

Title	Daniel : the old English poem of Nebuchadnezzar against God
Sub Title	
Author	石黒, 太郎(Ishiguro, Taro)
Publisher	慶應義塾大学藝文学会
Publication year	1997
Jtitle	藝文研究 (The geibun-kenkyu : journal of arts and letters). Vol.73, (1997. 12) ,p.462- 478
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	安藤伸介, 岩崎春雄両教授退任記念論文集
Genre	Journal Article
URL	<a href="https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00072643-00730001-0462">https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00072643-00730001-0462</a>

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the KeiO Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

# *Daniel* : the Old English Poem of Nebuchadnezzar against God

Taro Ishiguro

The Old English poem *Daniel*<sup>(1)</sup> was long regarded merely as a paraphrase of the first five chapters of the Book of Daniel<sup>(2)</sup> and thus the title *Daniel* has been used to refer to this anonymous poem preserved in the codex generally known as MS Junius 11. The poem had received little critical attention except that which discusses the Song of Azarias alleged to be an interpolation, until some studies defended the unity of the poem<sup>(3)</sup>. Robert T. Farrell has demonstrated that there is no sufficient reason to assume that the poem has been interpolated<sup>(4)</sup>. Farrell's study culminates in his edition of the poem, after which there has been no question against its unity<sup>(5)</sup>. Critics at last started to discuss its literary value. The discussion of the theme was first explicitly discussed by Graham D. Caie in 1978, who argued that our poet "radically and consciously changes the original didactic purpose of the biblical narrative . . . to a universal warning of the dangers of pride at a time of prosperity"<sup>(6)</sup>. While the biblical account focuses on the prophetic ability of Daniel and uses the episodes concerning Nebuchadnezzar, the Babylonian king, to delineate his ability, the Old English poem puts more emphasis on the king. Yet Farrell's observation that "Daniel and the three children represent a positive morality; Nabuchodonosor, Baltasar and the Jews (as they are presented being led into the captivity) are depicted as evil-doers"<sup>(7)</sup> seems questionable. If we regard the two Songs in the middle of the poem (283-408) as

interludes and concentrate on the “dynamic”<sup>(8)</sup> narrative of the poem, we can see that Nebuchadnezzar occupies the central stage of the narrative and the other characters, even Daniel, appear peripheral. As Caie remarks, the poem is not about Daniel despite its title and its main source, but about Nebuchadnezzar whose life represents a warning against pride<sup>(9)</sup>. The whole poem constitutes a narrative about a king who errs not once for his presumption and incurs condign punishments for it, but is at last redeemed by benevolent God; Nebuchadnezzar is just an earthly king before God, the Heavenly King, but he does not recognise the omnipotence of God, which causes him to come a long way before he finds salvation. This paper will examine first how Nebuchadnezzar is presented in the narrative and then how the poet’s use of epithets<sup>(10)</sup> depicts him in contrast with God.

The poem begins with a ‘prologue’ which gives an account of the Israelites’ fortunes and foreshadows Nebuchadnezzar’s future. The ‘prologue’ does not have any source in the Bible and is thus considered as the poet’s invention. It tells that the Israelites enjoyed prosperity after they accepted the Lord’s authority through Mosaic Law. But their prosperity was conditional :

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 (8-11)

“As long as they were permitted to dispose over the realm and to govern their cities, theirs was a dazzling prosperity. As long as the people were willing to keep their Father’s covenant among them, [God] was a

good shepherd to them.”<sup>(11)</sup>

The people of Israel believed in the truth of divine wisdom only for a little while (28-29a) and they in the end abandoned the decrees of the Lord (31b-32a). God protected and bestowed prosperity on them while they showed respect and humility towards Him, and dispossessed them of peace and prosperity that they had enjoyed, once they abandoned Him. They sought earthly pleasure and defied the Almighty. This presumption on the part of the Israelites resulted in the sack of Jerusalem and their captivity in Babylon. God became angry with the Jews and put an end to their prosperity by leading the Chaldeans to the city. This brings Nebuchadnezzar onstage as he was to lead the troops to sack Jerusalem. The recollection of the hubris and nemesis of the Israelites constitutes a ‘prologue’ to the poem’s main narrative, Nebuchadnezzar’s own hubris and nemesis<sup>(12)</sup>, as well as providing a scene to introduce him into the narrative.

Nebuchadnezzar is not presented as an evil character in the beginning where he devises the sack of Jerusalem. He is given neutral epithets, neither good nor evil in themselves, *wera aldorfrea* “lord of men” (46b) and *Babilones brego* “prince of Babylon” (47a). Attacking Jerusalem itself may not be a praiseworthy act, but it is part of God’s plan. During the plunder, Nebuchadnezzar is not mentioned but the poet merely describes how his troops deprive the city of its treasures. The name Nebuchadnezzar appears again as the subject of the sentence which states that the Israelites were led to captivity (72a). Nebuchadnezzar’s character is not yet emphasised here. It is revealed when he has completed the attack and returned to his own realm in which he is the king and the highest of all—at least so he seems to believe.

The king's presumption seems to increase after the sack of Jerusalem. He orders the wisest of the Jewish youths to be brought to him, who will counsel wisdom to him. But he does not intend to thank God for the prosperity which he enjoys (85-86). The king is declared by the poet to be *se hæðena* "the heathen one" (94b) when the three youths, Hananiah, Azariah and Mishael, are brought in front of him. He is not only heathen but "fond of pomp" (*corðres georn* 95a) and "proud" (*þam wlancan* 96a). This hubris of his invites a warning from God.

Nebuchadnezzar receives the first warning from God in a dream (110). He is not happy with the dream and summons magicians to interpret it. The magicians cannot carry out interpretation because the king does not tell them what he dreamed. Our poet does not give us the details of the dream which Nebuchadnezzar saw. He only provides the gist of what God told the king in his dream :

hu woruld wære wundrum geteod,  
ungelic yldum oð edsceafte.  
Wearð him on slæpe soð gecyðed,  
þætte rices gehwæs reðe sceolde gelimpan,  
eorðan dreamas, ende wurðan. (111-15)

"how the world was miraculously transformed into a new creation unlike the former ages. The truth was made known to him in sleep that there must befall and come about a violent end of every empire and of earth's pleasures."

It may be that the dream was in essence the same as what is in the 'prologue,' that no mundane power or prosperity is perpetual and that

it disappears immediately one lost God's favour. If the 'prologue' is to declare the controlling theme of the poem, the message of the first dream is naturally imagined as the first warning against pride or hubris to Nebuchadnezzar. Daniel the prophet comes out and recounts the dream to the king, which his heathen magicians could not do. The king is told about "the destiny of nations" (160b) and immediately perceives "the beginning and end of what was revealed to him" (162). The king does receive the warning here, but he does not amend.

In spite of Daniel's God-given presageful prophecy, the king does not believe in the Lord's omnipotence. He starts building an idol. He does so, our poet says, "because he was not a discerning man, this impetuous and wisdom-wanting keeper of the kingdom" (176-77a). Nebuchadnezzar forces his subjects to worship the idol. They perform this unrighteous worship because they do not know the better counsel (182b), but the three youths refuse the king's command. The king gets furious with their defiance. He is described to be angry by three adjectives while dealing with the youths: *bolgenmod* (209a), *yrre* (210a and 224a), and *hreohtmod* (241a). God has become also angry (*reðemod* 33) in the 'prologue' when the Hebrews abandoned Him. The king is angry with the three youths because they defy him, but they defy him because they worship God, their true Lord. The king thus defies God. He orders them to be thrown into fire.

A miracle saves the youths and gives a warning to Nebuchadnezzar. God acknowledges a firm faith in the three youths and sends an angel to protect them. The deadly fire does not harm the youths at all but instead attacks the heathens who have been surrounding the furnace. The Babylonian king witnessing the miracle is depicted in the middle of the rejoicing Hebrews:

Hyssas wæron  
bliðemode, burnon scealcas  
ymb ofn utan, alet gehwearf  
teonfullum on teso. Ðær to geseah  
Babilone brego. Bliðe wæron  
eorlas Ebreā (251b-56a)

“The youths survived, cheerful of spirit ; the minions outside were burnt up about the furnace—the fire had turned to the hurt of the persecutors while the prince of Babylon looked on. The Hebrew men were cheerful.”

The king may have been shocked for a while, as we are told a few lines later that “[t]hen the headstrong king, when he came to trust his senses, saw a miracle, come to pass in the midst of the punishment” (269-70a). He may have been unable to trust his senses while the fire turned onto his minions, so shocked. The scene is so shocking to the king that “[i]t seemed uncanny to him” (270b). After the two interludes known as the Song of Azarias and the Song of the Three Children, the king remarks :

“þæt eower fela geseah,  
þeode mine, þæt we þry sendon,  
geboden to bæle in byrnende  
fyres leoman. Nu ic þær feower men  
geseo to soðe, nales me sefa leogeð.” (411b-15)

“Many of you, my lords, saw it, that we dispatched

three men, sentenced to burning, into the scorching glare of the fire. Now I see four men there for sure : my mind does not deceive me.”

It is important that the king himself witnesses the marvel and he believes it as he has perceived it with his senses.

To the king’s remark, his counsellor, *cyninges ræswa*, replies and encourages him to recognise who has given the youths such a gift and released them (416–29). The use of the word *ræswa* is significant. The word occurs only in poetry and usually means “a prince, king” or “a leading man, chief person, leader”<sup>(13)</sup>. The word appears three more times in the poem, which all refer to Nebuchadnezzar. The word is related to the verb *ræswan* “to think,” and it must be being used in its fundamental sense “one who takes thought” here. Bosworth and Toller cite only this line of the poem under the signification, “a counsellor”<sup>(14)</sup>. This counsellor may quite possibly be Daniel<sup>(15)</sup>. Whoever it is, the king takes his *ræswa*’s advice : he releases the three youths and acknowledges publicly that He who has saved them is the Wielder of mighty powers. Nebuchadnezzar then summons an assembly and declares the omnipotence of God which he has found in the miraculous preservation of the youths. The poet gives the king the epithet *ræswa* for the first time at this point : *Swa wordum spræc werodes ræswa* “Thus in these words the mentor of the multitude spoke” (486). Thus the *cyninges ræswa* succeeds in converting his king to such an extent that the king himself is called *ræswa*, and in making him recognise the meaning of the miracle which has taken place in front of the king ; but yet his success is short-lived.

We are not told what the king actually has done, but that :



No þy sel dyde,  
ac þam æðelinge oferhygd gesceod,  
wearð him hyrra hyge and on heortan geðanc  
mara on modsefan þonne gemet wære,  
oðþæt hine mid nyde nyðor asette  
metod ælmihtig, swa he manegum deð  
þara þe þurh oferhyd up astigeð. (488b-94)

“It made him none the better, for presumptuousness  
scathed the prince. His thought grew haughtier and  
the pretention in his heart and in his mind greater than  
was fitting—until the almighty ordaining Lord put  
him down by force, as he does many of those who in  
their presumptuousness clamber upwards.”

His pride has grown greater than is “fitting” and it is foretold that he will be punished for it. The generalisation of God’s punishment of those who are inflated with pride reminds us of the ‘prologue.’ God sends a warning dream to Nebuchadnezzar again, the content of which is more personal than the previous dream. Our poet says, *him þæt neh gewearð* “it concerned himself” (496b). The content is described by the poet. The description (497-522) is stylistically well balanced by “the use of verbal parallels” as Farrell remarks in his note to the passage<sup>(16)</sup>: it seemed to the king (*þuhte him*) that there was a lofty tree which towered up to the stars and embraced the whole world; it seemed to him that the tree was a shelter for beasts and birds; and it seemed to him that there descended an angel from the heavens and declared in a clear voice—the angel ordered (*het*) the tree to be hewn down and the beasts to flee when it is falling; he ordered its leaves and branches to be cut off but

its root to be kept ; and he ordered the tree to be shackled and tortured, *þæt his mod wite þæt migtgra wite wealdeð þonne he him wið mæge* “so that *his mind* may know that a mightier being than *he* can resist has the power of punishment” (my emphasis) (521-22). There is a transition without explanation from the tree to the king here<sup>(17)</sup>. The poet implies that the dream is about the king himself and that the king may have understood but not want to acknowledge it. The dream is now to be interpreted by Daniel. Daniel explains to the king that the dream is about the king himself and that the tree signifies him. He encourages the king to amend before God punishes him. But Daniel’s counsel does not avail : “instead, his pride mounted up aloft from his heart” (596b-97a) . He starts boasting of his fortified city of Babylon and praises the city.

The praising of the city is another form of idolatry. Nebuchadnezzar has forced his subjects and the Israelites, including the three youths, to worship the statue for their god. He has built the city which dominates the world and feels proud of it. But he should remember that it is a special gift (*sundorgife* 605b) from God and that it is He who has allowed him to build such a city. Instead, he extols the city addressing it by *ðu* “thou” (608-11). It is a sin of hubris that he neglects God, the Creator, and praises the city, the created. It is the same by nature as the worship of an idol.

Nebuchadnezzar goes into exile as a penalty for the hubris. The poet relates that the people’s lord (*gumena drihten* 612b) fled<sup>(18)</sup>, and that the king of the festive city (*winburge cyning* 621b) suffered misery. The king is then called *se earfoðmæcg* “the sufferer” (622a) and *wilddeora gewita* “the comrade of wild beasts” (623a)<sup>(19)</sup>. It is noteworthy that one who is called a king at one line is referred to by such epithets in the immediately following lines. More importantly,

however, it is at the point where he is called by such miserable names that Nebuchadnezzar undergoes thorough conversion. The text reads :

Ða se earfoðmæcg up locode,  
wildeora gewita, þurh wolcna gang,  
gemunde þa on mode þæt metod wære,  
heofona heahcýning, hæleða bearnum  
ana ece gast.<sup>(20)</sup> (622-26a)

“When he looked up as a sufferer, a comrade of wild beasts, through the passage of clouds, he remembered in mind that the Lord, the high King of the heavens, was the only everlasting spirit of children of people.”  
(My translation)

The poet uses epithets of a king in clauses describing the past, *þær þe he ær wide bær herewosan hige* “to the place where he had carried a soul of a war-king” (627a-28a) ; and *ðonne gumena weard in gylpe wæs* “than when he was in pride as the guardian of people” (635). But he is given miserable epithets, *earmsceapen* “miserably shaped,” *nacod nydgenga* “naked wretched wanderer,” *wræcca* “an exile” and *wæda leas* “without garment” (631-34) in a clause which accounts that he is returning to mankind, viz. to the city of Babylon.

The king is again called by the poet as *ræswa* when he has returned from exile. He is restored to the throne as the guardian of Babylon. He recounts widely how he has undergone conversion during the exile, and preaches Gospel before mankind. After the severe but fruitful seven-year exile, he does not err any more but rules over his kingdom as a noble king should do :

siððan weardode wide rice,  
heold hæleða gestreon and þa hean burh,  
frod, foremihtig folca ræswa,  
Caldea cyning, oðþæt him cwelm gesceod (664-67)

“afterwards he protected his wide kingdom, guarded the treasures of men and the high city, the experienced and most mighty mentor of people, the king of the Chaldeans, until death harmed him.” (My translation)

The word *ræswa* is again used for Nebuchadnezzar, and his *ræswa*-ness is corroborated by the adjective *frod* “wise, prudent.” He has finally become a king who deserves the epithet *weard* “guardian.” He dies as people’s lord (674b).

During his life prior to the exile, Nebuchadnezzar does not acknowledge, before the omnipotence of God, that he is an earthly king and that he is merely a mortal powerless being. This contrast is well seen in the poet’s use of the various epithets for Nebuchadnezzar and God. Nebuchadnezzar is king of Babylon and thus the word *cyning* “king” is often used as his epithet, together with *Caldea* “of the Chaldeans” (599a ; 667a), *leoda* “of people” (435a) or *winburge* “of the festive city” (621b) preceding it to make a compound. He is in some places called *swiðmod cyning* “the arrogant king” (100a ; 161b ; 268a ; 528a), *wulfheort cyning* “the wolf-hearted king” (135a ; 246a) and *anmod cyning* “the proud king” (224a). He is also referred to simply as *cyning* six times (95a ; 129b ; 148b ; 165b ; 416b ; 430a). God is on the other hand qualified as a much greater *cyning*. He is called *þone hean cyning* “the high king” (198b), *witig wuldorcyning* “the wise king of

glory” and *heofona heahcýning* “the high king of the heavens” (625a). God is thus a “high” king of the heavens while Nebuchadnezzar is just a king of one nation on earth. More frequently used than *cýning* to refer to Nebuchadnezzar is the word *weard* “guardian.” Nebuchadnezzar is as often as ten times in the poem called *Babilone weard* “the guardian of Babylon” (99b; 104b; 117a; 167a; 209b; 228b; 448b; 460a; 487a; 641a), similar to which are the epithet phrases *þære burge weard* “the guardian of the city” (173b) and *Babilones brego* “the ruler of *Babylon*” (47a; 255a). Here too, it is seen that God is distinguished by the qualifiers which are used with *weard*. God is called *heofonrices weard* “the guardian of the heavenly kingdom” (12a; 26a; 457a) and *middangeardes weard* “the guardian of the world” (596a). It is clear from the qualifiers that the realms which they guard are much different in scale.

God is naturally most often referred to by the word *god* “God,” forty times in the poem<sup>(20)</sup>. Another word which signifies the Christian Deity also appears at a considerably high frequency: *metod*, whose meaning “in heathen times may have been *fate, destiny, death*” according to Bosworth and Toller, occurs twenty-six times in the poem and exclusively refers to God. It is interesting to see that the Song of Azarias begins with *Metod alwihta, hwæt* “Lord of all creatures, behold!” (283a) and concludes with *soðfæst metod* “the Lord steadfast in truth” (332b). These two words are used exclusively for God naturally from their meanings.

There are a few other words used by the poet to signify both God and Nebuchadnezzar which draw attention. The word *drihten* “lord” is mainly employed to signify God, in twenty-six places and incidentally at the same frequency as *metod*, but in four other places it is used as an epithet of Nebuchadnezzar. At 130b, the magicians who have been

summoned to recount the first dream address their king as *drihten*. At 547b, Daniel is said to have thought that his *drihten* is guilty against God, before he interprets the king's second dream, and not to have spoken much to his *drihten* at 593b when he has finished the interpretation. This use of *drihten* is comparable to that at 130b in that the word is used to indicate the social relationship between Daniel and Nebuchadnezzar. Nebuchadnezzar is to Daniel his king and master as much as he is to the magicians.

The word *aldor* is used in apposition with *drihten* at 548a when Daniel thinks that Nebuchadnezzar is guilty against God. Daniel, when speaking to Belthazar, Nebuchadnezzar's descendant<sup>(22)</sup>, calls Nebuchadnezzar *pin aldor* "your parent" at 753a, using the word in its original sense "elder, parent"<sup>(23)</sup>, and again as *aldor ðeoda* "people's lord" at 757b which is the epithet given to Nebuchadnezzar by the poet at 409b if the widely accepted emendation holds<sup>(24)</sup>. *Aldor* thus seems to be the epithet reserved for Nebuchadnezzar. It is supported by the uses of *aldorfrea* and *aldordom* in the poem. The former, a compound of simplexes both meaning "lord," occurs when Nebuchadnezzar is first introduced into the narrative. The latter, which may be translated as "dominion, rule," is resumed by the king when he has returned from the exile.

*Frea* seems to be a term equally applicable to God and Nebuchadnezzar. Of the four occurrences as an epithet of God, two are found in the Song of the Three Children which addresses to God. Another is used between the Songs, at 350b, and looks back on the miraculous preservation of the youths as the aid of the *frea*'s power. The other occurrence of *frea* is placed in apposition with *god*, and is not to be confused with Nebuchadnezzar. It should be noted further that *frea* is not accompanied by a determiner when it refers to God; when it is used

for Nebuchadnezzar, it occurs with a possessive adjective. At 159b, Daniel recounts the dream *sinum frean* “to his lord” ; at 185b, people of Babylon worship the idol *swa hyra frea ærest* “just as their lord first [did]” ; and at 585a, Daniel himself addresses Nebuchadnezzar by *frea min* “my lord.” Nebuchadnezzar is a *frea* only in the eyes of his subjects. His *frea*-ship is restricted in such a way that the word sounds hollow when it is used for the earthly king.

*Deoden* refers to both God and Nebuchadnezzar in the poem, but our poet basically uses the word as the epithet of the latter. God is given the epithet before Nebuchadnezzar is introduced into the narrative and between the two Songs where it is unambiguous that the word refers to God. Nebuchadnezzar is meant by the word eight times in the poem. In one occasion the king’s counsellor (*ræswa*) addresses him by the word (419a). It makes a parallel to the use of *frea* when Daniel addresses the king as *min frea* during his interpretation of the second dream.

Daniel is given comparatively fewer epithets. He is qualified by the following when he first appears in the narrative : *se wæs drihtne gecoren, snotor and soðfæst* “who was chosen by the Lord, wise and firm in truth” (150b-51a). The same phrase is repeated when he appears before Belthazar at 735-36a. Another epithet given to him is *godes spelboda* “God’s messenger,” which we find in two places (532a ; 742a). He is once called *se wisa* “the wise one” (549a), and *æcræftig ar*<sup>(25)</sup> “the messenger wise in law” (550a). At 593a, his name is just mentioned, without any epithet given. The fact that so few epithets are given to Daniel suggests that our poet puts the less emphasis on him than on Nebuchadnezzar. Daniel’s role in the poem appears peripheral where Nebuchadnezzar is given subtle images of his own by various epithets.

The poem as it stands concludes with a passage (675-764)

depicting the last day of Belthazar, the third generation after Nebuchadnezzar. Belthazar commits the sins of his predecessor, but is not to be redeemed unlike the latter. God allows the Medes and the Persians to take over the Chaldean kingdom. Although the foreign troops are approaching, Belthazar holds a feast with his kinsmen, where a mysterious writing appears on a wall. No one can interpret the writing except Daniel. Daniel reproves Belthazar for putting the sacred vessels of the Israelites into people's possession and compares him with Nebuchadnezzar. Nebuchadnezzar, Daniel says, would not do such a thing and he announced that only He who grants earthly prosperity is the Lord of all creatures. Belthazar denies the existence of God. Here ends the whole poem, and this seemingly abrupt ending has invited criticism that the poem is incomplete<sup>(26)</sup>. I assume that it is structurally complete as we have it now. The passage about the Israelites in the beginning of the poem forms a prologue to the narrative of Nebuchadnezzar. The Israelites were punished because they became arrogant toward God, and the punishment was brought to them through the plunder of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans. Now Belthazar becomes so presumptuous that he gives away sacred cups plundered from Jerusalem. And it is clearly implied that his kingdom is about to be destroyed by the Medes. The passage of Belthazar and the mysterious writing on a wall thus makes an epilogue to the narrative of Nebuchadnezzar. Belthazar is brought in to conclude the kingdom and delineate Nebuchadnezzar's faith in God after his true conversion.

We have seen that the poet's presentation of Nebuchadnezzar by means of various epithets puts him in good contrast with God. The opposition is not that of wise Daniel and Nebuchadnezzar, but that of the heavenly King and the earthly king. The earthly king fails to acknowledge God and worships idols. Idolatry springs from hubris, and



vice versa. In idolatry it is not God but an idol, a man-made thing, that is worshipped, but man is a creature of God. Nebuchadnezzar not only ignores the Creator but defies Him by worshipping idols. The various epithets given to Nebuchadnezzar show that he is merely an earthly king who can be debased to a miserable man once nemesis has fallen on him. Nebuchadnezzar is a man of hubris. His hubris leads to idolatry. Nebuchadnezzar symbolises idolatry in opposition to God. Only when he has humbled himself to such an extent that he finally acknowledges God, does he find salvation. The poem is a narrative of Nebuchadnezzar's hubris, nemesis, and ultimate salvation, and Daniel, the three youths and Belthazar are playing supporting roles.

I offer this small study to honour two *ræswan* of mine, who, *snottre and soðfæste*, have been guiding me since I entered Keio University.

## NOTES

- (1) All references to *Daniel* are cited from G. P. Krapp, ed., the *Junius Manuscript*, Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records 1 (New York, 1931).
- (2) F. A. Blackburn, ed., *Exodus and Daniel*, Belles-Lettres Ser. 1 (Boston and London, 1907; rpt. New York, 1972), ix.
- (3) E. g., R. T. Farrell, "The Unity of old English *Daniel*," *Review of English Studies* ns 18 (1967), 117-35; and H. J. Solo, "The Twice-Told Tale: a Reconsideration of the Old English *Daniel*, 245-429," *Papers on Language and Literature* 9 (1973), 347-64.
- (4) op. cit.
- (5) *Daniel and Azarias*, Methuen's Old English Library (London, 1974).
- (6) "The Old English *Daniel*: a Warning against Pride," *English Studies* 59 (1978), 1-9, 2.
- (7) "The Structure of Old English *Daniel*," *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 69 (1968), 533-59, 543.
- (8) R. E. Finnegan, "The Old English *Daniel*: the King and His City," *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 85 (1984), 194-211, 194.

- (9) op. cit., 2.
- (10) I use the term “epithets” in this article for members of a variation which refer to a character of the narrative, e. g. Nebuchadnezzar.
- (11) Translation of the Old English longer than a phrase are taken from S. A. J. Bradley, trans. and ed., *Anglo-Saxon Poetry* (London, 1982), unless otherwise noted.
- (12) I use these Greek terms as they well express the situation discussed in this paper. A mortal man’s arrogance against a deity (hubris) deserves a retribution (nemesis).
- (13) J. Bosworth and T. N. Toller, *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* (Oxford, 1898), s.v.
- (14) *ibid.*
- (15) For discussion on the identity of the *ræswa*, see J. A. George, “*Daniel* 416-29 : an ‘Identity Crisis’ Resolved ?”, *Medium Ævum* 60 (1991), 73-76.
- (16) Farrell, *Daniel and Azarias*, 78.
- (17) *ibid.*, 79.
- (18) I should like here to thank Professor Jane Roberts for her helpful comment on lines 612-19.
- (19) Bosworth and Toller, s. v. *gewita*, translates the phrase as “one who has the same knowledge [wit] as the beasts.”
- (20) Punctuation is altered at 623-24.
- (21) The number of occurrence decreases depending on the interpretation of a couple of dubious places. One is at 11b, where the word may well be an adjective, and the other is at 193a, where Krapp inserted *god* which is not in the MS, presumably *metri causa*.
- (22) The poem does not present him as Nebuchadnezzar’s son, but as the third generation of his descendants (675).
- (23) See Bosworth and Toller, s. v. *ealdor* ; and also A. Cameron, A. C. Amos, A. diP. Healey et al., eds., *Dictionary of Old English* (Toronto, 1986-), s. v.
- (24) The MS reads *ealde þeode*, which editors emend to *ealdor þeode*. I follow Blackburn in reading *þeode* as a genitive plural.
- (25) The MS reads *ar cræftig ar*, whose emendation is necessary. See notes in the editions.
- (26) See Farrell, *Daniel and Azarias*, 32-33.