

Reading Daniel as a Text in Theological Hermeneutics



Aaron B. Hebbard



Reading Daniel as a Text in Theological Hermeneutics

James Clarke & Co

and

The Lutterworth Press

Click on the links above to see our full catalogue
for more excellent titles in
Hardback, Paperback, PDF and Epub!

*Reading Daniel as a Text
in Theological Hermeneutics*

ISBN: 978 0 227 90342 1

C

L

Would you like to join our Mailing List?

[Click here!](#)

Reading Daniel as a Text in Theological Hermeneutics

AARON B. HEBBARD



James Clarke & Co

James Clarke & Co
P.O. Box 60
Cambridge
CB1 2NT
United Kingdom
www.jamesclarke.co.uk
publishing@jamesclarke.co.uk

ISBN: 978 0 227 17364 0

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A record is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2009 Wipf and Stock

Published by arrangement with Pickwick Publications

All rights reserved. No part of this edition may be reproduced,
stored electronically or in any retrieval system,
or transmitted in any form or by any means,
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise,
without prior written permission from the Publisher
(permissions@jamesclarke.co.uk).

*To my wife, Nicole,
my Knucklehead.*

You make life all the sweeter.

Contents

Acknowledgments / ix

Abbreviations / xi

Introduction / 1

1 A Hermeneutic Reading of Daniel / 7

The Historical Continuum of the Danielic Community

Purpose of Daniel

Danielic Hermeneutics

2 Narration in Daniel / 30

The “Tell” of Three Narrators

Conclusion

3 The Introduction to Danielic Hermeneutics / 52

Setting the Sense of Reading

Daniel 1: Introduction to the Narrative

4 The Undergraduate Courses—Danielic Hermeneutics in Theory / 76

Daniel 2: Disclosing Dream and Identity

Daniel 3: The Exit Exam for the Unbending Boys

Daniel 4: Nebuchadnezzar’s Conversion to Yahwism

Daniel 5: Belshazzar, the Lightweight Interpreter

Daniel 6: The Rise, Fall, and Rise of Daniel

**5 The Graduate Courses—Danielic Hermeneutics in
Praxis / 158**

Daniel 7: The Court of Heaven Casts Judgment

Daniel 8: Vision, Interpretation, Understanding

Daniel 9: Daniel's Seventy and Gabriel's Seventy-Sevens

Daniel 10: Another Angelic Encounter

Daniel 11: Revelation of Details

Daniel 12: Danielism—Survival of the Wisest

6 The Reader as Hermeneut / 215

Reader as Character

Reader as Text

Reader as Hermeneut

Bibliography / 225

Acknowledgments

WHAT YOU HAVE BEFORE YOU IS THE RESULT OF A LONG AND DIFFICULT road, traveled at a pace appropriate to my life. This road could not have been traveled so successfully or joyfully without the company that I have kept along the way. Some of my traveling companions have slowed my pace, others have prompted speed in my pace, while still others have not so much cared about the speed of my pace as much as the quality of my steps. To all of these fellow travelers I owe my gratitude and would like to give them due acknowledgment.

Those closest to me know best that this has not been an easy feat to accomplish, and I sincerely thank them for their perseverance of me and my endeavor. Primary among these few is my wife Nicole, my Knucklehead, to whom I dedicate this work because of her crucial words of encouragement that she offers me every step along the way. My children have been my pride and joy and I cannot imagine life without them; thank you Zoë Brent, Anastacia, Alethea, Angelia, and Zion. My mother Phyllis has been an unparalleled source of moral support and I would like to express to her that a good mother is forever. My in-laws, T. F. and ‘Crackers’ Miller, have been critically instrumental in their support, and I want to thank them sincerely for providing for me and my family with one of the best years of my entire life. To other family members who have shown their support in other, yet significant, ways I would like to say thanks to my brother Paul and his family as well as my brother-in-law Adam and his wife Jaimie—all of whom provided me with airline tickets sometime in my many travels.

The Lord has led me to some wonderful families in Scotland, who have been completely indispensable in my journey. Thanks to the pastors of Calvary of Motherwell, David and Kathy Simpson, to Howard McCallum and his wife Leslie, to Angela and Stef Butler and family, to Ritchie and Lynn Miller and family, to John and Cathy Ritchie, Bill and Isa McCallum, and Ewan.

Most influential in this endeavor has been David Jasper, my doctoral thesis advisor. I honestly could not have asked for a better or more accommodating mentor. He laid tremendous challenges before me and led me to the tools to meet them. I would also like to thank other readers Derek Coyle, George Newlands, and David Clark for their careful comments and insights.

I want to thank the academic institutes that have employed me and have welcomed me into their communities. First, to Vanguard University that has played a significant role in my life by educating me in the first two degrees in my career and for being the first institute to hire me as an adjunct professor. Second, to Community Christian College, which has been supportive of my academic and professional work and for being the first institute to hire me as a full-time professor. I will always remember the good. Third, to Trinity Learning Community, which has given me a healthy outlet and has unknowingly inspired me to climb to greater heights. Fourth, to the school of my vision, Imago Dei College, which is the most likely candidate to produce a “Daniel.”

Last but not least, I would like to thank the fine folks at Wipf and Stock. They have made my first publishing experience a joyful one.

Now to him who is able to keep you from stumbling,
And to present you faultless
Before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy,
To the only God our savior,
Who alone is wise,
Be glory and majesty,
Dominion and power,
Both now and forever,
Amen.

Abbreviations

<i>AUSS</i>	<i>Andrews University Seminary Studies</i>
<i>BETL</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses</i>
<i>BHS</i>	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i>
<i>BSac</i>	<i>Bibliotheca sacra</i>
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
<i>Daniel</i> ^B	The book of Daniel
<i>Daniel</i> ^C	The character of Daniel
<i>ETL</i>	<i>Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses</i>
<i>ESV</i>	English Standard Version
<i>GBS</i>	Guides to Biblical Scholarship
<i>HAR</i>	<i>Hebrew Annual Review</i>
<i>IDB</i>	<i>The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</i> . 4 vols. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
<i>JSOTSup</i>	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplements

<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
NIV	New International Version
NJPS	New Jewish Publication Society Bible
OT	Old Testament
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
<i>TDNT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . 10 vols. Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum Supplements
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

Introduction

THE BOOK OF DANIEL¹ IS ALL ABOUT INTERPRETATION, OR AT LEAST IT is according to the reading represented here. This is not to say, of course, that what we are about to embark upon is the only reading, nor is it an attempt to debunk the vast amount of historical-critical attention given to Daniel^B. Quite the contrary; as we will notice, this reading of Daniel^B not only invites other readings, but nearly insists upon their presence. We must further assert that this reading is not only cognizant of the historical situated-ness of the original text but also—and distinctively—of this reading presented hereafter.

The very issue of hermeneutics demands that its proponents must be conscientiously sensitive to the placement of a text in its historical setting, which also serves the readerly community with a sense of continuity in the vein of narrative theology. By and large our interests here do not entertain the vast amount of historical-critical data, with which Danielic scholarship is so inundated—and has been for centuries—as a separate and prefatory entity. While at present, I can offer no justification for reiterating already-overstated material on the Danielic historical-critical issues, neither do I wish to ignore such works; indeed, they will be one of several springboards that we will utilize to aid the accomplishments sought for in this reading. Though it is certainly not the preferred methodology here, I am not opposed to Danielic historical criticism per se. Due to the over-saturation of historical-critical attention given to Daniel^B, I feel compelled to validate any inclusion of historical-critical data in this text.

Firstly, of course, is that the primary protocol of this reading is interdisciplinarity; reading Daniel^B without seamless cognizance of its historical-critical context would fail to fulfill its own expressed reading strategy. Like the nature of hermeneutics itself, interdisciplinarity also

1. For the sake of clarity and economy, the *book* of Daniel shall henceforth appear as Daniel^B; Daniel as *character* shall henceforth appear as Daniel^C.

musters strength and acquires greater credence with the acknowledgment of pertinent historical details maintained in the equation.

Secondly, in some (post)structural attempts to read a text apart from any historical context, the pendulum has swung to a point of complete disregard for historical data and has suffered willful naïveté to some extent.² If such naïveté can be avoided simply by the awareness of historical data, then such information is a welcomed asset. We can come to the text not simply as contemporary and actual readers, but perhaps better as informed and ideal readers.

Thirdly, in the field of narrative theology, the dependence upon the historical identity of the community of the text is crucial for a deeper understanding of the continuity with the identity of the contemporary community of faith. Narrative theology as a methodology promotes that ‘real’ readers are best served as mindful members of a community in the grand historical continuum.

Fourthly, in the field of hermeneutics, which is constantly on our reading horizon, history is an integral part of its theory and practice. One of the many chasms that hermeneutics seeks to bridge is between the horizon of the past and the horizon of the present.

Fifthly, and perhaps most importantly, Daniel^B is not only an historical piece of literature but it is likewise emphatically historically conscious. Daniel^B’s deliberate concerns for history put a similar responsibility on the reader to acquire a like-minded historical awareness.

For these reasons—and perhaps more—the historical-critical issues remain important for this particular study. Yet, with that stated, it is important to note that the historical-critical issues will not be tackled here; again, that would only serve as a review of the prolific literature on these issues offered elsewhere. This is a fundamental competence that will be assumed for our reading.

In a similar vein, the vast amount of narratological and literary criticism will not receive an in depth treatment either. Biblical scholarship by and large has reached a point now when prefatory justification or full explanation of a literary approach is superfluous. Again, certain

2. Phillips addresses this issue in his “Introduction” to *Semeia* 51, 3–4. He claims that poststructuralism regains some ground in historical criticism lost by structuralism, yet poststructuralism reshapes the posture of “historical description” primarily by its rhetorical nature.

competencies will be assumed in this reading.³ At many junctures during our reading, proposals and reading protocols will be highlighted from the various leaders in the field, whether they are predominantly associated with either a biblical or literary discipline.

Yet I think it is well worth the time to summarize the essential differences between the historical and literary approaches, and further to explain the reasons they are both integral to our present work of hermeneutics. While historical criticism asks a certain set of questions that are external to the text itself, literary criticism asks an entirely different set of questions that are concerned with the internal workings of a text. The narratological approach allows the flourishing of new literary skills and tools that help us in understanding a text, whether it is ancient or modern. Though the historical-critical methods of traditional biblical studies are relatively modern in the long history of biblical interpretation, their goals are to read the ancient text in its most accurate and reasonably situated time and place. Narratology, which is quite remarkably different from historical-critical interpretations, invites fresh readings and seeks to loose the bonds of fossilization, an approach that we must realize has its advances and its shortcomings. Edgar McKnight nicely summarizes our present hermeneutical goal when he claims, “literary criticism dissolves the distance between the ancient texts and the modern reader-critic.”⁴

The crucial point to be made is that Daniel^B as an historical text is now being transplanted into a different and contemporary context, and now its meaning and effectiveness must be retained or perhaps reestablished. The point is not to de-historicize Daniel^B, but to promote its iterability, which further strengthens its place in history, regardless of immediate context.⁵ Reading Daniel^B solely as an ‘historical document’ potentially causes its fossilization and in effect dampens its contemporary significance; however, reading Daniel^B from a literary perspective ensures its vivacity and seeks new applications of relevance, which thereby provides an avenue of continuity.

I must also assert quite plainly and boldly that this reading is not a commentary on Daniel^B. Yet, if this is not a commentary on Daniel^B,

3. See the bibliography for references.

4. McKnight, *The Bible and the Reader*, 12.

5. Derrida, *Acts of Literature*, 64.

we might rightly ask, then what is it? The answer to this question leads to the issue of methodology.

From the beginning of this reading, the desire, goal, and understanding were to approach Daniel^B from an interdisciplinary position. Daniel^B would not receive similar treatment as traditional commentaries that focus primarily on historical-critical, theological, or practical issues in a verse-by-verse format. Though these approaches are indeed important; additionally, disciplines such as literary criticism, narratology, narrative theology, and hermeneutics would play integral parts in this reading of Daniel^B. Even within these disciplines, a certain intradisciplinary adherence must be maintained.

With this anticipated framework, the reading of Daniel^B began. Yet shortly into the reading, the interdisciplinary quality found in the hermeneutical character of Daniel^C became blatantly obvious. The text struck me: I was not the interdisciplinarian working on Daniel^B; Daniel^C was the interdisciplinarian already at work showing me the way to do interdisciplinarity in that he maintains religious, academic, social, and political perspectives integrally and proficiently. Furthermore, the challenges presented in the book such as narrational shifts, bilingualism, and genric⁶ interplays prove Daniel^B to be literature that demands interdisciplinarity in its reader as well. With this in mind, we must begin to read Daniel^B as an exercise in the theory and practice of interpretation, which demands sharp skills in at least the disciplines already mentioned. In short, Daniel^C is observed as the paradigm of the good theological hermeneut.

Likewise, much of the same can be stated concerning of the issue of hermeneutics. My intention was to interpret the text of Daniel^B, but what I found was that Daniel^B is a text that enlightens me how to interpret. The hermeneutical circle is essentially inescapable: I sought to interpret Daniel^B, only to read Daniel^{B/C} to discover the already-existent promotion of interpretive theory and praxis; then I study hermeneutics in order to be equipped to understand better the text of Daniel^B, until at last I interpret Daniel^B in a mode more aligned with the “Danielic interpretive ideology.”

6. “Genric” is employed over “generic” due to the “general” connotation of the latter; this follows Gerhart in her essay “Genric Competence in Biblical Hermeneutics,” 27–43.

Together interdisciplinarity and hermeneutics play complementary roles. The study of Daniel^B as an exercise in hermeneutics is indicative of its endorsement of interdisciplinarity. Hermeneutics is inherently an interdisciplinary field of study for it is at once a science and an art, a theory and a practice, and as we will see, it is human and divine, natural and supernatural, immanent and transcendent, material and spirit, temporal and timeless as well as past and present and future on a single continuum.

Furthermore, my reading of Daniel^B stems also from a narrative theological perspective, which requires both historical and literary competencies. In other words, discovering the aesthetic beauty of Daniel^B as literature will not suffice, nor will affirming the historical date of composition work to establish credentials; neither historical-critical data nor narratological discovery is the aspiration. History and narratology are only tools in order to get to a deeper—and perhaps “apocalyptically hidden”⁷—meaning of theological significance.

When we finally begin to read the text of Daniel, my reader might notice a sense of paradox in my treatments of the earlier half of the Danielic narrative and equally in the latter half of the narrative. In the earlier half, when dealing with the theoretical side of Danielic hermeneutics, I tend to go about digging through theories by way of praxis of interpretation. In short, I practice interpretation in order to arrive at the theories latent in Daniel^B. In the latter half when exposing the practical demands of Danielic hermeneutics, I proceed through the material using theory to demonstrate how the reader is expected to practice the act of interpretation. In short, I arrive at theory through praxis in the earlier half of Daniel^B, and theorize about the practical implications for the reader in the latter half.

To a certain degree I find this method quite apropos. If I was to theorize abstractly about the theory of interpretation as found in the earlier narrative, the foundational basis would remain too abstract and I would fail to demonstrate that Daniel^B is indeed laying down the groundwork as a hermeneutics textbook. Likewise, if I was to practice interpretation in the latter half of the narrative, as I believe the text encourages the reader to do, I could perhaps hamper the point of praxis by limiting other readers’ practices of interpretation to my own interpreta-

7. Such an oxymoron is indicative of the genre and the demands to interpret the mysterious.

tion. My goal is not so much to interpret the text but rather to show that the text of the latter half demands that we must indeed interpret; though admittedly, I ultimately come to these conclusions by way of interpretation. Again, the hermeneutical circle is inescapable; whether I arrive at these conclusions from my own (con)text or from the Danielic text is a very blurry line indeed.

Finally we will come to the last chapter in which we gather together the various and multiple implications for the reader. In this chapter the reader is recognized as playing a role as character, as text, and finally as hermeneut before going his/her way to do the business of hermeneutics. Ultimately our reading is about what significance the text has for the reader; not the historical reader, but the contemporary reader who is sensitive to his/her own placement in the historical continuum and as a theological and literary member of a long-standing pistic community.

The primary text used in English is the ESV, while others will also be used with reference. Other translations include those of Goldingay,⁸ Goldwurm,⁹ Fewell,¹⁰ and the NJPS Tanakh translation. All references to Hebrew and Aramaic are from the Masoretic Text, *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*.¹¹

8. Goldingay, *Daniel*.

9. Goldwurm, *Daniel*.

10. Fewell, *The Circle of Sovereignty*.

11. Kohlenberger, ed., *The NIV Interlinear Hebrew-English Old Testament*.

1

A Hermeneutic Reading of Daniel

A person discovers the shape of the life story in other ages, the story of deeds, and the story of experience, and coming back from this to his own time is how he discovers by contrast its current shape, the story of appropriation.¹

And finally if one digs deeply enough into these kinds of studies, one invariably detects beneath the veneer of historicity a modern theological purpose motivating the entire interpretive enterprise.²

OUR READING OF DANIEL^B IS CONSCIOUSLY HERMENEUTICAL, BOTH IN theory and practice as the very literature itself demands. Theoretically we read Daniel^B as a literary construct intended to teach the reader how to go about doing the business of interpretation. We come to these conclusions by means of praxis, by actually doing the business of interpretation. Such a relation between theory and practice becomes indicative of the mysterious points of entry and exit of our hermeneutical circle.

In our reading much attention will be given to the role of the reader, but before we begin to read Daniel^B, we need to pause to define and describe from a variety of angles the meaning of our reference to the reader. In an attempt to become Stanley Fish's informed reader, or Robert Fowler's critical reader, or James Joyce's ideal reader, or a variety of other similar terms,³ we must tackle and assume the identity of

1. Dunne, *A Search for God in Time and Memory*, xi.

2. Darr, "Narrator as Character," 49.

3. "Ideal Reader" is a term by Joyce, see Eco, *The Limits of Interpretation*, 46; Other terms offered by Fowler are informed readers, optimal readers, superreaders, competent readers, educated readers, hypothetical readers, etc. Fish cites Ronald Wardhaugh's mature reader and Milton's fit reader, *Is There a Text in This Class?* 48.

the reader as a member of the grandiose Danielic readerly community. We must carefully assess and employ the integral components of the Danielic community, including beliefs, practices, and competencies that constitute its very identity.

The Historical Continuum of the Danielic Community

What we have to realize firstly is that we, in the twenty-first century, are now the actual readers of Daniel^B. This fact may be painfully obvious enough but it must be stated plainly since it marks a decided point of departure from the assumptions of an historical-critical approach alone. With that said, however, we must also realize that we are best served if we are historically conscientious of the notion that we fall on a latter end of a continuum composed of the grand Danielic readership. In this sense, we are not simply readers in an historical vacuum but with much more genuine sensitivity, we are readerly inheritors of the ancient and sacred literature. Presuming certain narrative theological assertions, our reading is not simply a link between the past and the future, rather it is an approach that bases its foundations on those laid in the history of the Danielic community in order to understand more adequately its present condition, all so that it might also be preparing itself for what it may become in the future. In this sense, the community is as eschatologically expectant as Daniel^B itself.

The commonalty of the readerly community throughout the ages may be easier to establish than we might presume when based upon certain philosophical assertions. What our present—and later—community must come to grips with is the temporality of humanity on one hand, and yet the eternity of our God on the other. Within this schema and tension between the two, will we find our placement in the grand continuum of the Danielic community. To state the case another way, we must realize that the historical community of Daniel^B's readers are indeed a part of the past, and that perhaps the same will be said of today's community in the generations to come, but though we are separated by time, we are simultaneously joined by our co-subjection to temporality. Furthermore, our integral cohesion to past and future pistic communities are substantially strengthened by our co-submission to Yhwh, who is revealed in the historical narrative, continues to be a present force in our time, and who will be a continuing object around which the pistic

community of the future will identify itself. All of this is revealed to the reader by the text and the life that permeates from the community. George Stroup summarizes the point adequately,

In Christian communities this identity narrative consists of a “text” which begins with the canonical history Christians called “Scripture” and extends through the community’s history into the present. Scripture and the history of the community’s attempts to interpret the text and make it intelligible to the rest of society constitute the community’s “tradition” and therein its narrative identity.⁴

The community of Daniel^B, however, is not simply a stagnant entity of the same thing existing in different times. Daniel^B is not only consciously time-sensitive literature from the very first verse, but it records and anticipates the movements and changes in the historical continuum. In fact, such change—and sometimes quite radical change—in political, religious, and theological dimensions is one of the primary motifs in the book. The Danielic community, therefore, is one of full realization of change as well as anticipation and hope in Yhwh in the future. The passing of time allows for the changing of circumstances; and perhaps many of these circumstances are not favorable for the pistic community, but the hope lies in a time when there will be no time, when the consummation of Yhwh’s promise of hope becomes a reality. The movement of time is inevitable and the change that accompanies it is natural, but the hope that the wise and righteous must hold onto comes with a promise of fulfillment. Therefore, Daniel^B, and reflected by the readerly continuum, is emphatically eschatologically-oriented.

Daniel^B does not allow the reader to remain focused on the past; the reader is rather forced to look to the future by means of eschatological prophecy. The tension lies in the presentation of the future by an historical character; and in the present, the reader must apprehend the significance of both past and future. The Narrator never presents Daniel^C as being alive during the course of the reading of the narrative, he is always a figure from the past (Dan 1:21), yet he offers the keys to understanding the present and the future. The recording of the miraculous and faithful work of Yhwh in the past is precisely what offers hope to the faithful of Yhwh in the future. While on one hand, Daniel^B sur-

4. Stroup, *The Promise of Narrative Theology*, 91.

veys the turbulent times of change ahead; on the other hand, it makes glorious promises for the end of time when the wise and righteous will experience everlasting life, and the wicked will suffer shame and everlasting contempt. In the meantime—and it is important to note—the Danielic community can indubitably expect change, even revolution, but our ethical positions and our theological convictions must wisely reflect our hope in the eternality of Yhwh and his kingdom.

Daniel^B is vigorously historical and makes astounding claims about the past, and yet it also makes moral, political, and social judgments about the present, which is always before the reader. With a comprehensive view of the historical continuum, Daniel^B makes dismal predictions about the future of the world, yet finally offers the sincerest hopes in the end times for those who are wise. All of which are ultimately dependent upon the interpretation of an account recorded as history;⁵ the implications of this interpretation of history are for the present and future life of the pistic community. The tension between the past and the future, between memory and hope, is a necessary component in the present life of the community of faith, and our approach to the interpretation of Scripture is key to the sustaining of this tension. If we feel no need to reinterpret Scripture for an appropriation in our present times by keeping Scripture fossilized within a distinctly historical-critical model of reading, or if we dismiss Scripture as irrelevant for the task of understanding the future, not only do we risk losing the tension between past and future but we also risk losing our perspective on the invaluable contribution Scripture—and most specifically here, Daniel^B—has made throughout its history, and ignoring the potential it has powerfully to shape our present and future.⁶

Purpose of Daniel

In proposing the purpose of the writing of the book of Daniel^B, we are forced to speak of purposes of the literature rather than of a single purpose due to the various potential authorial communities.⁷ However,

5. Ibid., 94.

6. Ibid., 260.

7. We will not discuss the authorial options in this treatise. The three main candidates are the Judean exiles in Babylon (consult for support Baldwin, Young, Wiseman), the Hasidim (consult for support Collins, Russell, Plöger, Hengel, Albertz), and the *Maskilim* (consult for support Beyerle, Wills, Davies).

as Daniel Smith-Christopher argues in his essay, the purposes of the various times, conditions, and authors have so much in common with each other that we can legitimately return to our search for a purpose of the literature that befits several options.⁸ In other words, we need not search for a solitary purpose for a particular time, place, and condition. We can justifiably observe the purposes that Daniel^B serves for the readership among several historical possibilities since there is much in common among them such as oppression, lack of religious, political, and social freedom, and enforced cultural integration. The commonality of circumstances in which we find all three candidates of the pistic community allows us to return to a less complex discussion of a single purpose of the book. This historical note is in step with our narrative theological *modus operandi*; the Danielic community has continuity and solidarity.

Through the assessment of archeological and anthropological research, Smith-Christopher describes the conditions of Judean life under Neo-Babylonian, Persian, and Hellenistic empires (both Ptolemaic and Seleucid dynasties) as rather similar to one another.⁹ In support of his case he states, “Memories and traditions regarding the hubris of Babylonian rulers that formed the ‘raw materials’ for the Daniel tales would not need extensive ‘revision’ to be flexible enough to apply with equal cynicism to the pretensions of rulers throughout the Persian and Hellenistic eras.”¹⁰ His point is not to ignore the real differences between the political and ideological regimes from 605 to 164 BCE, but rather to show that they all had a similar proclivity toward power and control over wealth, territory, and human resources. Furthermore, and on the opposite side of the socio-political spectrum, the Jews suffered greatly under all empires.¹¹ The point could be well argued that from an apocalyptic literary perspective stories of a purported earlier time could be used to mask the narrative that actually bespeaks of the present—and

8. Smith-Christopher, “Prayers and Dreams,” 266–90.

9. *Ibid.*, 274–80.

10. *Ibid.* 280.

11. Smith-Christopher argues that the alleged lenience toward the Jews in the Persian empire may be more of a ploy of propaganda than of reality; likewise the conditions under the Hellenistic regimes were as equally ‘exilic’ in their own homeland as they were in Babylon; *ibid.*, 278.

as we will later suggest, even our own present, and the 'presents' to come in future Danielic communities.

The purpose must therefore be multifaceted, yet consistent with the evidence we have before us in the pages of Daniel^B. Predominantly and most broadly, Daniel^B is didactic. Yet we must be careful not to assume that what the reader is supposed to learn from the stories and visions in Daniel^B is solely taken from the content itself. The actual process of learning is as important as the content of the lesson itself. Clearly in Daniel^B knowledge and wisdom are highly esteemed qualities to be sought after. At the same time, clearly the possession of wisdom and knowledge are not to be found primarily from human sources but rather from Yhwh, who is the ultimate source of everything that the exiles would need to survive. Yhwh is the integral component that provides the eschatological triumph of superior knowledge of the wise and righteous over superior strength of any number of human political entities.¹² On this new battlefield the Jews were forced to renegotiate their identity as a people bereft of any political identity; they must return to their fundamental existence as the people of Yhwh. Eventually, those who find their identity in the wisdom and submission to Yhwh defeat the imperial powers of the earthly kingdoms.

In the end, the three qualities with which Daniel^B is most concerned and wishes to instill into the readerly community, both then and now are faith, wisdom, and interpretive skill. So in this vein let us proceed to assume an identity that is in line with the prescribed Danielic ideology of an integrated pistic, sophic, and interpretive community.

Without a doubt we cannot possibly mistake the supreme promotion set forth in Daniel^B is that of total faith in the sovereign God. Those whose adherence clearly lies within these bounds compose the pistic community, the community of faith. No reader can become a "Daniel^C" in wisdom and interpretive skill and somehow bypass placing total faith in Yhwh. This uncompromising faith in Yhwh is indeed what makes Daniel^C successful in the other two subsequently promoted qualities. The historic pistic communities that held Daniel^B in such high regard attest to this very endorsement. The importance of Daniel^B in pious

12. Ibid., 274–80, 289.

Jewish communities¹³ as well as early Christian communities¹⁴ affirms the importance of the identity of the community revolving around devotion to God.

Knowledge and wisdom are of extreme importance in the Danielic corpus. Knowledge about man and knowledge about God are "joined by many bonds," and any serious attempt to study one's self inescapably demands a deep contemplation of God.¹⁵ True knowledge of self demands knowledge of God; but meaningful knowledge of God requires an intimate look into one's self lest this knowledge of God settle as an impersonal pursuit.¹⁶

The wisdom motif is strong enough that some scholars have often suggested that the genre of Daniel^B is associated with wisdom literature.¹⁷ We cannot possibly miss in Daniel^B the theme of the wise man, trained in an earthly school of wisdom and additionally endowed with supernatural wisdom from Yhwh, who is able to solve unsolvable riddles and mysteries. Clearly, the reader must notice the blatant preferences given to the wise who receive their sophic gifts from Yhwh over against those whose wisdom solely comes from man alone. The degree of import cannot be overstated: acquisition of pure wisdom is not just a highly esteemed ideal; in Daniel^B it becomes a matter of life or death.

Daniel^B is literature designed by a community of the wise to instill a thirst for wisdom and to provide a means by which to accomplish it. In a Danielic worldview wisdom leads to righteousness (Dan 12:3); as in the closing chapter, the comparisons are not drawn between the wicked and the righteous but rather between the wicked and the wise (Dan 12:3, 10). The implication is lucid: wisdom must be firmly established as the foundation of righteousness. Such promotion that inextricably links wisdom and righteousness is a common motif in other wisdom literatures in the Hebrew Canon. Again, a proverbial line is drawn in the

13. See Ulrich, "The Text of Daniel in the Qumran Scrolls," 573; Flint, "The Daniel Tradition at Qumran," 329; Bruce, "The Book of Daniel and the Qumran Community" 222; Brownlee, *The Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls for the Bible*, 48.

14. See Kee, *Community of the New Age*, 27, 45; Rowland, "The Book of Daniel and the Radical Critique of Empire," 447.

15. Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, I:47.

16. Stroup, *The Promise of Narrative Theology*, summarizing Calvin, 19.

17. See Heaton, *The Book of Daniel*, 41–47; also supported by von Rad.