

## **The Heteroglossic Hebrew Heroes of Daniel 1-6**

**David M. Valeta**

**University of Colorado, Boulder**

The following article outlines the basic application of Mikhail Bakhtin's concepts of heteroglossia and menippean satire, with a focus on the phenomenon of language, in an analysis of Daniel 1-6. My summary comments at the SBL/AAR meeting in San Diego will include a brief overview of menippean satire, including a handout of Bakhtin's 14 characteristics of this genre construct.

### **Polyglossia and Parody: Language in Daniel 1-6**

**David M. Valeta, pages 91-108 in Roland Boer, ed., *Bakhtin and Genre Theory in Biblical Studies*, (SemeiaSt 63, Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2007)**

#### *Introduction*

The presence of two major languages in Daniel that do not correspond to accepted generic boundaries is one of the most difficult questions in Daniel research. The Court Tales of Daniel 1-6 and the Apocalyptic Visions of Daniel 7-12 are divided into the Aramaic section of Dan 2:4b-Dan 7, sandwiched by the Hebrew sections of Dan 1-Dan 2:4a and Dan 8-12. This perplexing and persistent problem as yet admits no adequate solution. The existence of Aramaic and Hebrew in Daniel continues to puzzle scholars. Proposals that explain the development of the text diachronically by means of various source theories have led to an impasse.<sup>1</sup> Others attempt to explain the change through reference to the translation history of the book.<sup>2</sup> This has led to more gridlock. This paper suggests that the work of Mikhail Bakhtin, particularly his concept of polyglossia, may provide some new avenues of exploration towards understanding this perennial conundrum.

### *Language as a Context-Driven Phenomena*

Recent narrative and sociological studies have suggested intriguing new avenues to explain the presence of the two languages in Daniel. Daniel C. Snell posits that the reason for Aramaic in Daniel and Ezra is to lend authenticity to reports about foreigners and statements to them.<sup>3</sup> Arnaud Sérandour argues that Hebrew represents a local and sacred idiom while Aramaic signifies the official international and political language of profane use.<sup>4</sup> Thus both these theories suggest from a narrative viewpoint that when the servants of the king begin to speak in Daniel 2:4b, they naturally speak in Aramaic, representing the official language of the royal court. The text simply reflects this expected state of affairs and lends authenticity to the account. These suggestions are interesting because their starting point is that the change of languages from Hebrew to Aramaic is intentional and part of the rhetorical strategy of the book rather than an accident of the translation or redaction process. Hedwige Rouillard-Bonraisin adds another layer of rhetorical intentionality with the suggestion that the language division in Daniel is a function of openness and hiddenness. Her argument is that over time Aramaic became the more commonly spoken language while Hebrew became more progressively a language of the elite. The Aramaic stories, recounting the distant past, are retained in that language because they are popular, accessible and non-threatening. The apocalyptic visions are written in Hebrew because they deal with currently sensitive political realities and thus are recorded in a relatively more obscure, less-accessible idiom.<sup>5</sup>

The proposals of Sérandour and Rouillard-Bonraisin add a sociological component that is particularly important because they recognize that when two or more

national languages exist in a culture and in works of literature, they each embed an ideology, a key Bakhtinian concept.<sup>6</sup> In the multicultural, polyglottic world of the Hellenistic Judea, language was an important indicator of self-identity.<sup>7</sup> Certainly, the preservation of indigenous languages was a means of cultural and nationalistic conservation.<sup>8</sup> Moreover, evidence exists that throughout history, in times of crisis, Hebrew literature consistently revived as an expression of resistance and survival.<sup>9</sup> It may be an overstatement on Rouillard-Bonraisin's part to consider Hebrew as a language for keeping secrets and thus inaccessible to outsiders. The multicultural nature of Hellenistic society precludes the plausibility of such a scenario. Nevertheless, Rouillard-Bonraisin's instincts are correct that this document purposefully utilizes several languages. Languages are carriers of ideology that assists the book in relaying its message.

Another recent study suggests that the change to Aramaic occurs because of literary artistic considerations related to ideology. Bill T. Arnold contends that the author uses Hebrew and Aramaic intentionally in order to express differing ideological perspectives.<sup>10</sup> The two languages are utilized as rhetorical devices to express the narrator's shifting point of view, and it plays a large compositional role in Daniel. He explains that, in Daniel 1, the author's point of view is evident on two levels. First, the author is internal to the narrative as revealed by the consistent use of the Hebrew names for Daniel's friends throughout Daniel 1. Second, the author's assessment of Daniel's determination to resist the royal diet in Dan 1:8 and the report of God's blessings towards the Hebrew heroes in Dan 1:17 indicates that the chapter's ideological point of view is clearly oriented towards Daniel and his friends. Thus, the author's internal position, both phraseologically and ideologically, is consonant with the use of Hebrew in the opening

chapter of this bilingual document.<sup>11</sup> The point of view clearly shifts, however, in Daniel 2. First, while Daniel 1 opens with a Judean date formula, Daniel 2 begins with a Neo-Babylonian one. Second, the narrator is moving towards an external viewpoint manifested in part by the use of actual rather than reported speech. Daniel 2:4b begins with the words of the courtiers of Nebuchadnezzar, who speak flattering words about the king even as they try to hide their inability to meet his requests. When the king's servants begin to speak, it appears that they naturally speak in Aramaic, the official language of the court, and the text is simply reflecting this expected state of affairs. The switch to Aramaic in verse 2:4b confirms the shift of the narrator's point of view to the external.<sup>12</sup> The use of two languages lends authenticity to the account and contributes to the literary artistry in the composition of these court tales. The use of both Hebrew and Aramaic, as well as the smattering of Greek, in the book of Daniel is intentional, and it serves both artistic and ideological purposes.<sup>13</sup> This new movement in Daniel studies concerning its multilingualism is going in the right direction. The following analysis builds on this prior work.

### *Bakhtin and Polyglossia*

According to Bakhtin, there are two extremely important factors in the prehistory of novelistic discourse, laughter and hetero- or polyglossia.<sup>14</sup> Bakhtin argues that every pre-novelistic literary creation has the attribute of heteroglossia or the presence of multiple conflicting voices in a text.<sup>15</sup> This is typically indicated by the presence of different ideological voices in the text, and is occasionally made obvious by the presence

of two different sociological or even national languages.<sup>16</sup> This is also true of the pre-novelistic menippea, a genre categorization that I have previously argued applies to the stories of Daniel 1-6.<sup>17</sup> According to Bakhtin, the menippea is a multi-styled, multi-toned and/or multi-voiced work that is dialogic and is based on the presence of multiple genres, voices, and/or multiple languages. The menippean construct compels new ways for thinking about the use of the multiple languages in Daniel. The languages are an intentional aspect of the text, an integral part of its menippean heteroglossic and dialogic nature.

Menippean creations are characterized by an organic unity of seemingly very heterogeneous features.<sup>18</sup> The use of several languages is therefore most likely a purposeful rhetorical and literary strategy in the formation of this narrative that contributes to its polyglossic ideological conflicts. Language is inherently ideological because it is an expression of contextualized social interaction and embodies a distinct view of the world. The interanimation and contestation of languages may, therefore, provide a venue for the testing of ideas.<sup>19</sup> Language is the medium through which an alternative reality may be experienced. Bakhtin states of language in pre-novelistic forms, “Language is transformed from the absolute dogma it had been within the narrow framework of a sealed-off and impermeable monoglossia into a working hypothesis for comprehending and expressing reality.”<sup>20</sup> These languages also in all likelihood contribute to the book’s satirical humor. Laughter and criticism suggest digging beneath surface indications to capture an alternative reality.<sup>21</sup> The menippea uses and abuses genres, tones, styles, ideologies, monologic truth statements, sacred values, and more in its comical but dogged pursuit of the truth. When considering Daniel 1-6 as a menippean

construction, languages and voices should not be excluded from this list. Consequently, an exploration of the multiple voices and multiple languages of Daniel 1-6 illustrates how they contribute to the overall menippean structure and satiric nature of the court tales.

### *The Multi-Voiced Nature of Daniel 1-6*

Multiple voices exist in the Daniel narratives. For Bakhtin, the fundamental indicator of different voices is the presence of different ideologies. The characters clearly represent very diverse ideologies and therefore voices. Daniel and his friends represent the voice of faithful adherence to the Hebrew God. They seek kosher food to keep them strong, ask for mercy and intervention in events, are receptive to visions and apparitions from God, seek the interpretations of such, sing hymns to God, pray, and refuse to worship any god but their God, no matter what the cost. The kings, on the other hand, fundamentally worship only themselves. They destroy the Hebrew God's temple, capture his people, and desecrate his possessions. They demand dream interpretations, erect great statues to themselves, make laws in furtherance of their own grandiosity and desires, throw huge banquets, and are so prideful that they are turned into animals.

Different ideologies are also manifest in the fact that the heavenly voice of judgment continually casts a pall over the commands and desires of kings. The kings make plans, bark commands, roar decrees, and shout about the magnificence of Babylon. Meanwhile, divine dreams and apparitions portend death and disaster. All will finally be laid to waste. The voice of judgment stymies kings in their every attempt to assert real power. Their voices are covered. The kings become puppets, singing hymns to the voice of judgment and bestowing favor on the carriers of that voice. The king's advisors also

exhibit diverse ideological voices. Some of the king's advisors, such as Ashpenaz and Arioch, are people sympathetic to the Judeans. Others, such as the Chaldeans of Chapter 3 and the satraps of Daniel 6, work against them. These characters are more than bit players. They are another expression of the ideological tension in the book.

Different ideologies are similarly reflected in the reasoned voices of Daniel and his friends versus the wildly reactive voices of the kings. Daniel's voice, in particular, remains consistently calm and steady throughout the text. The voices of kings, to the contrary, are exploding with inappropriate passions, such as anxiety, fear, rage, and a hysterical worship of the Hebrew God. Except for the officials of Daniel 3 and 6 who accuse the Judeans, the kings' officials and family generally try to talk sense into the king or smooth his way.

The voices of different characters thus represent differing levels of wisdom. The wise men of the king are never wise. Daniel, on the other hand, is always wise. Even the queen mother of Dan 5 knows this fact. She too is wise, unlike her husband and son. Moreover, diverse voices are present in different spaces. The royal court scenes, where official, stylized, and solicitous language is the norm, portray voices different from those in the scenes outside the court, such as the discussion between Daniel and Ashpenaz in Dan 1, where the conversation takes on a more informal and intimate tone, or, in Dan 3, where open rebellion breaks out.

The fact that the book of Daniel has both a public and hidden transcript indicates that it is a multi-voiced work.<sup>22</sup> The public transcript carries the voice of cooperation with empire. The hidden transcript carries the voice of resistance. Daniel 1 exemplifies this well as the public transcript indicates that the Judaeans are being shaped and formed

through the learning of Babylonian language and arts while the hidden transcript indicates that the exiles secretly conspire with the advisor to the king to resist cultural assimilation by manipulation of their diet. These voices speak simultaneously throughout the narrative. The voices of rebellion are likewise diverse within Daniel. Most of the time, the voices of resistance are circumspect and remain part of the hidden transcript. Occasionally, however, they break into the open, as in Daniel 3 and 6 where Daniel and his friends openly defy the kings' decrees regarding worship.

The voice of the narrator also reflects dialogism. The previous discussion of Arnold's view noted that the narrator switches from an internal to an external point of view between Dan 1 and Dan 2. This is a mark of heteroglossia. Furthermore, the narrator is the only character in the text that uses different social languages within the same national language. He uses official and professional language in telling us most of this story but he also uses slang in reference to Belshazzar's fear-induced scatological episode. This incidence of slang is quite grating when set against the usually high register of discourse. It flags that something far beneath royalty has just occurred. For all the high and mighty airs that kings exhibit, they are still quite human with all the frailties that go with it. The different social registers strip the king of any pretensions.

The use of so many different sub-genres within Daniel 1-6 is, according to Bakhtin, an expression of polyglossia. Each sub-genre reflects the different voices of its use history. Moreover, the parodying of the form and use history of each genre brings another voice into the text's conversation. Daniel is a virtual chorus of generic voices. This brief analysis of the many voices of Daniel 1-6 lays bare the polyglossic satirical nature of the work. The character's voices and actions operate on a number of levels to

introduce a series of diverse attitudes, ideological points of view, and narrative tones that produce laughter and scorn. Additionally, the narrator switches his narratological point of view. He also uses different social registers within one language to contrast two opposing attitudes toward royal status. This too is funny. The parodying of so many biblical genres adds more voices to the textual discourse. In light of these several levels of satiric dialogism in the text, the presence of three languages in Daniel 1-6 logically reflects yet another level of the text's satiric heteroglossia. It is *intentional* to the work.

### *Aramaic in the Book of Daniel*

The ancient Near East had been a polyglottic culture for over two millennia before the Hellenistic period. Akkadian and Sumerian sat side by side for centuries, and Akkadian eventually appropriated a great deal of Sumerian in its development. Akkadian became the *lingua franca* in regions where people spoke other languages.<sup>23</sup> Aramaic supplanted Akkadian in that role during the Persian period.<sup>24</sup> After the conquests of Alexander the Great, Greek became the *lingua franca*, but Aramaic, Akkadian, Hebrew, and other languages lived on. The Hellenistic Near East was characterized by a vast and complex polyglossia.

Language development and usage is a fluid process, and languages in polyglottic areas can absorb the influence of other languages as indicated above. Polyglots can use their languages in a separate fashion or combine them within a single sentence or speech. Polyglossia is reflected in single written documents early in human history.

Archaeologists found Sumero-Akkadian interlinear bilingual compositions in Ashurbanipal's library at Nineveh.<sup>25</sup> The Dynastic Chronicle uses both Sumerian and Babylonian traditions in a bilingual form.<sup>26</sup> Letters from el-Amarna reflect "a kind of

creole in which the vocabulary is mostly Akkadian (with some local words and phrases) but the morphology and syntax reflect the local NW Semitic dialects.”<sup>27</sup> In the Persian period, it was common to find Aramaic script written on Neo-Babylonian legal tablets. This intersection of more than one language in written materials is described as macaronic literature.<sup>28</sup> Eventually, this phenomenon spread into literature and became especially present in the Middle Ages with the combination of Latin and developing national languages in a variety of literary forms.<sup>29</sup> In this later form, it is common to see the interweaving of the languages throughout the text, which does not appear in the earliest forms of macaronic literature.

Written manifestations of polyglottism are found in the Hebrew Bible. Aramaic is embedded in the Hebrew text in Gen 31:47 and Jer 10:11. Ezra 4:8-6:18 and 7:12-26 is, of course, the greatest occurrence of Aramaic in the Hebrew Bible before Daniel. Gerard Mussies discusses the presence of Greek loanwords in the Hebrew Bible, most importantly in 1 Chr 29:7; Ezra 8:27; Neh 7:69-71, and Dan 3:5-7.<sup>30</sup> A mistaken perception exists within some circles of the biblical academy that macaronic literature is usually the result of a redactional process. This does not, however, have to be the case. The history of literature reveals that some works are originally composed in multiple languages or may quite intentionally have a sprinkling of foreign words.<sup>31</sup>

Bakhtin observes that many pre-novelistic literary forms came into being in the Hellenistic period, eventually becoming the dominant literature. These new genres were responses to the polyglossia of the Hellenistic world. In such an environment, the possibility of macaronic literature could increase radically. Because the Hellenistic milieu reflects a time of profound polyglossia, the intermingling of languages, cultures and

ideological perspectives animated everyday life. The tension between majority and minority cultures created an environment where those under subjugation developed various strategies, including literary ones such as serio-comical compositions, to subvert the dominant structures of their time.<sup>32</sup> The reanimation of Hebrew literature in periods of crisis mirrors this peoples' constant reclaiming of their linguistic roots even while they were forced to learn and use the language of the dominant culture. It is therefore quite plausible to maintain that a pre-novelistic literary composition of the time could be macaronic. The book of Daniel is one such instance.

The fact that Aramaic was the primary international language of literature and commerce in the Ancient Near East for hundreds of years is significant for its appearance in both of the books of Ezra and Daniel.<sup>33</sup> It is the language of empire. In the book of Ezra, the Aramaic portion first begins at 4:8. Verse 7 states in Hebrew: "And in the days of Artaxerxes, Bishlam and Mithredath and Tabeel, and the rest of their associates wrote to King Artaxerxes of Persia. The letter was written in Aramaic and translated." This verse signals that the letter will be in Aramaic, which it is (Ezra 4:11-16)—as is the king's response (Ezra 4:17-22). Other official documents are also in Aramaic within the text. These include: a report from Tattenai and Shethar-bozenai sent to King Darius (Ezra 5:7-17); a decree from King Darius (Ezra 6:3-12); and a letter from King Artaxerxes to Ezra (Ezra 7:12-26). Aramaic conveys official communiqués between the Persian kings and various officials in Yehud in the book of Ezra. Ezra apparently uses two languages to reflect two different literary voices, one the voice of Persian authority. Unfortunately, the interweaving of the Aramaic with the Hebrew is not perfectly consistent for the surrounding narration is also in Aramaic (Ezra 4:8-10, 23-24; 5:1-6; 6:1-2, 13-18) and

one other official communiqué is not in Aramaic, the original order of King Cyrus to build the temple (Ezra 1:2-4). Nonetheless, the lack of precision in this early example of Hebrew macaronic literature does not negate the fact that Aramaic seems to bear the voice of authority and a particular ideology within Ezra.

The book of Daniel uses Aramaic, the official language of the royal court until the Greek conquest, in some very unofficial ways to express humor and satire towards the king and his empire. The Aramaic conveys a satirical ideological perspective through two fundamental means. The shift to Aramaic in Daniel occurs at a point of reported speech where the counselors respond to the king's request. The king's request in Dan 2:3 is, however, in Hebrew. If the Aramaic were simply a concession to realism in the report of actual speech, one would expect the Aramaic to begin with the king's request. Instead, it begins with the advisors' response to the king. Daniel Smith-Christopher notes that the counselors' first words, "O King, live forever!" (ייה וימלעל אכלמ) serve as an ironic statement that sets the predominant satirical tone of Daniel 1-6.<sup>34</sup> Each king who is greeted in this way is in the end humbled in some manner.<sup>35</sup> This irony provides an important clue that the introduction of Aramaic into the text is more than a simple literary device to inject realism into the dialogue and more than a mere signal of the shift of the narrator's point of view from internal to external. Rather, it is an indication that the Aramaic language is being used in a creative and sarcastic manner. The prevalence of Aramaic wordplays in the stories of Daniel confirm that the language switch is intentional, and a brief survey of some of these constructions provides the final piece of evidence that the language change is part of an calculated rhetorical strategy.

### *Examples of Wordplay*

The work of Anthony Petrota provides a framework to illustrate the extensive use of wordplay throughout the Court Tale section of Daniel.<sup>36</sup> He argues that instances of wordplay are more than examples of mere ornamentation but are also important in the overall message of the composition. The persistent use of wordplay techniques such as paronomasia, repetition, antanaclasis, and syllepsis demonstrate that the court tales are a highly complex creation designed to judge king and empire.<sup>37</sup> The following examples will highlight some of the most important occurrences of various wordplay techniques. There are many more occurrences of wordplay in addition to those explored below. These examples simply demonstrate that wordplay is a pervasive technique throughout the court tales of Daniel and this literary convention plays a significant role in the composition of these narratives.

### *Daniel 1*

Although it is written in Hebrew, this chapter does exhibit some wordplay techniques that are also used in the Aramaic stories.<sup>38</sup> This demonstrates that literary creativeness using wordplay is found in all the court tales regardless of language. The most conspicuous technique is the use of the *Leitwörter*, or leading word, which is the recurrence of a word or phrase that sets the tone for a passage. In chapter 1, the root king or rule (Klm) occurs in various forms over twenty times. This is a chapter seemingly about royal privilege and power, and yet the entire chapter describes various scenes of resistance and subversion. From the beginning, Nebuchadnezzar appears to be in control, but the reality is that the king's servants collude behind his back and help the Hebrew heroes to subvert the wishes of the king. The repetition of the verb give (Ntn) three times in this chapter, each time with God as the subject who acts to allow things to happen in the story, indicates that there is an ironical undercurrent at work throughout this chapter.

The king may claim to be all-powerful, but the story indicates that reality is indeed quite different.

In Daniel 1, King Nebuchadnezzar is portrayed as a conqueror of both the political and cultic power centers of Judah as he defeats King Jehoiakim and plunders the sacred articles of the temple. Then the finest of the deportees are chosen for special education and training for imperial service. The public transcript indicates that the king's desires are completely fulfilled, for indeed the conscripts are trained and in the end presented to the king for royal approval. As far as the king knows, his orders have been totally followed and completely obeyed. However, the reader also learns that Daniel and his three friends negotiate with the king's servants to change the terms of their subjugation. Many posit that the Hebrew heroes' concerns stem from piety and a desire to remain ritually pure. While purity is certainly an issue<sup>39</sup>, another likely motivation, one that is apropos to the political nature of this chapter, is the motivation to resist the royal edicts whenever possible. Their actions have the political consequence of setting themselves apart from the king's agenda and the Babylonian training table.<sup>40</sup> Their resistance takes the form of the trickster hero, which Scott defines as one that makes his way through a treacherous environment of enemies not by strength but by wit and cunning.<sup>41</sup> This resistance is covert and invisible to the king, and yet is powerfully subversive and indicative of the true relationship between the king and his subjects. The delicious denouement of this story is that the king knows nothing of this subterfuge, and deems the four Hebrews to be better servants than even his most trusted countrymen (Dan 1:20-21). This commendation by the king adds to the irony of this chapter because the heroes are in effect rewarded for their subversive behavior. Thus the public transcript of this story attempts to affirm the king's sovereignty while the hidden transcript reveals that his conquered subjects resist surrendering their identity in a variety of ways. This is a chapter primarily about power and control, not dietary scruples.

There are other clues in the text that indicate that power and control, rather than purity issues are the primary concern. Daniel 1:1-7 is filled with commands that indicate that royal control is absolute, even to the changing of the captives names, which is an attempt to eradicate their identities.<sup>42</sup> In verse 7, the chief official gives the Hebrew heroes new names. The Hebrew verb used here is *My#w*, with the sense of setting or determining. Daniel's reaction to this determination of new names on the part of the king's servant is not to challenge the new names, which would be risking a direct public confrontation with an order of the king, but instead chooses another area of covert resistance. Daniel determines not to defile himself with the royal rations and in verse 8 the same word, *My#w*, is used to describe Daniel's determination not to be defiled with the royal food and wine. The use of the same verb in these two different ways is an example of a wordplay technique called antanaclasis. Antanaclasis is the repetition of a single term with different senses, and here it is used to highlight the direct contrast between the actions of the royal servant and Daniel. The *patbag* (*gb-tp*) is royal food, and it is the political implications of such food that seems to trouble Daniel.<sup>43</sup>

### *Daniel 2*

In this dream interpretation story there are a number of wordplay techniques that heightens the ambiguity and playfulness of the narrative. When the king asks the counselors to tell the contents of the dream to him, he uses a form of the verb to know (*dy*) in verses 3, 5 and 9. His counselors respond many times with a form of the verb to declare (*hwx*), a technical term with the nuance to interpret. The shifting use of these synonyms highlights the cross-purposes of the king and his advisors.<sup>44</sup> Once they begin to understand each other, the advisors cannot believe the king is asking them to interpret the dream without telling them its' content. The king threatens to annihilate all of them. This type of wild swing of action and emotion is characteristic of each of the court tales and underlines the satirical nature of these stories. A second synonym wordplay is the varied

use of the words interpretation (ר#פ) and secret (זר). While the king and his advisors frantically search for an interpretation, it is God through Daniel who provides the hidden answer to the mystery, creating an ironic contrast between the supposed knowledge of the counselors and the true knowledge from on high. There is also in this scene an example of paronomasia, which is a wordplay determined by the sound of letters and syllables. Daniel, who is a son of the exile (wlg, v 25) is the one to whom the mystery is revealed (lg, v 19, 22, 28, 30, 47).<sup>45</sup> Finally in chapter 2, there is the use of lists of multiple synonyms in order to heighten the hyperbolic quality of this story. These include lists of sages (v 2, 10, 27), rewards (v 6), rulers (v 10), power (v 37), shattering (v 40), and homage (v 46).<sup>46</sup> This is a technique that is used in many instances throughout the court tales of Daniel.

### *Daniel 3*

Daniel 3 has been recognized by many to be an example of comedic storytelling.<sup>47</sup> The most prominent feature of this chapter is the numerous repetitive lists of government officials, residents of the empire, and musical instruments.<sup>48</sup> These staccato lists paint a vivid word picture of a king and his subjects who act in mechanical and robotic ways. The ironic contrast of this lifestyle compared to the dignified behavior of the three Hebrew heroes creates a comical scene. The ludicrousness of the scene is emphasized by the repetition of references to the red-hot blazing furnace (v 6, 11, 15, 17, 20, 21, 23, 26) being heated extraordinarily high (v 19, 22) to receive the bound heroes (v 20, 21, 23). This hyperbole heightens the dramatic intervention by the angel of God. There are two other techniques worth noting. The first is an example of antanaclasis, which is the repeated use of a single term with different meanings. In verse 1 the word image (Mlc) refers to the image of gold, the statue that Nebuchadnezzar sets up.<sup>49</sup> Later in verse 19, image (Mlc) is used in a description of how the king's face changes because of his fury towards the recalcitrant heroes. Meadowcroft suggests that this wordplay may suggest

that the original statue was an actual image of the king.<sup>50</sup> There may also be an allusion back to chapter 2 where the statue (Mlc) is ultimately destroyed. There is also an example of paronomasia in verse 7 where all (lk) the people hear the sound (lc) of all (lk) kinds of music. This wordplay reinforces the bureaucratic lockstep obedience that the king requires, and this behavior is an ironic contrast to the dignified steadfast refusal of the three heroes to follow the orders of the king (v 16-8).

#### *Daniel 4*

The rise and the fall of the great tree in this chapter sets forth the antithesis of human and divine kingship in no uncertain terms.<sup>51</sup> The synonyms great (br) and mighty (Pqt) (v 8, 17, 19, 27, 33) and king (Klm) and rule (+l#) (v 14, 22, 23, 29, 31) are used to establish this contrast. Nebuchadnezzar boasts of his greatness, but his words are hollow compared to the God of heaven who is in reality great. This is reinforced by the numerous references to the antonyms earth or ground ((r)) and heaven (ym#).<sup>52</sup> The hyperbolic boastfulness of the king is ironically contrasted with the true power of God. Two examples of paronomasia in verses 19 make clear the connection between the tree and the king, and that the fall of tree necessarily parallels the fall of the king. (The tree's height 'reached to heaven' [v 17, ym#l ) +mY], and the king's greatness reaches to the heavens [v 19, ym#l t+mw]. The tree's appearance is 'to all the earth' [v 17, (r) lkl], while the king's rule is 'to the end of the earth [v 19, (r) Pwsl].<sup>53</sup> Another way this contrast is heightened is through the poetic wordplay techniques found in Dan 4:7-14, which emphasizes the greatness of the tree, setting it up for a great fall. Further wordplay examples are far too numerous to detail in this short paper, but interested readers can access the extended list of wordplay techniques in this poem in an article published by Alexander DiLella.<sup>54</sup>

## *Daniel 5*

Chapter 5 contains numerous wordplays, including the well-known writing on the wall. In verses 2 and 3, there is an example of the literary device known as phrasal repetition, where entire statements are repeated with small but important changes.<sup>55</sup> The reader learns that Belshazzar causes the temple vessels to be brought forth in verse 2, but verse 3 adds that these vessels are from the house of God. The narrator subtly introduces his point of view with the addition of these words. Then there is a further wordplay based on the verb to bring forth (qpn). The verb to bring forth (qpn), is used in the haphel in these verses 2 and 3 and refers to the moving of the vessels, while in verse 5, it is used in an atypical way in the peal to describe the appearance or “bringing forth” of the writing on the wall. This paronymous wordplay underlines the ironic contrast between the human insolence of the king and the divine response towards this rebellious behavior. A second graphic instance of paronomasia is the loosening (Nyr̄t #m) of the knots (yr+q) of the king’s bowels in verse 6, while the same words are used in verses 12 and 16 to describe the ability of Daniel to “loosen the knots” of interpretation of the riddle.<sup>56</sup> In verse 12 it is the queen mother who informs the king of Daniel’s abilities. This advice coming from a female character adds to the sarcasm of the scene.<sup>57</sup> There is no doubt here that the king is being severely ridiculed.<sup>58</sup> Then in the interpretation of the writing on the wall in verses 26-28, there is the extended paronomastic structure where three weights ( )nm, lqt, Nysrp) are used as three acts of evaluation (hnm, htlyqt and tsyrrp) in order to make three judgments against the king.<sup>59</sup> A final wordplay that combines paronomasia, which is determined by the sound of letters and syllables, and the pun, which is determined by the meaning of words, is the fact that the weighing (lqt) of the king’s actions results in the slaying (ly+q) of the king!

## *Daniel 6*

Meadowcroft describes Daniel 6 as having a cheerful haggadic tone.<sup>60</sup> This chapter is often compared to chapter 3, which has a plethora of repeated lists. While there are fewer lists in Daniel 6, there are many words that are used again and again, which lends a stilted parodic quality to the narrative.<sup>61</sup> Arnold proposes that the words seek (h (b)) and find (שׁכח) are used as *Leitwörter*, or leading words.<sup>62</sup> Daniel's enemies seek (h (b), v 5) to find (שׁכח, three times in v 5, twice in v 6) some fault to use against him. Then in verses 8 and 12-14, seek (h (b)) is used in the sense of praying or seeking a petition from royalty or a deity. This use of the same word with a slight difference of meaning is an example of antanaclasis. Thus there is pronounced contrast between how Daniel prays to his God while his enemies seek his destruction. The irony is emphasized further by the fact that counselors try to find (שׁכח) a fault in Daniel in verse 5 but instead find him praying to God in verse 12. Then in verses 23 and 24, Daniel is found innocent and no harm is found on him. This process of seeking and finding results once again in an ironic contrast between the enemies and Daniel. Another wordplay in this chapter is based upon the usage of the word law (טד) to describe the law of God (v 6) and the law of the Medes and Persians (v 9, 13, 16). The officials attempt to indict Daniel, who is following the divine law of his God, by recourse to their own human law, creating another ironic contrast. This use of a single term that carries two meanings is a technique called sylepsis.<sup>63</sup>

The extensive use of Aramaic wordplay demonstrates the text's satirical use of the official language of the court to win an ideological battle with the king. The Aramaic language is manipulated in such a way that it mocks and ridicules the king. His very language is used against him. In this way, the use of Aramaic is itself an act of satire and an integral part of the menippean structure of Daniel 1-6. There is something deliciously wicked and witty in turning the king's official language on him. When the king appears on the scene in full force with direct speech, his advisors begin to betray him in the

language of power. This technique enhances the effect of the public versus hidden transcript first revealed in Daniel 1.

The presence of wordplays in both Hebrew and Aramaic also helps resolve another aspect of the language conundrum of Daniel 1-6. The wordplays are one of the most important indices that neither the Hebrew nor Aramaic portions of Daniel 1-6 were translated out of an original in the other language. Most wordplays do not translate well. It is extremely difficult to emulate in the receptor text any acrostics, alliteration, anagrammatical wordplays, antanaclasis, homonym wordplays, onomatopoeia, paronomasia, puns, and rhyming that appears in a source text. Such phenomena literally get lost in translation. Although Aramaic and Hebrew are cognate languages with great similarities, it remains impossible to translate the large number of wordplays in Daniel 1-6 effectively across the two languages. It is for this reason as well that translation theories regarding the presence of the two major languages in Daniel fail. The Aramaic in Daniel is another aspect of its satirical drive.

The appearance of the few Greek words in Daniel 3 highlights the internationality of the macaronic effect. The listing of several of the instruments in Greek indicates that the author has many languages at his command. He could have written in any of the three languages. Furthermore, it is not an accident that the musical instruments are in Greek. Just as the three Judeans will not “sing” to a Greek tune, readers need not either. The light application of Greek words is a reminder of the social location of Daniel 1-6 and the socio-ideological nature of this literature. The Aramaic text with its few Greek inserts is a highly complex creation designed to judge king and empire. This manifestation of heteroglossia underscores how language can be employed to destabilize and delegitimize control.<sup>64</sup> According to Ferdinand Deist, such humor is a particularly effective way for common people to define their identity and to subvert the violence of power.<sup>65</sup>

*Implications for Daniel 7-12*

Although Daniel 1-6 is the focus of this paper, one obvious question remains. Why does the Aramaic of the book of Daniel not disappear when the royal court tales disappear from the text at the end of Daniel 6? If the only point of the Aramaic is to lampoon the king, then its job is done at 6:29. One possible answer to the problem is simply to suggest that this early piece of macaronic literature is as imprecise as Ezra is in its application of multi-linguaged dialogism. That could be right. It is also possible, however, that the carryover is deliberate and serves its own narratological and ideological functions. A brief investigation of the structure of the entire book is helpful.

It is interesting to note that from a language point of view the book has a dual, 1:5 construction; with the exception of Dan 2:1-4a, which disrupts the schema just slightly, the Daniel narratives begin with one Hebrew chapter which is followed by five Aramaic chapters. The Daniel visions begin with one Aramaic chapter that is followed by five Hebrew chapters. This structural pattern may be calculated. It reflects a twinning, or doubling, of form in the two parts of the book. In Daniel, form is just as important as content in conveying its ideological message.

Furthermore, the first six chapters of Daniel are “earthbound”. Although a number of otherworldly visions occur, the setting of the chapters are fixed on earth in the royal court, in the royal domicile, in the royal banquet hall, the slaves’ quarters, on the executioner’s block, on the plain of Dura, and so forth. The space is terrestrial and the language is predominantly Aramaic, the official language of the literary court and the popular language of the intended audience for whom the text is written. In Daniel 7-12, however, the space is otherworldly because heavenly visions dominate the text. Hebrew in this period is already a language that is associated with sacredness and is less well

known among the people, although not entirely so. Arnaud Sérandour, it may be recalled, argues that Hebrew represents a local and sacred idiom in this period while Aramaic signifies the official international and political language of profane use. If this is correct, then the use of Hebrew to represent the otherworldly visions would carry its own ideological message. Daniel 2-6 uses Aramaic to bring judgment upon earthly empires. Daniel 8-12 uses Hebrew to bring judgment upon the descriptions of empire in the heavenly vision.

Obviously, this structure is not perfect. Daniel 1 and 7 do not follow suit with respect to language and space. Perhaps Daniel 1, as the book's introduction, is intentionally written in the Hebrew as a *reversal* of the pattern of the other earthbound chapters. This underscores the importance of the language switch in Dan 2:4. If Daniel 1-6 were composed entirely in Aramaic and Daniel 7-12 entirely in Hebrew, one would not pay great attention to the change and probably never bother to question the underlying ideology of language use in the text. Daniel 7, on the other hand, is the introduction to the visionary part of the text and is a hinge chapter within the book. It has, in the concentric structure of Daniel 2-7, many parallels with Daniel 2. It would make sense for it to continue the argument of Daniel 2 in the same language. The language reversal in Daniel 8 might well then jar the reader into noticing the switch to the sacred language. The overall effect is to cause the 1:5/1:5 doubled pattern of the book.

This twinning pattern plays out in content as well as structure between Daniel 1-6 and Daniel 7-12. While it is beyond the scope of this paper to do a careful study of Daniel 7-12, note several of the mirroring devices between the two major sections of the book of Daniel. First, the date formulae of Daniel 7-12 refer to Belshazzar (Dan 7:1; 8:1), Darius

(Dan 9:1; 11:1) and Cyrus (Dan 10:1). Second, Daniel's Neo-Babylonian name, Belteshazzar, is mentioned in Dan 10:1. Third, Daniel again eats no rich food, meat, or wine in Dan 10:2. Fourth, precious metals and stone are part of the symbolism of the visions as gold is mentioned alone in Dan 12:5, gold and silver in Dan 11:38, bronze in Dan 10: 6, and precious stones in Dan 11:38. Fifth, the visions of Dan 7-12 are intensifications of their counterparts in the earlier part of the book. The four beasts (Dan 7:2-14) and the ram and the goat (Dan 8:2-14) are extremely arresting images. Sixth, Daniel now acts very much like the kings with regard to oracular visions. Daniel is the one with the terrifying visions that he does not understand and that need interpreting. The interpretations are provided to Daniel by heavenly figures and provoke extreme reaction. For instance, Daniel has "a dream and visions of his head while he lay in bed" (Dan 7:2). He repeats that he "watched in the night visions" (Dan 7:13). As to his fear, Daniel says, "my spirit was troubled within me and the visions of my head terrified me" (Dan 7:15). Even after the dream is interpreted, Daniel states, "my thoughts greatly terrified me, and my face turned pale" (Dan 7:28). Again, Daniel "became frightened and fell prostrate" in the face of another vision (Dan 8:17). Daniel is overcome by the vision and lays sick (Dan 8:27). His strength leaves him and his complexion grows deathly pale in Dan 10:8. The great man of his vision says to Daniel, "Do not fear" (Dan 10:12, 19); still he shakes (Dan 10:17). Daniel must approach an attendant to have his vision interpreted in Dan 7:16. In Daniel 8, Daniel tries to understand his vision (Dan 8:15). Someone stands before Daniel "having the appearance of a man" (Dan 8:15). It is Gabriel, who interprets this dream for Daniel, but even so Daniel still cannot understand it (Dan 8:27). Gabriel gives Daniel "wisdom and understanding" in Dan 9:22, which he apparently maintains in

Dan 10:1. The “one in human form (who) touches and strengthens Daniel” in Dan 10:18 is also Gabriel. Unfortunately by Dan 12:8, he again has no understanding. Daniel seeks answers by prayer and fasts (Dan 9:3), sharing behaviors with his prior self and Darius. Daniel says of one of his interpreted visions: “the vision . . . that has been told is true” like he once said to Nebuchadnezzar (Dan 8:26). Seventh, kings are just as self-centered, prideful, and vicious in Daniel 7-12 as they were in Daniel 1-6. The text says that no one can be rescued from the ram’s power (Dan 8:4, 7), which is similar to the power of God in Daniel 1-6. The horn of the goat grew as high as the host of heaven (Dan 8:10), much like the tree before it. The horn “acted arrogantly” and “took the regular burnt offering away from him and overthrew the place of the sanctuary” (Dan 8:11; cf. 8:13), calling to mind the sacred vessels of Daniel 1 and 5. In spite of these acts, the horn “kept prospering” as did Nebuchadnezzar before his judgment (Dan 8:12). Moreover, the text again reports that forces sent by a contemptible man will occupy and profane the temple, and abolish the regular burnt offering (Dan 11:31; 12:11). A kingdom will be divided and be uprooted in Dan 11:4 like the statue of Daniel 2. A branch from the root of the daughter of a king will rise up in 11:7 like the trees branches in Daniel 4. The king of the south is moved with rage (11:11). A king and his rage simply cannot be parted. The king will exalt himself and consider himself greater than any god, and he too will prosper (Dan 11:36-37). Eighth, God is once again the court of last resort (Dan 7:10). His throne is made of fiery flames (Dan 7:9) and a beast is put to death by fire (Dan 7:11), which counteracts the fiery furnace of Daniel 3. Judgment is given for the holy ones of the Most High (Dan 7:22) much like in Daniel 4. All peoples, nations and language serve the one who is like a human coming with the clouds of heaven (7:14a); his dominion and

kingship will never pass away or be destroyed (7:14b). Finally, the very best is saved for last. Daniel is rewarded at the end of days (12:13).

The two major sections of Daniel are not independent pieces. The switch from Aramaic back to Hebrew is original to the text. The 1:5/1:5 pattern is important to the overall message of judgment in the book. Consequently, the use of three languages in the book of Daniel must be appreciated as an essential feature of its dialogism and satiric artistry – *and* its menippean shape.

### *Conclusion*

Daniel 1-6 uses inserted genres, multiple tones, multiple voices, multiple social languages within Aramaic, and multiple national languages, namely Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek, to create a dialogic piece. The loosely constructed narratives exhibit varying degrees of irony, parody and humor. Each chapter can function as an autonomous tale,<sup>66</sup> but when the stories are edited and read together through the lens of the menippea, an overall organic unity emerges. There is a consistent and persistent message of judgment that weaves through the stories. The message disrupts controlling authorities and voices. It challenges easy claims to truth. It offers a hilariously subversive resistance to empire and any who support it. Each story creates memorable images independent of the others, but when they are read as a unit, the tone of judgment and satire becomes dominant and clear. Bakhtin's concept of polyglossia provides an essential tool to uncover the parody that is the foremost characteristic of the stories of Daniel 1–6, including a more satisfying explanation for the presence of multiple languages in this text.

---

<sup>1</sup> For good summaries of these issues in Daniel, see Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary*, 24-38; and Redditt, *Daniel*, 20-34.

<sup>2</sup> Collins, *Daniel*, 12-13.

<sup>3</sup> Daniel C. Snell, "Why Is There Aramaic In The Bible?," *JSOT* 18 (1980): 32-51.

<sup>4</sup> "Hebreu et Araméen dans la Bible," *REJ* 159 (2000): 345-55.

<sup>5</sup> "Problèmes du bilinguisme en Daniel," in *Mosaïque de langues, mosaïque culturelle: le bilinguisme dans le Proche-Orient ancien* (ed. Françoise Briquel-Chatonnet; Paris: Jean Maisonneuve, 1996), 145-70.

<sup>6</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, "Discourse in the Novel," in *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin* (ed. Michael Holquist; trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist; University of Texas Press Slavic Series 1; Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), 296.

<sup>7</sup> Martin S. Jaffee, *Early Judaism* (Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1997), 37.

<sup>8</sup> Doron Mendels, *The Rise and Fall of Jewish Nationalism* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1999), 17.

<sup>9</sup> David Aberbach, *Revolutionary Hebrew, Empire, and Crisis: Four Peaks in Hebrew Literature and Jewish Survival* (New York: New York University Press, 1998).

<sup>10</sup> "The Use Of Aramaic In The Hebrew Bible: Another Look At Bilingualism In Ezra And Daniel," *JNSL* 22 (1996): 1-16.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 10-11.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, 11-13. This point of view of a detached distanced observer continues until the end of the Aramaic section through Daniel 7. Arnold argues that the point of view in Chapter 7 continues to be external even though the genre changes from court tale to vision report.

<sup>13</sup> In addition to the Hebrew and Aramaic, Greek words appear in Dan 3:3-5 in the enumeration of the musical instruments.

<sup>14</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, "From the Prehistory of Novelistic Discourse," in *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin* (ed. Michael Holquist; trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist; University of Texas Press Slavic Series 1; Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), 50.

<sup>15</sup> Sue Vice, *Introducing Bakhtin* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), 18-44.

<sup>16</sup> Bakhtin, "Discourse In The Novel," 275.

<sup>17</sup> For a short discussion of my argument, see "Court or Jester Tales? Resistance and Social Reality in Daniel 1-6," *PRSt* 32.3 (2005): 309-24. For my full treatment, see *Lions and Ovens and Visions: A Satirical Analysis of Daniel 1-6* (Sheffield Phoenix Press, forthcoming 2007).

<sup>18</sup> Mikhail M. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (ed. and trans. Caryl Emerson; Theory and History of Literature 8; Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1984), 119.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 62.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 61.

<sup>21</sup> As Bakhtin states, "[T]he corrective of laughter and criticism to all straightforward genres, languages, styles, voices, [forces us] to experience beneath these categories a different and contradictory reality that is otherwise not captured in them." Bakhtin, *Prehistory of Novelistic Discourse*, 59.

<sup>22</sup> For discussion of public and hidden transcripts, see James C. Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (New Haven: Yale University Press), 1990.

<sup>23</sup> Richard I. Caplice, "Languages (Akkadian)," *ABD* 4:170.

<sup>24</sup> Steven A. Kaufman, "Languages (Aramaic)," *ABD* 4:174; cf. M. A. Dandamaev and V. G. Lukonin, *The Culture and Social Institutions of Ancient Iran* (ed. and trans. P. L. Kohl; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989 [1980]), 112-16.

---

<sup>25</sup> Jerrold S. Cooper, "Sumer, Sumerians," *ABD* 6:231; and William W. Hallo, "Sumerian Literature," *ABD* 6:234-235.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 236; and I. Finkel, "Bilingual Chronicle Fragments," *JCS* 32 (1980): 65-80.

<sup>27</sup> John Huenhergard, "Languages: Introductory," *ABD* 4:160.

<sup>28</sup> Bakhtin, "Prehistory of Novelistic Discourse," 78-79.

<sup>29</sup> See, e.g., Siegfried Wenzel, *Macaronic Sermons: Bilingualism and Preaching in Late-Medieval England (Recentiores: Later Latin Texts and Contexts)* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994).

<sup>30</sup> "Languages (Greek)," *ABD* 4:195-96.

<sup>31</sup> Jan-Wim Wesselius, "The Literary Nature of the Book of Daniel and the Linguistic Character of Its Aramaic," *AS* 3.2 (2005):241-83, makes such an argument for the intentionality of languages in Daniel.

<sup>32</sup> Michael E. Vines, *The Problem of Markan Genre: The Gospel of Mark and the Jewish Novel*. *Academica Biblica* 3. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002, 141.

<sup>33</sup> Kaufman, "Aramaic," *ABD* 4:173.

<sup>34</sup> Daniel Smith-Christopher, "Daniel," in *NIB* 7 (Nashville: Abingdon, 1996), 51.

<sup>35</sup> Other uses of this phrase are found at Daniel 3:9; 5:10; 6:7, 22.

<sup>36</sup> Anthony J. Petrotta, *Lexis Ludens: Wordplay And The Book Of Micah* (New York: Peter Lang, 1991).

<sup>37</sup> Definitions for technical terms are discussed below with pertinent examples. For a glossary of technical wordplay terms, see Petrotta, "*Lexis Ludens*," 153.

<sup>38</sup> Bill T. Arnold, "Word Play and Characterization in Daniel 1," in Scott B. Noegel, ed., *Puns and Pundits: Word Play in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near Eastern Literature* (Bethesda, Md.: CDL Press, 2000) 231-50.

<sup>39</sup> See Mary E. Mills, "Household and Table: Diasporic Boundaries in Daniel and Esther," *CBQ* 68 (Bethesda, Md.: CDL Press, 2006): 408-420.

<sup>40</sup> Philip P. Chia. "On Naming The Subject: Postcolonial Reading of Daniel." *Jian Dao* 7 (1997): 17-36.

<sup>41</sup> Scott, *Hidden Transcripts*, 162-66.

<sup>42</sup> See Chia, "Naming the Subject," 26-29, for the significance of the resistance of the changing of names.

<sup>43</sup> Danna Nolan Fewell, *Circle of Sovereignty: Plotting Politics in the Book of Daniel*. 2d ed. (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1991), 19.

<sup>44</sup> T. J. Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel: A Literary Comparison*, *JSOTSup* 198 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995,) 175-82.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, 182-83.

<sup>46</sup> John E. Goldingay, *Daniel*, *WBC* 30 (Dallas: Word Books, 1989), 43.

<sup>47</sup> Hector I. Avalos, "The Comedic Functions of the Enumerations of Officials and Instruments in Daniel 3," *CBQ* 53 (1991): 580-88; David M. Gunn & Danna Nolan Fewell. *Narrative in the Hebrew Bible* (London: Oxford University Press, 1993), 174-88.

<sup>48</sup> Peter W. Coxon, "The 'List' Genre and Narrative Style in the Court Tales of Daniel," *JSOT* 35 (1986): 95-121.

<sup>49</sup> The dimensions of this statue are quite ludicrous. See Smith-Christopher, "Daniel," 61-62.

<sup>50</sup> Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel*, 148.

<sup>51</sup> For an excellent study of this chapter that captures the ironical nature of this story, see Matthias Henze, *The Madness of King Nebuchadnezzar*, *JSJSup* 61 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), especially 99.

<sup>52</sup> Goldingay, *Daniel*, 85.

<sup>53</sup> Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel*, 47.

---

<sup>54</sup> Alexander A. DiLella, "Daniel 4:7-14: Poetic Analysis and Biblical Background," in *Melanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Henri Cazelles*, AOAT 212 (ed. A. Caquot and M. Delcor; Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1981), 247-58.

<sup>55</sup> Bill T. Arnold, "Wordplay And Narrative Techniques In Daniel 5 And 6," *JBL* 112:3 (1993): 481.

<sup>56</sup> Shalom Paul, "Decoding a 'Joint' Expression in Daniel 5:6,16," *JANESCU* 22 (1992): 121-27; Al Wolters, "Untying the King's Knots: Physiology and Word Play in Daniel 5," *JBL* 110:1 (1991): 117-22.

<sup>57</sup> HJM van Deventer, "Would The Actually 'Powerful' Please Stand? The role of the queen (mother) in Daniel 5," *Scriptura* 70 (1999): 241-51.

<sup>58</sup> For an examination of instances of ridicule of foreign rulers in the Hebrew Bible, see Athalya Brenner, "Who's Afraid of Feminist Criticism? Who's Afraid of Biblical Humour? The Case of the Obtuse Foreign Ruler in the Hebrew Bible," *JSOT* 63 (1994): 38-55.

<sup>59</sup> Again, this is a highly complex argument, which has been investigated by many. For a comprehensive article, see Al Wolters, "The Riddle of the Scales in Daniel 5," *HUCA* 62 (1991): 155-77.

<sup>60</sup> Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel*, 94.

<sup>61</sup> See Goldingay, *Daniel*, 124-5 for a complete list of repeated words.

<sup>62</sup> Arnold, *Wordplay*, 482-4.

<sup>63</sup> Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel*, 99, notes this contrast. The judgment that this is an example of sylepsis is mine.

<sup>64</sup> Bakhtin, "Discourse," 263-75.

<sup>65</sup> Ferdinand Deist, "Boundaries and Humour: A Case Study from the Ancient Near East," *Scriptura* 63 (1997): 415-24.

<sup>66</sup> As argued by Tawny L. Holm, "Daniel 1-6: A Biblical Story Collection," in *Ancient Fiction: The Matrix of Early Christian and Jewish Narrative*. Ed. Jo-Ann A. Brant et. al. SBL Symposium Series (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature), 149-166.