

# ANGLICA

An International Journal of English Studies

29/1 2020

## EDITOR

Grażyna Bystydzieńska [g.bystydzienska@uw.edu.pl]

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Martin Löschnigg [martin.loeschnigg@uni-graz.at]

Jerzy Nykiel [jerzy.nykiel@uib.no]

Marzena Sokołowska-Paryż [m.a.sokolowska-paryz@uw.edu.pl]

Anna Wojtyś [a.wojtys@uw.edu.pl]

## ASSISTANT EDITORS

Magdalena Kizeweter [m.kizeweter@uw.edu.pl]

Dominika Lewandowska-Rodak [dominika.lewandowska@o2.pl]

Bartosz Lutostański [b.lutostanski@uw.edu.pl]

Przemysław Uściński [przemek.u@hotmail.com]

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDITOR

Barry Keane [bkeane@uw.edu.pl]

## ADVISORY BOARD

Michael Bilynsky, University of Lviv

Andrzej Bogusławski, University of Warsaw

Mirosława Buchholtz, Nicolaus Copernicus University, Toruń

Jan Čermák, Charles University, Prague

Edwin Duncan, Towson University

Jacek Fabiszak, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

Elżbieta Foeller-Pituch, Northwestern University, Evanston-Chicago

Piotr Gąsiorowski, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

Keith Hanley, Lancaster University

Andrea Herrera, University of Colorado

Christopher Knight, University of Montana

Marcin Krygier, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

Krystyna Kujawińska-Courtney, University of Łódź

Brian Lowrey, Université de Picardie Jules Verne, Amiens

Zbigniew Mazur, Maria Curie-Skłodowska University, Lublin

Rafał Molencki, University of Silesia, Sosnowiec

John G. Newman, University of Texas Rio Grande Valley

Jerzy Rubach, University of Iowa

Piotr Ruzskiewicz, Pedagogical University, Cracow

Hans Sauer, University of Munich

Krystyna Stamirowska, Jagiellonian University, Cracow

Merja Stenroos, University of Stavanger

Jeremy Tambling, University of Manchester

Peter de Voogd, University of Utrecht

Anna Walczuk, Jagiellonian University, Cracow

Jean Ward, University of Gdańsk

Jerzy Welna, University of Warsaw

Florian Zappe, University of Göttingen

## GUEST REVIEWERS

Patrycja Antoszek, John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin

Teresa Bela, Jagiellonian University, Cracow

Bartłomiej Błaszkiwicz, University of Warsaw

Anna Branach-Kallas, Nicolaus Copernicus University, Toruń

Ty Hawkins, University of Central Arkansas

Jonathan Hope, Arizona State University

Barbara Kowalik, University of Warsaw

Grace Livingstone, University of Cambridge

Sarah Maltby, University of Sussex

Marek Paryż, University of Warsaw

Alicja Piechucka, University of Łódź

Anna Pochmara, University of Warsaw

Jesús Tronch, University of Valencia

Grzegorz Welizarowicz, University of Gdańsk

Ross Wilson, University of Nottingham

Elżbieta Wilczyńska, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań


Beata Zawadka, University of Szczecin

Joanna Ziarkowska, University of Warsaw



UNIVERSITY  
OF WARSAW

Jacek Olesiejko

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7047-2498>

Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań

# The Economy of Property and Prosperity in *Daniel* of the Old English Junius Manuscript: A View on the Poem's Syncretism

---

## Abstract

The heroic economy of treasure subtends both the treasure plundered from the temple in Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar and the political structure of Babylon in the Old English *Daniel*. The golden idol that Nebuchadnezzar erects is a sign of the worldly glory and wealth that generates the flow of goods in the heroic economy of exchange of honour. The aim of the paper is to argue that the *Daniel* poet makes a contrast between the secular flow of treasure, at the foundation of Nebuchadnezzar's power, and the divine economy of grace, at the centre of the covenant between the Hebrews and God.

**Keywords:** Old English *Daniel*, Old English biblical verse, Old English poetry, Anglo-Saxon England, *Beowulf*

---

## 1. Introduction

The Old English poem *Daniel*<sup>1</sup> survives in one copy in Junius Manuscript 11, where the text is bound with five other poems which, like *Daniel*, are biblical in subject; *Genesis A* and *B*, *Exodus*, and *Christ and Satan*. *Daniel*, whose narrative is based on the first five parts of the Old Testament Book of Daniel, has received a lot of critical attention on account of its vivid portrayal of King Nebuchadnezzar. The most important critical traditions of interpreting the poem focus on either Nebuchadnezzar and his pride or the fall of Israel into Babylonian dominion and the attendant of theme *translatio imperii et studii*. Graham D. Caie, for example, argued that *Daniel* contains three exempla on pride that affects the sinner's soul in a time of prosperity (2). For Robert E. Bjork, the theme of the Old English adaptation is "oppositional contrast between evil and good men, based on their relationship to law, that permeates the poem" (215). The other strand of criticism, represented, for example, by Earl R. Anderson, aligns the poem with the early medieval tradition of *translation imperii*, the transfer of centre of power from one empire to another, suggesting that Israel in the poem loses the status

of the chosen nation and that status is transferred onto *populus Christianus* (1). More recently, Samantha Zacher has also discussed the poem in the light of the medieval concept of *translatio imperii* (96).

What has invariably escaped the critical attention that the poem has received is the extent to which it is influenced by vernacular heroic poetry, not merely in terms of alliterative diction, but also ideology. Although much attention has been given to king Nebuchadnezzar of the poem, there has been little interest in the political model of kingship in *Daniel*. The poet focuses not only on Nebuchadnezzar himself, his growth in pride and conversion, but on the relationship between him and the people of Babylon as well as the Hebrews. At the beginning of *Daniel*, Nebuchadnezzar is first an aggressive marauder king that inspires terror among neighbouring nations, not unlike Scyld Scefing in *Beowulf*. At the end of the poem, he converts to the faith and becomes a spiritually enlightened king who does not only follow Daniel's, the prophet's, advice, but is the receptacle of wisdom in an active way, taking on the responsibility for distributing wisdom and learning among his subjects, an activity which is unprecedented in the biblical source.

The major ideological vernacular influence on the poem that comes from heroic verse is the concept of honour as well as the secular concept of gift and obligation. In Old English heroic verse, the hero participates in what Peter S. Baker calls the economy of the exchange of honour, namely, a system of exchange in which "treasure and honour, indissolubly bonded, are traded up and down the social hierarchy in such a way that the participants gain (and occasionally lose) honour with each transaction" (37). Baker suggests that 'honour' best translates OE concepts of *ar*, *blæd*, *dom*, *hreb*, *lof*, *mærþo*, *tir* or *þrymm* (12). In the Old English *Daniel*, the pattern of rise and fall, one of the most pervasive themes of the poem, depicts nations and characters as receiving and losing *blæd*, honour. Nebuchadnezzar in the poem is especially obsessed with glory, *blæd*, and honour, *dom*. The concept of honour, reinforced by the poem's recurrent use of such heroic concepts as *blæd* and *dom*, I would like to argue, serves to strengthen the poem's contrast between the divine economy of salvation and the secular economy of honour and glory. One of the features of the text that seems to have attracted little critical attention is the fluctuations of glory and honour that are variously apportioned by God in the economy of salvation, a process that drives human history as perceived by the author of the Old English adaptation. The present article will focus on the poem's engagement with redefining secular notions of honour and glory, two ideological concepts that not only pervade Old English heroic verse but also exert a strong influence on religious poetry of the early medieval England. As the following pages will try to demonstrate, the poem represents, and deconstructs, these notions from a Christian perspective with a view to reformulating and Christianising secular notions of power and authority.

## 2. The Relationship of a Chosen Nation to Land and Temporary Political Structure

The opening of the poem demonstrates that God favoured Israel over other nations by providing them with worldly prosperity so that they were able to thrive. The nation's position of power was maintained by the heroic economy of treasure sharing among the Hebrews:

Gefrægn ic Hebreos eadge lifgean  
in Hierusalem, gold-hord dælan,  
ciningdom habban, swa him gecynde wæs. (*Daniel* lines 1–3)

I have heard tell of the Hebrews living blessedly in Jerusalem, sharing the gold-hoard, holding the kingdom, as was natural to them. (trans. Daniel Anlezark)

As in all earthly kingdoms, the economy of exchange of treasure is vital to the maintaining of the kingdom's prosperity, and the possession of property and prosperity is presented as natural to the Israelites. Prosperity and political power were first given to Moses; the strength of the Hebrew army granted to Moses by divine favour, and the exodus from Egypt was a test to the nation's courage: "þurh metodes mægen on Moyses hand wearð wig gifen, wigena mænio [...] þæt wæs modig cyn" (*Daniel* lines 4–7) ["since through the creator's power an army of many warriors was given into Moses's hand, and they journeyed from Egypt by a great wonder"; trans. Daniel Anlezark]. The worldly prosperity that came to Israel was also contingent upon its successful ruling of cities:

þenden hie þy rice rædan moston,  
burgum wealdan, wæs him beorht wela.  
þenden þæt folc mid him hiera fæder wære  
healdan woldon, wæs him hyrde god,  
heofonrices weard, halig drihten,  
wuldres waldend. (*Daniel* lines 8–13)

While they were able to guide their kingdom, rule the cities, their glory was bright. While that people intended to keep their father's covenant with him, God was their protector, the guardian of heaven's kingdom, holy Lord, glory's ruler. (trans. Daniel Anlezark)

The continuance in prosperity is guaranteed by God as long as the Hebrews keep covenant with the creator. Two syntactic units beginning with *þenden* [while] demonstrates that the Israelites' prosperity depends on their remaining faithful to their covenant with God.

In the economy of divine favour that exalts Jerusalem over neighbouring tribes, God is the ultimate dispenser of worldly property and prosperity. Courage

and strength are two virtues, distributed by God among the Hebrews, that contribute to the flourishing of Israel as well. Israel also thrived as a scourge of God, endowed with the domination over those people who were not mindful of their loyalty to the people of God:

Se ðam werude geaf  
 mod and mihte, metod alwihta,  
 þæt hie oft fela folca feore gesceodon,  
 heriges helmum, þara þe him hold ne wæs. (*Daniel* lines 13–16)

He gave that company courage and strength, the maker of all things, so that often, with helmed men of the army, they harmed the life of many a nation that was not faithful to him. (trans. Daniel Anlezark)

The poet makes a point that courage and strength are distributed by the creator and, as such, their distribution is subordinated to the economy of salvation that extends to all kingdoms. Such a dispensation of glory and prosperity follows certain logic: prosperity is given to those nations who observe the covenant and keep faith.

The reversal came to the Hebrews, however, when “hie wlenco anwod” (17) [“pride invaded them”; trans. Daniel Anlezark ], and when they failed to observe the law and broke their covenant, which resulted in their cutting off their bonds with God:

þa hie æcræftas ane forleton,  
 metodes mægenscipe, swa no man scyle  
 hie gastes lufan wið gode dælan. (*Daniel* lines 19–21)

Then at once they abandoned the power of the Law, the creator’s majesty, as no man should cut off his spirit’s love from God. (trans. Daniel Anlezark)

The poem’s play on the word “dælan” (*Daniel* lines 2, 21), whose primary sense is “distribute,” refers to the economy of worldly prosperity that the Hebrews are soon to lose.

As will be shown in the following pages, the literal and political exile to which the Israelites are subjected is purgative and salvific, insofar as it makes the Israelites realise their spiritual condition as exiles from God and pilgrims to the kingdom of God; they are to learn how to benefit from the economy of grace and take advantage of the worldly economy of honour and treasure only to the extent that it does not distract them from their spiritual goal. In the Old English *Daniel*, Israel lapses from his ordained status of the chosen nation because of the growing attachment to material values. God sends them good counsel a number of times:

Hie þære snytro soð gelyfdon  
 lytle hwile, oðþæt hie langung beswac

eorðan dreamas eces rædes,  
 þæt hie æt siðestan sylfe forleton  
 drihtnes domas, curon deofles cræft. (*Daniel* lines 28–32)

For a little while they believed in the truth of that wisdom, until passion, the joys of the earth, deprived them of eternal counsel, so that they themselves eventually abandoned the Lord's decrees, chose the craft of the devil. (trans. Daniel Anlezark)

The counsel of the wise men, however, does not prevent Israel from further lapse into longing after temporal values. This incurs God's anger and deprives them of prosperity:

þa wearð reðemod rices ðeoden,  
 unhold þeodum þam þe æhte geaf  
 Wisde him æt frymðe, ða ðe on fruman ær ðon  
 wæron mancynnes metode dyrust,  
 dugoða dyrust, drihtne leofost;  
 herepað tæhte to þære hean byrig,  
 eorlum elðeodigum, on eðelland  
 þær Salem stod searwum afæstnod,  
 weallum geweorðod (*Daniel* lines 33–41)

Then the prince of the kingdom grew belligerent, unfriendly toward the people to whom he gave property. At the start he had guided them, those who originally had been the dearest of humankind to the creator, the dearest host, most lovely to the Lord before that; he had showed them the line of attack to the high city, to those foreign men, in the native land where Salem stood secured skilfully, honoured with walls. (trans. Daniel Anlezark)

As the Israelites turn to accumulating worldly goods, they lose their prosperity that has been given to them provisionally. More to that point, they lose their status as a scourge of pagan nations who do not recognise God as their lord. That function is transferred by God from them to Nebuchadnezzar, who, despite being presented as a heathen and wicked conqueror of Jerusalem, becomes an unconscious agent of God's retribution bringing Israel to just punishment.

The opening section of the poem is embellished with a system of parallels and contrasts between Israel and Nebuchadnezzar's Babylon. While Jerusalem is initially presented as flourishing in the spirit of moderation, using and dispensing worldly possession wisely and acting as a scourge of divine justice, Nebuchadnezzar's Babylon is the opposite of the ideal from which Jerusalem has lapsed. In medieval exegesis, Nebuchadnezzar is identified with the devil and is the embodiment of anything but good. Bede in his commentary on Ezra and Nehemiah claims that Nebuchadnezzar, like Pharaoh in the Book of Exodus, is, typologically, the enemy of the church:

Nebuchadnezzar commanded all the peoples subject to him to fall down and worship his statue when they heard the sound of the instruments and the musicians, and the devil is eager to turn humankind away from uprightness of mind through the pleasure of earthly pomp and to subvert the hearts of the deceived into following the covetousness which is the service of idols. (119)

Nebuchadnezzar in *Daniel* is identified with Babylon. As “Babilone weard” (*Daniel* line 448) [“the guardian of Babylon”] he is contrasted with God as “heofonrices weard” (*Daniel* line 457) [“the guardian of heavenly kingdom”]. In the opening section of the poem, as he attacks Jerusalem, he is called “wera aldor-frea” (*Daniel* line 46) [“lord of men”], “Babilones brego” (*Daniel* line 47) [“Babylon’s prince”]. Nebuchadnezzar pillages Jerusalem: “Þa wigan ne gelyfdon, bereafodon þa recede wuldor readan golde, since and seolfre” (*Daniel* lines 58–60) [“Those warriors did not believe, they looted that glory of buildings, the temple of Solomon, of red gold, treasure and silver”]. They plunder Jerusalem carrying away its material wealth: “gestrudan gestreona under stan-hliðum” (*Daniel* line 61) [“they plundered treasure under the stone-cliffs”] (trans. Daniel Anlezark).

Nebuchadnezzar, despite being appointed the scourge of justice, is sinful. He is blamed by the poet for not being grateful to God for the gifts he received, for the advancement of his earthly glory, and for the wisdom he seeks from the wise men of Israel:

nales ðy þe he þæt moste oððe gemunan wolde  
 þæt he þara gifena gode þancode  
 þe him þær to duguðe drihten scyrede. (*Daniel* lines 85–87)

not at all for the reason that he could or would remember that he should thank God for the gifts which the Lord allotted him there for his benefit. (trans. Daniel Anlezark)

Graham D. Caie claims that by stealing the vessels, which are the symbol of the gift of wisdom, “and by his training of the Israelite youths, he hopes to acquire *snytro* [“wisdom”; trans. J.O.] in the same way as he accumulated his worldly possessions” (7). The holy vessels become part of the wealth that Nebuchadnezzar accumulates through conquest, using it to sustain his worldly economy of honour and power. Nebuchadnezzar’s desire for dominion makes him stand in parallel to the Hebrews’ *wlenco*. The assimilation of the Hebrews into Babylon, etymologically, the confusion of sin, reflects the evaluation of the Hebrews and Nebuchadnezzar as party to the same sin; their preoccupation with worldly prosperity leads to their punitive displacement from the position of power. The portrayal of Nebuchadnezzar as the scourge of God, ironically, provides a negative exemplum of the king’s presumption to usurp God’s role of the distributor of glory and prosperity; the fact that Nebuchadnezzar is given prosperity and power to conquer

Israel will in no way protect him from the harm that his arrogance will do to his soul later in the poem.

These contrasts made by the Old English poet evoke major characteristics of Augustine's contrast between the City of God and the city of men that he formulates in his *Civitate Dei*. Augustine groups humanity under two categories, namely, the elect, spiritually alienated from this world in which they abide in the constant expectation of salvation and habitation in the City of God, and the reprobate, who, preoccupied with earthly transitory values, represent *civitas terrena*, earthly city, which will cease to exist at the end of time. "God's City lives in this world's city, as far as its human element is concerned; but it lives there as an alien sojourner" (*City of God*, 18.1). While the former are essentially good, and the latter wicked and damned, Augustine argues that the city of men has an important role to perform in the history of salvation and the elect, while on pilgrimage to the other better world, must make use of its material gifts to an extent that serves their paramount goal of salvation and does not distract them from that goal. What Israel must remember is that while they do inhabit this world, they are *peregrini*, a word whose meaning in Augustine's usage ranges from pilgrims to exiles, alienated from this world, both metaphorically and literally, being not entitled to the enjoyment of this world's values.

The perception of Christians as pilgrims had been widespread in Christian culture until the Old English *Daniel*'s composition. The Christian status of pilgrims is foundational for Augustine of Hippo's concept of the City of God. As regards the commonplace representation Christians as pilgrims, Martin A. Claussen claims that Augustine views the Christians' *peregrinatio*, pilgrimage, on earth as "not only a metaphor, but also as the actual description of the Christian life" (47). According to Claussen, Augustine's theological underpinnings of the concept of Christians as *peregrini* to some extent derived from the definition of *peregrinus* that had functioned in the Roman law. As Claussen demonstrates, in the Roman law, *peregrinus* was juxtaposed to *cives*, citizen (35). In contrast to rights that citizens had, *peregrini* were entitled to limited rights: "He could enter into only certain kinds of contracts, his testatory and marriage rights were limited, he could not sue for personal damages. In the same way, he could never have dominium, or use civil processes of acquisition and transfer" (36). What distinguishes *peregrini* from full citizens of the Roman empire is thus their alienation from land and its rights.

Claussen claims that Augustine's concept of the City of God as a collection of individuals on pilgrimage to their spiritual destination was subtended by his distrust of the Roman Empire and the links between the state and the church as well as his belief that such links are merely provisional and not essentially important for the existence of the church (1991, 45). Claussen's additional argument is that Augustine premised his distinction between *peregrini* and the city of men on the distinction well known in Roman law between *utor* (use) and *fruo* (enjoyment)



of earthly values (49): “Augustine, in *City of God*, synthesized his views of the city of God on earth with his understanding of Roman law, and often contrasts the citizens of the earthly city, who have full rights to use and enjoy the goods of the earth, with the *peregrini*, belonging to the heavenly city, who can only use these same terrestrial goods” (51). He concludes that the ethical distinction of *utor/fruor* forbids the Christians to have the full possession of worldly goods and serves to make manifest the status of Christians as pilgrims of the City of God (52). Augustine thus describes Christians as *peregrini* not metaphorically, but in reality; in contrast to the citizens of the earth, they are not entitled to laying a valid legal claim to worldly possessions (51). While Augustine admits that earthly goods are necessary for the earthly city to prosper and some of them include gifts of God, he warns that they generate wars in the city of men and cause people to neglect higher goods that inform the peace of the City of God:

But a household of human beings whose life is not based on faith is in pursuit of an earthly peace based on the things belonging to this temporal life, and on the things belonging to this temporal life, and on its advantages, whereas a household of human beings whose life is based on faith looks forward to the blessings which are promised as eternal in the future, making use of earthly and temporal things like a pilgrim in a foreign land, who does not let himself be taken in by them or distracted from his course towards God, but rather treats them as supports which help him more easily to bear the burdens of the corruptible body which weighs heavy on the soul; they must on account be allowed to increase the load. (*City of God*, 19.17.15)

Claussen expressly argues that “by describing Christians as *peregrini*, Augustine is able to give them a fictive corporate legal identity, with a definite status and unique characteristics on earth” (48). One’s status of *peregrinus* is not related to the social class to which individual *homini Dei* belong; one’s ontological worth is solely determined by the very status of *peregrinus* (53). A *peregrinus* “is the object of the perfecting action of God” (53). These regenerative actions of God, according to Claussen, are discussed in Book 15 of *City of God*, where Augustine raises the topic of punishments aimed at healing *civitas Dei peregrina* as well as the issue of regeneration that elevates the city from this world to another. As *peregrini* must comply with burdens and responsibilities that bind residents of the earthly cities, they are firmly tied to *civitas terrena* (54). In *Daniel*, the Hebrews’ exile from Israel and Babylonian slavery are not only retributive, but also purgative.

Graham D. Caie claims that the function of the poem’s introduction is to advance the didactic theme that “all joy, prosperity and wisdom, symbolised by the possession of the holy city Jerusalem and the sacred vessels, come from God alone, and it is only right that man should give him thanks. The alternative is to give oneself up to pride and thus forfeit the divine city, replacing it with worldly vices and earthly knowledge” (5). The distinction made in the introductory portion of the poem, however, is not so much between divine and worldly wisdom, or the

unearthly nature of Jerusalem and Babylon as a symbol of pride and other worldly vices, as between the wise dispensation of worldly goods and their abuse. In other words, the poem's teaching reflects the Augustinian distinction between the use of worldly goods, practiced by the inhabitants of the City of God during their temporal exile on earth, and the corrupting enjoyment of worldly values. During their exile, the alienation from land property to which the Hebrews are subjected will teach them to practice *utor*, rather than *fruor*, in the maintaining of their worldly prosperity.

### 3. Nebuchadnezzar's Dream and *translatio imperii*

After the conquest and return to Babylon, Nebuchadnezzar exists at the peak of might:

þa wæs brene Babilone weard,  
 mære and modig ofer middangeard,  
 egesful ylða bearnum. No he æ fremede,  
 ac in oferhygde æghwæs lifde. (*Daniel* lines 104–107)

The guardian of Babylon was then famous, mighty and proud across the middle-earth, terrifying to the children of men. He did not keep the Law, but in every way lived in great pride. (trans. Daniel Anlezark)

It seems that Nebuchadnezzar *oferhygd* [pride] parallels Israel's *wlenco*. There is a connection between his lawlessness and pride that corresponds to Israel's rejection of the covenant. Both instances of pride coincide with the achievement of prosperity.

Another parallel is a warning that comes to Nebuchadnezzar, a warning that in both instances is ignored. The warning comes to Nebuchadnezzar in a dream, whose content he does not remember on his waking up:

þa þam folctogan on frumslæpe,  
 siððan to reste gehwearf rice þeoden,  
 com on sefan hwurfan swefnes woma,  
 hu woruld wære wundrum geteod,  
 ungelic yldum oð edscafte.  
 Wearð him on slæpe soð gecyðed,  
 þætte rices gehwæs reðe sceolde gelimpan,  
 eorðan dreamas, ende wurðan. (*Daniel* lines 108–115)

Then in the first sleep, after the royal prince turned in to bed, the sound of a dream came to the tyrant, wandering into his mind, about how the world was wondrously transformed, unlike the ages before the new creation. In sleep, the truth was made

known to him that the cruel end of each empire must happen, must come about for earth's joys. (trans. Daniel Anlezark)

It is of great significance that the poet focuses on the moral teaching that the dream is conveying, rather than its content. The figure of gold, silver, bronze and iron, present in the source, *Daniel* 2:31–42, but omitted in the Old English poem, was the medieval locus classicus for the concept of *translatio imperii*. Earl R. Anderson was the first to argue that Daniel is influenced by the early medieval concept of *translatio imperii*. Nebuchadnezzar's first dream, as reported in Vulgate, was locus classicus of the doctrine of *translatio imperii*: "a prophecy of the 'course of empire' from Babylon (the golden head of Nebuchadnezzar's image) to Media-Persia (the silver breast and arms) to Greece (the brass belly and thighs) to Rome (the iron legs)" (17). The reason for such an omission, I would like to argue, is the poet's aim to dehistoricise the Old Testament story and present the fall of Israel and Nebuchadnezzar as more generalised types of peoples and rulers who suffer divine retribution for their sins. This omission also helps to forge a more direct parallel between the fall of Jerusalem and the fall of Babylon. The theme that pervades the poem is thus not *translatio imperii* as such, but, rather, the relationship of the faithful to the world and its temporary political structures as well as the role of the city of men and its structures in the salvation of the elect. In the economy of grace that shapes human history, wealth and land are given to, and taken away from, people and their rulers. It seems that the juxtaposition between Israel in exile and the city of Babylon parallels Augustine's idea of the City of God and of men, whose inhabitants differ in their attitude to the possession of material values and land, is much more important to the Old English poet than the expression of the theme of *translatio imperii* found in exegetical works on the *Book of Daniel*.

Another contrast brought into the source by the Old English poet, between Nebuchadnezzar's greed and the Hebrews' God as the ultimate dispenser of property and prosperity, reinforces the Old English poet's idea of Israel's exile and deprivation as purgative. Since the wise men at Nebuchadnezzar's court are unable to give an account and explanation of the dream, they seek Daniel's wisdom and counsel. Daniel arrives at the hall to declare the content and meaning of the dream. While Daniel in the Old Testament source receives the knowledge of the dream directly from God, in the Old English poem the prophet has this knowledge mediated to him by an angel of God: "Him god sealde gife of heofnum þurh hleoðorcwyde haliges gastes, þæt him engel godes eall asægde swa his mandrihten gemæted wearð" (154–157) ["God gave him grace from the heavens through the utterances of a holy spirit, so that an angel of God explained everything to him, as his earthly lord had dreamt it"; trans. Daniel Anlezark].<sup>2</sup>

In the poem, Daniel is presented as recognising both earthly and divine hierarchies that exist in balance. The highest dispenser of wisdom is God, while

Nebuchadnezzar, whom Daniel tells the dream, is Daniel's earthly lord ("mandrihten," 157). In Vulgate, Daniel is rewarded by Nebuchadnezzar and made a governor, which is not mentioned by the poet: "Then the king advanced Daniel to a high station, and gave him many and great gifts: and he made him governor over all the provinces of Babylon: and chief of the magistrates over all the wise men of Babylon" (*The Book of Daniel* 2: 48). In the poem, however, when he has told the dream's beginning and end as well as provided its explanation, he enjoys prosperity among other learned men of Babylon as reward:

ða hæfde Daniel dom micelne,  
 blæd in Babilonia mid bocerum,  
 siððan he gesæde swefen cyninge,  
 þæt he ær for fyrenum onfon ne meahte,  
 Babilonie weard, in his breostlocan. (*Daniel* lines 163–167)

Then Daniel had great esteem, glory in Babylon among the scholars, after he had explained the dream to the king, which for his sins the guardian of Babylon previously had not been able to grasp in his heart. (trans. Daniel Anlezark)

Similarly to the case of warriors in heroic poems, it is Daniel's *blæd* [esteem, prosperity] that ranks him high among Babylonian scholars. Daniel is thus shown by the Old English poet to belong to the class of learned men that do not to exercise any secular power. The Old English poet thus avoids presenting Nebuchadnezzar as the direct dispenser of the gift that Daniel receives.

#### 4. The Golden Statue and the Furnace Episode

As a ruler of cities, and primarily the ruler of Babylon, Nebuchadnezzar is represented as being driven by an inordinate desire to accumulate wealth and satisfy his *fruor*, enjoyment of worldly values. Nebuchadnezzar and his Babylon are thus an extreme case of what Israel must avoid becoming. Although Nebuchadnezzar's power and prosperity is perceived as instrumental by the Old English poet in performing justice, his arrogant predisposition to attribute to himself the divine agency of a distributor of honour and glory will render his reign another exemplary warning against pride and overreliance on worldly values. While the statue of gold, silver, bronze and iron is removed from the poetic account of the dream, the golden statue that Nebuchadnezzar erects on the plain of Dura might correspond to the symbolism of gold in Jerome's interpretation of the passage, where he identifies the statue's gold with Babylonian empire over which Nebuchadnezzar rules. Like in the source, Nebuchadnezzar defies God by establishing an idol on the plain of Dura:

he wyrcaŋ ongan      weoh on felda  
 þam þe deormode      Diran heton,  
 se wæs on ðære ðeode      ðe swa hatte,  
 bresne Babilonige. (*Daniel* lines 168–173)

He began to build an idol on the plains that the brave ones call Dura, which was the region that was called thus: Babylon the mighty. (trans. Daniel Anlezark)

The meaning of the Old English *weoh* ranges from idol to wealth and money. The golden idol is thus metonymically a sign of the worldly glory, attached to the symbolic function of wealth that subtends the flow of goods in the heroic economy of exchange of honour. It is stressed by the Old English text that Nebuchadnezzar erects the idol for his people:

þære burge weard  
 anne manlican ofer metodes est,  
 gyld of golde, gumum arærde,  
 for þam þe gleaw ne wæs. (*Daniel* lines 173–176)

The guardian of the city raised up for men a human likeness, an idol of gold against the commandment of the creator, because the guardian of the empire was not wise. (trans. Daniel Anlezark)

Nebuchadnezzar's conditional gift of the golden idol that he erected for his people is a parody of God's gift of grace that he freely bestows on those who wilfully keep covenant with him. Nebuchadnezzar bestows his gift against God's will. The fact that the idol has a human likeness implies that it is an image of Nebuchadnezzar himself. Nebuchadnezzar's position of "burge weard" ["the guardian of the city"; trans. Daniel Anlezark] is also significant in the larger context of a description evoking the patristic understanding of Babylon as synonymous with the earthly city that is at war with the City of God. The symbolism of the golden statue also testifies to Nebuchadnezzar's desire for *fruor*, enjoyment of material possession. The statue, arguably, forges the ultimate contrast between Babylon, whose lord and citizens claim a full possession of empire and its material values, and the Israel, which represents the City of God on pilgrimage to the kingdom of God on account of its exile from land as well as deprivation of material possessions; as exiles and slaves in Babylon, Israel are purged from their desire to possess worldly goods and reorient their goal from an earthly dominion to a spiritual empire.

The contrast of righteous and unrighteous kinds of obedience is essential to the Old English poet's dichotomy of the cities of God and of men. The Babylonians worship the idol that Nebuchadnezzar has erected. Their obedience is unrighteous:

Fremde folcmægen, swa hyra frea ærest,  
 unræd efnde, (him þæs æfter becwom  
 yfel endelean), unriht dyde. (*Daniel* lines 185–188)

The populace did as their lord did first, acted without heed, did an unrighteous thing  
 (an evil reward later came to them for that. (trans. Daniel Anlezark)

The three youths defy Nebuchadnezzar's decree that all his subjects should worship the idol. The poet makes a vivid contrast between the obedience ("hlyst" 178) of Babylonians with the youths' faithfulness to Abraham's covenant:

ða wæron æðelum Abrahames bearn,  
 wærfæste, wiston Drihten  
 ecne uppe, ælmightigne. (*Daniel* lines 193–195)

These were by noble descent sons of Abraham, they were faithful to the covenant,  
 they knew the Lord, eternally on high, the Almighty. (trans. Daniel Anlezark)

They are heedful of "hyra þeodnes dom" (190) ["the princes's edict"]. They remain faithful to God who endowed them with grace: "Cnihtas cynegode cuð gedydon, þæt hie him þæt gold to gode noldon habban ne healdan, ac þone hean cyning, gasta hyrde, ðe him gife sealed" (198–199) ["The royal youths made it known that they would neither have nor hold that gold as their god, but rather the high king, the shepherd of souls, who gave them grace"] (trans. Daniel Anlezark).

They will not be persuaded to "þæt hie þider hweorfan wolden, guman to þam gyldnan gylde, þe he him to gode geteode" (*Daniel* lines 203–204) ["that they should turn there, the men toward the golden idol, which he had set up as a god for them"]. It is reported to Nebuchadnezzar that the youths will not worship the idol that he has erected to his honour and glory: "hegan ne willað, ne þysne wig wurðigean, þe ðu þe to wuldre wundrum teodest" (*Daniel* lines 207–208) ["do not wish to do this, nor honour this idol, which you have wondrously set up to your glory"] (trans. Daniel Anlezark). The worship that Nebuchadnezzar desires is connected to the heroic conception of honour and glory that is borrowed from Old English poetic lore. The gold that served as the material to build the idol is the material that engines the flourishing of the earthly honour that accrues to Nebuchadnezzar as an earthly prince.

The idol of gold is symbolic of secular and pagan economy of exchange in which the youths refuse to participate. The poet makes a contrast between the secular flow of treasure that lies at the foundation of Nebuchadnezzar's power and the divine economy of grace that lies at the centre of the covenant between the Hebrews and God. The contrast between Nebuchadnezzar's Babylon as the city of men and Israel as a type of City of God on pilgrimage emerges from the episode that gives an account of furnace miracle, during which the three youths are put on

trial, forced to renounce their faith, thrown to a fiery furnace, and miraculously rescued from fire by an angel of God. As they suffer torment in the furnace, the youths express their contrition, on behalf of other Hebrews, and recognition of the Hebrews' arrogance:

We ðæs lifgende  
 worhton on worulde, eac ðon wom dyde  
 user ylðran; for oferhygdum  
 bræcon bebodo burhsittende,  
 had oferhokedon halgan lifes. (*Daniel* lines 295–299)

Living in the world we brought this about, and our elders also committed crimes;  
 in arrogance the citizens broke commandments, despised the calling of holy life.  
 (trans. Daniel Anlezark)

The Old English poet has the boys recognize *oferhygd* rather than *wlenco*, imputed to them by the poem in the poem's introduction, which makes the Hebrews parallel Nebuchadnezzar's pride. The poet thus creates a structural parallel between the fall of the Hebrews and their exile from Jerusalem and the fall of Nebuchadnezzar and his own exile from Babylon that is happen later in the poem.

The youths say that their exile is punishment for their sin and that they are rightly punished with the servitude under Nebuchadnezzar's tyrannical rule:

Siendon we towrecene geond widne grund,  
 heapum tohworfene, hyldelease;  
 þa usic bewræcon to þæs wyrrestan  
 eorðcyninga æhta gewealde,  
 on hæft heorugrimra, and we nu hæðenra  
 þeowened þoliað. þæs þe þanc sie,  
 wereda wuldorcýning, þæt þu us þas wrace teodest. (*Daniel* lines 300–307)

We are exiled across the wide earth, dispersed in crowds, without protection;  
 throughout many lands our life is despised and a byword among many peoples,  
 who have banished us as chattels to the rule of the worst of earth's kings, into the  
 captivity of warlike men, and we now suffer servitude to the pagans. To you be  
 thanks for this, wondrous king of hosts, that you have made this punishment for us.  
 (trans. Daniel Anlezark)

The boys recognise Israel's alienation from land and property as God's justice; only in exile can Israel truly reassert their status as pilgrims not preoccupied with temporality. The youths' contrition brought about by the suffering in the furnace causes them to reassert their refusal to obey Nebuchadnezzar's command to worship the idol, the ultimate symbol of the earthly city's commitment to worldly values.

When the boys are miraculously rescued from the furnace by an angel of God, Nebuchadnezzar, once he acknowledges the Hebrew God's superiority over his idol of gold, releases and rewards them:

Pær þa mod-hwatan  
 Þry on geðancum ðeoden heredon,  
 bædon bletsian bearn Israela  
 eall land-gesceaft ecne Drihten  
 ðeoda waldend. (*Daniel* lines 356–360)

Then the stouthearted three praised the prince in their thoughts, the children of Israel commanded all land-creatures to bless the eternal Lord, the ruler of nations. (trans. Daniel Anlezark)

The youths then turn to Nebuchadnezzar in gratitude: “hwurfon hæleð geonge to þam hæðenan foran” (*Daniel* lines 430–433) [“Then the king ordered the young men to come to him. The bold youths obeyed the order, the noblemen turned as they were instructed, the young heroes went before the pagan”; trans. Daniel Anlezark]. As the furnace episodes demonstrates that the boys succeed in saving their lives and disobeying Nebuchadnezzar's order to worship idols, the furnace episode inculcates in the Israelites the need to draw benefit from Nebuchadnezzar's earthly power in a way that does not cause a loss of divine grace again.

The youths' obedience causes the restoration of the covenant and the regaining of their favour, an addition to the source that the poet makes (Bjork 225). It is important to notice the symbolic function of treasure that is the symbol of favour extended by God through Nebuchadnezzar; Nebuchadnezzar returns treasure and heirlooms to the Hebrews:

Agæf him þa his leoda lafe þe pær gelædde wæron  
 on æht ealdfeondum, þæt hie are hæfdon.  
 Wæs heora blæd in Babilone, siððan hie þone byrne fandedon,  
 dom wearð æfter duguðe gecyðed, siððan hie drihtne gehyrdon  
 Wæron hyra rædas rice, siððan hie rodera waldend,  
 halig heofonrices weard, wið þone harm gescylde. (*Daniel* lines 452–457)

Then he returned to them the heirlooms of the people, which had been brought there in the possession of those ancient enemies, so that they had honour. Glory was theirs in Babylon, after they passed the test in the fire, their honour was made known among the seasoned troop, after they had obeyed the Lord. Their counsels were potent, after the ruler of the skies, the holy guardian of the heavenly kingdom, shielded them against that harm. (trans. Daniel Anlezark)

Like Daniel for his service to Nebuchadnezzar, the boys too receive and accept their share of prosperity, *blæd*, from their earthly lord. While Nebuchadnezzar



distributes material wealth among the Hebrews as their reward, they in fact benefit from a spiritual gift of greater value. The narrator admits that the Hebrews win earthly glory in Babylon. However, they obtain it owing to their spiritual merits from God rather than Nebuchadnezzar. Like Daniel before, the youths enjoy prosperity and honour as a result of their obedience to God. Israel, under the Babylonian rule, must somehow comply with Nebuchadnezzar's earthly authority. As the faith of the three boys restores the covenant between Israel and God, God bestows upon the Israelites worldly prosperity under Nebuchadnezzar's rule removing the danger of persecution.

### 5. Nebuchadnezzar's Conversion

The youths' reception of *blæd* that follows, and compensates for, their exilic dispossession of land and honour is also structurally important in the poem. The restoration of the Hebrews to grace foreshadows Nebuchadnezzar's exile and his own restoration to reason and former glory that follows his conversion. At the time of his prosperity at its highest, Nebuchadnezzar dreams a second vision, in which an angel fells a towering tree, sheds the tree of its fruit. The only part of the tree that remains fixed in the ground is its stem, from which new shoots are to grow when God wills it. Nebuchadnezzar asks Daniel to interpret the dream:

Swa þin blæd lið.      Swa se beam geweoþ,  
 heah to heofonum,      swa þu hæleðum eart  
 ana eallum      eorðbuendum  
 weard and wisa.      Nis þe wiðerbreca,  
 man on moldan,      nymðe metod ana.  
 Se ðec aceorfeð      of cyningdome,  
 and ðec wineleasne      on wræc sendeð,  
 and þonne onhweorfeð      heortan þine,  
 þæt þu ne gemyndgast      æfter mandream,  
 ne gewittes wast      butan wildeora þeaw,  
 ac þu lifgende      lange þrage  
 heorta hlypum      geond holt wunast.  
 Ne bið þec mælmete      nymþe mores græs,  
 ne rest witod,      ac þec regna scur  
 weceð and wreceð      swa wildu deor,  
 oðþæt þu ymb seofon winter      soð gelyfest,  
 þæt sie an metod      eallum mannum,  
 reccend and rice,      se on roderum is. (*Daniel* lines 563–579)

So your glory lies. As the tree grew, high to the heavens, so are you the guardian and guide for men, alone among all dwellers of the earth. There is no rival for you, a man on the earth, except the creator alone. He will cut you off from your kingdom,

and send you friendless into exile, and then he will transform your heart, so that you do not remember human happiness, nor be aware of any intellect except the way of wild animals, but you will continue living for a long time on the courses of the deer across the forest. There will be no food for you except the grass of the moor, nor resting place fixed for you, but the shower of rain will waken and pursue you like a wild animal, until after seven years you believe the truth, that there is one creator for all people, a ruler and a power, who is in the heavens. (trans. Daniel Anlezark)

The tree felled by the angel represents the transience of Nebuchadnezzar's glory, *blæd* (*Daniel* line 562). Nebuchadnezzar's *blæd* is contrasted with the youths' *blæd*; in the divine economy of grace, the king loses what the youths have gained. According to Daniel's interpretation of the dream, the vision of the tree that gives shelter and nourishment to animals, is felled on an angel of God's command, and is not restored to its former glory before the period of seven years foreshadows Nebuchadnezzar's exile and life in wilderness among animals that will conclude with his conversion and return to Babylon. Like in the source, Daniel exhorts the king to give alms:

Syle ælmyssan,      wes earmra hleo,  
 þinga for ðeodne,      ær ðam seo þrah cyme  
 þæt he þec aworpe      of woruldrice.  
 Oft metod alæt      monige ðeode  
 wyrcan bote,      þonne hie woldon sylfe,  
 fyrene fæstan,      ær him fær godes  
 þurh egesan gryre      aldre gesceode. (*Daniel* lines 586–592)

Give alms, be the protector of the weak, place a petition before the prince, before that time should come when he cast you out of the empire. Often the creator allows many a nation fixed in sin to make remedy, when they themselves wish to, before God's sudden attack deprives them of life with frightening terror. (trans. Daniel Anlezark)

The counsel, however, is expanded by the Old English poet. The Vulgate version only consists of a counsel to give alms with a view to averting God's judgment of Nebuchadnezzar: "Wherefore, O king, let my counsel be acceptable to thee, and redeem thou thy sins with alms, and thy iniquities with works of mercy to the poor: perhaps he will forgive thy offences" (*Book of Daniel* IV: 27). In *Daniel*, admonishment includes an additional reflection on the transience of earthly kingdoms, complete with a consolation that punishment visited upon the wicked serve to purge them of sin and restore them to former glory.

Nebuchadnezzar is presented as a king who does not listen to a wise man's counsel and grows in pride, paralleling the Hebrews at the beginning of the poem:

Ongan ða gyddigan      þurh gylp micel  
 Caldea cyning      þa he ceastergeweorc,

Babilone burh,     on his blæde geseah,  
 Sennera feld     sidne bewindan,  
 heah hlifigan;     þæt se heretyma  
 werede geworhte     þurh wundor micel,  
 wearð ða anhydig     ofer ealle men,  
 swiðmod in sefan,     for ðære sundorgife  
 þe him god sealde,     gumena rice,  
 world to gewealde     in wera life. (*Daniel* lines 599–607)

The king of Chaldeans began to brag in a great boast when he ruled the city; in his glory he saw the city of Babylon towering high, encompassing the broad field of Shinar. The general had built that great marvel for the troop, and grew stubborn over all people, arrogant in mind, because of the unique grace God had given him, the empire of men, the world to rule in mortal life. (trans. Daniel Anlezark)

Here, Nebuchadnezzar is both a king and a universalised figure representing all the reprobate inhabitants of the earthly city; Babylon itself embodies, in his eyes, *civitas terrena*. He is a negative exemplum of kingship and the *Daniel* poet's representation of his pride at a time of prosperity strongly evokes an episode in *Beowulf*. In the Old English poet's account, Nebuchadnezzar's fall from prosperity resembles the fate of the hypothetical proud prince, from Hrothgar's discourse on pride in *Beowulf*, whose pride at the height of prosperity brings him to ruin. Hrothgar begins his lesson on pride with a remark that Beowulf has achieved prosperity: Blæd is aræred geond widwegas, wine min Beowulf, ðin ofer þeoda gehwylce" (*Beowulf* lines 1703–1705) ["Your glory is upraised, my friend Beowulf, through the world's wide ways over every nation"; trans. R.D. Fulk]. He adds that his physical agility must be balanced by wisdom: "Eal þu hit gepyldum healdest, mægen mid modes snyttrum" (*Beowulf* lines 1705–1706) ["You will keep hold of all of it steadily, strength and discernment of intellect"; trans. R.D. Fulk].<sup>3</sup> Wisdom derives from the appropriate use of material possessions that are invariably gifts from God; it is God who distributes material and gifts.

What the *Daniel* poet and the *Beowulf* author share is the perception that it is prosperity and trust in material property that generate the growth of pride, *oferhygd*, that results in a proud individual's displacement from society and his exile. In *Beowulf*, Hrothgar presents the evil king Heremod as well as the hypothetical prince as rejecting this wisdom and growing proud. Their internal imbalance is paralleled by Nebuchadnezzar's madness that causes him to leave Babylon and live in exile like an animal for the period of seven years. While Hrothgar presents life in exile as leading to inevitable termination of one's life, exile in *Daniel* is represented as spiritually regenerative. It inculcates in the individual how to use property only to the extent that is permittable to the *peregrini* to the City of God.

Once Nebuchadnezzar is restored to his humanity is he able to come back to the city of men:

Gewat þa earmsceapen eft siðian,  
 nacod nydgenga, nið geðafian,  
 wundorlic wræcca and wæda leas,  
 mætra on modgeðanc, to mancynne,  
 ðonne gumena weard in gylpe wæs. (*Daniel* lines 631–635)

Then the humiliated one went journeying back to mankind, the beggar naked without clothes, accepting the chastisement, a miraculous exile, more measured in intellect that the protector of men had been in his boasting. (trans. Daniel Anlezark)

Like Israel, Nebuchadnezzar is alienated from property and land. The passage that follows is an addition to the biblical material. In the Old Testament *Book of Daniel*, on his return Nebuchadnezzar praises God in an extended speech, his transformation into an enlightened king and death not existent in the biblical account. In *Daniel*, however, Nebuchadnezzar is presented as a model worthy of emulation for Christian kings. Nebuchadnezzar takes on the responsibility of “liffsuma” after he is restored to the throne:

þa wæs eft geseted in aldordom  
 Babilone weard, hæfde beteran ðeaw,  
 leohtran geleafan in liffruman,  
 þætte god sealde gumena gehwilcum  
 welan swa wite, swa he wolde sylf. (*Daniel* lines 640–644)

When the guardian of Babylon was again established in lordship, he had a better manner, a more enlightened belief in the source of life, that God gave to each man prosperity or punishment, as he himself desired. (trans. Daniel Anlezark)

The fragment emphasises God’s agency in the process of salvation economy. This creates a contrast to Nebuchadnezzar’s former arrogance and his ingratitude to God for the gift of prosperity.

It is also essentially important that in the Old English poem, exile as a time of loss of property and prosperity is a formative period for Nebuchadnezzar as a ruler. He learns the ways of wise kingship through exile and hardship, as Daniel declared: “swa ær Daniel cwæð, þæt se folc-toga findan sceolde earfoð-siðas for his ofermedlan” (*Daniel* lines 654–656) [“just as Daniel earlier had said, that the sovereign must discover the way of hardship because of his great pride”]; trans. Daniel Anlezark]. Nebuchadnezzar disseminates wisdom, alongside Daniel the prophet:

Swa he ofstlice godspellode  
 metodes mihtum for mancynne,  
 siððan in Babilone burhsittendum  
 lange hwile lare sægde,  
 Daniel domas. (*Daniel* lines 657–661)

So he urgently preached concerning the creator's power before mankind, when Daniel for a long while announced his doctrine and judgments to the citizens in Babylon. (trans. Daniel Anlezark)

Samantha Zacher claims that the Old English text confuses the grammatical subject of "he" at line 657, so that both Nebuchadnezzar and Daniel can actually be designated (103). Nebuchadnezzar thus serves as an example that it is God who causes the rise and demise of kings and kingdoms on earth: "oððæt him God wolde þurh hryre hreddan hea rice" (*Daniel* lines 669–670) ["until God wished to deprived him of the high kingdom through his demise"; trans. Daniel Anlezark]. The divine economy of property and prosperity continues to give life to the empire even after his death:

siððan þær his aferan ead brittenon,  
 welan, wunden gold, in þære widan byrig,  
 ealh-stede eorla, unwaclice,  
 heah hord-mægen, þa hyra hlaford læg. (*Daniel* lines 671–674)

Afterward there his heirs shared undiminished the prosperity, wealth, twisted gold, the great mass of treasure, when their lord lay dead. (trans. Daniel Anlezark)

It has been argued that Nebuchadnezzar's Babylon is redeemed through Nebuchadnezzar's conversion and maturation as king. Finnegan claims that these lines suggest that after Nebuchadnezzar's conversion, until the reign of Balthazar, Babylon is fully converted: "the poem suggests that heathen Babylon, an unconscious instrument in a divine plan, having overcome lapsed Jerusalem, was converted by true Israel's remnant, and became for a time, in the absence of physical Jerusalem's capacity to suggest spiritual realities, the earthly symbol of the Heavenly Jerusalem, the true City of God, whose citizens Daniel and the three children never ceased to be" (Finnegan 207). Finnegan supports his view with Augustine's idea of the city of men and the City of God from *Enarratio in Psalmum 64* and *The City of God* (especially book 15 chapter 2): "With the king's conversion and Daniel's preaching to Nabuchodonosor's receptive subjects, the poem, suggests that the physical symbol of the heavenly Jerusalem becomes, for a time, the transfigured burh of Babylon" (209). More recently, Tristan Major argues that the *Daniel* poet makes a pointed contrast between Babel and Babylon in the poem, point out that "Babel is a warning of the past, not an indicator of how present events will turn out" and that Nebuchadnezzar, unlike Nimrod, and the builders of Babel, is redeemed (234).

I would like to argue, however, that the structure of the poem suggests otherwise. Contrary to Tristan Major's claim that Babylon is redeemed, Babylon is a warning of the past too, as the reversal that befalls the city three generations after Nebuchadnezzar's reign, when Belshazzar becomes king. The narrative of

the fall of Babylon, the result of Belshazzar and his people's pride, echoes the reversal and fall of Jerusalem from the poem's beginning. Like the Hebrews at beginning of the poem, Belshazzar is destroyed by "wlenco" ['pride'] (357). As a result of the pride, Babylon will lose its glory, *blæd*, as it will be invaded by the Medes: "ða metod onlah Medum and Persum aldordomes ymb lytel fæc/let Babilone blæd swiðrian, /þone þa hæleð healdan sceoldon" (*Daniel* lines 680–683) ["Then, within a short while, the ordaining Lord granted dominion to the Medes and Persians and let the glory of Babylon, which those men should have guarded, dwindled away"; trans. Daniel Anlezark]. The poet's comment on the passing of Babylon's glory, that it is God who leads the Medes to Babylon, completes the poem's focus on the pattern of rise and fall that characterises temporal political structures in *Daniel*.

## 6. Conclusion

The poem's beginning and the end of Nebuchadnezzar's reign serve as an occasion for the poet to articulate an expression of the normative use of property that characterises the City of God on earth. The poem offers a discussion of worldly honour in the context of Christian economy of salvation. As a retributive action of God, exile is a purgative and salvific experience in the poem. The *Daniel* poet's handling of the theme of exile approximates the Augustinian concept of *Civitas Dei peregrina*, the City of God on pilgrimage. The text engages in a deconstructive appropriation of themes and motifs from vernacular verse and elevates the concept of the exchange of honour into a religious dimension. The poet's syncretic manipulation of the vernacular imagery and heroic concepts is subtended by an Augustinian use of the concepts of exile and pilgrimage. The concept is used in the poem in a surprising way, however. While Augustine himself explored a commonplace contrast between Jerusalem as a type of heaven and Babylon as a type of hell, the *Daniel* poet avoids such a symbolism; cities in the poem, both Jerusalem and Babylon, do not function as contrasting symbols of good and evil and types of the City of God and the city of men as such.<sup>4</sup> There is nothing in the Old English poem that suggests the poet intended to present Jerusalem as a type of the Church. Rather, the proper Christian attitude is conceptualised in the Augustinian terms of exile and pilgrimage. Both Jerusalem and Babylon, as symbols of the reversal of fortune and fall from prosperity, are actually more likely to evoke the symbolism of ruin as a sign of transience that pervades many Old English poems. Both Jerusalem and Babylon, therefore, function as a warning against commitment to worldly power that characterises all *civitas terrena*.

As regards the poem's representation of Nebuchadnezzar, his royal power and his humanity, the text deliberately obscures and collapses the divide between personal and political aspects of Nebuchadnezzar's persona. In the economy of

salvation, exile and madness protect Nebuchadnezzar from the harm that worldly economy of honour brings to his soul. Nebuchadnezzar is made the audience's equal in the Christian economy of salvation. As a king, Nebuchadnezzar is bifurcated into an individual, who eventually repents his sin and converts, and a scourge of God, whose suppression of the Hebrew results from God's justice. His exercise of power is deliberately ambiguous, since it partly represents his personal fault and is partly an instrument of just punishment for Israel's national sin. Nebuchadnezzar is eventually redeemed from his sin, because he recognises the role that he is to play as king.

## Notes

- 1 All quotations from Old English *Daniel*, as well as their modern English translations, come from Anlezark, *Daniel*. 2011. *Old Testament Narratives*. London: Harvard University Press. Verse numbers are indicated in brackets.
- 2 In *Vulgate*, the meaning of the dream is revealed to Daniel in a vision from God at night: "Then was the mystery revealed to Daniel by a vision in the night: and Daniel blessed the God of heaven" (*Daniel* 2: 19).
- 3 All quotations from Old English *Beowulf*, as well as their modern English translations, come from Fulk, R.D. 2010. *The Beowulf Manuscript*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. Verse numbers are indicated in brackets.
- 4 Tristan Major demonstrates that it was Augustine of Hippo who invented and popularised this typological contrast between Jerusalem and Babylon (Maror 2018, 69).

## References

- Anderson, Earl R. 1987. "Style and Theme in the Old English Daniel." *English Studies* 68.1: 1–23.
- Augustine. 2003. *The City of God*. Trans. Henry Bettenson. London: Penguin Books.
- Anlezark, Daniel. 2011. *Old Testament Narratives*. London and Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Baker, Peter S. 2013. *Honour, Exchange and Violence in Beowulf*. D.S. Brewer: Cambridge.
- Biblia Sacra Vulgata*. 2007 [1969]. Ed. Robert Weber and Roger Gryson. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Bjork, Robert E. 1980. "The Oppressed Hebrews and the Song of Assarias in the Old English *Daniel*." *Studies in Philology* 77.3: 213–226.

- 
- Caie, Graham D. 1978. "The Old English *Daniel* as a Warning Against Pride." *English Studies* 59.1: 1–9.
- Claussen, Martin A. 1991. "'Peregrinatio' and 'Peregrini' in Augustine's 'City of God.'" *Traditio* 46: 33–75.
- DeGregorio, Scott. 2006. *Bede: On Ezra and Nehemiah*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Farell, R.T. 1967. "The Unity of the Old English *Daniel*." *The Review of English Studies* 70: 117–135.
- Finnegan, Robert Emmet. 1984. "The Old English *Daniel*: The King and the City." *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*. 85.2: 294–211.
- Fulk, R.D. 2010. *The Beowulf Manuscript*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Major, Tristan. 2018. *Undoing Babel: The Tower of Babel in Anglo-Saxon Literature*. Toronto: Toronto University Press.
- Zacher, Samantha. 2013. *Rewriting the Old Testament in Anglo-Saxon Verse*. London: Bloomsbury.