Yale Near Eastern Researches 10. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

Bergmann, Claudia. "The Ability/Inability to Eat: Determining Life and Death in 'Bel et Draco,'" *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period* (2004) Vol. 35.3: 262-283.

Beverly, Jared. “Nebuchadnezzar and the Animal Mind (Daniel 4).” *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament.* September 2020.

Berkowitz, Beth A. *Animals and Animality in the Babylonian Talmud*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.

---. *Defining Jewish Difference: From Antiquity to the Present.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.

---. “Animal Studies and Ancient Judaism.” *Currents in Biblical Research* (2019) Vol. 18.1: 80-111.

Beyerle, Stefan. “The Book of Daniel and its Social Setting.” Pages 205-228 in *The Book of Daniel, Volume 1 Composition and Reception.* Edited by John J. Collins and Peter Flint. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Bickerman, Elias J. *Four Strange Books of the Bible: Daniel, Jonah, Koheleth, Esther*. New York: Schocken Books, 1968.

Black, Mary B. "Ojibwa Taxonomy and Percept Ambiguity." *Ethos* 5, no. 1 (1977): 90-118,

Black, Matthew. “The Throne-Theophany Prophetic Commission and the ‘Son of Man’: A Study in Tradition-History.” Pages 57-73 in *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity. Essays in Honor of William David Davies.* Edited by Robert Hamerton Kelly and Robin Scroggs. Leiden: Brill, 1976.

Black, Max. *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1962.

Blake, Charlie, Claire Molloy, and Steven Shakespeare. Editors. *Beyond Human: From Animality to Transhumanism.* London and New York: Continuum Books, 2012.

Bledsoe, Amanda M. Davis. “The Relationship of the Different Editions of Daniel: A History of Scholarship.” *Currents in Biblical Research* 13.2 (2015): 175-190.

Block, Daniel I. *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 1-24,* The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997.

Blok, Anton. "Rams and Billy-Goats: A Key to Mediterranean Code of Honour." New Series, 16.3 (1981): 427-40.

Boccaccini, Gabriele. *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism: An Intellectual History from Ezekiel to Daniel.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2016.

Boxall, Ian. "The Animal Apocalypse and Revelation 9:1-21: Creaturely Images During the Great Tribulation." in *Reading Revelation in Context: John's Apocalypse and Second Temple Judaism,* Ben C. Blackwell et al (eds.) (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Academic, 2018),

Brettler, Marc Z. "Judaism in the Hebrew Bible? The Transition from Ancient Israelite Religion to Judaism." *Catholic Bible Quarterly* 61 (1999): 429-47.

Bryan, David. *Cosmos, Chaos, and the Kosher Mentality*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Brock, Brian. "'To See What He Would Name Them…' Naming and Domination in a Fallen World." Pages 1-22 in *Fallen Animals: Art, Religion, Literature*. Edited by Zohar Hadromi-Allouche. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2017.

Brueggemann, Walter. *The Theology of the Book of Jeremiah.* Old Testament Theology Series. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Butler, Judith. *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex.* New York: Routledge, 1993.

Calarco, Matthew. *Thinking Through Animals: Identity, Difference, Indistinction*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2015.

Cason, T.S. "Confessions of an Impotent Potentate: Reading Daniel 4 through the Lens of Ritual Punishment Theory." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 39: (2014) 79–100.

Cavalieri, Paola. Editor. *The Death of the Animal: A Dialogue.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2009.

Chan, Michael J. "Ira Regis: Comedic Inflections of Royal Rage in Jewish Court Tales." *The Jewish Quarterly Review* (Winter 2013) Vol. 103.1.

Chen, Mel Y. *Animacies: Biopolitics, Racial Mattering, and Queer Affect.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2012.

Cooper, John. *Eat and Be Satisfied: A Social History of Jewish Food*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, 1993.

Cohen, Jeffrey J. Editor. *Monster Theory: Reading Culture.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.

Collins, Adela Yarbro. *Crisis and Catharsis: The Power of the Apocalypse.* Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1984.

---. *The Combat Myth in the Book of Revelation*. Harvard Theological Review, Volume 9. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976

Collins, John J. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature, Third Edition.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2016.

---. "Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre." Pages 1-51 in *Semeia 14*. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979.

---. "What is Apocalyptic Literature?" Pages 1-18 in *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

---. *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel.* Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993.

---. "The Genre Apocalypse Reconsidered." *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum/Journal of Ancient*

Christianity 2016; 20(1): 21-40.

---. *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception, Volume 1*. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint; Leiden: Brill, 2002.

---. *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception, Volume 2*. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint; Leiden: Brill, 2014.

---. "The Court Tales in Daniel and the Development of Apocalyptic." *Journal of Biblical Literature,* 94 (1975), 218-34.

---. "Apocalypse and Empire." *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* 76 (2011): 1-19

---. "Prayer of Nabonidus." Pages 83-93 in *Qumran Cave 4-XVII. Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*. Edited by G. Brooke. DJD 22. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.

---. "The King has Become a Jew: The Perspective on the Gentile World in Bel and the Snake." In *Diaspora Jews and Judaism: Essays in Honor of, and in Dialogue with, A. Thomas Kraabel*. Edited by Robert S. MacLennan and J. Andrew Overman. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

Crawford, Sidnie White. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008.

Davies, Philip R. *Daniel*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.

---. "Reading Daniel Sociologically." Pages 345-61 in *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings.* Edited by A.S. van der Woude. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1993.

DeMello, Margo. "Modification: Blurring the Divide: Human and Animal Body Modifications." Pages 338-52 in *A Companion to the Anthropology of the Body and Embodiment*, edited by Frances E. Mascia-Lees. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2011.

DeSilva, David A. *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance, Second Editions* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2002.

Derrida, Jacques. *The Animal That Therefore I Am.* New York: Fordham University Press, 2008.

DiPalma, Brian Charles. "The Animalistic Nebuchadnezzar and the Heroic Encounter: Daniel 4:30 Iconographically Revisited." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 139, no. 3 (2020): 499-520.

---. *Masculinities in the Court Tales of Daniel: Advancing Gender Studies in the Hebrew Bible* London and New York: Routledge, 2018.

DiTommaso, Lorenzo. "The Apocalyptic Other." Pages 211-46 in *The "Other" in Second Temple Judaism: Essays in Honor of John J. Collins*. Edited by Daniel C. Harlow, Matthew J. Goff, Karina M. Hogan, and Joel S. Kaminsky. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011,

Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. New York: Routledge, 1966.

Dugan, Elena. "The Nature of the Beast: The Animal Apocalypse(s) of Enoch." Unpublished Dissertation: Princeton University, 2021.

Eggler, Jürg. *Influences and Traditions Underlying the Vision of Daniel 7:2-14: The Research History from the End of the 19th Century to the Present*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 177. Fribourg: University Press Fribourg Switzerland, 2000.

Eichrodt, Walther. *Ezekiel: A Commentary.* Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 2003.

Eilberg-Schwartz, Howard. "The Problem of the Body for People of the Book." Pages 34-55 in *Reading Bibles, Writing Bodies.* Edited by Timothy K. Beal and David Gunn. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Emanuel, Sarah. *Humor, Resistance, and Cultural Persistence in the Book of Revelation: Roasting Rome.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020.

Fish, Stanley. *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980.

Feuillet, André. *Le Fils de l'homme de Daniel et la tradition biblique*. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1953.

Flannery-Dailey, Frances. *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests: Jewish Dreams in the Hellenistic and Roman Eras.* Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Flannery, Frances, Colleen Shantz, and Rodney Alan Werline. Editors. *Experientia: Inquiry Into Religious Experience in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.

Flint, Peter W. "The Daniel Tradition at Qumran." Pages 329–67 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Edited by John J. Collins and Peter W. Flint. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Freidenreich, David M. *Foreigners and Their Food: Constructing Otherness in Jewish, Christian, and Islamic Law*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011.

Frilingos, Christopher A. *Spectacles of Empire: Monsters, Martyrs, and the Book of Revelation.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004.

Frisch, Alexandria. *The Danielic Discourse on Empire in Second Temple Literature.* Leiden: Brill, 2016.

---. "The Four (Animal) Kingdoms: Understanding Empires as Beastly Bodies." Pages 56-80 in *Four Kingdom Motifs before and beyond the Book of Daniel*. Edited by Andrew B. Perrin and Loren T. Stuckenbruck. Leiden: Brill, 2021.

Fröhlich, Ida. "The Symbolical Language of the Animal Apocalypse of Enoch ('1 Enoch' 85-90)." *Revue De Qumrân* 14, no. 4 (56) (1990): 629-36.

Fuller, David J. "From Prophet to Waiter: Habakkuk's Cameo Appearance in the Apocryphal Additions to Daniel."JGRChJ 11 (2015) 33-50.

Gadd, Cyril J. "The Harran Inscriptions of Nabonidus." *Anatolian Studies*, vol. 8, 1958: 35–92.

Galambush, Julie. “God’s Land and Mine: Creation as Property in the Book of Ezekiel.” Pages 91-108 in *Ezekiel’s Hierarchical World: Wrestling with a Tiered Reality.* Edited by Stephen L. Cook and Corrine L. Patton. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 31. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Gilhus, Ingvild Sælid. *Animals, Gods and Humans: Changing Attitudes to Animals in Greek, Roman and Early Christian Ideas.* London and New York: Routledge, 2006.

Gilmore, David. *Monsters: Evil Beings, Mythical Beasts, and All Manner of Imaginary Terrors* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009.

Ginsberg, Harold L. *Studies in Daniel.* New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1948.

Golan, Naama. “The Daniel Narratives (Dan 1-6): Structure and Meaning.” *The Journal of Hebrew Scriptures*, Vol. 19 (2019):1-24.

Goldingay, John E. *Daniel: Revised Edition*. World Biblical Commentary 30. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Academic, 1996, 2019.

Gore-Jones, Lydia. “Animals, Humans, Angels and God: Animal Symbolism in the Historiography of the ‘Animal Apocalypse’ of 1 Enoch.” JSP 24.4 (2015): 268-87.

Gowan, Donald E. *When Man Becomes God: Humanism and Hybris in the Old Testament*. Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series 6. Pittsburgh: The Pickwick Press, 1975.

Grabbe, Lester L. “The End of the Desolations of Jerusalem: From Jeremiah’s 70 years to Daniel's 70 Weeks of Years.” Pages 67-72 in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee* Edited by Craig A. Evans and William F. Stinespring. Homage series 10. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

Grafius, Brandon R. “Text and Terror: Monster Theory and the Hebrew Bible.” *Currents in Biblical Research* Vol. 16(1) (2017) 34-49.

---. *Reading the Bible with Horror*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2019.

Green, Anthony. "Beneficent Spirits and Malevolent Demons: The Iconography of Good and Evil in Ancient Assyria and Babylonia." Visible Religion 3 (1984) 80-105.

Grillo, Jennie. "Worship and Idolatry in the Book of Daniel through the Lens of Tertullian's *De idololatria.*" Pages 247-262 in *Monotheism in Late Prophetic and Early Apocalyptic Literature: Studies of the Sofja Kovalevskaja Research Group on Early Jewish Monothesism*, Vol. III. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.

Gross, Aaron S. *The Question of the Animal and Religion.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2015.

---. "Introduction and Overview: Animal Others and Animal Studies." Pages 1-24 in *Animals and the Human Imagination: A Companion to Animal Studies*. Edited by Aaron Gross and Anne Vallely. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.

---. "Religion and Animals." Published online in 2017 in *Oxford Handbooks Online.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.

Gruen, Erich S. *Constructs of Identity in Hellenistic Judaism: Essays on Early Jewish Literature and History.* Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016.

---. *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

Gzella, Holger. *Cosmic Battle and Political Conflict: Studies in Verbal Syntax and Contextual Interpretation of Daniel 8.* Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2003.

---. "חיי." *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Page 269. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Translated by John T. Willis, et al. 8 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974–2006.

Hallowell, Irving A. “Ojibwa Ontology, Behavior, and World View.” Pages 19-52 in *Culture in History: Essays in Honor of Paul Radin*. Edited by Stanley Diamond. New York: Columbia University Press, 1960.

Hamrick, James R. “Conflicting Traditions: The Interpretation of Daniel’s Four Kingdoms in the Ethiopic Commentary (Tergwāmē) Tradition.” Pages 275-99 in *Four Kingdom Motifs before and beyond the Book of Daniel.* Edited by Andrew B. Perrin and Loren T. Stuckenbruck. Leiden: Brill, 2021.

Han, Jin Hee. *Daniel’s Spiel: Apocalyptic Literacy in the Book of Daniel.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2008.

Hanson, Paul D. “Apocalypse, Genre,” and “Apocalypticism.” Pages 28-34 in *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible Supplementary Volume.* Edited by Keith Crim. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1976.

Haraway, Donna J. *When Species Meet.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008.

---. *The Companion Species Manifesto*. Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press, 2003.

---. *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2016.

Hartman, Louis F., and Alexander A. DiLella. *The Book of Daniel*. Anchor Bible 23. Garden City: Doubleday, 1978.

Hayes, Christine Elizabeth. *Gentile Impurities and Jewish identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Hays, Christopher B. “Chirps from the Dust: The Affliction of Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel 4:30 in Its Ancient near Eastern Context.” *Journal of Biblical Literature,* Vol. 126, No. 2 (Summer, 2007): 305-325.

Hemelrijk, Emily A. and Klaas A., D. Smelik. “Who Knows Not What Monsters Demented Egyptians Worship? Opinions on Egyptian Animal Worship in Antiquity as Part of the Ancient Conception of Egypt.” *ANRW* 2/17.4 (1984): 1852–2000.

Hempel, Charlotte. “Maskil(im) and Rabbim: From Daniel to Qumran.” Pages 133-156 in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honor of Michael A. Knibb*. Edited by Charlotte Hempel and S.N.C. Lieu. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Henze, Matthias. *The Madness of King Nebuchadnezzar*: *The Ancient Near Eastern Origins and Early History of Interpretation of Daniel 4.* Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Hicks-Keeton, Jill. *Arguing with Aseneth: Gentile Access to Israel’s Living God in Jewish Antiquity* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.

Hieke, Thomas. “Torah in Judith: Dietary Laws, Purity and Other Torah Issues in the Book of Judith.” Pages 97-110 in *A Pious Seductress.* Edited by Géza G. Xeravits. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012.

Hill, John. *Friend of Foe?: The Figure of Babylon in the Book of Jeremiah MT*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Holm, Tawny L. “The Fiery Furnace in the Book of Daniel and the Ancient Near East.” *JOAS* 128, 2008: 85-104.

---. “Book of Daniel.” In *The Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Religion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.

Hooker, Morna. *The Son of Man in Mark.* Montreal: McGill University Press, 1967.

Howard, Cameron B. R. “Animal Speech as Revelation in Genesis 3 and Numbers 22.” Pages 21-30 in *Exploring Ecological Hermeneutics*. Edited by N.C. Habel and P. Trudinger. SBL Symposium Series. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.

Humphreys, Edith L. *The Ladies and the Cities: Transformation and Apocalyptic Identity in Joseph*

and Aseneth, 4 Ezra, the Apocalypse and the Shepherd of Hermas. Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Humphreys, W. Lee. "A Life-style for Diaspora: A Study of the Tales of Esther and Daniel." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92 (1973), 211-23.

Idelson-Shein, Iris. "Introduction: Writing a History of Horror, or What Happens When Monsters Stare Back." In *Monsters and Monstrosity in Jewish History: From the Middle Ages to Modernity.* Edited by Iris Idelson-Shein and Christian Wiese. London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2019.

Ingold, Tim. *The Perception of the Environment: Essays on Livelihood, Dwelling and Skill.* London and New York: Routledge, 2000.

---. *The Perception of Environment: Essays on Livelihood, Dwelling, and Skill.* London: Routledge, 2000.

Jacobsen, Thorkild. *The Treasures of Darkness: A History of Mesopotamian Religion*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976.

Jerome. *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel*: *Translated by Gleason L. Archer.* Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2009.

Johnson, Raup. *Historical Fictions and Hellenistic Jewish Identity: Third Maccabees in its Cultural Context*, Vol. 43. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.

Kabalek, Kobi. "Monsters in the Testimonies of Holocaust Survivors." In *Monsters and Monstrosity in Jewish History: From the Middle Ages to Modernity*. Edited by Iris Idelson-Shein and Christian Wiese. London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2019.

Kaminsky, Joel S. "Israel's Election and the Other in Biblical, Second Temple, and Rabbinic Thought." Pages 17-30 in *The "Other" in Second Temple Judaism: Essays in Honor of John J.*

Collins. Edited by Daniel C. Harlow, Matthew J. Goff, Karina M. Hogan, and Joel S. Kaminsky. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011.

---. *Yet, I Have Loved Jacob: Reclaiming the Biblical Concept of Election*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 2007.

Keel, Othmar. "Die Tiere und der Mensch in Daniel 7." Pages 1-35 in *Hellenismus und Judentum. Vier Studien zu Daniel 7 und zur Religionsnot unter Antiochus IV*. Edited by Othmar Keel and Urs Staub. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.

Klawans, Jonathan "Notions of Gentile Impurity in Ancient Judaism." *AJS review* 20 (1995): 285–312.

King, Barbara J. *Being with Animals: Why We are Obsessed with the Furry, Scaly, Feathered Creatures who Populate Our World*. New York: Doubleday, 2010.

Knibb, Micahel A. "Eschatology and Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 327-348 in *Essays on the Book of Enoch and Other Early Jewish Texts and Traditions*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Koch, Klaus. *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic: A Polemical Work on a Neglected Area of Biblical Studies and Its Damaging Effects on Theology and Philosophy*. London: SCM Press, 1972.

Koester, Craig R. *Revelation: A New Translation With Introduction and Commentary*. (Vol. 38a) New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2008.

Koosed, Jennifer L. and Robert Paul Seesengood. "Daniel's Animal Apocalypse." Pages 182-195 in *Divinanimality: Animal Theory, Creaturely Theology*. Edited by Stephen D. Moore. New York: Fordham University Press, 2014.

Kosmin, Paul J. *Time and Its Adversaries in the Seleucid Empire*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2018.

Kotrosits, Maia. *The Lives of Objects: Material Culture, Experience, and the Real in the History of*

Early Christianity. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2020.

Kraemer, David. *Jewish Eating and Identity throughout the Ages*. New York: Routledge, 2007.

Kvanvig, Helge S. "An Akkadian Vision as Background for Daniel 7." ST 35 (1981) 85-89.

---. *Roots of Apocalypticism: The Mesopotamian Background for the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*. WMANT 61; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988.

Lacocque, André. *The Book of Daniel.* Richmond: John Knox Press, 1979.

Lambert, Wilfred G. "Dingir.šà.dib.ba Incantations." *JNES* 33 (1974): 267–322.

Launderville, Dale. "Ezekiel's Cherub: A Promising Symbol or a Dangerous Idol?" *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 65, 2 (2003)

Layard, Austen Henry. *Nineveh and Its Remains*. New York: George P. Putnam, 1849.

Lemke, Werner E. "Nebukadrezzar, My Servant." *CBQ* 28 (1966): 45-50.

Lim, Timothy. *The Formation of the Jewish Canon.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.

Lucas, Ernest C. "Akkadian Prophecies, Omens, and Myths as Background for Daniel Chapters 7-12." Ph.D. Disssertation. University of Liverpool, 1989.

---. "Daniel: Resolving the Enigma." *Vetus Testamentum* 50, no. 1 (2000): 66-80.

Macumber, Heather. "A Monster without a Name: Creating the Beast Known as Antiochus IV in Daniel 7." *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* Vol. 15.9 (2015) 1-26.

---. "The Threat of the Monstrous in the Scrolls." Pages 145-68 in *New Methods and Perspectives.* Edited by Carmen Palmer, et al. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature Press, 2020.

MacDonald, Nathan. "Food and Drink in Tobit and Other 'Diaspora Novellas.'" Pages 165-176 in *Studies in the Book of Tobit: A Multidisciplinary Approach.* Edited by Mark Bredin. London and New York: T&T Clark, 2006.

Mackenzie, Louisa and Stephanie Posthumus. Editors. *French Thinking About Animals.* The Animal

Turn Series. East Lansing: Michigan State Press, 2015.

Machiela, Daniel A. “Situating the Aramaic Texts from Qumran: Reconsidering Their Language and Socio-Historical Settings.” Pages 88-109 in *Apocalyptic Thinking in Early Judaism*. Edited by Cecilia Wassen and Sidnie White Crawford. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

Maimonides, Moses. *The Guide of the Perplexed Volume Two: Translated and with an Introduction and Notes by Shlomo Pines.* Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1974.

Martinez, Florentino Garcia. *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* Leiden: Brill, 1992.

Marzouk, Safwat. *Egypt as Monster in the Book of Ezekiel.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.

Mason, Steve. “Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History.” *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods* 38 (2007): 457-512.

McHugh, Susan. “Literary Animal Agents.” *PMLA* 124, no. 2 (2009): 487-95.

McLay, R. Timothy. “The Old Greek Translation of Daniel IV-VI and the Formation of the Book of Daniel.” *Vetus Testamentum*, 55 (2005): 304-323.

Meyer, Eric D. *Inner Animalities: Theology and the End of the Human*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2019.

Meyer, R. *Das Gebet des Nabonid.* Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962.

Mickey, Sam. *On the Verge of a Planetary Civilization: A Philosophy of Integral Ecology.* London & New York: Rowman & Littlefield International, 2014.

Midgley, Mary. *Beast and Man: The Roots of Human Nature*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Milik, J. T. “Prière de Nabonide' et autres écrits d'un cycle de Daniel.” *RB* 63 (1956) 407-15.

Miller, Patricia Cox. *Dreams in Late Antiquity: Studies in the Imagination of a Culture*. Princeton,

NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994.

---. *In the Eye of the Animal: Zoological Imagination in Ancient Christianity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018.

Mittman, Asa Simon. “Introduction: The Impact of Monsters and Monster Studies.” In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Monsters and the Monstrous*. Edited by Asa Simon Mittman and Peter J. Dendle. Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2012.

Mobley, Gregory. “The Wild Man in the Bible and the Ancient Near East.” *JBL* 116/2 1997 217-33.

Montgomery, James A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1927.

Moore, Carey A. *Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah: The Additions*. New York: Doubleday, 1977.

Moss, Candida R. "Aesthetics." Pages 89-113 in *Divine Bodies: Resurrecting Perfection in the New Testament and Early Christianity*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2019.

Mroczek, Eva. *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Najman, Hindy. “The Inheritance of Prophecy in Apocalypse.” Pages 36-51 in *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature.* Edited by John J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Newbold, R. F. "Boundaries and Bodies in Late Antiquity." *Arethusa* 12, no. 1, 1979: 93-114.

Newsom, Carol A. “‘Resistance is Futile!’: The Ironies of Danielic Resistance to Empire.” Interpretation (2017): 167-177.

---. With Brennan W. Breed. *Daniel: A Commentary.* The Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2014.

---. *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran.* Leiden: Brill,

2004.

---. “God’s Other: The Intractable Problem of the Gentile King in Judean and Early Jewish Literature.” Pages 31-48 in *The “Other” in Second Temple Judaism: Essays in Honor of John J. Collins.* Edited by Daniel C. Harlow, Matthew J. Goff, Karina M. Hogan, and Joel S. Kaminsky. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.

---. *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

---. “Spying Out the Land: A Report from Genology.” Pages 437-50 in *Seeking Out the Wisdom of the Ancients: Essays Offered to Honor Michael V. Fox on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday.* Edited by R. L. Troxel, K. G. Friebel, and D. R. Magary. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005. Reprinted. Pages 19-30 in *Bakhtin and Genre Theory in Biblical Studies*. Edited by Roland Boer. Semeia Studies 63. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007.

---. “Why Nabonidus? Excavating Traditions from Qumran, the Hebrew Bible, and Neo- Babylonian Sources.” Pages 57-79 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts*. Edited by Sarianna Metso, Hindy Najman, and Eileen M. Schuller. STDJ 92. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Nickelsburg, George W.E. *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.

---. *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.

Niditch, Susan. *“My Brother Esau is a Hairy Man:” Hair and Identity in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Noegel, Scott B. “On the Wings of the Wind: Towards an Understanding of Winged Mischwesen in the Ancient Near East.” KASKAL: Rivista di Storia, ambiente e culture del Vicino Oriente antico 14 (2017): 15-54.

Noth, Martin. “The Understanding of History in O.T. Apocalyptic.” Pages 194-214 in *The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Essays*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967.

Odell, Margaret. *Ezekiel,* Vol. 16 of Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys Pub., 2005.

Oliver, Kelly. *Animal Lessons: How They Teach Us to Be Human.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2009.

Olson, Daniel C. *A New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch “All Nations Shall be Blessed.”* Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 24. Danvers, MA: Brill, 2013.

Orwell, George. *Animal Farm: A Fairy Story*. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2009, 1984.

Overholt, Thomas W. “King Nebuchadnezzar in the Jeremiah Tradition.” *CBQ* 30 (1968): 39-48.

Pearce, Sarah. “Philo of Alexandria on the Second Commandment.” Pages 49-76 in *The Image and its Prohibition in Jewish Antiquity,* Journal of Jewish Studies Supplement Series 2. Edited by Sarah Pearce. Oxford: Journal of Jewish Studies, 2013.

---. *The Land of the Body: Studies in Philo’s Representations of Egypt.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.

Pick, Anat. *Creaturely Poetics: Animality and Vulnerability in Literature and Film*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2011.

Pines, Noam. *The Infrahuman: Animality in Modern Jewish Literature.* Albany: SUNY Press, 2018.

Pippin, Tina. *Apocalyptic Bodies: The Biblical End of the World in Text and Image*. London: Routledge, 1999.

Popović, Mladen. “Prophet, Books and Texts: Ezekiel, *Pseudo-Ezekiel,* and the Authoritativeness of Ezekiel Traditions in Early Judaism.” Pages 227-251 in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism.* JSJSup 141. Edited by M. Popvić. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

---."Ezekiel (Book and Person)." Pages 592-604 in Second Temple and Hellenistic Judaism, *EBR* 8 (2014).

Porter, Paul A. *Metaphors and Monsters: A Literature-Critical Study of Daniel 7 and 8.* Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1983.

Portier-Young, Anathea E. "Daniel and Apocalyptic Imagination." Pages 224-240 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Prophets.* Edited by Carolyn J. Sharp. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

---. *Apocalypse Against Empire: Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011.

---. "Languages of Identity and Obligation: Daniel as Bilingual Book." *VT* 60 (2010): 98-115.

Raphael, Rebecca. "Monsters and the Crippled Cosmos: Construction of the Other in Fourth Ezra." Pages 279-301 in *The "Other" in Second Temple Judaism: Essays in Honor of John J. Collins.* Edited by Daniel C. Harlow, Matthew J. Goff, Karina M. Hogan, and Joel S. Kaminsky. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011.

Reed, Annette Yoshiko. *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

---. "Writing Jewish Astronomy in the Early Hellenistic Age: The Enochic *Astronomical Book* as Aramaic Wisdom and Archival Impulse." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 24 (2017) 1-37.

Reeves, John C. and Lu Waggoner. "An Illustration from the Apocrypha in an Eighteenth Century Passover Haggadah." *HUCA* (1988) 59:253-268.

Regev, Eyal. "The Ram and Qumran: The Eschatological Character of the Ram in the Animal Apocalypse (1 En. 90:10-13)." Pages 181-195 in *Apocalyptic Thinking in Early Judaism: Engaging with John Collins'* The Apocalyptic Imagination. JSJSup 182. Edited by Cecilia Wassen and Sidnie White Crawford. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

Reinhold, Meyer. “Roman Attitudes Toward Egyptians.” Ancient World 3 (1980): 97–103.

Reynolds, Bennie H. III. *Between Symbolism and Realism: The Use of Symbolic and Non-Symbolic Language in Ancient Jewish Apocalypses 333-63 B.C.E.* JAJSup 8. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.

Rillera, Andrew Remington. “A Call to Resistance: The Exhortative Function of Daniel 7.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* Vol. 138.4 (2019) 769.

Isaac Rooks. “No Place for Waltzing Matilda: Uncanny Australian Swamps and Crocodiles in *Rogue, Black Water,* and *Dark Age*.” Pages 129-146 in *Postcolonial Animalities.* Edited by Suvadip Sinha and Amit R. Baishya. New York: Routledge, 2019.

Rosenblum, Jordan D. *The Jewish Dietary Laws in the Ancient World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Rowland, Christopher. *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity.* London: SPCK Publishing, 1982.

---. “The Visions of God in Apocalyptic Literature.” *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period* 10, no. 2 (1979): 137-54.

Rowley, Harold H. *The Relevance of Apocalyptic: A Study of Jewish and Christian Apocalypses from Daniel to the Revelation.* London: Lutterworth, 1963.

Rubenstein, Jay. *Nebuchadnezzar’s Dream: The Crusades, Apocalyptic History, and the End of History.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.

Sacchi, Paolo. *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History.* Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1990.

Sack, Ronald H. *Images of Nebuchadnezzar: The Emergence of a Legend, Second Revised and Expanded Edition*. Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press; London and Toronto: Associated University Press, 2004.

Sanders, Seth L. *The Invention of Hebrew,* Traditions. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2009.

---. Daniel and the Origins of Biblical Interpretation," *Prooftexts* 37, 1-55.

Satran, David. "Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation of the Fourth Chapter of the Book of Daniel." PhD. Dissertation: Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1985.

Scurlock, JoAnn and Burton R. Andersen. *Diagnoses in Assyrian and Babylonian Medicine: Ancient Sources, Translations, and Modern Medical Analyses*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2005.

Segal, Michael. *Dreams, Riddles, and Visions: Textual, Contextual, and Intertextual Approaches to the Book of Daniel*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2016.

---. "From Joseph to Daniel: The Literary Development of the Narrative in Daniel 2." VT 59 (2009): 123-49.

---. "Harmonization and Rewriting of Daniel 6 from the Bible to Qumran." in *HĀ-ʾISH MŌSHE: Studies in Scriptural Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature in Honor of Moshe J. Bernstein.* Edited by Binyamin Y. Goldstein, Michael Segal, and George G. Brook. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

Senter, Phil, Uta Mattox, and Eid. E. Haddad. "Snake to Monster: Conrad Gessner's Schlangenbuch and the Evolution of the Dragon in the Literature of Natural History." *Journal of Folklore Research* 53, no. 1 (2016): 66-124.

Shelley, Mary. *Frankenstein: Or the Modern Prometheus.* First published in 1818. Online: The Floating Press, 2009.

Sherman, Paul. "The Hebrew Bible and the 'Animal Turn.'" *Currents in Biblical Research* (2020) Vol. 19.1: 36-63.

Simkovich, Malka Z. Commentary on *Bel and the Dragon. The Jewish Annotated Apocrypha*. Edited

by Jonathan Klawans and Lawrence M. Wills. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021.

Singer, Peter. *Animal Liberation.* New York: Harper Collins, 1975.

Smelik, Klaas A. D. "My Servant Nebuchadnezzar: The Use of the Epithet "My Servant" for the Babylonian King Nebuchadnezzar in the Book of Jeremiah." *VT* 64, no. 1 (2014): 109-34.

Smith, James. *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1931.

Smith-Christopher, Daniel L. "A Postcolonial Reading of Apocalyptic Literature." Pages 180-198 in *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature*. Edited by John J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

---. "Gandhi on Daniel 6: Some Thoughts on a 'Cultural Exegesis' of the Bible." Biblical Interpretation 1,3 (1993).

Sommer, Benjamin D. "Dating Pentateuchal Texts and Perils of Pseudo-Historicism." Pages 85-108 in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*. Edited by Thomas B. Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch J. Schwartz. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 78. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

Sperber, Dan. "Why are perfect animals, hybrids, and monsters food for symbolic thought?" *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion,* 1996, Vol. 8.2 (143-169).

Steiner, Gary. *Anthropocentrism and Its Discontents: The Moral Status of Animals in the History of Western Philosophy.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2010.

Steussy, Marti J. *Gardens in Babylon: Narrative and Faith in the Greek Legends of Daniel*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.

Stokes, Ryan E. "The Throne Visions of Daniel 7, 1 'Enoch' 14, and the Qumran 'Book of Giants' (4Q530): An Analysis of Their Literary Relationship." DSD 15 (2008): 340-358.

Stone, Ken. *Reading the Hebrew Bible with Animal Studies.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2018.

Strawn, Brent A. *What is Stronger than a Lion? Leonine Image and Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near East.* Paulusverlag Fribourg, Switzerland: Academic Press Fribourg; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2005

Strømmen, Hannah M. *Biblical Animality after Jacques Derrida*, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2018.

Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "The Formation and Re-formation of Daniel in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Pages 101-130 in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth; Baylor University Press, 2006.

---. "Images of Dealing with Social Injustice from Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition: A Resource for Renewed Reflection." Pages 91-106 in *Turning to the World: Social Justice and the Common Good Since Vatican II*. Edited by Carl N. Still and Rompré Gertrude. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2018.

Tiller, Patrick Albert. *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse (1 Enoch 85–90)*. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI, 1991.

Toy, Crawford H. *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel.* New York: Dodd, 1899.

Trotter, Jonathan R. "The Tradition of the Throne Vision in the Second Temple Period. Daniel 7:9-10, "1 Enoch" 14:18-23, and the "Book of Giants" (4Q530)." *Revue De Qumrân,25*(3 (99), (2012) 451-466.

Valeta, David M. "Polyglossia and Parody: Language in Daniel 1-6." Pages 91-108 in *Bakhtin and Genre Theory in Biblical Studies*. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2007.

VanderKam, James C. *1 Enoch: The Hermeneia Translation*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012.

Van der Kooij, Arie. “Jeremiah 27:5–15: How do MT and LXX relate to each other?” JNSL 20/1 (1994): 59-78.

Van der Toorn, Karl “In the Lion’s Den: The Babylonian Background of a Biblical Motif.” *CBQ* 60 (1998): 626-640.

Walsh, Matthew L. “Sectarian Identity and Angels Associated with Israel: A Comparison of Daniel 7-12 with 1QS, 11QMelchizedek, and 1QM.” Pages 171-181 in *Dead Sea Scrolls, Revise and Repeat: New Methods and Perspectives.* Edited by Carmen Palmer, Andrew R. Krause, Eileen Schuller, and John Screnock. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2020,.

Wasserman, Emma. *Apocalypse as Holy War: Divine Politics and Polemics in the Letters of Paul* New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018.

Wasserman, Mira Beth. *Jews, Gentiles, and Other Animals: The Talmud After the Humanities*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017.

Weil, Kari. *Thinking Animals: Why Animal Studies Now?* New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.

Wesselius, Jan-Wim. “The Literary Nature of the Book of Daniel and the Linguistic Character of its Aramaic.” Aramaic Studies 3.2 (2005): 241-274.

Willis, Amy C. Merrill. *Dissonance and the Drama of Divine Sovereignty in the Book of Daniel.* LHB/OTS, 520. New York: T & T Clark, 2010.

---. “A Reversal of Fortunes: Daniel among the Scholars.” *Currents in Biblical Research* (2018) Vol. 16.2.

---. “Heavenly Bodies: God and the Body in the Visions of Daniel.” In *Bodies, Embodiment, and Theology of the Hebrew Bible.* Edited by S. Tamar Kamionkowski and Wonil Kim. New York: T & T Clark, 2010.

Wills, Lawrence M. *The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King: Ancient Jewish Court Legends*. HDR 26. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

Wolfe, Cary. *Zoontologies: The Question of the Animal*. Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press, 2003.

Wood, Alice. *Of Wings and Wheels: A Synthetic Study of Biblical Cherubim*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.

Wright III, Benjamin G. *The Letter of Aristeas: 'Aristeas to Philocrates' or 'On the Translation of the Law of the Jews.'* Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015.

Wyrick, Jed. "Animal Worship." Pages 331-33 in *The Eerdman's Dictionary of Early Judaism.* Edited by Daniel C. Harlow and John J. Collins. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010.

Yonge, C. D. *The Works of Philo: Complete and Unabridged*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995.

Young, Ian. "What is Old Greek Daniel chapter 8 about?" *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament,* 2020, Vol. 44(4), 693-710.

Ziegler, Joseph. *Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco,* Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Gottingensis editum 16/2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954.

Zimran, Yisca. "The Notion of God Reflected in the Lion Imagery of the Book of Hosea." *VT* 68.1: 149-67.