

## WAS JOSEPH A TYPE OF DANIEL? TYPOLOGICAL CORRESPONDENCE IN GENESIS 37–50 AND DANIEL 1–6

JOSHUA M. PHILPOT\*

**Abstract:** *Joseph and Daniel share many similarities: both men are Hebrew exiles, both speak God’s word prophetically, both recount dreams, and both are given the ability to interpret those dreams. Even though they are like bookends in the Hebrew canon, these connections may suggest intentionality. In what follows, I will argue on thematic, sequential, and linguistic grounds that the author of the book of Daniel shaped the narrative of Daniel 1–6 after Joseph’s life. If this is correct, the texts of Genesis 37–50 (and 41 in particular) and Daniel 1–6 (and 2 in particular) portray the historical Joseph as typological of the historical Daniel, only situated in another role and context. In other words, the intentional literary strategy employed by the author of Daniel 1–6 was to construct his narrative in such a way to evoke and mirror the Joseph story in Genesis 37–50. This is to say that the author of Daniel noticed a pattern in Joseph that is then replicated in Daniel, and thus the author presents Daniel according to that Joseph-pattern because the author of Daniel recognizes (i.e. interprets) the repetition of the pattern to be significant. I will demonstrate this thesis within both texts, grounded upon the following three premises: (1) historical and thematic development; (2) linguistic and sequential event correspondence in Genesis 41 and Daniel 2; and (3) escalation within the redemptive historical outline of the Hebrew canon. Finally, the theological implications of this study will be summarized in the conclusion.*

**Key words:** *Daniel, Joseph, typology, biblical theology, intertextuality, canonical theology, correspondence*

### I. TYPOLOGY

While many scholars, past and present, have engaged in the study of typology of the NT’s use of the OT,<sup>1</sup> many others have documented how OT authors em-

---

\* Joshua Philpot is an adjunct professor in the School of Christian Thought at Houston Baptist University and associate pastor at Founders Baptist Church, 24724 Aldine Westfield Rd., Spring, TX 77373. He may be contacted at [jphilpot@hbu.edu](mailto:jphilpot@hbu.edu).

<sup>1</sup> In the last several decades we have seen the renewal of evangelical interest in biblical theology and intertextuality, e.g. Leonhard Goppelt, *Typos, the Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982); idem, “τύπος, ἀντίτυπος, τυπικός, ὑποτύπωσης,” TDNT 8:246–59; E. Earle Ellis, *Paul’s Use of the Old Testament* (1981; repr., Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2003), 126–35; idem, “How the New Testament Uses the Old,” in *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods* (ed. I. Howard Marshall; Exeter: Paternoster, 1977), 210–12; Elizabeth Achtemeier, “Typology,” *IDBSup* 926–27; S. Lewis Johnson, *The Old Testament in the New: An Argument for Biblical Inspiration* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980), 53–79; idem, “A Response to Patrick Fairbairn and Biblical Hermeneutics as Related to Quotations of the Old Testament in the New,” in *Hermeneutics, Inerrancy, and the Bible: Papers from ICBI Summit II* (ed. Earl D. Radmacher and Robert D. Preus; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984), 791–99;

ploy the same hermeneutic even before the time of Christ and the apostles.<sup>2</sup> While the terms “type” (Gr. *τύπος*) and “antitype” (Gr. *ἀντίτυπος*) are merely descriptive terms and not used explicitly in the LXX in the way described here, one would be mistaken to assume that OT authors avoided type-antitype constructions. To the contrary, this study will seek to show that the Joseph narrative described by Moses in Genesis 37–50 is indeed typological of Daniel as described by its author in Daniel 1–6.<sup>3</sup>

---

Grant R. Osborne, “Type, Typology,” in *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology* (ed. Walter A. Elwell; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984); idem, “Type; Typology,” *ISBE* 4:930–32; G. K. Beale, “Did Jesus and His Followers Preach the Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? An Examination of the Presuppositions of Jesus’ and the Apostles’ Exegetical Method,” *Them* 14 (1989): 89–96; John E. Alsup, “Typology,” *ABD* 6:682–85; G. P. Hugenberger, “Introductory Notes on Typology,” in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New* (ed. G. K. Beale; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), 331–41; Stephen G. Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty: A Biblical Theology of the Hebrew Bible* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2003), 231–34; D. A. Carson, “Mystery and Fulfillment: Toward a More Comprehensive Paradigm of Paul’s Understanding of the Old and the New,” in *Justification and Variegated Nomism*, vol. 2: *The Paradoxes of Paul* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 425–28; Scott T. Yoshikawa, “The Prototypical Use of the Noachic Flood in the New Testament” (Ph.D. diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2004), 8–35; R. T. France, “Relationship Between the Testaments,” *Dictionary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible [DTIB]* (ed. Kevin J. Vanhoozer; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005), 669; Daniel J. Treier, “Typology,” *DTIB* 823–27; Bruce K. Waltke and Charles Yu, *An Old Testament Theology: An Exegetical, Canonical, and Thematic Approach* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2007), 136–39; G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson, “Introduction,” in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 25; Mark D. Elliott, “Typology,” *NIDB* 5:692; Kenneth Berding and Jonathan Lunde, “An Introduction to the Central Questions in the New Testament Use of the Old Testament,” in *Three Views on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (ed. Kenneth Berding and Jonathan Lunde; Counterpoints; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008), 18–22; Dana M. Harris, “The Eternal Inheritance in Hebrews: The Appropriation of the Old Testament Inheritance Motif by the Author of Hebrews” (Ph.D. diss.; Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2009), 15–19; David L. Baker, *Two Testaments, One Bible: A Study of the Theological Relationship Between the Old & New Testaments* (3rd ed.; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2010), 169–89.

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., Baker, “Typology and the Christian Use of the Old Testament,” 313–30; Foulkes, “The Acts of God,” 342–71; Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985); James M. Hamilton, “Was Joseph a Type of the Messiah? Tracing the Typological Identification Between Joseph, David, and Jesus,” *SBJT* 12 (2008): 52–77; Geoffrey W. H. Lampe and Kenneth J. Woollcombe, eds., *Essays on Typology* (SBT 22; Naperville, IL: A. R. Allenson, 1957); Claus Westermann, ed., *Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics* (Richmond: John Knox, 1963); Horace D. Hummel, “The Old Testament Basis of Typological Interpretation,” *BR* 9 (1964): 38–50. For an example of typological exegesis without labeling it as such, see Daniel I. Block, “Echo Narrative Technique in Hebrew Literature: A Study in Judges 19,” *WTJ* 52 (1990): 325–41.

<sup>3</sup> I refer to the writer as “the author of Daniel” instead of “Daniel” since it is feasible that someone other than the historical Daniel may have constructed a book on Daniel’s life and prophecies. The authorship of Daniel is a highly contested issue and beyond the scope of this article. For an updated discussion see Andrew E. Steinmann, *Daniel* (ConcC; St. Louis: Concordia, 2008); James M. Hamilton Jr., *With the Clouds of Heaven: The Book of Daniel in Biblical Theology* (NSBT 32; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2014), 21–40; Ernest C. Lucas, *Daniel* (Apollos Old Testament Commentary; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2002). The critical consensus that the book of Daniel was composed during, or sometime near, the Maccabean struggle in the second century BC is to be rejected based on internal evidence (see Jan-Wim Wesseliuss, “The Literary Nature of the Book of Daniel and the Linguistic Character of its Aramaic,” *ArSt* 3 [2005]: 241–83) and external evidence (see Roger Beckwith, “Early Traces of the Book of Daniel,” *TynBul* 53 [2002]: 75–82). For that view, see George Buchanan, *The Book of Daniel* (Mellen Biblical Commentary; Lewiston, NY: Mellen Biblical Press, 1999); John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary*

Before proceeding in analyzing this relationship, however, a preliminary question must be asked: What is typology? Such a discussion is extensive, and the literature vast.<sup>4</sup> For the sake of brevity, the argument here will adopt the definition proposed by Hamilton that typology is “canonical exegesis that observes divinely intended patterns of historical correspondence and escalation in significance in the events, people, or institutions of Israel, and these types are in the redemptive historical stream that flows through the Bible.”<sup>5</sup> Hamilton’s essay treats patterns of linguistic and sequential points of contact under the heading of “historical correspondence,” and for reasons that will be stated in the following paragraph the present study will treat them separately. As a subset of a canonical approach to reading the OT and NT,<sup>6</sup> typology assumes the teleological relationship of one text to another (historical correspondence), with one divine author guiding persons, events, and institutions through human agency.<sup>7</sup> The question of whether the analogical relationship includes a prophetic element—“prophetic” in the sense that the type foreshadows a greater future occurrence (i.e. escalation)—is also a subset of typological analysis, although if one accepts the divine inspiration of the Bible, then the forward-looking nature of the type is a given.<sup>8</sup>

Thus, in following the definition of typology above, and in order to establish biblical warrant for typological relationships, the methodology employed in this paper will examine three specific areas—historical correspondence, linguistic/sequential data, and escalation in the redemptive-historical stream of the OT. Further clarification might be helpful. I am using historical correspondence to refer to the parallel contexts in which the type-antitype relationships appear and the thematic development within each. Linguistic data are primarily concerned with the author’s use of specific words or phrases that are unique to both narratives and

on the Book of Daniel (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994); John E. Goldingay, *Daniel* (WBC 30; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1989); W. Sibley Towner, *Daniel* (Interpretation; Atlanta: John Knox, 1984), and others.

<sup>4</sup> For an updated discussion on typology, see Andrew David Naselli, *From Typology to Doxology: Paul’s Use of Isaiah and Job in Romans 11:34–35* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2012), 125–28; Hoskins, *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple*, 18–36.

<sup>5</sup> Hamilton, “Was Joseph a Type of the Messiah?,” 53. While this definition grounds the type in true historical events, Gerhard von Rad, “Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament,” in *Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics*, 19, argues against the historicity of the underlying events in favor of a theological reading only. The method proposed by G. K. Beale is also worth adopting. He sees five characteristics that are common in types and which serve to reveal typological relationships with or without the presence of τύπος: (1) close analogical correspondence of truths about persons, events, or institutions; (2) historicity; (3) a pointing-forwardness; (4) escalation in meaning between correspondences; and (5) retrospection. G. K. Beale, *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 19.

<sup>6</sup> As articulated by Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993).

<sup>7</sup> Richard Lints, *The Fabric of Theology: A Prolegomenon to Evangelical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 273.

<sup>8</sup> For a more recent analysis and overview of typology within biblical studies, see Joshua M. Philpot, “See the True and Better Adam: Typology and Human Origins,” *Bulletin for Ecclesial Theology* 5.2 (2018): 77–90.

which intentionally link type with antitype. Additionally, in some cases the sequence of events in the antitype matches that of its type. This sequential event correspondence is particularly relevant in the Joseph-Daniel stories of Genesis 41 and Daniel 2, which will be discussed in more detail momentarily.<sup>9</sup> Redemptive-historical import refers to the implications of the type-antitype in the larger storyline of the Bible, which may also include the position of the books in the Hebrew canon. Escalation, finally, involves the movement from a lesser event, person, or institution to a greater one by means of progression or fulfillment.<sup>10</sup> It is within these parameters that one can know whether or not a typological relationship exists, and how to proceed in analyzing that relationship.

There is a second question that must be asked, which is why there are typological constructions in the OT. This question is outside of the scope of this paper, although others have probed this question deeply and deserve notice.<sup>11</sup> I will only treat it tentatively in the conclusion. With the above definition of typology in mind, it is now appropriate to turn to the question at hand, which is whether or not the author of Daniel takes a typological approach in positioning Joseph as a type of Daniel.

## II. IS JOSEPH A TYPE OF DANIEL?

1. *Historical and thematic development in Genesis 37–50 and Daniel 1–6.* Before going to a more detailed analysis of Genesis 41 and Daniel 2, some thematic points of contact between Joseph and Daniel are in order, some of which are more obvious than others. Although these connections are not necessarily linguistic or sequential, there are strong signs of literary borrowing and influence. The key questions are how the author of Daniel was influenced by the Joseph story and what he sought to accomplish by borrowing from it.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> The phrase “court tales” is often used as a classification of the genre of Daniel 1–6. Although this genre label is advocated by numerous scholars (Collins, *Daniel*, 38–51; Goldingay, *Daniel*, 6 *passim*; Lucas, *Daniel*, 22–31), it is to be rejected on the basis that it supposes Daniel to be simply one among many legendary myths of court contests in the ancient Near East (ANE), which were prevalent in the second century BC. The Daniel narratives are presented as historical, which can be seen by the careful attention the author gives to dating and names. Moreover, for the author of Daniel to claim God’s sovereign rulership over kings on the basis of fictional tales denigrates the narrative character of the book and the weightiness of the matters contained therein—that is, the end of the world. For the purposes of this paper, then, the text of Daniel 1–6 will be treated as true and historical narrative portraying the lives and events of true and historical persons.

<sup>10</sup> Baker, *Two Testaments, One Bible*, 192.

<sup>11</sup> See the analysis in Philpot, “See the True and Better Adam,” 77–90.

<sup>12</sup> I primarily have in mind the arguments of Lucas, *Daniel*, 65–66; Terence Mitchell, “Shared Vocabulary in the Pentateuch and the Book of Daniel,” in *He Swore an Oath: Biblical Themes from Genesis 12–50* (ed. Richard Hess, Gordon Wenham, and P. E. Satterthwaite; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994); Towner, *Daniel*, 29–31. See also Wesselius, “The Literary Nature of the Book of Daniel and the Linguistic Character of its Aramaic,” 249–50, who writes, “This is not an instance of a relatively vaguely defined process of ‘influence’ of one text on another, but that we are dealing here with a highly sophisticated literary emulation. . . . The author of Daniel wrote his book in such a way that as a whole it refers to other literary works within and outside of the Hebrew Bible, and within this framework contains numerous allusions to various elements in these other works.” More positively, see the argument that the typological

The first observation is that Joseph and Daniel are the only Hebrews given the ability to interpret dreams in the OT. Dreams and dream reporting are widespread,<sup>13</sup> but these two are unique in that God equips them specifically with the ability for interpretation.<sup>14</sup> Second, both are *captives* in a *foreign land* on the cusp of an *exodus*—Joseph in Egypt, Daniel in Babylon. Third, just as Joseph is described as “handsome in form and appearance” (Gen 39:6), Daniel, likewise, is “without blemish, and of good appearance” (Dan 1:4).<sup>15</sup> Fourth, both avoid compromising God’s law. In the fracas of Genesis 39, Joseph refuses to lie with Potiphar’s wife (Gen 39:7–18). In Daniel 1, Daniel refuses to eat from the king’s portion of food (Dan 1:8–16) and thus defile himself and his friends.<sup>16</sup> Fifth, both are given exceptional wisdom by God, which is recognized by their pagan counterparts (Gen 41:39; Dan 1:4, 17; 5:10). Sixth, both are given new names, Joseph after his dream sequence with Pharaoh (Zaphenath-paneah, Gen 41:45), and Daniel before his first dream sequence with Nebuchadnezzar (Belteshazzar, Dan 1:7). Seventh, Joseph finds favor with his superiors, first in the eyes of Potiphar<sup>17</sup> and second with the keeper of the prison.<sup>18</sup> Similarly, God gives Daniel favor and compassion in the sight of the chief officer (Dan 1:9). Although the vocabulary is slightly different in this last point, the thematic parallel is still present. In an essay on shared vocabulary between the Pentateuch and Daniel, Mitchell discounts this connection as just “two very different ways of saying the same thing.”<sup>19</sup> As an independent unit, that Daniel finds favor with Nebuchadnezzar is nothing new, and on those grounds Mitchell’s objection might be substantiated. Many in the OT find favor with their superiors.<sup>20</sup> But coupled with the other correspondences mentioned above, the evidence suggests more than mere repetition. Indeed, Daniel is cast as another Joseph, both of

pattern in Adam stretches into the narratives of Joseph, Mordecai, and Daniel in Matthew Y. Emerson and Peter J. Link Jr., “Searching for the Second Adam: Typological Connections between Adam, Joseph, Mordecai, and Daniel,” *SBJT* 21.1 (2017): 123–44.

<sup>13</sup> Abraham (Genesis 20), Jacob (Genesis 28, 31, 46), Gideon (Judges 7), Solomon (1 Kings 3). Cf. in the NT Joseph (Matthew 1–2), Pilate’s wife (Matthew 27), Ananias (Acts 9), Cornelius and Peter (Acts 10), and Paul (Acts 16).

<sup>14</sup> This is indicated by the Hebrew פתח, and Aramaic פשר, terms found in the Joseph-Daniel narratives alone, save Eccl 8:1. The use of this word within the Hebrew Bible (HB) will be discussed below.

<sup>15</sup> In both texts, the standard term for “appearance” is used—מראה (from ראה)—establishing a textual link. David is likewise described as having a “good appearance,” or “form,” in 1 Sam 16:12, 18 (וטוב ראי [v. 12]; ואיש תאר; [v. 18]).

<sup>16</sup> Daniel’s three friends, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, also refused to break God’s law in a foreign land in Daniel 3 when they refused to worship Nebuchadnezzar’s golden statue.

<sup>17</sup> Gen 39:4: וימצא יוסף חן בעיניו (“and Joseph found favor in the eyes of Potiphar”).

<sup>18</sup> Gen 39:21: ויהי יהוה את־יוסף ויט אליו חסד ויתן חנו בעיני שר בית־הסוהר (“And it happened that YHWH was with Joseph and looked upon him with steadfast love, and gave him favor in the eyes of the chief of the prison”).

<sup>19</sup> Terence C. Mitchell, “Shared Vocabulary in the Pentateuch and the Book of Daniel,” in *He Swore an Oath: Biblical Themes from Genesis 12–50* (ed. R. S. Hess, G. J. Wenham, and P. E. Satterthwaite; Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1994), 138–39. Mitchell fails to take into account the use of חסד in both Gen 39:21 and Dan 1:9, as well as the many other points of linguistic contact noted in the analysis of Genesis 41 and Daniel 2 below.

<sup>20</sup> E.g. David in 1 Sam 16:12, 18.

whom are acknowledged by their pagan counterparts as having a divine spirit (Gen 41:38; Dan 4:8, 9, 18; 5:11, 14).

Additional thematic connections are clear in Genesis 37 and Daniel 6 specifically. In Genesis 37, Joseph's brothers hate him because their father (Jacob) favors him (37:4). Likewise, in Daniel 6, Daniel's fellow presidents and satraps hate him because of the favor he receives from King Darius (Dan 6:4). In both accounts, the enemies of Joseph and Daniel conspire to kill them, presumably out of jealousy, or to gain the prominence with their superiors that Joseph and Daniel already possessed. In both accounts the enemies succeed, and both Joseph and Daniel are cast into pits—Joseph into a pit near Dothan (Gen 37:24), and Daniel into a pit of lions (Dan 6:16). Both Jacob and Darius presume Joseph and Daniel to be “torn to pieces” (Gen 37:33) by fierce animals, even though both are unharmed. In both accounts, Jacob and Darius are offered comfort from others to console them in their sadness. In both accounts, the comfort is refused (Gen 37:35; Dan 6:18). And last, in both accounts Joseph and Daniel are rescued out of their respective pits (Gen 37:28; Dan 6:23).

As if these developments were not enough, Wesselius notes additional finer points of thematic correspondence in the Joseph–Daniel cycle, which taken together present a greater case for unity within the supposed disunity in the book of Daniel.<sup>21</sup> Wesselius writes that the book exhibits a highly stylized literary genre that he calls a “linear composed dossier.”<sup>22</sup> For instance, the change of subject from Joseph to Judah in Genesis 38 agrees with the same phenomenon in Daniel 3, the text about Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego. Further, the nature of the predictions in the Joseph narrative seem to agree in all cases with those in Daniel; that is, “the three episodes of double dreams which Joseph has or which are explained by him correspond with the three riddles posed to the Babylonian kings, two dreams and one enigmatic inscription.” Moreover, “in Daniel all three thus assume the character of Pharaoh's double dream in Genesis 41: an enigma presented by God to the king, which is explained by the Israelite courtier.”<sup>23</sup> Wesselius also considers

<sup>21</sup> E.g. Collins, *Daniel*, 24–38, who understands Daniel as a collection of fictional tales and *ex eventu* apocalyptic predictions.

<sup>22</sup> Wesselius, “Literary Nature of the Book of Daniel and the Linguistic Character of its Aramaic,” 255. He defines this as “a text which consists of a number of elements which are usually in roughly chronological order, and which show a considerable amount of deliberately conceived discontinuity and even outright contradiction, which [is] counterbalanced by several indicators of unity and continuity.”

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 250–51: “All the elements which occur in pairs in Genesis have been fused into one only in Daniel, such as the ‘double dreams’ of Joseph, of the steward and the baker, and of Pharaoh, the sexually tinted accusations of Genesis 38 and 39 and the accusations of theft in 42 and 44. By contrast, the nightly prediction of Genesis 46 appears to correspond with the two visions of Daniel 7 and 8. In the substance of these elements some systematic shifts can be observed. We already noted the three riddles which God put before the kings, corresponding with three different pairs of dreams in Genesis. The four different accusations in Genesis 38, 39, 42 and 44 are fused into a pair of highly similar accusations of refusal to commit idolatry in Daniel 3 (corresponding with the pair in Genesis 38 and 39) and forbidden adherence to Daniel's own religion in ch. 6 (corresponding with Genesis 42 and 44). Some shifting of motives and elements can be observed between the parts which are now similar in Daniel. The punishments which followed or threatened to follow the false accusations of Genesis 38 and 39 return in Daniel 3 and 6, namely the punishment of burning and of being thrown into a prison or ‘pit, hole’

the length of Daniel's career in Babylon an instance of literary emulation. If Daniel was placed in Nebuchadnezzar's court following the first deportation, he would have served 20 years of that reign until the fall of Jerusalem (cf. the aligning of Nebuchadnezzar's accession year with the 19 years of 2 Kgs 25:8), 70 years in Babylonian exile (Dan 9:2), and 3 years under king Cyrus (Dan 10:10). This would put Daniel's long career at 93 years, which is exactly the same number of years as Joseph's career in Egypt (Gen 37:2; 50:22).<sup>24</sup>

In sum, the many thematic strands of the Joseph story are intentionally woven together in the Daniel narrative linking the two. It is not compelling to suggest that Daniel's story simply happened in a way similar to Joseph's story. The facts about Daniel are independent, to be sure, yet portrayed so as to cause the reader to recall something or someone in the past, evidence which cannot be easily dismissed. Indeed, in Daniel there is a "conscious literary strategy, which was not intended to deceive the reader (in that case the indications for the unity of the text would have been entirely superfluous), but which aimed to create the (above) kaleidoscopic view of the events which were to be described."<sup>25</sup> The evidence suggests that the author of Daniel has intentionally shaped his narrative after the events and characteristics of Joseph's life and personality. He is doing this because the Joseph story has taught him (via influence) that God sent a man before Israel to prepare for the first exodus (cf. Ps 105:17), and he is presenting Daniel this way (via borrowing) because he believes Daniel plays the part of Joseph for the second. But even this evidence can be strengthened on linguistic and sequential grounds.

2. *Linguistic and sequential event correspondence in Genesis 41 and Daniel 2.* Having established thematic links between the accounts of Joseph and Daniel, the focus now turns to the linguistic and sequential event correspondences between Genesis 41 and Daniel 2. The connections in these seemingly disparate texts go beyond common motifs. Even though separated by time and language differences, they share a similar vocabulary and ordering of events, as the following table illustrates:<sup>26</sup>

---

(Gen 40:15). The story about Nebuchadnezzar's first dream, in Daniel 2, formally corresponding to Genesis 37 with Joseph's two dreams, not unexpectedly has assumed certain characteristics of Genesis 41, with the dreams of Pharaoh.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., 251–52.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., 256.

<sup>26</sup> The first column gives the sequence of events, the second describes the events of Genesis 41, and the third the events of Daniel 2.

	Genesis 41: Joseph	Daniel 2: Daniel
1	“Pharaoh had a dream” (41:1; ופרע חלם)	“Nebuchadnezzar dreamed dreams” (2:1; חלם נבצדנצר חלמות)
2	Pharaoh’s spirit was troubled (41:8; ותפעם רוחו)	Nebuchadnezzar’s spirit was troubled (2:1; ותפעם רוחי; 2:3; ותתפעם רוחו)
3	Pharaoh calls for his magicians (41:8; חרטמים) and Egypt’s wise men (חכמיה) to interpret (פתר) his dream	Nebuchadnezzar calls for his magicians (2:2; חרטמים)—satraps, and enchanters, who are later called “wise ones of Babel” (חכמי בבל; 2:12)—to interpret (פשר) his dream
4	“Pharaoh recounted to them his dreams” (41:8)	“The king gave orders ... to tell the king his dreams” (2:2)
5	Professionals are unable to interpret Pharaoh’s dream (41:8)	Professionals are unable to both declare <i>and</i> interpret Nebuchadnezzar’s dream (2:4–11)
6	Captain of the guard (שר הטבחים) is aware of a captive Jew with dream-interpreting abilities (41:10–12)	Captain of the guard (רבי־טבחים) is aware of a captive Jew with dream-interpreting abilities (2:14)
7	“Pharaoh sent and called for Joseph” (41:14)	“Daniel went in and requested of the king” (2:16)
8	“They hurriedly (ויריכהו) brought [Joseph]” (41:14)	“Arioch, in haste (בהתבהלה) brought Daniel” (2:25)
9	Joseph is asked if he can interpret the dream (41:15)	Daniel is asked if he can declare <i>and</i> interpret the dream (2:26)
10	Joseph downplays his abilities and attributes dream interpretations to God (41:16)	Daniel downplays his abilities and attributes dream interpretations to God (2:28–30)
11	The dream is recounted by Pharaoh <i>to</i> Joseph (41:17–24)	The dream is recounted by Daniel <i>to</i> Nebuchadnezzar (2:31–35)
12	Joseph tells Pharaoh that his dream is about what God will do in the future (41:25)	The <i>interpretation</i> is recounted by Daniel to Nebuchadnezzar (2:37–44)
13	The <i>interpretation</i> is recounted by Joseph to Pharaoh (41:26–31)	Daniel tells Nebuchadnezzar that his dream is about what God will do in the future (2:45)

14	The dream is “determined by God, and God will quickly bring it about” (41:32)	“The dream is true; and its interpretation is trustworthy” (2:45)
15	Joseph is worshiped as a result of his dream reporting (Gen. 41:40, 43), receiving homage (אָנֵרד; “Kneel!”) from the people (41:40)	Daniel is worshiped as a result of his dream reporting (Dan. 2:46), receiving homage (סָגַד) from Nebuchadnezzar (2:46)
16	Joseph is given gifts (41:42)	Daniel is given gifts (2:48; cf. 5:16, 29)
17	Joseph is promoted to a ruler in a foreign land (41:40–41)	Daniel is promoted to a ruler in a foreign land (2:48; cf. 5:16, 29)

This table reveals that the author of Daniel, perhaps Daniel himself, noticed a pattern in Joseph that is replicated in Daniel. Thus, Daniel intentionally crafted his dream narrative in ways that recall the historical situation in Joseph, not only in the terminology but also in the ordering of events.

There are three main divisions to the table, designated by three shades. First, the time, key characters, setting, and crisis are set forth at the beginning (sequence 1–8). These factors all correspond in both texts at hand. The time for Joseph is two years after he goes to prison, and for Daniel two years after Nebuchadnezzar begins his reign in Babylon.<sup>27</sup> The setting is a royal court. The characters are an angry king, his professional courtiers and diviners, a captive Jew, and a chief guard. The crisis is that the king has had a dream about the future and his advisers are unable to interpret it. The captive Jew is rushed to the king’s aid with his life and the lives of his people at stake. Like a masterful storyteller, the authors of both narratives draw the reader into their stories with heightened suspense and intrigue.<sup>28</sup>

As the table shows, there are a number of points of linguistic correspondence between the two stories in this first section. For sequence 2, the text reads that both Pharaoh and Nebuchadnezzar had “dreams.” The Hebrew חלם and its cognates (e.g. Aramaic חלום) are found 121 times in the HB, 42 of which appear in Genesis 37–50, with 28 in Daniel, accounting for almost 60% of all occurrences.<sup>29</sup> Given its frequency, the presence of חלם, however, does not necessarily lead to an intentional literary parallel, that is, if חלם stood by itself. But given the frequency of

<sup>27</sup> This date, of course, is contested by both conservative and liberal scholarship because of its supposed contradiction with Dan 1:1, an explanation I will not treat here. I agree fully with Steinmann, *Daniel*, 111, who sees no discrepancies in the dates: “Nebuchadnezzar’s second regnal year is actually the third year in the Daniel narratives. The Babylonian system of reckoning the years of a king’s reign did not count his first partial [accession] year.”

<sup>28</sup> Similarly, Lucas, *Daniel*, 67–68, understands this chapter in terms of a play in six acts.

<sup>29</sup> These results were compiled by using Abraham Even-Shoshan, *A New Concordance of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1989); and Gerhard Lisowsky, *Konkordanz zum Hebräischen Alten Testament* (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1958).

the subsequent פַּעַם (“trouble”) in sequence 2, which only appears five times in the HB, the parallel becomes increasingly more significant. Out of the five occurrences of פַּעַם, three appear in the Joseph and Daniel cycles where the subject of the “troubling” is Pharaoh’s or Nebuchadnezzar’s respective spirit.<sup>30</sup> The only difference between Gen 41:8 and Dan 2:1 is that in the former פַּעַם is in the Niphal stem while in the latter it is in the Hithpael stem; though in Dan 2:3 the Niphal is used when Nebuchadnezzar speaks of himself. Therefore, that Pharaoh and Nebuchadnezzar each had dreams is nothing new. But that each had dreams which “troubled” their “spirit,” is something unique to Genesis 41 and Daniel 2 alone.

As the story moves along, sequence 3 also shows linguistic correspondence. After having their dreams, both Pharaoh and Nebuchadnezzar call on their “magicians” to interpret the dreams.<sup>31</sup> Like פַּעַם, this word appears only a handful of times in the HB, and in only two locales—Egypt (Heb. חַרְטָמִים, pl. חַרְטָמִים) and Babylon (Aram. חַרְטָמִין, pl. חַרְטָמִין). In Genesis 41, the חַרְטָמִים are those whom Pharaoh calls upon to interpret his dream but fail (v. 8), which he relays to Joseph in his frustration (v. 24). In Exodus, they are those who stand before Pharaoh and reproduce the first three plagues of Moses (7:11, 22; 8:7), but whose magic runs dry in the plague of gnats (8:18). They then acknowledge that only the “finger of God” can produce gnats from dust (8:19), and eventually, in the agony of boils, beg Pharaoh to let Israel leave Egypt (9:11). In Daniel, the חַרְטָמִין are those who are summoned by Nebuchadnezzar for divine advice on his dreams. Like the Egyptian חַרְטָמִים, however, they are unable both to declare or interpret the king’s dream (2:2, 10, 27; 4:4); nor can they read the anomalous writing on the wall (5:11). Instead, Daniel, like Joseph before him, who is “ten times better than all the magicians” (חַרְטָמִים), is able to do what the חַרְטָמִין cannot (1:20). For this, Daniel is dubbed “Chief of Magicians” (רַב חַרְטָמִיָּא) by king Nebuchadnezzar himself (4:9).

Further linguistic correspondence is noticeable in sequence 3 with the cognate words פָּתַר and פִּשֵּׁר. The verb פָּתַר (“to interpret”) occurs nine times in the HB, all within the Joseph cycle,<sup>32</sup> along with the five occurrences of the noun, פִּתְרוֹן (“interpretation”).<sup>33</sup> The Aramaic equivalents, פִּשֵּׁר and פִּשְׂרָא, occur thirty-five times in the HB, thirty-three of which are in Daniel 2–5, with one occurrence in Dan 7:16 and one in Eccl 8:1.<sup>34</sup> The linkage between Daniel and Joseph on this point, then, is unmistakable.<sup>35</sup> As noted in the introduction, God spoke to many in the OT

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Gen 41:8, Dan 2:1, 3. In Judg 13:25 the spirit of YHWH “troubles” Samson, and in Psalm 77:5 there is no reference to spirit.

<sup>31</sup> Commonly translated “magicians” (ESV, NASB, ASV, KJV), but sometimes “diviner-priests” (NET, HCSB), its usage indicates someone who is a professional in the magic arts, and who, with the help of manuals and divinatory aids, can interpret dreams. See Collins, *Daniel*, 133; Lucas, *Daniel*, 69; Mitchell, “Shared Vocabulary,” 138; and James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1972), 137. For the range of meaning, see HALOT.

<sup>32</sup> Gen 40:8, 16, 22; 41:8, 12[2], 13, 15[2].

<sup>33</sup> Gen 40:5, 8, 12, 18; 41:11.

<sup>34</sup> See Even-Shoshan, *New Concordance of the Old Testament*, 967, for all occurrences.

<sup>35</sup> Although Mitchell (“Shared Vocabulary,” 133) argues against literary correspondence between Joseph and Daniel, he does allow for “some parallelism” with the limited usage of פָּתַר and פִּשֵּׁר in the HB.

through dreams and visions (Num 12:6), but only Joseph and Daniel are gifted with the ability of “interpretation.”

Besides the more obvious sequential event correspondence illustrated in the table, one final point of vocabulary should be mentioned. Like Joseph, Daniel is on good terms with the “captain of the guard.” The root, טבח, is normally used with reference to a cook (i.e. someone who slaughters meat—Deut 28:31; 1 Sam 25:11; Jer 11:19), or in the killing off of people (Jer 25:34; Ezek 21:15; Ps 37:14) or animals (Exod 21:37). But in construct with רב (or in Joseph’s case, Heb., שר), the phrase most likely refers to “chief guard” or “chief executioner.” It is hardly likely that when Nebuchadnezzar wants all of the wise men of Babylon slaughtered that he would use his chief cook. Rather, he would call upon his “chief slaughterer” to do the job, the same kind of man that Nebuchadnezzar commissioned to destroy Israel and take captives into exile.<sup>36</sup> That the Joseph-Daniel cycle mentions this individual is not necessarily significant in its own right. But that both Joseph and Daniel find favor with a chief guard who is aware of a captive Jew who has dream-interpreting abilities (sequence 6) should not be discounted. Again, the author of Daniel is linking the two narratives with similar vocabulary and events, presumably because he sees Daniel as a prophet in a Joseph-type role.

Sequence 8 resumes the suspense of both narratives. In Joseph’s case, the magicians are unable to interpret Pharaoh’s dream. Pharaoh is angry and possibly violent. In a daring act of boldness and courage, Pharaoh’s cupbearer remembers that one of his dreams was interpreted by a captive Hebrew under the watch of the captain of the guard who might be able to help. Pharaoh immediately sends for this captive, and Joseph is brought “hurriedly” to Pharaoh’s presence to meet the task (Gen 41:14). Daniel 2, however, has a much more heightened tone, for the consequences of failing the king are more drastic. After all the magicians of Babylon cannot declare Nebuchadnezzar’s dream, he becomes extremely violent and orders all the “wise men of Babylon” killed in 2:13. Like the cupbearer in Genesis 41, in a great act of boldness Daniel requests time from Nebuchadnezzar to discern his dream, which he is granted (2:14–16). When God reveals to Daniel the dream in a “vision of the night” (2:19), the captain of the guard (Arioch) “in haste brought Daniel into the king’s presence” (2:25). The parallels between both accounts are apparent, even though language barriers obscure any linguistic correspondence.

In the second main division of the table the story moves from setting and crisis to a climax of tension. With regard to the dream report itself in sequences 9–14, both texts share a similar literary structure, which is somewhat different from other dream sequences in the OT. In the dream accounts in Genesis, for example (excluding Joseph), the formula usually follows distinctive patterns with only slight variation: (1) God appears to a human recipient in a night dream;<sup>37</sup> (2) an introductory “Behold” or a vocative (e.g. “Jacob, Jacob ...”);<sup>38</sup> (3) self-identification by

<sup>36</sup> I.e. Nebuzaradan, the “captain of the guard” (רב־טבחִים). Cf. 2 Kgs 25:8, 11, 20; Jer 39:9, 13; 40:1; 41:10; 43:6; 52:12, 15, 26, 26.

<sup>37</sup> Gen 20:3, 6, 16; 28:12–13; 31:10–12 (Angel of YHWH), 24; 46:2.

<sup>38</sup> Gen 20:3; 28:12, 13; 31:11; 46:2.

God;<sup>39</sup> (4) assurance of God's presence,<sup>40</sup> directions,<sup>41</sup> or warnings;<sup>42</sup> and (4) the dreamer awakes or the dream abruptly ends.<sup>43</sup> In the Joseph and Daniel cycles, however, the dream reports are unique and more intricate: (1) the king announces that he has had a dream;<sup>44</sup> (2) followed by an introductory formula;<sup>45</sup> (3) a description of the dream (Gen 41:17–24; Dan 2:31–35); (4) an interpretation formula;<sup>46</sup> (5) the identification of the various symbols and meaning of the dream (Gen 41:26–31; Dan 2:37–44); and (6) a word on the trustworthiness of the dream.<sup>47</sup> This means that although certain parallels can be maintained from other dream reports, only those of Joseph and Daniel match up in terms of this specific structure.<sup>48</sup>

One further point should be made with regard to sequences 12–13. Here, the order of events crisscross in the texts. After both dreams are recounted (one by Pharaoh to Joseph; the other by Daniel to Nebuchadnezzar as he had stubbornly demanded), in Genesis Joseph follows Pharaoh's description with a statement that "God has told Pharaoh what he is about to do" (41:25). In other words, Pharaoh's dream is about the immediate future. Joseph follows this statement with an explanation of what the various symbols in the dream mean. Daniel, on the other hand, first interprets the symbols for Nebuchadnezzar (Dan 2:37–44), and then follows the interpretation with a statement that "God has made known to the king what will take place in the future" (2:45). Both interpretations, however, are concluded with a statement on their essential certainty. God is working to bring about his appointed end, which Joseph and Daniel believe will happen in full, and his work involves Pharaoh and Nebuchadnezzar.

The final division of the table serves as the resolution to the stories. As a result of their dream interpreting Joseph and Daniel are worshiped, and three aspects of this worship are worth noting in particular. First, Joseph and Daniel both receive homage. In Genesis 41:40 Pharaoh demands that all people—excluding Pharaoh

<sup>39</sup> Gen 28:13–15; 31:13; 46:2–3. In Genesis 20, Abimelech does not receive a self-identification by God although it is clear that Abimelech recognizes that he converses with God in his dream (20:4, 6).

<sup>40</sup> Gen 28:13–15; 46:2–3; cf. 1 Kgs 3:5–15.

<sup>41</sup> Gen 31:12, 46:2–3; cf. Num 22:20; 1 Kgs 3:6–9.

<sup>42</sup> Gen 20:3, 31:24.

<sup>43</sup> Gen 20:8; 28:16; cf. 1 Kgs 3:15.

<sup>44</sup> Gen 41:15: "I have had a dream ..."; Dan 2:3—"I had a dream ..." Additionally, Ludwig A. Rosenthal, "Die Josephsgeschichte, mit den Büchern Ester und Daniel verglichen," *ZAW* 15 (1895): 279–80, notes the similar phraseology between Gen 41:15 and Dan 5:15–16:

Gen 41:15: "I have had a dream, and there is no one who can interpret it. I have heard it said of you that when you hear a dream you can interpret it."

Dan 5:15–16: "But they could not show the interpretation of the matter. But I have heard that you can give interpretations and solve problems."

<sup>45</sup> Gen 41:2: "In my dream, behold, I was standing ..."; Dan 2:31—"You, O king, were looking, and behold ..."

<sup>46</sup> Dan 2:36: "This was the dream; now we shall tell its interpretation before the king." This formula is not in the Joseph narrative, although the meaning is still implied in Gen 41:25 when Joseph says, "Pharaoh's dreams are one and the same; God has told to Pharaoh what he is about to do."

<sup>47</sup> Gen 41:32: "The matter is determined by God, and God will quickly bring it about." Dan 2:45: "The dream is true, and its interpretation is trustworthy."

<sup>48</sup> Robert Gnuse, "Dreams and Their Theological Significance in the Biblical Tradition," *CurTM* 8 (1981): 166–71.

himself—pay homage to Joseph. Similarly, after hearing the storyline of his future Nebuchadnezzar falls face down and pays homage to Daniel in 2:46. Whereas all people are to “bow the knee” to Joseph (Gen 43:43), Nebuchadnezzar himself bows his face to Daniel. Second, both are given gifts for their work (Gen 41:42; Dan 2:48). As an aside, it is interesting to note that with the exception of the signet ring, the same gifts Joseph receives (garment and gold necklace) are the ones Daniel receives from Belshazzar following his interpretation of the handwriting on the wall (Dan 5:29). Even despite language barriers these rewards are described in similar terms:

Gen 41:42      וילבש אתו בגדי־שש וישם רבד הזהב על־צואו

“And he clothed him in a linen garment and placed a chain of gold around his neck.”

Dan 5:29      והלבישו לדניאל ארגונא והמונכא די־דהבא על־צוארה

“And he clothed Daniel in purple, and a chain of gold [was placed] around his neck.”

Finally, both Joseph and Daniel are given promotions as Israelite rulers in a foreign land. Whereas Joseph is “set over all the land of Egypt” (Gen 41:41), Daniel is “made to rule over the whole province of Babylon” (Dan 2:48).

In sum, the accumulation of these seventeen instances of linguistic and sequential event correspondence point to intentional narrative-shaping on the part of the author of Daniel. While most commentators note some of these connections,<sup>49</sup> they are often dismissed on the grounds that the author of the stories of Daniel simply “knew the Joseph story and was occasionally influenced by it as he told the story of Daniel, when he saw some correspondence between the two stories.”<sup>50</sup> Or, as Mitchell concludes, “the trend of evidence suggests some minimal use of the Pentateuchal vocabulary by the writer of Daniel.”<sup>51</sup> These objections fail in light of the evidence mentioned above. I grant that in terms of *verbal* parallels the evidence is limited (חלם / פעם and פתר / פשר being the only verbal links between Genesis 41 and Daniel 2). But the many strands of thematic, linguistic, and sequential correspondence together suggest more than “genre influence” (to use Mitchell’s term).<sup>52</sup> Rather, my contention is that the writer of Daniel, being conscious of the history of his people who are now in exile as they once were in Egypt and being conscious of God’s divine gifting of dream interpretation, casts Daniel as a new Joseph.

<sup>49</sup> Among them, Collins, *Daniel*, 155; Goldingay, *Daniel*, 42–43; E. W. Heaton, *The Book of Daniel: Introduction and Commentary* (London: SCM, 1956), 122; André Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1979), 36; Lucas, *Daniel*, 65; Montgomery, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, 186.

<sup>50</sup> Lucas, *Daniel*, 65.

<sup>51</sup> Mitchell, “Shared Vocabulary,” 140.

<sup>52</sup> Montgomery, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, 186. Montgomery emphasizes the natural humanity of certain decisions by Joseph and Daniel that would lead to similar prose: “That this story was influenced by that common, cosmopolitan *genre* of literature (cf. the dreams of royalty) is not to its discredit. The story-telling art included cosmopolitan Jewry among its clients.”

## III. CANONICAL IMPLICATIONS AND ESCALATION

What, then, is the connection between Joseph and Daniel in terms of their canonical setting? In other words, how do these stories connect in the redemptive-historical stream that runs through the Bible? In order to answer this question we must consider the two great exodus events in the OT. The first begins in the Torah and in the book of Genesis in particular. Jacob and his sons are sojourners in Canaan, wandering about without a land of their own. In God's providence he places one of Jacob's sons in exile in Egypt with purposes beyond Jacob's knowledge. This son, Joseph, is prudent and wise, and able to interpret dreams. He is handsome and of good appearance, and in each area of his life he succeeds in finding favor in the sight of his superiors, first with his father, then Potiphar, and then with the captain of the prison. Even the king (Pharaoh) eventually recognizes his wisdom. Hoping to capitalize on that wisdom, this king promotes Joseph to be a ruler of Egypt. The world is then faced with a drought of drastic proportions that could bring many to the point of death, even Jacob's seed. Yet Joseph's wisdom comes to their aid, and he devises a plan to save his kinsmen—indeed, the whole non-Israelite world—by giving them protection and provision in the world's most fruitful environment. As God continues to bless him, Joseph continues to flourish in Egypt. Yet Joseph does not forget his heritage, nor the promise of God to his ancestors. Like his father before him, Joseph desires to be in the land of promise for his final resting place. He anticipates a journey out of Egypt, an exodus, that would bring his bones to the place of blessing (Gen 50:24–25; Josh 24:32; cf. Ps 105:16–22).

Being faithful to his promises, God multiples Abraham's seed so that they outnumber the Egyptians. They become a "great nation" in need of their own land. In a desperate attempt at population control, a new Pharaoh who "did not know Joseph" (Exod 1:8) forces Abraham's seed into slavery. But God raised up a deliverer in Moses, who acts as the arm of YHWH by leading the people through the Red Sea and to the mountain of God. God subsequently provides his law, a manifesto for how the Israelites are to live in the land of promise. Although stubborn and rebellious toward God and his law, the Israelites eventually take full control of the land by the time of David and Solomon in the Former Prophets (Joshua-Kings). Yet this triumph is short-lived. Even though they are forewarned of their coming demise by Moses and the Latter Prophets (Isaiah-Ezekiel, even some of The Twelve), the Israelites and their kings reject the law of God and are forced into exile in the land of Babylon.

The story of Israel, then, comes full circle, and it is here that Daniel, like Joseph, finds himself a captive youth in a foreign land. Yet like Joseph, Daniel is prudent and wise, and able to interpret dreams. Like Joseph, Daniel is handsome and of good appearance. Like Joseph, Daniel finds favor in the sight of his superiors, not only with the chief eunuch, but also during the reign of kings Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, and Darius the Mede (Dan 6:28). Interestingly, like Joseph, Daniel's wisdom is recognized by *each* king, and *each* promotes Daniel to be a ruler in Babylon or Persia. Like Joseph, Daniel sees that his brothers, the Israelites, have sinned

greatly, and are in a world of turmoil as exiles. Yet, like Joseph, Daniel remembers the God of his ancestors, the God who brought his people out of the land of Egypt with a mighty hand and made a name for himself (Dan 9:15). And like Joseph, Daniel desires to return to the land of promise by way of a second exodus.<sup>53</sup>

While a number of solutions have been proposed for Daniel's placement in the Writings (Psalms-Chronicles), most neglect to mention an exodus-themed approach. When understood along the lines of this theme, the reason for the patterning of the book of Daniel after the story of Joseph becomes increasingly clear. In chapter 9 and during the reign of Darius the Mede, Daniel is said to be reading the prophet Jeremiah when he discerns that 70 years must pass before the people return to the land of promise (v. 9). He therefore prays that God would "make good" on this prophecy and, like the previous exodus from Egypt (9:15), accomplish a similar yet greater exodus (escalation) that would allow the people to return to Jerusalem. It is therefore within this structure that the author of Daniel recognizes that Daniel is in a Joseph-type role. He has been led into exile against his will and because of the sins of his brothers. But like Joseph, Daniel desires to save the people of God, and like Joseph, is on the dawn of a new exodus and a return to the land (Gen 50:24–25). The author of Daniel, therefore, writes in the stream of this paradigm. He intentionally crafts his narrative along thematic, linguistic, and sequential correspondences that would cause the reader to understand Daniel as a new Joseph who makes provisions for a new exodus.<sup>54</sup> Moreover, at the end of Daniel 12, God's messenger tells Daniel of another future exodus (1290 days + 45 days), and that Daniel will stand up for his portion at the end of time.

Thus, the Hebrew canon is supported on two sides by two great exodus events, each of which is advanced by a dream-interpreting prophet. On one side stands Joseph, an exile in Egypt who saves the people of God, and who grounds his dying hope in God's covenantal promises. On the other side stands Daniel, an exile in Babylon who desires to save the people of God, and who grounds his hope on those same promises. Both envisage an exodus in the near future. Both make provisions to see it through.<sup>55</sup>

#### IV. CONCLUSION

Throughout this paper, I have argued that the author of Daniel intentionally constructed his narrative in such a way to cause the reader to understand Daniel as

---

<sup>53</sup> "Moses had prophesied that Yahweh would restore his people after judging them (e.g. Lev. 26:33–45), the latter prophets pointed to a new and better exodus (e.g. Isa. 11:15–16), and the Psalms sing Israel's history to shape her vision of the future. In this context, the idea that Daniel presented himself as a new Joseph because he believed himself to be a forerunner of a new exodus is right at home" (Hamilton, *With the Clouds of Heaven*, 231).

<sup>54</sup> If this is correct there are obvious implications for the dating of chaps. 1–6. Although these chapters chronologically precede chap. 9, it seems that only after Daniel is given the prophecy of the 70 weeks in response to his study of Jeremiah that he or the author of the book would view Daniel in a Joseph-type role, and thus write with that role in mind.

<sup>55</sup> For more divine patterns of correspondence and escalation between Joseph and Daniel, see the excellent overview in Hamilton, *With the Clouds of Heaven*, 221–24.

a new Joseph. Furthermore, I have argued that the reason for this is that, like Joseph, Daniel is on the cusp of a new exodus and thus the author of the book bearing his name is willing to take action to advance that purpose in the shaping of historical events. These evidences, therefore, indicate that the author of Daniel *read* Joseph this way, not simply as an Israelite hero who outsmarted the Egyptian Pharaoh, but as a prophet of Israel, a “dreamer of dreams” (Deut 13:1) who gave signs of the future that came to pass, and who paved the way for God’s redemptive activity. Daniel, likewise, was a prophet and dreamer, but not one in the mold of Jeremiah 23, speaking visions of his own mind and not from the Lord, but a prophet in the mold of Deuteronomy 18, paving the way for a new redemptive act of God.

The author of the book of Daniel, then, is not simply writing historically but theologically. The metanarrative of Scripture presents God as sovereign and in control of history. He acts in ways consistent with his character and purposes. Daniel’s prayer in chapter 9 is therefore a plea for all that he understands God to be faithful in doing. Only God’s divine hand will set the events in motion. Yet even though the people will return to the land, for which Daniel prayed and worked, the angel Gabriel tells Daniel that the exile will not culminate in the exodus Daniel envisioned, but in a far greater exodus in the distant future. This exodus will not be centered on a people, but a person—a leader, a prince, an anointed one (9:24–27). It is not difficult to understand this anointed one, or Messiah, to be Jesus Christ. Daniel’s ultimate plea before YHWH is for his great mercy (9:18), and for YHWH to hear, forgive, pay attention, and act (9:19). God’s action began with the exodus out of Babylon, but it did not end there. For although God spoke in many times and in many ways by prophets and dreamers like Joseph and Daniel, “in these last days he has spoken to us by his Son” (Heb 1:2), who superseded what two young dreamers envisioned, and accomplished a greater exodus in Jerusalem (Luke 9:31).