

Article

Gandhi and the World of the Hebrew Bible: The Case of Daniel as Satyagrahi

Ed Noort ^{1,2} 

¹ Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies, University of Groningen, 9712GK Groningen, The Netherlands; e.noort@rug.nl

² Stellenbosch Institute for Advanced Study (STIAS), Wallenberg Research Centre, Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch 7600, South Africa

Abstract: Among the biblical characters used as examples in developing and explaining *satyagraha*, Daniel is the most important after Jesus. In Gandhi's speeches and writings from 1909 to 1946, Daniel served as the ideal *satyagrahi* both in South Africa and in India. Over time, Daniel received company in the gallery of examples in which Socrates occupied a prominent place. Depending on theme, place, and audience, past and present characters from different traditions and scriptures accompanied Daniel. They represented the development of aspects of *satyagraha*: nonviolent active resistance as a weapon of the strong, courageous actions as a deliberate choice without excitement, love for the antagonist, preparedness to suffer, and no fear of death. All these aspects are embodied by the Gandhian Daniel. Gandhi emphasized the active role of Daniel as a resister, not the traditional view of the victim of court intrigues. In this paper, I argue that the image of the ideal *satyagrahi* Daniel could be strengthened by combining the court narratives from the first half and the apocalypses from the second one of the biblical book. The article provides context both for Gandhi's political and religious practice and for the book of Daniel. The strange world of apocalypses seems to contradict the model of the Gandhian figure Daniel. However, they are crisis literature, and it makes sense to observe how the protagonist and his audience in times of occupation, persecutions, and war ask for guidance. Apocalypses show how Jewish resistance to foreign rule was conceived. The result of the survey is a complex image of competing literatures from roughly the same period and the hands, heads, beliefs, and sufferings behind them. The view of the end of history, a program of nonviolence, and hope in the Daniel apocalypse serve as contrast propaganda to contemporary visions on the violent Maccabean revolt and the Seleucid persecutions. They offer a nonviolent counterweight to the ideology of the state propaganda of the Seleucids. They contradict the historiographic idealization of the Maccabean revolt and its armed resistance.

Keywords: Gandhi; Old Testament/Hebrew Bible; Daniel; Socrates; *satyagraha*; hermeneutics; apocalypses; nonviolence



Citation: Noort, Ed. 2022. Gandhi and the World of the Hebrew Bible: The Case of Daniel as Satyagrahi. *Religions* 13: 859. <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel13090859>

Academic Editor: Jakob De Roover

Received: 16 July 2022

Accepted: 9 September 2022

Published: 14 September 2022

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright: © 2022 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

The article on Gandhi's use of scriptures in this Special Issue on nonviolence and religion ended with a short overview of his ambivalent relationship with the Hebrew Bible (Noort 2022, pp. 13–14) and the big exception: Daniel. This paper explores the importance of the Gandhian Daniel when combined with other characters from tradition and authoritative scriptures. It sketches the background of the literary context and historical setting of the biblical book of Daniel from which Gandhi took his example and reflects on the possibility of deepening Gandhi's intention by combining the courtier Daniel with the visionary sage of the apocalypses in contrast to other ideologies of the Seleucid era.

I begin with the Gandhian texts in which Daniel appears (2), ask for the reception of Gandhi's approach in the scholarly discourse on Daniel (3), continue with the book of Daniel and its apocalyptic program in a historical context (4), and make a plea for giving

Daniel a place in the debates on nonviolence by reading the courtier and the apocalyptic seer together through the Gandhian lens (5).

Daniel, the legendary sage, counsellor, dream interpreter, and visionary, was inspirational for Gandhi as a Jewish courtier who obeyed the laws of his God more than the edicts of the king due to hostile conspiracies. Thrown into the lion's den, he was saved by his God, whose universal power was recognized by the sovereign (Dan 6:1–28). Gandhi's favorite chapter is a part of the collection of court narratives (Dan 1–6). Together with canonical parallels such as the Joseph novella and the book of Esther and the non-canonical, widespread narrative of *Alḥiqar* (Porten and Yardeni 1993, pp. 23–57), they treat the theme of the threats and precariousness of Jewish life in an exposed position under foreign rule. For Gandhi, the way in which the hero handled the threat was crucial. In a wider context, the overarching question is how an initially divinely legitimized foreign rule can be resisted and ended. To draw out how the stories about Daniel answer this question, I compare the different approaches to this question in the books of Daniel and Maccabees.

2. Daniel and Companions

In his speeches and writings, Gandhi often referred to Daniel by explaining and developing the most important aspects of *satyagraha*. Depending on time and context, Daniel received company (See Table 1).

Table 1. An overview.

DANIEL AND COMPANY	
South-Africa, London	Genre, Situation and Themes
Daniel	Johannesburg. Speech after imprisonment on passive resistance against laws in conflict with conscience. 24 May 1909.
Jesus Christ, Daniel, Socrates, Tolstoy	Germiston. Report of speech after imprisonment. "Soul Force" as the better term for passive resistance. 7 June 1909.
Daniel	Farewell party in London. Report of speech and direct speech. Not accepting any violent method means willingness to suffer. 12 November 1909.
Daniel	Kimberley. Report of speech on resistance to laws against reason and holiness. 24 April 1911.
Jesus, Daniel, Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, Tolstoy	Farewell party Durban. Report of Speech. Passive resistance needs greater courage than physical resistance. 8 July 1914.
India	
Harischandra, Prahlad, Mirabai, Daniel, Socrates, Arabs (in Franco-Moroccan War)	Letter to Shankarial. "Ideas on Satyagraha". Satyagraha brings good both to the satyagraha and his adversary. 2 September 1917.
Prahlad, Daniel, Jesus, Mirabai, and others	Letter to Satyan and Bose. Passive resistance is soul force and essentially a religious principle as old as the world itself (before). 16 September 1917.
Henry David Thoreau, Daniel, John Bunyan	Letter to the <i>Times of India</i> . Civil resistance, not violence, is the true remedy. 20 August 1919.
Bunyan, Daniel	Letter to Esther Faering (Menon). Justification of rebellion in the religious sense of the term. 25 August 1919.
Daniel, Socrates, Prahlad, Mirabai	Congress Report on Punjab Disorders. Satyagraha as a weapon of the strongest. Not any ill will towards persecutors. 25 March 1920.
Zoroaster, Mahavir, Daniel, Jesus, Muhammed, Nanak, a host of others	After Chauri Chaura killings, article in <i>Young India</i> . Non-resistance to evil means not to retaliate. 9 February 1922.
Daniel, Bunyan, Latimer, Prahlad	After Chauri Chaura killings, Notes in <i>Young India</i> . Civil resistance excludes the idea of excitement. 9 March 1922.
Daniel	Report of talk with missionaries in <i>Harijan</i> . Real belief needs no guarantee, statutory or otherwise. 28 April 1946.

2.1. Daniel in South Africa

At a meeting in Johannesburg on 24 May 1909, Gandhi mentioned Daniel for the first time in a public speech when, just released, he looked back on his third time in jail.¹ From February 25 onward, he had been imprisoned for not producing his (burnt) registration certificate. After the early morning release from his three months of imprisonment with hard labor, he addressed crowds first in a mosque in Pretoria, later in Johannesburg. The reference to Daniel appears only in the English part of the Johannesburg speech, a meeting where Gandhi was received as a hero; Rev. Joseph Doke was also present there.² In jail, Gandhi “found much consolation in reading the book of the prophet Daniel”. He had been able to borrow a Bible from the prison’s library and it formed part of his extensive reading. Daniel was one of the “greatest passive resisters that ever lived”. He was an example for Indians when they were confronted with laws “in conflict with their consciences” (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 9, p. 220). The tertium comparationis of Daniel and the Indians in South Africa was the opposition against laws in conflict with conscience. Though *satyagraha* had already been coined the year before, here Gandhi still used “passive resistance”. Gandhi probably encountered Daniel during his third prison term because Daniel does not appear in his extensive accounts of his previous imprisonments.³

2.1.1. Daniel’s Elder Brother: Socrates

What historically would be nonsense: calling Socrates Daniel’s elder brother, makes sense through the way Gandhi used these two beloved examples: Daniel and Socrates. Next to (daily) readings of the Gita, Quran and the Bible, the Upanishads, and the Jain poet, Rajchandra, it was Daniel and Socrates who encouraged and comforted Gandhi during his imprisonments. Especially Socrates figured prominently during his earlier prison stays. The figure of Socrates functioned in two directions. Firstly, as a stimulus and comfort for Gandhi himself during his prison terms. Secondly, as a mighty weapon and message for the Indians during the struggle.

The first mention of Socrates appeared in a “Special Contribution” to the *Indian Opinion* of 26 August 1905 (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 5, pp. 69–70),⁴ but Socrates begins to become especially important for Gandhi during his readings⁵ and rewriting of Plato’s *Apology*. In a series of six articles,⁶ he paraphrased the *Apology* during his time in prison and used it as a wake-up call to the Indians not only in South Africa but also in India.⁷ The homiletic character of his paraphrase may be illustrated by the last sentence:

“This (process and death of Socrates) is a historical event, that is, an event that actually occurred. We pray to God, and want our readers also to pray, that they, and we too, may have the moral strength which enabled Socrates to follow virtue to the end and to embrace death as if it were his beloved. We advise everyone to turn his mind again and again to Socrates words and conduct”. (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 8, p. 229)

In a stimulating article, Phiroze Vasunia (Vasunia 2015) studied Gandhi’s paraphrase and its connections to Ruskin’s *Unto This Last*,⁸ stressed Gandhi’s own preparedness for death and dying for a just cause, and made clear which translation Gandhi used (Cary 1905; Vasunia 2015, p. 179). He demonstrated Socrates’s/Gandhi’s willingness to self-sacrifice and die worthily rather than to escape in a cowardly manner.⁹ Vasunia carefully compared Cary’s translation and the Gujarati and English version of Gandhi’s paraphrase of the third speech of Socrates (Plato 2017, *Apology* 38c–39b).¹⁰

Gandhi identified himself strongly with the character of Socrates, resulting in the title of his rewriting of the *Apology* in Gujarati *Ek satyavirni katha*, “Story of a true soldier” or, as Gandhi 1958–1994 vol. 8 renders it, “A soldier of truth” (Vasunia 2015, pp. 177–78). Moreover, his readings of the *Apology* and his view on Socrates were an incentive for the further development of *satyagraha* instead of “passive resistance”. It was the influential art critic, social thinker, evangelical, and later Oxford professor John Ruskin (1819–1900), and especially his four essays from 1860 titled “Until This Last”,¹¹ that influenced Gandhi

strongly. One week after the closing article on Socrates's *Apology*, Gandhi began with "extracts" from Ruskin's essays because "Socrates gave us some idea of man's *duty*. He practised his precepts."¹² It can be argued that Ruskin's ideas are an elaboration of Socrates's. Ruskin has described vividly how one who wants to live by Socrates's ideas should acquit himself in the different vocations" (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 8, p. 241). However, just as Gandhi stated that Ruskin elaborated the ideas of Socrates, we may focus on the reversed direction: Gandhi read Socrates through the lens of Ruskin (Vasunia 2015). Ruskin stated that there are five intellectual professions/vocations in a civilized nation: the soldier (for defense), the pastor (for teaching), the physician (for health), the lawyer (for enforcing justice), and the merchant (for provisions), and that their duty is to die for their cause in case of battle, falsehood, plagues, injustice, and famine. Gandhi united these professions in himself. He was a preacher, a healer, a lawyer, came from a caste of merchants, and was prepared to die for his cause (Vasunia 2015, pp. 176–78). The image of Socrates preferring death above flight or giving up his divinely given duty, on the one side, and the vision of Ruskin on the other side inspired Gandhi to develop *satyagraha* further.

The result of Gandhi's prison readings of Plato appeared on 4 April 1908 for the first time in *Indian Opinion*.¹³ In his preface, Gandhi already mentioned the principal elements that made Socrates an example and an inspiration. Socrates lived in the fear of God and had no fear of death.¹⁴ He himself adhered to the traditional religion but encouraged the people to fight the corrupt elements of its practices. Socrates showed no fear after his death sentence and took the poison smilingly. *Mahatma* Socrates "was a great *satyagrahi* and adopted *satyagraha* against his own people". His words could be an elixir for healing the disease of India, i.e., the British oppression. For "we must learn to live and die like Socrates" (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 8, pp. 172–74). It is not difficult to see how Gandhi recreated Socrates in his own image and how in turn this image inspired him. The intertwining of Socrates's repeated assertion that he fulfils a divine mission,¹⁵ doing his duty "unto this last", the unshaken awareness of being innocent, and the courage of dying fearlessly for the good of the community illustrated the importance of Socrates for Gandhi. Socrates, Gandhi, and Ruskin came together in Gandhi's rendering of the incentive never to give up your task from the *Apology*:

"The right thing for a man is not to desert his post, even if he has to run the risk of being killed or any other risk, whether he has chosen the post of his own will or has been put there by a superior" (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 8, p. 213; Plato 2017, *Apology* 28d).¹⁶

Leaving his post would mean for Socrates ceasing to practice philosophy, to critically examine the youth and the citizens of Athens, and no longer "opening the eyes of men for their own ignorance" (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 8, pp. 196–97; Plato 2017, *Apology* 23b). This post is divinely given and therefore, "I shall obey the god (*ho theos* [Apollo]) rather than you; and so long as I have breath and am able, I shall not stop practicing philosophy" (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 8, p. 213; Plato 2017, *Apology* 29d). Metaphorically, his task is to be reins for strong horses, i.e., Athens and the Athenians.¹⁷

Even more important than the repeated statements on his adherence to traditional religion and beliefs in response to the charge of atheism are Socrates's utterances that "something god-inspired and spirit-like comes to me" (*hoti moi theion ti kai daimonion gignetai*), a voice (*phōnē*), a spiritual sign (*daimonion sēmeion*) that opposes the undertaking of wrong actions.¹⁸ The inner voice, however different the contexts of Socrates and Gandhi might be, appeared to be a powerful guide and important compass for Gandhi as well. Most clear were Gandhi's thoughts about this "Voice of God, of Conscience, of Truth, or the Inner Voice or the 'still small Voice'" in the discussions about his fasts in 1933, when even his old adversary from South Africa, Jan Smuts, tried to stop him with an appeal for "old friendship's sake and for the great causes you have championed so successfully" (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 55, pp. 120–22).¹⁹ Gandhi, however, listened to his inner voice and started his three-week fasting anti-untouchability strike.

In his last article, Gandhi paraphrased Socrates's famous view that death can only be a good thing, because it is either the highest form of sleep—and that is a blessing—or it is a journey to another place where he will meet Orpheus, Hesiod, Homer, and others (Plato 2017, *Apology* 41a). When Socrates concluded “that this one thing is true: that nothing can be bad for a good man, either alive or dead, and his affairs are not ignored by the gods” (Plato 2017, *Apology* 41c–d), Gandhi rendered it as: “Believe it as a truth that no good man can come by evil either in life or after death. Such a man is never forsaken by God. And you may be sure that the man of truth is always happy” (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 8, p. 229). He reinforced the element that the outcome of a battle—life or death—does not matter for the man of truth, a *satyagrahi*. It is in the hand of God. How closely connected and how inspirational Socrates's views were is demonstrated by Gandhi in his “Triumph of Truth” celebrating the agreement with General Jan Smuts one week after his release from his (first) prison term: “He (the *satyagrahi*) will give no thought to success or failure. He is pledged only to the great task of serving Truth, doing his duty in the name of God. The outcome itself is in the hands of the Lord” (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 8, p. 61, *Indian Opinion* 8.2.1908). Here, Socrates, Gandhi and *satyagraha* are amalgamated.

Gandhi “saw something of himself in Socrates whose life had been a long *satyagraha* against a society entrenched in error and prejudice” (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 8, p. VI). Inspirational for Gandhi was the fact that Socrates followed virtue to the end, practiced his precepts, adhered to the traditional religion but fought the corrupt elements of it, and above all that he did not desert his post, his duty in life. He was prepared to die for it. Though it is too short-sighted to establish clear oppositions, in which Daniel represents the religiously motivated ideal of how to live in opposition to unjust laws and Socrates how to die, Socrates returned in later writings and speeches of Gandhi with a strong emphasis on the way he handled suffering, dying, and death.²⁰

2.1.2. Daniel Again

Returning to Daniel and his first appearance in Gandhi's speeches in 1909, the expression “passive resistance” did not, in fact, fit with Daniel's actions. Two weeks later (7 June 1909), Gandhi explained at a meeting in Germiston that “soul force” (*satyagraha*) would be the better term. Active resistance, including violence, should be called “body force”. In the demonstration of this “soul force”, Daniel received company. The purest form of *satyagraha* was represented by Jesus Christ, Daniel, Socrates, and Tolstoy, who lived according to their convictions.²¹ Daniel and Socrates were now a couple, accompanied by Jesus and Tolstoy (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 9, p. 243). “Soul force” should be taken literally, for Gandhi emphasized that the recognition of the existence of the soul as apart from the body and its permanent and superior nature connected with a living faith was a *conditio sine qua non* for a successful use of *satyagraha*.²²

From June until November 1909, Gandhi remained in England for negotiations on the future of the South African Union. A recognition of theoretical equality (voting) and a satisfying solution for immigration rules could not be reached. The farewell party for Gandhi in London was dominated by the failed negotiations; however, on the way back, he would write his masterpiece *Hind Swaraj* on the future of independence (Gandhi 2009). In the speech at this party, he returned to the problem of the expression “passive resistance” and explained *satyagraha* through Daniel, who “refused to obey the laws of men which he did not approve” (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 9, p. 541 and vol. 10, p. 78).²³ What Daniel did was the same as what the South African Indians did when they refused to accept the laws concerning the Registration Act. The decision they made not to meet violence with violence forced them to act as Daniel did. Gandhi repeated the example in a speech at Kimberley, where he “likened the Transvaal passive resistance to the conscientious opposition offered by . . . Daniel to the Laws of the Medes and the Persians”.²⁴ The report offered an additional argument. Daniel's conscience spoke because the laws of the Medes and the Persians were “against reason and holiness”. Daniel received the title “Prophet”.

The last time for Daniel in South Africa came at the Durban farewell party before Gandhi, his family, and Kallenbach left South Africa definitely for (England) and India. Not conscience but courage was the theme of his speech when Gandhi referred to the power of passive resistance. Passive resistance is not “the weapon of the weak”. You need “greater courage to be a passive resister than a physical resister”. Moreover, “it was the courage of a Jesus, a Daniel, a Cranmer, a Latimer and a Ridley..., and Tolstoy who could go calmly to suffering and death” (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 12, p. 446). To Jesus, Daniel, and Tolstoy, three (Anglican) bishops were added. These three “Oxford martyrs” were burned at the stake during the persecutions of Mary Tudor (1555/1556), who tried to reverse the English Reformation. Now the emphasis was not on “conscience” but on “courage”.

2.2. Daniel in India

The definite return to India brought a new context for Gandhi’s use of exemplary characters from authoritative scriptures, tradition, and contemporaries. In “Ideas about Satyagraha” from 1917, Gandhi repeated that *satyagraha* was not the power of the weak, not passive: “it can only be used by the strong... and indeed it calls for intense activity”. A real *satyagrahi* does not fear for his body; he has no fear of death; truth is his ultimate goal; he has compassion with his antagonists; he acts without waiting for others. Who were now together with Daniel in the “cloud of witnesses”, who were real *satyagrahis*? Gandhi began with Harishchandra, continued with Prahlad and Mirabai, followed by Daniel and Socrates, and “those Arabs who hurled themselves on the fire of the French artillery” (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 13, pp. 521–23). The legendary King Harischandra of Ayodhya entered the life of Gandhi at an early stage. He saw the play as a child, identified himself with the tragic ruler who became the slave of *chandala*, and, preserving his dharma, was willing to sacrifice his dearest wife Taramati (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 39, p. 11 and vol. 30, pp. 252–53). Prahlad, a devotee of Vishnu, was the pious son of a king, who did not like his son’s spiritual inclination and tried to kill him through poison, elephants, snakes, drowning, and fire. Prahlad survived all these trials and continued to worship Vishnu. The poet Mirabai, a 16th century *bhakta* and devotee of Krishna, refused to commit *sati* after her husband’s death.²⁵ Her inlaws tried to kill her through poison, snakes, and drowning, but they did not succeed. Mirabai stayed with her “real husband”: Krishna. Harishchandra, Prahlad, and Mirabai stuck to their truth, faced all trials, and were saved. Gandhi had these three Indian characters accompanied by the pair Daniel and Socrates and finally “the Arabs who hurled themselves on the fire...”. He was referring here to a story from the Franco-Moroccan War (1911–1912), in which the Arabs ran into the artillery fire of the French. The French refused to continue the shooting and embraced the Arabs, impressed by their bravery. However, Gandhi had a *caveat* here. Those Arabs were *sayagrahis* indeed and the reaction of the French demonstrated that *satyagraha* is successful. However, the Arabs were not *satyagrahis* through a deliberate choice. They were religiously motivated but “had no love in their hearts. A *satyagrahi* does not lay down his life in anger” (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 13, pp. 517–18). Gandhi repeated the importance of a religious motivation in the same month, September 1917. According to Gandhi, *satyagraha* is a *religious* principle, and he underlined this with the conduct of Prahlad, Daniel, Mirabai, and others, whose guiding principle in their lives was religion (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 13, p. 531).

Guided by Gandhi’s use of the figure of Daniel, the examples of Harishchandra, Prahlad, and Mirabai appear here in the survey of his return to India. This does not mean a separation between a Greek-Judean-Christian lifeworld and the Indian one, nor a claim on priority. Gandhi would be the last to agree to such a scheme or claim. Chronologically, Mirabai already appears in 1907 in a wish “that we badly need thousands of women who can compare with Mirabai” (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 7, p. 51). A song of her demonstrates that the ultimate love of God makes anything else bitter tasting. Compared to *satyagraha* petitions and deputations are such a bitter tasting (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 9, p. 386). The same is the case with Prahlad, “God’s devotee, (who) boldly embraced the red-hot pillar” as a demonstration of courage and honor (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 7, p. 123). In

an encouragement letter to the Tamils just before his third imprisonment in 1909, he reminds his audience that “we are both descendants of Prahlad . . . passive resister of the purest type” (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 9, p. 199). The examples fulfil different functions in different situations and—more importantly—Gandhi tailors his examples to his audience or addressees.

Two years later, Daniel received other companions. In a letter to *The Times of India* (22 August 1919), Gandhi wrote about civil disobedience, and now the context and addressees required different examples. Next to Daniel, who disobeyed the law of the Medes and the Persians,²⁶ he referred to Henry David Thoreau,²⁷ through his “immortal essay” on civil disobedience (Thoreau 1849), and to John Bunyan,²⁸ the puritan, non-conformist preacher, who spent twelve years in jail after the restoration of the Stuart monarchy (Hofmeyr 2004). Civil disobedience against laws that wound the conscience was the link between Thoreau, Daniel, and Bunyan (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 16, p. 51).

In the same month, Daniel and Bunyan were brought together in a letter to his “dearest child”, the Danish missionary Esther Faering, who wanted to stay in India and later lived in his *ashram*: “Success [of requests for a longer stay in India] could only be justified in the religious sense of the term, even as Daniel’s and Bunyan’s were justified” (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 16, p. 63).²⁹ Daniel and Bunyan served as examples of religiously motivated acting. The reference fitted with Faering’s background and the problems around her engagement in the *Sabermati Ashram*.

The Congress Report on the Punjab Disorders of 1920 contained a chapter on *satyagraha*. It demonstrated the long-lasting need of delimiting *satyagraha* from “passive resistance”. Again, it was necessary to emphasize that the former as the weapon of the strong excluded physical force or violence while the latter not. The examples Gandhi used were now almost all traditional: Daniel, Socrates, Prahlad, and Mirabai. Daniel refused to obey a law that was against his conscience and calmly suffered the punishment; Socrates wanted to teach the truth to the Athenian youth and was sentenced to death; Prahlad refused his father’s orders because they were inconsistent with his religious beliefs; Mirabai followed her conscience against her husband’s orders. Gandhi emphasizes their common ground: “none of them had any ill will towards their persecutors. Daniel and Socrates were model citizens of their state, Prahlad a model son and Mirabai a model wife” (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 17, pp. 152–53).

The first months of 1922 were dominated by the dramatic Chauri Chaura killings (Tidrick 2006, pp. 176–80; Guha 2019, pp. 155–57), when aggressive protesters torched a police station, killing 22 policemen, because they had fired on an advancing crowd. For Gandhi, the incident demonstrated that the people were ill prepared, not ready for real *satyagraha* and *ahimsā*. He himself went on a five-day fast and called the Non-Cooperation Movement off.³⁰ The British sentenced 170 men to death by hanging and Gandhi, also arrested, to 6 years in jail.³¹ Deeply affected by the spiral of violence, Gandhi emphasized two other elements of *satyagraha*. The idea of *excitement* should be excluded, and he illuminated it by the examples of Daniel, Bunyan, Latimer, and Prahlad. Without excitement, Daniel “opened his doors (windows)” for praying to his God; Bunyan turned into a non-conformist without excitement, Latimer at his execution said calmly that his hand should be burnt first, because “it was this hand had offended writing contrary to his heart”. Prahlad “rushed to the pillar his father had heated and embraced it” without excitement. All these actions were deliberate decisions. A new aspect had been added: “deliberate decisions taken without excitement are the real test for true civil disobedience” (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 23, p. 53).

The second element was non-retaliation. One week after the Chauri Chaura events, Gandhi reacted with remarks on retaliation (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 22, p. 363. YI 9 February 1922). His own life had been devoted to non-retaliation, because “the greatest teachers of the world: Zoroaster, Mahavira, Daniel, Jesus and Mohammed, Nanakand and a host of others” inspired him.³² The commandments were no obligation to blood-revenge but a restriction of it.³³

Twenty-four years later, in April 1946, Gandhi returned for the last time to Daniel, adding again a new aspect to the Daniel image. Christian missionaries had asked Gandhi whether an independent India would guarantee the rights of mission and proselytization. His answer was negative, because a real believer leaves the outcome of his work to God, as Daniel did. Obeying his conscience, he went into the lion's den, and after he was saved by God, the king recognized "that the God of Daniel is the living God, enduring forever" (Dan 6:26). "Who is the living God will come to light without statute or guarantee" (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 84, p. 52). Therefore, the missionaries did not need any guarantee if they really believed their own message.

2.3. The Gandhian Daniel and Company: Summary

After Jesus, Daniel was the most important biblical character for Gandhi. Daniel was paired with Socrates, spiritually "his elder brother", and accompanied by characters suitable for the addressees of his writings and speeches in their own context. Though at an early stage Daniel was "one of the greatest *passive resisters* that ever lived", Gandhi used the Daniel narrative time and again to explain the idea and practice of *satyagraha* as the better definition of what "passive resistance" really meant.

Daniel and company demonstrated the wide range of Gandhi's use of authoritative scriptures. For Gandhi, there were no boundaries between the scriptures of different religions. Past and present, holy writ and tradition can come together. History, legend, and myth are mixed.

Which aspects of *satyagraha* represent the character Daniel? Daniel was—next to Socrates—a comforting figure during imprisonment. Just as Gandhi did, Daniel, a model civil servant and citizen, opposed laws in conflict with his conscience. Gandhi's comparison that Daniel did the same as the Indians did with their opposition against the Registration Act goes in a twofold direction. First, it serves as an encouragement in the direction of the Indians, and second, as a signal to his English audience that the events in South Africa mirrored the situation and the actions of the biblical hero Daniel, a figure of their own tradition. The object of the conscientious opposition received an additional qualification as "Law of the Medes and the Persians" (Dan 6:12.15), a symbol for an unchangeable decision that became a trap for the king himself (Dan 6:14). Daniel's defiance of such a law enlarged his conscientious decision, for the content of the law itself was "against reason and holiness", important concepts in Gandhi's thought (Noort 2022, section 2.2.1, p. 3). According to Gandhi, "Soul force" should be taken literally, and this required a belief in the superior nature of the soul combined with a living faith. The Gandhian Daniel embodied the courage of a real *satyagrahi*. *Satyagraha* was and is the weapon not of the weak but of the strong. Immense courage will be needed. It was Gandhi's crucial message when he definitely returned to India. Daniel by then received other companions. Harischandra, Prahlad, and Mirabai preceded Daniel and Socrates. The American biblical scholar Daniel Smith-Christopher drew attention to the social resistance of Mirabai. Her *religious* devotion was a critique of domestic power in which marriage was strictly regulated and in this way demonstrated active resistance (Smith-Christopher 1993, pp. 327–28). When Daniel and Socrates represented conscience against unjust laws, the Indian background transferred it with the Gandhian examples to resistance against royal and domestic power. Such a resistance needed a deliberate choice. If not, if there was no love for the antagonist, the most important aspect of *satyagraha* was missing. The *conditio sine qua non* of Daniel's civil disobedience was nonviolence.³⁴ *Satyagraha* should be offered without excitement. There is no place for retaliation and the outcome of *satyagraha* should be left to God. Daniel resisted nonviolently and was prepared to suffer. There was no fear of death.

3. The Gandhian Daniel and His Reception

Gandhi's model Daniel as the exemplary *satyagrahi* has had a limited reception. In especially Christian reception history, the book of Daniel has been considered largely for its

view on the future and the supposed tools it offered to reveal the secret meaning of history, powers, and empires (Koch 1997).

As far as I can see, there has been only one serious engagement with Gandhi's approach to demonstrate the relevance of the Gandhian Daniel (Smith-Christopher 1993, 1996). Emilsen mentioned it and it came to life again in the commentary of Newsom on Daniel, especially in the sections about the reception history (Emilsen 2001a, 2001b; Breed 2014; Newsom 2014).

Daniel Smith-Christopher's point of departure was the question as to whether readings from different cultural contexts "could give us new ideas about what the (biblical) text historically meant" (Smith-Christopher 1993, p. 323).³⁵ He analyzed how the Gandhian Daniel really acted in Dan 6, whether his active resistance fitted into the exegesis of the court tales, and what this meant for an implied attitude to foreign rule in Daniel 1–6. The crucial verse, Dan 6:10, reads (KJV):

"Now when Daniel knew that the writing (royal decree) was signed he went into his house; and his windows *being open* in his chamber toward Jerusalem, he kneeled upon his knees three times a day, and prayed, and gave thanks before his God, as he did aforetime".³⁶

Gandhi supposed that Daniel actively *opened* his windows. In this way, he demonstrated his opposition against the unjust royal decree. Retelling the narrative in 1946, Gandhi made Daniel's active resistance even clearer. Normally, according to Gandhi, Daniel prayed *behind closed doors*, but now the windows were open so that all could see him (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 84, p. 52). Smith-Christopher supported Gandhi by referring to the Septuagint, rendering the active form "he opened" instead of the passive form of the MT.³⁷ This may seem to be a very small detail, but it proved that there was a textual tradition that gave Daniel an even more active role in his opposition.³⁸ Drawing the circle wider, Smith-Christopher concluded that the court tales read in the context of the "highly politicised apocalyptic visions of Dan 7–12... take on political significance as Jewish calls to remain steadfast". Taking up the recent trend of judging the Persian rule less positively than earlier in the scholarly debate, he raised the possibility of understanding the court stories as folk tales of subordinated Jews taking up a court setting but longing for freedom and power (Smith-Christopher 1993, pp. 333–37). The Daniel stories served as resistance literature for Jews under foreign rule.³⁹ As I will argue in the next sections, reading the court narratives together with the apocalypses offers even more possibilities than Smith-Christopher indicated in his pioneering paper.

4. The Book of Daniel and Its Context

4.1. Daniel: Not by Human Hands

In the following sections, we leave the Gandhian reading of the figure of Daniel and turn to the world of the book of Daniel in which this collection of court stories, dream interpretations, visions, and apocalypses emerged. In its historical context, the book of Daniel is one voice among competing and controversial other voices from roughly the same time. A time of dangers, persecutions, and wars not only on the narratological level but also in the real world and a time of the search for resistance to imperial power and propaganda. Bringing the Gandhian figure of Daniel together with the book of Daniel and the competing voices of the Maccabees is rewarding because the choices made by Gandhi and the authors of Daniel obtain context in the real world. Gandhi himself was not aware of this broader context. For him, Daniel—the courageous satyagrahi from the court narratives—was essential. The second part of the biblical book with the apocalyptic visions did not really interest him. Eschatology and apocalyptic thinking were not very important for him because on first view, they lack direct indications for concrete actions. When Gandhi referred to eschatology, he transferred it immediately to a concrete situation. The famous "swords into ploughshares" of Isa 2:4 resulted in a call on both Muslims and Hindus not to expect peace by the possession of rifles during the tensions shortly before independence in 1947 (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 87, p. 298; Emilsen 2001b, p. 21). The "Prince of Peace" (šar šālôm) of Isa 9:6 (MT 9:5) led in 1935 to the conclusion that "it is a first-class

human tragedy that peoples of the earth who claim to believe the message of Jesus who they describe as the Prince of Peace show little of that belief in actual practice" (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 62, pp. 175–76; Emilsen 2001b, p. 23).

Nevertheless, a look at the book of Daniel, from which Gandhi conceived of his protagonist, is needed.⁴⁰ It is the latest book of the Hebrew Bible and the only one that contains apocalyptic visions (Koch 1972, p. 23; Collins 2003, pp. 49–52).⁴¹ It is part of a group of larger Danielic literature from Persian and Hellenistic times until deep in the common era.⁴² For the reception history, it is important that fragments of all twelve chapters of the Book of Daniel have been found in Qumran.⁴³ This means that within a relatively short time between an edition of the Book of Daniel that would become the Masoretic Text and Qumran, there was already a connection between the court stories and the apocalyptic parts. The Aramaic part of Daniel contains the court stories (Dan 3–6), which are surrounded by the dream vision of Nebuchadnezzar (Dan 2) and the apocalypse of the four beasts (Dan 7).

In the apocalyptic visions, Daniel himself is in need of an angelic interpreter. He is not the active agent but the receiver. The scope is enlarged; it is not any longer the situation at a foreign court that is at stake but the secret meaning of world history and the long-awaited end of foreign rule and occupation. The primary question of this crisis literature is not how to act truthfully in a conflict situation, not the question of *lāmā* "why (this suffering and suppression)", but *‘ad mātay* "how long?". The answer is given in revelatory dreams and visions, revealing the secrets of the end of history by a heavenly figure. A four-kingdom scheme (Newsom 2014; Perrin and Stuckenbruck 2020) revealed the past and the future.⁴⁴ In it, the historical empires of Babylonia, Media, and Persia are represented by the beasts of lion, bear, and leopard, respectively, while the fourth kingdom meant Greece and the Seleucids after the death of Alexander the Great (Dan 7:3–7). The addressees of the apocalyptic part of Daniel are the politically and religiously suppressed Judaeans during the Seleucid reign. The "Wise among the people" (*maškilim*, Dan 11:33–35; 12:3), probably the hands and heads behind the book of Daniel, chose another way than the armed resistance of the Maccabees. On one side, they opposed the extreme Hellenization ("those who violate the covenant" (Dan 11:32); on the other side, the Maccabees are only "a little help" (Dan 11:34). The *maškilim* did not join the armed battles (Helms 2013, p. 24). "Deliverance by divine intervention, not militant struggle is the bottom line of the book of Daniel" (Tonstad 2016, p. 143).

4.2. Maccabees: Armed Resistance

The deep rift between Hellenized and traditional Judaism is the theme of the Books 1 and 2 Maccabees from roughly the same period as the youngest texts of the book of Daniel. 1 Maccabees describes the battles of the Maccabee family against inner and outer enemies, and homage is paid to their rise in power as the Hasmonean priest-kings. The main corpus of 2 Maccabees narrows the chronological frame from the rise of the Seleucid king Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175 BCE) until the defeat of his general Nicanor in 161 BCE and focusses on the battles of Judas Maccabeus.

Tonstad emphasized that the Maccabean uprising was not only a battle against the Hellenization from outside as a defense against Antiochus IV Epiphanes but also an internal conflict within the Jewish community.⁴⁵ Although fluid boundaries between the two existed,⁴⁶ religious purging became the ultimate goal, if necessary by the sword. Divine legitimation and inspiration could be found in the fall of Jericho under Joshua (2 Macc 12:15–16),⁴⁷

the reform of Josiah (2 Kgs 23:4–20), and the deuteronomistic ideology of the ban (devotion to destruction):

"They (Mattathias and the *hāsīdīm*, "the (militant) pious") organised an army and struck down sinners in their anger and renegades in their wrath; the survivors fled to the Gentiles for safety they tore down the altars; they forcibly circumcised

all the uncircumcised boys that they found within the borders of Israel". (1 Macc 2:45–46)

"They (Edomites, Ammonites) were shut up by him (Judas) in their towers, and he encamped against them, devoted them to destruction,⁴⁸ and burned with fire their towers and all who were in them". (1 Macc 5:5)

Further Deuteronomi(sti)c influences on 1 and 2 Maccabees are clearly visible (Berthelot 2007, pp. 46–53).⁴⁹

4.3. Daniel and Maccabees

Against the background of a shared history of persecution by the Seleucids, especially by Antiochus IV Epiphanes and his desecration of the Jerusalem temple, the books of Daniel and the Maccabees offer different answers for survival and resistance. They cover in their central sayings roughly the same period of the second century BCE, but they differ in their vision on the role of human action.

For the book of Daniel, two points are crucial, as Tonstad has demonstrated (Tonstad 2016, p. 142). The first is the famous dream of Nebuchadnezzar, which envisages a statue with images of parts of the human body and a series of metals representing the diminishing power and value of the four empires of Babylonia, Media, Persia, and Greece:

"The head of that statue was of fine gold (Babylonia), its chest and arms of silver (Media), its middle and thighs of bronze (Persia), its legs of iron (Greece [Alexander]), its feet partly of iron and partly of clay (Ptolemies and Seleucids)" (Dan 2:32–33).

The last and weakest part of the statue will be crushed by a stone "cut out *not by human hands*" (Dan 2:34.45). The dream interpreter Daniel spans ages and imperial powers with a vision of hope for the threatened present of the Seleucid persecutions. It is a dream interpretation of cultural and religious resistance. The deliverance from imperial power will *not* be by human hands; it will come without human agency. An everlasting kingdom will appear, for "the God of heaven will set up a kingdom that shall never be destroyed" (Dan 2:44). This probably refers to a direct manifestation of divine ruling (Koch 2015, pp. 213–23).

The second point focusses on a heavenly scene and introduces Michael, the guardian angel of Israel, who helps the heavenly messenger, Gabriel. The divine answer to Daniel's prayers and mourning was delayed, according to the text, because Gabriel was opposed by the national angel of Persia.⁵⁰ Admittedly, Daniel's search for understanding the future fate of Israel and his prayers were heard immediately by God:

"but the angel of the kingdom of Persia opposed me (Gabriel) twenty-one days. So Michael, one of the chief-princes came to help me and I left him there with the prince of the kingdom of Persia". (Dan 10:13)

After delivering his message, Gabriel has to return "to fight against the prince of Persia" (Dan 10:21a).⁵¹ In this vision, the wars are transcended to heaven. The scenes in heaven mirror the earthly circumstances and national parties. Therefore, both Israel and Persia have their own guardian angel. However, one thing is clear for the "wise" (*maškilîm*), the hands and heads behind the book of Daniel. The real battle, the course of history towards the end of time, will be decided in heaven. No battle on earth will be decisive. This important premise allows a detailed report in disguise of the events from Alexander the Great till Antiochus IV Epiphanes (Dan 11:3–40 in combination with foresayings of the end of time. Thus, Michael, "the great prince, the protector of your (Daniel's) people", returns in the final chapter of the book as the deliverer of Israel (Dan 12:1). Resurrection of the dead, final judgement, afterlife, will occur when the time of the end has come. Of course, the crucial question follows 'ad mātay "how long", will it take till this end, this delivery will come? (Dan 12:6).

Both examples, the pulverization of the imperial power by a stone "not made by human hands" in the dream of Nebuchadnezzar, and the battle between the angels of nations

claiming that the course of history will be decided in heaven, not by armed resistance on earth, contradict the Maccabean solution of the violent revolt.

4.4. The Role of Apocalypses

Though there is violence in the rhetoric of the Daniel apocalypses, moving the vindication of war to the heavenly domain means that violent *human* action is not the decisive factor. With the help of the analyses of Anthea Portier, it is possible to widen this aspect. She argued that the first Jewish apocalypses emerged as resistant counter-discourse: not a flight from reality into fantasy, but a literature of resistance to an empire, which realized its power not only through force and physical violence but also through propaganda and ideology.⁵² Within this sphere, the Daniel apocalypses contradicted the Seleucids' claims through their ideological propaganda:

“they answered terror with radical visions of hope.... a new visionary form that reconnected past, present, and future in a narrative governed by divine providence. In these ways apocalypse intervened in the logic of terror and so countered the empire's deadliest weapon”. (Portier-Young 2011, pp. xxii–xxiii, 175)

With this definition of the exercise of power, apocalypses are resistance literature indeed (Portier-Young 2016, pp. 104–9).

However, this does not mean that apocalypse as a genre in general took the position of Daniel. The allegory of the Animal Apocalypse in 1 Enoch sides with Judas Maccabeus and his revolt. In this dream vision the flock of sheep (Jews) is attacked by birds of prey, the raven representing the Seleucids. Finally “a large horn (Judas Maccabeus) sprouted on one of the lambs” (1 Enoch 90:9) “And those ravens battled and contended with it, and they wanted to eliminate its horn, but they did not prevail against it” (1 Enoch 90:12; Olson 2013, pp. 208–14). The passage tells the early military successes of the Maccabean revolt, the failure of the Seleucid armies, and is apparently unaware of Judas' death in the battle of Elasa (160 BCE). Therefore, the passage may be dated before 160 BCE. The allegory of the Animal Apocalypse serves as propaganda for the Maccabean revolt and its armed resistance, because it is followed by the eschatological final battle in which all the beasts and birds of prey will be destroyed⁵³ (Olsen 2013, pp. 90–99). Judas and his battles are the last important step for the eschaton with a final battle, a last judgement and a new Jerusalem, a new temple where God will reside (1 Enoch 90:20–36).⁵⁴

5. Gandhi and Daniel: Perspectives

The result of this survey is a complex image of competing literatures from roughly the same period and the hands, heads, and beliefs behind them (Grabbe et al. 2016). The courtier Daniel and his nonviolent resistance is enhanced by the consciously active role ascribed to him by Gandhi. On the other hand, the Daniel apocalypses and dreams of hope and trust in the same biblical book emphasize “not by human hands” and offer a nonviolent counterweight to the ideology of the state propaganda of the Seleucids. They contradict the historiographic idealization of the Maccabean revolt and its armed resistance. With the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch, which positively includes the Maccabean revolt in the course of (biblical) history, apocalypse stands against apocalypse. These competing voices do not offer a simple solution; they ask for choices, referring to their own different worldview in complex political, cultural, and religious situations.

How can this be accomplished? One solution is by walking with Gandhi in reading Daniel as the active courtier *and* the receiving seer. This seems a contradiction because Daniel's ethic of quietism (Collins 1993) seems to collide with the active role of the *satyagrahi*. However, again and again Gandhi stated that the outcome of *satyagraha* lies in the hand of God (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 8, p. 61). His ultimate ideal was Ramarajya, Rama rule in this world. He made Tolstoy's *The Kingdom of God is Within You* more concrete with the extension *The Kingdom of God on Earth* (Gray and Hughes 2015; Noort 2022, p. 6). It is the same creed as the basic assumption of the Danielic apocalypses. Therefore, a reading of Daniel that combines court narratives and apocalypse supports its qualification

as resistance literature opposing imperial power. Most scholars assume that the court narratives literary-historically precede the apocalypse. However, a reversed, combined reading of the courtier narrative against the background of the apocalypses as the final text makes Daniel the active sage who obeyed his conscience against unjust laws, knowing that the outcome of his actions did not depend on him.

In Biblical Studies, the scholarly discussion on war, on peace, and (non)violence have mainly focused on the problem of the violent images of God in the Hebrew Bible, divinely legitimized human violence (Noort 1997; Noort 2018), war narratives on the one side (Schmitt 2011), and prophetic eschatological views of an eternal peace on the other. A courageous, but outdated attempt by Burress to connect Gandhi with the ethics of the prophets will require the newer results of inquiry into prophetic literature (Burress 1998). Till now, Daniel simply did not appear in this discourse because biblical scholars and faith communities focused on images of God and the belief systems in which violence, power, and divine action played the main roles. A recent, valuable overview studying the three canonical parts of the Hebrew Bible on violence does not provide any reference to Daniel or apocalyptic literature (van Ruiten and Bekkum 2020). The postcolonial discourse on apocalyptic literature as resistance literature, and the choices made there, are still at an early stage of systematic reflection. For Gandhi, problematic images of God were not that significant because, for him, the world of the divine had many colors. His examples from a religious context were always positive ones. If needed, as in the case of the violent character of the Gita, he proposed an allegorical reading but was flexible when he could not maintain such an interpretation (Gandhi 2010; Noort 2022, p. 12; Parekh 1999, p. 167–68).

To focus on the Gandhian Daniel and his “elderly brother”, Socrates does not intend to reduce the power of other examples in their company, e.g., from the Indian context. Daniel and Socrates obtained their important place in the South African context, where both belonged to the cultural baggage of adversaries such as Botha and Smuts. Accompanied by others, they kept their place after the return to India.

The Gandhian Daniel is a model civil servant and citizen, opposing laws in conflict with his conscience, laws against reason, and holiness. His soul force as a weapon of the strong enables him to make deliberate choices without excitement. He leaves the outcome of his civil resistance to God and has love for his antagonist. He is prepared to suffer and has no fear of death. This also applies to the Gandhian Socrates. He follows virtue to the end, practicing his precepts, and adheres to the traditional religion but fights the corrupt elements of it. Above all, he does not desert his post. Daniel and Socrates were real satyagrahis.

The biblical Daniel offers the possibility to connect the courtier and the apocalyptic seer. As argued above, contextualizing the Danielic literature brings a real world to life, in which wars, persecutions, and occupation asked for answers of hope and resistance. They were given and practiced in different ways. The choice for Daniel in the context of apocalyptic resistance literature offers Biblical Studies the opportunity to explore new territory. Gandhi opened the door for it.

Funding: The research received no external funding.

Acknowledgments: Many thanks to my colleagues and co-fellows Louise du Toit, Wolfgang Palaver and Ephraim Meir for the intensive discussions during our common stay at the Stellenbosch Institute for Advanced Study in 2021. Deep-felt thanks to the staff of STIAS for creating a vibrant academic climate during our stay in Stellenbosch.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest.

Notes

- ¹ On 28 December 1907, Gandhi was sentenced to leave Transvaal within 48 h or to register under the Transvaal Asiatic Registration Act (TARA). By failing to do so, his first imprisonment began on 10 January 1908. Negotiations with General Jan Smuts ended with his release on 30 January. His second imprisonment began on 7 October 1908 for two months with hard labour, and the third one for three months with hard labour starting on 25 February 1909.

- 2 The Baptist missionary Joseph J. Doke (1861–1913) and his family nursed Gandhi after the brutal assault on his life on 10 February 1908 by the Muslim Pathan (Afghan) Mir Al'am, a former client who was convinced that Gandhi had betrayed them by accepting a compromise (voluntary registration) with Smuts concerning the Asiatic Registration Act (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 8, pp. 93–97). According to Emilsen (1997), p. 89, Gandhi had three wishes during his recovery: 1. Registering voluntarily as fulfilling his part of the compromise (he did); 2. The attackers should not to be charged, but released (they were sentenced); 3. Olive, the daughter of Doke, should sing Gandhi's favourite hymn "Lead, kindly Light" (she did) (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 29, p. 140, vol. 35, p. 395). Joseph Doke was also the first biographer of Gandhi: Doke (1909).
- 3 Gandhi (1958–1994), My first experience in gaol: vol. 8, pp. 119–21, 134–36 (I), 139–43, 145–46 (II), 152–55 (III), 158–62 (IV), My second experience in gaol: vol. 9, pp. 120–24 (I), 140–42 (II); 145–49 (III), 161–65 (IV); 179–83 (V).
- 4 Gandhi paraphrased an article from "The Christian World" in which the author referred to the substantial influences of other religions on Early Christianity. There is a reference to the apologist Justin Martyr, who regarded the wisdom and reason of Socrates as inspired by the *Logos* (Joh 1:1) which—according to Justin Martyr—made him a Christian even before the incarnation (Justin Martyr, *Second Apology*, X v). For Gandhi, it was important that the article stated that "Religion, by a hundred different names and forms, has been dropping the one seed into the human heart, opening the one truth as the mind was able to receive it". He called the author "broadminded", stated that Europeans and Indians are working together for the common good, and ended with a call for Muslims and Hindus to realise the same tolerance as demonstrated in the article.
- 5 Reports on Gandhi's extensive reading during his terms in jail: Gandhi (1958–1994), vol. 8, p. 159; vol. 9, pp. 181–82, 241–42.
- 6 Gandhi (1958–1994), vol. 8, pp. 172–74 (Indian Opinion 4 April 1908); 185–87 (IO 11 April); pp. 196–99 (IO 18 April); 212–4 (IO 25 April); pp. 217–21 (IO 2 May); pp. 227–29 (IO 9 May).
- 7 Gandhi used here the title *Mahatma* for Socrates, a title he disliked when given to himself.
- 8 The title of Ruskin's *Unto this Last* comes from Mt 20:14, the parable of the workers in the vineyard: "But he answered one of them, and said, Friend, I do thee no wrong: didst not thou agree with me for a penny? Take *that* thine *is*, and go thy way: I will give unto this last (one), even as unto thee" (KJV). Although Gandhi knew the parable, he did not think it necessary to explain it to his readers, and Vasunia (2015, p. 181), argues that Gandhi interpreted *Unto this Last* "also in the terms of a principled commitment to be upheld to the very end of one's life, that is, unto the last or unto death".
- 9 A proposal of exile as a verdict from the side of the defendant would probably have won over a majority of the jurors. Socrates, however, provocatively proposed that he be rewarded by receiving meals and maintenance in the Prytaneion, the townhall (Plato 2017, *Apology* 36d–37a). Forced to propose a penalty, he suggested a fine of one mina of silver (Plato 2017, *Apology* 38b–c).
- 10 In this article, I use the new edition of Loeb Classical Library 36 (Plato 2017) based on the revised critical Oxford edition = Plato (1995).
- 11 See Ruskin (1905). Cf. Wong (2012).
- 12 Indian Opinion 16 May 1908.
- 13 Five articles introduce the *Apology* and paraphrase Socrates's first speech. The sixth article renders the second and third speech with Socrates's answer to the verdict and the definite voting for the death penalty by the jurors. For a study of especially the sixth article, (see Vasunia 2015).
- 14 For the important theme of (non) fear, fearlessness in relation to death, faith and God, see (Palaver 2021, pp. 17–18; Noort 2022, pp. 5–6).
- 15 In comparing Gandhi's and Socrates's piety, it should not be forgotten that one of the accusations Socrates faced was "that he did not believe in gods at all" (Meletus, Plato 2017, *Apology* 26c). The repeated statements about divine guidance are therefore a part of his defence.
- 16 Socrates refers to Homer (1999, Book XVIII, 96, 98, 104), where Thetis tries to stop her son Achilles, who states that it is his duty to kill Hector and to revenge Patroclus's death even when he himself will be killed. Comparable is *Apology* 39a and Gandhi (1958–1994, vol. 8, p. 228), where Socrates discusses the possibility of escaping death in a battle by laying down arms. Gandhi adds "but such a man we call a coward".
- 17 Gandhi (1958–1994, vol. 8, p. 218), uses the metaphor of reins for Athens as a sluggish horse. The corresponding passage in Plato (2017), *Apology* 30e, offers a stronger expression. Socrates describes himself as a *μύωψ*, *myōps* a gadfly or horse-fly. It became his nickname. See, however, Marshall (2017) (Spur).
- 18 Mentioned by Gandhi in his paraphrase of *Apology* 31d (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 8, p. 218). Ironically, Socrates' *daimonion* prohibits him to go into politics, unlike Gandhi. The most important reference in the *Apology* is 40 a–c, where the *daimonion* does not stop Socrates from going to his trial and to speak as he did, accepting, even seeking, his own death (Bussanich 2013, pp. 276–93; Irrera 2018, on the Socratic δαίμων: McPherran 1996, pp. 185–90).
- 19 For the context and Gandhi's reflections on proof, certainty and the kind of inspiration, see (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 54, pp. 113–14; vol. 55, pp. 254–56).
- 20 Gandhi (1958–1994), vol. 29, p. 237 "Socrates embraced death in his dark and solitary cell and initiated his friends and us into the mysterious doctrine that he who seeks peace must look for it within himself"; vol. 22, p. 245 "The prison cell where Socrates drank the poison cup was undoubtedly the way to bliss"; p. 432 "Holding a cup of poison in his hands, Socrates addressed to his dear pupil a discourse on the immortality of the soul" (*Phaedo*, Cary 1905); p. 501 "(Imprisonments) are temples of liberty only

for those who are innocence personified”; vol. 23, p. 6 “Socrates made his best speech holding a cup of poison in his hand and, by his death, won immortality for himself and his words”; vol. 49, pp. 169–70: Retelling of the third speech of Socrates from the Apology; vol 53, p. 469. Gandhi recommended in a letter to the seriously ill Annapurnanand the reading of the dialogue of Socrates on death (*Phaedo*).

Of the four examples, Tolstoy received the highest praise: “he not only expounded (the doctrine of *satyagraha*), but lived according to it”.

It would be a misunderstanding to conclude that this dualism, Gandhi’s fasts, *brachmacharya*, the preparedness for suffering and asceticism led to a negative view of the body. Nursing the human body, proper body care, hygiene, nutrition and respect were essential for Gandhi (Coelho 2021, p. 1).

12 November 1909 at Westminster Palace Hotel, London.

Gandhi (1958–1994, vol. 11, p. 41). *Diamond Fields Advertiser*, 25 April 1911.

The practise of (self) sacrifice of a widow, in which she is burned on the pyre of her dead husband.

The expression meaning a law that cannot be revoked is a direct reference to Dan 6:12.

Thoreau’s essay—originally a lecture—was published in 1849, and reprinted as *On the Duty of Civil Disobedience*. He reflected on the role of the State and the right of individuals to oppose unjust laws—in his case, slavery and the American–Mexican war of 1846–1849.

John Bunyan (1628–1688), author of *The Pilgrim’s Progress*, refused to stop preaching and calling the people together, because “it was against his conscience”.

Letter to Esther Faering (Menon), August 1919. For the context, see Barnes (1959) and Reddy and Terp (2013).

It did not mean that by halting the Non-Cooperation Movement, the aims of *swaraj* would be adjusted. They would be the pillars “forever”: 1. removal of untouchability; 2. manufacture of *khaddar* 3. Hindu–Muslim unity; 4. cultivation of nonviolence.

After mass protests, the High Court reviewed the sentence in 1923: 19 death sentences were confirmed and the men executed, and 113 were convicted to imprisonment of various lengths.

For Gandhi, the Mosaic *lex talionis* “an eye for for eye” (Ex 21:22–25; Lev 24:19–21; Dtn 19:16–21; Mat 5:38–39) was the symbol of retaliation. He later revised his opinion and was open to the possibility that the intention of the *lex talionis* was a limitation of blood revenge. See Noort (2022, pp. 13–14).

Gandhi is not really sure: “It may be my wish that is father to the thought”, but he did not want to lead the reader into religious discussions (p. 363), given the broad reception history of the negative interpretation.

“Violence is the law of the beast in us. Self-suffering, i.e., civil resistance is the law of the (hu)man in us” (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 16, p. 51). Gandhi replied to a letter of “Pennsylvanian” in *The Times of India* (Gandhi 1958–1994, vol. 16, pp. 540–44) in which the author asked Gandhi to concentrate on social reforms and to give up his opposition against the Rowland Acts. Giving up the resistance was not possible for Gandhi because the Acts wounded consciences.

(Smith-Christopher 1993, p. 325) “If it is possible that cultural perspectives can suggest new possibilities for historical meaning of biblical texts, then once such a new interpretive idea is suggested, it should hold up to critical scrutiny and not simply be accepted on the basis of a moral sympathy with the source”. To reach historic shores is in my view one bridge too far, but sometimes Gandhi’s intuitive reading exposed redactional processes in the original text. An example is Mt 5:22; see Noort (2022, n. 1).

The translations following Vulgata: Dan 6:10; Hebrew Bible (Aramaic) and LXX: 6:11.

The Hebrew /Aramaic root *pāṭaḥ* “to open” appears in Dan 6:11 MT in the passive *p^elīḥān* “the windows were opened to Jerusalem”. Theodotion follows MT. Vulgata: *fenestris apertis*. The LXX (G*) read *thyridas enoixen en tō hyperōō autou* “he (Daniel) opened the windows in his upper chamber” in an active form, as well as the Ethiopian Daniel.

The question whether G*, MT/Theodotion or MT offers the “original” text of 6:11 does not make sense. They represent different traditions. The differences between the MT, Old Greek and the revision of Theodotion in the chapters 4–6 do not allow for a judgement about the “better” text. For an overview: Newsom (2014, pp. 2–12).

Newsom acknowledged the new approaches stimulated by postcolonial studies but warned against the underestimation of the complex relationship between imperial and colonized discourse (Newsom 2014, p. 16). A central point for her is the relation of divinely legitimated Gentile rule and the end of it.

For an overview of the main positions in the scholarly debate on the textual and tradition history, see Helms (2013, 2018) and Niehr (2016, pp. 618–29). Newer commentaries: Collins (1993) and (Newsom 2014).

From Dan 11: 29–39 it appears that the narrative of the violent and forced Hellenization by Antiochus IV Epiphanes (168 BCE by defiling the temple, Dan 11:31; Macc 1:29–32.54) does not know about the cleansing and rededication of the temple by Judas the Maccabee (164 BCE 1 Macc 4:36–61). Therefore, the final form of the MT Daniel may be dated between 168–164 BCE.

García Martínez, 4QPseudo-Daniel Aramaic and the Pseudo-Danielic Literature, in García Martínez (1994, pp. 137–61), discusses the wide range of Jewish (Syriac and Persian Pseudo-Daniel) and Christian works. 4QPseudo-Daniel Aramaic might be a genuine product of the Qumran sect. The Syriac and Persian Pseudo-Daniel are Jewish texts, and the Arabic, Coptic, Slavonic, Greek and

Hebrew Pseudo-Daniel are late Christian texts. This demonstrates the everlasting need of mastering history and the longing for knowledge of the turn of history, the new eon.

1Q71-72; 4Q112-116; 4Q174; 6Q7 all published in *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* vols. I, III, V, XVI. See (Barthélemy and Milik 1955, 1962, 1968, 2000).

By situating Daniel at the courts of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar and Darius the Mede, the dreams and visions covering the time of the Seleucid rulers of the 2nd century BCE and thereafter are presented as *future* events, while the intended audience on the basis of a verifiable past may trust the visions that go beyond their own time and situation.

The author(s) of 1 Macc calls the Hellenised Jews “renegades” (1 Macc 1:11; 7:5; 9:23; 11:21.25), “law breakers” (1 Macc 3:5.6; 9:58) and “ungodly” (1 Macc 3:8; 6:21).

The argument for making a covenant with the Gentiles that “since we separated from them many disasters have come upon us” (1 Macc 1:11) resembles the argument of Jer 44: 15–18, where halting offerings to the queen of heaven led to death by the sword and famines according to the protests against Jeremiah.

Schwienhorst-Schönberger (2012). Josua 6 und die Gewalt, pp. 459–60, in Noort (2012).

kai anethematisen autous //Hebr. *hirm hif*.

Berthelot mentions a.o. Dtn 7 (not worshipping foreign gods), Dtn 13 (total loyalty to YHWH), Dtn 20 (war laws) and 2 Kgs 18–19 (Hezekiah and Sennacherib).

śar “prince” is here an angelic appearance. The image of the heavenly national representatives may have originated from Dtn 32:8: “When the Most High/Elyon apportioned the nations, when he divided humankind, he fixed the boundaries of the nations according to the number of *the sons of God*” (MT em./4Q37). Every son of God (lesser god) received his own nation. Here, they appear as angels, protectors for their own nation.

For the New Testament scholar Walter Wink, author of the trilogy on the Powers (Wink 1984, 1986, 1992), the apocalypse of Dan 10 was important because of the war between contending powers (angels of the nations) was waged *in heaven*. He used it in a theology of prayer, arguing that being aware of these powers, and naming, unmasking and engaging them may lead to “politics of hope. Hope envisages its future and then acts as if that future is now irresistible, thus helping to create the reality for which it longs” (Wink 1999, p. 185). On Daniel: Wink 1986, pp. 88–91; 1999, pp. 4, 188–92, 195).

Dan 7; The Apocalypse of Weeks (1 Enoch 93:1–10 and 91:11–17; The Book of Dreams (1 Enoch 83–90).

1 Enoch 90:18-19 “And I watched until the Lord of the flock came to them. And he took in his hand the rod of his wrath and he struck the earth; and the earth split open. And all the beasts and all the birds of the sky fell away from the flock, and they sank into the earth, and it covered over them”.

Oegema (2016, p. 81) speaks of “realized eschatology” in embracing Judas and his revolt resulting in the Hasmonean reign.

References

- Barnes, Alice M. 1959. “My Dear Child”. *Letters of M.K. Gandhi to Esther Faering*. Ahmadābād: Navajivan Publishing House.
- Berthelot, Katell. 2007. The Biblical Conquest of the Promised Land and the Hasmonaean Wars according to 1 and 2 Maccabees. In *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology*. Edited by Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 118. Leiden and Boston: Brill, pp. 45–60.
- Breed, Brennan W. 2014. Sections: History of Reception in Newsom, Carol A. 2014. In *Daniel*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Burress, Lee. 1998. A Comparison of Selected Old Testament Prophets and Gandhi. *Gandhi Marg* 10: 135–48.
- Bussanich, John. 2013. Socrates’ Religious Experiences. In *The Bloomsbury Companion to Socrates*. Edited by John Bussanich and Nicholas D. Smith. London, New Delhi, New York and Sydney: Bloomsbury, pp. 276–300.
- Cary, Henry Francis. 1905. *The Defence and Death of Socrates; Being the “Apology” and Parts of the “Phaedo”; or “The Immortality of the Soul” of Plato*. London: Arthur C. Fifield.
- Coelho, Cajetan. 2021. Human Body in Indian Context—Body Language of ‘Non-Anthropologist’ Mahatma Gandhi. *Academia Letters* 3571. [CrossRef]
- Collins, John J. 1993. *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Collins, John J. 2003. Prophecy, Apocalypse and Eschatology: Reflections on the Proposals of Lester Grabbe. In *Knowing the End from the Beginning*. Edited by Lester L. Grabbe and Robert D. Haak. London and New York: T & T Clark International, London: Bloomsbury Publishing, pp. 44–52.
- Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*. Vol I. *Qumran Cave I*. 1955. Edited by Jean-Dominique Barthélemy and Józef Milik. Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 150–51.
- Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*. Vol. III. *Les ‘petites grottes de Qumran*. 1962. Edited by Maurice Baillet, Józef Milik and Roland de Vaux. Oxford: Clarendon Press, p. xxiii.
- Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*. Vol. V. *Qumran Cave 4. 1*. 1968. Edited by John M. Allegro. Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. xix–xx.
- Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*. Vol. XVI. *Psalms to Chronicles*. 2000. Edited by Eugene Ulrich. Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. xix–xxviii.
- Doke, Joseph J. 1909. *M.K. Gandhi: An Indian Patriot in South-Africa. With an Introduction of Lord Ampthill*. Madras: G.A. Nateran & Co.

- Emilsen, William W. 1997. Gandhiji and “Lead, kindly Light”. *Pacifica* 10: 84–92. [CrossRef]
- Emilsen, William W. 2001a. Gandhi, Scripture and the Bible. *Pacifica* 14: 71–86. [CrossRef]
- Emilsen, William W. 2001b. *Gandhi's Bible*. Delhi: ISPCK.
- Gandhi, Mohandas Karamchandi. 1958–1994. *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, KS ed. New Delhi: The Publications Division, Ministry of I&B, Government of India, vols. 1–100. Available online: <http://www.gandhiheritageportal.org/the-collected-works-of-mahatma-gandhi> (accessed on 28 December 2021).
- Gandhi, Mohandas Karamchandi. 2009. *Hind Swaraj and Other Writings*, Centenary ed. Edited by Anthony J. Parel. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gandhi, Mahatma Karamchandi. 2010. *The Bhagavad Gita According to Gandhi*. Berkeley: North Atlantic Books.
- García Martínez, Florentino. 1994. *Qumran and Apocalyptic. Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 9. Leiden, New York and Köln: Brill.
- Grabbe, Lester L., Gabriele Boccaccini, and Jason M. Zurawski, eds. 2016. *The Seleucid and Hasmonean Periods and The Apocalyptic Worldview*. Library of Second Temple Studies. London: T&T Clark, vol. 88.
- Gray, Stuart, and Thomas M. Hughes. 2015. Gandhi's Devotional Political Thought. *Philosophy East and West* 65: 375400. [CrossRef]
- Guha, Ramachandra. 2019. *Gandhi. The Years that Changed the World 1915–1948*. London: Penguin Random House UK.
- Helms, Dominik. 2013. *Konfliktfelder der Diaspora und die Löwengrube. Zur Eigenart der Erzählung von Daniel in der Löwengrube in der Hebräischen Bibel und der Septuaginta*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 446. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Helms, Dominik. 2018. *Daniel/Danielbuch*. WiBiLex. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft. Available online: <http://www.bibelwissenschaft.de/stichwort/16161/> (accessed on 20 April 2022).
- Hofmeyr, Isabel. 2004. *Portable Bunyan: Transnational History of the Pilgrim's Progress*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Homer. 1999. *Iliad. Volume II: Books 13–24. Translated Murray, Augustus Taber*. Edited by William F. Wyatt. Loeb Classical Library 171. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Irrera, Elena. 2018. Self-Images of Socrates: Respect of Tradition and Critical Examination in Plato's *Apology*. In *Defending a Philosophical Life: Readings of Plato's Apology of Socrates*. Edited by Vivil Valvik Haraldsen, Olof Pettersson, Tvedt Wiese and Elisabeth Oda. Lanham: Lexington Books, pp. 155–77. Available online: https://www.academia.edu/18132465/Self_Images_of_Socrates_Respect_of_Tradition_and_Philosophical_Innovation_in_Plato_s_Apology?email_work_card=view-paper (accessed on 4 March 2022).
- Koch, Klaus. 1972. *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*. Naperville: Allenson.
- Koch, Klaus. 1997. *Europa, Rom und der Kaiser vor dem Hintergrund von zwei Jahrtausenden Rezeption des Buches Daniel*. Berichte aus den Sitzungen der Joachim-Jungius Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften (Hamburg). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Koch, Klaus. 2015. *Daniel 1–4. Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament XXI/1*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Marshall, Laura A. 2017. Gadfly or Spur? The meaning of ΜΥΩΨ in Plato's *Apology of Socrates*. *Journal of Hellenistic Studies* 137: 163–74. [CrossRef]
- McPherran, Mark L. 1996. *The Religion of Socrates*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Newsom, Carol A. 2014. *Daniel*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Niehr, Herbert. 2016. Das Buch Daniel. In *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. Edited by Christian Frevel. 9. Auflage. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Noort, Ed. 1997. *Unde Malum. The Relation between YHWH and Evil in the Old Testament*. In *The Problem of Evil. Essays on Cross-Cultural Perspectives*. Edited by Anand Amaladass. Chennai: Satya Nilayam Publications, p. 5188.
- Noort, Ed. 2012. *The Book of Joshua*. Leuven, Paris and Walpole: Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium CCL.
- Noort, Ed. 2018. A God Who Kills. Deadly Threat in the Hebrew Bible and Its Explanations. In “You shall not kill”: *The Prohibition of Killing in Ancient Religions and Cultures*. Edited by J. Cornelis de Vos and Hermut Löhr. *Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements* 27. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, p. 8399.
- Noort, Ed. 2022. Gandhi's Use of Scriptures: A Hermeneutic of Nonviolence against Letters That Kill. *Religions* 13: 153. [CrossRef]
- Oegema, Gerbern S. 2016. Was the Maccabean Revolt an Apocalyptic Movement? In *The Seleucid and Hasmonean Periods and The Apocalyptic Worldview*. Edited by Lester L. Grabbe, Gabriele Boccaccini and Jason M. Zurawski. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, pp. 69–87.
- Olsen, Daniel. 2013. *A New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch: All Nations Shall Be Blessed*. *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, vol. 24.
- Palaver, Wolfgang. 2021. Gandhi's Militant Nonviolence in the Light of Girard's Mimetic Anthropology. *Religions* 12: 988. [CrossRef]
- Parekh, Bhikhu C. 1999. *Colonialism, Tradition, and Reform: An Analysis of Gandhi's Political Discourse*, 2nd ed. New Delhi: Sage.
- Perrin, Andrew, and Loren T. Stuckenbruck. 2020. *Four Kingdom Motifs before and Beyond the Book of Daniel*. Themes in Biblical Narrative 28. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Plato. 1995. *Platonis Opera. Vol I: Tetralogiae I-II*. Edited by E. A. Duke. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Plato. 2017. *Euthyphro. Apology. Crito. Phaedo*. Translated and Edited by Christopher Emlyn-Jones, and William Preddy. Loeb Classical Library 36. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Porten, Bezalel, and Ada Yardeni. 1993. *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt*. Literature, Accounts and Lists. Newly Copied, Edited and Translated into Hebrew and English. Jerusalem: Hebrew University, Department of the History of the Jewish People, vol. 3.
- Portier-Young, Anthea E. 2011. *Apocalypse against Empire: Theologies of Resistance in Early Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

- Portier-Young, Anatheia E. 2016. *Apocalyptic Worldviews—What They Are and How They Spread: Insights from the Social Sciences*. London: T&T Clark, pp. 104–20.
- Reddy, Enuga Sreennivasulu, and Holger Terp. 2013. *Friends of Gandhi: Correspondence of Mahatma Gandhi With Esther Faering (Menon), Anne Marie Peterson And Ellen Horu*. New Delhi: Gyan Publishing House.
- Ruskin, John. 1905. Unto This Last. Four Essays on the First Principles of Political Economy (serialised 1860 Cornhill Magazine, book 1862). In *The Works of John Ruskin*. Edited by Edward Tyas Cook and Alexander Wedderburn. London: George Allen, vol. 17.
- Schmitt, Rüdiger. 2011. Der “Heilige Krieg” im Pentateuch und im Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk. *Studien zur Forschungs-, Rezeptions- und Religionsgeschichte von Krieg und Bann im Alten Testament*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 381. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Schwienhorst-Schönberger, Ludger. 2012. Josua 6 und die Gewalt. In *The Book of Joshua*. Edited by Ed Noort. Leuven, Paris and Walpole: Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium CCL, pp. 433–71.
- Smith-Christopher, Daniel L. 1993. Daniel 6: Some Thoughts on a ‘Cultural Exegesis’ of the Bible. *Biblical Interpretation* 1: 321–38. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Smith-Christopher, Daniel L. 1996. Daniel. In *New Interpreter’s Bible*. Nashville: Abingdon, pp. 19–152.
- Thoreau, Henry David. 1849. Resistance to Civil Government. A Lecture delivered in 1847. In *Aesthetic Papers*. Edited by Elizabeth Peabody. Boston: John Wilson, pp. 189–211.
- Tidrick, Kathryn. 2006. *Gandhi: A Political and Spiritual Life*. London and New York: I.B.Taurus.
- Tonstad, Sigve K. 2016. To Fight or Not to Fight: The Sabbath and the Maccabean Revolt. *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 54: 135–46.
- van Ruiten, Jacques, and Koert van Bakkum, eds. 2020. *Violence in the Hebrew Bible. Between Text and Reception*. Oudtestamentische Studiën/Old Testament Studies 79. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Vasunia, Phiroze. 2015. Gandhi and Socrates. *African Studies* 74: 175–85. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
- Wink, Walter. 1984. *Naming the Powers: The Language of Power in the New Testament*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Wink, Walter. 1986. *Unmasking the Powers: The Invisible Powers That Determine Human Existence*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Wink, Walter. 1992. *Engaging the Powers: Discernment and Resistance in a World of Domination*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Wink, Walter. 1999. *The Powers that Be: Theology for a New Millennium*. New York: Doubleday.
- Wong, Daniel. 2012. Toward a Postsecular Economy: John Ruskin’s Unto This Last. *Nineteenth-Century Contexts: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 34: 217–35. [\[CrossRef\]](#)