FROM HERE TO ETERNITY AND BACK:

Locating

Sacred Spaces and Temple Imagery in the Book of Daniel

Faculty of Religious Studies
McGill University, Montreal

September 2009

A thesis submitted to McGill University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Abstract

This dissertation offers a reading of sacred spaces and temple imagery in the Book of Daniel using critical spatial theory. It is argued that the idea of sacred space is, in fact, one of the main concerns in Daniel and forms a running theme within the narrative. Because the allusions are often vague and buried deep within the individual stories a methodology has been chosen that foregrounds the notion of the spatial. Unlike other methodologies used to define sacred space, this approach is pre-eminently equipped to perform a depth analysis of the text. Although some elements from older models are incorporated, these have been reformulated and reconfigured into a new context, which goes beyond the traditional binary model that sharply and uncompromisingly juxtaposes the sacred and the profane. Critical spatial theory adds to the traditional historical and societal vantage points the spatial view, creating a trialectic which, rather than ending up with mutually exclusive opposites, results in an integrated system able to expose the sub-narrative underlying the actual text. Thus, the concepts of 'exile', 'kingdom', and 'dreamscape' that are usually understood in a more temporal and abstract sense are now studied as primarily spatial phenomena and brought into each other's orbit. Therefore, by adding the spatial component, new insights will be gained that show how the narrative past and future bear on what are the true present concerns 'on the ground' for those who produced the text. Furthermore, it correlates the concrete and abstract realms that are described in the text and it exposes the various power relations they contain. The notion that space is socially produced, and consequently defined through the ways it is acted upon, thought about, and moved in, is one of the key concepts of critical spatial theory.

The point of departure for the argumentation in this study is the consensus view that although the finished text is a product of the mid-second century BCE, especially the court tales contain older materials that may go back to the late Persian or early Hellenistic Period. The proposed spatial analysis will be applied on three levels. The first is the world that forms Daniel's narrative frame, i.e., that of the Exile, because this was obviously meaningful to the editors. In doing so, full notice will be taken of the ancient Near Eastern realia that made up the world that is described. This is followed by the implied world of the Hellenistic era especially in Judea, which directly concerned the editors of the text. This, then, brings us to the world that remains wholly within the narrative, namely the alternate realities of the heavenly realm and dream worlds, which contain the hopes and ideals of those responsible for the text. In conclusion it will be assessed what effect these three worlds have on each other and how this relationship may contribute, in the minds of the Daniel group, to producing a fully restored world in which the human and divine both have their fixed places and space.

Resumé

Cette dissertation offre une interprétation de l'espace sacré et les images du temple dans le Livre de Daniel, en utilisant la théorie critique d'espace. C'est affirmé que l'idée de l'espace sacré est une des préoccupations centrales de Daniel, un thème qui existe à travers la narration. Puisque les allusions sont souvent imprécises et sont bien cachées dans les histoires individuelles, une méthode a été choisie qui souligne l'idée de l'espace. Contrairement aux autres méthodes utilisées pour définir l'espace sacré, cette approche est particulièrement bien equipée pour une analyse dans les moindres détails du texte. Bien que quelques éléments sont incorporés des modèles plus anciens, ils ont été reformulés et reconfigurés dans un contexte nouveau, qui transcend le modèle traditionnel binaire dans lequel le sacré et le profane sont juxtaposés nettement puis d'une manière intransigeante. La théorie critique d'espace rajoute un point de vue spatial aux points de vue historiques et sociétaux traditionnels, créant une trialectique qui, au lieu de finir par les contraires qui s'excluent mutuellement, a pour resultat un système intègre, capable de révéler la sous-narration à la base du texte. Ainsi, les concepts d' « exil, » de « royaume, » et de « scène a l'intérieur du rêve »—normalement compris dans un sens plus temporel et abstrait—sont ici compris essentiellement comme phénomènes spatiaux et se sont rapprochés. Donc, l'ajout de l'élément spatial amène un regard neuf, où le passé et le futur narratif atteignent les vrais soucis présents pour ceux qui ont produit le texte. De plus, il fait une corrélation entre les champs concrets et abstraits décrits dans le texte, en exposant leurs dynamiques de pouvoir. La notion que l'espace se construit socialement—et donc est défini par les manières par lesquelles il est influencé, considéré, et utilisé—est un des concepts clés de la théorie critique d'espace.

Le point de départ de l'argumentation de cette étude est l'accord général que même si le texte final est un produit du milieu du deuxième siècle avant JC, les récits de la cour contiennent des données plus anciennes qui pourraient dater de l'époque Perse ou bien de la première époque hellénistique. L'analyse spatiale proposée va être appliquée à trois niveaux. Le premier, c'est le monde qui comprend la structure de la narration de Daniel, i.e., celle de l'exil, car c'était évidemment significatif aux rédacteurs. De cette façon, l'attention sera faite aux artéfacts Proche-Orientaux Anciens qui formaient le monde décrit. Ceci est suivi par le monde implicite de l'époque hellénistique, surtout en Judée, question des rédacteurs du texte. Ensuite, nous sommes rendus au monde qui reste entièrement dans le récit, c'est à dire les réalités alternatives du royaume des cieux et le monde des rêves, qui contiennent les espoirs et les idéaux de ceux qui étaient derrière le texte. En conclusion, nous allons évaluer quel est l'effet de ces trois mondes les uns sur les autres, et comment cela pourra concourir à—dans les têtes du groupe Daniel—produire un monde complètement régénéré, dans lequel l'humain et le divin ont, tous les deux, leurs espaces fixes.

Acknowledgements

Abbreviations

AJSR	Association for Jewish Studies Review
ArtB	The Art Bulletin
ASTI	Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute
AUSS	Andrews University Seminary Studies
BA	Biblical Archaeologist
BAR	Biblical Archaeology Review
BASOR	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research
BTB	Biblical Theology Bulletin
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
CBR	Currents in Biblical Research
DDD	Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible
DSD	Dead Sea Discoveries
HAR	Hebrew Annual Review
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
HTS	Hervormde Teologiese Studies
HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual
JAAR	Journal of the American Academy of Religion
JAB	Journal of the Aramaic Bible
JANES	Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JCS	Journal of Cuneiform Studies
JHS	Journal of Hebrew Scriptures
JJS	Journal of Jewish Studies
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies
JQR	Jewish Quarterly Review
JSIJ	Jewish Studies, an Internet Journal
JSJ	Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods
JSNT	Journal for the Study of the New Testament
JSOT	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament
JSS	Journal of Semitic Studies
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
NEA	Near Eastern Archaeology
NovT	Novum Testamentum
OTE	Old Testament Essays
OTP	*Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. J.H. Charlesworth, ed. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983
PEQ	Palestine Exploration Quarterly
PIBA	Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association
RQ	Revue de Qumran
SBLSP	Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers
SJOT	Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament
UF	Ugarit Forschungen

TynBul	Tyndale Bulletin
VT	Vetus Testamentum
VTS	Vetus Testamentum Supplements
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft

ABD	Freedman, D.N., ed., *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
ANET	J.B. Pritchard, ed. *The Ancient Near East in Texts Relating to the Old Testament* Princeton, N.J. Princeton University Press 1969. 2d ed. with supplement.
BDB	Brown, F., S.R. Driver, C. A. Briggs, et al., *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1906. Repr., Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers Inc., 2000.
DDD	Van der Toorn, K., B. Becking, P.W. van der Horst, eds. *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. 2nd extensively rev. ed. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1999
DJD	*Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955-.
DSSSE	Florentino García Martínez & Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. Leiden; New York: Brill, 1997-1998.
EDDS	Schiffman, L.H. and J.C. VanderKam, eds. *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
HALOT	Koehler, L., W. Baumgartner, and J.J. Stamm, eds., *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated and edited under the supervision of M. E. J. Richardson. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1994-1999.
TDOT	*Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament.* 15 vols. Edited by G. J. Botterweck and. Translated by J. T. Willis, G. W. Bromiley and D. E. Green. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974-.

Table of Contents

Introduction

According to a medieval Jewish tradition [1] there are seventy facets or aspects to the Torah. This is to explain that there are innumerable ways to interpret it and, in the extreme, that its meaning is not located in any one particular time or place but that it truly transcends time and space. While this dictum refers to the dynamics within one particular school of thought, i.e. rabbinic Judaism, one might equally apply it to the myriads of modern approaches to the study of biblical text in its widest sense. These range from the traditional literary approaches of form, redaction, tradition, and canonical criticism, as well as the history of religions and comparative schools to the more recent social science approaches, which apply the findings of anthropology, sociology and ritual. To this may also be added various forms of literary and specifically narrative theory and a host of postmodern readings. While today many of the traditional methods are still used to great benefit, some have had to be remodelled, and others put on the back burner, all depending on the questions we ask of the text. At the same time the application of wholly new schools of thought have emerged, some of which are standing the test of time, others still in their infancy and finding their way into the forest of interpretation. In a narrower sense, a similar development can be demonstrated in the field of sacred space studies, the most prominent of which in our times having been formulated by Mircea Eliade. But what applies to the traditional areas of interpretation, also applies to his approach.

It is with this in mind that I want to subject the Book of Daniel to one of these newer approaches, namely critical spatial analysis, in order to attain a better understanding of the mapping, applications and function of its various sacred spaces. Critical spatiality, as this method is also known, was first formulated by the French philosopher Henri Lefebvre in the mid-seventies and carried forward by the American geographer Edward W. Soja in the following years. The greatest breakthrough for the current study, though, would not come until the mid-nineties, when critical spatiality was

---

[1] Numbers Rabbah, Naso 13:15. See G. Scholem, *On the Kabbalah and Its Symbolism* (New York: Schocken, 1965), 62-65. See also the discussion in B. Levy, *Fixing God's Torah* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 5-6 on even more facets.

introduced as an analytical tool for the study of biblical texts. We should remember that since this approach hails from the social sciences, and specifically cultural geography, it is normally applied to present-day existing socio-geographical contexts or those of well-documented recent history. Its usefulness for the study of ancient texts has only fairly recently been demonstrated and thus in recent years we have been able to observe how spatial analysis of narrative has made significant inroads in biblical studies. [2]

Critical spatiality aims to bring out dimensions of the narrative worlds that are not sufficiently covered - if at all - by the more traditional approaches. However, that does not mean that these older methodologies are obsolete – far from it. It supplements as well as interacts on many levels with these existing methodologies. As will be shown, this approach goes beyond the mere indication of spatial markers and the identification of human movement through (narrative) spaces. This is in contrast to the many studies that stop short at such identification and whose premise it is to see space as a static three-dimensional container in which movement forwards, backwards, left, right, up and down is possible and can be described. Critical spatiality, however, looks at space as in constant flux. It is socially and epistemologically produced, meaning that the nature of the same space can change depending on the perspective from which it is observed, thought about and used. Thus, its character and even its very existence become directly dependent upon the behaviour within it and the thinking about it. This enables the reader to determine what the inter-social dynamics are within a given narrative as well as determine what the relationship is between the state of a place and the circumstances that created that state. Since critical spatiality can be applied on a synchronic as well as on a diachronic level it enables a reader to better understand such a multi-layered and multi-faceted text as the Book of Daniel.

---

[2] See the results of the Constructions of Sacred Space Group that functioned over a number of years under the aegis of the Society of Biblical Literature and American Academy of Religion. Their work is to a certain extent continued in SBL's Space, Place, and Lived Experience in Antiquity Section. See further Section 1.2 below, fn. 19.

When thinking about the religious and (geo-)political concerns in the Book of Daniel it is often easy to forget that many of the associations that these invoke in the mind of the contemporary reader did not belong to the lived reality of the author/editor of that text. Thus, despite the fact that the book deals with the gravity of Exile and the fear of a protracted exilic experience, the framer of the text was, in fact, not living in exile but in the Land of Israel. This results at times in clear cases of cognitive dissonance within the narrative. For instance, despite the closeness in time to the destruction of the city and the temple according to the narrative chronology, there is absolutely no emotional response to this event in the narrative, or even knowledge of it, until Daniel's prayer in chapter 9. There is no concern for or awareness of other exiles, other than the immediate group around Daniel. In addition, there is no mention at all of the priesthood, other than, indirectly in a seemingly loose remark referring to the evening sacrifice, again in chapter 9. This is all in stark contrast to the emotional outpouring found in texts that likely do date from immediately following the destruction, such as Lamentations, or from the exile and Persian period, such as the latter prophets. These all display a great urgency with regard to a restoration of the temple and its cult, as well as a restoration of autonomy for the people in the Land. This seeming strange attitude of emotional detachment, despite clear indications that a major concern in the text is the welfare of the Temple and the mourning of its repeated violation and loss coupled with the ultimate hope of its glorious reinstatement, may in fact be a result of the fact that the text's framer had in principle free access to a functioning Temple in Jerusalem. [3] The second destruction and resulting expulsion from Jerusalem would not take place for another two centuries. Yet, the conditions of the framer's lived world were certainly far from ideal; in particular for those who had expected a complete and idealized restoration of full autonomy as it had been perceived to be in the pre-exilic world, a world that had been so completely uprooted by the sixth-century Babylonian invaders. And although certain prophecies had appeared to come true with regard to the end of the Babylonian Empire, this had not resulted in the longed-for true restoration. In its place came the Persian Empire, which, in turn, was followed by Seleucid Greek rule.

---

[3] This is so regardless of any stirrings of early sectarianism and possible opposition to temple authorities and practices.

Naturally, Daniel's framer was well aware of this sequence of events and its consequences. These are included clearly in two places in his text, namely, the historical reviews in chapters 8 and 11 which both end in his present time. Yet, the temptation is great to lift the Book of Daniel, which was accepted as prophetic in nature by both earlier commentators and in present-day conservative circles, [4] out of its historical and even geographical context. Although a re-use of Daniel themes is already apparent in the Books of the Maccabees as well as the War Scroll - not to mention the Pseudo-Daniel texts from Qumran (although these may represent a separate development) – the ultimate paradigm for this re-use was set most likely by the author of the New Testament Book of Revelation who reinterpreted certain facets of Daniel and actualized them to fit his own late first century early-Christian reality. [5]

The approach taken in this dissertation follows the consensus view concerning the date of composition for Daniel, i.e., the writing of the last six chapters and final compilation of the complete book took place during the Antiochian persecution; whereas the first six chapters were written significantly earlier, most likely in the early Hellenistic Period. This means that at their core these cannot refer to the perils of Antiochus' reign. However, as John Collins points out, "someone who read these tales in the time of Antiochus could apply them to his own situation. This, however, does not prove that the tales were written with that situation in mind." [6] Yet, whatever allusions to Antiochus' policies the final compiler or later readers may have read into the court tales, it is the aim of this dissertation to trace sacred space and temple imagery. Its main concern will therefore not be with the presence or absence of these

---

[4] See Chapter 2.3: Early Views on the Character of the Book.

[5] See D.E. Aune, *Revelation* [WBC 52C] Dallas: Word Books, 1994: 1284-85, whose index of biblical sources covers no less than four whole columns of references from the Book of Daniel with all chapters represented. See further, G.K. Beale, *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John*, Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1984. The other texts that he mentions are various Qumran texts (especially the War Scroll), *I Enoch*, *IV Ezra*, and *II Baruch*. See also A.J. Tomasino, "Daniel and the Revolutionaries: The Use of the Daniel Tradition by Jewish Resistance Movements of Late Second-Temple Palestine," Diss. University of Chicago, 1995 and S.C. Madden, "Josephus's Use of the Book of Daniel: A Study of Hellenistic-Jewish Historiography," Diss. University of Texas, 2001.

[6] J.J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel*. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977: 9.

allusions unless they are considered to contribute to a further understanding of sacred spaces within the tales.

Looking for temple imagery in Daniel may, at first sight, not seem a very promising enterprise, if only because the narrative is set in a post-destruction context. [7] Even so, Daniel's concern with the temple forms a very clear frame for the rest of the book. It opens with references to the spoliation of the temple. Midway through the book we have references to the heavenly sanctuary, to be followed by a prayer for the restoration of Jerusalem and the destroyed temple. Towards the end the reader is encouraged to look forward to a full restoration despite temporary setbacks. It will be argued that this imagery can indeed be extrapolated from the text beyond these references and that it forms the main driving force of the book. In order to do so, however, it needs to be established how exactly temple imagery is defined. When we limit the search strictly to references to the actual building of the Jerusalem temple, the results will indeed be slim. Extending it to cult references – which has been done before [8] - will broaden the field somewhat but that too will result in only scratching the surface. Likewise, merely indicating the spots on the map that have been generally recognized as constituting sacred space and connecting the dots, thus mapping the sacred spaces, while useful, is only one part in a much larger project.

It will be helpful to look at the conceptual range of 'temple imagery' in other contemporary Second Temple Period texts in order to understand what may have concerned the framers of Daniel. Included are texts that focus on the heavenly

---

[7] However, the absence or inaccessibility of the Temple has never precluded an intense interest in its fate. If anything, this condition has heightened the attention. A recent study, for instance, tracing this interest is B. Ego, A. Lange & P. Pilhofer (eds.), *Gemeinde ohne Temple / Community without Temple. Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999. Other examples are found in the many treatments of rabbinic responses in the wake of the destruction of the Second Temple, such as D.W. Nelson, "Responses to the Destruction of the Second Temple in the Tannaitic Midrashim," Diss. New York University, 1991; B.Z. Rosenfeld, "Sage and Temple in Rabbinic Thought after the Destruction of the Second Temple," *JSJ* 28(1997): 437-464.

[8] W. Vogel, "The Cultic Motif in Space and Time in the Book of Daniel," Diss. Andrews University, 1999. This work, however, does not cover the entire text of Daniel.

sanctuary and those describing visionary as well as competing or contested sacred spaces. This covers the synchronic comparison. Likewise, a diachronic search of imagery is required since neither the groups behind the texts, dating roughly to the third to first centuries BCE, nor specifically those behind Daniel, operated in a vacuum. They clearly inherited knowledge, themes, and imagery from those who came before them. It should be noted that especially in the ancient Near East ideas have proven to be extremely persistent and in many cases a clear line of continuity can be demonstrated from ancient Mesopotamia, through Assyria, Babylonia, Persia, and the Seleucid dynasties. Thus we can trace spatial imagery, to which these cultures attached great significance, all the way to Hellenistic times. In this way the period of both the narrative setting and that of the final product of Daniel can be accounted for, and the assumption that the framers had access to much authentic material to set up their narrative becomes a reasonable premise. This is, of course, aside from the primary source of information that they found in the texts that would later comprise the Hebrew Bible, which itself is much indebted to what the surrounding cultures had to offer. In many commentaries and studies we find that often connections are made to ancient Near Eastern materials in order to elucidate individual passages or themes in the text. However, as this study is concerned with a search for sacred spaces, this is what we will also look for in the supporting ancient Near Eastern materials. As noted above, many ancient Near Eastern texts are remarkably interested in spatial matters and these offer rich and thus far not fully appreciated ways to read and assess the spatial markers in Daniel. [9]

Chapter One introduces the methodology and provides an overview of the application of various theories of space, and specifically sacred space, to biblical and Second

---

[9] Examples range from the world building creation myths to accounts of gods and heroes making journeys into the heavenly realms, the nether world in and/or through dreamscapes. Considered too must be the topographical texts describing cities, the royal building accounts of temples, as well as the tableaux found on the monumental palace reliefs throughout the various historical eras of Mesopotamia. In addition, it has been shown that the layout of ancient urban centers as revealed by archaeology may contribute to an understanding of the built environment aspects in narratives. On the usefulness of applying critical spatiality to an actual archaeological site, see S. Lumsden, "The Production of Space at Nineveh," *Iraq* 66(2004): 187-197. This, in turn, enables the reader to extend this line of analysis to a purely narrative environment.

Temple period texts. The chapter considers the question of what exactly comprises sacred space (and 'the sacred' in general) and briefly traces its terminological development in the Hebrew Bible. Which elements exactly make up temple imagery will subsequently be addressed. The chapter concludes with a proposal on how spatial theory can contribute to determining the function of temple imagery within the narrative.

Chapter Two reviews recent research on Daniel and further details related to the question of Daniel's genre, date, its possible relationship to wisdom and prophecy, its textual history and connection with other, more or less, contemporary texts. It explores the role of apocalypticism in Daniel's eschatology and seeks to foreground the latter's spatial character over its temporal aspects.

Chapter Three identifies and clarifies the various spaces in the Book of Daniel in light of its narrative structure. These range from the real to the imaginary spaces including those spaces that the book merely alludes to. For example, throughout the book dreams function as a vehicle connecting the earthly and heavenly, the present and the future. The dreamstate itself opens up a stage on which a human being may view and experience the non-earthly and non-temporal. [10] These dreamscapes also signify the ever present but elusive heavenly temple to which they provide a portal for the elect. Thus, dreams and visions are both a means and an end-destination for some until the eschatological Kingdom manifests itself in all its portrayed magnificence. It will be demonstrated that these three radically different spaces, from a temporal, a spatial, as well as an ontological perspective, not only can be united but are, in fact, interdependent in the Book of Daniel. The chapter concludes with a description of the various ways in which to approach the interplay between, and connect the various seemingly disparate worlds created by Daniel's narrative.

---

[10] The dreamstate can be seen as a liminal space, a conduit leading from one spatial reality to another, but also one with an ontological aspect, leading the dreamer from one state of being to another and psychologically, from one level of consciousness to another.

The questions that are raised specifically concerning these textual worlds will be approached not only by means of critical spatiality but in addition, to facilitate the transition from praxis to text, I will borrow some pertinent elements from the concept of 'possible worlds' as worked out by literary theorist Lubomír Doležel. It will be indicated in this chapter how this contributes to the ability to map the various multi-leveled narrative spaces of Daniel.

Chapter Four highlights two topoi that form the framework of the Book of Daniel, Exile and Kingdom. Spatial analysis brings to the fore how these two areas intertwine in making sense of Daniel, by indicating the weaving of their various components into one text. They also provide the book with a thematic frame. Exile is a purely earthly state and represents the lost temple. Kingdom is at the same time a failed earthly and an eternal heavenly reality and represents the hope for a restored sanctuary that will last forever. It is a new kingdom on earth, reinforced by the heavenly powers that create a utopian, eschatological wished-for condition. Thus the eschatology implied here is not just a temporal given, but an actual space-transforming or -producing event.

Chapter Five offers an in-depth spatial analysis of Daniel's twelve chapters. The chapters will be treated individually since they represent clearly demarcated stories within the larger narrative. It will be noted that the analyses of Daniel 2 and 7 are significantly longer than those of the others. They have long been recognized by the various commentators as being connected as they deal with somewhat related subject matter. It has also been shown that they take up a central place within a larger chiastic structure of the entire book. Here, however, it is prompted by their very specific spatial content and import within the book. It will be demonstrated that the central theme in both chapters is the fallout of the destruction of the Jerusalem temple by a succession of nations as well as the disrespect they show towards the God of Israel, who is the true God of Heaven. In chapter 2 this is accomplished by presenting an earthly perspective and a response by means of the remains of the earthly temple. In chapter 7, a similar feat is accomplished from a heavenly perspective with the help of the furnishings of the heavenly temple.

Chapters 10 through 12 of Daniel are usually considered to form a narrative unit and are often treated as such in the commentaries. Yet, I will treat each separately, since from a spatial perspective they each have their own narrative to tell. Especially Daniel 12 has its own character as it forms the climactic conclusion not only to these two, but to the entire book, and therefore also stands very much on its own. The uniqueness of the chapter lies in the urgency of its message, but also in its subject matter that is radically different from the earlier chapters in that it boldly reveals to the reader details of the future world as part of the heavenly kingdom despite its caution to Daniel to keep all this a secret. This chapter of the thesis is concluded by an excursus on the imagery in chapter 2:34-35, 45.

Chapter Six presents the conclusion. Using critical spatiality as a tool to analyze sacred spaces and temple imagery in a text of which the greater part consists of apocalyptic material, has led to a number of surprising findings and confirmations. One of these opens up a new way of looking at apocalypticism and reveals it as a space-producing and space-transforming system which is able to (re-)connect heaven and earth and restore a balance in the cosmos that was deemed fragmented by the authors of apocalyptic texts.

CHAPTER ONE: Methodological Questions

Critical spatial theory is relevant for a wide array of research fields which deal with the 'real' world as well as the 'mental' world of texts and can thus be applied to every imaginable category of described space. Since this dissertation is primarily concerned with the workings of sacred spaces, a few authoritative older and alternative approaches dealing specifically with this area will be highlighted in order to indicate which gaps remain in the understanding of narrative space that may be filled through critical spatiality.

1.1. Comparative Religion and Phenomenology of Religion School: Eliade

The most quoted, lauded, and criticized work on sacred space is, in all likelihood, Mircea Eliade's influential book *The Sacred and the Profane*, first published in 1957 in German. In it the author makes a number of generalizing statements with regard to the nature of sacred space – generalizing in the sense that within a random number of cultures, disparate in time and place, a unifying pattern may be recognized in the way that they handle the relationships between the human and the divine and how this translates into concrete divisions of sacred and profane spaces.

For Eliade the world is divided into sacred space and profane space. Sacred space is revealed through hierophanies, that is any experience or irruption of the sacred in a particular spot, which is then consecrated by people, who have through this act, founded a center or a world. This constitutes an act of imitation of and return to the divine creation of the world or cosmos. Eliade summarizes his construct of sacred space, which he calls the 'system of the world', in four points. [1] It is based on the model of the center with in the middle an *axis mundi,* which is the connection between heaven, earth, and the underworld. Other elements in this system are the "navel of the earth" and the Sacred or World Mountain. Eliade's four points are:

---

[1] M. Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane: the Nature of Religion*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company, 1959: 36.

a) a sacred place constitutes a break in the homogeneity of space;

b) this break is symbolized by an opening which facilitates passage from one cosmic region to another (from heaven to earth and vice versa; from earth to the underworld);

c) communication with heaven is expressed by one or another of certain images, all of which refer to the *axis mundi*;

d) around this cosmic axis lies the world (= our world), hence the axis is located "in the middle," at the "navel of the earth"; it is the Center of the World.

He refines this further in the following: [2]

a) The Sacred Mountain – where heaven and earth meet – is situated at the center of the world;

b) Every temple or palace – and, by extension, every sacred city or royal residence – is a Sacred Mountain, thus becoming a Center;

c) Being an *axis mundi*, the sacred city or temple is regarded as the meeting point of heaven, earth, and hell.

This model has not gone uncontested. Jonathan Z. Smith has been especially outspoken in his critique of a number of its components. For instance, the statement that is at the core of any spatial analysis (and which, as we will see is a central element in critical spatiality, namely the notion that space is socially produced) is the relationship between spaces and the behavior of those occupying such spaces. For Eliade it is the correct human response to a hierophany that 'founds a world' or creates a (sacred) space, a center. Smith vehemently disagrees with this. He cites the very fitting passage by Géza Róheim who critiques the use of the Australian Aboriginal foundation myths,

> Looking at the kernel of these tedious [ancestral] narratives we are struck by one feature: in all of them *environment is made out of man's activity*… This is a man-made world. Environment is regarded as if it were derived from human beings. [3]

---

[2] M. Eliade, *The Myth of the Eternal Return; or, Cosmos and History*, Princeton: Princeton University Press 1991 [1954, 1965]: 12 and *Patterns in Comparative Religion*, Cleveland/New York: Meridian Books, 1966 [1958]: 328.

Smith adds to this that "it is anthropology, that is to the fore. It is the ancestral/human alteration of and objectification in the landscape that has transformed the undifferentiated primeval space during the Dream-time into a multitude of historical places in which the ancestors, though changed, remain accessible."[4]

Smith further argues that Eliade's concepts of a (cosmic) center is based on unsound premises and also that the notion of a Sacred Mountain or World Mountain with its derived concept of *axis mundi* is actually fictitious.[5] However, that does not mean that even if these components were toned down with regard to their cosmic significance, they would disappear altogether or have no value in understanding the workings of sacred places in the text. In fact, Smith modifies the notion of center such that "[t]he language of center is preeminently political and only secondarily cosmological."[6]

It should be pointed out that Eliade's system does allow for multiple centers.[7] There is no conflict therefore between centralized and decentralized sacred space – i.e., the co-existence of a variety of centers. More to the point, from the perspective of biblical religion: the wilderness traditions with a mobile sanctuary, the decentralized religion

[3] J.Z. Smith, *To Take Place. Toward Theory in Ritual*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987: 1-13 (at 11) G. Róheim, *Eternal Ones of the Dream: A Psychoanalytical Interpretation of Australian Myth and Ritual*. New York, NY, International Universities Press, 1945: 211, 213.

[4] J.Z. Smith, *To Take Place*, 11.

[5] J.Z. Smith, *To Take Place,* 16-17. He cites in this context R.J. Clifford, *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament*. [HSM 4] Cambridge, MA, 1972: 2. The latter writes, "The term 'cosmic mountain,' as it has been used in the study of Ancient Near Eastern religion, has been based in large measure on an assumed Mesopotamian *Weltberg*… The *Weltberg*, as it has been understood by an earlier generation of scholars, does not exist." Smith notes in particular the aboriginal myth that for Eliade had become almost foundational in support of his thesis on the *axis mundi*. Smith demonstrates that Eliade based himself on a corrupted version of an ancient myth that had been restructured in such a way as to suggest that it concerned actual current practices among the tribes. In addition Eliade went on to interpret the myth in a cosmological way, whereas Smith insists that, in order to understand the dynamics of the myth and of actual practices, it needs to be read anthropologically (11). See in this regard also S.D. Kunin's "Biblical Sacred Space," *God's Place in the World: Sacred Space and Sacred Place in Judaism*. London: Cassell, 1998: 11-45.

[6] J.Z. Smith, *To Take Place,*. 16-17.

[7] *The Sacred and the Profane*, 57.

with its many *bamot* or high places [8] following the settlement, as well as the centralized temple cult in Jerusalem can be explained through the model – because each of these sacred places represent their own center.

Another important aspect of Temple realia in the biblical text is the question of the inviolability/violability of the Jerusalem Temple and what happens to a *bona fide* sacred place after it has been violated. This can less profitably be explored in light of Eliade's approach to sacred space because of his extreme ambiguity on this issue. [9]

The dichotomy between sacred and profane space in Eliade's system is at times quite complicated, in the sense that it almost seems that these two quantities do not belong in the same universe or exist within the same time frame. He defines profane space as belonging to the realm of secular or modern man and it represents the chaotic space outside of the defined sacred area, which is either uninhabited or unclaimed by *homo religiosus*, who populates sacred space. In this too, he has been criticized early on already for his very stringent demarcation of sacred and profane spaces. [10] For Eliade, it

---

[8] But see L.S. Fried for another interpretation of *bamot* as actual temples, "The High Places (*Bamot*) and the Reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah: An Archaeological Investigation," *JAOS* 122(2002): 437-465.

[9] See *Patterns in Comparative Religion* [Cleveland, OH: Meridian Books, 1963[1958]: 3. As an illustration for an aspect of relativity in the perception of the sacred, Eliade describes an Indian tree, which to the believers has the status of a world tree (or cosmic tree, *axis mundi*) – but only to the particular group of believers is it meaningful. To anyone else it is just a tree. Even though he wavers somewhat regarding the last statement (cf. p. 11), it is helpful in order to understand the notions of contested sacred spaces. On p. 4, he discusses the levels of validity (and staying-power or lack thereof) of hierophanies. He explains that depending on the level of perfection of the religion within which it occurs, "[I]t can be seen then that some hierophanies are, or can in this way become, of universal value and significance, whereas others may remain local or of one period – they are not open to other cultures, and fall eventually into oblivion even in the society which produced them." He makes this dependent on the level of development of the specific religion. The problem with this statement is that throughout his work, despite being a comparatist and phenomenologist, he argues for the superiority of Christianity over all other religious systems. Further, one of his favorite examples of a hierophany is the incident of Moses encountering the burning bush (Exod. 3:1-5). Even if it may be argued that the narrative indicates that this place was already charged with sacredness, it is equally unclear as to exactly where it was located! Was it Horeb or Sinai? Moreover, despite a possible earlier history of holiness – which fits Eliade's thinking – after this incident, and the giving of the Law (which was not necessarily the exact same spot), the mountain is not longer relevant in subsequent tradition. Although, again solely according to Eliade, the fact that many centuries later a monastery was constructed on what was thought to be Mount Sinai, would grant it the notion of permanence in Eliade's Christian cosmic realm.

[10] L.E. Shiner, "Sacred Space, Profane Space, Human Space," *JAAR* 40(1972): 425-436.

appears that the world at the time of creation (mythical time) was a sacred potential. [11] It was secular man who willfully degraded and desacralized the world by letting loose upon it the "terror of history", subjecting it to linear time in contrast to *homo religiosus* who constantly yearns back for the original moment of creation and because he is subject to cosmic cyclical time is able to constantly renew, recreate and return to this one moment. [12] In any event, the truly religious persons, by their actions and ritual would actively participate in the sacred cosmic cycle and distance themselves from secular, linear history. To the secular person, on the other hand,

> space is homogeneous and neutral … Geometrical space can be cut and delimited in any direction; but no qualitative differentiation and, hence, no orientation are given by its virtue of its inherent structure. We need only remember how a classical geometrician defines space. Naturally, we must not confuse the *concept* of homogeneous and neutral geometrical space, with the *experience* of profane space, which is in direct contrast to the experience of sacred space and which alone concerns our investigation. … What matters for our purpose is the *experience* of space known to nonreligious man – that is, to a man who rejects the sacrality of the world, who accepts only a profane existence, divested of all religious presuppositions. … The profane experience … maintains the homogeneity and hence the relativity of space. No *true* orientation is now possible, for the fixed point no longer enjoys a unique ontological status; it appears and disappears in accordance with the day. Properly speaking, there is no longer any world, there are only fragments of a shattered universe, an amorphous mass consisting of an infinite number of more or less neutral places in which man moves, governed and driven by the obligations of an existence incorporated into an industrial society. [13]

---

[11] M. Eliade, "The Prestige of the Cosmogonic Myth," *Diogenes* 23(1958): 1-13 (at p.9). He writes: "In all traditional societies, to 'cosmicize' a space is equivalent to consecrating it, because the cosmos, being a divine work, is sacred by virtue of its very structure. To live in a cosmos is, above all, to live in a sanctified space, one that offers the possibility of communication with the gods."

[12] See especially Eliade's monograph *The Myth of the Eternal Return,* 1991(1954). For a discussion on his nostalgia for the mythical 'golden age' or 'paradise', R. Ellwood, "Mircea Eliade and the Nostalgia for the Sacred," in, *Ibid.*, *The Politics of Myth. A Study of C.G. Jung, Mircea Eliade, and Joseph Campbell*. Albany: Suny Press, 1999: 79-126 (esp. 99-114). See further B.S. Rennie, "*Illud Tempus,* Time By Another Name," in, *Ibid.*, *Reconstructing Eliade: Making Sense of Religion*.Albany: Suny Press, 1996: 77-87. For a critical treatment of Eliade's approach to sacred/profane space and sacred/profane time, see J.Z. Smith, "The Wobbling Pivot;" *ibid.*, *Map is Not Territory*, Chicago: The University of Chicago press, 1978: 88-103.

[13] M. Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane*, 1987[1957]: 22-24.

To sum up: sacred time and the existence and behavior within sacred space is cyclical; all takes place, in what Eliade terms, *in illo tempore*. [14] Profane time and existence is historical and linear, representing the 'terror of history' which prevents humans from returning to the ideal, 'real', cosmogonic beginnings.

Eliade's concept of the hierophany that reveals a sacred spot, which becomes a center in the ripples of space is probably the one that has drawn the most criticism, especially from Jonathan Smith as was indicated above. He argues the opposite, namely that it is the ritual act that sanctifies space. [15] I believe that to be correct, since in addition, not all accounts of 'hierophanies' lead to the establishment of sacred place either. Daniel is in fact rife with examples of *bona fide* hierophanies that remain unconnected to the place where they happen. [16] A further point that has been raised is that Eliade's insistence on 'the center', too, does not fully describe the workings of sacred place in practice. Another aspect that needs to be accounted for and is not covered sufficiently (if at all) by Eliade is the issue of inclusion and exclusion. The question of who is eligible to enter a sacred place, under what conditions (such as purity, lineage, gender, age), and when, is addressed by other scholars who work in the field of anthropology. [17] Although their models are able to answer questions not attended to by Eliade's it will become clear

---

[14] On this term and its use, see B.S. Rennie, "*Illud Tempus,* Time By Another Name," p. 81, fn. 1.

[15] J.Z. Smith, *To Take Place*: 104. He writes: "A ritual object or action becomes sacred by having attention focused on it in a highly marked way. From such a point of view, there is nothing that is inherently sacred or profane. These are not substantive categories, but rather situational ones. Sacrality is, above all, a category of emplacement." A little further (p. 105), he says: "sacrality is conferred 'by virtue of the sacrament.' …Ritual is not an expression of or a response to 'the Sacred'; rather, something or someone is made sacred by ritual (the primary sense of *sacrificium*)."

[16] For instance in chapters 3 and 6, in the fiery furnace and the lions' den the kings observe or are told of the presence of heavenly beings without this having consequences for the nature of these places. Likewise, Daniel's encounter with the angel in chapter 10 does not result in the establishment of even a temporary sacred space.

[17] Mary Douglas (*Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Ark, 1966) is often cited. See S.D. Kunin, *God's Place in the World. Sacred Space and Sacred Place in Judaism*. London: Cassell, 1998. Further, Ph.P. Jenson, *Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992. This is quite different from the summary mention of some sort of distinction with regard to accessibility to the sacred that is noted by J.Z. Smith, "The Wobbling Pivot," p. 95.

that critical spatiality is able to tie up the loose ends left behind by the other approaches. For instance, since none of these methods fully deal with space as being socially produced, seeing space as a fluid category, they can consequently also not be interested in the question by whom and why certain spaces are produced or re-produced. [18] This for instance leaves much of the area of authority relations unexplored. As such, the role and place of cultic personnel as agents of power - be they earthly or heavenly - are altogether insufficiently treated by Eliade. His system remains locked in the search for mythical markers and the way that the sacred may be *experienced* and is connected with the archaic first moment of divine creation.

In addition, the very strong dichotomy between sacred space and time, on the one hand, and profane space and time, on the other, prevents a global view of the functioning of the sacred within human society as seen from the viewpoint of that society, which would make it possible to see the functioning of sacred space, as 'a space', within and as dependent on the larger context of space. To this should be added the very real question of the extent to which we can truly speak of profane spaces in the ancient Near East. After all, political power was seen as divinely ordained and the king was the representative of the gods on earth, if not divine himself. Other models, and especially Eliade's phenomenological method, consider sacred space within its own conceptual world of myth, symbol and a-temporality. Furthermore, when discussing aspects of power and authority, the prime interpretation of the heavens as a space of power comes to mind.

---

[18] I leave out of this discussion the suggestion that Eliade in his work communicated a well-developed idea about 'worldmaking' that could be understood as being somehow connected to the (partly postmodern) notion of 'socially produced spaces', or perhaps, the 'possible worlds' of literary theory. The fact that he allows for 'multiple centers' or the 'founding of a world' is not identical to what is proposed in this dissertation with regard to 'multiple worlds'. I am not even convinced to what extent this may indeed be found in Eliade's work and to what extent it is not rather a reading-in by one of his important commentators, W.E. Paden. For his interpretation of Eliade (which, in fact, he himself calls post-Eliadean and moves much more towards the social-scientific approaches), see his "The Concept of World Habitation: Eliadean Linkages with a New Comparativism," *Changing Religious Worlds: The Meaning and End of Mircea Eliade*. B. Rennie, ed. Albany: Suny Press, 2001: 249-259. He admits, "[f]or the primary limitation of Eliade's comparative method was that while it identified common forms of world-building behaviors, it paid relatively little attention to what those behaviors showed about their specific worlds" (254). With regard to the need for comparative studies to employ the social sciences in its spatial analysis, he comments, "But a comparative study of space reveals social structure and values too. It shows hierarchy, subordination, gender roles, egalitarianism. It shows local and national memory…. Where Eliade was interested in what space showed 'upwardly' and cosmically, contemporary historians of religion are more apt to explore what space shows 'downward' and laterally into the actual forms of social existence" (257).

When, in addition, the rule of God is called kingship and his kingdom (either the current one in heaven, or the one to come on earth) is juxtaposed to the human ones operating on earth, critical spatiality is able to describe and classify these dynamics as contested sacred spaces.

1.2. Critical Spatial Theory: Edward W. Soja

We will now turn to the model developed by cultural geographer Edward Soja. Although its primary function is the interpretation of the relationships between contemporary social, political and geographical conditions, it offers as well exciting new insights for the study of the dynamics within ancient narrative. In the past decade a number of successful forays have been made into applying it to ancient texts. This was especially the case within the context of the Constructions of Ancient Space Seminar, which has operated under the auspices of the SBL since the late 1990s until 2003. [19]

In summary, Edward Soja's system is premised on the idea that it communicates an epistemological trialectic. [20] In other words, it represents three distinct, yet intertwined

---

[19] A number of volumes containing the most important papers from these meetings have been published. *'Imagining' Biblical Worlds; Studies in Spatial, Social and Historical Constructs in Honor of James W. Flanagan*. D.M. Gunn and P.M. McNutt, eds. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002; *Constructions of Space I* and *II*, J.L. Berquist and C.V. Camp, eds. New York: T & T Clark, 2007, 2008.

[20] E.W. Soja, *Thirdspace. Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publ., 1996: 10, summarizes his model as:
    Firstspace is "fixed mainly on the concrete materiality of spatial forms, on things that can be empirically mapped."
    Secondspace is "conceived in ideas about space, in thoughtful re-presentations of human spatiality in mental or cognitive forms." "*Secondspace* is [also] the interpretive locale of the creative artist and artful architect, visually or literally re-presenting the world in the image of their subjective imaginaries; the utopian urbanist seeking social and spatial justice through the application of better ideas, good intentions, and improved social learning." More importantly yet, "in Secondspace the imagined geography tends to become the 'real' geography, with the image or representation coming to define and order the reality." [1996: 79]
    Thirdspace concerns those in society who are disadvantaged and marginalized and entrapped in imposed urban or regional substandard spaces by those in positions of authority who are interested "to create and maintain modes of social and spatial division that are advantageous to its continued empowerment and authority. … Those who are territorially subjugated by the workings of hegemonic power have two inherent choices: either accept their imposed differentiation and division … or mobilize to resist … [and] to struggle against this power-filled imposition. These choices are inherently spatial responses, individual and collective reactions to the ordered workings of power in perceived, conceived, and lived spaces" (1996:87).

ways of interpreting and thinking about space. Most spatial theorists are in agreement on the distribution of these three aspects of critical spatiality. The first of these represents the basic, tangible reality in which we all live and function and which we can all perceive, describe and, in principle, manipulate. The second is the way we plan for and think about space. It is a creative or mental sphere. The third one, too, is the space in which we all live but which at the same time is dominated or manipulated by that segment of society that is in power, from the top down, and in charge of Firstspace. However, from the margins as well as from the ground up, other voices can be discerned. These signify the grassroots, the suppressed thoughts and voices of resistance from those not in power. Edward Soja refers to these three spaces as Firstspace, Secondspace, and Thirdspace respectively. Thus, when those in power (of Secondspace, i.e. interpretation and decision making concerning Firstspace) relegate a group into a Thirdspace position, that group is in fact marginalized.

An important element of critical spatial theory is the notion that space is socially produced. Put differently, the perspectives of societal groups that occupy space determine the nature of that space. Therefore, since diverse groups with differing interests and ideologies may depend on the same space, each distinct perspective yields a different interpretation of that space. Soja explains the foundation of this dynamic as follows: [21]

> This process of producing spatiality or 'making geographies' begins with the body, with the construction and performance of the self, the human subject, as a distinctively spatial entity involved in a complex relation with our surroundings. On the one hand, our actions and thoughts shape the spaces around us, but at the same time the larger collectively or socially produced spaces and places within which we live also shape our actions and thoughts…

As stated, Soja's basic model consists of the triad Firstspace, Secondspace, and Thirdspace. These are representations of space and markers to identify spaces of power relationships as well as social and ideological spaces. Soja is deeply indebted to the

---

[21] E.W. Soja, *Postmetropolis: Critical Studies of Cities and Regions.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Publ., 2000, p. 6.

French Marxist philosopher Henri Lefebvre [22] whose ideas about the ordering of space in the trialectic of Perceived, Conceived, and Lived Space, he further interprets. In his main study on the subject Soja experiments with these concepts and molds them in various directions. The two pioneering names of Lefebvre and Soja are often cited together in the further re-interpretations of their thought. As their ideas become part of thinking about areas beyond the field in which they were first espoused, they again evolve.

Yet, however much they evolve and adjust, the basic division remains intact. [23] The three spatial categories have variably been used to describe somewhat differing spatial phenomena, although all agree on the third component as meaning 'lived space'. Alternative designations are 'material space', 'designed space', and 'lived space', [24] or

---

[22] H. Lefebvre, *Le production de l'espace*, 1974 (English transl.: *The Production of Space*. Oxford, Blackwell Publ., 1991). He applied it, even more so than Soja, to a contemporary politicized social situation.

[23] The correlation between these views is shown in the following grid:

Edward Soja *Trialectics of Being* * *Trialectics of Spatiality*	Spatiality Firstspace	Historicality Secondspace	Sociality Thirdspace
Henri Lefebvre	Perceived Space Spatial Practice Absolute Space	Conceived Space Representation of Space Dominant Space Abstract Space	Lived Space Representational Space Dominated Space Differential Space
Victor Matthews	Physical Space	Imagined Space	Lived Space
Claudia Camp	Material Space	Designed Space	Lived Space

* The three categories that are distinguished here (Soja, *Thirdspace*, 1996, p. 71, 74) do not tally with First-, Second-, and Thirdspace respectively. In fact, the 'trialectics of spatiality' only apply to 'spatiality' in the first line, not to the other two categories. These first three rather provide the 'other side of the coin' and are indicative of Soja's position that although 'spatiality' be foregrounded, the other two need not be completely abolished. Moving away from a situation that he recognizes in which only historicality and sociality were the key analytical perspectives, he argues for the prioritizing of spatial perspectives. But yet, these three must inform each other. He states this specifically on pp. 171-172: "The spatial critique should … not be construed as an assertion of a deterministic spatialism or a hegemonic new form of critical thinking… Any privileging of spatiality – or of Thirdspace – has to be understood as temporary, a strategic foregrounding of the weakest part of the ontological triad [= the trialectic of being] designed to restore a more balanced trialectic. It must be remembered, therefore, that

19

'physical', 'imagined' and 'lived space'. [25] In all cases, Firstspace represents the visible material space, with its natural markers as well as those recognizable man-made landmarks that are part of the 'built environment', [26] intruding into the natural scape, that were placed there by those in control. [27] Depending on the perspective of the author, Secondspace may be understood as the imaginings, interpretations or ideologies concerning Firstspace by those who control and/or inhabit Firstspace. Thirdspace, or lived space, is that which is occupied by the marginalized and those clearly not in power. Soja sees Secondspace especially as the locus of creative expression for the idealistic visual and literary artists and architects who through their good intentions may redefine reality. [28]

In order to dispel some of the ambiguities that exist with regard to the place and function of especially Secondspace, [29] even within Soja's own formulation of it, I would like to suggest the following. The thought-about-space of the artists and thinkers that Soja places in Secondspace, can only be that which is seen as representing the voices of legitimation, those that form an extension of the ruling powers. Thus, monumental art, architecture, and epic literature serve to both validate, shape, but also to create the dominance aspect of Firstspace – whether only described, or actually implemented. It

---

every geography, every journey into real-and-imagined Thirdspaces, is also filled with historicality and sociality, with historical and social as well as spatial 'determinations'. To say that space today provides a more revealing critical perspective than time is thus not a statement of eternal hegemony but of strategic sensibility. History and critical historiography continue to be of central importance in making sense of the contemporary world, especially when they are radically open to 'other' critical perspectives."

[24] C.V. Camp, "Storied Space, or, Ben Sira 'Tells' a Temple," *'Imagining' Biblical Worlds; Studies in Spatial, Social and Historical Constructs in Honor of James W. Flanagan*. D.M. Gunn and P.M. McNutt, eds. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002: 65.

[25] V.H. Matthews, **"**Physical Space, Imagined Space, and 'Lived Space' in Ancient Israel," *BTB* 33(2003): 12-20 (at 12).

[26] E.W. Soja, *Thirdspace*, 1996: 75.

[27] Or in Soja's own words, "Firstspace (Perceived Space) refers to the directly-experienced world of empirically measurable and mappable phenomena," or it represents "materialized spatiality." E.W. Soja, "Thirdspace: Expanding the Scope of the Geographical Imagination," *Architecturally Speaking. Practices of Art. Architecture and the Everyday*. A. Read, ed. London: Routledge, 2000: 13-31, at p. 17.

[28] E. W. Soja, *Thirdspace*, 1996: 79.

[29] A problem that has been recognized is that both Second- and Thirdspace represent interpretations of Firstspace. See here the issues raised by C. Camp, "Storied Space, or, Ben Sira 'tells' a Temple," pp. 66-67.

keeps the components of Firstspace under control and at the same time creates them. Yet, the comparable expressions of those in the marginalized zones of Lived Space or Thirdspace would *also* have to take place in Soja's Secondspace – since it represents *mental* space. [30] This could include, for instance, the production of graffiti by street artists, underground literature and poster art. The second problem in the model, of course, is quite obvious. Art too, once realized in paint, print, or stone, has modified Firstspace and thus becomes part of it. The solution here lies again in understanding it in light of a division of power. Whereas the monumental art is supported and preserved by the authorities of the moment, the art generated from Thirdspace may be and often is erased or negated by those very same powers. The reverse is not really imaginable, unless in a situation of a revolution generated from Thirdspace. Once that happens, a complete reversal of the power division may be seen. Looking at the model in this way makes it clear that the spaces remain the spaces, defined by the behavior within them, but the actual players may shift.

This seems also to be more in line with the initial division proposed by Lefebvre, who would place Soja's friendly and idealistic artists rather in Thirdspace, or his own Lived Space. It is also likely that Lefebvre, as an idealistic thinker, would see himself as belonging rather to Soja's Thirdspace whereas Soja seems to place himself in his own Secondspace. In this light, it is also helpful to understand Soja's Second- and Thirdspace as Lefebvre's dominant and dominated space respectively.[31]

The functioning of this model can be illustrated by means of the interplay of artifact and text in the ancient Near East and the biblical world. Monumental architecture and art (as we know from Assyrian palace reliefs, but also from its literary counterpart in the Jerusalem Temple) as well as epic literature may be considered expressions generated from Firstspace. Any blueprints (either in material form or in text – such as the building instructions communicated through dreams to Mesopotamian rulers, or those of the Tabernacle in the Bible) that precede the implementation of the plans,

---

[30] E. W. Soja, *Thirdspace*, 1996: 79.

[31] See also Lefebvre, *Production*, 39.

belong to Secondspace. They serve to validate and shape, but also create the domineering aspect of Firstspace whether only described, or actually implemented. It keeps the components of Firstspace under control and at the same time creates them. However, any graffiti or autographs left behind by builders and artisans, or later irreverent visitors, may be relegated to Thirdspace. Any expression decrying injustices perpetrated by the Firstspace rulers, or those lamenting defeat and destruction should likewise be placed in Thirdspace. However, we do not always know of these voices, since they can be erased by the powers in charge, or they can be co-opted and turned upside-down to serve the purposes of those in power.

It has been noted [32] that this simple threefold division is in need of serious augmentation if it is to explain the various social dynamics and strata within biblical (and probably any ancient) narrative. Since we are dealing with so many entrance levels in narrative, the suggested triadic power construct is too simple and rigid to account for the diverse positions of the author(s), narrator(s) and narratees, without considering their identity and narrative point of view. Depending on the perspective of the author, Secondspace may be understood as the imaginings, interpretations, or ideologies concerning Firstspace by those who control Firstspace. Thirdspace, or lived space - as said - is occupied by the marginalized and those clearly not in power. It is their hopes and thoughts concerning Firstspace that becomes interesting to the researcher.

With the above in mind it is not too difficult to elucidate the earthly spaces of Daniel's narrative by means of Soja's model. The question is what to make of the very, if not more, important Other spaces that are presented in the text, namely the wildly fantastic ones and the frenzied jumping around between them by the characters in the texts that we are studying, through their visions and dreams. These spaces are the heavenly realm and the dreamspace that provides access to it, but also implied are future worlds that may or may not be realized. Will the critical spatiality model be able to account for these? In order to determine this, the first question should be whether these are purely imaginary, metaphorical, and ideational spaces, or whether it is possible that the framers

---

[32] See the essays in the volumes of the SBL Constructions of Ancient Space Seminar.

of Daniel and similar literature perceived these other-dimensional spaces as quite real and accessible under the right conditions. It is reasonable to assume that on the narrational level the dreamscapes *function* on a Secondspace or Thirdspace level, depending on the point of view from which they are projected. The heavenly realm, again purely as part of the narrative, is an alternative place of power, thus a First- and Secondspace. However, when looking at these as spaces as such, in need of a classification, it seems that Soja's model requires extension. Since these spaces represent spaces of an entirely different order, perhaps we may connect them with Soja's description of "worlds" as "artfully lived spaces, metaphorical and material, real and imagined, contested and loving, dangerous and playful, local and global, knowable and incomplete, necessary for survival yet often still 'up in the air,' ... limitless … yet intimate and comforting at the same time. Here we have another version of a space of radical openness, a space filled with the representations of power and the power of representations." [33] Soja refers here to the possibility of a "point in space that contains all other points", a sort of viewing device, which he understands in light of Thirdspace. However, he explains it at the same time as a portal to religious or mystical space. But since these particular realms that are so prevalent exactly in religious and mystical texts, are so wholly Other (beyond the Sojan sense of Otherness), perhaps they should be described separately as a possible Fourthspace for the dreamscape and Fifthspace for the heavenly realm. [34] Being completely beyond space and time, they consist of a completely

---

[33] E.W. Soja, *Thirdspace,* 131. He uses here Jorge Luis Borges' short story "Aleph" as an illustration of such another world. "Aleph" represents a "point in space that contains all other points" which he understands in light of Thirdspace. Soja quotes Borges' own commentary on the story (54): "What eternity is to time, the Aleph is to space. In eternity, all time – past, present, and future – coexists simultaneously. In the Aleph, the sum total of the spatial universe is to be found in a tiny shining sphere barely over an inch across." In fact, the concept of the Aleph resembles the viewpoint of the Divine packed into a singularity – "it is analogous to the mystical experience in providing a simultaneous panorama of all space and all time," as one reviewer puts it. For a recap of this short story and Soja's understanding of it as Thirdspace, cf. *id.* pp. 54-60. It is here that Soja's model of Thirdspace becomes too fragmented (something he is at pains to avoid) and what he describes, it seems to me, indeed contains aspects of the wholly different space of other dimensional worlds. His view of an all-inclusive Thirdspace, loaded with potential may be applicable to actual lived social spaces, for textual situations dealing with the fantastic, however, this becomes somewhat problematic and we need to call in supporting models.

[34] Fourth- and Fifthspace to make it congruent with the qualities of the fourth and fifth dimensions, both as they function in astrophysics and have become narratized in the genre of science fiction. The first three dimensions are spatial, the fourth represents time, or space-time in Einsteinian understanding, and the fifth dimension is of a more hypothetical nature beyond the first four. The last two approximate the notion of 'hyperspace' which, besides also being a concept in astrophysics, is

Other fabric: within grasp but never to be owned. While from a narrative perspective these two spaces operate and can be understood as worlds-within-worlds and thus as disentangled from the main narrative, critical spatiality accords them function and purpose. Yet, Soja does open the door to these other spaces when he suggests: "The "third" term – and Thirdspace as a concept – is not sanctified in and of itself. The critique is not meant to stop at three, to construct a holy trinity, but to build further, to move on, to continuously expand the production of knowledge beyond what is presently known." [35] Yet, within this study the terms Fourthspace and Fifthspace will not be used. They are only introduced here to demonstrate that the model can be extended. For the present study it will suffice that for each of these Other realms the trialectic also functions to explain their internal dynamic, as well as their relationships to the other domains that have been identified. Thus, the earthly, the heavenly, the visionary and dreamscapes and underworld each display the trialectic when the actions of their denizens are taken into account.

Since we are dealing with a literary work, the question arises what kind of space is represented by the text itself. Given that a text is a product of the mind, it could very well be argued that it belongs in its entirety to Secondspace. But depending on whether the author behind the text, or the later editor, is part of the social elite and works from a position of power and domination (the 'voice of the winner') or is part

likewise a popular theme in science-fiction literature. It connotes 'other worlds' or 'spaces parallel and simultaneous to our own'. Hyperspace is understood in sci-fi literature to be the space through which one travels through 'short-cuts' between very distant points in 'normal space'. Hyperspace or the fourth dimension here functions as a kind of conduit between worlds, but also into other realms, to a fifth dimension beyond 'normal space' where other laws of physics and time rule: worlds with non-corporeal inhabitants where time-, place-, and shape-shifting are possible. Fifth space could thus be an apt designation for the heavenly realm. However, the approach that will be taken in this study, is to see the various domains as each consisting of their own trialectic of First-, Second, - and Thirdspace.

[35] E.W. Soja, *Thirdspace,* 61. In "Thirdspace: Expanding the Scope of the Geographical Imagination," *Architecturally Speaking. Practices of Art. Architecture and the Everyday*. Alan Read, ed. London: Routledge, 2000: 13-31 (at p. 21) he phrases it somewhat differently: "Thirding thus does not end with the assertion of a third term or with the construction what some might describe as a holy trinity. Making practical and theoretical sense of the world requires a continuous expansion of knowledge formation, a radical openness that enables us to see beyond what is presently known, to explore "other spaces" … that are both similar to and significantly different from the real-and-imagined spaces we already recognize." To this he adds (22) that Thirdspace (as Lived Space) is also: "a starting point for new and different explorations that can move beyond the "third term" in a constant search for other spaces; and still more to come."

of the marginalized of society who finds himself to be in opposition to those in power, the text could belong to First- and Secondspace or Second- and Thirdspace respectively. While this difficulty with the model should be noted, [36] it can be resolved by introducing the notion of point-of-view from narrative theory. This approach is eminently suited to disentangle the various notions of space within a narrative, if only because of the fact that the dynamics of a 'real' world got transposed onto a narrative one. It is important to emphasize, however, that not every single space that is identified in a narrative needs to be or even can be fitted within Soja's tight trialectic. This model is *only part, albeit an important one,* that is advocated by critical spatiality, *of the foregrounding of spatial thinking in general over against other ways of looking at reality*, and, it should be added, in our context, of narrative.

Thus subjecting a complex and multi-leveled narrative like Daniel, with its ever shifting points of view, to the insights of critical spatial theory, while at the same time borrowing some elements from narrative theory, can clarify many of the dynamics in the narrative that will otherwise remain obscure. In particular the narrative notion of 'possible worlds' works exceedingly well in conjunction with spatial theory, especially in view of the fact that it will be able to help connect Daniel's 'impossible' worlds to the actual narrative world and the real world behind the framers. The concept of possible worlds has been formulated foremost by literary theorists Lubomír Doležel, Ruth Ronen, and Marie-Laure Ryan. [37] It will thus be possible to locate the various worlds that are depicted in the story line, with each containing its own spatial trialectics and lead them back to the central theme of sacred space and Temple. [38]

---

[36] See on this also C.V. Camp, "Storied Space, or, Ben Sira `Tells' a Temple," 2002: 64-80.

[37] L. Doležel, *Heterocosmica. Fiction and Possible Worlds*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998; R. Ronen, *Possible Worlds in Literary Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994; M.-L. Ryan, *Possible Worlds, Artificial Intelligence and Narrative Theory*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1991.

[38] See Chapter Three, "Danielic Spaces," on the aspect of narrative space and possible worlds.

1.3. The Concept of Sacred Space

In order to understand what sacred space is we need to establish first what may be understood by 'the sacred'. One of the first systematic studies addressing this question is Rudolf Otto's *The Idea of the Holy*. [39] Its premise is that the holy constitutes an awareness of the numinous, the otherworldly, the supernatural, the transcendent; an elusive quality that, according to him, is best described as a *mysterium tremendum*. In Otto's thinking, the Divine represents the Wholly Other. [40] This awareness as a religious feeling is open to any individual. It is a fully personal psychological process and experience which has no need for either ritual or space, not unlike the profile for Eliade's *homo religiosus*.

Although this very brief summary hardly does justice to Otto's complete presentation, it has to suffice here. His ideas did find a number of prominent followers and inspired others to develop them further. However, there were also those who took issue with his system on fundamental grounds. In an insightful essay, Thomas B. Dozeman juxtaposes Otto's phenomenological approach to the anthropological approach of Jacob Milgrom. [41] One of the findings relevant to this study is that in Otto's interpretation of the holy, no sufficient attention is allowed for the spatial. It is solely built on a personal, direct, and charismatic process that can neither be taught nor transmitted through ritual. [42] Milgrom, on the other hand, prefers "a more anthropological approach, in which the spatial dimension of

---

[39] R. Otto, *The Idea of the Holy: An Inquiry into the Non-Rational Factor in the Idea of the Divine and its Relation to the Rational* (J.W. Harvey, transl.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2nd ed., 1950 [1917]. One specific incident in Otto's life that is of particular interest here concerns an experience he had during his travels in North-Africa in 1911. On a certain Sabbath he found himself in a synagogue in Mogador in Morocco. During the recitation of the *kedusha*, with the exclamation of the קדוש קדוש קדוש from Isa. 6:3 Otto felt a spontaneous and intimate connection with the divine. This was supposed to be one of the formative experiences that helped him formulate his ideas concerning 'the holy'. See on this G.D. Alles, ed., *Rudolf Otto: Autobiographical and Social Essays*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1996: 61-62. On this episode, see also H.G. Kippenberg, *Discovering Religious History in the Modern Age*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002: 179.

[40] *Idea of the Holy*, 25-30.

[41] Th.B. Dozeman, "The Holiness of God in Contemporary Jewish and Christian Biblical Theology,"*God's Word for Our World; [...] Studies in Honor of Simon John De Vries*. Vol. II. J.H. Ellens [et al.], eds. London: T & T Clark International, 2004: 24-36. Dozeman refers specifically (pp. 30-34) to Milgrom's seminal commentary *Leviticus* [AB 3, 3a, 3b], New York: Doubleday, 1991-2001.

[42] *Id.*, 26.

holiness as a symbol system of sacred space provides the point of departure for interpretation. Within this symbol system, cultic ritual, not individual charisma or inspired speech, is the key for interpreting the nature of holiness, its transfer to humans, and its relationship to morality." [43] Importantly, Milgrom emphasizes that "the *separate quality of holiness is spatial*. Holiness is the realm of the gods in distinction from the world of the humans." He further explicates holiness as "'that which is withdrawn from common use' be it a place or precinct, along with objects and persons." [44] It is correct cultic behavior and properly functioning sacred institutions that facilitate legitimate boundary crossings between the human and divine domains. Likewise, it is ritual that ultimately regulates navigation of the aspects of danger and negative demonic forces, to assure survival. Ritual also has the vital function of protecting the holy from impurities, since contamination of sacred spaces and objects by impurity has the power to drive holiness away from the human domain. Within the Hebrew Bible we can trace various approaches to holiness, such as priestly and prophetic, and it is clear that it is subject to development and change. The most noticeable is surely the ever widening sphere of what constitutes sacred space, expanding from sanctuary to city to land. At the same time holiness that is connected with classes of persons, such as priests and Levites, also becomes 'democratized' and all Israelites become subject to a certain level of holiness. [45] In both these cases, however, a very strong notion of gradedness is retained. Some things are still more holy than others.

By Hellenistic times the basic understanding of what was and what was not holy in Judaism was fully crystallized. This does not mean that no new developments occurred. On the contrary, what had happened was that a solid frame had taken shape within which, for instance, apocalyptic ideas could be clearly formulated and understood. By the time of the consolidation of Daniel and contemporaneous texts many of these ideas were taken for granted and do not call for further explanation

---

[43] *Id.*, 30.

[44] *Id.*, 31. Italics mine. This approach to holiness is in line with the semantic range of the Hebrew root קד"ש (*qdš*) which contains a strong spatial aspect.

[45] *Id.*, 34.

within the respective texts. Thus, in Daniel sanctuary, city, and land are described with holiness-related terminology. [46]

Risa Levitt Kohn provides a useful starting point for the most basic understanding of what sacred space related to land, as delimited from all other spaces, means in the biblical narrative context as it was inherited by the framers of the Book of Daniel:

> The concept of place is central to the "plot" of the Hebrew Bible. As is the idea of the "promised land." It is this place and this place exclusively that is covenanted to the people of Israel and their progeny. Entire biblical books are devoted to the land's conquest, its occupation, and subsequent loss. [47]

In this view it is its specific selection or setting apart by God as a 'promised land' for His 'chosen people' that makes the land sacred. But within this sacred space of Land, one City is elevated over others, within which, in turn, a most holy center is found, and this center is the Temple – both in its presence as well as its absence. [48] Therefore one cannot be understood without the other. We will see that especially in the literature of the Second Temple period these concepts often blur and become almost interchangeable. Since it is God who bestows holiness upon the places indicated above, the Divine itself must therefore also be holy. All holiness is derivative of the divine. In his interpretation of the *trishagion* or קדושה in Isaiah 6:3, the 19th century commentator Meir Leibush ben Yechiel Michel (Malbim), explains "… the threefold holiness

---

[46] This process is very clearly illustrated in the Halakhic Letter, or *Miqsat Ma'aseh Ha-Torah*, from Qumran which contains two fascinating phrases: "And we are of the opinion that the sanctuary [is the Tent of Meeting] and that Jerusalem is the 'camp' [מחנה], and that 'outside the camp' [is outside of Jerusalem], that is, the encampment of their settlements" [ll. 29-31 of the composite text]. The other phrase reads, "For Jerusalem is the camp of holiness, and it is the place which He has chosen from among all the tribes of Israel. For Jerusalem is the capital [or chief] of the camps [מחנות] of Israel" [ll. 59-60 of the composite text]. *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah* [DJD X]. E. Qimron & J. Strugnell, eds. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994: 48-51, 52-53.

[47] R. Levitt Kohn, "In and Out of Place: Physical and Social Location in the Bible," *From Babel to Babylon; Essays on Biblical History and Literature in Honour of Brian Peckham*. J. Rilett Wood, J.E. Harvey, M. Leuchter, eds. New York: T & T Clark, 2006: 253-262 (at p. 254).

[48] The concept of concentric circles of "graded holiness" is an important element in the biblical understanding of sacred spaces. It can be seen in the geography of Temple – City – Land, but also within the described architecture of the Temple and even in the account of the Sinai legislation. See Ph.P. Jenson, *Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World* [= JSOTSS 106]. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.

attributed to God in this verse, 'Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord of Hosts' should be construed as, 'He is holy in heaven, for He is separated from form; He is holy on earth, for He is separated from matter; He is holy for all eternity, for He is removed from all privation.' To assert that God is holy, therefore, is to say that God is separated, i.e., He is *not* form; He is *not* matter; He is *not* deprived." [49] In his commentary on Is. 6:3 Malbim philosophizes, if you will, the *Targum Jonathan* on this passage and turns it into an example of negative theology. This reads: "Holy – in the highest heaven, the place of his divine abode [בית שכינתיה]; holy – upon earth, the work of his might; holy – forever and ever unto all eternity." In both approaches to the verse a rudimentary trialectic of a spatial, societal, and temporal character can clearly be recognized.

Two further questions arise in this context. Do sacredness and holiness have the same meaning and do they cover the same ground? [50] It is at times hard to determine which aspect of קד"ש exactly is meant in a biblical text. The terms 'holy' and 'sacred' are often used interchangeably, although these two words are not always used synonymously. [51] Yet, their meaning overlaps to a great extent. However, where this does not seem to be the case, the difficulty lies in the fact that most nuances are in fact captured within the Hebrew root.

'Holiness' is probably best described as a state of numinosity that can be conferred upon places, persons or objects. These thereby become separated from those that are 'not holy'. Management of the holy necessitates rituals that are structured within what can be described as cultic activity. For the 'not (yet) holy' to commune with the holy a number of rituals also come into play. In order to render that which is 'not holy' fit for entrance into the domain of the holy, it must adapt to the condition of holiness through

---

[49] S. Roth, "Sanctity and Separation," *Tradition* 14(1974)4: 29-45 (at p. 30).

[50] W. Oxtoby, "The Idea of the Holy," *The Encyclopedia of Religion* M. Eliade, et al., eds. New York, N.Y.: Macmillan, 1987: 413-438. The starting point for his discussion is R. Otto's seminal work *The Idea of the Holy*.

[51] In addition, in contrast to קד"ש both 'holy' and 'sacred' carry the notion of inviolability, something which seems not to be part of the semantic range of קד"ש. See the *Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978, pp. 445 and 781. It is of interest that this aspect did become part of the thinking about the Temple and the city of Jerusalem. Whether or not this ever was the case in ancient times, in today's usage of the terms this possible understanding no longer applies.

acts of purification, such as the observance of dress codes, the intake of or abstinence from certain food stuffs, as well as meditative acts, prayer and the like. Similar ritual acts may actually construct (consecrate) sacred spaces. The reverse process would result in contamination of the holy, and hence a descending into the realm of the 'non-holy.' The root קד"ש, which signifies all that is holy, carries the overall meaning of 'separation from'. [52] By extension we may add 'belonging to', as in 'being a possession of the Divine.' Another range of meaning that is covered by קד"ש pertains to matters of cleanliness and purity.

In order to explain two seemingly quite distinct meanings of קד"ש, Baruch Schwartz [53] argues that this root in reality represents "two unrelated etymologies, distinct but identical Semitic roots which we might call *qdš* I and *qdš* II." He distinguishes between meanings of what, on the one hand, is commonly associated with separateness and holiness, whereas on the other hand meanings pertaining with

---

[52] B. Levine analyzes this lexeme in "The Language of Holiness: Perceptions of the Sacred in the Hebrew Bible," *Backgrounds for the Bible*. M.P. O'Connor and D.N. Freedman, eds. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1987: 241-255. See further *TDOT* 12: 521-545. W. Oxtoby explores the semantic range of the two possible English translations of 'holy' and 'sacred' for the Hebrew root קד"ש in "The Idea of the Holy," *The Encyclopedia of Religion* M. Eliade, et al., eds. New York, N.Y.: Macmillan, 1987: 413-438. See also E. Berkovits, "The Concept of Holiness," *Essential Essays on Judaism*. D. Hazony, ed. Jerusalem: Shalem Press, 2002: 247-214. [Originally in his, *Man and God; Studies in Biblical Theology*, Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1969]. He takes on Otto's notion of the Wholly Other, with which he disagrees, and also discusses the issue whether or not *qodesh* only functions as a noun or also has adjectival value; he favors to use it solely as a noun – this in contrast to the conclusions in Levine's study.

[53] See B.J. Schwartz, "Israel's Holiness: the Torah Traditions," *Purity and Holiness; the Heritage of Leviticus*. M.J.H.M. Poorthuis & J. Schwartz, eds., Leiden: Brill, 2000: 47-59 (at pp. 47-49). Another division within the range of meanings that he recognizes within this root is the different approach in priestly and non-priestly texts in the Pentateuch (summarized at pp. 58-59). Here too, we see that various elements have clearly merged in later understanding of the concept. Schwartz's summary is shown here graphically:

Non-Priestly	*Priestly*
Israel's holiness results from its election	Israel's holiness is an emanation of the divine nature turning Israel into a sacred object (a *qodeš*)
Israel's holiness granted from on high; expressing God's transcendence and sovereignty over all nations	Israel's holiness it radiates to them as a result of God's presence in their midst; expressing His immanence
Israel became holy, i.e., was chosen at a specific point in time; this holiness is passed on through birth	Israel becomes holy constantly. In E and D it is granted to them; in H it is a quality that is to be actively sought and acquired through observance of the commandments
Israel's holiness expresses privileged status	Israel's holiness expresses utter subservience
Holiness is the precondition resulting in the necessity to uphold the commandments	In H observing the commandments is the precondition, resulting in holiness
God can rescind His election of Israel if they act contrary to the covenant	Israel can loose its holiness when the Divine Presence departs (as punishment), making holiness no longer attainable

cleanliness and purification are covered. Schwartz objects to attempts "to associate the two with each other," suggesting that "there is no plausible semantic development that can be posited from 'clean' to 'separate' or vice versa" (fn 8). What is overlooked, however, is that a clear connection appears within an extended meaning. Thus, rather than one being *derived* from the other, they do in fact deal with similar concepts. In addition, while they are strictly not synonymous, they overlap and it is that area that translates into *qdš*. Holiness *implies* purity and vice versa. In that case it is rather the meaning of "simply being clean" as in having washed, that is derivative. In other words, purification is a necessary precondition for entering into a sacred state, as well as into sacred space. In addition, that which is holy *is* necessarily pure.

In summary, Schwartz's two options represent the following: I (holy, sacred) is separated, belonging to, designated for the Divine; II. (washed as in רח"ץ and clean, pure as in טה"ר) is sanctifying: preparing for the Divine, or: purifying in that sense. Thus it becomes clear that both belong to or designate a state of fitness to enter the realm of the holy.

Certainly in post-exilic literature these senses have come to overlap greatly and one cannot be understood without taking the other into consideration (if this could not already be argued for the Pentateuchal traditions). In other words, the only purpose of cleanliness achieved for reasons of purification is to prepare for entrance into the holy. It therefore is a holy act, part of the rituals to enable communication with or participation in the holy.

In English the root is rendered by 'holy' and 'sacred'. Schwartz notes the difficulty that along with simply a word, an entirely different value system is superimposed. Thus, whereas the English terms denote a positive value, in the sense of being intrinsically good and ethical, this is not the case with *qdš*, which is neither good nor bad. In the Hebrew Bible the term merely indicates "something that belongs to the divine sphere." [54]

For the purposes of this thesis this simple interpretation of *qdš* will suffice and, as it stands, will be able to contribute to a further spatial understanding of the concept.

---

[54] *Id.*, 49. While this is true in a very general sense, this view should be adjusted to a certain extent since in a number of cases the context in which קד"ש occurs deals with ethical and moral issues.

With the possible differences in nuance in mind, when translating the term *qdš*, 'sacred' and 'holy' will often be used interchangeably, since the fine nuances that do exist between these two terms are not relevant to the nature of the analysis in the subsequent chapters.

In the Book of Daniel, the following pattern in the use of *qdš* can be observed. In its sense of 'separation from' or 'belonging to (the Divine)' קד"ש, is quite consistently (25 times) present in Daniel. [55] It is used here exclusively for places and characters. One of its antonyms, in a spatial sense, is the root שמ"ם (desolate, despoiler). Although not strictly meaning 'unholy', the result of the action indicated by the root in Daniel is aimed at the desecration of that which is holy. Except for two secondary applications, it occurs 7 times. [56] In addition, the court tales are full of references to the House of God (בית אלהים, בית אלהא) and Temple (היכל), both referring to the Sanctuary in Jerusalem; the God of Heaven, and the gods *whose habitat is not with men* (implying the same); and emissaries from the divine habitat.

1.4. Defining Temple Imagery

At the outset, the Daniel narrative introduces the reader to two temples. One is on earth on Mount Zion in Jerusalem. It is an edifice adjacent to the king's palace. This is in accord with a known general pattern for ancient Near Eastern royal and temple complexes. The other is the heavenly temple or residence of God. Together these two complexes represent the extremes of what is also understood to form an *axis mundi*, according to Eliade's system. It is also explained as the heavenly temple forming an *archetype*, and the earthly temple being modeled according to it. It will become apparent that most of the architectural features of the earthly temple as well as its furniture and implements are mirrored in the heavenly temple. The descriptions that we have of the earthly temple, however, are in large part not found in Daniel, although

---

[55] 4:5, 6, 10, 14, 15, 20; 5:11, 7:18, 21, 22, 25, 27; 8:11, 13, 14; 9:16, 17, 20, 24, 26; 11:28, 30, 31, 45; 12:7. The root is not used in the sense of purification. See 12.10 for a series of other terms signifying purification.

[56] 8:13; 9:17, 18, 26, 27; 11:31; 21:11

knowledge of them is implied. With regard to the activities in the heavenly temple, Daniel adds some new elements. However, here too, we see that other texts dealing with the subject provide much richer and elaborate depictions. At the same time, for the narrative dynamics in Daniel to work, here too, this knowledge is implied. Aside from the structure, its cultic personnel (including their vestments) are also part of the wider context of temple imagery. It is they, after all, who have access to the structure, energize it and act as intermediaries between the people and the divine. When looking at their heavenly counterparts, we see that various classes of angels fill the part. In addition, static decoration in the earthly temple, depicting an assortment of hybrid beings, has come to life in the heavenly temple. For instance, cherubim are part of the decoration or the stands for certain temple vessels, and they no doubt also carry the divine throne. They also decorate the temple veil. In the heavenly temple these are living beings. Since the temple forms the center point of Israel's sacred geography, the city and the land become often interchangeable with the actual temple building. In addition, it will be shown that a variety of metaphorical references are used to allude to the temple, ranging from mountains to rocks.

Within Daniel's narrative we find that sacred space is neither stable nor static. Its boundaries are fluid, ownership changes and hence it becomes contested. Despite this its originary source is ever present, whether distant or near. However, the referents do not stop here. There is, in fact, another source of temple imagery, namely that of the Other. Babylonian and Persian sacred spaces and human responses to divine encounters play an important part in the conflict stories in Daniel. These issues together with their human and divine responses are the subject for a critical spatial analysis.

CHAPTER TWO: Survey of the Literature

2.1 General Issues

This survey covers, in principle, only the most recent work concerning the Book of Daniel, and specifically its Masoretic text version. [57] Since many excellent overviews already exist and are readily available in the form of articles or commentary introductions, most of the work treated below will not pre-date the mid-nineties, with only very few exceptions. However, some important studies pertaining to the versions of Daniel and early apocryphal texts will be included in order to arrive at a more rounded picture. The appearance of John J. Collins' seminal commentary in 1993 [58] formed a watershed in Daniel studies. In it is contained not only the most scholarly commentary to date, as far as content as well as size, but the introduction, excursuses and footnote apparatus cover much of the scholarship up to 1993. In addition, there is Henry O. Thompson's annotated bibliography on Daniel, [59] which lists work until 1990. Just recently David M. Valeta provided a much needed update with his Part I of an annotated overview of Daniel studies, covering the first six chapters and an announcement of the forthcoming Part II on the last six chapters. [60] It should be noted that while many individual articles and some collections dealing with topical issues in the text [61] have appeared in the past decennium, not many monographs covering the entire book have seen the light of day, [62] other than a limited number of commentaries. This situation is

---

[57] The *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Fifth improved ed., Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997) offers, so far, the most detailed critical edition of the Masoretic Text (MT) taking all known textual variants into consideration. It is based on the Leningrad Codex. In *The Dead Scrolls Bible*, M. Abegg Jr., P. Flint, and E. Ulrich (San Francisco: Harper, 1999) provide an English translation of Daniel based on the Qumran fragments, highlighting the variants between it and the standard MT. Translations in the text will follow either a modernized version of the 1917 JPS translation, or will be my own where indicated.

[58] J.J. Collins, *Daniel* (1993).

[59] H.O. Thompson, *The Book of Daniel. An Annotated Bibliography*. New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1993.

[60] DM. Valeta, "The Book of Daniel in Recent Research (Part I)," *CBR* 6(2008)3: 330-354.

[61] A.S. Van der Woude (ed.), *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1993; *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*; 2 vols. J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint, eds., Leiden: Brill, 2002.

[62] Most of those are, interestingly, dissertations.

quite different when it comes to dissertations that have been produced (but most of the time not published!) in the past fifteen years. [63]

Some general trends found in recent work are a) new venues into the connection with Enochic studies which has made great strides thanks to the work of especially Gabriele Boccacini; [64] b) continued work on the Daniel texts from Qumran – both the standard

[63] The following is just a sampling of what has been produced mainly in North America and is contained in the ProQuest Database of Theses and Dissertations: B.G. Toews, "A discourse grammar of the Aramaic in the Book of Daniel," University of California, Los Angeles, 1993; J.J. Choi, "The Aramaic of Daniel: Its Date, Place of Composition and Linguistic Comparison with Extra-Biblical Texts," Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield IL, 1994; A.J. Tomasino, "Daniel and the revolutionaries: The use of the Daniel tradition by Jewish resistance movements of late Second Temple Palestine," The University of Chicago, 1995; C.L. Aaron Jr., "Loosening a knot: Theological development in the book of Daniel," Union Theological Seminary in Virginia, 1996; A.A. Stele, "Resurrection in Daniel 12 and its contribution to the theology of the book of Daniel," Andrews University, 1996; L.O. Anderson Jr., "The Michael figure in the book of Daniel," Andrews University, 1997; T.L. Holm, "A biblical story-collection: Daniel 1-6," The Johns Hopkins University, 1997; P.J. Lambach, "A Detailed Comparison of 4Qdan^c and the Other Qumran Texts of Daniel with the Masoretic Text of Daniel," Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary, 1997; C.J. Obiajunwa, "Semitic interference in Theodotion-Daniel," The Catholic University of America, 1999; P.B. Petersen, "The theology and the function of the prayers in the Book of Daniel," Andrews University, 1999; W. Vogel, "The cultic motif in space and time in the Book of Daniel," Andrews University, 1999; C.H. Pae, "The "Book of Watchers" and the "Book of Daniel": Apocalypses engaged in the interpretation of the canonical Torah," Graduate Theological Union, 2000; S.C. Madden, "Josephus's use of the Book of Daniel: A study of Hellenistic-Jewish historiography," The University of Texas at Arlington, 2001; M. Nel, "A theological-hermeneutical investigation of Daniel 1 and 2," University of Pretoria (South Africa), 2001; R.G. Wooden, "The Book of Daniel and Manticism: a Critical Assessment of the View that the Book of Daniel Derives from a Mantic Tradition," University of St. Andrews (UK), 2001; P.V. Niskanen, "The human and the divine in history: Herodotus and the Book of Daniel," Graduate Theological Union, 2001 (published T&T Clark, 2004); S. Kirkpatrick, "Competing for honor: A social-scientific reading of Daniel 1-6," University of Notre Dame, 2003 (published by Brill, 2005); A. Portier-Young, "Theologies of resistance in Daniel, the Apocalypse of Weeks, the Book of Dreams, and the Testament of Moses," Duke University, 2004; D.M. Valeta, "Lions and ovens and visions, oh my! A satirical analysis of Daniel 1-6," The Iliff School of Theology and University of Denver, 2004 (published by Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2008); D.R. Watson, "The writing on the wall: A study of the Belshazzar narrative," Hebrew Union College - Jewish Institute of Religion (Ohio), 2004; S.I. Kim, "Proclamation in cross-cultural context: Missiological implications of the Book of Daniel," Andrews University, 2005; M. Probstle, "Truth and terror: A text-oriented analysis of Daniel 8:9-14," Andrews University, 2005; A.C. Merrill Willis, "Loose ends: Dissonance and the drama of divine sovereignty in the book of Daniel," Emory University, 2008; C.T. Hahm, "The priestly influence upon Daniel 7-12," The Claremont Graduate University, 2008.

[64] G. Boccaccini has initiated a series of Enoch Seminars over the past few years. The proceedings of the first meeting have been published in the journal *Henoch*. Those of the second have appeared in book form, *Enoch and Qumran Origins. A New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005 in which particular attention is given to the dream visions in Daniel and 1 Enoch. But see also the earlier study by S.B. Reid, *Enoch and Daniel*, Berkeley, CA: BIBAL Press, 1989, which is the published version of his 1981(Emory University) dissertation, "The Sociological Setting of the Historical Apocalypses of 1 Enoch and the Book of Daniel"; P.M. Venter, "Daniel and Enoch: Two Different Reactions," *HTS* 53(1997): 68-91 and further L.T. Stuckenbruck, "Daniel and

text as well as the so-called Pseudo-Daniel corpus; c) newly edited critical editions and studies of the versions; d) more extended work on the apocryphal Daniel literature; e) studies linking Daniel to the historical works of Herodotus [65]; f) unity of the text and dependence on Ezra-Nehemiah and the Joseph cycle; [66] g) a continued defense of the so-called conservative or traditional view, i.e., the dating of Daniel in exilic times with, among other arguments, insisting on the 5th century character of especially the Aramaic of Daniel and defending it as genuine prophecy; h) further historical-critical studies, which, again among other arguments, equally use the linguistic argument to prove a late date; i) the emergence of a veritable South-African school of Daniel studies with a special focus on spatial issues. [67]

However, an analysis of Daniel's sacred geography and temple imagery covering the entire book has been wanting so far and this is what the present study seeks to remedy. [68] This oversight is all the more surprising in light of the rich geographical imagery that is generally contained in apocalyptic texts (and therefore also in Daniel), which make them pre-eminently suited for spatial analysis. [69] These range from naturalistic earthbound descriptive and political spaces to those that are wildly fantastic and otherworldly and including the strictly regulated traffic between these two realms. It is exactly the opening up of the otherworldly spaces which creates a breach into the linear temporality to which the human mind is held captive. This is one prime example

Early Enoch Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls," P.W. Flint, "The Daniel Tradition at Qumran," J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint (eds.), *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* II: 368-386.

[65] P. Niskanen, *The Human and the Divine in History: Herodotus and the Book of Daniel*. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

[66] J.W. Wesselius, "The Literary Nature of the Book of Daniel and the Linguistic Character of its Aramaic," *Aramaic Studies* 3(2005)2: 241-283.

[67] See especially the work by M. Nel, I. Spangenberg, H. van Deventer, and P.M. Venter.

[68] A few studies have appeared in recent years that deal with analyses of sacred and related spaces in complete works, such as J.M. Scott, *On Earth as in Heaven: The Restoration of Sacred Time and Sacred Space in the Book of Jubilees.* Leiden: Brill, 2004; S. Schweitzer, *Reading Utopia in Chronicles.* London: T&T Clark, 2007; L.I. Lied, *The Other Lands of Israel: Imaginations of the Land in 2 Baruch.* Leiden: Brill, 2008; C.M. Maier, *Daughter Zion, Mother Zion: Gender, Space, and the Sacred in Ancient Israel.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008 (which deals with the Book of Lamentations and many more incidents of the metaphor).

[69] An exception being K. Coblentz Bautch, *A Study of the Geography of I Enoch 17-19 'No One Has Seen What I Have Seen'.* Leiden: Brill, 2003.

which illustrates Edward Soja's concern that in many modern studies of human society the temporal (historical) is prioritized over the spatial. Yet, once the spatial is foregrounded many hitherto seemingly unconnected matters can be explained in light of each other.

2.2   Date and Structure of Composition

Since MT Daniel is widely considered to be of a composite nature, establishing the date of its composition is particularly difficult if not impossible. Nevertheless it is possible to make some comments with regard to the Court Tales, that make up the first six chapters, as an originally separate group of stories and the last six chapters (the Vision Account) as a unit composed in addition to those at a relatively much later time. Looking for an approximate date for the final product that forms MT Daniel is somewhat less complicated, but also has its own set of difficulties. Moreover, there are the versions to contend with, as well as the Pseudo-Daniel literature and questions with regard to the relationship between these texts. However, there is a general consensus that the Court Tales may derive from the late Persian, early Hellenistic Period, perhaps having circulated independently, and the Vision Account from the late Antiochean period. Both sections would then have been collated shortly before the conclusion of the Maccabean revolt.

2.3   MT Daniel, Other Versions and Apocryphal Traditions

As luck would have it, much of MT Daniel is attested at Qumran [70] providing us with a usable *terminus ad quem* based on the paleography of the mss. The earliest text samples

---

[70] Fragments of all chapters of Daniel were found distributed over three caves (cave 1, 4, and 6, with the bulk in cave 4), with the exception of ch. 12. This, however, is mentioned in 4QFlorilegium. The critical edition for the Cave 4 fragments is E. Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles* (DJD XVI; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000: 239-291; the Cave 1 fragments are to be found in D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD I; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955): 150-151; and the Cave 6 fragments are in M. Baillet, J. T. Milik and R. de Vaux, *Les 'petites grottes' de Qumrân* (DJD III; 2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1962): 114. Further treatment of these texts: E. Ulrich, "Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran," *BASOR* (1987)268: 17-37; (1989)274: 3-26; E. Ulrich, "Orthography and Text in 4QDan[a] and 4QDan[b] and in the Received Masoretic Text," *Of Scribes and Scrolls; Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Interstamental Judaism, and Christian Origins, Presented to John Strugnell*. Ed. by H.W. Attridge [et al.]. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1990: 29-42 //*The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*, E. Ulrich. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans; Leiden: Brill, 1999: 148-162. The

are thought to date back as far as the mid-second century, the bulk of the fragments date to between 100 BCE and 50 CE and some as late as the mid-first century CE. [71]

The main non-Hebrew/Aramaic versions of the Book of Daniel are the Latin (Vulgate), Greek (LXX and other text traditions) [72] and the Syriac (Peshitta). [73] The history of the various Greek texts and their relation to the MT, as well as the additions in Greek is very complex and outside the purview of this dissertation. It will therefore only be mentioned in passing. [74] The only exception is the very important manuscript known as Papyrus 967, which is the oldest representative of the Old Greek tradition, and may date to the second or early third century CE. Since it is the only witness which displays an alternative chapter sequence, the consequences of this for Daniel's narrative flow will be discussed in Chapter Three. Apart from the canonical MT and

Cave 1 fragments were described by J.C. Trever, "Completion of the Publication of Some Fragments from Qumran Cave 1," *RQ* 5(1965)3/19: 323-336 and "1QDan[a]; the Latest of the Qumran Manuscripts," *RQ* 7(1970)2/26: 277-286. See also E. Ulrich, "Orthography and Text in 4QDan[a] and 4QDan[b] and in the Received Masoretic text," *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999: 148-162; L.T. Stuckenbruck, "The Book of Daniel and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Making and Remaking of the Biblical Tradition," *The Hebrew Bible and Qumran: The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls (Proceedings of the Jubilee Celebration at Princeton Theological Seminary)*. Vol. 1. J. H. Charlesworth, ed., N. Richland Hills, TX: BIBAL Press, 2000: 135-172; P.W. Flint, "The Daniel Tradition at Qumran," *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* II: 329-367.

[71] E. Ulrich, "Daniel, Book of," *EDSS* I, 171-172.

[72] For the Greek and Latin texts see K. Koch and M. Rösel – *Polyglottensynopse zum Buch Daniel*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2000. See also T. McLay, *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel* [SCS 43] Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1995 and S. Pace Jeansonne, *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7-12* [CBQMS 19] Washington DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1988. The Greek Daniel traditions consist of two complete recensions, the Old Greek, which at first became the basis for the LXX, and the so-called Theodotion recension which soon replaced it. They both diverge at some major points from the MT in chs. 4-6 and have the three additional stories of the Prayer of Azariah, Susannah, and Bel and the Dragon. See further T. McLay, "It's a Question of Influence: The Theodotion and Old Greek Texts of Daniel," *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers Presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies*, [July] 25th-3rd August 1994. Alison Salvesen, ed. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1998: 231-254; A.A. Di Lella, "The Textual History of Septuagint-Daniel and Theodotion-Daniel," *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* II: 586-607.

[73] For the critical edition of the Peshitta see R.A. Taylor, *The Peshitta of Daniel*; Leiden: Brill, 1994. Specifically on the date (aside from the introduction in the above edition), see also *ibid.*, "The Peshitta of Daniel: Questions of Origin and Date," *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 247(1994): 31-42 (at p. 40-41). While the origins of the Peshitta on Daniel are shrouded in mystery, it is reasonable to assume a date of around the mid-second century CE. See also, K.D. Jenner, "Syriac Daniel," *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* II: 608-638.

[74] A good introduction to the versions is found in J.J. Collins, *Daniel* [Hermeneia], Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993: 3-12. See as well the introduction in R.A. Taylor, *The Peshitta of Daniel,* pp. 16-22.

Greek with additions, there exists also an extensive tradition of apocryphal Daniel texts dating from late Antiquity into mediaeval times. [75] An important, separate group is formed by the so-called Pseudo-Daniel texts from Qumran. [76] Their importance rests in the fact that due to their early date and provenance they may play a significant role in the discussion concerning *Vorlagen* and parallel traditions. [77]

2.4   Early Views on the Character of the Book

As probably no other part of the Hebrew Bible, except the Pentateuch, the Book of Daniel has given rise to much contentious exchanges with regard to the origin of the text, its composition and redaction, the identity and status of its author and the message of the text. Likewise, Daniel is fairly unique with regard to the intensity of its later reception. To begin with, the reader is presented with a notoriously complicated text. A particular set of difficulties is found in the somewhat related problem of its use of two languages and the genre of the two distinct parts of the book: chapters 1-6 representing the court tales and chapters 7-12 the vision reports. This overview will address the more important aspects related to these issues.

Since the earliest times readers of the Book of Daniel have taken its (seeming) internal claims of being an early sixth century BCE work with revelatory content pertaining to the Maccabean period seriously. Possibly as a result of its content, the protagonist Daniel has come to be referred to as a prophet, even though within the book he is never called so. [78] The murky prehistory of the text goes back as early already as the

---

[75]   The current definitive study on these texts is L. DiTommaso's *The Book of Daniel and the Apocryphal Daniel Literature.* (SVTP 20) Leiden: Brill, 2005.

[76]   J.J. Collins, "'Pseudo-Daniel" Revisited," *RQ* 17(1996)1-4: 111-135 is a general description and contains as well a text reconstruction. L DiTommaso's "4Q*Pseudo-Daniel*^{a-b} (4Q243-244) and the Book of Daniel," *DSD* 12(2005)2: 101-133 deals more specifically with the relation between these texts and MT Daniel.

[77]   The critical edition of these texts was prepared by J.J. Collins, P. Flint, and É. Puech. G.J. Brooke et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam, *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD XXII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996).

[78]   Daniel is called a prophet in the New Testament (Matt. 24:15). To this should be added Josephus (*Ant*. x, xi, 4) as well as evidence from Qumran. In 4QFlorilegium he is mentioned as Daniel *the prophet*

question of its place in the canon. In the Jewish and Protestant canons Daniel is found among the Writings, whereas in the LXX and the Catholic canon it is found in the Prophets, between Ezekiel and the Twelve. [79] The only commentator not to take the internal information of Daniel at face value is the third century CE pagan philosopher Porphyry who considered the book to be a forgery and also in addition an example of bad history writing. He noted correctly that up to the Maccabean period the account was fairly correct, consisting of *vaticinia ex eventu*, but immediately following that era the account no longer tallies. He concluded therefore that the entire book had to have been written at the time of the Maccabean crisis. [80] Early Christians have read a number of traditions in Daniel in light of their own times and concerns. This has led to a not insignificant reuse in certain NT texts. [81] The authority that the NT has accorded to the book as well as its elevation of Daniel to the status of prophet together with the confusing internal temporal foci of the book, has given rise to what is now known as the conservative view. Scholars, especially of the conservative Christian bend, think that the book relates true history about real persons from the early exilic period with authentic prophecy that not only concerns the Maccabean period but contemporary times as well,

---

alongside Ezekiel *the prophet*. 11Q Melchizedek, however, mentions "said Dan[iel]" but a few lines earlier the text refers to Isaiah *the prophet*. Although the text is broken off at a crucial point, it is interesting that the proposed restoration leaves no room for the additional 'the prophet'. And, more importantly, at least one of the so-called Pseudo-Daniel texts from Qumran with certainty does not refer to him as a prophet. For a discussion on this issue, see e.g. K. Koch, "Is Daniel Also Among the Prophets?," *Interpretation* 39(1985): 117-130 and M.A. Knibb, " 'You Are Indeed Wiser than Daniel' Reflections on the Character of the Book of Daniel," *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*, 1993: 399-411). See for a short overview of the issue, L. DiTommaso, "4Q*Pseudo-Daniel* [A-B] (4Q243-4Q244) and the Book of Daniel," *DSD* 12(2005): 101-133 (at p. 101, fn. 2).

[79] See R. Raviv, "On the Original Position of the Book of Daniel in the Jewish Bible," *JSIJ* 6(2007). She concludes that despite the prophetic upgrading that Daniel received in rabbinic texts of especially Babylonian provenance, its original place in the Hebrew Bible was indeed among the Writings.

[80] M. Casey, "Porphyry and the Origin of the Book of Daniel," *JThS* 27 n.s.(1976): 15-33; A.J. Ferch, "Porphyry: An Heir to Christian Exegesis?," *ZNW* 73(1982): 141-147; and M. Casey, "Porphyry and Syrian Exegesis of the Book of Daniel," *ZNW* 81(1990): 139-142.

[81] D. Ford, *The Abomination of Desolation in Biblical Eschatology.* Washington D.C.: University Press of America, 1979; *G*.K. Beale, *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1984; C.A. Evans, "Daniel in the New Testament: Visions of God's Kingdom," P.W. Flint, "The Daniel Tradition at Qumran," J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint (eds.), *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* II: 490-527; and J.D. Dunn, "The Danielic Son of Man in the New Testament," in *id.*: 528-549.

culminating in the return of the Christian Messiah. [82] This view is countered by the so-called scholarly critical view that accepts the book as a composition from the mid-second century BCE with somewhat older elements in the first six chapters contained therein. These two competing views can be summarized as follows:

The conservative view [83] favors an early date for the book; i.e. Daniel the prophet is the author of the book, the writing of which took place during the period that it purports to describe. Included in this approach to the book are the efforts to see every event and person mentioned in it as historically valid rather than as symbolic language describing a different time and situation. Two examples are the attempts to retain Belshazzar a) as Nebuchadnezzar's literal son (or: if that is no longer possible in the face of evidence to the contrary, as his grandson – but in any case, as a close relative), b) as an independent ruler, a full fledged king of Babylon. [84] Another example concerns the efforts to prove the historicity of Darius the Mede. [85]

---

[82] The Jewish view as represented in rabbinic literature and later commentators (including certain present day Orthodox opinions) agrees only with the conservative Christian views insofar as they both support a literalist reading of the text and accept the story line as historic. The interpretations of Daniel's eschatology, of course, vary greatly since the Christian view upholds a Christian-messianic approach, whereas the Jewish commentators argue for a restoration of Israel under Jewish messianic rule. Typical for the Jewish reading of the text is also the acceptance of an alternative chronology of events which is based on the interpretation of Dan. 9:24-27 by the midrashic chronography *Seder Olam Rabbah*. The Babylonian Talmud (Yeb. 82b and Niddah 46b) attributes this work to the 2nd century CE Tanna R. Yose b. Halafta, who may have used older sources. *SOR* "reckons 490 years from the destruction of the First Temple to that of the Second Temple (chapters 28 and 30). This requires an artificial shortening of the Persian period to 34 years … a similar reckoning occurs in *b. 'Aboda Zara* 9a." L.L. Grabbe, "A Dan(iel) for All Seasons: For Whom Was Daniel Important?" *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* I: 229-246 (at p. 239). It is of interest that today the *SOR* chronology is still kept up by the very conservative Orthodox Jewish publishing company Artscroll. In all its commentaries and works on history this chronology is used, which results in a rather skewed picture of history. For instance, at the back of its Daniel commentary the chronology of Daniel's life is presented as occurring between the years 3328-30 AM [= 432-430 BCE] and 3393 AM [= 367 BCE]. That corresponds then to the entire history from Nebuchadnezzar's 7th year to Cyrus' 3rd year. Oddly enough, the editors bring in Evil Merodach as successor of Nebuchadnezzar and predecessor of Belshazzar, occupying the throne for no less than 23 years! This is an entire episode and monarch not accounted for in Daniel. Of course others that should be there are not, such as Nabonidus. Also inserted is, following Ahasuerus, the "Miracle of Purim" followed by Darius. Now this Darius is thought by certain midrashic traditions to be the son of Ahasuerus and Esther, making him a Jewish king who then permits the real rebuilding of the Temple. (H. Goldwurm, *Sefer Daniel*. 1980: 334).

[83] Or "literal-historical," as P.R. Davies calls it, as opposed to "historical-critical" which prioritizes the Antiochian period. *Daniel* [Old Testament Guides] Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1985: 13-14.

[84] L.L. Grabbe, "The Belshazzar of Daniel and the Belshazzar of History," *AUSS* 26(1988): 59-66.

The early critical view favored a late (i.e., Maccabean period) date for the entire book. S.R. Driver, for instance, thought that it could not have predated 300 BCE and was written in Palestine. However, "it is at least *probable* [italics author] that it was composed under the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes" around 168 BCE. [86] He further points out that it would be quite silly to assume that a prophet in the Babylonian Exile would cheer up his contemporaries with prophetic messages pertaining to four hundred years in the future! He does, however, think that the first six chapters contain a historical core, that there was an exilic Daniel with three companions who reached a status of prominence, interpreted Nebuchadnezzar's dreams, etc. A later writer then utilized historical accounts that undoubtedly existed in his time and mingled that with legends of Daniel and his three friends. [87] A similar view was espoused by H.H. Rowley, who maintains that the tales, while containing older materials, are documents of the Antiochian persecution. [88] A more nuanced view concerns a late redaction, whereby the first six chapters (the court tales) may have an earlier (and individual) prehistory. The latter is, in fact, a fairly generally accepted position today. John Collins points out the most likely scenario with the tales having their provenance in the Eastern Diaspora. He writes, "There is no apparent reason why a Jew in Palestine should either compose or collect a set of tales all of which are set in Babylon, and whose hero functions like a Chaldean wise man. Such tales would be much more clearly relevant to Jews in the Diaspora, especially to those who functioned or aspired to function in any capacity at a gentile court." [89]

---

[85] For a critical view on this issue, see L.L. Grabbe, "Another Look at the *Gestalt* of 'Darius the Mede,' *CBQ* 50(1988): 198-213.

[86] S.R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament.* Cleveland: Meridian Books 1967(1897): 497.

[87] *Id.*, 509-511.

[88] H.H. Rowley, "The Unity of the Book of Daniel," *HUCA* 23(1950/51): 233-273. See Collins' critique of this position in *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel*. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977: 9-11.

[89] *Ibid.,* p. 35. He adds to this that "[s]uch a court is not necessarily located in Babylon. Both the Persian and Seleucid empires administered their territories through satraps who seem to have functioned like kings in their own territories. There were, then, a number of such court settings" (p. 64, fn. 58).

Karel van der Toorn argues that chapters 1-6 may well hail from the Babylonian diaspora even though the end product is of the Hellenistic period. [90] Shalom Paul narrows this down: "The Book of Daniel, though authored and compiled at a very late date (with Dan 1-6 dating from the Hellenistic period and chapters 7-12 from the eve of the Maccabean revolt), nevertheless bears noticeable linguistic, philological, and typological Mesopotamian imprints." [91] He attributes the notable fact of very ancient markers in a relatively late text to the "remarkable continuity of Babylonian cultural, societal, and linguistic norms that were preserved and maintained not only in their original cuneiform garb, but were also transferred and transformed into Aramaic, the new *lingua franca*. There was no break in the vitality of the cultural milieu after Cyrus' conquest of the neo-Babylonian empire, as the ever-expanding documentation of texts through the Hellenistic period so amply demonstrates. Some have even called the Seleucid period the 'final flowering of Babylonian culture'." [92] Sharon Pace considers the Persian period or early Hellenistic period the most likely for the origin of the court tales, despite their Babylonian setting. [93] Concerning the redaction of the entire book, Lester Grabbe suggests that the author of Dan 7-12 is likely the editor and compiler of the whole. [94] The question of the unity of the book is only an aside here: the fact that the text displays an almost perfect overall chiastic structure, including several internal ones, [95] is not evidence of a single early author. A later author or redactor could have accomplished the same literary effect. Among the historical inconsistencies that have

---

[90] K. Van der Toorn, "Scholars at the Oriental Court: The Figure of Daniel against its Mesopotamian Background," *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* I: 37-54 (at p. 38).

[91] S. Paul, "The Mesopotamian Babylonian Background of Daniel 1-6," *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* I: 55-68 (at p. 55).

[92] *Id.*, p. 65.

[93] S. Pace, *Daniel* (2008): 3-4.

[94] L.L. Grabbe, "A Dan(iel) for All Seasons: For Whom Was Daniel Important? *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* I: 229-246 (at p. 231).

[95] See D.M. Gooding, "The Literary Structure of the Book of Daniel and its Implications," *TB* 32(1981): 43-79; W.H. Shea, "Unity of Daniel," *Symposium on Daniel (Daniel & Revelation Committee Series, vol. 2)* F.B. Holbrook, ed. Washington DC: Biblical Research Institute, 1986: 165-255 with charts on pp. 243, 248; J.E. Miller, "The Redaction of Daniel," *JSOT* (1991)52: 115-124.

given rise to suspicion as far as an early date of composition is concerned, can be listed: [96]

   - the initial dates in the book, Nebuchadnezzar's conquest of Jerusalem, are inaccurate;
   - the identities of the Babylonian and Persian kings are problematic;
   - historically no Median Empire existed between the Babylonian and Persian Empires
   - the account of the death of Antiochus is problematic; and
   - the internal dates for historical events are riddled with inaccuracies.

2.5   Genre

Establishing exactly what Daniel's genre is has been an ongoing quest which is in great part due to the composite character of the book. [97] Another reason, more of an external nature, is the fact that the final edited version of the Book of Daniel appears at a crossroads in history and changing cultural conditions. First the applicability to Daniel of historiography as a literary genre will be considered. It will be shown that this fits both parts of the book, although from different vantage points. The court tales are an attempt to describe exilic history and this extends to the narrative frame of the vision accounts as well. Within the latter a very deliberate and ideological manipulation of historical data may be observed, as if to force a different outcome of events than what the framers in real time were undergoing. There is a clear obsession with the structure of time, periodization, and successive reigns. But, there is yet another way to look at these historiographical issues that might help us to make sense of the book as a whole. First, there is the *historical context behind the story*, acting as the narrative frame, namely the Neo-Babylonian era followed by the Persian Period. Secondly, there is the *story behind the narrative*, consisting of the Seleucid era and culminating in the Antiochian crisis. This becomes clear partly in the visions that

---

[96] See on this, e.g., P.R. Davies, *Daniel* [Old Testament Guides] Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1985: 26-31.

[97] J.J. Collins, *Daniel* (1993): 38-60, discusses the various possibilities of establishing the genre for the parts of Daniel and looks at the relationships to similar literatures for clues.

reach beyond the narrative frame. [98] The structure of both these narratives makes use of intricate chronologies that follow a number of systems. They are based on regnal years and jubilees. However, the only possible underlying chronology is that of the Seleucid era, which was the era in which the framers of Daniel lived.

With regard to both parts, we also have to take into consideration the ancient Near Eastern realia that are used to create a convincing setting. Interestingly, for the first part it is possible to look for counterparts in known politico-historical contexts. These range from the linguistic, cultural, architectural, to behavior and even dress codes. For the second part we have to look for mythological counterparts, that are as richly represented in Daniel.

2.5.1 Is it History?

The discussion above on the nature of Daniel from the various points of view is closely related to that of genre. Those commentators who fit into the more conservative profile consider all or most of the information in Daniel as historically sound and will try to defend it with the help of external sources. Those on the other end of the spectrum, ranging from the historical-critical scholars to the so-called "minimalists," prefer to read Daniel (and in fact, much of the Hebrew Bible) as (historicized) fiction. Comparison between the historical plays by William Shakespeare and the historical books of the Hebrew Bible has become quite popular. It is argued that, just as Shakespeare's work should not be read for historical fact, neither should the Bible. For instance, Philip R. Davies suggests that Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* has as much to do with the historical Caesar as biblical Israel has to do with historical Israel - this despite the appearance in the play of other historically grounded characters such as Brutus. Or, as he elaborates, "[I]t is well known that authentic geographical settings and genuine chronological settings do not of themselves guarantee the historicity of anything described as happening there (e.g. *A Tale of Two Cities*). The existence of common names, places and events between an historical

---

[98] See on the relationship between these two, G.I. Davies, "Apocalyptic and Historiography," *JSOT* (1978)5: 15-28. Further treatment of the narrative workings of this construct is found in Chapter Three.

construct and a literary one does not necessarily make the literary construct historical."
Thomas L. Thompson similarly used *Hamlet* as an illustration for the a-historicity of
the biblical account of the monarchies. [99] C.L. Seow has taken up the comparison with
Julius Caesar specifically with regard to Daniel in his commentary. [100] He writes:

> To be sure, certain characters in Shakespeare's play are historically verifiable, but
> others are purely fictitious. The play should be judged as literature, not history. Its
> purpose is to entertain… So, too, the value of the book of Daniel as scripture does not
> depend on the historical accuracy of the props on its literary stage, but on the power of
> its theological message. The authority of the book as scripture lies in its power to
> inspire and shape the community of faith. The book of Daniel functions as scripture
> inasmuch as it instructs the community as to the ways of God and the ways that
> community members should conduct themselves before the sovereign God.

However, the case is a little more complex than these easy comparisons seem to suggest.
It would surely have been the author/editor's intention to create a believable text with
which he would have been able to bring his point across. Granted that this would also be
the case when writing a historical novel, but the point is that in order to write a good
historical novel, research is warranted on the part of the author. Whereas it is likely that
the author of Daniel would not have intended to produce a straightforward history
(cloaking it in the form of a prophecy would of course already preclude that), that is not
to say that he did not include historical data. More importantly, the author of Daniel was
a very keen observer of the *effects* of history and this is exactly where the achievement
of the book lies. It is his perceived conception of the real history of some three hundred
years in his past that he interprets in light of his present and immediate probable future.
This historical point of departure was intentionally chosen because it was meaningful.
Therefore, returning to the example of Shakespeare: although one would not consult the
Bard on Julius Caesar's biography, it surely could be of interest to explore how a 16th
century author used his sources to compose his play and what these sources were. Surely,
this applies to the case of Daniel even more so, especially since the text served an

---

[99] P.R. Davies, *In Search of Ancient Israel*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992: 33-36. T.L. Thompson, *The Mythic Past: Biblical Archaeology and the Myth of Israel*. New York: Basic Books, 1999: 15.

[100] C.L. Seow, *Daniel* (2003): 5-6.

ideological purpose (as opposed to Shakespeare who merely intended to entertain) and the author not only cited but also manipulated his sources to bring his message across.

It seems more than warranted to take the distribution of ancient referents in the court tales very seriously and as more than just a fanciful archaizing trend on the part of the author in order to make his story seem more authentic. The present study argues that the choice of characters and settings is deliberate as is the disregarding of other data that should have been expected had the author wanted to produce a purely historical chronicle. It should also be remembered that due to the continuity of ancient Mesopotamian culture into the subsequent Persian and Hellenistic periods, the data might be assumed to have been readily available to a learned author from the third or mid-second centuries BCE. These may either have come directly or filtered through other biblical texts that he generously used to create his own. Therefore, even if the kernel of the court tales had an earlier independent existence, these too would have been treated by the final author/editor as reliable and usable sources.

Despite John Collins' statement, that "the ostensible setting of the tales in the Babylonian Exile is a fiction," [101] the value and importance of this setting should not be dismissed out of hand. Karel van der Toorn, as seen above, presents a more balanced verdict concerning the dilemma posed by the tales. Following his argument for an origin of the tales in the Eastern (Babylonian) diaspora, he writes, "Babylonian influence remains a distinct possibility, even if the book as a whole is a product of Jewish Hellenism. In searching for a Mesopotamian background of the Book of Daniel, one must distinguish between a historical and a literary background." [102]

Indeed, even if parts of the text can be harmonized with historical fact, that does not make it a work of history since it contains too many indicators to the contrary. These opinions indicate that one needs to remain prudent at all times and avoid either the extreme dismissive position of relegating everything to mere fiction, but also the other

---

[101] J.J. Collins, *Daniel* (1993): 47.

[102] K. van der Toorn, "Scholars at the Oriental Court," p. 38.

extreme of accepting Daniel as a detailed and faithful historical account. In their efforts to prove their point, representatives of the latter will force the text of Daniel to make it fit the known historical facts of the Neo-Babylonian Empire. Even when new information becomes available, such as the seeming earth-shattering finding, at the time, that Belshazzar was in actuality the son of Nabonidus and not Nebuchadnezzar, the conservative school has no trouble accommodating such new pieces of evidence. It is therefore important to weigh exactly to what extent the introduction of ancient Near Eastern facts, that seem to be reflected in the text, contributes to our understanding of the text and its circumstances. [103]

However, this does not mean that there have not been other proposals as to genre. Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. Di Lella, for instance, struggle with the fact that the inaccuracies in the book have so often led to a faulty blaming of Daniel's framer(s), as if they had concocted a massive fraud and were out to deceive their readership. "The so-called liberal has no right to sniff at the factual inaccuracies of the Book of Daniel, for it is unfair, not to say impious, to demand of ancient writers an awareness of the canons of nineteenth- and twentieth-century critical history in a book whose intent is essentially religious and not historical. But on the other hand, the so-called conservative also does the Word of God a huge disservice by insisting that the book does in fact deal with real persons and events of the seventh and sixth centuries B.C., as if the authors of Daniel intended to write history." [104]

---

[103] Prof. F.H. Polak of Tel Aviv University has kindly given me permission to cite the following from an e-mail exchange in July 2009 which clarifies much about the confusion caused by either the insistence to find historically verifiable data in literary texts, or as only alternative, the complete dismissal of the possibility that such data may be found in such texts. What he makes clear is that the question is wrong. "Literariness in itself is not an argument against historical content, unless one lacks the critical acumen to separate literary from historical data. Indeed, all historiography has literary aspects. Which brings me to the mention of presumed/unproven 'historical data' in literary texts. In literary texts all factual data occur as themes/motifs and not as facts. Themes/motifs figure in literary texts because of their contribution to plot/argument/idea, not because of their historical content. So one can, and always should, ask what a given mention does contribute to plot/argument/idea, but asking why a historical theme is not touched upon is missing the point, unless one asks for the literary/ideatic aspects." To this he added, "What is embarrassing is that this reasoning is based on Warren-Wellek [René Wellek and Austin Warren's *Theory of Literature*, first published in 1949], still largely unknown to general biblical scholarship, much to the detriment of our field."

[104] L.F. Hartman & A.A. Di Lella, (1978): 53-55.

With regard to identifying Daniel's genre, Di Lella writes, "The Book of Daniel … contains two basic literary genres: midrash or edifying story (chs. 1-6 as well as the deuterocanonical Susanna, Bel, and the Dragon in the Greek forms of the book); and apocalypse (2:13-45 and chs. 7-12)." He continues his explication of the genre with the problematic statement that this kind of "midrash or edifying story … is a Jewish adaptation of a literary genre found elsewhere in the Old Testament and in other ancient Near Eastern literature, viz. the religious romance or popular tale of the successful or wise courtier." [105] This displays a gross misunderstanding of the concept of midrash and takes the subcategory of the homiletical midrash out of its context. Midrash is a primarily rabbinic category that is in every single case (be it homiletical or halakhic) linked to a biblical lemma and comprises its interpretation. [106] Oddly enough, if taken in its (too) extended definition, the only possibly midrashic example in Daniel can be found in the part that Di Lella calls apocalyptic, i.e., in the prayer in chapter 9 where Jeremiah's seventy-year prophecy is considered.

With regard to the part that is identified as apocalyptic, Di Lella makes the useful observation that, since the term apocalyptic is derived from the NT Book of Revelation, the more ancient writers obviously were not conscious of the fact that they were composing "apocalypses." However, they knew they were employing a genre that we now know as apocalypse. Yet, it is equally true that "today there is no consensus among scholars as to its exact meaning or the extent of what can properly be classified as apocalyptic literature." This is, of course, a year before John Collins formulated his now classic definition of the genre. [107] Di Lella recognizes five necessary elements that characterize apocalypses: anonymous and pseudonymous authorship; dreams and visions; prophetia ex eventu, symbolic language, esoteric content. [108]

---

[105] *Ibid.*

[106] L. Teugels, "Midrash in the Bible or Midrash on the Bible? Critical Remarks about the Uncritical Use of a Term," *Bibel und Midrasch; zur Bedeutung der rabbinischen Exegese für die Bibelwissenschaft.* Hrsg. von Gerhard Bodendorfer und Matthias Millard. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998: 43-63.

[107] L.F. Hartman & A.A. Di Lella, (1978): 63.

[108] *Id.*, 67.

2.5.2 The Role of Apocalypticism

Apart from the issue as to whether 'apocalypse' is the proper designation for the genre it purports to describe, it should as well be pointed out that the overwhelming temporal aspect that apocalypse has carried ever since its coinage, in tandem with the term 'eschatology', should also be questioned. [109] When the strict temporal hold on these concepts is loosened, it becomes clear that a spatial value should also be added thus revealing an ideology that gives voice to the genre apocalypse as one of looking for a better space that could unfold in any time, but from the perspective of the intended audience most likely in the foreseeable future. However, this is only one aspect displayed in the texts that are usually grouped within the genre. There is also an unmistakable interest in history, witness the many texts that contain a so-called historical review. In Chapter Three it will be argued, though, that the function of these reviews is quite different from what is generally assumed. The same is true for the reports of glimpses into the heavenly realm. These elements are closely intertwined and should not be considered independently of each other.

Based on the various definitions of apocalypticism it makes most sense to relegate the last six chapters of Daniel to the genre apocalypse, whereas the first six chapters are court tales with some apocalyptic elements embedded within them. The definition formulated by John J. Collins together with the SBL Apocalypse Group in 1979 and modified in 1984 had as goal to be the most descriptive and detailed at the time. And, indeed, it still is the one most cited:

> An *apocalypse* is a literary genre 'of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisions eschatological speculation, and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world'. [110]

---

[109] B. Malina, "Exegetical Eschatology, the Peasant Present and the Final Discourse Genre: the Case of Mark 13," *BTB* 32(2992): 49-59 (at p. 50).

[110] J.J. Collins, *Apocalypse: Towards the Morphology of a Genre* [Semeia (1979)14]. The paradigm there presented was extended in *id.*, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish*

Collins' paradigm further sharply distinguishes between 'historical' apocalypses, that contain a 'review of history', and those that contain 'otherworldly journeys'. With regard to the sociological aspect he adds,

> A movement might reasonable be called apocalyptic if it shared the conceptual framework of the genre, endorsing a worldview in which supernatural revelation, the heavenly world, and eschatological judgment played essential parts. [111]

Even so, despite the paradigm's success, the major short-coming in the end likely is the fact that it is mainly concerned with the formal criteria that decide whether a text may be considered an apocalypse, rather than on what apocalypticism *does*.

The apocalyptist (who may be the narrative's narrator, the hero, or its author) envelops himself, as it were, in the conditions of heaven, which allows him to perceive the earthly realities from the heavenly perspective. As will be made clear in section 3.2, this means that the boundaries of the three-dimensional, physical earth fall away. The apocalyptist is thus able, for instance, to look at history in an 'unhistorical', non-linear way and present it to the reader in one grand sweeping panorama, in the same way as it had been explained to him in a vision or dream by an angelic guide. And just as he is able to pierce the temporal boundaries, the spatial and ontological boundaries, too, dissolve for him as long as he is in a state of apocalyptic thinking. This is part of what Lorenzo DiTommaso has recently dubbed the 'logic of apocalypticism'. This approach entails the connection of the temporal aspect of the heavenly realm's being beyond space and time to the possibility of knowledge about the future being revealed to human visitors. Part of this 'logic' consists of the notion that it is exactly the suspension of linear (earthly) time that facilitates the revealing of "the divine, panoramic view of history in the apocalyptic historiographies." [112] To which may be added that it also aids

---

Apocalyptic Literature. New York: Crossroad. (1984; Second ed., Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998: 5). For an assessment of this and other paradigms, see L. DiTommaso, "Apocalypses and Apocalypticism in Antiquity," *Currents in Biblical Research* 5(2007): 235-286; 367-432.

[111] Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 13.

[112] I am grateful to Dr. L. DiTommaso for sharing a copy of his forthcoming article on apocalypses and apocalypticism for the *Encyclopedia of the Bible and Its Reception*, in which he

understanding the workings of visualizing the fantastic elements of the heavenly world and the transformation of garbled verbal messages into dream images.

In addition it should be asked how critical spatial theory might add to the understanding of the genre of apocalypse. Kathryn Lopez has recently contributed significantly in this direction. [113] Countering the old misconception that apocalyptic writing is wishful thinking, she writes,

> If apocalyptic writing is more than wishful thinking, then how is it so? Apocalyptic writings are strategic attempts to implement a worldview as a lived space. At the heart of apocalyptic writing is the issue of who has the power to define reality, to write/right the maps. Critical spatial theory offers some helpful insights into the space that apocalyptic as a genre tries to define and normalize, and it provides some useful categories for analyzing the spatial strategies that apocalyptic writings use.

2.6   Daniel as a Pseudepigraphon

Closely related to the issue of composition and date is the identity of the protagonist: Daniel. In a pseudepigraphic work [114] the protagonist is (and sometimes the entire text is attributed to) an authoritative individual from the past who is considered to be significant to the understanding of its intended audience. [115] All of the known Second

---

elaborates further on the potentiality for the unfolding under a-temporal conditions of what is often referred to as preordained future history.

[113] K.M. Lopez, "Standing before the Throne of God: Critical Spatiality in Apocalyptic Scenes of Judgment," *Constructions of Space II:The Biblical City and Other Imagined Spaces*. J.L. Berquist & C.V. Camp, eds. London: T&T Clark, 2008: 139-155 (at p. 139).

[114] Technically, only the last six chapters, the Vision Accounts, can be called a pseudepigraphon since they are written in the first person, with Daniel as speaker. The Court Tales are then anonymous stories *about* this same Daniel.

[115] See on pseudepigrapha and their socio-political nature (esp. with regard to Qumran), J.J. Collins, "Pseudepigrapha and Group Formation," *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. E.G. Chazon and M. Stone, eds. Leiden: Brill, 1999: 43-58; section on the Daniel texts (48-52). Specifically on the pseudepigrapha connected to characters from the Hebrew Bible, see James H. Charlesworth, "Introduction for the Generel Reader," *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha I*. New York: Doubleday, 1983: xxi-xxxiv. On the more general aspects of pseudonymity, see most recently K.D. Clarke, "The Problem of Pseudonymity in Biblical Literature and its Implications for Canon Formation," *The Canon Debate*. Eds.: L.M. McDonald, J.A. Sanders. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002: 440-468. See as well, M.E. Stone, "Pseudepigraphy Reconsidered," *Review of Rabbinic Judaism* 9(2006): 1-15.

Temple pseudepigrapha are ascribed to a famous precursor such as Enoch, Moses, Abraham, Levi, Baruch and others. However, although the name Daniel occurs a few times throughout the Hebrew Bible, it is not known as that of a famous hero or eponymous ancestor but it rather belongs to the obscure member of a prominent family or group. On the other hand, the name is well known from ancient Ugarit. In its literature we read of the exploits of the wise Dan'el (or D'nil) who converses with the gods. [116] Can it be this Dan'el who is reflected in Ezekiel's listing of wise men of old (14:14, 20 where he is mentioned in conjunction with Noah and Job, and 28:3)? [117] There are a few more obscure Daniel references in *1 Enoch* (the *Book of the Watchers*) and *Jubilees*, both roughly contemporaneous with Daniel, but these too do not seem to have been the model for the biblical Daniel. The presence of these names merely indicates that there existed dormant traditions about individuals with the theophoric name Daniel, associated with the notion of a judging God. [118]

---

[116] That, true to his name, he also dispensed justice, is shown by A.H.W. Curtis, "The Just King: Fact or Fancy? Some Ugaritic Reflections," *Reflection and Refraction. Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*. R. Rezetko, T.H. Lim & W.B. Aucker, eds. Leiden: Brill, 2007: 81-92.

[117] In all three cases written without a *yud* (although vocalized to read 'Daniel'), which would reinforce the idea that this Daniel might reflect a distant echo of his Ugaritic namesake. See e.g. M. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1-20* [AB 22] New York: Doubleday, 1983: 257.

[118] Over time commentators have put forward various suggestions, incorporating new data as they became available, and often displaying their personal biases in their findings. An overview of the most often cited representatives will bear this out.
C.F. Keil, *Biblical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949[1877] (transl. by M.G. Easton from the German edition of 1869) (1877[1869]: 1, 3) – mentions the Daniel of Ezekiel and of Ezra, Nehemiah and Chronicles. His position is that the Daniel of Ezekiel is the same as the protagonist of the Book of Daniel. See esp. his vigorous defense of this position on pp. 3, 32-33.
G. Behrmann, *Das Buch Daniel übersetzt und erklärt*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1894: xvi – He notes the biblical Daniels and suggests that the one in Nehemiah (where also the names of Daniel's three companions are listed) has come to be identified with the individual of the Book of Daniel and that the three companions have in this way been introduced into the exilic stories. He does, however, consider the Daniel in Ezekiel to be a different person.
F.W. Farrar, *The Book of Daniel* [The Expositor's Bible]. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1901: 5, 8-11 – Farrar suggests that because Daniel is known to have served under Cyrus in his old age, it cannot be excluded that the Daniel mentioned as signing the covenant in Neh. 10:7 may be one and the same. He seems to retract this later, though.
K. Marti, *Das Buch Daniel*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1901: vii-viii. Ezekiel's Daniel, who is likely a non-Israelite, is not the same as our Daniel, and Ezekiel does not portray him as a younger contemporary.
J.A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1927: 2-3 – the origin for the name is to be sought in Jewish folk traditions. He mentions Ezekiel's Daniel but rejects any identification with the exilic Daniel and criticizes those who do (note 1).

E.W. Heaton, *The Book of Daniel* [The Torch Bible Commentaries]. London: SCM Press, 1956: 25-28 – Discounts the Ezra and Chron. Daniel, but thinks the Dan'el of Ezekiel may well have played a role in the formation of Daniel.

A. Jeffery, *The Book of Daniel* [The Interpreter's Bible VI]. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956: 341-552 (at p. 344) – mentions Ezekiel's and Ugaritic Dan'el and then suggests that there may have been a Jewish Danel legend circulating with the exile as setting.

G.Ch. Aalders, *Daniël* [Commentaar op het Oude Testament] Kampen: J.H. Kok, 1962: 5-6 – is of the opinion that the Dan(i)el mentioned in Ezekiel can only refer to the protagonist of the Book of Daniel. It would be unthinkable that the prophet Ezekiel would mention an idolatrous mantic specialist "in one breath with true believers of the living God."

O. Plöger, *Das Buch Daniel*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, G. Mohn, 1965: 28 – He is not at all clear why the author would have selected the name Daniel. He suggests that because of the demonstrated affinity for the Book of Ezekiel in chapters 8 and 10, the name of Ezekiel's Daniel could have inspired our anonymous author from the Maccabean period.

L.F Hartman & A.A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel* [AB 23]. New York: Doubleday, 1978: 7-8; reject a link with the Daniel of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles. The Daniel of Ezekiel is a more likely candidate for influence but the probability of direct derivation is not great.

J. Baldwin, *Daniel. An Introduction & Commentary* [Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries]. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 1978: 82 – written from the conservative point of view, Daniel is accepted as a historical person acting during the Exile, although he is not necessarily the author. Although the various Daniels are mentioned, no use is seen in adopting the name for the protagonist from them because of their obscurity. This would not have enhanced the credibility of the text, therefore: Daniel is Daniel.

A. Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979: 3 – while mentioning all the Daniels, he thinks that the author, "has taken something from the legends circulating about the incomparably wise hero Daniel." He therefore does not make a connection with the (albeit obscure) royal or priestly Daniel.

N. Porteous, *Daniel.* London: SCM Press, 1979: 17-18 – names Ezekiel's and Jubilees' Daniel and acknowledges that these may have informed the Daniel of our text. He adds though that our Daniel "acquired whatever authority he has from the book that bears his name."

W. Sibley Towner, *Daniel* [Interpretation]. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1984: 5 – suggests that the name is derived from Ezekiel's Daniel.

P.R. Davies, *Daniel* [Old Testament Guides] Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1985: 40-41 – lists all existing Daniels but rules out the Ezra and Chronicles Daniels as references since the characters' narrative lives do not coincide at all or sufficiently with that of our Daniel.

J.E. Goldingay, *Daniel* [Word *Biblical Commentary* 30]. Dallas: Word Books, 1989: 7 – mentions the Ezekiel and Nehemiah Daniels, as well as the Ugaritic tradition. Goldingay makes no real pronouncement on their influence.

P.L. Redditt, *Daniel* [The New Century Bible Commentary]. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999: 34 – sees the Daniel of Ezekiel as possible inspiration for later Daniel traditions in the Babylonian setting.

D.E. Gowan, *Daniel* [Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries]. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2001: 21-22 – only mentions Ezekiel's Daniel, but makes no pronouncement on derivation of the name.

E. Lucas, *Daniel* [Apollos Old Testament Commentary]. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2002: 313-314 – does not venture an opinion, other than that author and protagonist are not the same. He only mentions the Ezekiel connection.

C.L. Seow, *Daniel* [Westminster Bible Companion]. Louisville / London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003: 3-4 – lists Ezekiel's and Jubilees' Daniels. He prefers to see a line of influence from Ugarit through Ezekiel to the Book of Daniel.

In *1 Enoch* 6:7, a Daniel (spelt דניאל in 4QEn^{a}ar 3:8) is mentioned as one of the Watchers who descended on Mount Hermon. George Nickelsburg [119] notes that Jozef T. Milik had identified this angel with Ezekiel's Daniel and further that in *Jub* 4:20 Enoch married the daughter of a Dan'el who would in turn be connected to his namesake in *1 Enoch*. While the latter connection remains unclear, there may indeed be one between the Daniel of Ezekiel, the one of Enoch and of *Jubilees* and Ugaritic Dan'el. [120]

1 Chron 3:1 lists a Daniel as the firstborn of David and Abigail, although in the parallel passage in 2 Sam 3:3, this son is named Chileab (which is likely due to a scribal error). Ezra 8:2 mentions a Daniel as a member of one of the returning priestly families (descended from Ithamar). This may be the same person who is listed in Neh. 10:7 as one of the priestly signatories of the covenant document (in fact, the names of Azariah, Mishael and Hananiah also occur in Nehemiah's lists). Klaus Koch, [121] however, points to the problem created with introducing this priestly Daniel into the search for the source of the name; after all, our Daniel is of royal blood, [122] which precludes a priestly descent. John Collins [123] also rejects a connection between the Ezra/Nehemiah Daniel and sees Ezekiel's Daniel as the most likely candidate to have inspired the name Daniel for the protagonist of the Book.

---

[119] G. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1* [Hermeneia].Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001: 180.

[120] This is also suggested by J.J. Collins in his *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* (Missoula, MO: Scholars Press, 1977:1-3).

[121] K. Koch, *Das Buch Daniel*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980: 119.

[122] The phrasing of the verse might suggest that three classes are named: *from* the Israelites, *and from* the royal seed, *and from* the nobility, which would leave the question of Daniel's royal pedigree open. However, it is argued by commentators that "the text does not speak of three separate classes, but of one class that answered to the three descriptions." J. Slotki (1951: 2). Montgomery (1927: 119-120) explains the listing likewise. He points out, though, that no further identification can be made from this and that the identification with a relative of king Zedekiah made by some early commentators (like Josephus) is as uncertain as identifying him with a priestly character.

[123] In fact, he does not see a connection with any of the other pre-existing Daniels. He suggests that perhaps the name was taken over from the occurrence in Ezekiel, in a time during which the earlier pagan Ugaritic correlation had long been forgotten. He further writes: "Because Daniel was not as well known as Noah and Job in Jewish circles, the post-exilic author was free to attach the name to a figure who would illustrate righteousness and wisdom in a historical context." *Daniel* (1993): 1-2.

Recently Michael P. O'Connor has suggested abolishing every connection between pseudepigraphic Daniel and all the other characters bearing the name, both biblical and non-biblical. Since every attempt at seeing such connection is purely speculative, he ventures that the choice of Daniel may be due to the popularity of this name in West-Semitic onomastics. However, he seems to undermine his own argument when he acknowledges that he knows "of no first-millennium epigraphic attestations of the name." [124]

Thus, while agreeing with the views that tend to exclude a direct identification of Hellenistic Daniel with any of the other so named characters, one still needs to investigate the motive of the author/editor to choose the name Daniel for his protagonist. Assuming that the traditions in Ezra/Nehemiah, Chronicles and Ezekiel were known to the final editor of the Book of Daniel, one may venture that he was prompted to combine two important traditions in this constructed identity, royal and priestly. Being so concerned with the destruction of the temple and restoration of full autonomy, by selecting an obscure personage, subtlety on the one hand could be maintained in this otherwise amazingly bold choice and on the other hand, it would create continuity and meaning by linking the pseudepigraphic Daniel to real historical namesakes. Nevertheless, a more substantial reasoning is required. The author/editor of the book would surely have selected the name of his protagonist very carefully. Names in the ancient Near East were always bestowed with the greatest care and were infused with meaning associated with the one bearing it. [125] As will be seen in Daniel 1 (and elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible), this equally applied to name changes. The meaning of the name Daniel is clear: 'God judges' or 'God is (my) judge'. Admittedly, Daniel does not act as a judge. He is a courtier; an expounder of dreams and a seer, but not a judge, and neither is he judged. But, in his dream interpretations he does communicate God's judgments, contained in those dreams, to Nebuchadnezzar. The only episode resembling a judgment, but more so a test, is the one in which Daniel is confined to the lions' den.

---

[124] M.P. O'Connor, "The Human Characters' Names in the Ugaritic Poems: Onomastic Eccentricity in Bronze-Age West Semitic and the Name Daniel in Particular," in *Biblical Hebrew in Its Northwest Semitic Setting. Typological and Historical Perspectives*. S.E. Fassberg & A. Hurvitz, eds. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006: 269-284 (at 282, fn. 65).

[125] See J.H. Tigay, *You Shall Have No Other Gods. Israelite Religion in the Light of Hebrew Inscriptions* [HSS 31] Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986: 5-6.

Ultimately that event, however, too seems to have been more for the benefit of the king, as Daniel was never in any real danger. Another instance may be found in the prayer of chapter 9, where Daniel seeks to avert the severity of God's decree and acts as defense counsel. He acts similarly also with regard to the king with whom he negotiates and persuades to mend his ways. Where then are references to actual judgment to be found? First, covertly, in God's actions *vis-à-vis* the kings, and overtly in the heavenly throne room. The heavenly throne room is, of course, the heavenly counterpart of the earthly royal throne room of the royal palace in Jerusalem where the king of Judah would have acted as judge. But it also represents the Temple where on the relevant days in the liturgical year (New Year, the Day of Atonement) God would have judged His people. However, if the royal and priestly Daniel may have inspired authority as to an otherwise not fully specified pedigree in 1:3, Ugaritic Dan'el (by way of Ezekiel's Daniel) could have furnished the aspects of judge and communicator with the heavenly realm.

But this is not all. Other examples, roughly contemporaneous with Daniel and covering the same sensitive historical and societal upheavals in Judah, are the *Vision of the Heavenly Palaces*, the *Animal Apocalypse* and the *Apocalypse of Weeks* (chs. 14, 85-90 and 93) of *1 Enoch*. They cover similar material as Daniel and use similar images. Yet, these texts seem to allow themselves greater liberty to express their urgent and radical sentiments than Daniel is able to do. It may therefore be suggested that this is due to the choice of name for the pseudepigraphical heroes in both texts. The Book of Daniel in its narrative time frame [126] is placed between the historical Book of Chronicles [127] and the prophetic Books of Ezekiel and Zechariah, and preceding the historical Books of Ezra and Nehemiah. Imagery from these and other prophetic books is amply attested. But the name of the protagonist rather hails from those historical books: a royal and a priestly Daniel. Only the legendary Daniel of Ezekiel carries the aura of hoary antiquity with it,

---

[126] This is apart from the question of its place in the various canons.

[127] Chronicles represent its own problems with regard to the period of composition, the subject matter covered, as well as its position in the canon. It is a rewriting of the books of Samuel and Kings, but displays significant variants, additions and omissions vis-à-vis these books. The most recent overview of the issues concerning the composition date of Chronicles can be found in S.J. Schweitzer, "Reading Utopia in Chronicles." Diss. University of Notre Dame, 2005: 6-9.

so perhaps this echo too was carried over into the exilic Daniel. [128] The Daniel of Ezekiel clearly belongs to a different category and must be seen as a foreign import into the text, resting on different traditions, yet some of his characteristics (through Ezekiel's filter) may have informed Daniel the Seer.

Enoch, on the other hand, is an antediluvian character who was granted a very special connection to the realm of the divine. He functioned in a time when history had barely begun to take shape and all of the calamities and conflicts that besieged the narrative world of Daniel and continued into the world of both authors/editors could still have been averted … if only. Therefore, the author of the Enoch texts boldly looked back to the dawn of history when the slate could still have been kept clean, whereas the editor of Daniel was already a captive of history. This observation may prove helpful in determining the immediate concerns for both author/editors. The editor of Daniel displays extreme concern about the immediate situation "on the ground." He sees either an impending new exile, with Antiochus as a new Nebuchadnezzar, or he judges the situation in Judah to have deteriorated to such an extent that it is comparable to an exilic existence for the righteous ones. The one responsible for the Enoch texts looks beyond the current situation. They are for the moment beyond repair, which is why he retreats into the distant past, travels into the unknown to look for solutions and thus bypasses the sordid present.

What ultimately appears with regard to the relationship of judgment and the character of Daniel seems to be that in the court tales and the prayer of chapter 9 there is room for repentance and repair. In the apocalyptic vision chapters this flexibility has disappeared. Judgment is final and there is no more room for appeal. Therefore, it is not just the hero's name that is Daniel, it becomes the reader's name as well.

---

[128] There are some recent opinions that want to identify the Daniel of Ezekiel 14 with the one of the Book of Daniel but only "at the price of regarding 14:12-20 as a postexilic composition," (L.C. Allen, *Ezekiel 1-19* [WBC 28] Dallas: Word Books, 1994: 218). It concerns here Harold H.P. Dressler, "The Identification of the Ugaritic Dnil with the Daniel of Ezekiel," *VT* 29(1979): 152-161 and H.-M. Wahl, "Noah, Daniel und Hiob in Ezechiel XIV 12-20 (21-3): Anmerkungen zum traditionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund," *VT* 42(1992): 542-553. See further on this discussion J.J. Collins, *Daniel* (1993: p. 1, n. 5).

CHAPTER THREE: Danielic Spaces

In Daniel's narrative the reader is confronted with many different, sometimes literally outlandish spaces that are partly original to Daniel but that are all grounded in earlier traditions and world views. The basic geography in which the narrative takes place is limited to the area covered by the Neo-Babylonian Empire and subsequently the Persian Empire. Whatever real spaces seem to reach beyond these boundaries consist either of spaces of memory or of 'future history' and concern the Land of Israel, the City of Jerusalem and the Temple. Within the narrative a constant juxtaposition of the spaces of Babylonia and the Land of Israel occurs, resulting often in the creation of counter images of these two. Jerusalem and the Temple take on characteristics that are known from Babylon and its temples, with the latter two appearing in a satirized version in the narrative. When the narrative moves to the otherworldly spaces in the latter part of the book, an ancient Near Eastern cosmology is presupposed.

3.1. The Nature of Daniel's Earth and Netherworld

A simple reading of the Book of Daniel reveals two very significant and juxtaposed spaces as well as a number of ideological spaces that together make up its narrative world, the earthly and the heavenly realm. From the narrative point of view, these are to be seen as representing 'real' spaces. The earthly consists of natural Firstspace manifestations like mountains, planes, rivers, as well as built-environment. These man-made structures include cities, palaces, temples, domestic environments, as well as places of punishment. It also consists of ideological spaces (Secondspaces), such as kingdoms, exile, but also memory spaces and contested spaces. The most important of these are the Land of Israel and Babylonia/Persia and the cities of Jerusalem and Babylon. From the perspective of the Judean characters, exile, memory spaces and contested space are at the same time to be understood as Thirdspace, since they concern the lived space of the exile and any thoughts from the exiled Judeans with regard to the lost land, city and destroyed temple concerns hopes for their restoration.

The heavenly realm likewise contains Firstspace aspects such as heavenly bodies, the celestial palace, temple and throne room. [1] Its Secondspaces consist of the Kingdom of God that will be manifested on earth and the making and unmaking of the earthly kingdoms that are subject to divine manipulation. The cases where the natural earthly markers such as mountains, seem to attain an other-worldly component as they play a role in dreams and visions, also belong to the divine machinations of Secondspace. Thus it can be observed that throughout Daniel's narrative aspects of the heavenly realm break through into the earthly reality as visitations from above take place, incidentally, without resulting in the establishment of permanent or even temporary sacred spaces. In one rare case the direction is reversed when Daniel is granted a visit to the heavenly throne room.

All the spaces that were identified above can be construed as some form of sacred space. Either because this was their function from the outset, for instance the heavenly and earthly temples, or because they represent places that are used for ritual or prayer. The royal palaces are to be seen as part of the larger sacred space complexes as well, since they typically adjoin the temple. In addition, since kingship in the ancient Near East is understood as having been given by the gods, the king is the representative of the divine on earth and hence too has a very important sacral function. [2]

With regard to domestic space, we find an interesting development in Daniel. Both the kings and Daniel are said to have houses and private quarters. In the case of the king this is his palace where he rules supreme and which displays all his riches. But is this truly a safe place for him? In chapters 2 and 4 Nebuchadnezzar's peaceful rest is disturbed in the innermost privacy of his bedroom when he experiences symbolic dreams that are obviously sent to him from the realm of the divine. In chapter 4 we are introduced to a king, very proud of his Secondspatial endeavors, out of which sprang forth the Firstspace result of the city of Babylon. Yet, the palace from which he oversees all this, is also the

---

[1] In fact, with regard to the initial act of creation, one could paraphrase the notion of critical spatiality's social production of space along the lines of, 'in a giant explosion of secondspace thought, God created firstspace'.

[2] See on the role of the king in the cult and his relationship to the divine, e.g., J. Bidmead, "The *Akitu* Festival: Religious Continuity and Royal Legitimation in Mesopotamia". Diss. Vanderbilt University, 2002: 199-201.

place where he has an encounter with the divine which communicates to him a message of gloom (4:26-28). Thus, in the context of the narrative, the First- and Secondspace of the king do not in actual fact offer him security or comfort. He constantly needs to look over his shoulder. The same is true for Belshazzar, in chapter 5, who in the midst of a celebration of his power has a divine visitation for all to see – in fact an unsolicited invasion into the privacy of his royal residence. His fear is graphically described and by night his kingdom is no longer his. By contrast, the narrative portrays Daniel's private quarters as a refuge. It truly is the lived space of the oppressed (despite his rank) where he can find solace and the intimacy to communicate with his God. The divine visitations that Daniel experiences there are solicited and in the form of the obtaining of useful information, intelligence, with which to withstand the royal power and at times, even to surpass that power.

Moving to the extended world of Daniel's narrative, it becomes clear that Eliade's traditional portrayal of the ancient tripartite cosmos in which an *axis mundi* connects the three levels of heaven, earth, and underworld cannot be maintained. In addition to the absence of a central sacred place that would connect the three, in Daniel the underworld as a place where the dead reside may only be present in a faint allusion in 12:2, where אדמת-עפר (*'admat-'afar*) alludes to the notion of *sheol*. [3] In addition, the underworld in its guise as the primeval sea may be present in the vision of chapter 7, where the monstrous hybrid beings rise up from the sea. That representation, however, takes place within a dream vision, which itself is located in heaven. It is tempting to see in the imagery of the beasts emerging from the sea a reflection of the Mesopotamian depiction of the netherworld, *apsu*, which is inhabited by so-called *Mischwesen*, or hybrid creatures. They usually consist of similar components as those described in Daniel. Thankfully, we know exactly how they looked since the Assyrian palaces were lavishly decorated with such beings, often acting as fearsome guards. [4]

---

[3] *TDOT* 1, "Adamah" (p. 94) – "(e) The dead sleep in the *'adhmath – 'aphar*, "the dust of the earth" (Dnl 12:2; Bab. *Bit epri*) [K. Tallqvist, *Sum.-akk. Namen der Totenwelt* (1934), 37] which denotes either the "Underworld" [N.H. Ridderbos, *OTS* 5(1948): 177] or the earth as the substance in which the dead are bedded down. [Fohrer, *KAT*, XVI, 319f.]."

[4] For some examples of human and eagle-headed genies, see S.M. Paley, *King of the World: Ashur-nasir-pal II of Assyria 883-859 B.C.* Brooklyn: The Brooklyn Museum, 1976. For winged bulls with human heads, see V. Danrey, Winged Human-Headed Bulls of Niniveh: Genesis of an Iconographic Motif," *Iraq* 66(2004): 133-139.

Other, more indirect allusions to the netherworld may be found in the places of punishment in chapters 3 and 6, the fiery furnace and the lion's den, respectively. In addition, the episode in the lion's den takes place over-night and both places are intended to become the victim's grave. Although the role of the netherworld is negligible in Daniel, what is alluded to is significant. The chthonic, represented by fire and wild animals, is neutralized by forces from the celestial realm. In each case a heavenly figure, which is only seen by the victims and the royal victimizer saves those who are condemned to perish in the chthonic realm (in the case of the lions' den, the king only hears about the angel). With regard to Daniel 6, one should further note a partial overlap with the fate suffered by Joseph when he was thrown into a dry pit. *Targum Onkelos* uses the same word [גובא] that is used in Daniel to translate the Hebrew for pit [בור] in Gen. 37: 24. This word has broad associations with שאול. The connection is made clear when a distraught Jacob talks about going down to *sheol* himself (37:35). On the other hand, *bor* may also refer to imprisonment (for punitive reasons). See, for instance, Jer. 38:6. However, it should be noted that there is a great lexical overlap between the two meanings of (a very specific) prison and the underworld. This is so especially in view of the subterranean location of the *bor* (also sometimes *shahat* – cf. the use of these terms in Ps. 7). Both these terms, again, also function as descriptions for the underworld. [5]

3.2. The Nature of Daniel's Heavenly Realm and its Inhabitants [6]

The summary above is based on and facilitated by the cosmology that the framer(s) of Daniel inherited from the ancient Israelite traditions as they are found in Genesis and other older biblical traditions, as well as *I Enoch, Jubilees* and other pseudepigrapha. On the one hand we find here the earth as we know it. Beyond the rims of the known earth,

---

[5] See K. van der Toorn, "In the Lions' Den: the Babylonian Background of a Biblical Motif," *CBQ* 60(1998): 638.

[6] An earlier version of this section was presented at the 2007 Regional New England Session of SBL in Newton. An expanded version, entitled "When Going on a Heavenly Journey, Travel Light and Dress Appropriately," is forthcoming in the *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 19(2010)3.

however, it was surrounded by mythical worlds, enveloped by the primal ocean, the upper and lower waters. The earth was the designated habitat for the physical creatures that were subject to linear temporality and to decay, meaning they would come into existence, develop and ultimately cease to exist. Deep beneath the earth was found the netherworld, where in ancient Israelite and many other ancient religions the dead would sleep in an eternal dark nothingness. These were the rules that applied to life in the earthly world.

For the observer on earth the divine realm was supposed to be 'elsewhere', usually up in the sky and beyond. The rules that applied to its environment and its divine inhabitants were structurally different from that on earth. It did not conform to the three-dimensional reality known on earth and therefore direction and size became inconsequential. Since, in addition, it did not consist of matter, it was also not subject to the ravages of time. It was understood to be a non-corporeal non-temporal space. Although these two worlds were coeval, it could be argued that they existed in different dimensions. It was therefore not possible to cross over from one to the other, except in very specific cases and under very stringent conditions. The boundaries between these worlds could either be crossed legitimately or transgressed. The exact manner of how divine manifestations in the human, earthly world were realized, is not described other than that angelic beings usually descended to the earth and left it again by ascending. In almost all instances the angelic visitors would appear in human form and often the individual that encountered them would not recognize their angelic status. Sometimes they would simply appear and disappear. However, the procedure for reverse traffic, that of humans to the divine world is radically different. The descriptions of the various processes in the biblical corpus are sufficiently clear that based on them, subsequent textual traditions have developed intricate rituals and manuals to facilitate these boundary crossings.

Before moving to what all this means in the context of Daniel, a few examples of the traffic between the earthly and divine realms need to be mentioned. After all, Daniel presumes familiarity with all these traditions.

The first example is from *1 Enoch* 14 (part of the *Book of the Watchers*), which is generally dated to the 3rd century BCE. In a dream vision Enoch ascends to a heavenly structure that consists simultaneously of conflicting substances: fire and various kinds of frozen water: ice, snow, and hail stones. [7] He is able to move through a wall [8] of fire and encounters a house that is built of ice and snow. Its ceiling displays the path of the stars, [9] lightning flashes, and fiery cherubim. Above them a watery heaven is described. [10] Enoch enters the house that is both hot and cold and chillingly devoid of life. There are doors of fire, one opens and Enoch finds himself in a house that is larger than the first one and is built of flaming fire. It is so glorious that he is unable to describe it. Its floor is of fire, higher up again there is lightning and the path of the stars, and its ceiling, too, consists of fire. Inside Enoch perceives the divine throne. The description that follows contains many elements that we know from Ezekiel and Daniel. [11] When approaching the Deity seated on the throne, Enoch is careful not to look at Him. He was undoubtedly aware of the tradition

[7] See C.C. Afzal, "Wheels of Time in the Apocalypse of Jesus Christ," *Paradise Now: Essays on Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism*. A. De Conick, ed. Atlanta: SBL, 2006: 195-210. He discusses the translational problems with regard to the icy building elements: whether they are crystals or hail stones; and the nature of the phrase "path of the stars" or alternative solutions (pp. 204-205). See also D. Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot*. (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1988), p. 80.

[8] Although the Ethiopic reads 'wall' here, the Greek has 'building', suggesting that there may be a total of three buildings rather than two. M. Himmelfarb provides further support for the modeling on a traditional tripartite temple complex for the architecture encountered by Enoch (*Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993, p. 14). The reading of the Greek is toned down by G.W.E. Nickelsburg, (*1 Enoch 1* [Hermeneia] Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001, pp. 258, 262), clearly preferring the Ethiopic description of a wall encircling two houses.

[9] Ceilings painted with the starry images of the heavens are widely known from Egypt where they adorn both temples and tombs. See G. Leick, *A Dictionary of Ancient Near Eastern Architecture* (London: Routledge, 1988), p. 45 and J. Baines, "Palaces and Temples of Ancient Egypt," *CANE* (1995), pp. 303-317. Baines writes about the Egyptian temples of the Greco-Roman period (p. 313), "The top of each wall, and especially the ceiling, symbolizes the sky, parts of it bearing patterns of stars or more detailed astronomical representations, and parts, solar motifs indicating the passage of the sun through the temple." With regard to Mesopotamia, see Y. Tomabechi, "Wall Paintings from Dur Kurigalzu," *JNES* 42(1983): 123-131 (at p. 128). She writes, "Blue was also a favorite background color on wall paintings in Mesopotamia: the ceiling or the upper walls of Room 9 of the Ur Mausoleum (Third Dynasty of Ur) was covered with gold ornamentations of a sun and six-pointed stars which were pinned against a blue background. In the Old Babylonian Palace at Mari as well, six-pointed stars were painted against a blue background. (At least in these examples the blue may represent the color of the sky.)"

[10] D. Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot*, p. 83, points to a likely connection with Ps. 104 with its allusions to a cosmic temple. In vv. 2-3 we read (Halperin's translation): "Arches the sky like tent, Roofs his upper champers with water." Translators and commentators alike have recognized this as a difficult passage, nevertheless, Halperin's solution makes much sense.

[11] See the comparative graph in Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, p. 255.

that doing so is not conducive to good health (Exod. 33.20). [12] It should be noted that for the entire duration of Enoch's tour through the heavenly palace, he is not described as undergoing any sort of transformation. However, it is significant to note that he is able to move through fiery walls with no ill effect to himself. I will return to this matter below.

Much can be deduced concerning the view of the heavenly realm represented in this short account of Enoch's visit to the heavenly abode. First of all, it is clear that it is possible for these contradictory elements to coexist and hold together in heaven in a way that would be impossible on earth as the resulting amalgamation would not only be unstable, but the substances would extinguish each other.[13] It is widely thought that the two houses that Enoch describes exist within one another, resulting in the paradoxical notion that the larger one exists *inside* the smaller one. Hence George Nickelsburg's supposition that adjoining houses are meant. [14] Yet, just as the architectural layout in *3*

---

[12] In an early study, C. Rowland analyzes some examples of visual (near-)encounters with the Divine in his "The Visions of God in Apocalyptic Literature," *JSJ* 10(1979)2: 137-154.

[13] Or as Nickelsburg, *I Enoch 1* [p. 262] phrases it: "… its systematic emphasis on the coexistence of mutually exclusive opposites." M. Dean-Otting, *Heavenly Journeys: A Study of the Motif in Hellenistic Jewish Literature*. [JUU 8] (Frankfurt a/Main: Peter Lang, 1984), p. 50, describes it as "the optical impression of a wall of hailstones surrounded by tongues of fire, a virtual physical impossibility, and therefore, tantalizingly magical, must have dazzled a reader some two thousand years ago."

[14] As mentioned, Nickelsburg (*id.*, p. 264), especially, is reluctant to entertain this idea and proposes that the houses are not inside each other but rather adjacent. In support, he invokes the much later *3 En* 1.1 ("Rabbi Ishmael said: When I ascended to the height to behold the vision of the chariot, I entered six palaces, one inside the other, and when I reached the door of the seventh palace ..."). However, this passage merely suggests the concentric idea and clearly speaks of six palaces or rooms within one another. The seventh is said to be entered through a door in the sixth house, thereby unmistakably implying that the seventh, in which the Holy One resides, is located *within* the sixth house. He, in fact, presents the comparison with *3 En* 1.1 (p. 264, fn. 18) only to conclude that if *1 En* 14 would contain this idea "one would have the paradox of a house larger than the house in which it stands." He sees the mention of the door as indicating "that Enoch is looking through that door into a second house to which it is the entry." As I will suggest, the conundrum can be resolved by understanding Enoch's experience of the wholly otherness of the nature of heavenly space in either a contemporary fourth/fifth dimensional perspective, or as through the notion that time and space are suspended in dreams and visions and do not have to answer to earthly conventions. In short, Nickelsburg considers the episode in a waking and three-dimensional way, which is what creates the paradox for him. See also his "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee," *JBL* 100(1981): 575-600 (Repr. in *George W.E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning*. J. Neusner & A.J. Avery-Peck, eds. Leiden: Brill, 2003, pp. 427-457, at p. 433), where he still allows for "the house within a house" although clearly preferring "here one house adjoining another." Yet he clearly realizes that more is going on than the description of simply two adjoining structures, when he writes (*ibid.*, p. 434), "Enoch ascends to heaven, where God dwells in a temple of psychedelic construction and proportions." He allows for the strange conditions described in the text by noting (*ibid.* p. 435), "what is impossible with man on earth is possible in the presence of the holy

Enoch, the door mentioned in *1 En.* 14.15 could very well lead to another, inner house. It must be noted, though, that *3 Enoch* does not refer to larger houses within smaller ones – there is no mention of size. In any case, both draw heavily on the traditional layout of the Jerusalem Temple with its concentric outer and inner courts culminating in the Holy of Holies, as found in the Hebrew Bible.

A clear indication that the second house is located within the first, however, is provided by the idea that the ceiling of the former is similar to a level within the latter that appears to hover between its floor and ceiling. In fact, since it is not specified that the door is located in a wall, it may also lead to a higher level within the structure. Enoch seems to be looking upward through the architecture, which may even be partly transparent, and he would need to ascend further within the structure to reach the next level.

The seeming impossibility of a larger house existing within a smaller house could be resolved by understanding the heavenly realm as existing within a fourth, or higher dimensional space, whereas the earthly realm is confined to a three dimensional space. These two realities would clash if someone from one particular dimension perceives reality in a different dimension and is not properly adapted to the alternative circumstances. The result would be that this particular person's perception becomes skewed. Similarly, other aspects of regular three-dimensional directions are subject to change when shifting to another dimension. For instance, in a fourth dimensional realm there would be no conventional fixed up-down-forward-backward. This may help to explain Jacob's vision into heaven during his dream at Bethel in which he saw angels going up and down a *sulam* [15] that was put on the earth, reaching into heaven, the upper

---

God." C.R.A. Morray-Jones in "The Temple Within," [*Paradise Now*, (2006), pp. 145-178] phrases it very clearly: "[t]he structure of this celestial temple involves a *curious reversal of normality*: the inner of the two 'houses' is larger than the outer" (p. 148).

[15] Exactly what is meant by the word *sulam* has never been resolved; but it is certain that the traditional translation of 'ladder' is not correct (although this is the meaning the word has retained in Modern Hebrew). More likely it refers to either the outer stairway of a ziggurat or other kind of temple complex that in various Mesopotamian contexts was used as a model for the stairway of the gods connecting the heavenly and earthly realms. The fact that Bethel was already recognized as a sacred space makes this a likely explanation for this site as well. See e.g. R.K. Gnuse, *The Dream Theophany of Samuel: Its Structure in Relation to Ancient Near Eastern Dreams and Its Theological Significance.* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1984), 67-68. For an interpretation in ancient art, see K. Weitzman and H.L. Kessler, *The Frescoes of the Dura Synagogue and Christian Art* (Washington D.C., 1990), 17-

part of which Jacob recognized as the Gate of Heaven. The up-down direction of the angels has perplexed commentators and scholars alike, [16] evoking especially the question as to where those angels came from in the first place., as it would have been expected that they would have moved down (from heaven) and back up again rather than the reverse. Some of the early interpretations argue that the story refers to angels who, for a variety of reasons, were on earth at that moment using the ladder to get back up into heaven. Others prefer a metaphorical explanation for the imagery. Contrary to these explanations, it may be suggested that the vision as it stands may further illustrate the strange physical and structural properties of the heavenly realm. [17] In addition, the strong ancient Near Eastern background of the images used to describe the vision and its context go far in clarifying the spatial components of this narrative as well as those in the episode of *1 Enoch 14* that was discussed above. [18]

Moreover, since dreams have the capacity to collapse space and time, [19] conditions that occur in the dream or visionary state could easily be transposed onto the heavenly

---

21. The use of the word *maqom* (place) has prompted early midrashists to identify it with Jerusalem, specifically the Temple, rather than Bethel. All other lexical hints, such as "House of God" and "Gateway of Heaven" are fully exploited. See J. Kugel, "The Ladder of Jacob," *HTR* 88(1995): 209-227, at p. 216.

[16] For some diverse early interpretations, see J.L. Kugel, *The Ladder Of Jacob. Ancient Interpretations of the Biblical Story of Jacob and His Children* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006), pp. 9-35. Or, *id.*, "the Ladder of Jacob" at p. 213. In early medieval Jewish mysticism we encounter the seemingly contradictory term *yordei merkavah* ('descenders to the chariot') for those mystics who seek to *ascend* to the divine chariot throne. In light of lexographical studies of the verbs על"ה and יר"ד the description of what goes on in Jacob's dream could perhaps be clarified more satisfactorily. See e.g. E.R. Wolfson, "'Yeridah la-Merkavah': Typology of Ecstasy and Enthronement in Ancient Jewish Mysticism," *Mystics of the Book; Themes, Topics, and Typologies* (R.A. Herrera, ed. New York: Peter Lang, 1993), pp. 13-44, who proposes a different directional reading of the terms.

[17] The entire episode of Gen. 28.1-22 is charged with notions of earthly and heavenly sacred space. This is picked up very succinctly in the *Targum Ps.-Jon.* on the passage, which wraps the strange happenings into five miracles that were performed for Jacob.

[18] With regard to Gen. 28, this would refer to discussions of the nature of the *sulam*. See on this e.g., M.D. Oblath, "'To Sleep, Perchance to Dream...'; what Jacob Saw at Bethel (Genesis 28.10-22)," *JSOT* 26(2001)1: 117-126. Also, N. Wyatt, "Where Did Jacob Dream his Dream?," *SJOT* 2(1990): 44-57. W. Heimpel, "The Sun at Night and the Doors of Heaven in Babylonian Texts," *JCS* 38(1986): 127-151 offers some promising insights with regard to technical terminology pertaining to entrances into various spaces as they occur in the Babylonian texts as well as in *1 En 14* and Gen. 28.

[19] This is also noted by F. Flannery, *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests: Jewish Dreams in the Hellenistic and Roman Eras* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), pp. 6-7 and 113. While she observes correctly in my opinion, that the dissolution of the boundaries of normal space and time results in an *ontological* change as well, it is never explained why that would be so and how it is to be accomplished.

realm. In this way the vision or dream state with which people were familiar could be considered to be a gateway to the heavenly realm and at the same time could be seen as an extension of that realm. Thus it seems, questions concerning the heavenly realm abounded but the answers could only be imagined. We should, therefore, never forget when reading these texts that we are dealing with narrative (and perhaps even experiential) universes and not with reflections of scientific constructs.

At this point it should be noted that increasingly throughout the Second Temple period the heavenly realm became equated with an extended celestial temple complex inhabited by the Deity ruling the earth and the heavens as a king surrounded by His royal / priestly court. [20] If it is to be accepted that indeed the heavenly habitat functions as a temple with angelic priests officiating, related questions come to mind: are sacrifices to be brought in this temple, and if so, what do they consist of? Martha Himmelfarb [21] recently dealt with this question and approaches it much in light of the present discussion.

Another consequence of this development is the notion that the heavenly temple becomes almost thought of as a living organism. It reverberates with life; the actual structures are able to express praise to the Deity. Moreover, many of the elements that are known from the building account and inventory list of temple furnishings in Kings and Chronicles as well as Ezekiel function as full fledged or partial angelic forces in especially the Angelic Liturgy or Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (*Shirot 'Olat ha-Shabbat*) from Qumran. [22]

---

[20] For a recent discussion on the various positions, see J. Klawans, "Temple as Cosmos or Temple in the Cosmos: Priests, Purity, Sacrifice, and Angels," Chapter 4 in *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple. Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 111-144. See also M. Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), pp. 59-60 as well as C. Werman, "God's House: Temple or Universe," *Philo und das Neue Testament: Wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen* 1. (Internationales Symposium zum Corpus Judaeo-Hellisticum Novi Testamenti (Eisenach/Jena, Mai 2003) R. Deines & K.-W. Niebuhr, eds. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2004), pp. 309-320.

[21] M. Himmelfarb, "Earthly Sacrifice and Heavenly Incense: the Law of the Priesthood in *Aramaic Levi* and *Jubilees,*" *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities* (2004), pp. 103-122 (at pp. 121-122).

[22] C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* [HSS 27]. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.

In recent years a number of studies have appeared surveying the geographies of both heaven and earth in various texts dating from the Second Temple period and Late Antiquity. [23] Likewise, scholarly interest in the nature of angelic beings as they appear in texts of the same period has noticeably increased. [24] While these studies show great detail in many areas, there is, to my knowledge, no treatment of the wider significance of the properties and substances that comprise the spatialities of the ancient world. Recognition of the correlation between these spatialities and those of the denizens of the two habitats may shed light on the nature of various rituals that accompany the boundary crossings between the two realms and the dynamics that underlie these crossovers.

Kevin Sullivan offers a useful overview and classification of qualities that make clear in which way angels are different from human beings. [25] To the sources he mentions should be added *1 Enoch* 15, a text that likely offers one of the most succinct summaries of the qualities of the heavenly and earthly inhabitants and the dire consequences of the mixing of categories. *2 Enoch* 29 [26] should also be considered

---

[23] K. Coblentz-Bautch, *A Study of the Geography of 1 Enoch 17-19 'No One Has Seen What I Have Seen'* (Leiden: Brill, 2003); and P.M. Venter, "Spatiality in Enoch's Journeys (1 Enoch 12-36)," *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition* (F. Garcia Martinez, ed. Leuven: Peeters, 2003), pp. 211-230.

[24] F.V. Reiterer et al., eds., *Angels: The Concept of Celestial Beings – Origins, Development and Reception* [*Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2007*]. (Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007); R.M.M. Tuschling, *Angels and Orthodoxy* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2007); A.T. Wright, *The Origin of Evil Spirits*. (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2005); K.P. Sullivan, *Wrestling with Angels: A Study of the Relationship between Angels and Humans in Ancient Jewish Literature and the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 2004); C.H.T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Leiden: Brill, 2002); M.J. Davidson, *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1-36, 72-108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992); and M. Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabinischer Zeit*. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1992).

[25] His analysis is limited to those angels who appear in human form. This leaves an entire range of other angelic guises unexplored, such as the *seraphim, cherubi*m and other hybrid beings, that appear in Is. 6, Ezekiel, the *Shirot 'Olat ha-Shabbat* and elsewhere, who seem to represent a different class of angels within the heavenly host. These guises too, it will be argued, can be explained through the spatial model suggested in this study. Although in rabbinic and later mystical understanding there is an overlap in angelic manifestations and those of the Deity, the focus here is on angelic appearances and human angelomorphisms.

[26] F.I. Andersen, *OTP,* I, pp. 148-149. Both versions of 2 *Enoch*, while different, are relevant and in fact complement each other.

since it provides a unique case of a formal "angelogony" that specifies that angels (or: "ranks of bodiless armies") were formed from heavenly fire. From these sources the following angelic characteristics become clear:

Angels can appear in many forms, and often do so in human guise when they need to communicate directly with humans. However, they can also appear in various hybrid forms, such as *cherubim*, *seraphim*, and *hayot*. They can shape-shift, or appear as pure flame and change into human beings. [27] Their natural appearance seems to be fiery and thus includes luminosity. [28] They do not partake of food, although at times they can pretend to do so. [29] Although they are described as resembling human males, this

---

[27] In *1 En.* 17.1 Enoch is led to a "place in which those who were there were like a flaming fire; and whenever they wished, they appeared as human beings." Cf. also 19.1. For an extensive treatment of the identity of these mysterious beings, see K. Coblentz-Bautch, *A Study of the Geography of 1 Enoch 17-19*, 2003, pp. 44-46. Cf. also 2 *Bar.* 51.10: in the afterlife the righteous will "live in the heights of that world and they will be like the angels and be equal to the stars. And they will be changed into any shape which they wished. …." (Sullivan, *Wrestling*, p. 131).

[28] There is certainly a relationship between the luminosity of the angels and that of the Deity Himself. See R. Loewe, "The Divine Garment and Shi'ur Qomah," *HTR* 58(1965): 153-160. Further also M. Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, p. 121, fn. 53: "In Genesis Rabbah 3.4, God wraps himself in light in order to create the light of the first day of creation. According to some manuscripts of the midrash, it is in a white garment that God wraps himself … The proof text for the garment is Ps. 104.2, 'He covers himself in light as a garment,' rather than Daniel 7, so there is no clear literary link to the garments of the throne scenes in Enoch and Daniel." This is, perhaps, too pessimistic. As Himmelfarb indicates elsewhere in her study, there is a clear connection between whiteness of garments and purity and entrance into both the earthly and heavenly Holy of Holies. It is consequently not farfetched to see a link between whiteness and luminosity in the same context. In a more comparative view this can also be reflected in the way representations of certain divine characters in the ancient Near East are dressed in gold. See on this A.L. Oppenheim, "The Golden Garments of the Gods," *JNES* 8 (1949): 172-193, as well as N.M. Waldman, "A Note on Ezekiel 1.18,"*JBL* 103(1984): 614-618 who also addresses the aspect of power associated with the divine radiance, or *melammu*, that could envelop gods, rulers, as well as buildings or cities.

In addition, it should be noted that the white dress worn by members of the priestly classes as well as the Essenes, as referred to by Philo and Josephus, is clearly related to matters of purity, but is also in imitation of the luminosity of angels. See, E.J.C. Tigchelaar, "The White Dress of the Essenes and the Pythagoreans," *Jerusalem, Alexandria, Rome; Studies in Ancient Cultural Interaction in Honour of A. Hilhorst* (F. García Martínez and G.P. Luttikhuizen, eds. Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 301-321. He notes (p. 312), "… there might have been a connection between the white dress of the Essenes and the bright dress that is sometimes worn by angels. … Similarly, Adam's 'garments of light' are associated with paradise and priesthood." Tigchelaar lists (fn. 49) as sample texts *TestLevi* 8.2, *1 En.* 71.1and a number of NT texts. He adds, "part of the transfiguration of Jesus is the whitening of his clothes." In fn. 51 Tigchelaar adds "the colour white as the colour of the future life of the elect in Rev. 3.4-5…". It is not difficult then to see a clear connection with the passages in Daniel where the colour white figures for the dress of the divine occupant of the throne in ch. 7, the angel who is both luminous and dressed in white in ch. 10 and 12, and the righteous humans in a heavenly state in ch. 12.

[29] A.B. Lieber, "Jewish and Christian Heavenly Meal Traditions," *Paradise Now*, (2006), pp. 313-339; K.P Sullivan, *Wrestling with Angels*, pp. 179-195; D. Goodman, "Do Angels Eat?," *JJS*

seems to be more a reflection on the society to which they appear than their own nature. [30] They do not procreate among themselves, although they have proven (in Gen. 6) that they can interbreed with humans – despite the fact that this is an illicit act. They can appear and disappear, they can fly or float upward, [31] and they can cover immense distances in an instant.

But what happens in the reverse situation when humans who tread on (heaven-like) sacred ground – be it on earth or in heaven? The traditional means of getting there is either through a dream or vision in which the body remains within the earthly reality. Another is a physical ascent by strict invitation from the Divine. The visitor is then physically transported, body and soul, but, as shall be demonstrated, in those cases a number of adjustments are required before the visit can be effected.

A different feature that often occurs in dream or vision sequences is the gateway to heaven. This 'gateway' can be a door or a gate, which functions as a portal to the heavenly realm. The visionary either steps through this portal and enters, or approaches it and peaks through it into a region of the heavens, or it is opened for him while he is on earth looking up. Examples of the first, where gateways are mentioned for example, are

37(1986)2: 160-175; M. Dean-Otting, *Heavenly Journeys* (1984), pp. 184-186. There are a number of traditions suggesting that the righteous in the world to come receive nourishment (in imitation of the angels) by gazing upon the splendor of the Shekhinah. See e.g. TB Ber. 17a (and *ad loc*. fn c(8) in the Soncino ed.); ARN (version A) 1, 3a (J. Goldin, *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955), p. 13). These traditions are derived from Exod. 24.11: "And upon the nobles of the children of Israel He laid not His hand; and they beheld God, and did eat and drink." See also I. Chernus, the chapter "Nourished by the Splendor of the Shekinah," in *Mysticism in Rabbinic Judaism: Studies in the History of Midrash* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1982), esp. p. 76 ff. for sources affirming that the splendor of the Shekhinah nourished the angels. D. Goodman, *Do Angels Eat?*, pp. 164-165. See also, Gen.R. 2.2. A related tradition, with the roles shifted, is recorded in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* (12.1-2). Here Abraham travels together with an angel to Horeb, the mountain of God for forty days and nights without food or drink. Abraham says, "And I ate no bread and drank no water, because (my) food was to see the angel who was with me, and his discourse with me was my drink" (*OTP*, I, p. 694).

[30] K.P. Sullivan, "Sexuality and Gender of Angels," *Paradise Now*, (2006), pp. 211-228; B. Lang, "No Sex in Heaven: the Logic of Procreation, Death, and Eternal Life in the Judaeo-Christian Tradition," *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Mathias Delcor* (Ed. par A. Caquot [et al.]. Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1985), pp. 237-253.

[31] F. Landsberger, "The Origin of the Winged Angel in Jewish Art," *HUCA* 20(1947): 227-254. In the Hebrew Bible, we see that in Isa. 6 the *seraphim* have six wings and they fly up; in Ju. 13 the angel that visits the wife of Manoah to announce the birth of Samson, ascends from the altar that Manoah has built; and in Dan. 9 Gabriel flies closely by Daniel.

1 Enoch 14 (with regard to Enoch) and the *Hekhalot* texts with regard to the contemplating mystics. Examples of the earthly kind are found in Genesis 28 (Jacob at Bethel) and Revelation 4 (John). In Ezek. 1:1 it is mentioned that the heavens opened, without specific reference to a gateway, following which Ezekiel has visions of God. The gateway clearly functions as yet another vehicle into the divine realm, in addition to the dream or visionary state, and thus also as a further protective barrier between the two realms. It also shows that simply looking up into the sky, or traveling into space in real space and time, won't get the observer into the heavenly realm. [32]

In venturing an explanation for a motivation driving these works, I would suggest, firstly, that in a very general sense they are an attempt to understand the cosmos and the role of humanity within it. In order for all to go well, the earthly and heavenly realities need to be in harmony. It is specifically the task of humans to achieve and maintain this synchronization. In the Israelite/Jewish universe the divine responds to human action, much less than the reverse – if at all; Job being a clear exception. The fact that the cosmology emerging from these texts is an artificial construct does not make it any less real to those who adhere to the model.

The arguments presented in this chapter have mainly stayed within the boundaries as set by the textual material. On a different level it will be relevant to look for explicit socio-political causes that generated specific individual texts. It may be argued that the general and the specific (i.e., the real socio-political conditions and how they are reflected in the texts respectively) here are intimately intertwined, since any disruption in the socio-political order on earth is bound to upset the delicate balance between the earthly and heavenly realms and it is the task of the religious leaders (be they normative or sectarian) to restore this balance. Another widely supported *raison-d'être* for these texts is wisdom. This too, while certainly not unimportant, can be seen as secondary and

---

[32] See *TDOT* 15: 374-375, שער, for a concise discussion of the gate as entry into and exit from the heavenly realm in an ancient Near Eastern context. As we have seen also in the discussion of *1 Enoch 14* and other sources, the notion of doors and gates functioning as portals to the heavenly realm is old and wide-spread and is used well into the Hellenistic period and Late Antiquity. A good NT example of this is found in Revelation 4. See now also P. Schäfer, *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism*, Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2009: 35-39 for more examples.

derivative of the spatial paradigm and to be understood within the framework of boundary crossings and boundary transgressions. First, it should be noted that there are various ways to obtain information from the heavenly realm: illicit (as through the Watchers who conveyed forbidden knowledge to humans) and licit (as through the visionaries and ascenders to the heavenly palaces under angelic guidance). [33] Second, this knowledge was considered vital by the communities that sought it in order to sustain or restore the balance in the cosmos. On a different note, in the above it has also been possible to demonstrate the thin line that exists between so-called, 'vision and dream accounts' and 'actual' heavenly journeys. [34] From the perspective here presented, it is merely a semantic distinction as in the end each of these accounts is embedded within a narrative universe.

3.3 (Re)producing Urban Spaces

Mesopotamia is generally acknowledged as the birth place of the city. This happened very early on in the development of human society. [35] During the heyday of the ancient

---

[33] See the insightful remarks in A.Y. Reed, "Heavenly Ascent, Angelic Descent, and the Transmission of Knowledge in 1 Enoch 6-16," *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities* (2004), pp. 47-66. She illustrates how in the Book of the Watchers the improper and proper ways of mediating secret knowledge (stressed by the notion of descent of the Watchers and ascent of Enoch) and their respective consequences are carefully juxtaposed. To this should be added the first telling example of an attempt at acquiring illicit knowledge in the Hebrew Bible, which is found in Gen. 2.17 and Genesis 3 when the first humans are tricked into eating from the forbidden tree of the knowledge of good and evil, with dire consequences. In the nick of time they are prevented from also eating from the tree of life, lest they be knowing *and* immortal. They are expelled from the Garden (which was in later Second Temple texts understood as a proto-sanctuary). The Deity subsequently dresses them in animal skins, something that could later easily be understood as an effective manner to deny them further access to this place, in addition to the guarding cherub with the fiery sword: one cannot approach the inner sanctuary (as Eden is depicted in *Jubilees*) while dressed in animal skins. The story thus extends well beyond a simple etiological tale concerning the introduction of clothing, working the land, and the reason for painful childbirth.

[34] See Th.J. Kraus's remarks in his review of L. Carlsson's *Round Trips to Heaven: Otherworldly Travelers in Early Judaism and Christianity*, 2004 (*Bryn Mawr Classical Review* [36.1.2007]).

[35] There is ample archaeological evidence for early urbanization, but what is of even greater interest is the mythological interpretation that emerges from Mesopotamian literary traditions. It is very clear that the city, as symbol of civilization, was first created by the gods to function as their earthly habitat. Humans were to live in the cities to care for the gods. In order to have a structure to human society, kingship was also created by the gods and the first kings were directly appointed by them. See on this e.g. W.W. Hallo, "Antediluvian Cities," *JCS* 23(1970): 57-67; Th. Jacobsen, "The Eridu Genesis," *JBL* 100(1981): 513-529. The notion of divine creation of the first five cities is later transposed to Babylon, which is said to have been created by Marduk himself as a cosmogonic center of the world (*Enuma Elish*, the Babylonian Creation Myth). The quarter of Babylon that housed the great

city its center was occupied by the earthly and divine rulers, the kings and the gods. It is, therefore, as mentioned before, customary to find the main temple and the royal palace adjacent to one another in the layout of the city. This model was applied to larger as well as smaller settlements and can be encountered in a variety of cultures, including the Israelite, as well as spread over many centuries. The 19th century early researchers of the ancient Near East were more interested in uncovering monumental art and architecture than the totality of the city. They were convinced that these complexes did not represent a traditional city as it existed in the Western mindset with the Greek polis as a model, but that these were mainly Temple cities in the service of a despotic rule. Although there may have been a genuine problem with regard to the preservation of the common areas that would have been constructed with perishable mud brick, the early archaeologists were simply not sufficiently interested in the history of the common Mesopotamian. It is only in the 20th century that, following a shift in interest as well as the introduction of more advanced methods of excavation, the Mesopotamian city began to emerge as a well developed and fully functioning human urban society. [36] The importance of this shift lies in the fact that the partial remains of these ancient cities will now better allow us to assess the nature of the society that made it a "lived space." In this way they can also better function as a material backdrop for the narratives that have emerged from and grown around them. The knowledge thus gained will even be able to inform the stories about cities that were composed much later, such as the Daniel collection. What emerges equally, though, is that what was representative of the earlier view is more in line with the mythological interpretation of the city as a gift of the gods, the king as their representative, and ordinary humans as servants to both. Both these points of view need to be considered in order to extrapolate a more wholesome picture for understanding the function of the narrative under discussion. Before turning to the

---

Esagila temple was named Eridu, after the name of the first city in Southern Mesopotamia. In this way Babylon itself became equated with the divinely created first city. See A.R. George, *Babylonian Topographical Texts* [Louvain: Peeters, 1992: 39, 244-45, 247-49]. In contrast, Jerusalem gained a cosmological character only much later. However, even if not directly divinely created, it became the divinely chosen place as well as a cosmic center.

[36] M. Liverani, "Ancient Near Eastern Cities and Modern Ideologies," *Die Orientalische Stadt*: *Kontinuität, Wandel, Bruch.* [1. Internationales Colloquium der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 9.-10. Mai 1996 in Halle - Gernot Wilhelm, ed. Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag – SDV, 1997: 85-106

general biblical view and Daniel in particular, one important aspect with regard to Mesopotamian urban sacred space must be noted. Whereas the urban sphere was invested with both civilization and sacrality, the wilderness was considered to belong to the realm of the impure, the profane and danger. This was especially so for the distant mountain ranges and the lands that were not at any time part of any of the larger city states and empires that rose up in Mesopotamia. [37] This is quite in contrast to the ancient Israelite view as portrayed in the biblical narrative. There, the wilderness, though fraught with danger, comprised the arid territories that purified, through which one could wander under divine guidance, and ultimately, where the foundation and legislation of an entire people would take place.

The Hebrew Bible displays a profound suspicion with regard to the city. This becomes clear already in Genesis, where Cain is associated with the first cities. Cain, the banished fratricidal 'first son' and his descendants are further associated with the development of those skills that are particularly fitting for city life. In fact, similar skills are connected with the wisdom brought to mankind by the evil so-called 'sons of God'. [38] At this point, though, no judgment on the city is expressed yet. Among the immediate descendants of Noah's son Ham, Nimrod and Asshur are credited with founding the famous cities of Babylon, Uruk, Agade, and Nineveh. A more negative report is found in the attempt to build a tower reaching to heaven, usually associated with the great ziggurat of Babylon. God actively intervenes and prevents the completion of the work and the formation of an urban community. We later on learn that Abraham left the sprawling metropolis of Ur, by way of the similarly important city of Haran, only to pursue a nomadic lifestyle. He then gets to fight five kings of local Canaanite city states and loses his nephew Lot to the appeal of the city of Sodom. It is here for the first time that a clear disapproving voice is heard concerning the lewdness and depravity inherent in an actual city. Upon entering the

---

[37] K. Van der Toorn, "Een pleisterplaats voor de goden: het verschijnsel 'heilige stad' in het oude Nabije Oosten," *Jeruzalem als heilige stad; religieuze voorstelling en geloofspraktijk*. K.D. Jenner & G.A. Wiegers, eds. Kampen: Kok, 1996: 38-52.

[38] The *bnei elohim* of Genesis 6 are known as the Watchers in *1 Enoch*, where they are called *ᶜirin*. This same label is also used for a class of angels in Daniel 4, where they are not considered to be evil. See further discussion on these beings, R. Murray, "The Origin of Aramaic *'ir*, Angel," *Orientalia* 53(1984): 303-317 and also section 3.2 below.

Land of Canaan following the Exodus, the Israelites will encounter an intricate system of Canaanite city states. They are bluntly told, as for instance in Deuteronomy and the Book of Joshua, [39] that not only is this a society with which they should not mingle, it needs to be eradicated. Later yet, the 'city par excellence' that seems to carry the brunt of divine disapproval is Babylon. Despite this thoroughly negative depiction of the city, some argue that this cannot be the overarching view. It is first claimed that there is a prioritizing of the ideal of wilderness existence over the corrupting city life. By disclaiming this proposition it is argued that the Old Testament is not anti-urban. Moreover, the Israelites themselves became city dwellers and, most importantly, there is the divinely chosen city of Jerusalem around which a whole theology, called the Zion theology, developed. [40] Yet, this picture is false. The biblical view of the city is not at all related to the juxtaposition of nomadic versus urban life, of desert versus city, as is claimed. In fact, there is a very clear thread that connects the negative attitudes. All the cities that are denounced are under the tutelage of pagan gods and kings. The greatest of all of these is Babylon which forms, in a manner of speaking, a mirror image of Jerusalem. They are each other's rival and exact counter space; many of the epithets used to describe the lofty and cosmic character of one city are also found with regard to the other. [41] In the prophetic oracles against the nations, sometimes the oracle is directed at a city; especially singled out are Tyre and Babylon, but also Jerusalem. How can this be? It is only when the divine has abandoned the city as punishment for the behavior of its population and left it to its own resources that it becomes vulnerable and, in a way, just another pagan city. In other words, it is the divine presence that safeguards the city against destruction. So how can we explain the almost glowingly positive account in the Book of Jonah with regard to the prophecy against the Assyrian capital Nineveh, which is so much unlike the doom prophecy leveled against it

---

[39] It has long been realized that the narrative chronology and the archaeological record of Canaanite society do not add up and the Conquest model has likewise been questioned. On the archaeological versus literary evidence of the earlier Amarna period, see R. Gonen, "Urban Canaan in the Late Bronze Period," *BASOR* (1984)253: 61-73 and most recently, N. Na'aman, "The Trowel vs. the Text. How the Amarna Letters Challenge Archaeology," *BAR* 35(2009)1: 52-56, 70-71.

[40] See e.g. R.R. Wilson, "The City in the Old Testament,"*Civitas: Religious Interpretations of the City*. P.S. Hawkins, ed. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986: 3-13 and the literature cited there.

[41] D.C.T. Sheriffs, "'A Tale of Two Cities' – Nationalism in Zion and Babylon," *TynBul* 39(1988): 19-57. See also T. Boiy, *Late Achaemenid and Hellenistic Babylon*. [OLA 136] Louvain: Peeters, 2004: 77-78 and 315-316, where he deals with 'the image of Babylon in classical literature' and 'Babylon as symbol'.

in the Book of Nahum? First of all, most scholars consider Jonah to be a parody, and thus the information in it is not factual. Yet, we can use it to support our thesis. Nineveh is not just the capital of Assyria, it is Sennacherib's capital, [42] the same king who laid siege to Jerusalem and devastated the country side, witness his palace reliefs in Nineveh of the brutal conquest of Lachish. [43] The lesson of Jonah is that even for the people in Nineveh there is divine forgiveness if only they truly repent, which they do, and the decree is averted. Of course, this is used as a mirror for the inhabitants of Jerusalem who seem to be more stubborn. The truly comic relief in Jonah comes when ultimately not only the animals repent, but also the king himself does. The pictures sketched here of the workings of the ancient Near Eastern city do not conform to reality. It is very clear that the purpose of all these accounts is not so much to record history but to present a theological point of view. Moreover, they are strictly for Israelite consumption: to instill fear of neighboring cultures operating in an otherwise very similar religious universe, to instill fear of the Deity and not venture out to competing religious systems, or to provide hope in the face of an overwhelming enemy attack. Thus, the city parody bears resemblance to the cult or idol parody that is discussed in section 4.2.5.

It is quite clear from the discussion above that the Book of Daniel, just like most of the Hebrew Bible, does not present us with a faithful picture or description of the Firstspace of ancient cities. Needless to say, it is not its purpose to do so. What it does do, however, is paint an ideological impression of the urban enterprise. [44] If left to the wits of humans (or foreign gods) nothing good can come of it.

---

[42]   Although Nineveh was already an ancient city, it only rose to importance when Sennacherib made it his capital in 704 BCE. He greatly enlarged the city and built his magnificent palace there, called 'the palace without rival'. Nineveh was sacked in 612 when the Assyrian empire came to an end and Babylon came to power.

[43]   D. Ussishkin, *The Conquest of Lachish by Sennacherib*, Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, Institute of Archaeology, 1982.

[44] E. Soja describes this process as follows in *Postmetropolis: Critical Studies of Cities and Regions* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2000: 11). "From a Secondspace perspective, cityspace becomes more of a mental or ideational field, conceptualized in imagery, reflexive thought, and symbolic representation, a *conceived* space of the imagination …., the urban imaginary." Critiquing the strict dichotomy between "real and/or imagined" space, Thirdspace is introduced which deals specifically with urbanism "as fully *lived space*, a simultaneously real-and-imagined, actual-and-virtual, locus of structured individual and collective experience and agency" and opens up cityspace "as an active area of development and change, conflict and resistance, an impelling force effecting all aspects of our lives."

3.4 Daniel's Narrative Worlds

Such was the knowledge of the universe that Daniel's framer had inherited and in which the stories are set. In order to enter Daniel's narrative universe, one needs to establish first how many 'worlds' it consists of and whether it should not be considered rather as a 'multiverse' at least for the purpose of understanding the narrative as well as the 'actual world' behind the text.

In Chapter 1 it was indicated that an important component of many spatial theories is the notion of 'world making' (Eliade), the social production of space (Lefebvre), to which are added real and imagined worlds (Soja). These approaches to space deal firstly with examples from lived society (the real world) and although they move into the constructs of the mental and ideological (and therefore – as yet – unrealized) spaces, they are only secondarily applied to texts. Furthermore, it might be argued that as we are dealing with a text the entire analysis concerns a Secondspace product. In order to fully grasp the dynamics of the various spatialities within this narrative frame another approach will be called upon to complement the 'real world' probings of spatial theory, which allows us to move from praxis to text. Narratology adds this other component, which remains completely within the narrative world, thus allowing the reader to enter the world of the text. Lubomír Doležel summarizes this approach: "stories happen, are enacted in certain kinds of possible worlds. The basic concept of narratology is not 'story', but 'narrative world', defined within a typology of possible worlds." [45] Although narratology involves much more, and 'world-construction' and 'possible worlds'-theory [46] occupy just one aspect, it is nevertheless vital and it will be the one used in this dissertation to help illustrate the workings of the sacred within Daniel's narrative. It may be understood as an extension to Soja's Secondspace, or

---

[45] L. Doležel, *Heterocosmica. Fiction and Possible Worlds*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998: 31.

[46] Just as critical spatiality was formulated within different disciplines and for different purposes, but yet proves eminently applicable to the analysis of narrative, the concept of 'possible worlds', too, has a very different prehistory. It was first coined by G.W. Leibniz in a 1710 philosophical essay on theodicy. We are here only concerned with its present application to narrative.

mental space, and will be applied as an illustration of the dynamics of Secondspace wholly operative within a narrative construct.

The basic concept that the possible worlds approach uses is the Actual World as point of reference. This is the world of both the author and the reader. The possible worlds not only portray a variety of plot outcomes, but also may display a gradation of deviations from what is expected to happen in the 'real' world. At the next level, as we zoom into the text, we find the 'textual actual world' and 'textual alternative possible worlds'. These are "mental constructs formed by the inhabitants of the ['textual actual world']." What is relevant to the present study is the notion that there is a differentiation between the Actual, Real, or Basic World of the author(s) and readers and the Narrative or Fictional world of the text which describes a reality with which the reader can identify. Whereas the story may represent fiction, the events and setting that are described tally with the world known to the reader. A Possible or Alternative World may either display historical figures that fit the reality known and accepted, or they are presented inconsistently to what is known about them. The history presented in the narrative takes either a known turn, or its course takes a surprise turn or is alternatively manipulated to take a wished-for turn. The Possible World is either a Naturally Possible or Naturally Impossible World. The latter could describe the heavenly realm, where the laws of physics obviously differ from those of the earthly realm. Also, the appearance of inhabitants of either realm in the other, constitutes part of an Impossible World. In addition, the cast of characters is to be extended to personified, normally inanimate objects. [47]

Without adopting the further specific *termini technici* of the Possible World approach, Dolezel's model proposes the following:

a) The point of departure is a basic narrative world which corresponds to the "actual, empirical world." A narrative world consists of the following basic components:

   - a set of possible individuals – agents (acting characters);

---

[47] See L. Doležel, *Heterocosmica*, 115-116. *Ibid*., "Narrative Modalities," *Journal of Literary Semantics* 5(1976): 1-15 (esp. 10-12).

- a set of possible states which can be assigned to these agents; and

- a set of possible actions which these agents are able to perform.

To this I would add a fourth component, namely that of

- setting. This is the environment within which characters act and which also influences both nature and action, and vice versa.

b) Any number of alternative narratives can be constructed as possible worlds that may contrast in varying degrees with the basic world. In these worlds – also called *second world* - actions, feats, and conditions are possible or probable that could not occur in the actual or basic world. In other words, they allow for the fantastic to become normative.

Within the second world the following degrees of deviation from the basic world can be distinguished:

- the characters are unknown and impossible in the basic world - divine beings, demons, ghosts, elves, etc. These characters are likewise assigned actions that go far beyond what is possible in the basic world;

- human characters, such as fairy-tale heroes or superheroes, operating in the basic world have superhuman qualities and perform actions that are impossible in the basic world; and

- non-agents of the basic world (inanimate objects or animals) become active agents, usually acquiring human, but also sometimes superhuman characteristics - either would be impossible in the basic world.

It is interesting to note that Doležel consigns the term *intermediate world* to the narrative worlds of dreams and madness. This would probably include visionary states as well. While the content of these most often belongs to the second world, the actual states of dreaming, madness, of visions (elsewhere referred to as altered states of consciousness) do exist in the basic world. "This combination of contradictory features makes intermediate worlds a favourite semantic component of narratives; in plot-construction, they can serve … as a 'bridge' from the basic to the second world (for example, dreams revealing the will of gods)."

From this listing, it is possible to move to the following plot options for basic world and possible world relations:

- "Transformation of one narrative world into the other. In the extreme case, the transformation brings about the emergence of the whole narrative world: the story of Genesis (in its Biblical version)." Other examples concern the deification of or the turning into an angel of a narrative hero. The reverse is also possible - a character from the second world is deprived of his second world powers and transformed into a basic world character ("the deprivation being motivated as punishment"). One of the best known biblical examples of the latter that comes to mind is the fate of the angelic 'Sons of God' of Genesis 6, further developed in the *Book of the Watchers* in the Enoch corpus.

- "Intervention of agents of one narrative world in the events of another world." Again, the biblical examples abound. It is important that Doležel notes in this context the necessity of adaptation of the intervener from one realm into the other; disguise being considered a special case of adaptation. Obviously the human appearance of angelic beings should fall under this category. Examples of the opposite direction are also widely known from Second Temple period literature, for instance the stories about Moses and Enoch attaining the status and exterior of angels. (See above on the Nature of the Heavenly Realm).

- Visits between worlds. This does not necessarily refer to the taking of action by visitors, but may also refer to their non-intervention observer-status. The only action involved for them is the one of reaching the other realm. Although Doležel correctly distinguishes between the need for adaptation for the active and passive visitor as such, the process as developed in much of Second Temple and Late Antique literature shows a slight difference in this regard. It is not the distinction between action and passivity, but rather the means of transportation that is indicative for the need of adaptation. The question is thus whether the visitor is described as visiting the other realm in actuality, i.e., is physically transported, or the visit takes place through the medium of dream or vision and is only a mental transportation, while the body of the dreamer or visionary is sound on earth.

3.5 Daniel's Narrative Space

Since narrative, as a Secondspace endeavor, also creates space, the effect that the ordering of the chapters in Daniel has for the created narrative space will be treated in the present chapter.

The accepted sequence, with the six court tales making up chapters 1-6, and the vision account, chapters 7-12 is evidenced by all textual witnesses, save for one. It concerns the famous papyrus 967, which is the oldest known witness of the Old Greek translation of Daniel. [48] Whereas the MT Daniel and the other versions are arranged according to language, pap. 967 is ordered according to the narrative chronology, ignoring the original language issue, that of genre and person, which of course played no longer a role since the entire text was now homogenized into one Greek narrative. [49] At first sight, it seems that the only motivation for the translator was to organize the material chronologically. The placement of chs 7-8 before chs. 5-6 "corrects the retrograde progression of the sequence of kings across MT Daniel 5-9 and underscores the great importance that early readers and translators of the Book of Daniel accorded to the chronological record." [50] But is this really all that can be said about the result of the reshuffling? In the grid below the sequencing is put side by side for comparison.

---

[48] Photographs of the manuscript are available online:
www.uni-koeln.de/phil-fak/ifa/NRWakademie/papyrologie/PTheol1.html.

[49] This results in a chronological sequence of chs. 1-4, 7, 8,5, 6, 9-12, which is, incidentally, also the order of chapters in the OG as they appear in Pap. 967. See e.g. J. Lust, "The Septuagint Version of Daniel 4-5," *The Book of Daniel in the Light on New Findings*. A.S. van der Woude, ed. Leiden: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1993: 39-53 (esp. p. 46), who considers this order as original as does P.-M. Bogaert, "Relecture et refonte historicisantes du livre de Daniel attestées par la première version grecque (Papyrus 967), *Etudes sur le judaïsme hellénistique; Congrès de Strasbourg (1983)*. R. Kuntzmann et J. Schlosser, eds. Paris: Cerf, 1984: 197-224 (at pp. 198-200). Further, T.J. Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel. A Literary Comparison* [JSOT Suppl. Series 198]. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995: 83. Most recently, R.T. McLay, "The Old Greek Translation of Daniel iv-vi and the Formation of the Book of Daniel," *VT* 55(2005)3: 304-323.

[50] See L. DiTommaso, *The Book of Daniel and the Apocryphal Daniel Literature*. Leiden: Brill, 2005: 63, 67-70 (at p. 69).

MT sequence	Papyrus 967

1 – Beginning reign Nebuchadnezzar
    Intro; narrative time frame
	1 – Beginning reign Nebuchadnezzar
	    Intro; narrative time frame

2 – Nebuchadnezzar, year 2
    Dream of statue, mountain, and stone – four metals
	2 – Nebuchadnezzar, year 2
	    Dream of statue, mountain, and stone – four metals

3 – Nebuchadnezzar, year 2 (?)
    Golden statue - Daniel's friends – fiery furnace
	3 – Nebuchadnezzar, year 2 (?)
	    Golden statue - Daniel's friends – fiery furnace

4 – Nebuchadnezzar, year ?
    Dream of tree – King turns into wild animal
	4 – Nebuchadnezzar, year ?
	    Dream of tree – King turns into wild animal

5 – End reign Belshazzar
    Writing on the wall
	7 – Belshazzar, year 1
	    Dream vision heavenly throne room – four beasts

6 – Beginning reign Darius the Mede
    Daniel prays – den of lions
	8 – Belshazzar, year 3
	    Vision of ram and he-goat

7 – Belshazzar, year 1
    Dream vision heavenly throne room – four beasts
	5 – End reign Belshazzar
	    Writing on the wall

8 – Belshazzar, year 3
    Vision of ram and he-goat
	6 – Beginning reign Darius the Mede
	    Daniel prays – den of lions

9 – Darius, year 1
    Daniel's prayer
	9 – Darius, year 1
	    Daniel's prayer

10 – Cyrus, year 3
    Daniel's vision of Gabriel
	10 – Cyrus, year 3
	    Daniel's vision of Gabriel

11 – Cyrus, year 3
    Daniel's vision of Gabriel, cont'd
	11 – Cyrus, year 3
	    Daniel's vision of Gabriel, cont'd

12 – Cyrus, year 3
    Daniel's final vision – beyond the future
	12 – Cyrus, year 3
	    Daniel's final vision – beyond the future

Without going into the question of which ordering is original (which can likely not be answered), it is obvious that the translator made a purposeful decision with this sequencing. It is of interest that the corresponding part of Ezekiel in the papyrus displays a similar dislocation of chapters which has consequences for the interpretation. With regard to Daniel the following can be suggested. First of all the entire structure of the original Hebrew/Aramaic is disrupted. We now see H-A-A-A-A-H-A-A-H-H-H-H instead of the neater H-A-A-A-A-A-A-H-H-H-H-H. Also the perfect division of second and first person accounts no longer holds. The original has the first six chapters in second person, and the second six in first person. But, the chronology has now been equalized which results in the intrusion of the two symbolic visions into the earthly confines of the exilic basic narrative. The reversal of the chapters moved two of the exilic stories onto the heavenly vision grid. In this way, the narrative no longer shows very determinate boundaries between heavenly and earthly realities. Since that seems

also to be the end purpose of Daniel's framers in real time, this may be an attempt to show this thirdspace hope within the narrative structure.

3.6. Breaking Down Daniel's Spatialities

Above we touched on the problem of the fact that the Book of Daniel does not represent a singular spatiality. The approach created by Lefebvre on which Soja draws deals with spatial epistemologies in the 'real world'. A text, in principle, is the outcome of what is called Secondspace. It provides a 'representation' of space. However, within that text a whole world is recreated with its own sets of interacting spaces. Readers will be able to distinguish similar spaces as within their own real world. In a complicated text such as Daniel even more worlds are presented that sometimes do and sometimes do not interact. Each of these worlds will once again show the spatial distributions that were laid out. It was seen as useful, therefore, to introduce the narratological notion of 'possible worlds' to allow for the transfer from real world to literary world, and even worlds-within-worlds. Before the spatial relationships of a 'world' can be worked out, one needs to recognize the boundaries of that world. In Daniel we are not only dealing with textual worlds, but also with the world from which the author operates and the way he interprets that world.

REAL WORLD
Author/Editor: operates from Thirdspace position in Judea under Seleucid yoke in the mid 2nd
    century BCE.

BASIC NARRATIVE WORLD OF EXILE
Narrator and Author/Editor are identical and as such are outside of the narrative in No-space.
Protagonist Daniel: moves from Thirdspace Judean exilic captive to the level of the ruling
    powers in command of Firstspace.
Earthly rulers

HEAVENLY REALM
External Narrator fades away after 7:1
Daniel and Narrator merge

CHAPTER FOUR: Two Topoi

4.1 Topos 1: Exile

This section explores how the putative final editor of the Book of Daniel represents the spaces of Exile in Babylonia and subsequently how these may relate to the realities of his own time and issues in the Maccabean era. [51]

4.1.1 Mapping Exile in the Book of Daniel: Recovering the Exile / Recovering from Exile

The activity of 'mapping' has come to mean not merely the 'objective' projection of perceivable data onto a scaled grid, but also a representation of 'reality' that is strongly influenced by the premises and ideology of the mapper. But even the most 'objective' mapper can only work with the data that are available. Thus, when trying to chart the theme of a text, one has to contend with the data yielded by that text. [52] Despite this limitation, the exercise may furnish an indication of what was important to the framer behind the text. Therefore, the Exile as represented in Daniel acts as an ideal example for establishing its role in the worldview of the book's author. This brings us to the second part of the above title, which in my view, is what motivates the final editor in his treatment of the Exile. It is at once a rewriting of the past represented by that traumatic experience, as well as an attempt to remedy the space of the Land of Israel that has become overwhelmed by the condition of Exile.

Exile in Daniel represents two levels of a dystopian present. First in its Babylonian guise of the historical exile, it functions as the basic real world of the text and second, in its extended form in the Land of Israel under Seleucid rule it describes the actual world of the author. The means to counter the undesirable lived space (thirdspace) conditions are provided by the apocalyptic worldview to which the authors' groups subscribe.

---

[51] An earlier version of this section was presented at the 2006 Annual Meeting of the SBL in Washington DC.

[52] J.W. Flanagan, "Mapping the Biblical World: Perceptions of Space in Ancient Southwestern Asia," *Mappa Mundi: Mapping Culture/Mapping the World*. J. Murray, ed. Windsor: University of Windsor, 2001: 1-18 (on the role of the cartographer, cf. pp. 2-3).

Throughout the Book of Daniel the reader can see how the authors make light of the ruling powers, and, with God on their side, are able to overcome these powers making use of the most fantastic literary scenarios in which they live out a radical solution to their seeming desperate and powerless position. From their perspective this is not only a program that can be realized, but it must and will be so. [53]

Since the Exile - as seen through the literary lens of a text - has become an interpretation of a historical event, the exact details of which may or may not be completely recoverable, a few approaches may be used in order to 'situate' it and make sense of it. In this context it is of importance to compare some of the more contemporary approaches to the concept. The simplest and most obvious is to understand it in a purely *geographical* sense. Thus, for the medieval philosopher Maimonides an exilic condition means to be outside of the Land of Israel. Another approach is the *theological*. Such, for instance is the Modern-Orthodox Jewish position. It means to be removed from divine providence – "even when operative, [this] is no longer readily evident." A third option is to consider it *politically*. The 20th century French-Jewish philosopher Emmanuel Levinas phrases it as being "exposed to the threat of genocide." [54]

But, given the above possibilities of approach, what are the mappable data of Exile that the text in actual fact provides? Most are found right at the outset of Chapter One, as will be indicated below. The subsequent text is as much about the elements that are listed as about those that are conspicuously missing, but whose presence would have been expected based on other exilic and post-exilic texts. One blatant example is the almost complete disregard for other exiled Judeans. They do not feature anywhere in the narrative, [55] other than as a dim background collective. The only hint at any

---

[53] K.M. Lopez, "Standing before the Throne of God: Critical Spatiality in Apocalyptic Scenes of Judgment," *Constructions of Space II:The Biblical City and Other Imagined Spaces*. J.L. Berquist & C.V. Camp, eds. London: T&T Clark, 2008: 139-155 (at p. 139). See also section 2.4.2, The role of apocalypticism.

[54] Adapted and recontextualised from L.J. Kaplan's essay "Israel under the Mountain: Emmanuel Levinas on Freedom and Constraint in the Revelation of the Torah," *Modern Judaism* 18(1998): 35-46 (at p. 42).

[55] While it is true that in 1:3 Ashpenaz is instructed to select *from among* the Israelites [*bnei yisrael*] this is rather a rhetorical device to illustrate the selection process, a zooming in on the desired

consideration for them is found in the prayer of chapter nine (9:7). But even then, that section is more concerned with the state of the Temple and the city than with a return of the people to these places. There is no advice to them on how to cope religiously and otherwise under the new living conditions, as in Jeremiah's letter to the exiles, nor is there any list of them, as in Ezra-Nehemiah. In order to understand how Exile is located in the text, we must examine the structure of the text itself.

The book consists of two parts. By this is not meant the conventional division of court tales versus vision account or Hebrew versus Aramaic. Rather, it is the narrative contained within the chronological and geographical parameters of the Exile versus a sub-narrative, which takes place beyond these in an alternate supernatural textual world. This may be referred to as a 'sub-narrative' since it is directly dependent upon and derives from, the main-frame narrative. In fact, as indicated by the chronological markers at the beginning of each narrative segment in chapters 7 through 12, they fit on various points within the internal chronology of the main narrative of chapters 1 through 6.

Despite the impression at the beginning of the book, that locates it firmly within the historical parameters of the Exile, complete with the identification of dates, places, and persons, the subsequent narrative is clearly anything but historical. This is evident, among other things, from the artificiality of the dates and portrayal of the characters. However, rather than acting as proof of the inability of the author to produce good and reliable historiography it seems to be a purposeful act on his part. [56]

---

subjects, namely Daniel and his three friends. Interestingly, in 1:6 the four are presented as a group, among (unnamed) others as of the Judeans [*mibnei yehudah*], suggesting that those others were members of other exiled ethnicities, thus making the four lads the only Judean exiles. Similarly in 2:25, which mentions the captives of Judah from among whom [*min-bnei galuta di-yehud*] Daniel is singled out once again, in a re-introduction to the king. The same occurs in 5:13 and 6:14. Even Daniel's three friends seem to be artificially tagged on to the Daniel narrative. Only in ch. 1 do they appear together, at the end of ch. 2 they are suddenly added by Daniel to share in his reward. This latter addition, too, acts more as literary device to connect chapter 2 to chapter 3, in which the three appear without Daniel. Chapter 3 displays a similar process. In 3:8 the Chaldeans accuse "the Jews" [*yehudaye*]. However, in v. 12 the latter are reduced to "certain Jews that you [the king] has appointed over the affairs of the province of Babylon, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego…" Note that within the context this term is probably better translated as Judeans.

[56] Many of S.J. Schweitzer's findings from his analysis of the Book of Chronicles in light of the concept of utopia also shed light on issues in Daniel. Note his observation, "the utopian construct does not necessarily reflect the historical situation of the author, that is, the author does not legitimize his present,

One of the most pivotal events in Judean history, as described in the later books of the Hebrew Bible, is without a doubt the Babylonian Exile. Although in the Pentateuch the period of the slavery in Egypt, the Exodus and Conquest of the Land stand out, interestingly enough, these themes disappear almost entirely in the subsequent sections of the Hebrew Bible. [57] However, in Second Isaiah (43:16-19) as well as Jeremiah 23:7-8 we find the theme re-applied to the return from Babylonia. The Exile, on the other hand, is a theme that runs consistently through the Prophets and the Writings and as has been argued, is alluded to in the Pentateuch. [58] It is commonly assumed that only the elite and the artisans were exiled from the Southern Kingdom of Judah. [59] This meant that the society that was left behind was effectively bereft of indigenous leadership and came to be ruled from Babylon. [60]

Although recent debate has questioned the impact of the exile on both the population that was left behind in Judah as well as the exiles themselves, and its place within the

---

but criticizes it by depicting the literary reality in terms *not* to be found in the author's society." See his "Exploring the Utopian Space of Chronicles: Some Spatial Anomalies," *Hermeneutics Task Force, CBA,* August 3, 2003: 3 [www.case.edu/affil/GAIR/cba/schweitzer.pdf].

[57] Direct references may be found in Psalms 66, 77, 78, 81, 95, 105, 106, 114, 135 and 136, as well as in Ezekiel 20. Further also in Hosea, Amos, Micah, Nahum, and Haggai. For a thorough treatment of the Exodus theme and the events immediately following in the Hebrew Bible, see S.E. Loewenstamm, *The Evolution of the Exodus Tradition*. Jerusalem: Magness Press, 1992. [Transl. By B. Schwartz from the 1987 Hebrew edition].

[58] Lev. 26 and Deut. 27-31 list the curses that clearly imply exile from a land that is already lived in. Other, more indirect allusions can be found in the narratives of the Patriarchs who are forced to leave the Land for Egypt as well as the entire event of the slavery in Egypt and eventual expulsion. The "exile," of Adam and Eve from the Garden, especially offers a fascinating paradigm which has been utilized directly for instance directly in the midrash Genesis Rabbah. See G.J. Blidstein, *In the Rabbi's Garden: Adam and Eve in the Midrash.* Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson Inc., 1999 and also P. Morris, "Exiled from Eden: Jewish Interpretations of Genesis," *A Walk in the Garden; Biblical, Iconographical and Literary Images of Eden*. P. Morris and D. Sawyer, eds. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992: 117-166 (at pp. 121-127 concerning Gen. Rabbah). Perhaps the insistence in the *Book of Jubilees* that the Garden of Eden contained or even was the Holy of Holies, with the subsequent removal of Adam and Eve from the Garden because of their disobedience, may also be understood as a subtle allusion to the Babylonian Exile.

[59] In contrast to the Northern Kingdom, which saw a much wider segment of its population exiled.

[60] D. Rom-Shiloni, "Ezekiel as the Voice of the Exiles and Constructor of Exilic Ideology," *HUCA* 76(2005): 1-45 (esp. 38-41). In fact, in Ezekiel's thought the community that remained in Jerusalem became inconsequential in the furthering of his restoration program. The Land had, in fact, become Babylon.

greater historical scheme of things, [61] it will be assumed here that it was not only important but even more a watershed event; certainly from the perspective of the Judeans themselves. After all, if it was not important, why would they keep writing about it so much? [62] Another matter that has been raised in this context, is the question as to whether the Exile represented relatively livable conditions with chances of success for the individual to rise in society, this having prompted some scholarly circles [63] to

---

[61] See the literature cited in *Leading Captivity Captive; 'the Exile' as History and Ideology*. L.L. Grabbe, ed. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998; and *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period*. O. Lipschits and J. Blenkinsopp, eds. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003.

[62] This is supported by D.L. Smith-Christopher's approach to the Exile. See his "Prayers and Dreams: Power and Diaspora Identities in the Social Setting of the Daniel Tales," *The Book of Daniel; Composition and Reception* I: 266-290. He accepts a Persian period origin for the tales rather than a second century date, "(still the majority view)" (266). With regard to the impact of the Exile he observes: "[E]ven if a serious disaster is conceded for early in the Neo-Babylonian era, surely the Daniel tales come from so late in the Persian period, and perhaps entirely in the Hellenistic period, that such comments on early events are irrelevant? This would be true *only if we accept the notion that the devastation of Jerusalem and Judah was not really so bad* [italics his]. But the literature is clear – the continued occupation of Palestine in the Second Temple period was frequently perceived by the Jewish community as simply a continued state of exile." (276). Smith-Christopher sees this condition as the source for the recalculation of Jeremiah's 70 years in the later texts.

[63] The classical essay on this topic is W.L. Humphreys', "A Life-Style for Diaspora; a Study of the Tales of Esther and Daniel," *JBL* 92(1973): 211-223. D.E. Gowan refers to Daniel 1-6 as a "diaspora-novella." See his "The Exile in Jewish Apocalyptic," *Scripture in History & Theology: Essays in Honor of J. Coert Rylaarsdam*. A.L. Merrill & Th.W. Overholt, eds. Pittsburgh: The Pickwick Press, 1977: 205-223 (at p. 205). He further suggests that Daniel "presupposes the flourishing of Judaism in the diaspora" (p. 208). See contra this position, e.g. D.L. Smith-Christopher, *A Biblical Theology of Exile*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002: 35-38. See also his "Prayers and Dreams" (previous fn.), where upon recognizing the persistent "traditions of the Babylonian disaster" well into the Christian period, he states: "While this may suggest the presence of stereotypical language and established folklore patterns, it seems hardly acceptable that such 'exilic' formulae were intended to communicate a comfortable existence" (276). On the doubts that should be cast on the generally upheld positive review of Persian society vis-à-vis the exilic community, see the literature cited in *ibid.*, (277, fn. 33). Smith-Christopher recognizes this attitude of the Persian monarchs also in their policies in the province of Yehud. He detects veiled resistance to these policies, expressed especially in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, but this may be extended to the Books of Daniel and Esther. See his "Resistance in a 'Culture of Permission'," *Truth's Bright Embrace: Essays and Poems in Honor of Arthur O. Roberts*. Howard Macy & Paul N. Anderson, eds. Newberg: George Fox University Press, 1996: 15-38. (I am grateful to Prof. Smith-Christopher for making this article available to me). Recently S. Pace (Jeansonne) has revisited the question of the nature of the exilic experience and function of its narrative in Daniel, "Diaspora Dangers, Diaspora Dreams," *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich*. P.W. Flint, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam, eds. Leiden: Brill, 2006: 21-59. While attempting to be critical of the too rosy picture painted by Humphreys, Pace is too much convinced of the notion that the narrative is concerned with conveying lessons for living in exile. As well, she lumps together "the specific political and cultural situations faced by Jews under Babylonian, Persian and Hellenistic governments." Despite these being unique, "life in all these Diaspora communities was beset with similar problems." (pp. 28-29). This is too simplistic and ignores the important fact that a distinction should be made by true diaspora communities, exilic communities, and communities under foreign rule in their own land.

suggest that the court tales in fact prescribe "a lifestyle for the Diaspora." [64] Yet, one

has to caution that, in light of the fact that the tales of Daniel are strikingly

[64] The problem with this argument is already contained in its title. The concept *diaspora* is understood as being equivalent to *galut/gola.*. The LXX never translates the terms *golah or galut* with *diaspora* but usually as *aichmalosia* (captivity). Likewise, the three occurrences of *galuta* in Daniel are translated with this latter term. See further the listing in *TDOT* 2, גלה. See also the exhaustive study by J. Kiefer, *Exil und Diaspora: Begrifflichkeit und Deutungen im antiken Judentum und in der hebräischen Bibel.* Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2005. In the LXX the word "diaspora" either translates *zr'h* (scatter) or describes a number of negative connotations referring to horror or terrible punishment. See J. Lust, E. Eynikel, K. Hauspie, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Part I), Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992: 109. This may go back to the interpretation of *za^cavah* (horror) as *diaspora* in Deut. 28:25. In this light it should be noted that the OG of Dan. 12:2 uses *diasporan kai aischunen* to translate the phrase "(shall awake … to) reproaches and abhorrence" where, as in the Deut. passage it connotes a wholly negative concept. On this particular interpretation, see S. Pace Jeansonne, *The Old Greek of Daniel 7-12*. [CBQMS 19] Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1988: 101-102.

See on the vital distinction between *galut* and *diaspora*, H. Wettstein, "Coming to Terms with Exile," *Diasporas and Exiles; Varieties of Jewish Identity*. H. Wettstein, ed. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002: 47-59. Wettstein defines "diaspora" as a political concept, suggesting "geopolitical dispersion," including, "involuntary dispersion from a center, typically a homeland." However, "with … the coming of new generations, new social conditions, and movement from one diasporic location to another, a diasporic population may come to see virtue in diasporic life. And so 'diaspora' – as opposed to *galut* – may acquire a positive charge, as today it has for some." "Galut is, by contrast, an … almost religious, notion… One of its important resonances is a concomitant of involuntary removal from homeland: dislocation, a sense of being uprooted, being somehow in the wrong place" (47). It seems as if those who propose a livable diaspora for the mid-second century BCE, too easily confuse this period with the one following the destruction in 70 CE and the failed rebellion of Bar Kochba in 135 CE. Wettstein writes (48): "The destruction of the First Temple in 587 B.C.E. and the subsequent Babylonian exile was, of course, calamitous, but that prior exile lasted only half a century; exile could still seem unusual, an exception to the order of things. After Bar Kochba and the expulsion of the Jews from Jerusalem, however, with no hope for return in the foreseeable future, exile must have seemed like the rule." It is only in the wake of these events that rabbinic Judaism truly had to come up with a 'lifestyle for the diaspora'. "It is undeniable that the rabbis took *galut* [as a condition] seriously. For them it was inescapable, a kind of permanently temporary state" (50). Thus, to somewhat return to the notion of "lifestyle for the diaspora", Wettstein again formulates it most clearly: "Perhaps, seasoned by *galut*, the rabbis were able to develop a manual, as it were, for the successful negotiation of life experience, even when it goes badly" (50). He shows, using the midrash Lamentations as an example, how, faced with the lack of a religious center and Temple, the newly developed rabbinic theology succeeded to create a more intimate relationship between human and the Divine (53). It is therefore important to remember that the Maccabean period was one of hope to shake off oppressive foreign rule and regain national and religious independence. Thus, when certain writers of the Greek period situate their narrative during the Babylonian Exile, the purpose cannot be the belittling of the living conditions during that era. Rather, they imply that some of their current diasporic realities – that they may even perceive within subjugated Judea - recall exilic ones. For a somewhat different and rosy interpretation of the pre-destruction Hellenistic diaspora-experience for those born into it, see E. Gruen, "Diaspora and Homeland," in the same volume (18-46, esp. fn. 16). By dismissing every single negative piece of information within the relevant texts that hint at adverse conditions within the (Egyptian) diaspora and any wish to return to the homeland, he produces a glowing account of the Egyptian diaspora. It should be remembered that the situation in this period is very different from that following the destruction. At this time there still is a functioning Temple and the homeland is accessible for those who desire to visit it, be they in Egypt or in Babylonia. Furthermore, even in the period following the Babylonian Exile, only a handful of the population actually returned. In other words, the

depopulated it would be hard to imagine that to be their purpose. Although it is the predominant view, not all opinions side with the notion that the period of exile and following Persian rule described in the narrative was a relatively benevolent experience for those undergoing it. Daniel Smith-Christopher is probably the strongest voice of an alternative take on this period. He seeks to contribute "to recent work on the post-exilic period of biblical studies, especially with regard to recent challenges to the *supposed 'benign nature'* of Persian domination of the Hebrew (and other) peoples in the fifth to fourth century B.C.E." [65]

Even though the Exile is not the real-time reality (or Actual World) behind the Book of Daniel, it does function as the setting for the main narrative (Basic World) and must, as such, be explored within that context. In fact, the Exile is of such importance that it constitutes the narrative frame. It forms the preamble in the very first verse and the reader is directed back to the narrator's exilic present in the last verses – moving from Nebuchadnezzar to Cyrus. Furthermore, the final editor must have had a clear motivation for choosing this period as the setting for his text. At the time of the compilation of the Book of Daniel, the Exile was a distant memory, but interpretations of it were preserved in prophetic texts and historiographies that were available to the learned classes. [66] Of special interest to later writers is the notion, first expressed in Jeremiah 25 and 29, that the Babylonian Exile is to last seventy years. [67] This number

---

diaspora can be a thriving place as long as the homeland remains intact and accessible. While Gruen mostly cites Philo to the effect that the diaspora can be a good place, he also brings in Josephus. The latter, of course, wrote his work after the destruction of 70 CE. Yet, he too, writes in glowing terms about the diaspora (see the comparison of the views of both writers on p. 36). This can easily be explained by the need to justify his own diasporic community. At the same time, Gruen too easily overlooks the fact that due to this catastrophe, displacement had truly taken place; the populace of Judea was either killed off or sold into slavery. At best, they would have been disastrously impoverished. This again, would truly recall exilic circumstances.

[65]   D.L. Smith-Christopher, "Hebrew Satyagraha: The Politics of Biblical Fasting in the Post-Exilic Period," *Food and Foodways* 5(1993): 269. [Italics mine].

[66] On the reception of the theme of the Exile in Second Temple literature, see the collection of essays in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish and Christian Conceptions*. J. Scott (ed.), Leiden: Brill, 1997.

[67] J. Applegate, "Jeremiah and the Seventy Years in the Hebrew Bible," *The Book of Jeremiah and Its Reception - Le Livre de Jérémie et sa reception*. A.H.W. Curtis and T. Römer, eds. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997: 91-110. See also M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972: 143 ff. Weinfeld discusses the development from Jeremiah's original position that Babylonian rule over the Land is to last seventy years (a rounded

is picked up by those writers who considered that the conditions of exile had not been lifted after the return under Zerubabel (538) and the rebuilding of the Temple (516/15). The idea of an extended Exile forms a theme that runs through many Second Temple period texts. The seventy years of Jeremiah are multiplied into seventy periods, or weeks of years and would then total 490 years for the duration of the Exile. Furthermore, the Exile was no longer seen as a forced move from the Land to another specified place in the past, but had come to encompass the present and the Land of Israel itself as well. In fact, this expanded concept would become a *leitmotif* in Jewish consciousness that would spread slowly like an inkblot through time and space from the present of the authors, into the future, eventually enveloping later diasporas – even to the present day.

In the Book of Daniel, the beginning of the Exile is mentioned (with all the requisite elements) while the beginning of the restoration is not. Cyrus' conquest of Babylon, which ended the Neo-Babylonian empire, is alluded to at the end of chapter 5 with the murder of Belshazzar, and at the end of chapter 6, Cyrus simply succeeds the elusive Darius the Mede as king. This may be an indication that perhaps the editor of Daniel did place the beginning of the 70-year exile in 609 BCE and its end in 539 BCE. The computations most popular with commentators place the seventy years either from 609 to 539 or from 586 to 515. A further analogy found prevalent for the Jeremiah passage is that of the Sabbatical year of rest for the land. Nevertheless, it is clear that he did consider the 70 year duration as a given (cf. Dan. 9). If it was 609 BCE, this must have been a meaningful year to the framers of the text, as it saw the death in battle of Josiah, the reformer and last great king of Judah. The Babylonians placed his son Jehoiakim on the throne as head of a puppet regime. The Book of Daniel has king Jehoiakim deported, although in actual fact, the king died in 598 BCE, and was succeeded by his son Jehoiachin. The latter was the young king who was taken to Babylon. Therefore, either the author/editor of Daniel must have an earlier (and otherwise unattested) date for the siege of Jerusalem in mind, or there is a conflation

---

number for the actual sixty-six years) and that it is the later texts of Zechariah, Chronicles, and Daniel who applied it to the Land and the Temple lying in ruins. He also deals with the fascinating inscription in the Black Stone of Esarhaddon, which is dated to the early part of this king's reign (680-669 BCE).

between two very similar names. [68] Meanwhile, Nebuchadnezzar only succeeded his father as king in 605, although he had been leading military campaigns on his behalf many years before that. Yet, a campaign that included a siege of Jerusalem in 606 BCE is not attested and furthermore would not tally with other dates offered. Therefore, any attempt at harmonizing these dates with actual historical events, remains problematic and must be abandoned. [69] The narrative does not reflect actual history but is a theological and political reinterpretation of it, using literary means in order to achieve the desired result. In this light it seems reasonable to assume that the editor of Daniel too belonged to those who lived under the impression of an extended Exile. [70] The references to the seventy years of Exile, predicted by Jeremiah (25:9-12; 29:10) represent a crucial element in the prayer of Daniel 9. The explanation of the seventy years (or weeks of years) in Dan. 9:24 by Gabriel as meaning seven *weeks* of years, adding up to 490 years, has wide ranging consequences. Significant here is the notion that the Exile did not only exceed the initial seventy years, but as far as territory is concerned, it was no longer limited to an exile in Babylonia but it extended to the Land of Israel, the City of Jerusalem, and the Second Temple. Thus, the restoration in the Persian province Yehud, following Cyrus' policies was not considered a full restoration. This is how the situation is to be viewed from the narrative perspective. From the real time perspective of the editor, however, it would apply to his disapproval of the conditions in Judea under Antiochus IV, on the one hand, and of the Hellenizers on the other. Clearly, the criteria for the Exile to be ended were a restoration of the full Temple service, with a pure priesthood, possibly a Davidic monarch, and most importantly, a people that lived according to the commandments. Adele Berlin explains: "[E]xile is not only a geographic place, it is a religious state of

---

[68] This discussion only has relevance as long as it is assumed that Daniel reflects actual historical information. If the text is seen instead as a fictional use of known historical data that are manipulated and applied for a completely different purpose, one no longer needs to be baffled by names and dates that do not tally. G. Athas provides an interesting contribution to this effect in a recent article, "In Search of the Seventy "Weeks" of Daniel 9," *JHS Online* 9(2009). His view will be treated in the discussion of chapter 9.

[69] See J.J. Collins, *Daniel* (1993), pp. 131-133 for an overview of these problems and a comparison between the conflicting accounts within the Hebrew Bible and the few remaining historical Babylonian texts.

[70] J. VanderKam, "Exile in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature," *Exile; Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*. J.M. Scott, ed.. Leiden: Brill, 1997: 89-109; esp. pp. 94-109.

mind." [71] As stated earlier, it is the Land that bestows identity upon the people. Now, in addition, the exilic experience will come to contribute a layer to the formation of that identity, which in turn will become visible in the texts that were produced during and under influence of that experience.

Moving now to the text itself, critical spatial theory will prove a fitting analytical tool to facilitate an understanding of the complex dynamics of Exile specifically in the Book of Daniel. This becomes clear immediately in its first chapter. Following Edward Soja, the palace scene (and similar ones in the following chapters) may be seen as a Firstspace location from the (limited) perspective of the ruler and his court. However, from the perspective of the protagonists it must be seen as representative of Thirdspace, as this is their place of captivity. It could then be argued that the narrator (who is here to be identified with the framer, but is at the same time a narrative character himself) operates within Secondspace, as he manipulates Firstspace. Precisely how limited the ruler's perspective is, will become clear when both the vanquished kingdom of Judah and (or, with the help of) the heavenly kingdom are predicted to topple the earthly ones. Whereas the Babylonian kings surmised that by taking the Israelite God captive and destroying His habitat He was neutralized – a policy that had always been successfully carried out vis-à-vis other (divine) enemies - they did not take into account the truly other-worldly and non-corporeal character of this Deity, coupled with the fact that His permanent habitat was not on earth. This is of course strictly from the perspective of the Judean exilic narrator.

In the described as well as historically implied context of Daniel, we may, with regard to the Land of Israel, indicate the devastated Land and cities left over as a result of conquest by Babylonians and Seleucid Greeks, as Firstspace. The provinces that those victorious powers carved out of the once independent monarchies of Israel and Judah and the kind of governance they created for it would reflect Secondspace. Thirdspace then would be found in the musings and hopes for restoration by the authors of the Jewish apocalyptic and related literatures, which is expressed in their "lived space" conditions of either exile or under foreign yoke. But this balance shifts somewhat

---

[71] Cf. A. Berlin, "Psalms and the Literature of Exile; Psalms 137, 44, 69, and 78," *The Book of Psalms; Composition and Reception* [SVT 99] P.W. Flint and P.D. Miller Jr., eds. Leiden: Brill, 2005: 65-86.

when the Divine is introduced into this equation as the representative of true First- and Secondspace. This would apply to the notion of God as the ultimate owner of the Land (with all of its Deuteronomistic consequences) and its rulers, as well as to the influence the heavenly realm in general wields over the earthly and its inhabitants.

As mentioned before, Daniel's chapter 1 sets out the program for the rest of the narrative and is entirely informed by the experience of Exile. It introduces the characters and sets the stage. Right at the beginning one observes how the narrator initiates a Judean focus by first stating the year of the reign of Jehoiakim, the King of Judah, whose capital Jerusalem Nebuchadnezzar comes to besiege. Immediately, his focus moves away from the Judean perspective to that of the King of Babylonia as the agent of the subsequent actions, and the spatial positioning shifts from the city of Jerusalem to Babylon, and from the Temple in Jerusalem to the temple of Nebuchadnezzar. For Daniel and his friends, the nature of the exilic space fluctuates continually depending on the perspective of the beholder. At first, they find themselves in a purely Thirdspace reality, which is of course the king's Firstspace. However, the balance of power shifts when, in chapter 2, the king comes to depend on Daniel who is aided (behind the scenes) by his God.

If indeed it may be argued that it is the Land that has bestowed identity on the people, then loss of Land, or Exile/Diaspora, which is disPlacement, indicates that identity be lost. This is what ostensibly happened to the exiled population of the Northern Kingdom. However, it is not what happened to the exiled Judaeans. To the contrary, in the first place, the notion took hold that their God had gone with them into Exile. This had already been expressed by Ezekiel, when he wrote that although God had removed the people to far away countries, He would be for them as a little sanctuary (a *miqdash me'at*). Although the precise meaning of this phrase is a matter of some debate, it clearly indicates that the people had not lost their link to their identity, their future, or ultimately, their land. [72] In the years following the Return and settlement into a

---

[72] See on this passage B. Oded, "'Yet I Have Been to Them 'lemiqdash me`at' in the Countries Where They Have Gone" (Ezekiel 11:16)'," *Sefer Moshe: the Moshe Weinfeld Jubilee Volume; Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East, Qumran, and Post-Biblical Judaism.* Ch. Cohen, A. Hurvitz, and S.M. Paul, eds. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004: 103-114.

diminished national existence and a growing Diaspora, which would soon be threatened by the Hellenizing policies of the Greek rulers, another life line to hold on to emerged: the Text. [73] The Text became a rePlacement for the lost Land. One might say that Jewish history and identity waver between space and spacelessness (or, 'place and placelessness'), between the Land and the Text, whereby the Text transforms into a 'movable and provisional territory'. [74] The importance of the Text, that has almost fully taken shape at the time of Daniel's redaction, can be seen in the fact that Daniel gets his data about the Exile almost entirely from that same Text. If memory of the Exile is to be preserved and applied, it is through, and by means of, the Text. And indeed, Daniel operates within a textual universe. For instance, the all-important concept of the seventy-year duration of the Exile which is transformed into the seventy *weeks* of years in Gabriel's explanation of the passage to Daniel is textually based and can be found in other prophetic texts as well. It is also important to recall Daniel's mention of the Torah of Moses in the context of the prayer in chapter 9.

A number of factors may have contributed to the divergent fates of the two exiled populations. Firstly, it may be assumed that the centralized cult in Jerusalem would have imprinted a greater cohesiveness on the population of the Southern Kingdom and, at least at the higher echelons of the powerful priestly class and intelligentia, have kept syncretistic tendencies at bay. The cult in the Northern Kingdom was already more inclusive of surrounding religious influences, as is described in the Books of Kings and Chronicles, even if this is not borne out by the material culture. It is clear that the literature uses a propagandistic literary device to make the contrast between the post-Josianic Southern Kingdom and the idolatrous Northern Kingdom greater. Yet, the presence of a strong centralized cult would have contributed to a strengthening of identity among the Judahites. When a great part of the Northern population, as well as the populations from

---

[73] This refers specifically to the texts that would come to form the canonized Pentateuch, Prophets and Writings. They formed, in a way, a portable reference guide on how to live socially and religiously, a reminder of group identity, a verbal repository of the sanctuary and the cult, and a road map back home.

[74] Paraphrasing Z. Gurevitch and G. Aran, "The Land of Israel: Myth and Phenomenon," *Reshaping the Past: Jewish History and the Historians*. J. Frankel, ed.; Oxford: OUP, 1994: 195-210.

surrounding vassal states, were exiled in the successive Assyrian campaigns between 734-732 and 716 BCE it is argued that eventually these groups ceased to be individually identifiable. This would be caused, on the one hand, by the nature of the resettling program of the Assyrians, especially induction into the army, and on the other hand, the lack of a strong enough identity to remain a separate community. Evidence for this may be found in Assyrian epigraphic sources that display a high level of 'assyrianization' of the displaced populations, which may, indeed, have been a conscious policy on the part of the Assyrians as well as a natural development that can be seen among displaced populations throughout time. [75] This process is especially indicated by the fact that deportees from various lands, including Israel, took on Assyrian names. This may or may not have been a conscious policy on the part of the Assyrians, but it was certainly a conscious act with regard to the Babylonian encounter, where captives who were placed in court circles were given Babylonian names. Marjo Korpel writes: "Daniel and his friends got Babylonian names when they became officers in the Neo-Babylonian empire (Dan. 1:7). Even if this is pure fiction, it does reflect the custom of the time accurately." [76]

Although one may argue that we do not have definitive proof for the loss of identity and subsequent disappearance of the Northern tribes as they have not left us with any written sources, there are a number of scenarios in which they may have functioned beyond the Assyrian orbit. For instance, it could be imagined that perhaps some of them returned as well following Cyrus' edict and could have contributed to the construction of the temple on Mt. Gerizim. But again, there is no definitive proof. [77]

Thus, it must be clear that this is an argument for the historical case (regardless what that may have been in detail and in fact) from the later literary sources that we *do* have, which constitute, by definition, an interpretation of history. Based on this, what

---

[75] K. L. Younger, "The Deportations of the Israelites," *JBL* 117(1998)2: 201-227. See also his "'Give Us Our Daily Bread'; Everyday Life for the Israelite Deportees," *Life and Culture in the Ancient Near East*. Eds.: R.E. Averbeck, M.W. Chavalas, D.B. Weisberg. Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 2003: 269-288 at pp. 277, 282 and 284.

[76] M.C.A. Korpel, "Disillusion among Jews in the Postexilic Period," The Old Testament in Its World; Papers Read at the Winter Meeting, January 2003, the Society for Old Testament Study... [= OTS 52] R. P. Gordon & J.C. de Moor, eds. Leiden: Brill, 2005: 136-157, at p. 144.

[77] From a personal e-mail exchange with L.S. Fried, 26.2.2006.

emerges is a picture where the tribal system has collapsed as one by which to identify people. And, whoever is left following the Assyrian deportations has become a Judahite concentrated in the still functioning Southern Monarchy. After the latter group was deported by Nebuchadnezzar there may also very well have been cases where pockets of Israelites joined with the new arrivals in Mesopotamia. But, as said, the Northern group has left no textual remains. This, as is argued, is a perfect example of identity-forming and identity-robbing. [78]

It is likely that the fate of the Northern population was known to that of the South. Therefore, it is equally likely that the prophets who were active in Judah were able to warn about the consequences and provide advice as to how to act should a similar fate befall the South, as for instance, the letter to the deportees in Jeremiah 29. Thus, being securely grounded in the awareness of the centralized cult and with the confidence that eventually it would be restored, as well as forewarning of the negative experiences of the earlier exiled groups, the exiles from Judah had a better chance of surviving with their identity intact.

As we now shift our attention back to the Judean exiles, the following emerges. The sins committed by the population of all rank and file in the prayer of chapter 9, as well as the specific category of sinning population are all textual. This means that they are derived from the fulminations of the earlier prophets and the list categories in Deuteronomy and Leviticus. [79] It cannot be known to which extent the actual behavior of the populace of the editor's Maccabean era consisted of exactly these sinful acts, or

---

[78] R. Bauckham expresses serious doubt as to whether the Northern tribes did in fact disappear completely as early as is generally suggested. Since the biblical record is a Judean and not a Northern document it is logical that it reflects a Judean focus. In other words, from the fact that the tribes disappeared from the text it should not be concluded that they also disappeared from history. For instance, he adduces the Book of Tobit as a late witness to the probability that descendants of Israelite exiles were still living in parts of Mesopotamia. See, his "Tobit as a Parable for the Exiles of Northern Israel," *Studies in the Book of Tobit; a Multidisciplinary Approach*. M. Bredin ed. London: T & T Clark, 2006: 140-164 (esp. pp. 151-159). Further indications are the post-exilic prophetic hopes of a reuniting of the Northern and Southern tribes. Ezekiel is very clear on this, but so is Daniel's prayer in chapter 9. It could furthermore also be imagined that by the time the Judeans were exiled, remaining pockets of Israelite exiles may have joined them.

[79] See, e.g., J.H. Newman, *Praying by the Book: The Scripturalization of Prayer in Second Temple Judaism*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999: 102. See also, M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985: 487-490.

some thereof, if at all. But it is the editor who placed the prayer in the text and who uses it as a connection between at the one end, past and present sins and at the other end, future remedy. At first sight, the text tends to seem defeatist, placing the guilt squarely upon the people. However, the text can be read differently. Firstly, it can be seen as an attempt to answer the question of how a city under divine protection, with imparted cosmic significance, containing the very House of God, could be so utterly destroyed. In order to salvage the Deity's reputation, the initiative had to be accorded to Him. It had been the divine wish to act in this way. Next, the motive is to be found in the shortcomings of the people, who deserved punishment. This utter degradation is then followed by a complete turnabout, which requires *action* on the part of the people. Not only can they beseech the Deity to soften His decree or even annul it, they can actively turn away from trespassing and mend their ways. This then should have the desired result of restoration.

The dreams are meant to re-shape the real world of the editor. Those in the court tales reassure the reader that dreams indeed transform the reality of the dreamer. But there is a catch: the dreamer in the court tales is Nebuchadnezzar and the outcome of his dreams is not as he anticipates. In the first instance, he attempts to avert the verdict of the dream by actually building the object he dreamt of. He constructs a gigantic statue on a plain for all to see and admire. However, rather than using the different materials of the dream colossus, he alters the content of the dream and constructs it of entirely of gold. Since the diviner Daniel had explained to him that the golden head of the dream statue represented the king and his kingdom, with the declining materials representing his successors and with them the eventual downfall of the dynasty, he must have thought that by improving on the dream he could secure his own position. Thus, not only does he reshape the landscape through his dream, he intends to reshape the future as well. The reader only gets a second-hand glimpse of the royal dreams through an indirect report. It is as if the almighty king of Babylon is a captive of his own mind and is manipulated as if a puppet on a string – as are, incidentally the other kings in the narrative. Rather than being offered an expansion of his royal being, he is put in his place by the messenger of the God he thought he had captured, by being told how he should behave or else he would lose his kingdom.

In the second part of the Book the dynamics shift dramatically. Not only does the character Daniel become the main narrator, he is also the dreamer and he takes the reader along with him through his dream portal into the heavenly realm. One has to keep in mind, however, that the implied reader is intended here: that is, the editor's contemporaries who lived during the upheaval of the Antiochian crisis (a Secondspace event) and the Maccabean uprising (a Thirdspace response). It is they who are offered a way out of the current confines into a bright spatial future that extends even beyond the political boundaries of the small geographic area called Yehud or Judea. This spatial future is not only of a horizontal nature, but it is also vertical and transcendental. However, at all times the Temple, the city and the land form the center of this recreated universe. Although this notion is present much clearer in other texts (such as Ezekiel and a number of the Qumran documents) this centrality is unmistakably implied, for instance, in chapter six where Daniel prays in his home towards Jerusalem and the ravaged Temple.

A number of exilic and post-exilic texts display an, almost, obsessive preoccupation with the measuring of the spaces of the temple and the city. [80] Daniel, on the other hand, having to come to terms with the reality of an extended Exile, is much more concerned with measuring time by means of successive and finite kingdoms. Through this, time becomes contained, controlled, and defined by spatiality. The kingdom schema is brought into the narrative twice, in chapters 2 and 7, using very different metaphors. But it is interesting to note what happens to the two opposing main characters, Nebuchadnezzar and Daniel, in two rather different spatialities. Something similar is at play in the short review of history in chapter 11. By naming and containing the past through a manipulation and reinterpretation of history, with invented and imaginary traditions, it was thought the future could be controlled and secured. [81]

---

[80] See L.D. Crow, "Holy Precincts, Holy City, Holy Land: the Orientation of Diaspora Jews toward Jerusalem in the Persian Period," presented at the 1998 meeting of the Constructions of Ancient Space Seminar (www.gunnzone.org/constructs/crow.doc), p. 7.

[81] This device is, in fact, not unique to Daniel, to apocalyptic texts, or ancient texts. In our own time a telling example is found in George Orwell's futuristic dystopian novel, *1984*. One of the slogans typifying the particular totalitarian society described there, was: who controls the present controls the past, who controls the past controls the future.

In conclusion it can be asked what the Book of Daniel can tell the contemporary reader about the Exile? Firstly, that there was a historical Exile, but limited in scope. This is indicated, for example, by the manner in which chapter 1 has been set up. It is framed by a short temporal inclusio, which opens with the third year of Jehoiakim and ends with the first year of Cyrus. [82] It expresses both the essence of the Exile as well as its hoped-for but unrealized speedy end. It begins with one of the last independent Kings of Judah, and ends with the Persian King who ushers in the Restoration. Yet, this purported end did not bring the kind of restoration and renewed society expected by some circles as desired by God. Secondly, it transcends the geographical and temporal parameters on the ground as set by the biblical text. The stage expands to include the Land of Israel and the present of Daniel's framer. The narrative seeks to express that since it formally takes place outside the Land of Israel, everyone operates outside of Jewish sacred space. At the same time, in an underlying narrative, which is very much centered in the Land of Israel, it needs to negotiate a means to come to terms with the issue of contamination of that most sacred place, the Temple, that never really ceased. The oppressors are no longer Babylonians or Persians, but the Seleucid Greeks. And rather than uprooting the people physically, their very identity is under assault, as well as the center of their national and religious being: the rebuilt Temple in Jerusalem. [83]

When exilic space is seen in the classical binary opposition of 'sacred' and 'profane', with the resulting pair of 'desired' space and 'undesired' space, it is easy to move to an understanding of exile in terms of 'dystopia', restoration as wished for but ultimately failed 'utopia', and an eschatological kingdom as 'utopia'. Exile thus becomes an undesirable present, a dystopia, flanked by a more desirable past and

---

[82] Just as chapter 1 by itself, the complete first six chapters (the Court Tales) too, conclude with the mention of Cyrus' reign. Finally, the entire book is framed by a similar inclusio. Cyrus is the final chronological marker, introducing the last series of visions that begin in 10:1 and run through to the end of the narrative.

[83] Perhaps this is the situation that the author of 11:33 has in mind. This would also go a long way to explain the term "captivity" [*shevi*] as the extended exile discussed in ch. 9 and confirmed in ch. 12. Since this term can also refer to more general conditions of imprisonment, most commentators gloss it over as it is a usual outcome of a war situation. However, D. Smith-Christopher in his commentary on Daniel (1996) considers this possibility.

future. [84] It is the completely grim lived reality of exilic Thirdspace with an equally Thirdspace mental response against the First- and Secondspace realities of oppression that hopes to transform the lived space of the Land of Israel.

Returning to the meaning of the title at the beginning of this chapter, it may be concluded that, in order to Recover from the Exile, the Exile must itself first be Recovered (i.e., confronted) and transformed, so that in its wake, the future may be transformed. For the group represented by the framer of Daniel the (protracted) Exile is like a bad dream from which the dreamer hopes to wake up, and at the same time it is also an edifying dream that will assure that the awakening will inaugurate a period of true restoration. The last verse of the Book of Daniel leaves no doubt when the heavenly messenger tells Daniel: "Go on until the end when you will rest, and then rise up to your destiny at the end of days." Meaning that he, as one of those who are righteous, wise, and teach wisdom, will participate in the ending of the enduring Exile.

4.1.2. Divine Abandonment and 'Godnapping'

The above dealt specifically with the spatial and socio-political aspects of the Exile and the point of view of the exiles themselves. However, there is another aspect, which is essential if we are to understand the machinations inherent to the book. It concerns the notion of the exile of God from the Temple. In the case of the razing of the Temple in Jerusalem, the conquerors were not able to do what they would have done in any other similar case: carry off the statues of the gods. They had to make do with the holy vessels, and not only for the value of the precious metals. This was as close as they could get to a representation of the God of Israel. [85] However, and this is the gist of all the accounts in the Hebrew Bible: they did not know that they were not in a position to do so. Israel's God would choose where to go or not. In this case it was

---

[84] Or in the words of S.J. Schweitzer, "this traumatic event [i.e., the exile] and time period are the catalyst that separates a dystopian past from a utopian future," "Reading Utopia in Chronicles," Diss. Univ. of Notre Dame, 2005: 271.

[85] For an example of this thinking from the time of the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 CE, see J. Magness, "The Arch of Titus at Rome and the Fate of the God of Israel," *JJS* 59(2008)2: 201-217.

likely His choice to go into exile along with the people and be a *miqdash me'at* in their midst (Ezek. 11:16). [86]

Whereas the leave-taking of God receives much attention in the prophetic books, Daniel is conspicuously silent on the issue. Only the Temple vessels are mentioned and God is considered to be at home in His heavenly palace. However, there is much more at stake here and the relationship between the divine abandonment, "godnapping", [87] and the relatively positive treatment of Babylonia and her kings needs to be examined. [88]

The positive picture painted of Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel as well as in Jeremiah may have to do with the respect he showed towards the Temple vessels, the presence of which effectively meant that Babylon enjoyed divine protection from none less than the God of Israel. After all, Ezekiel's depiction of the leave-taking of the כבוד [*kavod*] from the Temple which subsequently becomes the *miqdash me'at* demonstrates that this

---

[86] B. Oded, "Yet I Have Been to Them 'lemiqdash me`at' in the Countries Where They Have Gone (Ezekiel 11:16)", *Sefer Moshe: the Moshe Weinfeld Jubilee Volume; Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East, Qumran, and Post-Biblical Judaism*. Ch. Cohen, A. Hurvitz, and S.M. Paul, eds. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004: 103-114.

[87] For this very apt neologism, see S.W. Holloway, *Aššur is King Aššur is King! Religion in the Exercise of Power in the Neo-Assyrian Empire*. Leiden: Brill, 2002: 144, citing A. Livingstone who coined it in "New Dimensions in the Study of Assyrian Religion," *Assyria 1995. Proceedings of the 10th Anniversary Symposium of the Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project Helsinki, September 7-11, 1995*. S. Parpola and R.M. Whiting, eds. Helsinki, 1997. The alternative term of 'deity-kidnapping' was introduced by S.K. Eddy, *The King Is Dead: Studies in the Near Eastern Resistance to Hellenism 334-31 B.C.*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961: 4.
Illustrations of the act of "godnapping" can be found in J.M. Russell, *Sennacherib's Palace without Rival at Niniveh*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1991: 60-61 and *ANEP* 538; a photograph of a detail of the original slab may be found at www.livius.org/a/1/mesopotamia/deported_gods.JPG. The alternative to "godnapping" is simply the destruction of the statue of a vanquished deity. This act would probably represent a worse fate for this deity's people as well. A graphic example of the dismembering of a statue can be found in Holloway, pp. 119-120 and Fig. 4. Even if in this case it may also represent the statue of a ruler, it was likely a votive image as it was captured during the sack of a temple.

[88] E. Gruen, "Persia through the Jewish Looking-Glass," *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers*. T. Rajak et al., eds. [Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007: 53-75] offers a different view. He suggests that the portrayal of (especially) the Persian kings in Daniel, Esther and similar texts emphasizes the comical. These kings cannot be taken seriously since they are puppets on the string of the God of Israel. Whatever they do, even if it is positive, is never of their own initiative. All their actions are staged. Understanding the texts such, would empower their intended readership which was confronted with real tyrants that they had to be able to make sense of in light of their loyalty to their religion.

was a deed of divine volition. [89] This entire process is fully in line with what is known concerning the actions attributed to the gods of Mesopotamia. When a city is overrun by the enemy, that fact alone proves that the citizens were unworthy and the foreign ruler was victorious by divine fiat of the patron deity of the conquered city. [90] This is in fact often attested in the written sources of such conquerors. A well-known example is the Cyrus Cylinder, where Cyrus attributes his victory over Babylon to the will of Marduk, the city's patron deity. At the same time the defeat of Nabonidus was attributed to his sins against the Marduk cult. [91] Needless to say these are circular arguments but they have a time honored successful history. Thus, what we do see in Daniel is that both Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus act according to the will of God. His representation, in the form of the Temple vessels, is moved to Babylon and thus functions as a protective shield for that city. In addition to the correct treatment of the vessels (under the circumstances), both Nebuchadnezzar and Darius are persuaded to also worship the God of Israel. It is only when Belshazzar defiles the vessels that the protection fails: the king is assassinated and the city is taken by the next foreign monarch under divine protection. Cyrus proves worthy, as he returns the vessels and the people to their place of origin. As a reward, Cyrus was already promised endless success. (See e.g. Isaiah 45:1-13, where Cyrus is called God's annointed). And well-deserved, for he had a formidable task to fulfil. As Nebuchadnezzar had been God's instrument in the destruction of the Temple and the removal of the vessels, so Cyrus was the instrument to reverse this process. At first the path is cleared through the desert for the solemn procession to inaugurate God's return to His sanctuary. Deutero-Isaiah describes all this in lyric words:

---

[89] D.I. Block, "Divine Abandonment: Ezekiel's Adaptation of an Ancient Near Eastern Motif," *The Book of Ezekiel: Theological and Anthropological Perspectives*. M. Odell and J. Strong, eds. Atlanta: SBL, 2000: 15-42.

[90] Not only divine images but also the royal images of the defeated kings were the object of abduction and/or mutilation. See Z. Bahrani, "Assault and Abduction: the Fate of the Royal Image in the Ancient Near East," *Art History* 18(1995): 363-382.

[91] See especially the authoritative study by P.-A. Beaulieu, *The Reign of Nabonidus, King of Babylon 556-539 B.C.* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989] for an assessment of all the existing textual witnesses and versions of the change of rule and the charges leveled against Nabonidus.

(11) Depart! Depart! Go out from there! Touch nothing unclean. Go out from the midst of it. Purify yourselves, you who carry the vessels of the Lord. (12) You shall not go out in haste, and you shall not go out in flight. For the Lord shall walk before you; the God of Israel shall be your rear guard. [Isa. 52:11-12].

It must have seemed to him as if the return of God's vessels "was nothing less than the return of God himself to Judah, and to his temple in Jerusalem." (52:6):

For eye to eye, they will see the Lord's return to Zion.

"The restoration of the temple is the high point, the culmination, of the prophet's writings. The ones who return first, who return most dramatically, are those who carry [the Lord's] vessels--the temple-vessels (52:11)." [92]

Oddly enough, though, in the end it was not Cyrus who actually realized the return of the vessels. This would happen under Darius. Ultimately, the reason why in Daniel no attention is given to the perceived grand role of Cyrus in these events, is that by the time the book had taken its definitive form, everyone knew that history had not quite played out in this way. Resentment and doubt with regard to the level of sanctity of the Second Temple emerged and the society of which Daniel's framers were part was faced with another, very real, temple crisis.

---

[92] L.S. Fried, "Cyrus the Messiah? The Historical Background to Isaiah 45:1," *HTR* 95(2002)4: 373-393 (at pp. 376-377).

4.2   Topos 2: Kingdom

The notion of kingdom is territorial and implies a spatiality, a domain. Moreover, in an ancient Near Eastern context it is also to be seen, from the perspective of its ruler, as a sacred space. The king's rule is sanctioned by his gods, whose representative he is. At the same time, the gods reside in the temple, built or maintained by the king at their instruction, in the main city of the kingdom. For the greater part, this construct is mirrored in those biblical narratives that deal with the institution of kingship in relation to the divine.

4.2.1 The Kingdoms of the Present and the Kingdom of the Future: From Nebuchadnezzar to Cyrus and Beyond

As the heading of this section indicates, the idea of 'kingdom' in Daniel covers all possible dimensions: earthly and heavenly, human and divine. These categories carry both spatial and temporal aspects. It is especially the perceived temporal implications that have traditionally persuaded interpreters to relegate the heavenly kingdom, or, alternatively the messianic kingdom or Kingdom of God, to the far future - in fact to a moment that was thought of as the 'end of history.' [93] This is not only so for the commentaries on Daniel, but especially for the later New Testament texts that are particularly rich in kingdom imagery and where the concept obtained added importance and urgency. At the same time, it is especially in New Testament studies, with regard to 'kingdom', that since the late 1980s an important field of spatial studies has developed. [94] Some of the

---

[93] This is not in the least because the final kingdom was perpetually deferred since it had never materialized by the time of the next commentator on the text. The language that gave rise to this continuous postponing is found in Daniel itself: *'ad sofo* (7:26); *le'et qetz* (8:17); *'aharit; mo'ed qetz* (8:19); *be'aharit malkhutam* (8:23); *ve'ad qetz milhama* (9:26); *'aharit ha-yamim* (10:14); *uleqetz ha-'itim* (11:13); *qetz lamo'ed* (11:27); *'ad-'et qetz* (11:35); *uve-'et qetz* (11:40); *ad-'et qetz* (12:4); *'ad-matai qetz* (12:6);*'aharit* (12:8); *ad-'et qetz* (12:9); *le-qetz ha-yamim* (12:13). Despite the fact that in many of these instances the specific idiom refers to the end of pre-ordained periods of time (such as most of the occurrences in ch. 11), where they for instance refer to the end of a reign, commentators are tempted to read into these cases references to the final end of history as well. See, for instance, J. Baldwin's comments on 11:40 (*Daniel*, p. 202). However, it should be pointed out that in many cases these references indicate not more than, indeed, the end of a specific shorter period of time (e.g., 2:31).

[94] G.W. MacRae, "A Kingdom That Cannot Be Shaken: The Heavenly Jerusalem in the Letter to the Hebrews," *Tantur Yearbook* (1979-80): 27-40; B. Chilton, "The Kingdom of God in Recent

methodological results of this work can profitably be applied to issues in Daniel. But, when doing so, it is important to always keep in mind the deep-seeded difference in concerns between the texts of the mid-2nd century BCE and the post-destruction Christian (as well as Jewish) texts of the late 1st and 2nd centuries CE. In contrast to the earlier texts, the post-destruction texts do not seem to display much interest in an earthly kingdom and if they do it is essentially negative. The focus is mostly on what will happen once the cursed human empires have been vanquished by the divine forces and the Kingdom of God can be fully manifested. In this light it is important to note that Daniel does not display any interest in a restoration of the Davidic monarchy. At the outset of the book the narrator mentions that one of the last Judaean kings, Jehoiachim, was led into captivity and this is the first and last time we hear of him. Yet, in reality this was the fate of his son Jehoiachin who was eventually released under Nebuchadnezzar's successor Evil-merodach (Amel-Marduk) in about 562 BCE, according to 2 Kings 25 and Jer. 52:31-34, and received honor at the Babylonian court. This could have raised hopes among the exiles of an eventual restoration of the monarchy. And indeed, however briefly, in subsequent events following Cyrus' edict we hear of heirs to the Davidic throne. The author of Daniel passes over these significant facts. Of course, at the time of Daniel's compilation these hopes had long since been crushed and the rule of the land was executed by priests who were centered around the Temple. Yet Chronicles (1 Chron. 3:18) refers to Jehoiachin's seven sons, a clear indication of persisting dynastic hopes.

4.2.2   Daniel's Royal Flush

Daniel confronts the reader with many forms of kingship, denoting both places and positions of power. One learns of the nature of kingship as being human or divine, earthly or heavenly, with sometimes the two being in concord, but most often not. Some of the kings are just, others are cruel. We also learn of alternative forces being offered

---

Discussion," *Studying the Historical Jesus. Evaluations of the State of Current Research* B. Chilton & C.A. Evans (eds.) Leiden: Brill, 1994: 255-280; S. Turner, "The Interim, Earthly Messianic Kingdom in Paul," *JSNT* 25(2003): 323-342; K. Wenell, "'The Kingdom' as Sacred Space: Issues for Interpretation – The Kingdom: Present/Future and Earthly/Heavenly," paper read at BNTS 2005; K. Wenell, "Contested Temple Space and Visionary Kingdom Space in Mark's Gospel," *Biblical Interpretation* 15(2007)3: 291-305.

the chance to rule a kingdom. [95] But in whatever form it is presented, Daniel's notion of earthly kingship is securely grounded in biblical as well as ancient Near Eastern traditions, as will be indicated below. This is less obvious for the kingdom directly set up by God that is to follow the collapse of the earthly kingdoms. This notion is graphically depicted first in Daniel's explanation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream of a gigantic multi-metal statue, symbolizing four successive earthly kings or kingdoms (2:44) but which will be toppled by a final everlasting one that will encompass the whole earth.

In Daniel, a tension exists between three forces of 'kingdom': the gentile kingdoms, the Jewish monarchy and the heavenly Kingdom of God. Most commentaries and more general studies on Daniel are quick to note these tensions, observe the political and religious strife involved, as well as the fleeting, passing character of the human dynasties and their empires in comparison to the everlasting Kingdom of God. The importance of the grand spatial aspect of this ultimate Kingdom is, however, often minimized. The concept of 'kingdom', by definition, designates a space of power. It is the delimited territory over which a monarch rules. Yet, in the eyes of the ruler himself and his subjects, he is all-powerful and invincible and delimitation is a flexible idea which is, in fact, reflected in the royal titulary. It is important to note that variations on that titulary, in use since the earliest Mesopotamian dynasties, retained their force for some two millennia as they were inherited by successive cultures. Thus, designations as 'king of (the) lands', 'king of the world', 'king of the four quarters', in addition to local variants such as 'king of kings', and 'great king', are used by Assyrian, Neo-Babylonian, Persian, as well as Seleucid kings. In addition, the inscriptions of most of the kings emphasize the notion that they received their kingship and power from their respective gods. [96] Daniel lampoons this attitude by focusing on the Kingdom that will

---

[95] See the commentaries on the vision in Dan. 7:13-14 where the kingdom will revert to the 'one like a human being' [בר אנש] and 7:27 'the people of the holy ones of the Most High' [עם קדישי עליונין] are given the ultimate kingdom.

[96] Examples abound. See for the older titulary M.-J. Seux, *Épithètes royales akkadiennes et sumériennes*. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1967; W.W. Hallo, *Early Mesopotamian Royal Titles : A Philologic and Historical Analysis*. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1957; *Ibid.*, "Royal Titles from the Mesopotamian Periphery," *Anatolian Studies* 30(1980): 189-195. For the early Neo-Babylonian kings, see S. Langdon, *Building Inscriptions of the Neo-Babylonian Empire. Part I:*

overpower, usurp, or absorb every other kingdom on earth. The result of this transformation is entirely spatial, since it will transform the entire earth. For this reason it could be argued that it is to be understood as being without borders. But there is another, more compelling, reason for this. The process that is envisaged goes beyond a 'merely' transformed earth with a rule of justice and righteousness. The texts of Daniel and contemporaneous (as well as slightly later) apocalyptica suggest a merging of the heavenly and earthly realms. This would result in an overwhelming of the physical earth by the conditions of the non-physical heavenly realm. As was demonstrated in Section 3.2, this implies a dissolving of not only the restrictions of linear time, but also of the notion of three-dimensional space and the laws of physics that are inseparably connected with it. This overwhelming unboundedness is what Isaiah saw in his majestic vision in the temple (6:3), but also what happened to the stone and the mountain in Daniel 2.

In addition, it must be emphasized that the notion of God's Kingdom contains a multiplicity of meaning and does not represent a solitary and unchanging event or condition. Since God is also looked upon and worshipped as King, [97] one can distinguish the ever present, but remote, heavenly kingdom which is God's heavenly abode from where He rules over all of creation. Regardless whether He is also present in a functioning cult center, or whether this has been abandoned, the heavenly realm is a constant. When texts speak of the coming Kingdom of God, this is always meant in a

_____

Nabopolassar and Nebuchadnezzar. Paris: Ernest Leroux: 1905 and for Nabonidus, P.-A. Beaulieu, *The Reign of Nabonidus King of Babylon 556-539 B.C.*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989. For Achaemenid royal titulary in especially the Behistun inscription, see M.C. Root, *The King and Kingship in Achaemenid Art: Essays on the Creation of an Iconography of Empire*. Leiden: Brill, 1979: 182-226. For the Seleucid rulers, see A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White, "Aspects of Seleucid Royal Ideology: The Cylinder of Antiochus I from Borsippa," *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 111(1991): 71-86 and T. Boiy, "Royal Titulature in Hellenistic Babylonia," *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 92(2002): 241-257.

[97] The Kingdom of God and Kingship of God should be distinguished. The latter is something that is always present, especially in light of criticism of the earthly monarchies of Israel and Judah. The Kingdom primarily refers to a particular domain, and may either imply an already present, but alternate reality, or be something that will either be realized at the "end of time" (whether that means forthcoming in the foreseeable future or in more remote times). See the overviews in *IDB* 3 under "King", 14-16 and *ABD* 4, 43-44. God's Kingship refers to a factual and inherent aspect of God which is active regardless of the realization of the 'Kingdom of God'. Ezek. 20:33 specifically mentions God pronouncing His kingship among the people of Israel. Zech. 14:9, 16-17 proclaim God as king of all the earth. This theme is furthermore widely present throughout the Book of Psalms. See further note 117 below.

context of an exchange: this moment will signal the end of the human reigns. However, this does not mean that God will abandon His heavenly abode and exchange it for a permanent one on earth. It is very clear that all the relevant texts point to some form of the earthly realm merging with the heavenly realm. They only differ as to the exact processes involved as well as who the heroes are who are to set this transformation into action.

Pervasively present in Daniel, is the idea that it is by the will of the God of Israel that kings rule or lose their kingdoms. However, the pagan rulers, too, owe their kingdoms to divine fiat of their own gods, just like the Davidic kings ruled by the divine sanction of God. The problem that arises explicitly with regard to Nebuchadnezzar (and less so with Cyrus) is a blurring of the divine categories. Nebuchadnezzar, of course, knows for certain that he owes his kingdom to Marduk or Nabu. However, in Jeremiah it is made clear that it is the God of Israel who sanctioned his rule since it is up to Him to distribute rule at will. Jer. 27:5-10 states:

> 5] I have made the earth, the man and the beast that [are] upon the ground, by My great power and by My outstretched arm; and I give it unto whom it seems right to Me. 6] And now have I given all these lands into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, My servant; and the beasts of the field have I given him also to serve him. 7] And all nations shall serve him, and his son, and his son's son, until the time of his own land come; and then many nations and great kings shall make him their bondman. 8] And it shall come to pass, [that] the nation and the kingdom which will not serve the same Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, and that will not put their neck under the yoke of the king of Babylon, that nation will I visit, says the Lord, with the sword, and with the famine, and with the pestilence, until I have consumed them by his hand. 9] But as for you, do not hearken to your prophets, nor to your diviners, nor to your dreams, nor to your soothsayers, nor to your sorcerers, that speak unto you, saying, You shall not serve the king of Babylon: 10] for they prophesy a lie unto you, to remove you far from your land; and that I should drive you out, and you should perish.

Some of the statements in this passage are readily recognizable from Dan. 2, 4 and 7 where the power of Israel's God in the allocation of kingships is emphasized. Furthermore, the enormous power wielded by Nebuchadnezzar is reflected in Dan. 4, but

at the same time that chapter serves as a parody of the above passage from Jeremiah. However, the seeming divine authorization for Nebuchadnezzar's rule is as much of a temporary nature as it is deceptive. The passage above already contains this precondition and in Jer. 50-51 they are explicitly enumerated in an unusually long oracle against Babylon. It spells the eventual demise of the Neo-Babylonian Empire, the end of Nebuchadnezzar's dynasty, and its conquest by Cyrus the Persian. One passage within this oracle (51:25-26) may perhaps be seen as having been reversed and paraphrased in Dan. 2:

> 25] Behold, I am against you, O destroying mountain, says the Lord, which destroys all the earth: and I will stretch out my hand upon you, and roll you down from the rocks, and will make you a burnt mountain. 26] And they shall not take from you a stone for a corner, nor a stone for foundations; but you shall be desolate for ever, says the Lord. [98]

---

[98] H. Freedman (*Jeremiah*, Soncino, 1949: 241) suggests that although Babylon was situated in a plain, the mountain imagery might metaphorically refer to its "towering strength." It seems more likely though, that the author had an image of the great ziggurat in mind, which represented a cosmic mountain. This is also suggested by G.L. Keown et al. (*Jeremiah 26-52*,[WBC 27], Dallas, 1995: 370), who notes the metaphorical approach as well, only to reject both and argue that it recalls the Oracle against Edom in Ezekiel, which was located in a mountainous region crowned by Mount Seir. J.R. Lundbom (*Jeremiah* 37-52 [AB 21C] New York: Doubleday, 2004: 458-459), too, considers the various options and ultimately sides with Keown that it recalls the imagery used for Mount Seir. This is unfortunate, especially in view of the later part of the Oracle, the significance of which is not noted. It is equally unfortunate that M. Kessler in his detailed comments on the passage does not consider fully the value of taking the use of language as a referent for the main temple in Babylon, despite noting that one of the names for such temples is *E-kur*, Mountain House [*Battle of the Gods: The God of Israel Versus Marduk of Babylon. A Literary/Theological Interpretation of Jeremiah 50-51*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 2003: 119-120]. The conclusion of the chapter (vv. 42-44) should leave no doubt as to what is going on. There it is described that "the sea has come upon Babylon" by which it is now covered, the land is dead and desolate, and God personally has taken out Bel from Babylon. This language is taken almost verbatim from the Annals of Sennacherib, who laid siege to Babylon and utterly destroyed, and flooded it. Kessler, *Battle*, 13-131, notes this, too, in passing.

A poignant passage concerning the destruction of Babylon in 689 BCE reads, "The gods who dwell therein – the hands of my people seized them and smashed (them). I made its destruction more complete than that by a flood. That in days to come the site of that city and (its) temples and gods, might not be remembered" Elsewhere in this text it is recounted exactly through which means Sennacherib was able to actually flood the city. Maybe he considered himself as a (semi-)divine being while doing this? Earlier he compares his military prowess to a raging storm. [D.D. Luckenbill, *Annals of Sennacherib*, 83, 84, II 44-45]. The mythological overtones clearly remain intact. On Babylon's destruction see *The Cambridge Ancient History* III, Part 2 (Cambridge, 1982): 38-39. This is according to Sennacherib's own reporting, there is no independent corroboration for it. Yet it was a pervasive tradition, which lived on also in the Annals of Esarhaddon, which "identify the destructive agency as a flood caused by the wrath of Marduk." See also, B.N. Porter, *Images, Power and Politics: Figurative Aspects of Esarhaddon's Babylonian Policy* [Philadelphia: American Philological Society, 1993], pp. 46-47. The apologetic response by Esarhaddon is of interest. He neglects to mention the deeds of his

The prophet Isaiah has only laudatory words for Cyrus. In 44:28 it is stated: "Who [= God] says of Cyrus, [He is] my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure: even saying to Jerusalem, she shall be built; and to the temple, your foundation shall be laid," and the following passage (45:1-7) contains the appointment of Cyrus, an unprecedented case for a foreign king, calling him God's 'anointed', God's holding him by the right hand and assuring him of success and prosperity. The irony of this phrase cannot have been lost on the original audience of this text. The exact reversal of this language is used in the Mesopotamian New Year's celebration, the *akitu* ceremony at which time it is the king who takes the cult statue of the god (e.g., Bel, Nabu or Marduk) by the hand to renew both his kingship and his relationship with the god, so that all will be well in the kingdom. [99]

Both Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus [100] are foreign kings, uniquely portrayed by Israelite prophets to be servants of the God of Israel and their actions and very authority are sanctioned by this divine power even though they are not adherents of the religion of Israel. This point has been noted by Werner Lemke [101] who adds to this his

father, and lays the blame wholly on the people of Babylon who had behaved displeasing toward Marduk, who had, in turn, left the city and the people. These now became vulnerable to attack. Note the phrasing "he felt stormy toward Esagila and Babylon". He further records, "The Arahtu Canal, river of abundance, was brought to (the stage of) angry flood, violent onrush of water, mighty inundation, and image of the deluge and the water swept over the city (and) its dwellings and made (them) a ruin" (Ep 7). Another version adds that Babylon has become a large lake. [Porter, p. 102]. For a summary of the development of the entire episode from the historical devastation by Sennacherib to Nabonidus' reinterpretation, see J.J.M. Roberts, "Myth Versus History," *CBQ* 38(1976): 1-13 (at pp. 9-11). I would suggest that many of these public text-materials may have been available to the scribes who composed and/or transmitted the biblical prophetic texts and that many of the tropes found in these texts were familiar in wider learned circles.

[99] For the meaning and implications of this metaphor, see L.S. Fried, "Cyrus the Messiah? The Historical Background to Isaiah 45:1," *HTR* 95 (2002): 373-393 (at 374, 386). See also, J.A. Black, "The New Year Ceremonies in Ancient Babylon: 'Taking Bel by the Hand' and a Cultic Picnic," *Religion* 11(1981)1: 39-59; J.A. Bidmead, *The Akitu Festival: Religious Continuity and Royal Legitimation in Mesopotamia*. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2002 (Diss. Vanderbilt University, 2002): 2.

[100] On Cyrus, see R.L.Braun, "Cyrus in Second and Third Isaiah, Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah," *The Chronicler as Theologian; Essays in Honor of Ralph W. Klein.* M.P. Graham, S.L. McKenzie & G.N. Knoppers, eds. London: T & T Clark, 2003: 146-164.

[101] W.E. Lemke, "Nebuchadrezzar, My Servant," *CBQ* 28(1966): 45-50 (cf. p. 46). This is in fact one of the arguments that Lemke adduces to prove that the three cases in the MT of Jeremiah (*'abdi* in 27:6, and further 25:9 and 43:10) that describe Nebuchadnezzar as an *'ebed* of God originate from a scribal error as neither are found in the LXX. The fact that the Babylonian king is described in the Book

observation that Nebuchadnezzar was most likely quite oblivious as to his appointment by (from his perspective) a foreign deity. Yet, in Dan. 2:47, Nebuchadnezzar at least realizes that this deity is a very great and mighty God, which would still not preclude him from honoring his own gods, of course. The lofty designation for both Nebuchadnezzar in Jeremiah and Cyrus, in Isaiah, need not raise any question marks: these passages do not purport to give an accurate historical account, but interpret certain events – and, in fact, Is. 45:4 quite dryly takes this into account when stating: "For the sake of Jacob My servant, and Israel My elect, I have called you by your name, I have surnamed you, *though you did not know Me*." [102] These passages form, so to say, a theological-political interpretation of the events presented in a narrative format. They have a rhetorical function to explain what happened to an audience to which the notion of the God of Israel who intervenes in history is relevant. It is not aimed at any foreign circle. A number of the themes discussed here are also reflected in the Book of Daniel.

Of the foreign kings mentioned in Daniel only two, Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus, are in fact historical. These two monarchs occupy the beginning and the end of the narrative time frame of the Book of Daniel. Also, although Belshazar, granted, is a historical

---

of Daniel as coming to an acceptance of the God of Israel as the true force in the universe would then have persuaded a later scribe to leave the botched passages in a secondary redactional layer of the Jeremiah text. With this, Lemke hopes to smooth out that which other commentators would have seen as an inconsistency by the author of Jeremiah in applying the title of "servant of the Lord" to a non-believer (p. 50). He thinks it odd that this title, which assumes a total submission to the deity that bestows the title, would have been applied to a non-believer. However, the submission that Lemke describes is well known to have existed between the gods of Babylon and their servants, the kings of Babylon as is evidenced by royal inscriptions. His conclusions are challenged by Th.W. Overholt, "King Nebuchadnezzar in the Jeremiah Tradition," *CBQ* 30(1968): 39-48. For the purpose of this study, however, it is sufficient to conclude that there is a definitive relationship between the Jeremiah portrait of Nebuchadnezzar and that painted in Daniel. See also K.A.D. Smelik, "Mijn knecht Nebukadnessar in het Boek Jeremiah: een provocatie aan de lezer," *Amsterdamse Cahiers* 16(1997): 44-59, who, after analyzing all the previous theories, does not think that the portrayal of Nebuchadnezzar in the Book of Daniel is informed by the passages in Jeremiah but that they form an independent and internal theological argument directed at the original audience of those passages. It is used as a lesson for the people who have not heeded the instructions of the earlier leaders who are also designated as *'ebed* of the Lord (Moses, some of the prophets, etc.). Now, as the ultimate inversion, a foreign king is so designated in an attempt to have the people finally hear. If so, then messages of hope, as in Ezek. 37:24 which promises a future Davidic king (*'abdi David*) who, as shepherd and servant of the Lord, will once more rule over the people (54-58).

[102] Although in Ezra 1:1-4 and in 2 Chron. 36:22-23 Cyrus has come to the realization that his might and success derived from the God of Israel.

figure, he was neither the son of Nebuchadnezzar nor was he ever king. He was, however, the son of the last Neo-Babylonian king, Nabonidus, and was acting-regent for a number of years. Darius the Mede is, at best, a composite fictional figure. Having said this, though, in view of the narrative techniques and purposes of Daniel none of the royal portraits reflect actual history. Nebuchadnezzar combines characteristics of his historical counterpart with those of Nabonidus, as does Belshazar. Similarly, Darius the Mede combines aspects of Nabonidus as well as Cyrus and the much later Darius I. [103] Ultimately, most of these monarchs represent a composite identity of the Seleucid King Antiochus IV. [104] In order to understand Daniel's view on kingship and its ultimate purpose, therefore, a brief excursus into the background of its imagery follows below.

4.2.3   Kingship in the Ancient Near East

The origin of kingship in the ancient Near East is lost in the hoary mythical past. The ancient stories that have been recovered from Mesopotamia tell of the gods who created people to work for them, rulers to keep the people in check, and cities for all to live in. The primeval connection between the creation of cities and kings is very strong and one cannot be understood apart from the other. In principle, each city had its own god and its

---

[103] On plausible connections between Darius 'the Mede' and Cyrus, see B.E. Colless, "Cyrus the Persian as Darius the Mede in the Book of Daniel," *JSOT* (1992)56: 113-126 and a rejoinder by J.W. Wesselius, "'De steen die door de tempelbouwers...'; een beschouwing over de leeftijd van Darius de Meder in Daniël 6:1," *Een boek heeft een rug; studies voor Ferenc Postma op het grensgebied van theologie, bibliofilie en universiteitsgeschiedenis, ter gelegenheid van zijn vijftigste verjaardag.* Red.: Margriet Gosker. Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1995: 221-224. Aside from the obvious connection that both the historical Cyrus and fictional Darius overthrow relatively quietly the last Neo-Babylonian king, Wesselius notes the enigmatic opening verse of ch. 6 with the seemingly superfluous information of Darius being about 62 years of age. Some calculation from data supplied by Herodotus informs us that this is also the age of Cyrus upon ascending to the throne of Babylonia. But be that what it may, and there is no reason to question it since it all concerns educated assumptions, another one can be added to link Darius also with Nabonidus, in view of the fact that all the kings who act in the narrative in one way or another stand in for this king. Nabonidus, too, upon his ascension to the throne was over sixty years old. He, too, was someone who "came from nowhere" and he would not beget a dynasty of his own.

[104] See on the multiple narrative identities of the kings in Daniel, C. Sulzbach, "Nebuchadnezzar in Eden? Daniel 4 and Ezekiel 28," *Stimulation from Leiden. Collected Communications to the XVIIIth Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament, Leiden 2004.* H.M. Niemann & M. Augustin, eds. Frankfurt a/Main: Peter Lang Verlag, 2006: 125-136, esp. 131-136. See further under Section 5.3.

own king. [105] Within the cities a central space was reserved for the temple in which a particular city's patron deity would take up residence, symbolized by his or her cult statue. The king, acting as the god's representative on earth, had complex ritual duties aside from those normally associated with political rank. [106] Although the king was thought as being very close to the gods, he himself (aside from a very few exceptions) was not typically deified. [107] Many of the traits associated with kingship in mythology proved very tenacious, long-lived, and easily transferrable to successive rules. [108] The eventual absorption of the city states into larger empires did not fundamentally change this relationship.

Scholars interested in the biblical occurrence of kingdom and kingship have pointed out the relationship between the ways this imagery functions in the biblical texts *vis-à-vis* the ancient Near Eastern concept of kingdom and kingship. Whether the line of influence can be traced to pre-exilic times, reflecting the appearance of the concept in, for instance, the Pentateuch and in Judges, depends on one's opinions concerning the date of composition for these books. It has also been suggested that the influence dates only to exilic times, including the mention in Exodus. Whether one or the other, is not really relevant for the situation in Daniel and this issue will therefore not be discussed here. What is relevant, however, is that the concept, as is portrayed in Daniel, has deep connections with the Mesopotamian model.

Despite the fact that in a wide array of Mesopotamian myths the cities and kingship were created at the same time, there are also indications that this had not always been

---

[105] J.J. Finkelstein, "The Antediluvian Kings: a University of California Tablet," *JCS* 17(1963): 39-51; W.W. Hallo, "Beginning and End of the Sumerian King List in the Nippur Recension," *JCS* 17(1963): 52-57*; W*.W. Hallo, "Antediluvian Cities," *JCS* 23(1970): 57-67 (esp. p. 61); P. Michalowski, "History as Charter: Some Observations on the Sumerian King List," *JAOS* 103(1983)1: 237-248.

[106] See e.g., J.N. Postgate, "Royal Ideology and State Administration in Sumer and Akkad," *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*. J.M. Sasson, ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2000 [1995]: 395-411.

[107] P. Michalowski, "The Mortal Kings of Ur: A Short Century of Divine Rule in Ancient Mesopotamia," *Religion and Power: Divine Kingship in the Ancient World and Beyond*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago [Oriental Institute Seminars 4], 2008: 33-46.

[108] B. Lincoln, "The Role of Religion in Achaemenian Imperialism," *Religion and Power*: 221-242.

the case. For instance, there are precedents in very ancient Sumerian thinking where the cities were created by the gods, whom themselves were the actual rulers of these cities with only a human representative or overseer in place. This person was clearly not considered a 'king' in his own right, as the nomenclature evidently indicates. [109] Only much later does this gradually change.

As indicated above, in the ancient Near East, going back all the way to Sumerian tradition, the monarchy was seen as having originated with the gods, the human king being a direct divine appointee. Even though in dynastic rule in principle the firstborn is the heir to the throne, he too needed the approval of the gods. This was accomplished through intricate coronation ceremonies. Although the king ruled supreme, he was accountable to the gods whose interests were represented by the priesthood and temple functionaries. On each New Year's festival (*akitu*) the king was reminded ceremoniously that he was "a humble servant of the gods." In this capacity "he was responsible for the nourishment of the gods… he was responsible for the 'shepherding' of the people …and … he had to administer justice to all," making him caretaker of the gods, provider, shepherd and judge. [110] In this capacity he got to share in the sovereign rule of the king of the gods. Dale Launderville describes the process this way: "the king of the gods commissions the earthly king to rule over a people who belong to the king of the gods; the earthly king accepts and thereby takes responsibility for the well-being of the people." [111] The most common metaphor to describe this triadic relationship is that of the owner of the flock (king of the gods/God), the shepherd (the earthly king), and the flock of sheep (the people). [112] That in ancient Israel these royal titles shifted back

---

[109] D. Launderville, "Anti-Monarchical Ideology in Israel in Light of Mesopotamian Parallels," *Imagery and Imagination in Biblical Literature; Essays in Honor of Aloysius Fitzgerald*. L. Boadt and M.S. Smith, eds. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2001: 119-128

[110] A.K. Grayson, "Mesopotamia," *ABD IV*, New York: Doubleday, 1992: 767. On this aspect of the Akitu festival, see J. Bidmead, *The Akitu Festival: Religious Continuity and Royal Legitimation in Mesopotamia*, pp. 82, 93 ff.

[111] D. Launderville, *Piety and Politics: The Dynamics of Royal Authority in Homeric Greece, Biblical Israel, and Old Babylonian Mesopotamia*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003: 25.

[112] In the *Animal Apocalypse* (*1 Enoch*), this metaphor is exploited to the extreme, with the foreign kings symbolized by angelic beings who act as wicked shepherds in charge of a helpless and straying flock.

and forth between the earthly king and God is evidenced in the following examples: king (Ps. 95:3), shepherd (Gen. 48:15, 49:24, Isa. 40:11, Jer. 23:1-6, Ps. 23:1; Ps. 80:1), [113] and judge (Gen. 18:25). Nebuchadnezzar II is also known to have referred to himself in similar terms in his building inscriptions. Some striking examples being: "Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, the humble one, the submissive one, the pious one, the worshiper of the lord of lords, the caretaker of Esagil and Ezida…"; "when Marduk, the great lord, the wisest among the gods, the proud one, gave me the shepherdship of the country and the people…"; and "Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, the loyal shepherd, the one permanently selected by Marduk…" [114] This concept was also part and parcel of Achaemenid royal ideology and is clearly depicted and described in the architecture commissioned by Darius the Great. In it he praises repeatedly 'the Wise Lord' [= Ahura Mazda], the greatest of all the gods, who created the sky and the earth and the people. Most importantly, he made Darius king over the earth, king of many kings, etc. [115] Needless to say, Daniel takes a very strong parodic stance when he persistently points out that it is his God who dispenses kingship or takes it away.

4.2.4 Kingship in the Hebrew Bible

The biblical version of the origin of kingship contrasts sharply with what was depicted above. Apart from the disconnect with the origin of the city, it did not occur in the mythological past but rather in the historical part of the biblical narrative. In contrast

---

[113] The most poignant display of the shepherd motif is likely to be found in chapter 34 of Ezekiel, which exhibits every aspect of the metaphor: God as owner of the flock, but also as the ultimate shepherd when the appointed shepherds fail. For a useful overview of the development of the motif in its biblical and Ancient Near Eastern context, see B.A. Fikes, "A Theological Analysis of the Shepherd-King Motif in Ezekiel 34," Diss. Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Texas, 1995.

[114] W.W. Hallo and K.L. Younger Jr., eds. *The Context of Scripture: Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World. Vol. II.* Leiden: Brill, 2003: 309. The designation of divinely favored shepherd was not restricted to the Neo-Babylonian kings. It was widely in use among the Assyrian predecessors as well. E.g., Sennacherib described himself variously as "pious shepherd, fearful of the great gods" to "expert shepherd, favorite of the great gods." See, J.M. Russell, *Sennacherib's Palace without a Rival at Niniveh*, Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1991: 242.

[115] B. Lincoln, "The Role of Religion in Achaemenian Imperialism," *Religion and Power*, 224-225, 228.

to the traditions of the surrounding cultures, kingship was only reluctantly bestowed by God onto a human being and, what is even more astounding, in response to the people's request. In Israel's historical narrative the people, who until that time had been ruled by judges, clamored for a king "just like the other people had."[116]

In the Hebrew Bible, the monarchy is treated in a variety of ways and, where it concerns a human king, most often not necessarily in a very positive manner. The biblical position is ambivalent at best. This may seem strange at first sight, especially in view of the fact that during most of the history of an independent Israel, followed by a separated Israel and Judah, and later yet Judea, these lands were ruled by kings. Despite this highly critical outlook, an image of ideal kingship emerged in Israel connected with the Davidic dynasty. However, very few kings were able to live up to the ideal and were actually remembered for this. The more realistic picture was that much like the dynastic strife seen in the surrounding empires and kingdoms, Israel's royal houses were plagued by infighting, murder, usurpation, injustice and other vicissitudes. It seems that the basest expectations that Samuel had warned about (I Sam. 8:11-17), were coming true.

An alternative form of kingship found in the Hebrew Bible (Exod. 19:6) is the concept that Israel be a kingdom of priests [ממלכת כהנים] and a holy nation. This seems to go against the grain of a monarchy as traditionally conceived. It also flies in the face of the strictly ranked hereditary priestly classes in Israel's society. Ultimately, it is exactly this concept that would prove to be one of the currents that motivated the budding sectarians of the Second Temple period.[117] This period saw widespread conflicts between various priestly factions over questions as to who was in charge of the Temple, issues of purity, and calendation.

---

[116] This request is reported in I Sam. 8:4-10 and God's response (11-17) lists all the negative and oppressive actions that the people may expect from royal rule. He warns that the people will come to complain about the injustices perpetrated in the name of the monarchy, but in that day God will not hear them.

[117] M. Himmelfarb, "A Kingdom of Priests: The Democratizing of the Priesthood in the Literature of Second Temple Judaism," *JJTP* 6(1997)1: 89-104.

There is a real question as to whether the biblical narrative actually presupposes the kingship of God. It has been noted that clear references to this concept are wanting, in particular for the Pentateuch and the historical books. [118] This applies to the period before the monarchy was instituted, but also thereafter. [119] Yet, the notion should not be dismissed out of hand. At best, the king of Israel was a co-regent, a junior ruler on behalf of God. He could be designated '(adopted) son of God', [120] 'shepherd', [121] or 'servant of God'. [122] Ultimately, the covenant that was cemented between God and the people at Sinai remained in force and the king was equally subject to this arrangement. God remained the ultimate judge, and when the necessity arose, also acted as commander-in-chief. [123] But there is also another way to understand God's kingship, and that is as head of the heavenly household. Ancient Near Eastern religion displays a pantheon with at its head a "king of the gods" but even in Israelite religion God shares the heavenly realm with the members (although inferior) of His council. M. Tsevat distinguishes between the two aspects of God's kingship and suggests that the latter (mythological) meaning, "is found primarily in the Psalms; elsewhere its occurrence is

---

[118] See also note 97, above. On the pervasiveness of the Kingdom of God, see D. Patrick, "The Kingdom of God in the Old Testament," *The Kingdom of God in 20th-Century Interpretation*. W. Willis, ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1987: 67-80. Since the author uses Jesus' proclamation of the Kingdom of God in the New Testament to test the presence of the concept in the Old Testament, he contradicts himself by concluding that it is more prevalent than he states at the outset of this article. Nevertheless, his earlier observations are correct as to the paucity of the actual concept. In other words, as it becomes much more clearly defined in later strata of the biblical text, it is telescoped back and becomes much more implied in the earlier strata. See further M.J. Selman, "The Kingdom of God in the Old Testament," *TynBul* 40(1989): 161-183. He notes the difficulty that seems to exist in the paucity of clear lexical references to the Kingdom of God or of Heaven. However, in his conclusions (181-182) he is quite clear about the wide distribution of the idea.

[119] The Books of Judges and I Samuel record the transition from a tribal society to a unified monarchy as well as a discussion on the merits and demerits of both kinds of society.

[120] 2 Sam. 7:14.

[121] As designation for David, 2 Sam. 5:2 and 1 Chron. 11:2; Ezek. 34:23, 37:24.

[122] These same titles of 'judge' and 'servant', indicating hierarchy, are also found in Ugaritic texts. In the Baal Cycle they are used to describe the relationship between senior and junior deities. Similarly, it is the king of the Ugaritic pantheon, El, who allocates dominion at his desire to those under him. See M. Smith, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle. Volume 1*. Leiden: Brill, 1994: 59. The appellation עבד (servant, slave, vassal) for the first and the last of the Davidic dynasty, David and Zerubbabel, is very telling, especially the very powerful statement with regard to Zerubbabel in Hag 2:23. However, for the other kings it must be considered as implied since the function of shepherd and servant under the tutelage of divine rule coincide.

[123] See some of D. Patrick's remarks in, "The Kingdom of God in the Old Testament," pp. 74-75.

sporadic or uncertain. [124] In most of the Hagiographa neither usage is found." But, curiously, he leaves out the entire category of apocalyptic texts, which clearly display this latter notion. [125]

4.2.5 Kingship in the Book of Daniel: From Human Monarchy to Heavenly Kingdom

As was demonstrated above, the two foreign monarchs Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus, who frame the earthly narrative in Daniel, form the crux for understanding the dynamics of monarchy in the book. The former seems to act with divine fiat when destroying the first temple and removing its precious cult vessels, [126] and the latter when he restores those vessels to their rightful place and grants permission for the rebuilding of the Temple.[127] However, that fact is curiously not mentioned in Daniel and neither is his edict for the people's return, although these themes are the focal issue in many earlier prophetic texts and the books of Ezra and Nehemiah. Yet, these facts need to be assumed – and were known to the author/editor - in order for the latter half of Daniel to make sense. Seen in this light, the problem of why an earthly monarch (and a foreign one to boot) could have been responsible for the restoration of the Temple, seems to be resolved. Since it is explained that he acted through the will of God, he only becomes an agent carrying out the divine will. In this way, the Second Temple too, becomes sanctioned by God. This underscores once again, as Dale Launderville phrases it, the real "chain of command" in which, "[r]oyal authority belonged to God or the gods. The king exercised it on their

---

[124] "King, God as" in *IDB Suppl. Vol.,* Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1976: 515.

[125] On the concept of "God as king" originating in ancient Canaanite religion, see H.-J. Fabry, "Melek," *TDOT* 8, 1997: 366-367. But, see also Launderville on the Sumerian gods acting as kings of their cities (fn 109, above).

[126] The biting condemnation that is launched later on in Jeremiah's Oracle against Babylon (ch. 51) possibly responds to the period following Nebuchadnezzar's second siege of Jerusalem in 587 BCE during which the Temple and the city were destroyed whereas vis-à-vis the relatively benign events of 597 BCE where he was still considered to be manageable.

[127] On these events, see Ezra 1:2-4; 6:3-5.

behalf. It was given in trust, and eventually the king was called to account for its exercise." [128]

From the above understanding of the divine as the ultimate supreme royal power as well as the subsequent logical deduction that kings rule kingdoms it is but a small step to the concept of a 'Kingdom of God' or a 'Kingdom of Heaven'. From the previous analysis and cited sources it becomes clear that an obvious tension, if not friction, exists between the institutions of divine rule and its earthly representative. [129] Therefore, it also follows that in the wake of the destruction of the structure that upheld the cosmic (and therefore social and political) balance, the yearning for and expectation of a Kingdom of God or of Heaven is a response to the failed or absent earthly kingship. [130]

Dennis Duling observes at the outset of his lengthy treatment of the Kingdom of God or of Heaven that this concept is still mainly understood as signifying rule, reign or sovereignty rather than kingdom. Yet, the connotation of it being a "spatial, territorial, political, or national" entity has been gaining ground since the late 1970's. [131] However, such understanding is only a step on the way to a full spatial interpretation of the texts in which the Kingdom or Kingdom-related terminology occur. In fact, Duling himself already turns into this direction (without actually identifying it as such) when he writes about the use of the concept in pseudepigraphic and apocalyptic texts:

---

[128] Launderville, *Piety and Politics,* p. 344.

[129] As is also suggested by D.C. Duling, "Kingdom of God, Kingdom of Heaven," *ABD IV,* 50(b).

[130] This would be adding another category to the socio-political typecasting of J.J. Collins' "three different modalities of expectation" in his, "Temporality and Politics in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature," *Apocalyptic in History and Tradition*. Chr. Rowland & J. Barton, eds. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002: 26-43. He distinguishes between the "triumphalism of imperial power regarded as the fulfillment of history; the deferred eschatology of those who look for an eventual utopia but are submissive to the current powers for the present; and the revolutionary perspective of radical, imminent expectation in the ancient Jewish and early Christian apocalypses," (p. 29). While not incorrect, this division does not quite answer the question of the prime cause for this way of thinking (when, if he contends, also correctly, that deprivation alone does not explain the phenomenon fully) and which could be seen as underlying all three categories: only an absent or failed political monarchy can create the need for another and better one.

[131] Duling, "Kingdom of God, Kingdom of Heaven," *ABD IV*, 50(a).

It should be noted that there is a social significance to the Kingdom references in this literature. The major theme is the ultimate vindication of the persecuted "elect" against the powerful; and mighty kingdoms of the world. These "elect" represent the perceived negative social experience ("alienation," "anomie"), if not the actual persecution, of marginal groups/sects. [132]

This is very much in line with the way many spatial theorists of the 1990's and 2000's are reading these selfsame texts. Admittedly, many of the current studies on Kingdom, in light of spatial theory, pertain to its occurrence in the New Testament. The most obvious reason for this is the fact that in the New Testament texts the concept has become full blown in a messianic context whereas in the Hebrew Bible, the Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha, one is hard pressed to even find the actual terms, although it is certainly implied. [133] Already in 1962 George E. Ladd asked a pertinent question: the kingdom of God – reign or realm? [134] His study is mainly concerned with the New Testament occurrences, and was written before the great advances of spatial theory in literary and biblical studies. Yet, he anticipated a number of issues that would be reinterpreted in current studies of the theme and can also be taken into consideration when looking at the later texts of the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple literature. In his text analyses, Ladd seeks to determine whether the formula is used to describe a 'reign' or a 'realm' – as the title of his essay indicates. In other words, are we dealing with a spatial concept, an ontological, or a temporal event. He further explores whether the manifestation of that Kingdom entails human or divine initiative and whether it is an individual or collective event.

In order to understand the concepts of 'earthly kingdom' and 'heavenly Kingdom' in a spatial manner, it is important to keep in mind how the world was imagined in the ancient Near East. It consisted, as pointed out above, of the world in which humans

---

[132] Duling, "Kingdom of God, Kingdom of Heaven," *ABD IV*, 52(a).

[133] Note the fact that the entry on Kingdom of God/Heaven in Hebrew Bible, extra-biblical literature, Dead Sea Scrolls, and Rabbinic literature, combined, only make up 13 columns in the *ABD* and the New Testament and early Christian literature a full 23. For the earlier *IDB*, the ratio is 7 to 11.

[134] G.E. Ladd, "The Kingdom of God – Reign or Realm?," *JBL* 81(1962): 230-238.

function, the underworld where the dead and the shadows reside in addition to a number of chthonic deities, and the heavens above the visible sky, which is the realm of the divine. The heavenly deities would interact with the human world (which they had created). It is thus important to distinguish between the present divine Kingdom (the heavenly realm) and that which will transform the human world in the future. The eschatological Kingdom will either consist of this transformed human society and physical earth or will be a fusing of the earthly and heavenly realms, creating a continuum in which the respective differences would dissolve.

Although the netherworld, as the lower part of the ancient tripartite cosmos, is under-represented in Daniel, [135] the other strata of this ancient three-storey cosmos, earth and heaven, are well represented. The text offers a view of how what happens in the earthly sphere is directly dependent on the machinations in the heavenly sphere, and how sometimes the movement from the upper realm to the lower is reversed by allowing an elect human a peek into the heavenly realm. The seer is not only confronted with a reversal of the usual spatial conventions to which he is accustomed, the restrictions of linear time are lifted as well, and he is made party to glimpses of the future. In Daniel, this future is very much concerned with a restored social order under the direct rule of God and His chosen worthy ones. Even though, as in the rest of the Hebrew Bible, the actual term 'Kingdom of God' or 'Kingdom of Heaven' does not occur, it is clearly implied and some terminological references come close. [136] Further, many of the more general categories emerging from the later literature (as in the New Testament and in Rabbinic texts) that define the nature of this 'kingdom' [137] are likewise implied in Daniel's version of the divine eschatological rule.

---

[135] See for this aspect, chapter 3, Danielic Spaces.

[136] As in 4:34 where Nebuchadnezzar is prompted to praise the King of Heaven (מלך שמיא).

[137] Such as: earthly/heavenly; imminent/future; individual/collective; spatial/spiritual. The only lengthy treatment of the Kingdom of God/Heaven in Rabbinic literature, to my knowledge, is found in S. Schechter, *Aspects of Rabbinic Theology. Major Concepts of the Talmud*. New York: Schocken, 1961 (reprint of the 1909 edition): 65-115. The treatment in Christian sources is manifold, but see, e.g., some of the categories discussed in G.R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Kingdom of God.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986. Further also, B. Chilton, "The Kingdom of God in Recent Discussion," *Studying the Historical Jesus. Evaluations of the State of Current Research.* B. Chilton & C.A. Evans, eds. Leiden: Brill, 1994: 255-280.

In a recent study, C.L. Seow notes, with agreement, the common opinion that, "the theme of the rule of God dominates the book of Daniel as it does nowhere else in the Old Testament." [138] He bases this notion on the frequent occurrence of the Aramaic and Hebrew terms for 'kingdom', 'power', and the like. Winfried Vogel, similarly, tries to relate most occurrences of the word for 'king' and 'kingdom' to God and the heavenly kingdom. He suggests: "Considering the large number of 261 occurrences of the root מלך for 'king', 'kingdom', or 'reign' in the book of Daniel, it is not difficult to recognize that 'the theme that is central to Daniel as it is to no other book in the OT is the kingdom of God,' and is indeed 'a tenet of faith which is of key importance in Daniel.' Since all chapters of the book except the last one contain references to kings and kingdom, it is obvious that this theme cuts across all perceived literary bounderies [sic] of the work." [139]

It seems that the conclusion drawn from the number and distribution of the occurrences of this particular root is too much informed by preconceived notions as to the nature of the entire text. My own, manual count of the root confirmed the total of 261 but I divide them up somewhat differently. An examination of the contexts of these occurrences yields the following result:

- מלכו /מלכות occurs 71 times; of which 52 times in a strictly political sense, 15 times with regard to the divine kingdom and 4 times in an ambiguous sense as God ruling in the kingdom of men.
- of this מזרע המלוכה (of the royal seed, 1:3) once and [לבית מלכו and היכל מלכותא] (terms for palace) each once.

---

[138] C.L. Seow, "The Rule of God in the Book of Daniel," *David and Zion; Biblical Studies in Honor of J.J.M. Roberts*. B.F. Batto and K. L. Roberts (eds.). Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004: 219-246.

[139] W. Vogel, "The Cultic Motif in Space and Time in the Book of Daniel," (1999): 308-309. His total of 261 comprises 192 for king(s) and 57 for kingdom, and 12 for reign or realm. He reached this count through the use of "the computerized Bible Works concordance." (308, fn 1). It should be noted here that the electronic concordances of Logos and Accordance yield a total of 190 and 194 respectively for the occurrence of מלך.

- מלך / מלכים occurs 190 times of which only 1 (4:34) refers to God (King of Heaven - מלך שמיא). מלכתא (queen) occurs twice.

- To this should also be added the Aramaic term שלטן and derivatives, indicating reign and occurring 28 times (of which 7 refer to the heavenly reign; 3 additional occurrences are not relevant). The Hebrew cognate root משל occurs 7 times.

From these results it cannot be inferred that the heavenly kingdom or the rule of God represent the predominant sense in which the root occurs in Daniel. It is only in a minority of occurrences that this can clearly be stated. It should also be emphasized that one of the most pervasive themes in the Hebrew Bible, incidentally, is the notion that God is the creator and owner of the world [140] and that He gives or takes away lands to and from whom He pleases. [141] In this way Daniel is therefore not much different from other texts in the Hebrew Bible. Nevertheless, it should be pointed out that the nature of particular narratives may differ, as do the historical circumstances that form their backdrop.

How then does the notion of the Kingdom of Heaven appear in Daniel? And how does it relate to the other Danielic spaces? In the first six chapters, most of the references to kings and kingdom, whether earthly or heavenly, are located in real space. This also applies to the relatively short dream accounts in chapters 2 and 4 and, what may be called celestial intrusion, in chapters 3 and 6 where mention is made of the heavenly beings that safeguard the three companions in the furnace and Daniel in the lion's den. In this category would also belong Daniel's communication with the divine through prayer, following which he receives information concerning the dreams. Most of the events in the last six chapters, however, except for their respective introductory lines

---

[140] For instance, in Gen. 14:19, 22, the unusual phrase [אל עליון קנה שמים וארץ] occurs, which is customarily translated as, "God Most High, Creator of Heaven and Earth." However, the principle meaning of the verb קנ"ה, i.e., acquiring ownership of something, gets lost in translation. A better translation would thus be, "God Most High, Owner of Heaven and Earth." See *HALOT* 3:1111-1113 for discussion. A passage like Exod, 19:5 also bears this out: "you shall be My own treasure from among all peoples; for all the earth is Mine [כי-לי כל-הארץ]."

[141] The land promise to the Patriarchs is the first case that comes to mind (cf. Gen. 16:18-21 and 17:8). Further, e.g., Deut. 11:21-25, which reiterates that promise, but adds to it that if the Israelites keep their part of the covenant, they will possess many nations and God will drive other nations out of these lands. Also, Exod. 34:11-24 and Deut. 7:1-2.

indicating the king and year of his reign in which the vision occurs, take place in other-worldly visionary or dream space. Between the two sections of the book, a shift of focus can be observed. In the court tales, the narrative point of view is generated from an earthly monarchical reality, using the promise (or threat, depending on the perspective) of a heavenly or final kingdom as something that will take place in the future. Yet, there is a tendency to recognize that the earthly monarchs, with all their faults, can still have a role to play as long as they repent and dispense justice. However, the warnings are not heeded and their fate, slowly but surely, becomes sealed. In the vision accounts, the focus has completely turned around. The narrative perspective is now from the ever present heavenly kingdom, looking down on the earthly kingdoms that are destined to perish. The original readers are here also introduced to some of the players in this heavenly stage production and find that they, too, will play a part in the coming events.

Seow is correct in stressing the relationship between the everlasting kingdom that is initiated by the stone in chapter 2, and the everlasting kingdom that is given in perpetuity to the one like a human being in chapter 7. [142] Indeed, the language describing those kingdoms is very similar with both following the destruction of four earthly kingdoms. He also points to a very interesting possible line of influence from Ugarit. In the Baal Cycle (KTU 1.2.IV), in the midst of a struggle in the pantheon that is slightly reminiscent of what Daniel observes in the heavenly scene, Baal is involved in a battle with the sea god Yamm, who had earlier received dominion from El. Baal succeeds in wresting it from him and he is wished (l. 10): "may you take your eternal kingship, your everlasting dominion." The wording is remarkably similar to the occurrences in Daniel. But, while interesting for determining sources for certain imagery, it does not help to clarify the issues of kingdom in Daniel. However, there is another very salient passage, closer to Daniel in milieu and text corpus: Nathan's prophecy to David in 2 Sam. 7:10-16 (and with a slight twist, the parallel text of 1

---

[142] C.L. Seow, "The Rule of God in the Book of Daniel," 245-246. For text, translation and discussion, see M. Smith, *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle*, 1994: 322 and especially E.Th. Mullen, *The Assembly of the Gods. The Divine Council in Canaanite and Early Hebrew Literature*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980: 54-59.

Chron. 17:11-14). [143] The two central themes of these passages concern the building of the temple and the everlasting duration of the Davidic dynasty. [144] The possible relationship between the everlasting kingdom in chapters 2 and 7 of Daniel, and the one promised in 2 Samuel/1 Chronicles has, to my knowledge, not been noted by commentators. However it could shed much light on the question as to the nature of the predicted kingdom in Daniel and add to the understanding of the concerns, such as a destroyed or threatened temple, and of the group behind the final edition of the text. It is quite surprising that J. Selman would conclude, following his careful analysis of the Kingdom of God in 2 Samuel and 1 Chronicles in light of temple and Davidic dynasty, that "[a] somewhat different view of the kingdom of God emerges from the book of Daniel. Although, as in the case of Chronicles, it is a major theme of the book, there is no association with the temple or the Davidic monarchy." [145] Even though he makes a weak connection between the portrayal of the son of man figure in chapter 7 and that of Solomon in Chronicles, he shies away altogether from drawing any conclusions from that comparison. [146] I would therefore suggest reading two points in

---

[143] M.J. Selman, "The Kingdom of God in the Old Testament," 1989: 164.

[144] See W.M. Schniedewind's discussion of the Samuel passage in his *Society and the Promise to David. The Reception History of 2 Samuel 7:1-17*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999

[145] M.J. Selman, "The Kingdom of God in the Old Testament," 171. He cites here (fn. 20) as well J. Goldingay, *Daniel* (1989: 33), who writes, "The theme that is central to Daniel as it is to no other book in the OT is the kingdom of God."

[146] *Ibid.*, 173. The similarity he sees between both instances amount to the son of man and the people of the holy ones in Daniel receiving the kingdom and in Chronicles the people of "Israel recognizing Solomon's kingship and in contributing to the temple (1 Chr. 28-9)." The difference between the two, according to Selman, is that in his opinion "the son of man is not linked to the Davidic covenant, and that the kingdom is clearly eschatological." Since it comes after the destruction of the last kingdom, "it belongs to the future." However, this complete ignoring of the link between Davidic kingship and the notion of the Messiah may be unwarranted. Many later traditions flowing from and building on this image in Daniel have made this connection, the New Testament not in the last place. It is commonly accepted that ideal kingship in Israelite and later Jewish thought was modeled on David and his son Solomon. Their kingship was directly sanctioned by God. Any subsequent hope for a restored monarchy included this image. The failure for this monarchy to materialize did not dim the hopes for it, but rather cosmicized it. Granted, the majority of scholars do not see a reference to a future restored Davidic kingship in this passage (or in Daniel altogether, for that matter). Yet, there may be more to it than a superficial reading leads on and royal imagery is certainly present. Since the figure of the one like a human being receives the kingship, he clearly gets to reign a kingdom. He is a cosmic, heavenly, yet humanlike being (from the observation of Daniel). The memory of the last Davidic kings was already dim and any image of a David *redivivus* was highly idealized. Within this same passage the people of the holy ones of the Most High [עם קדישי עליונין] likewise receive dominion. Perhaps this may

Selman's general conclusions together when applying it to the Book of Daniel. [147] He writes:

> (iii) Probably because the kingdom of God is not a separate theological entity, its nature cannot be expressed in a single thought. It has two main manifestations, a universal kingdom that encompasses the heavens as well as all the nations of the earth, and a more specific version in Israel centred on Zion. The kingdom of God is often in direct opposition to all earthly kingdoms, and will ultimately replace all other kingdoms.
>
> (iv) Within Israel, the kingdom of God is associated with the nation from the beginning… It was particularly visible in institutions associated with the Davidic covenant, that is, the Davidic monarchy and the Jerusalem temple.

It appears that the framers of Daniel struggled with both concepts, which seem to exclude each other. However, it should not be ruled out that what is often thought to be 'universalistic' in that it is inclusive of all nations on earth, in truth refers to one great nation under the God of Israel. [148] In this context belong also the earlier prophetic references that in the ideal future the nations will throng to Jerusalem to pay homage to God in the Jerusalem Temple. With regard to Daniel 7, David Aune writes rather bluntly, "Daniel 7 is concerned primarily with the oppression experienced by Judaeans living in

---

be connected to the passage in Exod. 19:6 where God tells the Israelites who are assembled at Mount Sinai, "you shall be to Me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation [ממלכת כהנים וגוי קדוש]."

J.J. Collins is one of the strongest opponents to seeing the idea of a restored Davidic monarchy before the first century BCE and as a related messianic reference for Daniel's 'one like a human being' in particular. See his *Daniel* (1993): 308-310. He writes (309), "The decisive objection against the messianic interpretation is that nowhere in the book do we find either support for or interest in the Davidic monarchy. … Since the figure in Daniel 7 is not called a messiah (unlike his counterpart in the *Similitudes of Enoch*) and there is no identifiable reference in the book to the restoration of the Davidic line, the messianic interpretation must be regarded as unwarranted." He reiterates this position in his "Kingship in Deuteronomistic and Prophetic Literature," *King and Messiah as Son of God. Divine, Humanm and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature*. A.Y. Collins and J.J. Collins. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008: 25-47 (at pp. 45-46). See on the characteristics of David *redividus*, e.g., J. Tromp, "The Davidic Messiah in Jewish Escatology of the First Century BCE," *Restoration; Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*. J.M. Scott, ed. Leiden: Brill, 2001: 179-202. On Collins' approach, as well as that of others, to the question regarding when exactly the idea of a royal messiah arises and how this is reflected in the texts, see also A. Chester, *Messiah and Exaltation*. [WUNT 207] Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2007: 198-205.

[147] *Ibid.*, 183.

[148] To paraphrase a passage from the American Pledge of Allegiance.

Palestine under Ptolemaic and then Seleucid rule …, an oppression that the group which produced Daniel thought could be terminated only by divine intervention. Judaean national sovereignty will then be restored and, indeed, Judea will dominate all the kingdoms of the world." [149]

Of course, this still does not answer the question when this is supposed to happen, or even whether it is an earthly transformation or an all-consuming heavenly event. John Collins contributes to the discussion with his exploration of the connection between 'end(time)' and 'kingdom' in Daniel. [150] He suggests that there is indeed such a connection in the expectations expressed in the book. He sees this especially in chapters 8 and 9. Although he recognizes that for Daniel this implies a restoration of the cult, he also points out that the hope for "everlasting righteousness" (9:24), "suggests a more far-reaching transformation. There is no doubt, however, that the desecrated temple dominates both chaps. 8 and 9 and that its restoration was the primary focus of the author's hopes in these chapters." This is certainly correct. However, it is argued in this dissertation that this is the main theme that runs through the entire book. One can easily agree with Collins that Daniel seems to look beyond this moment, since most of the ideas expressed in chapter 12 deal with a more ultimate fate of the *maskilim* and with resurrection of the righteous. [151] This is no longer earthly reality, as it would be if the

---

[149] D.E. Aune and E. Stewart, "From the Idealized Past to the Imaginary Future: Eschatological Restoration in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature," *Restoration; Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*. J.M. Scott, ed. Leiden: Brill, 2001: 147-201 (at p. 152). It must be pointed out that caution is warranted when making statements as these. Unfortunately in the past, but also in the present, such statements were either generated from antisemitic circles or lead to extreme antisemitic expression. Nothing could be farther from this than this particular reading of Jewish eschatology. It simply is born out by the logic of the text. The context is a rivalry of hostile kingdoms, none of which is fit to rule in conjunction with the Divine. Only the people of Israel, as long as they faithfully adhere to God's commandments are able to bring this about. To this should also be added, that these notions only came about under intense oppression and experience of extreme political despair. It is therefore to be argued that this can only be read as the most passionate and forceful thirdspace expression of an oppressed group. Thus the replacement, suggested by Aune is that of a wicked imperialist power by the Israelite model under God as it was first designed to be.

[150] J.J. Collins, "The Meaning of 'the End' in the Book of Daniel," *Of Scribes and Scrolls. Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins* H.W. Attridge, J.J. Collins, & Th.H. Tobin, eds. Lanham: University Press of America, 1990: 91-98 (p. 94).

[151] However, this is closely tied up with Collins' suggestion that the last six chapters went through an internal evolution, being updated as events unfolded, the latter part of ch. 12 possibly even having been written after the rededication of the temple. Likewise, the various intricate but conflicting

reinstated cult were the ultimate purpose. With this we move into a heavenly, mythical or utopian space-time continuum. He makes a very important observation in this regard:

> From the viewpoint of the final editor, the removal of the desolating abomination and the restoration of the temple cult are preconditions of the end, but do not in themselves constitute the state of salvation. [152]

Yet, Daniel is not too clear on the location of the end. First of all, while it is certainly true that the restored cult and cult center are preconditions for the subsequent events to take place, that in itself does not relegate it to secondary importance. It will remain vital since it is not suggested that after the final scene of Daniel is realized, the temple and the cult will dissolve or be abolished. On the contrary, a functioning temple is a vital element not just in bringing about this new state but as a necessary ever-present and constant energy source, so to speak, on the earthly side of the scale. After all, there will still be people around at that time, in addition to which the righteous dead will be resurrected. It is the very special martyred ones, the group of people who fought the just war, who will become like the angels and shine as stars. This does not seem to be everyone's fate in Daniel. But even if a more extreme shift in realities is projected in chapter 12, a restored temple is not only vital to set the process in motion, it is also more than a passing stage.

Placing the kingdom references in Daniel into perspective, it may be argued that in light of the pressing issues of national and religious survival during the times in which the Book of Daniel found its final form (towards or shortly after the successful outcome of the Maccabean revolt), as with other texts from that period, any eschatological hope pertained directly to that outcome. This means that expression was given to the hope

---

time constructs for the expectation of 'the end' are to be seen as a result of this ongoing updating process. This sounds all very plausible. But the question arises, if the final editor kept updating his work in light of new developments, why would the actual demise of Antiochus as it did actually happen not have been adjusted? This could throw serious doubt on this hypothesis of the composition history of the vision accounts because if this datum was not picked up, why would it have been done with regard to the rededication of the temple (and incidentally - without mentioning this momentous event)?

[152] *Ibid.*, p. 97.

of a full restoration of especially the cult and (possibly Davidic) kingship [153] with resulting Jewish political autonomy in the Land of Israel. [154] The kingship would be modeled on the ideal relationship between divine and earthly ruler as was described in the early ancient Near Eastern texts as well as in the biblical sources where this relationship had been made applicable to Israelite religion. This implied a restored equilibrium between earthly and heavenly categories where rule and ruling space would once again be synchronized. In many Second Temple period texts this hope is expressed in terms of nostalgia. An ideal past is portrayed under the best (or an idealized type) of Israel's kings or even to a time prior to this. The term (ארץ)-הצבי [155] is found, besides in Daniel, uniquely in Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel to indicate this sense. In Ezek. 20:6, 15 it concerns a recollection of an even earlier ideal period, with Israel's God as sole ruler, namely that of the Exodus shortly before the entering of the Land, the unsurpassable beauty and fertility of which is described in flowering language. The word חמדה is used as a synonym and once in conjunction with צבי, to qualify the Land. [156]

---

[153] But see J.J. Collins, "Response: The Apocalyptic Worldview of Daniel," *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection.* [Proceedings of the Second Enoch Seminar, 2003]. G. Boccaccini (ed.) Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005: 62. In a discussion on the nature of the "son of man" figure in Daniel, Collins suggests that "Daniel expresses no interest in the line of David or in the restoration of the monarchy." He further explains that the reason Daniel used "son of man" rather than "son of God" for the heavenly figure who receives the kingdom in the vision of chapter 7, is exactly because of "the close association of the title with the Davidic kingship, an institution in which Daniel expresses no interest."

[154] W.D. Davies (*The Gospel and the Land. Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994 [repr. of 1974 ed. with new preface]) seems to be torn between two positions in his dealing with Daniel's relationship to the Land. On the one hand he writes: "When the coming Kingdom of God is described, after the destruction of the powers that have succeeded each other in history, it is in terms of the triumph of Michael But Michael is the patron angel of Israel and its land, and that land is 'the fairest of all lands (NEB),' … There is no doubt that at the End the land remains central despite the cosmic horizons of Daniel." (97). Yet, he is reluctant to understand this in a political-nationalistic way. Instead, he strongly juxtaposes the Maccabean nationalistic forces, which favored a military solution, and the Hasidim, seen to be the pacifist eschatological group responsible for the Book of Daniel as well as the progenitors of the sectarians at Qumran (99). What is often lost sight of in this rigid division is the fact that it is not so much the military solution that is shunned by the so-called pacifist groups, but rather who is to do the fighting. Both in Daniel and, for instance, the War Scroll from Qumran, it is the angelic forces who either do all the fighting or they lead the human armies in their struggle. The anticipated outcome for the "nationalistic" as well as the "eschatological" is a very bloody result for the enemies.

[155] See *TDOT* 12: 236-237 for an analysis of this aspect of the term, as well as its application to foreign nations and cities in pronouncements of irony or lament.

When, ultimately, the Hasmonean rule did not live up to the expectations of the groups that may have been responsible for creating texts such as Daniel, the anticipation of immediate restoration faded. Concerns became more focused on the heavenly side of the equation and the political/national hope was deferred although it would never disappear. Any interpretation of the eschatological kingdom solely as a universal earthly or uniquely spiritual phenomenon emerged, however, within early Christian groups.

Seow proposes that the first chapter of Daniel functions as an introduction to the book, "even though there is no explicit mention of the rule of God there." He points out the various ways that God does act though in relation to the characters in the narrative. [157] But I suggest that there is more. The brilliance of the editor is to be found in the way he portrays the *seeming* absence of the divine rule. The focus of this chapter is on the competition between gods residing in temples and God residing in heaven and stresses that although the Temple in Jerusalem was ravaged, its God was not deactivated as will be set forth in Daniel's ensuing chapters.

Throughout Daniel the earthly kings are addressed with the wish that they live forever (emphasizing that ironically, of course, they don't). [158] On the other hand, concerning

---

[156] Jer. 3:19, 12:10; Zech. 7:14; Ps. 106:24. The last passage reflects the Exodus event.

[157] C.L. Seow, "The Rule of God in the Book of Daniel," 220-221.

[158] In fact, all three kings figuring in the narrative are so addressed (Nebuchadnezzar 2:4; 3:9; Belshazzar 5:10; and Darius 6:7, 22). In 6:21, God is referred to as the living God and in 6:27 He is, in addition, everlasting as is His Kingdom. The background of the formula "O King, live forever" is not entirely clear. Although it is primarily known from a number of inscriptions from the reign of Darius I, the cases where they appear all have an Egyptian context and date to or after his Egyptian campaign. It has been noted that this specific epithet is very common in Egyptian divine and royal titulary. See, e.g. L.S. Fried, *The Priest and the Great King: Temple-Palace Relations in the Persian Empire*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004: 65-67. For a detailed description of Darius' so-called Susa statue, see M.C. Root, *The King and Kingship in Achaemenid Art: Essays on the Creation of an Iconography of Empire*. Leiden: Brill, 1979: 68-72 and plates 10-11. With regard to both Darius and Xerxes bearing the title (and note: again in an Egyptian context), see P. Briant, *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2002: 546-547. According to K. Koch this particular form of address was unknown in Assyria and Babylonia. There the usual wish pertained to the monarch "having many years," "a long life," and other well wishes. Koch wonders whether the author may have used this phrase to avert the outcome of the dream which indicates that the "duration of the royal life was endangered" *Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament – Daniel* XXII2. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1994: 145. In his commentary on Dan. 2:4, J.J. Collins notes a few examples of this phrase from Mesopotamia and Persia (Hermeneia, 1993: 156).

God it is stated that He lives forever. [159] When the kingdom of God replaces the earthly kingdoms, it is to 'fill the earth'. All this is to happen at 'the end of time'. Although scholarship has recognized the two particular phrases and sometimes realized their connection, the overall function for the entire Book of Daniel has so far not been noted. The pious wish for the kings to live for ever together with the statement that the God of Israel is living and everlasting, as is His rule, form a set of key phrases for understanding the functioning of kingdom in Daniel.

Similarly, the earthly kingdoms are transitory, whereas the kingdom of heaven/God is to last forever. Indeed, the manner in which the earthly kingdoms are symbolized in Daniel 2 and 7 is telling. Selman observes that the earthly aspect is emphasized in that "they are compared with metals that tarnish or beasts that perish, notwithstanding the glitter and strength of gold, silver, bronze, and iron or the ferocious power of the animal kingdom. The kingdom of God is indestructible, lasting for ever." In addition, he writes, "the kingdoms of men are earthly in origin, the kingdom of God comes from heaven." [160] These remarks require some attention, since the truly great relevance that they have to Daniel's view on kingdom is missed. The symbolism used to describe the earthly kingdoms belongs to the category of idol parody, in which the characterization and functionality of the gods of the other nations are relegated to the materials that are used to construct them. [161] The connection to idol parody in Daniel is found in the way that the theme of the temple vessels is applied in the narrative. As was already pointed out, they were the only material representatives of the Israelite God (easily to be

---

[159] These two statements certainly carry strong satirical overtones. The aspect of satire in the court tales has been duly noted, e.g. by D.M. Valeta in his dissertation, "Lions and Ovens and Visions, Oh My! A Satirical Analysis of Daniel 1-6" [University of Denver, 2004]. Unfortunately, he overlooks the element of satire in the addresses to the kings that they may "live forever" in relation to the fact that neither they nor their dynasties do and that the living God of Israel has manipulated their kingship from the beginning. J.W. van Henten observes that references to the "living God" are already found in Deut. 5:26 and Josh. 3:10 and that this designation, "contrasts the Lord with the deities of the nations." The two designations in Daniel 6, one referencing King Darius and the other one God, could indicate a parallelism between the two. See J.W. van Henten and F. Avemarie, *Martyrdom and Noble Death. Selected Texts from Graeco-Roman, Jewish and Christian Antiquity*. London: Routledge, 2002: 58 (fn. 53).

[160] Selman, "Kingdom of God in the OT," 171.

[161] See N.B. Levtow's *Images of Others: Iconic Politics in Ancient Israel*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2008.

confused with actual representations). In Daniel 5, Belshazzar desecrates the holy vessels during a religious banquet at which occasion they are derided in comparison to his own "gods of gold, and of silver, of brass, of iron, of wood, and of stone" (5:4). [162] Likewise, the multi-metal statue of chapter 3, and its pure gold materialization in chapter 3 belong to this category. The animal imagery, too, goes further than merely indicating their ferocity. They are more than wild animals, they are the counterparts of the art-work known from Babylonian temples and palaces and have become the hybrid monsters, who have come to life in Daniel's vision in chapter 7.

4.2.6   Conclusion

To sum up, the Book of Daniel contains a serious critique of human kingship in general and the possibility of a restored Jewish monarchy in particular. It is not clear whether the author of Daniel would have thought that this dynasty had in fact ended or whether there was still a living, legitimate heir to the throne and therefore a possibility of reinstatement. In view of the fact that the Exile is taken as point of departure, it should not be ruled out that the ideals of the post-exilic prophets Haggai and Zechariah resonated in the authors' ideology, who did propagate a restored Davidic rule (even if under Persian suzerainty at first). In the end Daniel's position on a restored Jewish (Davidic) monarchy is not altogether clear. Perhaps its silence on the matter is in itself an indication that, either way, it was not a matter of supreme importance in the face of more pressing concerns. In any case, the text was completed before the heirs of the Maccabees initiated the much contested Hasmonaean dynasty and is thus not a critique of that institution. Daniel shows a massive failing of the entire monarchic system in which human kings do not know their place. Instead, possibly, the book propagates a theocracy along the lines of a 'kingdom of priests' as mentioned Exod. 19:6. In this light it is of interest that, although Daniel also does not really devote any attention to the human priesthood, there are a number of references to priestly paraphernalia, as can be seen in chapters 7 and 10. Especially the description of the heavenly messenger in chapters 10 recalls that of Simon the High

---

[162]   See for instance the latter part of Psalm 135.

Priest in the Wisdom of Ben Sira. Furthermore, the yearning for a restored Temple necessitates a functioning priesthood. However, that may be, this picture too would still not exclude some form of a restored monarchy. The Book of Daniel seems rather to favor a position of ambiguity, or wait and see regarding the matter.

On the other hand, the Kingdom of God is not just an eschatological event heralding a better time. It will inaugurate a better place, socially produced by God himself – rather than merely produced as during the first creation. As it will build upon existing conditions, no new creation is necessitated, as for instance depicted in the Book of Revelation. Since it refers to the conditions as they will pertain on earth, affecting human society, it is meant to be a certain measure of dissolving of the boundaries between the heavenly and the earthly. In this way the earth, under the direct reign of God and the priestly representatives will turn the human habitat into one great sacred space with a functioning Temple that is in the center of a purified City in an uncontaminated Land.

CHAPTER FIVE: Spatial Analysis of the Book of Daniel

The following chapter offers a new reading of Daniel's twelve individual chapters in light of critical spatiality. First a brief outline of each chapter's narrative is given and this is then followed by an analysis which foregrounds those elements that clearly refer or covertly allude to the various sacred spaces and occurrences of temple imagery.

5.1 Lifestyle of the Displaced and the Role of Imposed Name Changes

Chapter 1, which is written in Hebrew, serves as the introduction to the Aramaic court tales. It marks the beginning and end of the narrative chronology and locates the narrative during the Exile in Babylonia, [1] using the reigns of successive kings as temporal markers. At the outset of the chapter a number of poignant events happen immediately and at rapid pace. [2] The siege of Jerusalem by the forces of Nebuchadnezzar forms the introduction of displacement for the beleaguered Judaeans. Within the space of the first two verses king [3]

---

[1] A spatial analysis of 'exile' is found in chapter 4.1.

[2] The first two verses, which provide the setting of the narrative that follows, very subtly stress that the true agent behind the scene is God. He initiates the actions that are carried out by Nebuchadnezzar. It is openly stated in v. 2 that all was "given into his hand." This creates a great measure of predetermination with regard to the rest of the account and suggests that the exile to Babylon and the presence of the Judeans at court are more than mere happenstance.

[3] Commentators have duly noted the problems involved in the statements of these first two verses, which not only concern the dates but also the question of the Judean king's identity: is it Jehoiakim (as the verse states) or is it Jehoiachin who would better fit the profile. More conservative interpreters are compelled to harmonize one way or another in order to preserve the dates or the names given in the account. For instance, J.J. Slotki (1951: 1) resolves the apparent discrepancy created by "the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim" as really referring to "the third year of his revolt against Nebuchadnezzar" which, in turn, allows for the events described here to "correspond to the last year of his kingship", i.e. 597 BCE. In this way he does not have to account for a Babylonian phantom attack on Jerusalem in 607 or 604 BCE, which some commentators resort to in order to obtain a time span that approximates a seventy-year exile. L.L. Grabbe, on the other hand, noting these discrepancies in his "'The Exile' under the Theodolite: Historiography as Triangulation" (*Leading Captivity Captive; 'the Exile' as History and Ideology*. L.L. Grabbe, ed. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998: 80-100; at p. 88, fn 31), writes: "[d]espite efforts of some to redeem Daniel's statement as an actual event … there is no evidence of a siege of Jerusalem by the Babylonians at the time Jehoiakim reigned. Jehoiakim rebelled after three years according to 2 Kgs 24:1 (though during the *seventh* year of his reign), but the Babylonian response did not come until after his death because of the time it took for Nebuchadnezzar to recover from his defeat. By the time Nebuchadnezzar's army reached Jerusalem, his son Jehoiachin was on the throne, but he quickly capitulated. The author of Daniel has simply confused the accounts in 2 Kgs and 2 Chron." (i.e., 2 Kgs. 24 and 2 Chron. 36). The notion that Daniel's author was 'confused' is

and Temple are uprooted, the former imprisoned, the contents of the latter deposited in the temple of Nebuchadnezzar's god. [4] It is significant that the conquering ruler acknowledges the sacrality of these objects by placing them in his own temple rather than destroying them, even though it is clear that at that moment in the narrative chronology his god vanquished the Israelite God. [5] However, this is not a coincidence, since the narrator stresses that the God of Israel deliberately put the temple vessels into Nebuchadnezzar's hand. [6] Removing the resident divine image from a conquered temple was typical for ancient Near Eastern warfare. Such acts of removal of divine images of the national god signified that his or her people were likewise conquered and the divine powers neutralized. With regard to the Temple in Jerusalem, however, Nebuchadnezzar could not do better than take the holy vessels, because no image of the national god was available. Yet, despite the fact that Nebuchadnezzar had placed the sacred vessels in his treasury, he did not 'own' Daniel's God, who operated separate from the sacred vessels - therefore any

---

certainly too simplistic. Rather than confusing the accounts, it seems that he purposefully conflated them in order to accord with the time frame that he created to fit both his history and eschatology. At the same time, Grabbe's observation that the author was more inspired by the scriptural texts that he was familiar with than primary Babylonian records is important. Yet, the degree to which the biblical narrative itself is indebted to primary ancient Near Eastern sources should not be underestimated and these will be pointed out where relevant in this study, since they do illustrate what goes on within the narrative. Since this exercise does not purport to be one in tradition history but to be a narrative analysis, the question whether these data came into the narrative directly or via a detour becomes somewhat irrelevant. What is clear is that a great measure of cultural continuity took place in the region, which, through many filters and reworkings, remained recognizable in later texts.

[4] In one of his building inscriptions Nebuchadnezzar boasts of bringing "many treasures into Esagila." S. Langdon, *Building Inscriptions of the Neo-Babylonian Empire. Part I: Nabopolassar and Nebuchadnezzar*. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1905: 147. Esagila was the main temple of Marduk in the center of Babylon. This is, of course, not to suggest that this reflects in any way the biblical account of this king depositing the Temple vessels from Jerusalem there, only to show that it was a common policy to place war spoils or tribute there.

[5] Cf. M. Cogan, *Imperialism and Religion: Assyria, Judah and Israel in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C.E.* Missoula, MO: Scholars Press, 1974. Relevant especially is the chapter "Assyrian Spoliation of Divine Images" (pp. 22-41). Although Cogan deals with the period preceding the narrative of Daniel, it is quite clear that this policy was continued in the Neo-Babylonian and even the Persian and Seleucid empires. See for this L.S. Fried, *The Priest and the Great King. Temple-Palace Relations in the Persian Empire*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004: 26, 72, and further literature cited there. See also K. Frakes Kravitz, "Divine Trophies of War in Assyria and Ancient Israel: Case Studies in Political Theology." (Diss. Brandeis University, 1999). Still important is P.R. Ackroyd's "The Temple Vessels – A Continuity Theme," *SVT* 23(1972): 166-181; esp. pp. 180-181 dealing with Daniel and subsequent traditions. For a Hellenistic example of exiling a vanquished people's gods and sacred vessels, see Dan. 11:7-8 which describes the war between the Ptolemies and Seleucids.

[6] I. Kalimi, Isaac and J.D. Purvis, "King Jehoiachin and the Vessels of the Lord's House in Biblical Literature," *CBQ* 56(1994): 449-457.

communication from Him would be unintelligible to Nebuchadnezzar and his diviners and he needed the young Judean to serve as interpreter. In other words, Daniel's God did not behave like the gods that Nebuchadnezzar was accustomed to. [7] With regard to the Temple vessels it is interesting to note that the descriptions of their manufacturing, their functioning within the service as well as that of their fate after despoliation is not at all unlike the similar descriptions associated with the pagan gods of the other surrounding cultures. This is not to say that the vessels were worshiped or functioned as representations of the divine or as individuated objects for divine communication (except perhaps for the Urim and Thummim that was clearly seen as oracle). Yet, they were certainly esteemed and they were thus treated with the utmost reverence in their use and their upkeep. In the descriptions of the despoliation of the sanctuary as well, the status of these items seems to be seen by the despoilers in a similar manner that the gods of other despoiled temples might have been. After all, these must have been perceived as the only physical representatives, if not representations, of the non-corporeal and non-depicted God of Israel.

The short introduction in terse prose determines the earthly setting and juxtaposes the two cities that were the most important to the Judean mind: Jerusalem and Babylon. As they were both considered to be cosmic centers by their respective cultures, crowned with a magnificent temple complex, [8] this, by implication, immediately introduces the cosmic aspect of the narrative.

Next, the action zooms in on the interior of Nebuchadnezzar's palace. The following five verses (3-7) present the detailed account of how the identity of Daniel and his three friends [9] is taken away by forcibly assimilating them into the mores of the

---

[7] See chapter 4.1.2 on Temple spoliation, 'god-napping', and divine abandonment.

[8] Aspects of the rivalry between these two cities are treated by D.C.T. Sheriffs, "'A Tale of Two Cities' – Nationalism in Zion and Babylon," *TynBul* 39(1988): 19-57. See further chapter 3.3, (Re)producing Urban Spaces, on cities as cosmic centers.

[9] It should also be noted that the narrator has Nebuchadnezzar identify the larger pool of exiles from which to choose his trainees as the Israelites (בני ישראל). In addition they should be of royal descent (v. 3). Only in v. 6 does the narrator himself give the results of this selection process and narrows the groups down to Judaeans (בני יהודה). It is not clear from the narrative whether he understands the Judaeans to be a sub-group of Israelites, considers them to be identical, or whether he

Babylonian court during a three-year training program, [10] effectively robbing them of their language [11] and their names [12] by exchanging Judaean theophoric names for Babylonian ones [13] – thus emphasizing the victory of Babylonian religion over the

suggests that in the mind of Nebuchadnezzar the exile and destruction of the Southern Kingdom was a mere continuation and conclusion of the earlier one carried out against the Northern Kingdom. A similar reference to Israel occurs in 9:7 and 11 where it may be either anachronistic or express a utopian hope on the part of the author to see the tribes be reunited once more in an ideal future.

[10] Undoubtedly they were instructed as well in the art of dream divination, as may be learned from the fact that they appear to become colleagues of the other wise men and Chaldeans – although this is only specifically said of Daniel (1:17). This provides a notable deviation from the Joseph stories, to which Daniel is often compared. Daniel has to learn the craft of dream interpretation and is in need of explanations himself, whereas Joseph appears to have a natural aptitude for it. See also S.M. Paul, "From Mari to Daniel: Instructions for the Acceptance of Servants into the Royal Court," *Eretz Israel* 22(1993): 161-163 (= Abraham Malamat Volume) [Transl. from the Hebrew in: *Divrei Shalom. Collected Studies of Shalom M. Paul on the Bible and the Ancient Near East 1967-2005*. Leiden: Brill, 2005: 205-211] which offers an ancient model of the process of acquisition and induction of foreign court servants from Mari. For examples of religious specialists at the Assyrian and Babylonian court that clarifies the description in Daniel, see K. van der Toorn, "Scholars at the Oriental Court: the Figure of Daniel against its Mesopotamian Background," *The Book of Daniel; Composition and Reception* I: 37-54. See also A. Lenzi, "Secrecy, Textual Legitimation, and Intercultural Polemics in the Book of Daniel," *CBQ* 71(2009): 330-348. He focuses primarily on the nature of *raz*, the secret from the divine realm that the religious specialist has the ability to interpret and communicate. Although with regard to Daniel he deals primarily with chapter 2, the introduction is presented in the present chapter. Thus, Daniel becomes part of the guild of court scholars and diviners. However, the gist of the story (and the entire book for that matter) is the contrast between similarities and differences. In both cases the religious expert has access to divine secrets. However, the Babylonian scholars are ridiculed throughout. It is suggested that their craft is ineffective as are their gods, whereas Daniel and his God score on all points. What is not mentioned however – and this is pointed out by Lenzi – is that the two approaches differ and this difference is deftly put to work by the author. The Babylonian divining tradition is based on the consultation of ancient written works. Daniel, on the other hand, communicates directly with his God, who is a living God (see 4:31; 6:21, 27). This implies at the same time that the Babylonian gods are not living. This may also explain 1:17. All four are trained in Babylonian lore, and in addition receive understanding from God. However, only of Daniel is it said that he also received the skill to understand visions and dreams. Here we see yet another parody introduced in the text, aside from the idol parody that will be discussed below and the city parody (above), we may now also add the parody of the wise courtier (p. 347).

[11] J.L. Berquist, "Constructions of Identity in Postcolonial Yehud," *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*. O. Lipschits and M. Oeming, eds. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006: 53-66 (at p. 64) stresses how postcolonial criticism explicates language as an identity determining factor.

[12] It is worth noting in this context that the Hebrew already presents Daniel and his three friends in an unconventional manner – especially in light of their suggested royal descent: without patronymic or gentilic. This is indeed noteworthy considering the importance that is accorded to proper descent in the Hebrew Bible, as witnessed in the long genealogical lists as well as the listing in Ezra-Nehemiah of those who returned and their places of origin.

[13] In fact, Ph. Chia has shown the value of postcolonial criticism for understanding such spatially charged texts as Daniel. It is clear that this approach offers a valuable addition to critical spatial theory in explaining certain facets of Daniel. See his "On Naming the Subject: Postcolonial Reading of Daniel 1," *The Postcolonial Biblical Reader*. R.S. Sugirtharajah, ed. London: Blackwell Publishing, 2006: 171-185 [reprint from *Jian Dao* 7(1997): 17-35]. Here too we may see an instance in which the purported Babylonian setting reflects the political reality of the final editor. Antiochus I Soter, who was of Iranian

Judean. [14] Just as in the re-naming of places, the re-naming of persons constitutes an erasure of identity. But there is more. By taking the liberty of renaming his captives, Nebuchadnezzar clearly treads on the ground of the Judean God. Even though it is actually the chief of the officers who gives the lads their Babylonian names, [15] he could only have acted on direct orders of the king. In biblical traditions it is very often God who has the power to (re-)name significant individuals. Thus, from a Judean perspective, Nebuchadnezzar in fact (mis-)appropriates the prerogative of the Divine to bestow or change names; an act of authority as well as a means of describing or changing destiny. [16] This act by the monarch would then distinguish the renaming of

descent on his mother's side and who created a hybrid Greek-Iranian style court, is known to have bestowed Greek names on local Babylonian officials as a reward for their services and loyalty. Cf. S. Sherwin-White, "Seleucid Babylonia: a Case-Study for the Installation and Development of Greek Rule," A. Kuhrt & S. Sherwin-White, eds., *Hellenism in the East*. London: Duckworth, 1987: 1-31 (at 7-8, 29-30). Noting the similarities with the biblical precedents in Genesis (Joseph receives an Egyptian name from the King) and Daniel, she summarizes this policy: "[t]he purpose is the same: to reward and to assimilate – a primary political purpose" (29). For a different explanation, see M.D. Coogan, "Life in the Diaspora: Jews at Nippur in the 5th Century," *BA* 37(1974): 6-12. He suggests that Jews in Persian period Babylon may have *added* a Babylonian name for public use (11-12). This would necessarily only have applied to individuals who occupied public functions. He gives Daniel 1:7 and Esther 2:7 as biblical examples. The more obvious reality displayed by the names in the Murashu archives as well as in Elephantine, of course, is simply that of syncretism and assimilation. And this is, needless to say, what is also reflected in the Hellenistic reality of Daniel's framer and what would evoke his anger: people of high standing, members of the political and religious leadership, would voluntarily change their own names into Greek ones, and give their own children Greek names as well. See M.D. Coogan, *West Semitic Personal Names in the Murašu Documents*. Missoula, MO: Scholars Press, 1976. It concerns an important 5th century BCE archive of a Babylonian family business firm from Nippur. On these and other factors that would have contributed to the preservation of Judaean identity under exilic conditions, see B. Oded, "The Judean Exiles in Babylonia: Survival Strategy of an Ethnic Minority," *For Uriel; Studies in the History of Israel in Antiquity, Presented to Professor Uriel Rappaport*. M. Mor [et al.], eds. Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 2005: 53-76.

[14] B.T. Arnold, "Word Play and Characterization in Daniel 1," *Puns and Pundits; Word Play in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near Eastern Literature*. S.B. Noegel, ed. Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 2000: 231-248 (at 247).

[15] The fact that two of the four names are most certainly of Persian extraction has been noted but the significance of their appearance within a Babylonian court setting has to my knowledge not been satisfactorily explained. See Collins, p. 141. Further, R. Zadok, "On Five Iranian Names in the Old Testament," *VT* 26(1976): 246-247. A. Lacocque (1979: 29-30) disagrees with Zadok's derivation of the name Meshach and prefers to see it as derived from a variant of the name Mithra. See also Collins (p. 18) on the more general role of Persian loan words within the text of Daniel. Here too, a suggestion is wanting why the narrator would have inserted Persian terminology (and proper names) into a strictly Babylonian setting. Maybe by the time of the composition of the court tales the authors/editors were no longer able to distinguish between Babylonian and Persian linguistic data.

[16] Perhaps here we can find an allusion to the realities of the actual milieu of Daniel's final editor, reflecting societal developments going on in Hellenistic Judea against which he was so opposed. After all, some of the signs of Hellenization were to be found in the use of the Greek language and

the four lads from other cases of renaming or double-naming that we know from post-exilic biblical narrative and historical documents. It was not something that they underwent voluntarily, it was imposed, and it can only be assumed that they would keep on referring to each other and themselves with their given names. In fact, this form of an act of defiance is displayed by the stories' author. [17] It should be noted that Daniel's Babylonian name Belteshazzar is not used consistently throughout the book. First and foremost it occurs in the chapters (2 and 4) that take place during the reign of Nebuchadnezzar. Whenever the king speaks he addresses Daniel as Belteshazzar. Even the narrator complies by using "Daniel, whose name was Belteshazzar" when introducing the king's direct speech. Next it occurs just once in chapter 5:12, taking place during Belshazzar's reign, where Daniel is addressed or referred to otherwise only as Daniel. However, it concerns a clear reference to Nebuchadnezzar's initial renaming of Daniel. It is also only in the earlier two chapters that the narrator goes along with Nebuchadnezzar's policy. It is therefore rather unexpected that the name Belteshazzar also turns up in 10:1. [18] Throughout the book, in Daniel's own direct

adoption of Greek names. However, Collins would rule this out since "Daniel makes no objection to the gentile names, in marked contrast to his resistance to the royal food" (p. 141). Yet, this only reveals that there was a certain ambivalence with regard to the use of foreign names. Certain circles indeed displayed a stronger opposition to the use of these names. For a number of possible motivations for either position, see A. Demsky, "Double Names in the Babylonian Exile and the Identity of Sheshbazzar," *These Are the Names; Studies in Jewish Onomastics*. Vol. 2. A. Demsky, ed. Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1999: 23-40. Some major studies are devoted to the occurrence of gentile names by Jews in Palestine and the Diaspora during Graeco-Roman times. A rationale may be found in either the desire for assimilation, pleasing the authorities, or simply pragmatic considerations may have been at play, since individuals who can hardly have been accused of siding with the forces of Hellenization also appear with double names. See T. Ilan, "The Greek Names of the Hasmoneans," *JQR* 78(1987)1-2: 1-20 and most recently, M.H. Williams, "The Use of Alternative Names by Diaspora Jews in Graeco-Roman Antiquity," *JSJ* 38(2007)3: 307-327 and the literature cited there.

[17] One of the very few commentators to recognize this salient point is D.L. Smith-Christopher (1996: 39). He takes issue in this matter especially with Goldingay, Collins and Porteous and writes, "While it is true that many observant Jews in the Hellenistic period took on non-Jewish names (Philo), and even earlier there is evidence of names like "Zerubbabel," the issue here is not whether the names are non-Israelite, but that it is done by a power that assumes the authority to make such a change." In fact, the forced adaption of personal names to the languages of expanding national powers in the pursuit of empire is a known policy of subordination. Examples from modern history would be, for instance, the Russification and Turkification of the lands and people that became subject to the rule of Czarist Russia (but also the later Soviet Union) and the Ottoman Empire.

[18] While many commentaries gloss over this usage, Smith-Christopher suggests that this may be due to the Persians not having such a positive image compared, e.g., to Darius (a Mede?) in chapter 6, where Daniel is only called Daniel. (1996: 136). C.L. Seow (2003: 154) rather thinks that the use of this name is connected to the notion that, despite expectations and a beginning repatriation of exiles, it

speech he naturally only uses his own Judean name. With regard to the other examples of court tales in the Hebrew Bible, it is interesting to see that in each of them a case of renaming or double naming is present. But again, with a twist. In the Joseph cycle (Gen. 41:45), Joseph is given the Egyptian name Tzafenath-Paneach by Pharaoh out of gratitude for explaining to him his dreams and saving the state. In the account of Moses' life, interestingly, a Hebrew name is completely absent. The great legislator, of priestly descent no less, is known only by an Egyptian name given to him by the Egyptian princess who rescued him. This has baffled early and later commentators, although in all, it has received remarkably little attention. [19] In the Book of Esther (2:7), the heroine is introduced as "Hadassah (a Hebrew name) that is Esther (a Babylonian name)." This case is different from Joseph's. She is not renamed but simply known to her own inner circle as Hadassah, and in everyday civil life to the outside as Esther. Only in the case of Daniel and his friends is there an aspect of utter defeat involved on the part of the protagonists and a king who boldly transgresses a boundary from the perspective of the captured Judeans. However, in a stroke of genius the author/editor of the book boldly takes over the Judean identity of his protagonist by adopting his name for himself in the first-person vision account of the book. This step could possibly be an explanation why this pseudepigraphon is attributed to an otherwise obscure character rather than a famous hero or ancestor. [20]

stresses the fact that the exile is far from over yet, especially in light of the angel's explanation to Daniel in response to his prayer in chapter 9. Projecting this to the actual time of the author, Seow writes: "In some sense, every Jew in Palestine during the reign of Antiochus was still a 'Belteshazzar,' a captive and an exile." T. Longman III, *Daniel* (1999: 246) suggests something similar. J. Baldwin (1978: 179) posits that the mention of both Cyrus and Belteshazzar in 10:1 refers back to chapter 1 where both are introduced and forms thus an editorial comment stressing the unity of the entire book. Hartman & DiLella (1978: 262) think that "this clause is probably a later addition, based on 1:7." This would then function to tie the unit of chapters 1-12, that was thought to have circulated once independently, together with the rest of the book. The 10th century Karaite Japhet ben Ali from Jerusalem notes in his commentary on 10:1, "Whose name was called Belteshazzar: not '*whose name was* B.' Some think the name still remained upon him, and that he did not discard it. Others infer that he was called by that name till the fall of the Chaldean empire, and that the appellation ceased with that; which is probable."

[19] This is even stranger considering the fact that Moses spent the first three months of his life under his parents' care and even after he entered Pharaoh's household, his own mother cared for him for a considerable period. It is therefore reasonable to ask whether he remained nameless all this time, and whether there would be traditions preserving suggestions concerning his birth name. There may, indeed, be a hint in a text from Qumran in an Aramaic text called "Vision of Amram" (4Q543-547), dating most likely to the late 2nd century BCE (*EDSS*, 23). In a recent article, R. Duke suggests that this text may present us with the earliest proposal of Moses' birth name, i.e. Mal'akhyah [מלאכיה]. "Moses' Hebrew Name: The Evidence of the *Vision of Amram*," *DSD* 14(2007)1: 34-48.

[20] See also section 2.6 on Daniel as a pseudepigraphon.

This preamble of successive events of identity crushing would normally be setting the scene for the paradigm of "loss of land and cultic center equals loss of identity", resulting in a virtual disembodiment. Needless to say, the purpose of this account and the subsequent chapters is to demonstrate exactly the opposite. The quiet resistance of the protagonists begins in v. 8 (until the end of the chapter) when the assimilation tactics of the court encroach onto their personal cultic behavior related to dietary customs. [21] In addition to the tenacity that they display, they receive from God the ability to transcend time and space and peek into the unearthly realms of dreams and interpret them.

Furthermore, as long as an individual has control over the intake or refusal of identity-determining foods there is certitude of being-in-place psychologically, even if not in the right place physically. Therefore, even if to a certain extent assimilation on the

---

[21] Many commentators are puzzled by what exactly it was that Daniel and his friends thought would defile them. Often 2 Kgs. 25:29-30 (in conjunction with *ANET*, 308), is adduced to show that it could not have been dietary (*kashrut*) concerns, as in this passage the exiled King Jehoiachin seems to have accepted similar portions. However, this is not at all clear from the text, and neither is it specified what exactly the rations consisted of. No matter the various explanations: that particular passage specifically only refers to *lehem*, the primary meaning of which is bread, (and the Babylonian record specifies only oil rations) not to other food or wine or the king's table. He merely ate in his presence (if we follow the simple meaning of the text). See D. Soesilo's treatment of various solutions in a number of commentaries, "Why Did Daniel Reject the King's Delicacies? (Daniel 1.8)," *The Bible Translator* 45(1994)4: 441-444. See also W. S. Towner, *Daniel* (1984: 24-26) who argues against the position that Daniel is solely concerned with transgressing dietary laws and is more in agreement with J. Baldwin (*Daniel*, 1978: 83) that the refusal is rather informed by societal concerns. Recently S. Pace (Jeansonne) has returned to arguing in favor of the *kashrut* solution. ("Diaspora Dangers, Diaspora Dreams," *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich*. P.W. Flint, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam, eds. Leiden: Brill, 2006: 21-59, at pp. 23-25). However, this seemingly most obvious solution does not take into account that it is often arrived at by reading into the text the more detailed and documented rules of later rabbinic Judaism. In other words, we do not know exactly what the conventions were in the 2nd century BCE, let alone in the purported 6th century setting of the narrative. J.J. Collins' overview of the issue in *Daniel* (1993): 141-143 is still of value. He focuses there more on the matter of 'table fellowship' with the pagan king and minimizes the possibility of observance of pentateuchal dietary laws. Here he seems to retract from the conclusion in his earlier essay, "Daniel and His Social World," *Interpretation* 39(1985)2: 131-143 (at p. 135), where he claims exactly that. He cites W.S. Towner (1984: 24-26) in support, even though the latter never makes this claim. See more generally on this issue, N. Macdonald, "Food and Drink in Tobit and Other 'Diaspora Novellas,'" *Studies in the Book of Tobit; a Multidisciplinary Approach*. M. Bredin ed. London: T & T Clark, 2006: 165-178. He suggests that the food-related episodes in Daniel serve to emphasize the difference between the Judaean sense of moderation versus the Persian overindulgence in excessive feasting, drinking, and luxuries; the former attitude leading to life and the latter to death or loss. The episodes in question are the refusal of the king's delicacies by Daniel and his friends, Belshazzar's feast, and Daniel's fasting. Belshazzar's feast in chapter 5, in MacDonald's opinion, is more descriptive of Persian custom and in line with especially the Book of Esther and less so, Judith, than that it is Babylonian.

outside is tolerable, the purity and autonomy of the inside need to be maintained in order to preserve the individual's self. The attribution of cultic markers to food and the keeping of the requisite behavior related to that food are one way to accomplish the preservation of self in the most intimate of all spaces. [22] There is, however, yet an entirely different factor at issue that is not sufficiently considered in the major commentaries. The issue of purity versus defilement, connected with the intake or abstinence of certain foods is at the heart of the attainment of mystical experiences. It is thought that an intensified state of purity will prepare the mystic or visionary for a safe journey through the hazardous heavenly realm and protect him/her in the case of perilous encounters with heavenly beings. [23]

A very relevant point is noted by an early Christian interpreter, Ephrem the Syrian (4th c. CE), who suggests in the Daniel commentary ascribed to him that the reason for Daniel's request that he and his companions be excused from the obligation to eat the food from the table of the king, sprang from the desire to fast. "The commentator argues that the vegetables which they requested could also have been defiled, or the meat substituted for clean meat (had uncleanness been the reason), and that the request was therefore made so that these Jews could consecrate themselves and so that it would serve as a sign (to the Babylonians if they were seen to have a better complexion than the others who did eat from the table of the king) that the God of Daniel was almighty and the *He* had decreed the fall of Jerusalem, not the gods of Nebuchadnezzar." [24]

Another aspect of dietary behavior may be linked with rituals of mourning. It would not be unlikely that the framers of Daniel had their protagonist mourn for the fate of the First

---

[22] For a similar understanding (however, within a different interpretative context), B.T. Arnold, "Word Play and Characterization," p. 247. See also D.L. Smith-Christopher, "Hebrew Satyagraha: The Politics of Biblical Fasting in the Post-Exilic Period," *Food and Foodways* 5(1993): 269-292 (esp. 269-272). He stresses the point that the refusal of food intake, or even complete fasting, is a superb manner of showing defiance in the face of an overwhelming power.

[23] See section 3.2: The nature of Daniel's heavenly realm and its inhabitants.

[24] P.J. Botha, "The Relevance of the Book of Daniel for Fourth-Century Christianity According to the Commentary Ascribed to Ephrem the Syrian, in:, *Die Geschichte der Daniel-Auslegung im Judentum, Christentum und Islam. Studien zur Kommentierung des Danielbuches in Literatur und Kunst* (BZAW 371). K. Bracht, K. & D.S. Du Toit, D.S. (eds.) Berlin: De Gruyter, 2007: 100-122 (at p. 102).

Temple in Jerusalem, while at the same time they themselves would perhaps belong to groups who expressed their own concerns about the state of the Second Temple in a comparable way. This process is even more evident in chapter 9:3. Groups that adhered to rather severe rituals of fasting and abstinence (Mourners for Zion – אבלי ציון) are known from the period following the destruction of the Second Temple by the Romans as well as the early Middle Ages. [25] Admittedly, these traditions date from a much later period than those of our text, but the inspiration for this later conduct may be similar to the conditions that applied to the framers of chapter 1. Indeed, as Daniel Frank explains, [26]

> Daniel's behavior, moreover – his fasting, donning of sackcloth and ashes (9:3) and lamenting the Temple's destruction (9;16-18) – established a program for the Mourners in tenth-century Zion. And in calling themselves Maskilim, they clearly believed that their own activities were described in visions vouchsafed to the prophet

Especially instructive is the commentary on Psalm 5 by the 10th-century Karaite commentator Japhet ben Ali who sketches the way of life of the so-called Mourners for Zion (or, *'avelei tzion*) of Jerusalem. [27] He writes,

---

[25] These various examples are described in M.D. Swartz, "'Like the Ministering Angels'; Ritual and Purity in Early Jewish Mysticism and Magic," *AJS Review* 19(1994)2: 135-167. Even though his study deals with later phenomena they are illustrative of what is going on in Daniel. With regard to inclusion, exclusion and boundaries in a societal context, see P.R. Davies, "Food, Drink, and Sects: the Question of Ingestion in the Qumran Texts," *Semeia* (1999)86:151-163. A third aspect of rites of abstinence or intake of food is found in the trajectory that leads to preparatory rituals to attaining visions of the Deity and the heavenly realm. This is dealt with in chapter 3. On the relationship between abstinence from food and mourning as a continuity theme, see further J. Blenkinsopp, "The Second Temple as House of Prayer," *"Où demeures-tu"? (Jn 1,38); la maison depuis le monde biblique. En hommage au professeur Guy Couturier à l'occasion de ses soixante-cinq ans.* J.-C. Petit, ed. [Saint-Laurent, Québec]: Fides, 1994: 109-122 (at pp. 118-121). and *id.*, "A Jewish Sect of the Persian Period," *CBQ* 52(1990): 5-20 (at pp. 16-18). See also the discussion on mourning rituals, especially weeping, with regard to temples that have fallen into ruin, in L.S. Fried, "The Land Lay Desolate: Conquest and Restoration in the Ancient Near East," *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period.* O. Lipschits and J. Blenkinsopp, eds. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003: 21-54 (at pp. 44-45).

[26] D. Frank, *Search Scripture Well: Karaite Exegetes and the Origins of the Jewish Bible Commentary in the Islamic East.* Leiden: Brill, 2004: 201.

[27] *Ibid.*, 206-207. Frank adds here, "For him [Japhet] Psalm 5 is an inspired plaint through which the Mourners can contrast their own degradation in Jerusalem with the prosperity of the Gentiles; it expresses their fervent hope that God will soon remove Christians and Muslims from the Holy City that they pollute." It is of interest to note that for Japhet Islam and Christianity together constituted Daniel's Fourth Kingdom. This is worked out in his commentary on Dan. 2:41, 43. See Frank, 129-132.

the phrase *'el ha-nehilot* alludes to the Mourners for Zion whose hearts were filled with grief for the destruction of God's Temple, the desolation of Jerusalem and Zion, the cessation of the divine sacrifices and liturgy, the desecration of the Divine Name, and Israel's disastrous exile. They left off attending festivities, dressed themselves in rough garments …, observed continual fasts, and refrained from eating those delicacies with which they were familiar. Thereupon they became sick, their bodies dried out, their hearts became parched. It is they who complain about their situation in many of the Psalms, especially Psalm 102; the expression *'el ha-nehilot* refers to them.

The last verse of chapter 1 forms a kind of temporal inclusio, mentioning the last year of Daniel's activity at court. The story begins in the third year of Jehoiakim, king of Judah (which presumably coincides with the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, although this is not mentioned in the text) and ends with the first year of Cyrus. [28] This, of course, creates a difficulty with 10:1, which is said to take place in the third year of Cyrus' reign. [29]

Chapter 1 confronts the reader immediately with the relativity of sacred space. From the perspective of an objective outsider, it could be concluded that a transfer of sacred objects takes place from one sanctuary to another, or even that an elevation of these objects is realized as they are moved from a failed to a victorious sanctuary. However, the storyline does not allow this. There are points of (narrative) view to be considered.

---

[28] This implies a time frame of 58 or 60 years, if Daniel was exiled in 597 BCE with the first year of Cyrus in 539 and the third in 537. Alternatively, if 605 BCE is meant, the narrative spans 66 or 68 years. This would bring it close to the famous seventy years duration of the Exile prophesied by Jeremiah. See the discussion *ad loc*. in Collins (1993: 130-133). I cannot agree with the implications of his assessment (133) that "there is no reference to the prophecy of seventy years in Daniel 1-6. When that prophecy is taken up in Daniel 9, it is interpreted as seventy weeks of years, on the assumption that it did not find its fulfillment in the sixth century." This seems more like a circular argument. Firstly, the seventy years are specifically named in ch. 9, and only after the realization that the time had not yet come, the interpretation of the extended exile follows. Secondly, while it is true that there is no specific mention of the seventy years, it seems clear that the author/editor knew very well what he was doing and subtly slipped in the duration of the exilic narrative the way he did, to point out that 68 years was not yet seventy, and that therefore it would be imminent for the reader, while the extended notion was required to synchronize the reader with the protagonists of the story. Collins then cites Montgomery approvingly, who wrote, "exact calculations are not to be attributed to our author" and continues, "the genre is legend rather than historiography." In fact, it is neither; it is politico-religious ideology, which is packaged very cleverly by our author/editor. For a more sympathetic understanding of this issue, see A. Lacocque (1979: 25). N. Porteous (1979: 26) is more cautious, but does not rule out the possibility that the seventy years were already implied in the way chapter 1 is set up. J.E. Goldingay (1989: 13-14) is, however, quite certain of the allusion to Jeremiah's seventy year prophecy.

[29] Only the Old Greek has the first year here as well, thus harmonizing the time frame with 1:21.

Since the story is not told from the perspective of Nebuchadnezzar, the inevitable conclusion therefore must be: the Jerusalem Temple and its vessels were desecrated, so to say, in a Firstspace reality and the story provides the Thirdspace thoughts and hopes of the Judean narrator and narratees. Eliade, too, is helpful in this respect. He discusses the levels of validity (and staying-power, or lack thereof, if you will) of hierophanies. [30] He explains that depending on the level of perfection of the religion within which it occurs, "[I]t can be seen then that some hierophanies are, or can in this way become, of universal value and significance, whereas others may remain local or of one period – they are not open to other cultures, and fall eventually into oblivion even in the society which produced them."

The use of verbs of motion and location is also instructive in illustrating the power relationships. [31] In 1:1 Nebuchadnezzar comes [בא – qal perf] to Jerusalem and lays siege to it. These are all active deeds initiated by him. The other occurrences of the verb are in the hifil, of which he, again, is the initiator and the Judeans or Temple vessels are the objects [1:2bc; 1:3; 1:18ab]. The Judean king and the exiles are passive actors undergoing Nebuchadnezzar's offensive. However, 1:2 offers a twist: it is the God of Israel who actually enables Nebuchadnezzar to carry out his policy by handing over [ויתן -בידו] the king and the Temple vessels to him. Thus, the Babylonian king is reduced to a mere puppet by the divine director. However, this does not neutralize his initiative altogether. He is offered the opportunity and it is up to him how to carry it out, as will be seen later in his dream episodes. The other verbal form in this chapter, denoting power relationships is 'to stand before' (לעמוד לפני). This combination occurs quite often throughout the Hebrew Bible; mostly in the sense of someone standing (i.e., serving) in the presence of God. However, it can also be used for any encounter between one in power and someone of lesser rank. Finally, it is used in a more idiomatic sense of prevailing over something or someone. In this chapter and in the beginning of the next (1:5; 1:19; 2:2) it is used solely to indicate the

---

[30] M. Eliade, *Patterns of Comparative Religion*, p. 4.

[31] See D.N. Fewell's excellent treatment of the use of the verbs in this section. She juxtaposes the points of view of Nebuchadnezzar and the narrator creating the effect of a description of two opposing versions of the same event. *Circle of Sovereignty. A Story of Stories in Daniel 1-6*. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1988: 35.

submission or servitude of the Judean exiles and the diviners of Nebuchadnezzar's court; almost according a divine quality to the latter.

Recently P.M. Venter has subjected Daniel's first chapter to critical spatial analysis. [32] Since his point of departure is not sacred space specifically but rather an entire spatial interpretation of this chapter, his findings differ somewhat from my own. Thus, while his approach is effective on the limited scale offered by the single chapter and on that level also offers many insights, it would not work as well when the scope of the book as a whole, in which a whole range of supra-worldly spaces occur, is considered. In addition, Venter does not sufficiently allow for the fact that the spaces he describes are located within a narrative and not in the real world. He writes, for instance: [33]

> In the narrative of Daniel 1 Babylonia, the court of the king at Babylon, and the people living there, are all in the Firstspace. This perceived space can be located on any ancient Near Eastern map. The Babylonian empire can be linked to the era between 609 and 539 BCE. The socio-cultural setup can be studied *inter alia* with the results of social scientific investigation.

This misses the fact that the Firstspace that Venter identifies here is not true Firstspace, but rather a description and interpretation of the real Babylon and therefore Secondspace. However, there is a catch. It may be argued that we are dealing with Firstspace, but only from *an inner-narrative perspective*. However, from the perspective of the author/editor, it is mental space or Secondspace. Venter continues and states that "[t]he conceived Secondspace comprises the meaning attached to the physical spaces of the foreign land, the court, the food of the king, the dietary customs followed by Daniel and his colleagues." This, too, is only partly true insofar as *point of view* also functions as a space defining and producing technique within a narrative just as this applies to spaces in the real world. For instance, the owners of a mansion experience their property quite differently from their live-in servants. Thus, within the narrative Nebuchadnezzar too attaches a Secondspace meaning to his palace. It is

---

[32] P.M. Venter, "A Study of Space in Daniel 1," *OTE* 19(2006)3: 993-1004 (esp. 999-1000).

[33] *Ibid*., p. 999.

therefore not so much the behavior of Daniel and his friends that determines the space, but rather their presence in their capacity as foreign exiles. Venter further explains, [34]

> The meaning of the physical items in Firstspace indicated above, experienced on the level of Secondspace, are dictated by the ideas existing in Thirdspace. Formed by their Judean ideas on religious identity their Thirdspace was the strategic location from where they transformed the perceived space and the conceived space they lived in (cf Soja 1996:68). The food measures used for First and Secondspace were reinvigorated from the ideas in this Thirdspace. When they were still in their homeland, they could set up rules and regulations for the temple, sacrifices, worship, etcetera, that could function as indicators of the boundaries for their identity. In the Diaspora situation their system of purity and holiness had to be replaced by different measures such as those regulating their eating customs. This was the obvious way for the Judeans to express and protect their religious identity, keeping the balance between opportunity and protection in a foreign land. From their ideas in Thirdspace they projected rules for the specific food and drink they put on their table (Firstspace) to create a Secondspace of exclusive values in which their identity is entrenched. In the historical situation in Babylonia with its specific sociological structures Daniel and his three associates are depicted as the heroes who could hold their own and even surpass others in success due to the personal space they created around themselves.

It does not make much sense to understand the food stuffs as Firstspace items. Yet, Venter is correct to suggest that the importance attached to them (or the meaning they received) by the four lads came out of their Thirdspace consciousness which dictated that within the oppressive and threatening reality of exile they had to retain their Judean identity and loyalty to their God. However, I would challenge the connection between their actions centered on the food items and notions of purity or opportunity as the only or most important, as argued by Venter. The idea, postulated by Daniel Smith-Christopher, [35] that the refusal of the king's portion was the only form of resistance available to the four Judeans is much more persuasive within the context of

---

[34] *Ibid.*, pp. 999-1000.

[35] D.L. Smith-Christopher, "Hebrew Satyagraha: The Politics of Biblical Fasting in the Post-Exilic Period," *Food and Foodways* 5(1993): 269-292. For a further function of food refusal as resistance in conjunction with prayer, see section 5.9.

the chapter and the rest of the book. In this manner, the one subjugated is able to ward off the final encroachment of the oppressor upon his self. The preservation of self within a condition of oppression is the last barrier over which an individual can still hope to have power. He can decide to keep his bodily entrances closed to the unwanted foreign influences rather than be persuaded or overwhelmed by matters of language (propaganda) or food coming from a suspect source. It is never detailed of what the king's portion consisted [36] and ultimately the water and vegetables also came from the palace food stores since they were supplied by the king's steward. Therefore it may be assumed that the nature of the food had less to do with matters of dietary law but rather with the ability of the lads to decide for themselves what to eat and especially what not to eat. That this is so is supported by the passage in 10:3 which tells that Daniel had been mourning and therefore he had not partaken of "pleasant bread, flesh, or wine." Since Daniel is a servant of the court, even if in a high position, it is not unreasonable to assume that he obtained his food locally and that it would not have differed too much from that of his non-Judean colleagues. Fewell also notes this peculiar point. [37] She observes that,

---

[36] As is also pointed out by Venter (p. 996). He suggests that "the king's food had no danger of bringing any bodily harm or physical illness to the Judean men." Likewise he points out (p. 997) that the alternative diet that Daniel requests can hardly be seen as one providing the nutritious value to guarantee the result that is described in 1:15. Here Daniel and his friends outdid their colleagues in appearance and health. It was not so much the substance of the food but rather its source to which Daniel objected. Up to this point Venter does not differ much from Smith-Christopher. But he continues, "This represents the king and everything he stood for. It is what the food represented that endangered Daniel's purity. The cultural boundaries he erected around himself would be crossed by the foreign customs of the king. It would become part of the Judeans' life. It would be totally out of place and would render them impure and unholy. Put in different terms, taking this food 'would be tantamount to declaring complete political allegiance' (Fewell 1988:40)." Again, this is only partly true since the matter at hand is not one of purity. Although Fewell is closer to the core of the matter, here too the emphasis is on the act of refusal and self-determination of what to eat and when to eat, especially since both diets came from the same source. In fact, Venter seems to contradict himself after suggesting that the food was not in and of itself harmful, when he states (p. 1002) that "purity rules held up the boundaries of [Daniel's] mental space of holiness. Now he is confronted by a threatening power in the form of the king's order to eat his food. This food is an external harmful power that should be prevented from entrance into their bodies." It is unfortunate that Venter seems unable to go beyond the traditionally held view – however flawed – that the food episode is concerned with Jewish dietary law. He writes, "within a foreign cultural-religious space [Daniel] tried to create a personal space controlled by his beliefs of purity and holiness. The physical space at court represented a cultural-religious system that had to be accepted as the world God sent them to live in, but had to be prevented from becoming part of the Judeans' inner life. To defend their religion they had to fall back on the Judean customs of kosher rules" (p. 997).

[37] Fewell, *Circle of Sovereignty* (1988, 39-40).

Dan. 10.3 implies either that Daniel does not view meat and wine (also labeled desirable or delightful food) *per se* to be a problem of cultic defilement or that Daniel, in his later years, drastically relaxes his religious principles concerning diet. Furthermore, one might argue that the defiling nature of food eaten in exile is unavoidable (cf. Ezek. 4.13; Hos. 9.3, 4). In other words, choosing not to be ritually defiled by food substance is not an option for captives.

Fewell has compared the induction of the four Judeans into the Babylonian court with "the classic model of a *rite of passage*." This is aimed at facilitating a person in the passing of one stage of his or her life into the next in such a manner that the new stage, i.e. a new identity, is the only one that remains relevant. The intermediate stage, following the former identity and prior to assuming the permanent new one, is also known as the 'liminal' stage. The objective is that all roads to the former stage(s) are from now on closed. The only recourse left to Daniel is to make a point by resisting one particular element of the induction process: food. Thus, "the narrator suggests that the assignment of new identity may be part of what spurs Daniel to show resistance. In other words, Daniel is making an attempt to limit in some way the all-consuming indoctrination process." [38] By the end of the chapter Daniel and his companions have turned into full-blown Babylonian court officials, although secretly with their true identity intact. Or, as Venter puts it, "in the end Daniel and the others became outstanding officials at court while still upholding their Judean identity. Although they underwent a rite of passage and very successfully became part of the Babylonian court, they corroborated their original identity. They were successfully integrated into the court, but simultaneously kept their national identity. This dual citizenship was already formed in the liminal phase by the specific measures Daniel took." [39] Venter shows that liminality can also apply to spaces. [40]

---

[38] *Ibid.*, pp. 38, 39.

[39] Venter, "Study," pp. 995-996.

[40] *Ibid.*, p. 997.

This liminal stage of preparation for their eventual position can also be seen in terms of a liminal space. Being at the court of the king and totally subjected to the training program the king prescribed, Daniel tries to create a personal space for him and his fellows that would allow them to still hold up the spiritual boundaries that keep their holy identity intact. Daniel's resistance 'is an attempt to express some kind of personal control in a seemingly uncontrollable situation' (Fewell 1988:40). Within a foreign cultural-religious space he tried to create a personal space controlled by his beliefs of purity and holiness.

Here too, however, I would tend to amend Venter's position somewhat. Indeed, for the duration of the training period, the palace is a place of probation for the four Judeans. It is wrought with danger, both for their physical, as well as their spiritual, well-being. Therefore, Venter's observation that their attempt to isolate themselves already during this period represents "a personal space" is certainly correct. Yet, Daniel's attempt "to create a personal space controlled by his beliefs of purity and holiness," as Venter puts it, was certainly not an end in itself. His situation was truly precarious. If he were to fail in preserving his sense of self, his ability to keep open the communication channel with the Divine would have been at stake. These two notions were intimately and indissolubly intertwined.

With the process of forced acculturation seemingly completed, we have reached the point in the larger story where, again following Fewell [41]

> The old story world sets the new story world in relief. Homeland gives way to alien land. At least a similitude of political autonomy turns into political captivity. A native, though weak, king is harshly succeeded by a strong, but foreign one. Daniel 1 is both a story and an exposition to a larger story, that found in the narrative corpus of Daniel 1-6 or, if one thinks in broader terms, the entire book of Daniel. Consequently, the ending [of homeland and autonomy] that begins Daniel 1 (1.1-2) is strategic not only for the first short story, but also for the story that continues beyond ch. 1. Besides establishing the general temporal and locational setting … it introduces a dramatic irony that permeates the first story and the conflict that is to develop through the ensuing chapters.

---

[41] *Ibid.*, p. 34.

5.2   Dreaming of Statues, Mountains, and Stones

The first verses of chapter 2 are still written in Hebrew, with a shift to Aramaic taking place in v. 4. [42] The abrupt change of language, both within the narrative content as well as even with regard to the manuscript page layout, testify to the fact that this is more than a fanciful writer endeavoring to add some *couleur locale* to his story. Rather the contrary: within the subtle series of diminishing of self, the change of language would thus constitute the final act of a systematic erasure of the protagonists' identity.

Chapter 2 is the first to be centered around a dream account. It is broken up into various stages. First, the conditions of Nebuchadnezzar's frightful dream are narrated. After waking up startled from a nightmare (2:1), he demands his wise men to tell him its content (2:2-13). The reader, meanwhile, finds Daniel and his friends now solidly settled in the milieu of the Babylonian court, although they have not yet risen to rank. They only come to the fore (2:14) when the other religious specialists fail to tell the contents of the dream. Secondly, in order for Daniel to be able to perform the feat that the diviners think is restricted to the realm of the gods (2:11), he receives a vision of the dream from his own God (2:18-23). He is only able to make this request of the divine within the confines of his own sanctified domestic space, away from foreign soil (2:17). In his initial interaction with his God, the attributes of the Divine are solidly laid out (2:20-22): He is in charge of temporal and spatial, as well as cognitive and sapiential matters. Since similar appellations are known to have been bestowed on Marduk, [43] this could also have been formulated deliberately in this way by those responsible for ultimately framing the court tales, to represent this as surpassing the deity of the Babylonian monarch. [44] The desperate outcry of the diviners (2:11) that the

---

[42]   See the discussion in B.A. Mastin, "The Reading of 1QDan a at Daniel II 4," *VT* 38(1988): 341-346, which deals with the peculiar vacat at the junction between the Hebrew and Aramaic parts of the texts, displayed in the MT printed Bibles as well as in the Daniel ms. from Qumran Cave 1.

[43] During Nebuchadnezzar's reign the status of Marduk had become elevated to that of supreme god in the pantheon. This rise is clearly indicated by his appellations through time. See T. Abusch, "Marduk," in *DDD* 543-549.

[44] For instance, in one of the building inscriptions of Nabopolassar (Nebuchadnezzar's father), Marduk is called the one "who knows the hearts of the gods of heaven and earth, who sees the ways of men most clearly…". S. Langdon, *Building Inscriptions of the Neo-Babylonian Empire. Part I: Nabopolassar and Nebuchadnezzar*. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1905: 57-59. In inscriptions from

ability to know dreams belongs to "the gods, whose dwelling is not with mortals," is sharply juxtaposed with the references to the God of Israel throughout the chapter as "the God of Heaven" (2:18, 19, 37, 44) in such a way that He is also portrayed as the master of this realm. In 2:28 it is stressed that not only is He the master of the heavenly realm, it is also His dwelling place. Whereas the former are merely indicated through a negative location, the latter is positively and securely located in heaven. This is also to emphasize that surely, the presumably vanquished God of Daniel is not imprisoned in Nebuchadnezzar's temple, as other objects of god-napping would be, and thus in the power of his god. Not only does Daniel's God decide who is king, but He also chooses where He wishes to dwell. [45] Daniel then tells the king his dream (2:31-36), followed by the interpretation (2:37-45). In response (2:47) Nebuchadnezzar shows his gratitude to Daniel and acknowledges that the latter's God is "the God of gods and the Lord of kings, and a revealer of secrets (רזין). [46] He then promotes him, thereby securing his position and that of his friends (2:46-49).

Nebuchadnezzar's reign, he is referred to as "Marduk, lord of the gods…", (75); "Esagila, palace of heaven and earth, dwelling-place of the lord of the gods Marduk" (93, 101). An interesting detail, in comparison with Daniel 2:22, is provided when Marduk is addressed as "lord of the gods, the exalted, radiant light… [*nu-u-ru*]" The word *nu-u-ru* is the Babylonian cognate of the Aramaic נהורא that is used in 2:22. The framers of Daniel must have been aware of some of this divine titulary and re-applied it in a satirical way in the text. Another similar appellation for God is found in Isa. 60:1-3, 19 and Zech. 14:7 where the divine light seems to congeal with that of a renewed Jerusalem. See, likewise, J.A. Fitzmyer, *Tobit* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003): 313 on 13:11 which contains a similar notion. It is interesting to note that Babylon is also accorded this title. The epithet "Babylon, the light of the heavens" is found in the topographical series *Tintir = Babylon* (tablet 1, 5). This series, much like the Creation Epic *Enuma Elish*, which also deals in part with the cosmological character of Babylon, was copied many times over many centuries well into the Hellenistic period, and found in multiple copies. Cf. A.R. George, *Babylonian Topographical Texts*, Louvain: Peeters, 1992: 30. In the commentary to said line, George adds, "*nuru* is a common divine epithet, applied frequently in its most literal sense to solar and astral deities, but also found figuratively with other gods, including Marduk … Divine epithets are commonly borrowed by cities and their temples, and this may be one explanation of the present line" (243). He further remarks that in "a much later period E-sagil … is explained as *bitu nur ilu rabuti*, "House, light of the great gods", with further examples given (244). In later Jewish texts from the Greco-Roman era this image, likely based on the Isaiah passage, is worked out further, culminating in the Book of Revelation 21:23 and 22:5.

[45] See section 4.1.2 on god-napping and divine abandonment and the function of 'miqdash me'at'.

[46] This recognition of Nebuchadnezzar and the earlier claim by the diviners (2:11) concerning the divine as being in possession of secrets and the ability to reveal them to those in a position to do so, is a strong indication that in Mesopotamian culture too, the source of revealed information was with the gods and was not obtained exclusively through the expertise and training of the religious specialists themselves. Their training was, in fact, focused on learning to interpret the wisdom of the gods. See on this J.N. Lawson, "'The God Who Reveals Secrets': the Mesopotamian Background to Daniel 2.47," *JSOT* 74(1997): 61-76. He provides many examples showing that the gods were indeed the source of wisdom and secrets and that the conflict described in Daniel 2 is not one of divine versus human

Of the court tales, chapter 2 is probably the one better suited to test the various approaches for the study of sacred space. It contains many graphic elements that can be investigated through the models of the comparative and phenomenology of religion school, such as every single segment of the latter part of Nebuchadnezzar's dream and its interpretation. The more sociological and anthropological character of the entire image, which includes the statue and the mountain image, as well as its wider surroundings (both real space and dreamscape) can then be clarified through the notions of First-, Second-, and Thirdspace, with the narrative framework of the construction illumined through the notion of storied space as well as the sacred space interpretations of the phenomenologists of religion. Taken together then, the statue would represent the virtual embodiment of successive powers with the perceived ultimate and firstspace power reaching with its luminous golden head towards the God of Heaven, challenging the true divine firstspace power, with whom dwells the (true, primeval?) light (2:22), [47] rather than a reflection in a golden head. The stone, taken from the power that was thought to have been pushed into a thirdspace position, is then empowered by the real, but non-bodied, firstspace power, i.e. the God of Israel, to crush the false powers.

---

knowledge. The author of Daniel is merely suggesting that the offence (and therefore inferiority and ineffectiveness) of the court diviners rested in the fact that they consulted the wrong gods. Lawson does not address 2:11, a passage that only reinforces this argument further as it shows the contrast between the competing divine abilities.

[47] *1 Enoch* 18:9 may present additional awareness of the divine light. Here the seer has just seen a mountaintop being the likeness of the throne of God, with the top being of lapis lazuli. This is followed by the short statement "And I saw a burning fire." Apart from the immediate recognition of Ex. 24:9 ff. in this passage, Nickelsburg (*1 Enoch 1*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001 [Hermeneia]: 286) suggests that this may refer to the fire of the divine presence. See also the discussion in J. Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56-66* [AB 19B], New York: Doubleday, 2003: 217, on Is. 60:19-20 which identifies God with the primeval light that is to replace or augment the light of the sun and the moon in the eschatological future in a rebuilt Jerusalem. See also the equation of Marduk with light in note 44 above. For a sociological understanding of the 'light' theme and its connection with wisdom thought (which sees 'light' as representative of wisdom), see the essay by D.L. Smith-Christopher, "Prayers and Dreams: Power and Diaspora Identities in the Social Setting of the Daniel Tales," *The Book of Daniel; Composition and Reception* I: 266-290 (at 286-288). He notes the pair of light and dark, which occurs in Dan. 2:22, and suggests, based on similar passages, that this may also include a reference to God's power as 'light' and that of the nations as 'darkness.' He then moves his discussion to the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness from the Qumran War Scroll where the theme becomes militarized and Dan. 12 where the *maskilim* will come to shine in the firmament. He concludes with the interesting observation (86): "The point is this – Daniel's prayer for wisdom explicitly uses politicized language of opposition or 'spiritual warfare,' since 'wisdom' and 'light' are amongst the armaments of the faithful in their struggle."

This chapter also contains many of the traditional elements of literary dreams: an account of the dream and an interpretation, as well as a mention of the physical effects the dream has on the dreamer and the place and time when the dream occurs. Both Nebuchadnezzar's original dream (2:1) as well as Daniel's recycled version of it (2:19) are said to take place in the night. The reader is here confronted with a twist; it is not the dreamer who recounts the dream. The narrative suggests that the interpreter was offered a reenactment of the dream in a vision that he received from the divine realm. After recounting the dream, the interpretation he then offers differs somewhat on a number of details. From a form critical perspective the king's dream classifies as a message dream in need of interpretation and Daniel's vision as an incubated message dream, with the interpretation included. It is not related in which form he receives the interpretation, but it is likely that after he views the actual dream, a verbal message, or even a visible heavenly messenger, explains the dream to him. The reader has to wait until chapter 7 to see this mechanism laid out in clear detail. The fact that Daniel retreats into his own house (where it is explained in chapter 6 that he also performs his regular religious duties, such as praying, with the window oriented in the direction of Jerusalem and the Holy Temple) in order to pray for guidance in this particular predicament, indicates that the house functions as his private sanctified place. This, in combination with his actions, creates the proper conditions for dream incubation.

The description of the dream itself offers a number of interesting spatial images. The statue of a man, composed of various materials, towers above all else that might be near. It is clearly meant as a parody on the usual Mesopotamian statues that emanate power and strength, symbolized by the decreasing quality of the materials. Then, as often happens in dreams, the scene shifts abruptly to a scene in which a stone comes loose, seemingly by itself, from something that is not described. This stone is launched as a projectile and hits the statue, which crumbles upon impact, thereby restoring the horizon. The wind then completes the act of dispersing the remains until nothing is left of it, which is reinforced by the use of the chaff metaphor. Although the wind is not further specified in this passage, note should be made of a comparable passage in Jer. 49:36, in the Oracle against Elam. The text reads:

> And I will bring against Elam four winds from the four quarters of heaven
>
> And will scatter them toward all those winds, and there shall be no nation
>
> To which the dispersed of Elam shall not come

Since the wind in Daniel is clearly depicted as a divine instrument, it is tempting to understand this wind in the same category as the 'four winds' that occur in other biblical passages. It may thus be seen in a similar vein as the four winds in the above passage from Jeremiah. Furthermore, they are so specified in Daniel 7:2 and 8:8. In addition, 11:4 predicts tellingly along similar lines as 2:35, of a king, probably Alexander, that "his kingdom shall be broken, and shall be divided toward the four winds of heaven." [48] The 'four winds' paradigm is closely related to that of the 'four corners or quarters of the earth', as can also be seen from the Jeremiah passage above. This is a standard element in Mesopotamian royal titulary. The king is lord of the four corners of the world. Seen within the context of the 'four winds' pattern, the wind in 2:35 therefore becomes a punitive pun: the kingdom shall be dispersed to the four rims of its reaches.

After the statue has been destroyed and its remains have disappeared, the stone undergoes a miraculous transformation. It grows into an immense mountain, filling the whole earth (2:35c). Because of this last characterization, this mountain is often understood as a cosmic mountain. However, there are difficulties involved in such a description. Two that will be mentioned in the present context are that it is not identified with any known mountain, in fact, its location is not even specified, and it fits the category of 'imaginary' or 'literary' mountain. In short, it is thought not to be a real mountain but a *metaphor* for either a real mountain, or an earthly rulership, or the power of heaven. The most likely object for the metaphor would be Mount Zion with the Temple (see on this e.g. Keil *ad loc*).

---

[48] The 'four winds' as actual weather phenomena occur furthermore in Ezek. 37:9 and Zech. 2:10 and 6:5. 1 Enoch 18:1-3 describes the cosmological dimension of the 'four winds'. See on this passage, K. Coblents Bautch, *A Study of the Geography of I Enoch 17-19 'No One Has Seen What I Have Seen'* Leiden: Brill, 2003: 100-103.

One aspect that, to my knowledge, has been neglected in the commentaries is what a mountain may signify from the perspective of a Babylonian ruler. Mountain ranges were always on the periphery of empire and wrought with danger: both from so-called uncivilized tribal groups as well as from demonic forces. At the same time they were also seen as the abode of the gods. Perhaps as a result of this latter association, the shape of the main Mesopotamian sanctuaries, the *ziggurats*, is that of a mountain. [49] In fact, even in the mythological discourse between the gods, this association is emphasized. [50] By building stone mountains on the vast plains of Mesopotamia, it was perhaps also thought that the mountains and the forces they conceal or represent, could be contained, tamed, and thus be controlled. How ironic then that a monstrously transmogrifing mountain that overruns Nebuchadnezzar's empire, would appear in the king's dream - the same mountain, a natural yet divine if imaginary one, that shatters Nebuchadnezzar's artificial rival mountain. [51] In fact, the description of Nebuchadnezzar's dream proves to be a case of doubly turning the tables on the world

---

[49] Very often the name of a Mesopotamian temple complex, when it contains the elements *é* (Sum.: house) and *kur* (Sum.: mountain; but also: land, netherworld) already betrays its association with mountains. See the listing of temple designations in A.R. George, *House Most High: The Temples of Ancient Mesopotamia*. Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, IN, 1993: 116-118. Likewise, in A.W. Sjöberg and E. Bergmann, *The Collection of the Sumerian Temple Hymns* [Locust Valley, NY: J.J. Augustin Publisher, 1969] we find a personified temple addressed with various titles describing it as a mythical mountain. See hymn # 9, pp. 24 and 76-78. The other common term for mountain is *hursag*, which can refer to a mountain range. See A.R. George, *House Most High*, pp. 100-102 for temples with this term integrated in their names. On the meaning of these two terms, see further D.O. Edzard, "Deep-Rooted Skyscrapers and Bricks: Ancient Mesopotamian Architecture and its Imagery," *Figurative Language in the Ancient Near East*. M. Mindlin et al., eds. 1987: 13-24 (at pp. 14-16). See also E.J. Hamlin, "The Meaning of 'Mountains and Hills' in Isa. 41:14-16," *JNES* 13(1954): 185-190 (at pp. 188-189).

[50] See T. Jacobsen, *The Treasures of Darkness,* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976: 126. In a love poem between Nanna and Ningal, which contains creation language as well, Ningal assures Nanna that she will join him "in his lofty dwelling on the ziggurat of Ur:

In your house on high, in your beloved house, I will come to live

O Nanna, up above in your cedar perfumed mountain, I will come to live,

O lord Nanna, in your citadel I will come to live, …

O Nanna, in your mansion of Ur I will come to live …

For the full text and a commentary on these passage and further examples, see A.W. Sjöberg, *Der Mondgott Nanna-Suen in der sumerischen Überlieferung.* Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1960: 80-87.

[51] On the power of the image of the mythical or imaginary mountain, see F. Karahashi, "Fighting the Mountain: Some Observations on the Sumerian Myths of Inanna and Ninurta," *JNES* 63(2004): 111-118. In the two myths that are treated in this article, two aspects of gods fighting mountains are highlighted. In the first a whimsical Inanna pulverizes Mount Ebih out of spite because it did not pay her the proper respect. In Lugal-e, Ninurta fights a mountain and its allies, an army of stones. In the respective texts, both Inanna and Ninurta are called *kur gul-gul* (the mountain destroyer)!

of Babylon. It may be suggested that Daniel is obviously inspired by a passage in Jer. 51:25-26, part of a severe doom oracle against Babylon, in which Babylon is depicted as a mountain. [52] Earlier, as a juxtaposition of this image, Jeremiah had already referred to Jerusalem and its Temple as a mountain. [53] Clearly, these passages reference the notion of ancient Near Eastern temples representing mountains and the author is painfully aware of the positive weight this image carries in Mesopotamian religion. In this text, the mountain is personified and accused of being expansionistic, which is, in the context, treated as a negative trait. In Daniel 2, the authors have cleverly upstaged these passages, by recycling the metaphor back to the side of Israel's God and the negatives reversed into positives. The expansionist mountain (Zion) in the dream will now destroy the once expansionist mountain that was Babylon.

When read in light of critical spatial theory, the relationship between these two texts becomes even more profound and it emphasizes the pivotal character of the Jeremiah passage for understanding the dynamics in Daniel 2. It cleverly demonstrates that the application of an identical mountain motif intimates that not only are the rivals of equal strength; on the contrary, the one who seems to be the underdog in truth was always the superior partner in the conflict and destined to be victorious.

In Lefebvrian terms we are dealing with *perceived space* in the sense that it concerns two real elevations in a real landscape, i.e. Mount Zion and the great Ziggurat of Babylon. However, these are metaphorically turned into gigantic personified roaring and charging mountains, instruments of their respective divine powers. Once they have moved to this narrative and mental level, they represent Lefebvre's definitive *conceived space*. Yet, a case could be presented that both were *conceived space* already on the first level, since they are both, partly and wholly, man-made

---

[52] Jer. 51:25] "Behold, I *am* against you, O destroying mountain, who destroys all the earth," says the Lord. "And I will stretch out My hand against you, roll you down from the rocks, and make you a burnt mountain. 26] They shall not take from you a stone for a corner nor a stone for a foundation, but you shall be desolate forever," says the Lord. See further fn. 98 in section 4.2.1 on p. 111 above. [*]

[53] Jer. 17:3, "O My mountain in the field, I will give as plunder your wealth, all your treasures, and your high places of sin within all your borders." In Daniel 9, in the prayer for its restoration, Jerusalem is also called God's holy mountain.

constructions that have modified the natural landscape. But as such they have come to dominate that landscape and actually become one with that same landscape which in turn may yet be modified again. This is precisely what happens on the narrative level. The mountains first become mighty, and - one may add ironically - natural and primeval mountains, devoid of all semblances of human architecture and modification. This is followed by them becoming each other's *lived space* since the one who had vanquished the other is now vanquished in turn by those who had been vanquished first. Here we see the elevated level of the turning of the tables by former victims over their conquerors. Soja's triad explains this intricate model even more succinctly. The unimpressive and partly artificial mounds represent *firstspace* (the realities in the landscape, as well as the dominant powers that determined their form and format in a *secondspace* act). The powerful crags that have become at once the weapon and representation of the respective divine powers are devised in *secondspace*. And finally, the battle between the mountains takes place in *thirdspace*, as it is told and mustered from the perspective of the defeated.

5.2.1 EXCURSUS

An exploration of Dan. 2:34-35, 45 and a proposal for the solution of its problems

5.2.1.1. Introduction

At first sight it would appear that chapter 2 lacks any Temple imagery, whereas every other chapter of Daniel in one way or another manages to refer to it or its heavenly counterpart. It should therefore not come as a surprise that John Goldingay, for instance, states in his Daniel commentary, "Dan 2 has no reference to the people of God, the messiah, the eternal destiny of humanity, the remnant, or the temple – God's rule has sole focus." [54] It is the remark regarding the absence of the Temple that I wish to challenge in the following excursus. My objections do not imply that the

---

[54] J.E. Goldingay (1989: 60). He cites C. Barth, *Diesseits und Jenseits im Glauben des späten Israel*; 1974, pp. 97, 99.

160

Temple is actually mentioned in explicit terms. However, a careful analysis of the metaphoric elements in the passage yields surprising results. Marvin Sweeney has also argued for a reading that foregrounds the political and nationalistic agenda of Daniel. He focuses on the circumstances that gave rise to the final compilation of the book, the Maccabean revolt, and concludes that not only do the vision accounts (7-12) directly refer to this period but so do the court tales (1-6). Even if the latter have an earlier prehistory they were revamped to address to issues of the editor's world. First and foremost these concerned the well-being of the temple, the continuation of the divine service, a hope for a restored autonomy in the Land. He argues that rather than reading Daniel in light of later events, interpreters should return to its immediate historical and political context in order to make sense of the text. In addition, the various Babylonian and Persian kings in the court tales are to be understood as foils for Antiochus IV. [55]

The verses that form the basis for the analysis are part of the first dream of King Nebuchadnezzar (vv. 34-35) and Daniel's explanation of it (vv. 44-45). This is the dream of the gigantic statue, composed of four metals, that is destroyed by an enigmatic stone which, in turn, undergoes a mysterious transformation. The text (MT), with the elements to be discussed highlighted, reads:

> *2:34* – You saw until **a stone was hewn without hands**, which smote the image upon its feet of iron and clay, and broke them to pieces. *2:35* – Then were the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold**, crumbled together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing floors; and the wind carried them away**, and no place was found for them: and **the stone** that struck the image **became a great mountain**, and **filled the whole earth**.

> [*2:44* – And in the days of those kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed; nor shall the kingdom be left to another people; it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, but it shall stand for ever.] *2:45* – Just as you saw that **a stone was hewn from the mountain without hands**, and that it crumbled the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold; the great

---

[55] M.A. Sweeney, "The End of Eschatology in Daniel? Theological and Socio-Political Ramifications of the Changing Contexts of Interpretation," *Biblical Interpretation* 9(2001)2: 123-139.

God made known to the king what will happen in the future: and the dream is
certain, and its interpretation sure.

Before moving to the various opinions concerning the nature of the stone and the
mountain, it should be noted that the account of the dream and its repetition in the
interpretation do not match. [56] Firstly, the fact that in v. 34 the stone becomes a great
mountain is omitted in v. 45. Secondly, the vital piece of information concerning the
source of the stone (i.e., hewn from the mountain) that is mentioned in v. 45, is lacking
in v. 34. However, the Greek versions (OG and LXX) that do mention this also in v. 34
may likely have added it in order to harmonize both statements. Commentators have
noted these discrepancies and have suggested a variety of explanations. [57]

John Collins [58] made some important observations over thirty years ago with regard to
the possible origin of the dream sequence in chapter 2. The schema of the four
kingdoms and the four world-ages symbolized by different metals is clearly of non-
Jewish origin. As the head of gold signifies Nebuchadnezzar, he suggests that the dream
account must have originated in a time that his rule would have been fondly
remembered as a golden age. The other 'kingdoms' would then have signified
Nebuchadnezzar's immediate and inferior successors. If so, an early version of the
account could then perhaps have come about during the reign of Nabonidus, [59] although
Collins cites a number of later Hellenistic-Babylonian sources for it. [60] He further
suggests that the reference in 2:44 to the final kingdom set up by God would thus point
to a "lasting Babylonian kingdom" and Nebuchadnezzar's dynasty. It is this account,

---

[56] There are also inconsistencies between the description of the statue and its components in the
dream account and the interpretation. Treatment of these falls outside of the scope of this study.

[57] See e.g. P.R. Davies, "Daniel Chapter Two," *JTS* 27(1976): 392-401, who recognizes two
editorial layers in the dream. The first one dating to the end of the exilic period and the second being an
editorial adjusting addition in the Maccabean period (p. 400).

[58] J.J. Collins, "The Court-Tales in Daniel and the Development of Apocalyptic," *JBL* 94(1975):
218-234 (pp. 221-222).

[59] This is Davies' opinion, *ibid.*, p. 399. For Nabonidus' affinity for Nebuchadnezzar, see P.-A.
Beaulieu, *The Reign of Nabonidus, King of Babylon 556-539 B.C.* New Haven: Yale University Press,
1989: 111-112. Further, *ANET*, 310.

[60] *Ibid.*, p. 222, fn. 21.

then, that was taken over by the Jewish editor of chapter 2 and was incorporated into a court tale with its own agenda. Philip Davies [61] considers this reconstruction to be unlikely but would accept a very early Jewish *Vorlage*, although this would not predate the time of Nabonidus. Yet, it would take into account the gradual deterioration of the Neo-Babylonian dynasty and its total demise as a reasonable expectation at the time of its writing. In Davies' reconstruction the final kingdom must then represent "a great and permanent Jewish kingdom." [62] The mountain of 2:34 would refer to a kingdom "established on the holy hill of Jerusalem" and the stone possibly to Cyrus, who initiated the process of the return and the rebuilding of Jerusalem. With this in mind, Davies places this phase of the story at the end of the exilic period or immediately after. With the restoration taking place, the original eschatological aspect of the story would have become lost in its transformation into a court tale, only to be resurrected in the process of reuse during the Maccabean period. Here we see the 'stone cut out of the mountain' as added to the interpretation of the dream (2:45). Davies understands this as referring to a Jewish state already in existence in some form (i.e., the mountain) from which "the last kingdom would arise" (i.e., the stone). [63] However, that explanation would also be problematic because both mountain and stone would then signify the same, a stable future Jewish kingdom. The mountain image would represent a remnant from an earlier stage of the story and thus stand for a 'once-future' kingdom in 2:34. In the later clarification in 2:45 it has come to refer to the Judean autonomy that had meanwhile been established (Yehud/Judea). But the image of the stone would shift, in Davies' paradigm, from the messianic Cyrus to an abstract future kingdom. While the mountain might well be understood to symbolize Jerusalem, this is only feasible in a converging relationship with the Temple, which is built on a mountain. I propose therefore that the stone, which is depicted as an instrument of vengeance, much like a ballistic missile,

---

[61] P.R. Davies, "Daniel Chapter Two," pp. 397, 399-400.

[62] Neither Collins nor Davies mention Jer. 27:7, which explicitly states that God will allow Nebuchadnezzar's dynasty to endure for at least three generations. See also Goldingay (1989: 50-51) for comment on this.

[63] *Ibid.*, p. 401.

should rather be seen as a portable and essential element of the Temple – i.e., the great altar; [64] the same altar that had been desecrated by Antiochus. [65]

Before analyzing the passage under discussion in detail, a short overview of research of modern and ancient interpretations is in order, highlighting a number of solutions as well as noting questions that remain.

5.2.1.2. Modern interpretations of the stone and the mountain

Fortunately Daniel informs us that the materials the statue is made of represent kingdoms. Although exactly what these kingdoms are and what the provenance of the imagery is, has given rise to lively debate and creative solutions. All agree, however, that the stone signals the end of those kingdoms and that they will be replaced by God's indestructible reign. It is not made clear what the nature of God's reign is. Depending on the philosophical and religious background of the interpreter, as well as his/her cultural and historical milieu, it has variously been explained as a fifth (messianic?) kingdom, or a messianic figure inaugurating such a kingdom. [66] Christian interpreters, in general, favor the view that sees the stone as a symbol for Jesus (messianic figure), [67] or, collectively, as the Church; [68] an interpretation that may be reinforced by the reuses of these Danielic passages in the New Testament. Jewish interpreters, in general, look for a kingdom ruled by the Messiah (as scion of the restored House of David), which is yet to come. [69]

---

[64] Indicating the fluidity of these terms, C. Dohmen, "Mizbeah," *TDOT* 8, p. 221 writes: "as the center of any cult the altar itself represents *pars pro toto* the sanctuary and its cult."

[65] In the narrative world of Daniel the great altar and temple had been destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar, yet the great poet of Lamentations (in the true spirit of the lament genre) presented it as if God had rejected and abandoned His own sanctuary and altar (2:7).

[66] G. Pfandl provides a thorough overview and analysis of the various Christian interpretations, both ancient and modern, of the 'stone' passage. "Interpretations of the Kingdom of God in Daniel 2:44," *AUSS* 34(1996): 249-268.

[67] E.g., E. Siegman, "The Stone Hewn from the Mountain," *CBQ* 18(1956): 364-379.

[68] G.A.F. Knight, "'Thou Art Peter'," *Theology Today* 17(1960/61): 168-180.

[69] For a creative link between these passages in Daniel and I Samuel 16-17, see G.S. Oegema, *The Anointed and His People*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998: 58-60. Of special interest is

F.W. Farrar [70] states as a matter of fact that the mountain is Mount Zion and the stone is the Messianic Kingdom. In his commentary on chapter 2, James Montgomery [71] cites the opinion of C.F. Keil, who identifies the "stone that becomes a mountain" with Mount Zion. But, Montgomery argues, this is "properly denied by Behr[mann]." Arthur Jeffery is even more adamant in dismissing the possibility that Mount Zion may have been in the author's mind, in fact, he would not identify it with any existing mountain. His focus is more on the quality of the rock, "Good stones for the ballistae were quarried from special rock masses in the mountains," and it is the endurance of such rocks that comes to symbolize the kingdom of God. [72] Curiously, Margaret Barker, in her many writings about suppressed Temple symbolism in the Hebrew Bible, does not include the passage from Daniel 2. With regard to Daniel and *4 Ezra*, she states in her study *The Older Testament*, "Both books mention the stone/mountain, which is a recurring but *as yet inexplicable feature* of this tradition (4 Ezra 13.6; Daniel 2.45); cf. Zech. 4.6 ff, an obscure text and Deut. 32.4 ff, also obscure. The rock is a frequent image in the psalms and Isaiah" [73] [italics mine]. Although André Lacocque [74] had already observed in his commentary that "the 'stone not cut by human hands' (v. 34) represents Mount Zion, the Temple not built by human hands," he inexplicably discusses this in relation to chapter 7 and not at the appropriate passage of chapter 2 and the argument is not further worked out. In line with this approach, Philip Davies [75] does not add anything new to the debate on the stone. He too is not tempted into putting forward an explanation. Yet, he does elaborate more than others on a Jewish political meaning for the mountain image. He writes, "[t]he symbolism of the stone is admittedly unclear, but the mountain probably stands for Zion,

---

his comparison between Nebuchadnezzar's giant multi-metal statue that is crushed by the mysterious stone and the giant Philistine Goliath who was knocked down by the stone from David's slingshot.

[70] F.W. Farrar, 1901: 161.

[71] J. Montgomery, 1898(1927): 191.

[72] Cf. A. Jeffery, 1956: 390.

[73] M. Barker, *The Older Testament: the Survival of Themes from the Ancient Royal Cult in Sectarian Judaism and Early Christianity*, London: SPCK, 1987: 117-118.

[74] A. Lacocque (1979: 124). G.K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission*, 2004: 145 notes that he does not supply much evidence to support this thesis.

[75] P.R. Davies, *Daniel* (1985): 48.

and the dream depicts the imminent restoration of the Jewish people to their home which will soon become the centre of the earth. (This last suggestion is in any case implied also in the interpretation given in the chapter)." In an earlier study, however, Davies elaborated on the meaning of the dream signifying the imminent realization of a "Jewish kingdom which will fill the earth." There he also cautiously suggests that perhaps the stone might be a reference to acts of Cyrus as a liberating divine agent. In a somewhat awkward semantic turn he then jumps to the stage in which that stone having turned into a mountain "indicates that the kingdom is established on the holy hill of Jerusalem." [76] This explanation is part of his attempt to unravel the redaction history of the chapter. He considers it to be an older story referring to the excellence of Babylon. It would have received its first Jewish makeover at the beginning of the Persian period and the restoration of some form of Jewish autonomy in part of the Land; hence Cyrus' presence as the liberating agent in the narrative. All this would have been a story of political promise, stripped of any eschatological characteristics. In the Maccabean period it would have been revamped once again to fit the then current situation, and regained some of its eschatology, but would still have referred to the full reinstatement of Jewish autonomy in the entire Land. John Goldingay disagrees with this argument, stating that nothing indicates that the new rule signifies that of Israel. He thinks it "more natural to take the rock that destroys the regimes and grows into a crag filling the world as standing for God's own sovereignty and power establishing a lasting regime." [77] His position, however, does not take notice of the somewhat ambiguous phrasing of v. 44, which, even though introducing a kingdom that will be set up by the God of Heaven, also specifies that it will not be left to another people. Although one might perhaps argue that this implies a direct rule by divine rather than human powers, it is equally possible to understand it as a restoring of Jewish sovereignty in the Land, in the form of a theocracy, which would then be understood as the creation of a form of co-regency with God. Needless to say this explanation would bring it very close to the position of those who interpret this kingdom

---

[76] P.R. Davies, "Daniel Chapter Two," pp. 400-401.

[77] J.E. Goldingay (1989: 52).

as the messianic kingdom with the only difference being the question of imminence or distant future.

Recently G.K. Beale [78] likewise argued for the identity of the stone and the mountain in this verse as the (eschatological) Temple and provides many sources to support this. However, his main thesis is to show that this imagery is representative of the "new creation" and is ultimately fulfilled in the New Testament through Jesus and the Church becoming that Temple. In order to accomplish this, he also reintroduces some of the older suggestions concerning the meaning of the imagery, besides the Temple identification, such as the stone symbolizing "God's kingdom of Israel that would destroy and judge these [the four represented in the gigantic statue] unbelieving kingdoms." [79]

5.2.1.2. Early interpretations of the stone and the mountain

Josephus' version of the stone passage occurs in his account of Nebuchadnezzar's dream: [80]

> Then you saw a stone break off from a mountain and fall upon the image and overthrow it, breaking it to pieces and leaving not one part of it whole…but the stone grew so much larger that the whole earth seemed to be filled with it. This, then, is the dream which you saw; as for its interpretation, it is as follows…And Daniel also revealed to the king the meaning of the stone, but I have not thought it proper to relate this, since I am expected to write of what is past and done and not of what is to be; if, however, there is anyone who has so keen a desire for exact information that he will not stop short of inquiring more closely but wishes to learn about the hidden things that are to come, let him take the trouble to read the Book of Daniel, which he will find among the sacred writings.

The translator adds the following note to this account: "Josephus' evasiveness about the meaning of the stone which destroyed the kingdom of iron is due to the fact that the Jewish interpretation of it current in his day took it as a symbol of the Messiah or the

---

[78] G.K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004: 144-153.

[79] G.K. Beale, *id*., pp. 185-6; also 153.

[80] Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, X, 10, 4; (transl. R. Marcus – Loeb Classical Library 1995(1937), pp. 272-275.

Messianic kingdom which would make an end of the Roman empire." It is unfortunate that when discussing this passage, Louis Feldman, [81] the eminent Josephus scholar, does not elaborate further on this statement and seems to go along with it, as does Jay Braverman, [82] whom he cites. The problem is, however, that the only known pertinent sources that are contemporaneous with Josephus (c. 38 – after 100 CE) are early-Christian. His own writing only began after the Jewish War and therefore the Dead Sea Scrolls are not relevant in this respect, as the Qumran community was destroyed at about 68 CE. The dating of any rabbinic sources with certainty to this period is hazardous. The Mishna, the first written document of rabbinic Judaism, dates to 200 CE. This is a point Jacob Neusner, correctly, never tires to make. [83] Geza Vermes likewise does not comment on the significance of Josephus' phrasing of the passage and simply accepts the superficial meaning of "a 'new kingdom' established by God." [84] In an earlier study on Josephus' treatment of Daniel, [85] F.F. Bruce seems to understand Josephus' reading of the stone as relating to the 'saints [of the Most High]', to which he adds that *this* was "the current interpretation among the people." This attitude could then have motivated the actions of the Zealots. [86]

In venturing an explanation for Josephus' reluctance to comment on the stone, Anthony Tomasino expresses reservations with regard to the often expressed suggestion that it be understood as 'messianic'. He writes, "[e]vidence for the

---

[81] L. Feldman, "Josephus' Portrait of Daniel," *Henoch* 14(1992): 37-94 (at pp. 67-70).

[82] J. Braverman, *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel: a Study of Comparative Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Hebrew Bible*. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1978 [CBQMS 7]: pp. 109-111.

[83] J. Neusner, *Judaism in Society: the Evidence of the Yerushalmi*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983, pp. x ff. and at many other places in his work. Rabbinic interpretation of the mountain and the stone in Daniel 2 are mostly messianic in character, but postdate Josephus by centuries. For some examples see C.A. Evans, "Daniel in the New Testament: Visions of God's Kingdom," *The Book of Daniel; Composition and Reception* II: 490-527 (at pp. 507-508).

[84] G. Vermes, "Josephus' Treatment of the Book of Daniel," *JJS* 42(1991): 149-166.

[85] F.F. Bruce, "Josephus and Daniel," *ASTI* 4(1965): 148-162; p. 160.

[86] See further S.C. Madden, "Josephus's Use of the Book of Daniel: A Study of Hellenistic-Jewish Historiography," [Diss. University of Texas, 2001], pp. 141-144.

messianic interpretation of the stone in first-century Judaism is non-existent. We cannot assume from this silence that such an interpretation was therefore unknown at this time but it is probably that it was not a major aspect of the Jews' messianic hope." [87] The usual solution offered for Josephus' puzzling silence is that he did not want to offend his Roman protectors. This is already indicated by the fact that he offers his own rewriting of Nebuchadnezzar's dream. Whereas in Daniel's version of the dream (2:34) the stone smites the feet of the statue that were made of iron and clay, in Josephus' version it knocks down the entire statue at one fell swoop. Since the feet were thought to represent the fourth empire, which by the time of Josephus had come to mean the Roman Empire, he minimized insult by not having his hosts' rule suddenly end by the power of the Israelite God, whose Temple and city they had just destroyed. Rather, for his audience, it was deferred to an unspecified time in the future and the Roman Empire was safe. This makes especially good sense since in relating Daniel's dream Josephus had made another striking change. Instead of Daniel's mention of the feet of iron and clay (suggesting an especially weak alloy), Josephus has "legs and feet of iron." Daniel's explanation he renders as, the bronze empire (the Greek) "'will be ended by … another, like iron, that will have dominion for ever through its iron nature,' which, he said, is harder than that of gold or silver or bronze" (10.208-209).

Hanan Eshel [88] points out that Josephus' sensitivity vis-à-vis the Temple and its importance to the survival of Judaism, changed between the writing of his *Jewish War* (c. 79 CE) and the *Jewish Antiquities*, some fourteen years later. Whereas in the earlier work he seems to express a certain despair concerning the viability of Judaism without a central Sanctuary and its service, in the later work – vindicated by history – he is more optimistic as he sees that, indeed, Judaism does survive in Judea and in the Diaspora, where (for the time being?) alternatives to the Temple are found and successfully

---

[87] A.J. Tomasino, "Daniel and the Revolutionaries: The Use of the Daniel Tradition by Jewish Resistance Movements of Late Second-Temple Palestine" [Diss. University of Chicago, 1995], pp. 262-263.

[88] H. Eshel, "Josephus' View on Judaism without the Temple in Light of the Discoveries at Masada and Murabba'at," *Gemeinde ohne Tempel; zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. B. Ego, A. Lange & P. Pilhofer, eds. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999: 229-238 (at pp. 232-233).

incorporated in the tradition and in daily life. Eshel notes that the *Antiquities* displayed a much more optimistic view than did the *War* and that the goal of the former became one of persuading his Roman audience "to change their view about Judaism and to support the Pharisees and their leaders." However, it should clearly be kept in mind – while not untrue in and of itself – that this situation was (and even is today) considered to be undesirable and temporary. Eventually (so goes the rabbinic theorem), when the Messiah comes, the Temple will be rebuilt and the service will be reinstated. This would support the notion, described above, that Josephus may perhaps have felt more confident to insert the cryptic remark concerning the 'stone' as a reminder of the function of the Temple and its future into his rendition of Daniel, not least in view of his own priestly descent. After all, it should not be ruled out that Josephus had not only read the Book of Daniel very carefully, but was also aware of the emerging idea in which mountain, city, and temple became more and more conflated, as will be seen in the analysis of *IV Ezra* below. In the end we cannot say with certainty what Josephus may have intended with his evasion. This does, however, not preclude a number of informed suggestions, as has been shown above. In a similar vein Rebecca Gray [89] concludes that Josephus' own excuse for not commenting on the identity of the stone by saying that "as a historian it is not up to him to speculate on 'what is to be', "is not convincing. … Josephus' reluctance to explain the meaning of the stone is understandable only if he identified the fourth kingdom with Rome. In that case, the stone would signify that Roman hegemony was only temporary, and that the God of the Jews would eventually act to reestablish his people – convictions that Josephus would not want to express unambiguously to his Roman readers."

Being intimately familiar with the contents of the Jewish scriptures and specifically the prophets, Josephus must likewise have been aware of the 'stone' and 'mountain' symbolism referring to Zion and the temple contained in these texts. In his writings he already emphasized the cosmic character of the earthly temple and its connection with

---

[89] R. Gray, *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine: The Evidence from Josephus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993: 40.

the heavenly sanctuary. Charles Hayward [90] expresses some important thoughts to round out Josephus' picture of the Temple,

> Josephus wrote after the ghastly events of 66-70, which witnessed the collapse of the Jewish state and Temple, and the atrocities which accompanied these things. It is therefore not surprising that he strongly brings to the fore the cosmic significance of the Temple, the high priest, and the Service. … [H]e explains to his non-Jewish readers that the worship offered in Jerusalem had a beneficial effect for the whole world: perhaps he implies that the destruction of the sanctuary augurs no good for the future.

IV Ezra, a pseudepigraphic work dating to the late 1st century CE and possibly written in the Land of Israel, [91] is at various places heavily indebted to Daniel. In fact, in 12:11 a vision in which Ezra sees an eagle rising from the sea, symbolizing the fourth kingdom (here Rome), is directly linked to one that his "brother Daniel" (Dan. 7) had. The interpreting angel boldly declares that this particular vision had not been sufficiently explained to Daniel but would now be made clear to Ezra. [92] Chapter 13 blends imagery from Daniel 7 and 2. In Ezra's dream he first sees a scene that is reminiscent of Dan. 7:2 and 13 (vv. 2-3):

> *2* - Behold a great wind arose from the sea so that it stirred up all its waves. *3a* - And I looked, and behold, this wind made something like the figure of a man come up out of the heart of the sea. And I looked, and behold, that man flew with the clouds of heaven…

That this was no ordinary man is indicated by the following verses (3b-4):

> *3b* – and wherever he turned his face and looked, everything under his gaze trembled. *4* - and wherever the voice of his mouth issued forth, all who heard his voice melted as wax melts when it feels the fire.

---

[90] C.T.R. Hayward, "The Writings of Josephus," in his *The Jewish Temple, a Non-Biblical Sourcebook*. London: Routledge, 1996: 142-153 (at p. 152).

[91] M.E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra* [Hermeneia], Minneapolis: Fortress press, 1990: 9-10.

[92] *Ibid.*, 366.

The description of the pyrotechnic abilities of the manlike figure are interrupted by the next two verses (5-7) which suggest a reuse of Daniel 2:34-35, 45. The passage reads:

> *5* - After this I looked, and behold, an innumerable multitude of men were gathered together from the four winds of heaven to make war against the man who came up out of the sea. *6* - And I looked, and behold, he carved out for himself a great mountain, and flew upon it. *7* - And I tried to see the region or place from which the mountain was carved, but I could not.

The fiery actions of the manlike figure are then further displayed in vv. 9-11 when he destroys a hostile multitude which had assembled by sending forth a stream of fire from his mouth and a storm of fiery coals from his tongue, while at the same time remaining immobile. The fiery stream has been linked to the stream of fire issuing out from under the divine throne in Dan. 7:9-10 [93] as well as to the notion that "fire, of course, is God's standard instrument of destruction." [94]

The mysterious man may be akin to the 'one like a man' in Daniel 7:13, [95] and it is thus a divine being doing the carving (i.e., not a human hand). This is somewhat downplayed by Stone, who emphasizes rather the human aspect of the being. He notes that in Daniel the stone has "a redemptive function." [96] In Ezra's vision, Daniel's stone seems to have become absorbed into the mountain image. Whereas in Daniel the stone, after being separated from the mountain, becomes a projectile, in Ezra the entire mountain has become a vehicle for the divine human figure (13:6). The account of the mountain's arrival at its new location (12) is deferred until after the completion of the description of the figure and his adversaries (8-11). Once the mountain has arrived at its position, the man descends (13a). In vv. 35-36 the mountain in the vision is

---

[93] See K.M. Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict in 4 Ezra: Wisdom Debate and Apocalyptic Solution*. Leiden: Brill, 2008: 187.

[94] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 387.

[95] In 13:26 the angel reveals to Ezra that this man "is he whom the Most High has been keeping for many ages, through whom he will deliver his creation." This clearly points to a messianic figure, something which is not at all yet the case with the 'one like a man' in Daniel 7.

[96] *Ibid.*, 385. However he further notes that "the man rides upon it and destroys the enemies, a variation of the idea that the stone itself destroyed the idol (= enemy empires) in Daniel 2 (398).

identified by the angel as Mount Zion: "Zion will come and be made manifest to everybody, prepared and built, as you saw the mountain carved out without hands." Much like the discrepancies between dream and explanation in the case of Daniel 2, here as well, information is added that did not appear in the dream. In 13:6 the man is said to carve out the mountain, whereas in 13:36 it is said that the mountain was "carved out *without hands*."

Hermann Lichtenberger connects the "perfectly built Zion" of 13:36, now for all to see, with the earlier vision (10:25-58) in which a grieving woman transforms into a built city. This turns out to be Zion which will be revealed in the future but at the time of this earlier vision can only be perceived by Ezra. [97] Likewise, the mountain on which the mysterious man traveled turns out to be a reconstituted Zion once it has taken up its earthly position. Michael Stone notes the relevance of the qualification 'built' that is used each time in reference to Zion or the city, implying the notion of 'ready built', 'prefabricated', which signifies its preexistence and cosmic nature. [98]

The narrative setting in *IV Ezra* differs in a number of significant aspects from those of Daniel 7 and 2. First, Daniel's vision in chapter 7 is located in the heavenly throne room and the setting of *IV Ezra* is either on earth or in an earth-like but otherwise unspecified space. Secondly, the imagery that is borrowed from Daniel 2 in Ezra's dream was, of course, not Daniel's primary vision but that of Nebuchadnezzar. However, it may be added that God had made Daniel privy to the contents of the dream together with its extended explanation. But perhaps, since the angel had already made it clear to Ezra that some of the imagery was similar to what had been shown Daniel so many centuries earlier and that Ezra was supposedly living close to the time of the end, his vision would be clearer and thus the various images could be welded together in order to reach better understanding. It is the latter part of the vision, where the imagery from Dan. 2:34-35, 45 is reused, that is specifically of interest here. In

---

[97] H. Lichtenberger, "Zion and the Destruction of the Temple in 4 Ezra 9-10," *Gemeinde ohne Tempel; zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. B. Ego, A. Lange & P. Pilhofer, eds. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999: 239-249 (at p. 247).

[98] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 403.

both visions the image of a mountain is used to designate a future and final political entity in which humans and God each have their designated places and live in peace and in harmony with each other. While in Daniel the reader is left to speculate concerning the identity of the mountain, although most commentators agree that it must be Mount Zion, in *IV Ezra* there is no question since the angel simply provides the information. Between the two texts we may recognize an evolving picture in which Mount Zion, the city of Jerusalem and the Temple are increasingly interwoven and captured under one magnificent image of an expanding and mobile mountain.

5.2.1.3. *Mountain and stone language descriptive of Zion, Jerusalem and the Temple in other biblical materials.*

It will be shown below that the passages under discussion indeed contain vital language alluding to Temple realia. But even more so, by adducing other examples from the Hebrew Bible that without a doubt refer to the grouping of Mount Zion, the City of Jerusalem and/or the Temple in relation to actions from God and people, the function of the imagery in Daniel 2 can be better placed. It could be argued as well that the stone (אבן) symbolizes Israel's God since this or other terms for stone are at times used as a metaphor for the divine. [99] He would naturally be able to effortlessly change the image into a mountain and subsequently fill the whole earth. Yet, since this

---

[99] See e.g. Gen. 49:24, אבן ישראל (cf. the more common צור ישראל); and perhaps I Sam. 7:12, אבן העזר and certainly Is. 8:14a-b, "And He shall be for a sanctuary [למקדש]; but for a stone of stumbling [לאבן נגף] and for a rock of offence [לצור מכשול] to both the houses of Israel." See further the treatment of '*'eben*' in *TDOT* 1: 48ff. and '*tzur*' in *TDOT* 12: 311 ff. M. Dahood expressed doubt with regard to the phrasing of *'even yisra'el* in Gen. 49:2 as a divine epithet in his "Is 'Eben Yisrae'el a Divine Title? (Gn 49, 24)," *Biblica* 40(1959): 1002-1007. He is only able to remove this notion through a very severe emendation. I. Gruenwald discusses these epithets for the Deity in "God the 'Stone/Rock': Myth, Idolatry, and Cultic Fetishism in Ancient Israel," *Journal of Religion* 76(1996): 428-449. While he deals with the interpretative history of these phrases that opt for a metaphoric solution, he rejects that and rather looks at the ancient Israelite and ancient Near Eastern context of these terms. He also cites Eliade's explanation of a hierophany by which, for instance, the sacred manifests itself *in* a stone or a tree, becoming only visible to those who are open to such revelation, whereas for others it remains a stone or a tree. Eliade stops short of identifying these material objects with the actual deity. However, it is exactly that latter phenomenon that Gruenwald discusses in light of comparative studies, which leads him to state: "the comparative study of 'stone/rock' imagery leads into semantic territories that substantially transform the way in which the corresponding material in Scripture should be read." The comparative findings necessitate the reader to no longer see "the metaphorical interpretation … as inevitable and self-sustained" and rather opt for a "more … mythic reading (437). In fact, Gruenwald illustrates clearly how a naturally occurring rock or stone (not one fashioned into a likeness) could "contain an aspect of divine essence" without upsetting any religious tenets (442).

episode takes place very shortly after Nebuchadnezzar's siege of Jerusalem and his sacking of the temple it is not unreasonable to suggest that, within the narrative, this event was foremost on the mind of the Judean exile Daniel. Likewise, at the same time in the real world of the author/editor, the Second Temple has actually been plundered by Antiochus IV in either 170/169 or 168/167 BCE. [100] This event would have been sharply engraved in his memory and the image could therefore serve a double function.

A telling source for stone imagery is found in Zech. 12:3, "And it shall come to pass in that day, that I will make Jerusalem a stone of burden (אבן מעמסה) for all the peoples; all that burden themselves with it shall be sore wounded." In their commentary on Zechariah, Carol and Eric Meyers clearly bring Jerusalem within the orbit of the biblical "stone theology," pointing out that the author may have a clear agenda in relating this passage to the earlier stone passages in First Zechariah (esp. 4:7, 10) as well as Isaiah (28:16) [101] which all represent positive metaphoric images of the Temple, "which is at the physical and spiritual core of Jerusalem." The meaning of the verse would then be "Jerusalem as a precious stone will cause enormous difficulty to those who attempt to control her." The image is further explained: "Jerusalem in this case is therefore a sharp or jagged stone; carrying it will result in severe flesh wounds. The image of Jerusalem as a 'burdensome stone' is thus a mixed metaphor with an ironic twist. Jerusalem is a gemstone, the very foundation stone of the universe, [102] but all who try to make it their own will find it too heavy a load and one that will inflict damage on whoever attempts to bear it." [103] Needless to say that many of these examples have often been explained metaphorically evoking eschatological leaders or even the collective of the people. But, as the Meyers indicate, this is not the only possible reading. It is important to note that in the examples

---

[100] See D.R. Schwartz, "Antiochus IV Epiphanes in Jerusalem," *Historical Perspectives from the Hasmoneans to Bar Kohkba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls.* D. Goodblatt et al. (eds.), Leiden: Brill, 2001: 45-56 for a discussion on the likely date of the event. I Macc. 1:21-23 provides a list of the items that were plundered. This event is likely reflected in Dan. 11:28.

[101] "Therefore thus says the Lord God: Behold, I lay in Zion a stone for a foundation, a tried stone, a precious cornerstone, a sure foundation; whoever believes will not act hastily".

[102] Is. 28:16, "Therefore, thus says the Lord God: Behold I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a costly cornerstone of sure foundation."

[103] C.L. and E.M. Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14* [AB25C]. New York: Doubleday, 1993: 317-318.

of stone metaphors that they list, the images called forth are primarily descriptive of the city. However, in view of the fact that Jerusalem derives its significance by merit of the temple in its midst, it is not unlikely that here, as in the passages from Zech. 4, the stone may also point to the sanctuary. A passage that comes to mind which, as Dan. 2:34-35, 45, has both stone and mountain imagery is Zech. 4:7. In conjunction with Zech. 4:9-10 this verse has been recognized to contain imagery that is strongly suggestive of tradition ancient Near Eastern temple building traditions. [104] Thus what we have in the end is that the mountain and stone in Daniel's explanation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream may very well be understood to signify the city of Jerusalem, the Temple Mount, as well as the Temple itself. Moreover, apart from recognizing temple imagery in our passage, it can now also be shown that the actions that are described as happening to the mountain and the stone are temple related. Zech. 4:7, 9a is of the utmost importance for the understanding of Daniel 2.

Zech. 4:7, 9a

> 7] 'Who [are] you, O great mountain [הר-הגדול]? Before Zerubbabel [you shall become] a plain! And he shall bring forth the capstone [אבן הראשה] with shouts of "grace, grace to it!"' 9] The hands of Zerubbabel have laid the foundation of this temple; his hands shall also finish [it].

Meyers and Meyers had already provided substantial evidence in their commentary that the reality of temple building as known from accounts from the wider ancient Near East lie at the basis of these passages. The tradition of temple building as evidenced in the Hebrew Bible (specifically that of Solomon's Temple in I Kings and the Second Temple after the Exile in the later prophets) fits very precisely into this pattern. [105] The mountain encountered by Zerubbabbabel was therefore likely the mount of rubble that remained of

---

[104] C.L. and E.M. Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8*[AB25B]. New York: Doubleday, 1987: 244-254. See also B. Halpern, "The Ritual Background of Zechariah's Temple Song," *CBQ* 40(1978): 167-190 and A. Laato, "Zachariah 4,6b-10a and the Akkadian Royal Building Inscriptions," *ZAW* 106(1994)1: 53-69.

[105] See also, V.A. Hurowitz, *I Have Built You an Exalted House: Temple Building in the Bible in the Light of Mesopotamian and North-West Semitic Writings*. [JSOTSS 115] Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.

the destroyed temple and the following actions that are described reflect the ritual clearing process prior to the raising of the new temple building. Mark Boda explains that

> one ritual occurred at the outset of work in which a stone was chosen from the rubble of the former temple and carried out by a royal figure. Once the rubble was cleared, the foundation laying was begun with the royal figure laying the first stone of the new foundation. These two rituals provide the ritual background for the two oracles preserved in 4:6b-10a. … In the first, the prophet proclaims an oracle of confidence as Zerubbabel faces a mountain of rubble and then brings out the first stone (4:6b-7). The ritual character of this oracle is confirmed by the reference to "shouts" of … "Grace! Grace!", indicating a response from a group of people. " [106]

He notes that this contextual historical approach "stands in contrast to those who interpret the mountain metaphorically either generally as the difficulties of this period or specifically as human adversaries …. [or] any mythological mountain that competes with the glory of Mount Zion." [107] The results of a similar approach to the mountain and the stone of Daniel 2 in light of the Zechariah passage follows below.

Zech. 12:3, that was introduced above, too, is instructive for understanding the dynamics of the imagery in Daniel 2 as it paints a similar function of its stone image that metaphorically stands for Jerusalem (and by extension, must be suggested, its temple). Describing the dire conditions in tiny Persian Yehud and even smaller Jerusalem which were completely at the mercy of the Persians, the Meyers illustrate the role reversal in 12:2-3 of the imagery used for Jerusalem in 4:6 and 7, [108]

> What happens to both cup and stone is instructive. The meaning of these images is reversed. The cup, representing abundance and economic well-being accruing to those

---

[106] M.J. Boda, *Haggai, Zechariah* [The NIV Application Commentary]. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2004: 276-277.

[107] *Ibid.* 276. For a recent overview of the various proposals with regard to the meaning of the 'great mountain', see D.F. O'Kennedy, "The Meaning of 'Great Mountain' in Zechariah 4:7," *OTE* 21(2008)2: 404-421.

[108] C.L. and E.M. Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8* [AB25B]. New York: Doubleday, 1987: 354. M..A. Sweeney, *The Twelve Prophets, Volume Two*. [Berit Olam] Collegeville, Minn: The Liturgical Press, 2000: 685.

who hold it, instead has the opposite effect: it impairs the ability to function of those who hold it. Similarly, the constructive connotation of stones is turned upside down: Jerusalem will be the cause of injury, not strength, for those who purport to hold her. In both cases, the reversal is achieved through divine intervention and not through historical process.

The people of Yehud could only overcome their powerlessness through direct actions of God. When God takes charge, the 'cup' and the 'stone' are turned "from benign, if not positive, objects to *instruments of destruction*" [italics mine]. This approach to the text offers yet another connection with Daniel 2. In the real historical time of Zechariah, the Persian liberators were no longer the benevolent protectors but the representatives of a large grinding imperial power and Yehud with Jerusalem was a minor backwater on the periphery of the Empire. A similar situation applied to the final author/editor of Daniel 2. He lived in comparable circumstances under Seleucid rule. The Syrian-Greek kings at first had also treated the province of Judea and its people well, but under the current king Antiochus IV, conditions had rapidly deteriorated. In both cases the people and its religious hopes were directed at deliverance from these overlordships and a restoration of their autonomy. It is therefore not surprising that both Zechariah and Daniel make use of apocalyptic language to translate those hopes. In the grand scheme of things these hopes seemed perhaps grotesque, but in spatial terms, Thirdspace anxiety appealed directly in Secondspace language to the divine Firstspace power to overturn the false Firstspace power of the earthly rulers.

Marvin Sweeney suggests something similar. Since vv. 2-3 presuppose the centrality and cosmic character of Jerusalem as the site of the temple, "the reference to the heavy stone may then play upon the image of the Temple foundation stone in Zechariah 4." He also explains that the phrase 'cup of reeling' [סף-רעל] in v. 2 contains temple imagery, [109]

> Even when read in English, this term adequately conveys the imagery of drunkenness
> that points of the vulnerability of the nations, but the Hebrew expression, *sap ra'al*,

---

[109] M.A. Sweeney, *Twelve Prophets,* p. 685.

must also be considered in order to understand the full import of the metaphor. The usual term for 'cup' is *kos*, but the present text employs the term *sap*, 'basin' or 'bowl', which commonly designates the basins or bowls that are employed for sacred use in the Temple (1 Kgs 7:50; Jer. 52:19). The term is also employed to describe the threshold or door sockets of the Temple (Amos 9:1; Isa 6:4; Jer 35:4; Ezek 40:6, 7; 2 Chr 3:7; 1 Kgs 14:17). The *choice of this term therefore appears to be deliberate in order to convey the imagery of the Temple as an agent in the incapacitation of the nations that are arrayed against Jerusalem* [italics mine].

Is. 29:1-2, 7 is a passage which actually may provide one more element of the temple imagery used in Daniel 2. In it the prophet addresses the city of Jerusalem as Ariel [אריאל]. Some commentators understand this to mean 'Lion of God' in which case it would refer to David's status as being from the tribe of Judah. However, a more likely explanation may be found in the cultic instrument of the 'hearth [ארי] of God', which is part of the altar for the burnt offerings. Read like this, it is easy to see how the prophet would have identified the city of the Temple by this very central object of the cult. A few chapters further in 33:7 a related term is found [אראלם], but in its obscurity has created many problems for translators. It has been pointed out that it is not likely to assume that 'valiant ones' or 'heroes' would resort to weeping and therefore it is suggested that *'er'elam* [אראלם] should be understood to be the 'inhabitants of Ariel', i.e. Jerusalem. [110] The passages read:

---

[110] So J. Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1-39* [AB 19] New York: Doubleday, 2000: 438-440. He bases this not only on the connection with *ari'el* as Jerusalem earlier on in ch. 29, but also on a parallelism that he perceives after emending *shalom* (peace) to *shalem* (Salem), which is another epithet for Jerusalem. He would then retain *mal'akhim* as messengers. However, an emendation seems unnecessary if the *mal'akhim* are to be understood as "angels", we would then get "angels of peace." This angelic designation is also found in a number of Qumran texts. In fact, the term *'er'elam* may also be understood as referring to members of the angelic hosts. If so a completely different parallelism would be obtained. The Vulgate translates as follows: "ecce videntes clamabunt foris angeli pacis amare flebunt." The (medieval) Zohar interprets it in fact this way. *Soncino Zohar, Bereshith*, Section 1, Page 210a states: "The very heaven and the very earth lamented, as it is written: "I clothe the heaven with blackness, and I make sackcloth their covering" (Is. L, 3). The celestial angels all raised their voices in lamentation, as it says: "Behold, the angels cry without; the angels of peace weep bitterly" (Is. XXXIII, 7). The sun and the moon mourned and their light was darkened, as we read: "The sun shall be darkened in his going forth, etc." (Ibid. XIII, 10). For what reason? Because the other side had obtained sway over the Holy Land." For a text-critical and tradition-historical analysis of this verse, which suggests that the original reading demands a division into two words, yielding ארא לם, which then implies the introduction of a vision, see Richard D. Weis, "Angels Altars and Angles of Vision: The Case of אראלם in Isaiah 33:7," *Tradition of the Text; Studies Offered to Dominique Barthélemy*. G.J. Norton, S. Pisano, eds. Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991: 285-292.

29:1] Ah, Ariel, Ariel [אריאל], the city where David encamped! Add year to year, Let the feasts come round. 2] Then will I distress Ariel, And there shall be mourning and moaning; And she shall be unto Me as a hearth of God. 7] And the multitude of all the nations that war against Ariel, Even all that war against her, and the bulwarks about her, and they that distress her, Shall be as a dream, a vision of the night. [כחלום חזון לילה] – 33:7] Behold their valiant ones [אראלם] cry without; The ambassadors of peace [מלאכי שלום] weep bitterly.

Most commentators therefore see a connection with the altar that Ezekiel (43:15a) prescribes to be built; there spelled '*ha-har'el*' [ההראל]. [111] This spelling carries another association, namely, that of Mountain of God. Later in the verse and following into the next, however, we find the spelling הראיל (*qere*: הראיאל). These images taken together may perhaps provide yet another intriguing source for those in Nebuchadnezzar's dream and Daniel's explanation.

5.2.1.4. Analysis of the individual elements in vss. 34-35, 45

a) A stone was hewn without hands (from the mountain)

Possible scriptural links to this concept are found in the Pentateuchal altar laws [112] and the building account of Solomon's Temple:

Another text where this phrase is found is 4Q474. T. Elgvin, "4Q474 - a Joseph Apocryphon?," *RQ* 18(1997)1: 97-108. "L. 8 ות] לעש שלום מלאכ[ל]מ לל[. . One could reconstruct e.g. 'wha]t is upon the angels of peace to d[o'. … *Test. Dan* 6:5 uses the designation 'angel of peace' for the chief angel who is Israel's guardian and intercessor." Elgvin further lists all other occurrences of 'angels of peace" in Qumran literature (p. 104-5), most of which are in an eschatological context. Importantly, he adds "*Isa* 33:7 refers to peace negotiators as מלאכי שלום (second century interpreters could have connected the מלאכי שלום of this verse with the eschatological renewal promised in the preceding verse).

[111] See on this passage in M. Dijkstra, "The Altar of Ezekiel; Fact or Fiction?," *VT* 42(1992)1: 22-36. His argument for v. 43:15a being a later gloss is not relevant to the discussion here. However, reading it in light of the Isaiah passages (p. 29) above is. Also of interest is his explanation of *har'el* being an "etymologizing spelling" which indeed plays on the concept of Mountain of God (pp. 31-32). Also R.L. Routledge, "The Siege and Deliverance of the City of David in Isaiah 29:1-8," *TynBul* 43(1992)1: 181-190 (at p. 182, fn.. 6] and C.G.I. Wong, "On 'Visits' and 'Visions' in Isaiah XXIX 6-7," *VT* 45(1995)3: 370-376 (at p. 374).

[112] The most detailed study on this subject to date is P. Heger, *The Three Biblical Altar Laws* [BZAW 279] Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999.

Ex. 20:22

> And if you make Me an altar of stone, you shall not build it of hewn [אבני גזית]
>
> stones; for if you lift up your tool upon it, you have profaned it

and

Deut. 27:5-6

> And there you shall build an altar unto the Lord your God, an altar of stones; you
>
> shall lift up no iron tool upon them – You shall build the altar of the Lord your God
>
> of unhewn [שלמות] stones

as well as

I Kings 5:31

> And the king commanded, and they quarried great stones, costly stones, to lay the
>
> foundation of the house with hewn stone [אבני גזית]

and

I Kings 6:7

> For the house, when it was in building, was built of stone made ready at the quarry;
>
> and there was neither hammer nor axe nor any tool of iron heard in the house, while
>
> it was in building

In an insightful analysis, Michael Fishbane [113] shows the development that takes place throughout these verses, each of which seems to be commenting on, adding to, and extending the meaning of the previous which results in a conflation of the laws of the altar and the requirements for the stone work of the Temple.

With regard to the passages from Exodus and Deuteronomy, Saul Olyan offers some thoughts. He cites Roland de Vaux who opines that the concern for "the preservation of the natural state" of the altar stone (as well as other cultic objects) may be connected to the notion that sees "human agency as the source of defilement." [114] This is especially interesting against the background of the complicated and almost ambiguous

---

[113] M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel.* Oxford [Oxfordshire]: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press, 1985, pp. 159-162.

[114] S. Olyan, "Why an Altar of Unfinished Stones? Some Thoughts on Ex 20,25 and Dtn 27:5-6," *ZAW* 108(1996): 161-171 (see p. 162).

relationship between the First and Second Temples, the way they could become susceptible to defilement, or the Second Temple as even being inherently impure (or less pure), as well as the notion of a divinely built Third (eschatological) Temple.

That the altar can have 'a life of its own', so to speak, is indicated by Ezra 3:2-6. This passage tells of the activities of Jeshua the high priest and Zerubabbabel the Davidide governor of Yehud who in a joint venture built a new great altar for burnt offerings. If the narrative chronology is followed, this took place some seven months before the actual foundations of the new temple were laid. It has been noted that this might be considered as problematic, but that the concern of the authors/editors could have been to emphasize the continuity of the sacrificial cult and to make the hiatus as brief as possible. [115] What emerges from the passage and is of interest to Daniel 2 is that the altar is being built [ויבנו], which suggests an altar of stone and not of bronze, that it is for the burnt offerings [עלות] and that all this is being done according to the Law of Moses [ככתוב בתורת משׁה]. [116] Frank Fensham suggests, furthermore, that this new altar was set up on the spot of the old altar of Solomon's temple. [117] This may be further indicated by the phrase in 3:3, "they set the altar upon its bases" [ויכינו המזבח על-מכונתו]. It has also been noted that David erected an altar long before the First Temple was built (2 Sam 24:25; 1 Chron. 21:26; 22:1). [118]

Of further interest is

I Macc. 4:44-47 [119]

> They deliberated over what they should do with the profaned altar of the burnt offering, // and they came up with the good idea of dismantling it…Accordingly, they dismantled the altar, // and put its stones away on the temple mount in a suitable place

---

[115] See J. Pakkala, *Ezra the Scribe: the Development of Ezra 7-10 and Nehemiah 8*, [BZAW 347]. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2004: 142. For the textual and chronological problems involved in this passage and its place within the chapter, see pp. 140-144.

[116] See P. Heger, *Altar Laws*, 1999, pp. 18-19.

[117] F.C. Fensham, *The Books of Ezra-Nehemiah* [NICOT] Grand Rapids, MI.: Eerdmans, 1982, p. 59.

[118] D. Bergant & R.J. Karris, *The Collegeville Bible Commentary: Old Testament*. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1992: 342

[119] *Ibid.*, p. 128, n. 103; J. Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, p. 277.

until a prophet should come to give an oracle concerning them. // Taking uncut stones as prescribed by the Torah, they built a new altar after the pattern of the old. [120]

For the failure of the heavenly fire to appear in order to light the fire of the burnt offering that was subsequently brought by Judah and his men, see Jonathan Goldstein's [121] commentary to I Maccabees.

Mishna Midoth 1:6 adds:

> Four chambers were in the House of the Hearth, and in the north-eastern chamber the Hasmoneans hid the altar's stones desecrated by the Greek kings.

In his *Against Apion* (1:198) Josephus records a salient passage describing the precincts of the Temple in Jerusalem, attributed to Hecataeus of Abdera (or Pseudo-Hecataeus – c. 300 BCE), [122] which reads:

> Nearly in the center of the city stands a stone wall, enclosing an area about five *plethra* long (the *plethron* was 100 Greek feet) and a hundred cubits broad, approached by a pair of gates. Within this enclosure is a square altar, built of heaped up stones, unhewn and unwrought; each side is twenty cubits long and the height ten cubits. Beside it stands a great edifice, containing an altar and a lampstand, both made of gold, and weighing two talents.

---

[120] The act of removing the defiled stones and storing them respectfully is very much reminiscent of a similar attitude displayed in the wider ancient Near East in cases where despoiled sanctuaries or temples had fallen into disrepair. The statues of gods contained in such sanctuaries would be provided with temporary housing (sometimes for extended periods) until such time that they could be restored to their original or new sanctuaries. Provision was also made for such statues that had fallen into disrepair themselves. These policies are known to have continued into the Seleucid period. See on this V.A. Hurowitz, "Temporary Temples," *Kinattutu sa Darati. Raphael Kutscher Memorial Volume* (1993): 37-50.

[121] J. Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, pp. 280, 546-547.

[122] Cited in Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll: the Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1985: 196. See further M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, Vol. I, Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1974-1984: 20-25, 43; and, B. Bar-Kochva, *Pseudo-Hecataeus*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996: 149-150, 161-163.

And as well,

1 Enoch 90:28-29

> And I stood up to see till the old house was removed; and all the columns were brought out, and all the pillars and ornaments of the house were at the same time wrapped up along with it, and it was taken out and put in a place in the south of the land. // And I looked till the Lord of the sheep brought a new house greater and loftier than that first and raised it up in place of the first which had been removed: all its columns were new, and its ornaments were new and larger than those of the first, the old one which he had taken away; and the Lord of the sheep was in the midst of it.

In his commentary on this passage, Matthew Black states, inexplicably, that the "'old house' and the 'new house' are symbols of the old and the new Jerusalem … No explicit mention is made here of the Temple." As an afterthought he adds, "but it is no doubt included." [123] Even if, in the biblical passages that he adduces, 'house' may refer to Jerusalem, it refers first and foremost to the House of God, i.e., the Temple, the בית המקדש which stands on the הר הבית. The question whether the 'new house' (as representation of the new city) did or did not contain a temple has vexed scholars for the longest time and an attempt at solving the ambiguity in the text can only be done in light of other texts that deal with similar issues pertaining to the ultimate place of the temple and the proper carrying out of the cult. George Nickelsburg expresses some uncertainty with regard to the presence of a temple in this text, but is willing to entertain the possibility. He writes, "The New Jerusalem is brought down from heaven. It is both greater and higher than the old house (v. 29) and thus possesses the characteristics of both the city and the temple." He adds to this, "Whether the New Jerusalem does have a temple is debatable. Different from the Apocalypse of Weeks (91:13), here none is specifically mentioned." [124] Loren Stuckenbruck notes, "it is best not to interpret the imagery and vocabulary too precisely, that is, as applying either to a "new city" or to a "new temple" (contra Tiller, *Commentary…*, 376, who overstates the distinction), as the reference to Jerusalem does not exclude that here the temple or,

---

[123] M. Black, *The Book of Enoch*, Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985 pp. 278-279.

[124] G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, pp. 404-405.

more specifically, the cult is in view." [125] Patrick Tiller discusses this question at length in his commentary on the *Animal Apocalypse*. [126] Since the authors of this text are thought to belong to those groups in Hellenized Judea who were critical with regard to the authorities in charge of the temple cult, it is thought that they were looking for a period in Israel's history when the relations between human and divine were in harmony in a sacred space which was untouched by impurities. They found it in the desert camp [מחנה] with the tabernacle [משכן] which functioned during the forty years of wandering in the desert between the giving of the Torah at Mount Sinai and the entrance into the Land. Tiller comments, "Ideologically, the idealization of the desert camp may have arisen from a vision of an ideal future state in the presence of God. … Exegetically the utopian vision of the future and the tradition of a long past ideal age may have interacted to result in an understanding of the desert camp almost exclusively in terms of the immediate presence of God as a consequence of divine intervention and the defeat of Israel's enemies." There may have been a real-life circumstance that led to this particular choice. As Tiller points out, certain groups fled into the desert as a result of Antiochus' persecution, as recounted in I Macc. 2:27-38. [127] The retreat into the Judean wilderness by other discontents with temple affairs, as is known from the Dead Sea Scrolls, led to the composition of a number of texts that either idealized the desert camp or incorporated it into a vision of a renewed Jerusalem. One telling example is the so-called *Halakhic Letter* or *Miqsat Ma'asei ha-Torah*. Yet, it should be noted that these texts very clearly include a temple within the city of Jerusalem, or, alternatively have the temple grow to such gigantic proportions that it actually absorbs the city, such as in the *Temple Scroll* or the *New Jerusalem Text*. Perhaps a certain reading of Rev. 21:21-22 [128] may have contributed to scholars'

---

[125] L. Stuckenbruck, "'Reading the Present' in the Anumal Apocalypse (*1 Enoch 85-90*)," *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretation*. K. De Troyer & A. Lange, edsAtlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005: 91-102 (at p. 98, fn. 11).

[126] P.A. Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of I Enoch*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993: 45-51.

[127] *Ibid.,* p. 50.

[128] Rev. 21:21-22: And the twelve gates [were] twelve pearls; every several gate was of one pearl: and the street of the city [was] pure gold, as it were transparent glass. // And I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it.

willingness to understand *1 En.* 90:28-29 also as referring to a new city without a temple. This would likely be a result from understanding a Christian concern to distance itself from the traditional Jewish temple cult. But even here it might be argued that this is a case where the city is no longer a normal earthly city but one of both cosmic dimensions and cosmic qualities in which the divine has permanently taken up residence, the city has become the house of the divine (as was the temple traditionally) and the totality of the urban architecture that is described is in actuality very close, if not identical, to that of a temple, even if the central cult implements are missing. But even this could be seen as occurring on an evolving scale. The Second Temple lacked certain appurtenances that were present in the First, although the service could be fully performed in both. But, these were solidly earthly edifices. All other temple descriptions concern idealized literary constructs where earthly and heavenly qualities are mixed and the end result also is a visionary construct where the divine will be literally present and can be directly experienced by all worshipers.

What is demonstrated here is the power of spatial thinking. The Firstspace reality of the Second Temple is unacceptable to certain (Thirdspace) groups who are, at the same time, not able to change anything about this. What they can resort to, however, is to literally *rewrite* reality and thus, either hope to eventually overcome the powers of the day or otherwise retreat into their own recreated Firstspace reality.

b) Crumbled together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing floors; and the wind carried them away

In addition to the possible connection of this particular wind with the "four winds of heaven," that was discussed earlier, [129] there is also another passage that may have informed the reference to this in chapter 2. It concerns Is. 41:2, [130] 15-16: [131]

---

[129] See sections 5.2 and 5.7 below.

[130] For the reading of 'victorious' for צדק, rather than 'righteous', see J. Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40-55* [AB 19A]. New York: Doubleday, 2000: 197. I follow his opinion that this passage refers to Cyrus entrée into Babylon.

[131] E.J. Hamlin, "The Meaning of 'Mountains and Hills' in Isa. 41:14-16," *JNES* 13(1954): 185-190.

² Who was it that roused from the east, one victorious at every step?

Has delivered up nations to him and trodden down kings beneath him.

Has rendered their swords like dust, their bows like windblown chaff?

¹³ For I am the Lord, your God, who takes hold of your right hand

and says to you, Do not fear; I will help you.

¹⁴ Do not be afraid, O worm Jacob, O little Israel, for I myself will help you," declares

the Lord, your Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel.

¹⁵ "See, I will make you into a threshing sledge, new and sharp, with many teeth.

You will thresh the mountains and crush them, and reduce the hills to chaff.

¹⁶ You will winnow them, the wind will pick them up, and a gale will blow them

away. But you will rejoice in the Lord and glory in the Holy One of Israel.

Perhaps Zech. 7:14, applied to the Israelites, also reflects a similar notion:

But I will scatter them with a whirlwind [ואסערם] among all the nations whom they have

not known. Thus the land was desolate [נשמה] after them, so that no man passed through

nor returned; for they laid the pleasant land [ארץ-חמדה] desolate [לשמה].

c) The stone became a great mountain

As suggested above, in Dan. 2:33-35, 45 the mountain could be understood as
representing the Temple and the stone could then signify the altar. Mount Zion is often
equated with the Temple. But in much of the biblical and extra-biblical literature of
the Persian and Hellenistic periods, the images of Temple, City and Land demonstrate
fluidity and their sense may collapse into or veer away from each other. In many
ancient Near Eastern texts mountains are frequently associated with the abode of the
gods or the seat of the divine throne. Also, temples are often built on top of a mountain
or they symbolize a mountain (*ziggurat*).

In the Ugaritic text of the "Palace of Baal," [132] lines 25-28 have:

> Come and I myself will search it out; within my rock [ġry] El Zephon; in (my) holy place, in the rock [bġr] of my heritage; in (my) pleasant place, in the hill [bgbᶜ] of my victory.

That here it means primarily 'mountain' is demonstrated by the parallelistic use of gbᶜ, 'hill' in the next line. An identical parallelism is found in Num. 23:9. [133] Various lexicons and linguistic studies indicate that there is a relationship between the lexemes ġr and צור. [134] To this should be added the Aramaic טור as it is used in the Daniel passage under discussion. [135]

Mountains are obvious places where theophanies take place as they facilitate by their physicality the 'activation' of the axis between heaven and earth (in Eliadian terms). Furthermore, they function as 'footstools' or foundations for divine dwellings (be they of earthly or heavenly derivation). Since about the late 19th century, phenomenologists of religion have been persuaded to identify almost any mountain that occurs within a religious myth, or a geographical elevation with a religious function, as a centre of the world or navel of the earth and an axis mundi and this notion has crept into some commentaries on Daniel. [136] Richard Clifford, however, has eloquently put a number of the arguments emerging from the phenomenology school (that are often not supported by clear evidence) into perspective. He writes: [137]

---

[132] J.C.L. Gibson, *Canaanite Myths and Legends*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1978, p. 49.

[133] *HALOT*, vol. 3, p. 1016, n. 3.

[134] C.H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Glossary*. [Analecta Orientalia 38, 1965], p. 463, nr. 1953. Also, H. Dreyer, "The Roots qr, ʿr, gr and s/tr = 'Stone, Wall, City' etc.," *De Fructu Oris Sui; Essays in Honour of Adrianus van Selms*. I.H. Eybers [et al.], eds. Leiden: Brill, 1971: 17-25.

[135] *TDOT* 12: 312-13. See on this relationship also A. Wiegand, "Der Gottesname צור und seine Deutung in des Sinne Bildner oder Schöpfer in der alten jüdischen Litteratur," *ZAW* 10(1890): 85-96 (at p. 93).

[136] Cf. A. Jeffery (1956: 387), who writes: "[t]o the writer and his contemporaries the earth was flat and was surrounded by the circumambient ocean, and they were familiar with the conception of the world-mountain which was the navel of the earth. "

[137] R.J. Clifford, *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972: 21.

[c]aution is necessary in seeing cosmic significance in everything that has roots in the underworld and its top in the heavens. In some texts, these 'cosmic' characteristics are applied to gods, temple, a god's net, a mythical tree, a mountain. The idea of greatness is simply expressed in terms of filling the whole universe.

What constitutes a proper cosmic mountain depends on the divine activities thought to take place there. Veneration for certain mountains can be derived from the notion that they are "the meeting place of the gods, the source of water and fertility, the battleground of conflicting natural forces, the meeting place of heaven and earth, the place where effective decrees are issued. In these senses, the mountains are cosmic, that is, involved in the government and stability of the cosmos." [138] A related function of the cosmic mountain is that of abode for the divine. In this sense both Mount Zion and the *ziggurats* of Mesopotamia (artificial mountains) are to be categorized as cosmic mountains. In addition, they traditionally are thought to function as an *axis mundi,* connecting the heavens, the earth, and the underworld. According to these criteria the unnamed mountain that appears in the dream in chapter 2 is not cosmic (and neither for that matter is the tree in chapter 4), it is just very big. Furthermore, although the dream describes divine activity taking place with regard to the mountain, this activity is not of the nature described above and thus the requirements for a cosmic mountain are not met. Merely looked at from the narrative perspective it is an imaginary mountain which is located in no other place than the dreamscape. However, if it is understood as a metaphor for Mount Zion it could qualify as cosmic mountain that is also the center, in Eliade's terms.

Ezekiel 40:2 and 43:12

40:2 - In the visions of God brought He me into the land of Israel, and set me down upon a very high mountain, whereon was as it were the frame of a city on the south.

43:12 - This is the law of the house: upon the top of the mountain the whole limit thereof round about shall be most holy. Behold, this is the law of the house.

---

[138] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

Of course, there are as well the common sacrificial places known as במות, i.e., 'high places'. Within the context of this chapter, attention should be directed to Mount Zion, and, perhaps, even to Mount Sinai as a, or *the*, connection with God's heavenly palace or temple, as has been argued by D.N. Freedman. [139] His equation of both locales in later texts, however, is not completely convincing. Mount Sinai clearly looses out in importance to Mount Zion, and furthermore, as far as I know, it never enjoyed the 'official' status of 'center of the world'. In fact, a passage in Isaiah underscores clearly the process of the merging of Sinai qualities into Mount Zion. At the same time it is a passage that is strongly supportive of the argument that the author of Daniel alluded to Mount Zion with its Temple.

A passage in which Mount Zion becomes elevated and enlarged to cosmic proportions is Isa. 2:2-3

> 2 - And it shall come to pass in the end of days, that the **mountain of the Lord's house** shall be established as the top of the mountains, and **shall be exalted above the hills**; and all nations shall flow unto it. [140] 3 - And many peoples shall go and say: "Come and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and He will teach us of His ways, and we will walk in His paths." For out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.

The *Book of Jubilees* contains an interesting passage concerning the 'center of the world'. E. Tigchelaar [141] introduces this theme in his discussion of apocalyptic elements in Zechariah and *1 Enoch*, but does not extend it to Jubilees. Doron Mendels [142] relates it to Jubilees in a socio-political context. When we look at the relevant passages in

---

[139] D.N. Freedman, "Temple Without Hands," *Temples and High Places in Biblical Times*. Jerusalem: Hebrew Union College, 1981: 21-30. See on the comparison and weight accorded to both mountains, Levenson, *Sinai & Zion*.

[140] B. Schwartz makes an interesting case for reading נהרו in v. 2 as "they will see it" rather than "they will flow unto it." "Torah from Zion - Isaiah's Temple Vision (Isaiah 2:1-4)," A. Houtman et al (eds.), *Sanctity of Time and Space in Tradition and Modernity*. Leiden: Brill, 1998: 11-26 (at pp. 14-15).

[141] E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *Prophets of Old and the Day of the End: Zechariah, the Book of Watchers, and Apocalyptic*, Leiden: Brill, 1996: 254-255.

[142] D. Mendels, *The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in Hasmonean Literature*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1987: 64.

Jubilees, the obvious dependence on *1 Enoch's* geography (*1 En.* 26:1 f.) becomes immediately apparent. The pertinent passage is *Jub.* 8:11b-12: [143]

> And he divided by lot the land, which his three sons would possess. And they stretched out their hands and took the document from the bosom of Noah, their father. And the lot of Shem was assigned in the document as the middle of the earth…; 8:18-21, And Noah rejoiced because this portion was assigned to Shem and for his sons…he said: 'May the Lord God of Shem be blessed, and may the Lord dwell in the dwelling place of Shem.' And he knew that the Garden of Eden [144] was the holy of holies and the dwelling of the Lord. And Mount Sinai (was) in the midst of the desert and Mount Zion (was) in the midst of the navel [145] of the earth. The three of these were created as holy places, one facing the other…And he knew that a blessed portion and blessing had reached Shem and his sons for eternal generations…

Considering this theme in light of apocalypticism opens up a wide range of possibilities. Mircea Eliade illustrates this through the notion of the *axis mundi,* which connects heaven and earth. Usually the earth-point is formed by a sacred or cosmic mountain. Within the geography of Jerusalem the logical candidates are Mount Zion and the Temple Mount (and even Jerusalem as a city, built on mountains). Using concentric

---

[143] The translation is by O.S. Wintermute. [*OTP 2*, p. 72]. J. VanderKam's translation [*The Book of Jubilees*, p. 52] deviates somewhat in wording but not in meaning.

[144] On the importance of the Garden (פרדס) motif in ascent literature and apocalyptic, its identification with the (celestial) Holy of Holies and the people of Israel, see J. Davila, "The *Hodayot* Hymnist and the Four Who Entered Paradise," *RQ* 17(1996) 1-4, nrs. 65-68: 457-478. On the connection between the heavenly and earthly Edens and Temples, see I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, Leiden: Brill, 1980: 38, fn. 44, pp. 49-50. See also B. Halpern-Amaru, "Exile and Return in Jubilees," *Exile; Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*. J.M. Scott, ed. Leiden: Brill, 1997: 127-144 (at pp. 142-143). And see further the study by J. Milgrom, "The Concept of Impurity in *Jubilees* and the *Temple Scroll*," *RQ* 16(1993): 277-284. He indicates a clear connection between the emphasized sanctity of the Garden as God's dwelling place, the laws concerning impurity in relation to childbirth that found their origin there, as well as the notion that Sinai and Zion were already sanctified at creation. But Milgrom stresses Jubilees' innovation here: if Zion stands for the Temple Mount, than here, clearly its sanctity is not derived from the Temple but from its relation to the Garden. Jubilees thus argues that Jerusalem's holiness was pre-ordained at the creation of the universe. The Land is, consequently, equally holy. These notions, of course, tally very well with the insistence on ritual purity and the abstinence from agents of defilement.

[145] טבור הארץ - Cf. *Enc. Jud.* 9:1558-59; J. Levenson, *Sinai and Zion: an Entry into the Jewish Bible*. Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1985: 115-120 and his discussion of Eliade's position in the pages following.

circles, even the Land of Israel itself qualifies: tradition teaches that it, as being the highest place on earth, was not submerged by the Flood. [146]

The holiness of Jerusalem is derived from the Temple Mount with the Temple. From the Holy of Holies, holiness (ever decreasing) "spills over" in concentric circles to the Temple building and Temple Mount, the city, the surrounding countryside and then the entire Land of Israel. [147]

d) Filled the whole earth

God's Glory and God's Presence, כבוד and שכינה, are known to expand and fill the whole Temple (e.g. Is. 6:3; II Chron. 5:13, 14 and esp. 7:1) and the whole earth (e.g., Num. 14:21; Jer. 23:24; Ps. 72:19). But perhaps we may infer that more is going on in this particular passage. If the 'stone' stands indeed for the altar and the 'mountain' for the Temple, Daniel displays the process of ever expanding sacred space. Magen Broshi illustrates the working of this process in the existence of an oversized Temple plan with regard to the outline of the structure described in the Temple Scroll. From the modest size of the First and Second Temples, it is envisioned to cover the entire surface of 2nd century BCE Jerusalem. [148] The Qumran *New Jerusalem* Scroll is consumed by the measurements of the city. However, the description (which includes an operative Temple) only seems to take a plan into account, which is completely at the service of the Temple. In fact, the size of the projected city in this text would cover

---

[146] M. Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane: the Nature of Religion*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, [1959], pp. 38 ff. Also, Eliade, *The Myth of the Eternal Return: Cosmos and History*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2005: 12-17. Further references in L. Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, vol. V, Philadelphia: Jewish Pub., 1913-1938 pp. 14-16.

[147] See the enumeration in B.M. Bokser, "Approaching Sacred Space," *HTR* 78(1985): 279-299 (at pp. 289-290), which is based on the Mishna. See further the diagram in J. Maier, "Self-Definition, Prestige, and Status of Priests towards the End of the Second Temple Period," *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 23(1993): 139-150 (at p. 143).

[148] M. Broshi, "The Gigantic Dimensions of the Visionary Temple in the Temple Scroll," *BAR* 13(1987)6: 36-37 [Repr.: H. Shanks (ed.), *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls*. NY: Random House, 1992: 113-115.

what is now the entire West Bank,[149] or interestingly, the province of Yehud from the Persian period. In order to further substantiate the argument that the temple might at first define and then absorb the city, one only needs to look at any of the biblical phrases containing the word *qodesh* which can be read as either adjectival or nominal. [150] When translated as a noun, it often makes eminently more sense. For example, in Isa 63:15, which usually is translated as, "Look down from heaven, and see, even from Your holy and glorious habitation …" I would propose to translate מזבול קדשך ותפארתך rather as the "elevated habitation of your holiness and your splendour." [151]

5.2.1.5. The Altar as an Active Dream Agent

The concept of 'layered space' can very well be linked to that of 'erasure of sacred space' [152] in further understanding the dynamics of the passage under discussion. Thus, in addition to discovering conflated historical layers in the story format, this format of 'layered' history itself makes the erasure visible of one particular place: Jerusalem, the Temple Mount, the Holy of Holies, and the altar. This is specifically suggested in 8:13, in Daniel's prayer in 9:27, [153] and is more explicitly stated in 11:31 and 12:11, where reference is made to the *shiqutz (me)shomem* [154] or 'detestable thing' also translated as 'abomination of desolation'. It is important to note that the root שמ"ם itself implies 'erasure'. The root also occurs in 9:17 where it refers to "Your Sanctuary

---

[149] M. Broshi, "Visionary Architecture and Town Planning in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls* (D. Dimant and L. Schiffman, eds.; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995), 9-22; cf. p. 12. See now esp. L. DiTommaso, *The Dead Sea* New Jerusalem *Text: Contents and Contexts.* (TSAJ 110; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005).

[150] See the analysis of this lexeme in the context of Daniel by W. Vogel, "The Cultic Motif in Space and Time in the Book of Daniel," Diss. Andrews University, 1999: 78-80.

[151] *BDB*, p. 259 has, "high abode of thy holiness."

[152] See on this A. Wharton, "Erasure: Eliminating the Space of Late Ancient Judaism," *From Dura to Sepphoris: Studies in Jewish Art and Society in Late Antiquity* [= JRA Suppl. Series 40]. L.I. Levine and Z. Weiss, eds. Portsmouth, RI, 2000: 195-214. Also, J.R. Branham, "Sacred Space under Erasure in Ancient Synagogues and Early Churches," *ArtB* 74(1992): 374-394.

[153] See J.J. Collins (1993: 357f.) for references to passages in later texts such as I Macc 1:54 and Josephus *Ant.* 12.5.4 § 253 which specify the manner in which the altar was violated. II Macc. 6:2 adds to this the "erasure" caused by Antiochus in renaming Jerusalem for Olympian Zeus, on whose name the *shiqutz shomem* is a pun.

[154] *TDOT* 15: 238-248 ('Shamam', > "meshomem').

that lies desolate (*ha-shamem*)" and in 9:26, which refers to wars of desolation (*shomemot*) and further in 9:18. Aside from the direct concern of the author with regard to the events taking place in the Temple, the frequent use of the root שמ"ם may play on exactly those passages of Jeremiah using similar terminology in dealing with the destruction, ensuing exile and promises for it to end (25:11-12 and 29:10, but also 51:24:26). [155] Johan Lust [156] has discussed the different theories concerning the nature of the "abomination of desolation" that Antiochus IV introduced in the Jerusalem Temple. A traditional explanation is to see *shiqutz me(shomem)* as a derisive pun on the Phoenician god, Ba'al Shamem, the lord of heaven, or Zeus Olympus. Lust rejects this, however. [157] The most plausible range from a defiling of the great altar of the daily (*tamid*) offering itself, by bringing prohibited sacrifices or the placement of a foreign altar upon the existing altar. While the former is not excluded based on the Daniel text which simply does not specify what took place, the latter is specifically indicated by 1 Macc. Lust cites Elias Bickerman's [158] explanation of the desolation being a foreign altar superimposed on the *tamid* altar in light of the phenomenon of bomolatry (altar worship) in Syrian religion of the first millennium BCE and well into the Hellenistic period.

An interesting Qumran text (4Q390, 2ii11), dating most probably to the mid-first century BCE, provides evidence besides Daniel and 1 Maccabees with regard to the defiled altar. Although the *DSSSE* does not have the more complete reconstruction of a vital line, *DJD* XXX (and by extension the *Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance*, p. 437) does:

---

[155] Cf. L.L. Grabbe, "'The End of the Desolations of Jerusalem': From Jeremiah's 70 Years to Daniel's 70 Weeks of Years," *Early Jewish Exegesis. Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee*. C.A. Evans & W.F. Stinespring, eds. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987: 67-72.

[156] J. Lust, "Cult and Sacrifice in Daniel: the Tamid and the Abomination of Desolation," *Ritual and Sacrifice in the Ancient Near East*. J. Quagebeur, ed.. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1993: 283-299. [Updated and repr. in *The Book of Daniel; Composition and Reception* II: 671-688].

[157] *TDOT* 15: 465-469 ('shiqutz') favors an idol rather than an altar. But see E. Blum, "Der 'Schiqquz Schomem' und die Jehud-Drachme BMC Palestine S. 181, Nr. 29," *BN* 90 (1997): 13-27, who, as does Lust, objects to this on the grounds that it is not logical that the image of a deity would be placed on the altar for burnt offering.

[158] E.J. Bickerman, *The God of the Maccabees. Studies on the Meaning and Origin of the Maccabean Revolt*. Leiden: Brill, 1979. Translated from the German, *Der Gott der Makkabäer: Untersuchungen über Sinn und Ursprung der makkabäischen Erhebung,* Berlin: Jüdischer Buchverlag, 1937: 107-108 (= pp. 69-71, English transl.). See also "mizbe'ah," *TDOT* 8: 209-225 (p. 211, for altar worship).

יח]ללו בה ו [א]ת מזב]ח]. This text is extensively discussed by Devorah Dimant. [159] The phrase is found in a very fragmented part of a text that clearly offers a review of history, summing up the transgressions and subsequent punishments of the various generations, possibly up to the time of the author. Dimant establishes convincing links with *Jubilees* as well as the *Animal Apocalypse*. In her analysis of the text she unfortunately does not go into the historical implications of the content of exactly this fragment, 2ii11. This task, however, is picked up by Daniel Falk. [160] He understands this fragment (depending on the placement of the fragment following the larger part rather than preceding it, in which he follows Dimant) to refer to the great "apostasy under the Seleucids: violation of all of God's laws and commandments, factional disputes, hoarding of unjust wealth, defilement of the Temple, corrupt priests, and intermarriage or incest."

5.2.1.6. Conclusion

The discussion with regard to chapter 2 has shown that temple imagery occupies a central place in the dream account and its explanation. This result was achieved through a reading that veered away from so-called four empires aspect that usually perks commentator's interest, but focus instead on language that is known from other passages to undeniably refer to temple issues. It was found that the 'mountain' likely refers to the temple and that the great altar, may be recognized in "the stone hewn without human hands." Nothing would be more ironic than that the object that was destroyed or desecrated, respectively, would become the object of revenge and of ultimate victory as was also demonstrated in light of the exegesis of passages from Zechariah and the use of the pentateuchal altar laws within the Hebrew Bible. It should not be ruled out that even Josephus may have considered such a reading and that his reluctance to present an explanation of the dream in his book was informed by a desire to either flatter or at least not upset his Roman audience.

---

[159] D. Dimant, "New Light from Qumran on the Jewish Pseudepigrapha - 4Q390," *The Madrid Qumran Congress; Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, March 1991. Vol. II.* J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner, eds. Leiden: Brill, 1992: 405-448. See pp. 415, 419, 431.

[160] D. Falk, "Moses, Texts of," *EDSS* I, pp. 580-81.

Introducing the dreamscape as a level within spatial theory allows both the creator of a text as well as its reader to play around more freely with ideas and images than a description of real space (even within fiction) would permit. Therefore, there is no logical objection to introduce a ballistic, expanding and even shapeshifting altar into the dream narrative. A similar occurrence was seen in *IV Ezra* 13.

In this passage various levels of spatiality are therefore at play. Within the dreamscape another emerges, namely, that of the expanding mountain and stone. It may be asked whether Daniel is granted a visual replay of the dream or whether his knowledge only derives from a verbal translation of the image seen by Nebuchadnezzar. While this question cannot definitively be answered, it is reasonable to assume that Daniel indeed received the complete image if only for the simple reason that the entire text is so pre-occupied with images.

From the perspective of sacred space approaches, the following can be suggested. First of all, v. 35 pictures the expanding stone that grows into a mountain, which in turn fills the whole earth. If we try to visualize this image, what we will see is an engulfing of profane space by sacred space, beginning from a central point in all directions - somewhat like a volcanic eruption. In Eliade's approach this could be seen as the obliteration of profane space by sacred space. Yet, using Clifford's criteria, this mountain cannot be seen as a cosmic mountain. Even if it could be accepted as a symbol of Mount Zion (which is, in fact, a cosmic mountain), within this narrative it does not function as a cosmic mountain – it is, after all, not a real mountain but a dream image. From a different angle, in order to derive meaning from the image, the workings of Firstspace and Secondspace become relevant. The various kingdoms that are represented by the statue are sequential levels of decreasing earthly power, which are in turn toppled by a non-earthly divine power, which fills in the space left behind, creating a new Firstspace within the dream but which is expected to affect the real world in a most dramatic way. This returns us to Marvin Sweeney's call to pay more attention to the political and nationalistic agenda over the more common theological and

universalistic aspects. [161] We will now look at how this impacts on the interpretation of the dream in Daniel 2. In light of the passage in Zechariah (4:7-10) and specifically here v. 7, Mark Boda too had called for an interpretation that simply saw the great mountain encountered by Zerubbabel as the mount of rubble left after the temple's destruction wrought by Nebuchadnezzar. [162] This was a Firstspace circumstance that it was up to the concerted Secondspace effort of the leaders and the community to change. The various accounts dealing with this period (Haggai, Zechariah, Ezra) all indicate that this was very complicated and only accomplished after much hardship and delays. Daniel 2 may now be read as a response to these accounts. To begin with, the narrative starts at the beginning of the exile, immediately following the sack and ultimate destruction of the temple. However, the agenda of the authors looks far beyond this time and is aware of how the history of the construction of the Second Temple evolved. Using the language of apocalypticism the author communicates a superb message of defiance in support of his real-world audience. For, if the mountain in the dream could indicate Mount Zion, it is would be even more appropriate to recognize in it the mountain of rubble encountered by Zerubbabel, which would, eventually, be reconstituted into a functioning temple. Following this, it will be seen that two accounts become conflated: Zechariah 4:7 and the related Ezra 3:2-3. On the one hand, from both the mountain of rubble in the historical account of Zechariah and its apocalyptic dream version in Daniel a stone is taken. In Zechariah this is the foundation or first stone that will become the basis of the new temple. In Daniel this item becomes a missile of vengeance that takes down Nebuchadnezzar's statue. On the other hand, in Ezra a new stone altar is erected upon the grounds of the ruined temple, which too functions as the basis of the newly reconstituted temple. This too is a symbol of defiance in the face of the earlier destruction. Therefore, in the conflation of symbols in Daniel we may recognize the ultimate revenge upon Nebuchadnezzar the temple destroyer, and anyone else who would try this in the future. The ruined temple itself, together with its most important cult implement become an instrument of destruction aimed at the destroyer. Even more so, whereas the Zechariah and Ezra passages emphasize the necessary presence of a

---

[161] M.A. Sweeney, "The End of Eschatology in Daniel?"

[162] See above, pp. 163-164.

legitimate pretender to the Davidic throne, Daniel takes this aspect also to the next level by introducing the notion that all this is to be accomplished solely through the hand of the divine.

And even this element was already contained in the Zechariah passage, as in v. 6b the angel explains to the prophet: "this is the word of the Lord to Zerubbabel: Not by might, nor by power, but My spirit [לֹא בְחַיִל וְלֹא בְכֹחַ כִּי אִם־בְּרוּחִי] – said the Lord of Hosts."

5.3   Statue on a Plane

The chapter opens with Nebuchadnezzar's erecting of a golden statue (which may or may not be a materialization of the statue he had seen in his dream in the previous chapter). [163] The spatial image that is evoked in 3:1 is that of a (probably) empty plane [164] in which the only vertical object is this gigantic statue, measuring 60 by 6 cubits, and reflecting sunlight far and wide. Since it was intended as a symbol of Nebuchadnezzar's perceived universal power and an object of worship for his subjects, it functions simultaneously as a

---

[163] This could either suggest an image of a god, or more likely one of Nebuchadnezzar himself. Mesopotamian kings are known to have commissioned statues of themselves or important ancestors and predecessors as votive images to be placed in temples, or in open public spaces. Likewise, they would be produced in the wake of a victory in battle. Other gigantic royal images (usually as mountain reliefs) were erected in strategic places along the borders of the empire. This custom was continued at least into the Persian period. On a comparative note, that may serve as an illustration that the statue in ch. 3 is the execution of the dream in ch. 2, we may adduce Gudea's dream of detailed instructions to build a temple that were conveyed to him in a dream. He subsequently carries out the building of said temple according to the divine verbal blueprint. Gudea became King of Lagash in 2143 BCE. See e.g., Th. Jacobsen, *The Harps that Once… Sumerian Poetry in Translation.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987: 386 ff.

[164] E.M. Cook ("'In the Plain of the Wall' (Dan 3:1)," *JBL* 108(1989): 115-116) proposes that the name Dura would refer to a stretch of land between Babylon's inner and outer walls rather than to an open plain. This would be prompted by the fact that *duru* in Akkadian means 'wall' or 'fortress'. In Aramaic this could then be turned into *dura*, i.e., 'the wall'. While this is certainly not an impossible solution, especially in light of the fact that there is no known 'Plain of Dura', it seems that the author of the story had in mind to create something that stood out significantly and could be observed from far and wide. Cook relies here heavily on the OG that translates Dura as περιβολος, which can mean "enclosure" (so also Collins, 1993: 182). T.J. Meadowcroft, however, translates this term simply as "around the region of [Babylon]" (*Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel. A Literary Comparison*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995: 144). From a narrative perspective it would be very likely that it would be in the vicinity of Babylon, and thus not too far removed from the walls. See Collins, 1993: 182, who disagrees with Cook and favors seeing Dura as a place name, adding to this that *dur-* is a common element in Mesopotamian toponyms.

spatial and a socio-political centerpoint. This is demonstrated by the notion that all the functionaries from all the provinces, far and wide, are to come and pay homage to the statue. [165] However, a ripple appears at the surface, when it is suggested, starting with v. 8 and culminating in v. 12, that Nebuchadnezzar's three Judaean courtiers (i.e., Daniel's companions) will not participate in the ritual. This could likely be interpreted as an act that would render the ritual ineffective thereby thwarting Nebuchadnezzar's effort to seal his power. When the three are punished by being thrown into a fiery furnace, [166] the heavenly and earthly realms merge once more for a brief moment and

---

[165] The author once again creates an opportunity to mock Mesopotamian religion. Here it concerns a combination of the religious processions that are known to have taken place during the New Years ceremonies (the Akitu) as well as those taking place at the dedication of rock reliefs and stelae of the kings.

[166] The use of this manner of punishment is unusual, to say the least. The author must have included it to convey an added message. Although caution is warranted in trying to unravel various layers of meaning beneath the simple text itself, some allusions spring to mind while reading. One is the idea of a fiery netherworld. After all, the protagonists are sent to the furnace to die. However, in Mesopotamia the underworld is not known to be a fiery place. For this we must probably look to Greek cosmology. This is, of course not surprising, since the end redaction of Daniel dates from well into the Hellenistic period. Even though the Court Tales are usually dated earlier, a final redactor could surely have added or changed certain details in the existing story. Furthermore, there are some clear indications that such ideas had already been incorporated in 1 Enoch, especially in its description of the punishment of the fallen Watchers. Ch. 18 is here instructive, as are 10:5-6, 12-13. See K. Coblentz Bautsch, *A Study of the Geography of I Enoch 17-1*. Leiden: Brill, 2003: 134 ff. and G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *I Enoch I* [Hermeneia, 2001], *ad loc*. However, there is also some direct historical and lexical precedence for this extreme penalty. J.J. Collins only mentions a number of late and at best approximate examples, yet there is evidence in the Middle Assyrian law tablets that this kind of punishment was, if not actually carried out, at least included within the code of law, and – using the exact same terminology as Daniel. We know of an account concerning a court attendant who was an eyewitness of an offence against the king and refrained from informing him about the matter: "they shall throw the eyewitness, whether a woman or a man, *into the oven* [italics mine]." See M.T. Roth, *Law Collections from Mesopotamia and Asia Minor* [2nd ed.] Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997: 205. The word used here is *utūne* which is the Akkadian cognate for the Aramaic אתון in our passage. See further *HALOT*, 1829. T.L. Holm offers a very different venue for understanding the passage. Exactly in light of the sparsity of evidence from Mesopotamia, she prefers to look at Egypt. In all periods of Egypt's history there is evidence for immolation in a furnace as punishment for a variety of offenses. Add to this the fact that certainly by the Persian period and the following Hellenistic era there was an increasing cultural traffic between the two great civilizations including the function of Aramaic as lingua franca, and we have sufficient evidence to at least suggest a link with Egypt rather than Mesopotamia for the passage. See her "The Fiery Furnace: Daniel 3 in Its Ancient Near Eastern Context," *JAOS* 128(2008)1: 81-100. (I am grateful to Dr. Holm for sending me a pre-publication copy of her article). A.-P. Beaulieu emphasizes the Mesopotamian link over the Egyptian, citing a few documents that had hitherto not been studies in light of Daniel 3. He particularly looks at the role of Nabonidus (for whom Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel 3 functions as a cipher) based on his own inscriptions as well as the Verse Account. He further links the story to the Letter to the Exiles in Jer. 29: 21-23 which contains the report of two false prophets who had been roasted in the fire by Nebuchadnezzar. Although the manner of burning is not indicated, Beaulieu makes a good case of how one narrative may have influenced the other. See "The Babylonian Background of the Motif of the Fiery Furnace in Daniel 3," *JBL* 128(2009)2: 273-290.

Nebuchadnezzar experiences a vision of what must be a divine messenger who appears as a fourth person in the fiery furnace (3:25). Nebuchadnezzar alone is privy to this vision [167] as none of the bystanders are aware of it after he inquires from them about the presence of this fourth individual. The king refers to this mysterious individual as a *bar elahin* (son of the gods, or a divine being).[168] The text provides some clues as to the identity or nature of this figure. Firstly, the plural Hebrew form of *bar elahin* occurs in Gen. 6:2, 4 as *bnei elohim*, which is usually translated as sons of God and not 'sons of the gods', [169] although some translations use the more neutral 'divine beings', referring to angels. In fact, when Nebuchadnezzar retells his experience in v. 28, he uses the term *mal'akh*, but adding to it the recognition that this must have been a messenger from the God of the Judaeans. [170]

[167] This solitary model for the vision of a heavenly figure is not unusual in biblical and extra-biblical literature. Of course, within the Book of Daniel it happens to Daniel himself in 11:7 while his companions flee. In the Book of Numbers (22:22 ff.) maximum comic relief is effectuated when Balaam's donkey is the only one to see the angel of the Lord, and Balaam does not understand what makes his animal move this way and that, and finally, talk. The NT contains the account of Paul's vision on the road to Damascus (Acts 9:3 ff.; 22:6-11). Whereas his companions witness the light aspect of the vision, they do not hear the voice, which is directed solely at Paul.

[168] Although most English translations render 'son of the gods' or 'divine being', the King James versions render the christologically inspired '(the) Son of God'.

[169] Some medieval Jewish commentators, such as Rashi and Nahmanides, have veered away altogether from the 'heavenly being' connotation and prefer (sons of) human 'judges' or 'princes.' Ibn Ezra names all options, but prefers the earthly one. This may go back to the rendition of the verse in the various Targumim. In Targum Onkelos and Ps. Jon. the phrase is translated as 'sons of chiefs' or 'leaders' (בני רברביא) and the Targum Neofiti has (בני דיינא) 'sons of judges'. However, in the marginal glosses to 6:2 and 6:4, the alternative readings מלכייא (kings) and a corrective מלאכ' (angels) are given. As R.C. Newman observed with regard to this targum, "[t]hus the text of *Targ. Neof* seems to be nonsupernatural while a marginal note is clearly supernatural." See his "The Ancient Exegesis of Genesis 6:2, 4," *Grace Theological Journal* 5(1984)1: 13-36 (at 26). R. Kasher suggests that the reason for the replacement in T. Onqelos and Neofiti may be connected with the notion that angels are deemed to be good and cannot sin. He notes that "[a]ngels are also mentioned in one version of MS Neofiti on v. 2 and in the Neofiti marginalia on v. 4, but with no condemnation or criticism," "The Conception of Angels in Jewish Biblical Translations," *Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2007: Angels*. F.V. Reiterer et al., eds. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007: 555-584 (at 562, 583 and fn 2 there). The Targum versions may go back to a tradition attributed to R. Shimon ben Yochai in the Midrash Gen. Rabbah 26.5-7. He is recorded as saying that anyone who translates *bnei elohim* as *bnei elahaya* (i.e., sons of God) instead of *bnei dayyenaya* (sons of judges) is cursed. See further P.S. Alexander, "The Targumim and Early Exegesis of 'Sons of God' in Genesis 6," *JJS* 23(1972): 60-71. Another important occurrence of the phrase *bnei elohim* is found in Job 38:7 which undergoes similar ideological changes in its LXX and Targum versions. See further the discussion below under chapter 12.

[170] See *DDD*, "Angel II", p. 51 and "Sons of (the) God(s), pp. 794-800, esp. 799. See also T.J. Meadowcroft's discussion of θ translation sing. "son of God," in his *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel: A Literary Comparison*. [= JSOT Suppl. Series 198]. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995: 187, 283. LXX has "angel of God". The Vulgate, too, translates "son of God." A.T. Wright adds that the qualification *mal'akh* for *bar elahin* given in the text demonstrates that by the mid-second century BCE

The king's visual experience is not clear beyond the fact that he sees four men instead of three, and the fourth is clearly distinct from the other three. Klaus Koch is, to my knowledge, the only commentator who speculates that perhaps the fourth person has a luminous appearance. [171]

The identity of the mysterious divine rescuer has confounded commentators throughout the ages. An interesting example is found in a joining of midrashic interpretation with one of the Greek additions to Daniel, *The Prayer of Azariah and the Hymn of the Three Young Men*. In the latter, the anonymous author speculates that the rescuer is none other than the Angel of the Lord. He came down (from heaven) in answer to Azariah's heart-rending prayer, joined the three and "drove the scorching blaze out of the furnace and made the middle of the furnace as though a dew-laden breeze were blowing through it, so that the fire did not touch them at all." Although the miraculous acts of the angel are outlined, he is not named. Out of gratitude the three then burst into a spontaneous series of blessings of God. The hymn of blessing is mostly a listing of all that God is master of, all the elements, weather phenomena on earth and in the heavens, all creatures, in short, all of God's creation is called upon to bless the Lord. Among all these, vv. 44-48[66-70], which call upon every kind of precipitation, fire and extreme cold and heat, have sparked the interest of the interpreters. In the Babylonian Talmud we find the following: [172]

> R. Simeon the Shilonite lectured: When the wicked Nebuchadnezzar cast Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah into the fiery furnace, Yurkami, Prince of hail, rose before the Holy One, blessed be He, and said to Him: 'Sovereign of the Universe! Let me go down and cool the furnace and save these righteous men from the fiery furnace.' Said Gabriel to him, 'The might of the Holy One, blessed be He, is not thus [manifested], for thou art the Prince of hail, and all know that water extinguishes fire. But I, the Prince of fire, will go down and cool it within and heat it without and will thus perform a double miraclde.' Said the Holy One, blessed be He, to him, 'Go down.'

---

bnei elohim was interpreted as angels. *The Origin of Evil Spirits*. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck [WUNT 198], 2005: 71.

[171] K. Koch, *Daniel* (Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testaments pt. XXII/4). Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 2001: 297.

[172] TB Pesahim 118a/b. Soncino, 1983.

This story skillfully combines the weather data of the Hymn, with the tradition that identified Gabriel with the Angel of the Lord. Louis Ginzburg explains further that the name of the otherwise unknown angel Yurkami or Yorkami literally translates as 'angel of hail stones'. [173] Two curious additions to this account read: "Gabriel attended upon the three men as does a disciple upon his master, because 'the righteous are greater than the angels'" and "The three men made it possible for the angel to withstand the fire of the furnace, and not the reverse." [174] The latter is especially remarkable in that Gabriel is the angel of fire. The heat in the furnace was therefore considered to be too hot even for him.

The chapter ends, as do the other court tales (with the exception of chapter 5, where the king is killed instead), with the (unlikely) conversion of the pagan king to the God of the Judaeans and his call upon his subjects to do the same. This is the only chapter in which Daniel does not figure and it is therefore suggested by most commentators that this particular story found its way into the Daniel corpus much later. [175] However, when the focus is turned to the behavior of Nebuchadnezzar a continuity theme can be detected in which we not only are able to follow the transformation of the identity of one ruler into that of another and back, it also explains the placement of the chapter within the sequence of the court tales. [176] As to the identity transformation, a gradual progression is seen in his development as a narrative conflation of the historical Nebuchadnezzar in chs. 1 and 2 and the last Babylonian king Nabonidus in chapter 4 as well as, on a different

---

[173] L. Ginzburg, *Legends of the Jews IV* [Philadelphia: JPS, 1968: 328-331] and vol. VI (Notes 85-88): 416-418.

[174] Ginzberg, *Legends VI*, fn. 88, p. 418. He cites PR 35, 160b and TY Shabbat 6. The notion of humans surpassing angels is a common theme found in Second Temple and rabbinic literature. It already starts with the angelic jealousy upon the creation of Adam and also towards Moses with regard to the giving of the Torah. It is specifically found also in *2 Baruch* 51:12-13 which states that the righteous who enter the heavenly Eden following the destruction of the Temple, will be greater than the angels. See now, L.I. Lied, *The Other Lands of Israel: Imaginations of the Land in 2 Baruch*. Leiden: Brill, 2008: 287, 291.

[175] Likewise the three friends are mentioned only superficially in chs. 1 and 2 and do not figure at all beyond chapter 3. Collins, *Daniel* (1993, p. 179) posits that the motif of the three friends belongs to an independent tradition, originally not associated with Daniel.

[176] In chapters 1 and 2 we meet a Nebuchadnezzar who is slightly more true to his historical original, in chapter 3 he develops certain characteristics that are more in line with Nabonidus, which is intensified in chapter 4. This leads logically to chapter 5 which features Belshazzar, who in history acted as regent during his father Nabonidus' absence in Teima.

level lastly, an allusion to Antiochus IV. It is not only the king's madness, that figures so prominently in chapter 4 and is thought to reflect Nabonidus' absence for a number of years in Teima, but also his penchant for the construction of gigantic divine statues the worship of which he forces on the population. Of course we are familiar with the historical circumstances surrounding Nabonidus' absence in Northern Arabia, during which time his son Belshazzar acted as regent. This absence, however, received a negative 'press' from factions that were hostile to his reign. In addition, he was criticized for his numerous perceived deviations from established Babylonian religion which included the erection of a statue of the moon god Sin in the main temple in Harran. [177] Thus, as Paul-Alain Beaulieu has noted, the king's behavior with regard to the erection of the statue, the demand of its worship, and the erratic meeting out of punishment in chapter 3 is more in concert with what we know of Nabonidus. Yet, Jer. 29:21-23 records an instance in which two false Israelite prophets receive a sentence of death by burning from Nebuchadnezzar at the instigation of God. Beaulieu points out that much of this is part of a developing narrative tradition in which the figure of Nabonidus transforms into that of Nebuchadnezzar. The focus on a narrative rather than a purely historical development also makes questions with regard to actual occurrences and provenance of categories of punishment and lines of influence less relevant. Therefore, Beaulieu is also correct in stressing that in view of the Mesopotamian setting of the story it is sufficient to look for points of contact within the larger Mesopotamian orbit, even though we also know of cases of death by burning from Egypt. [178] Finally, Beaulieu remarks "it is the story [in Jer. 29:21-23] of the burning of the false prophets by the real Nebuchadnezzar that may ultimately have given its final shape to the motif of the fiery furnace, especially at the crucial point in the elaboration of the legend when the historical figures of Nebuchadnezzar and Nabonidus were merged into the exemplary and elaborately theologized Nebuchadnezzar who appears in the canonical version of Daniel." [179]

---

[177] For all these instances see P.-A. Beaulieu, *The Reign of Nabonidus King of Babylon 556-539 B.C.*, Yale University Press, 1989 and H. Schaudig, *Die Inschriften Nabonids von Babylon und Kyros' des Grossen*, Ugarit verlag, 2001.

[178] Beaulieu, "Babylonian Background," 289-290.

[179] *Ibid.*, p. 290.

5.4   Dreaming of Order and Disorder, Flora and Fauna [180]

This chapter tells the tale of Nebuchadnezzar's bad dream, a dream which, of all his wise men, only Daniel could explain. One moment the king is enjoying the riches that he has amassed, the beautiful city that he has built for his own glorification, and the magnificent empire that he rules. In his dream this success is signified by a luxuriant and gigantic tree, which provides shelter for all and sundry. Suddenly, by divine decree, the tree is chopped down. All the creatures flee the scene and only a stump is left in the earth. Then there is a sudden shift in the imagery: the stump is turned into a man who is turned into a beast who has to live as the beasts of the field for a specified time. The stump, however, is a metaphor of hope and of continuing or renewed life. [181] If the king repents and behaves, he will be restored and his dynasty will be preserved (4:23). The repentance that the king will have to display consists of acknowledging that he is not as a shepherd who rules on behalf of his own gods (which is a common element of Mesopotamian royal titulary) but that it is the God of Daniel who is actually in charge. His command over Firstspace is thus, once again, proven to be illusory. He holds this position at the most by proxy. Further, he must perform the deeds of justice towards his subjects that are expected of him as their ruler (4:24). This too is in fact a mission of which the royal titulary boasts. Nebuchadnezzar is thus merely admonished to practice what he promises. [182]

---

[180] Parts of this section appeared in C. Sulzbach, "Nebuchadnezzar in Eden? Daniel 4 and Ezekiel 28," *Stimulation from Leiden. Collected Communications to the XVIIIth Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament*, Leiden 2004. H.M. Niemann & M. Augustin, eds. Frankfurt a/Main: Peter Lang Verlag, 2006: 125-136.

[181]   See Job 14:7-9 - [7] "At least there is hope for a tree: If it is cut down, it will sprout again, and its new shoots will not fail. - [8] Its roots may grow old in the ground and its stump die in the soil, - [9] yet at the scent of water it will bud and put forth shoots like a plant."

[182] W.G. Lambert, "Nebuchadnezzar King of Justice," *Iraq* 27(1965): 1-11, published a unique text, which he cautiously places during the reign of Nebuchadnezzar II. It describes the pursuits of a Neo-Babylonian king as a just law-giver, caring for his subjects, presenting him as a "second Hammurabi" (3). Benjamin R. Foster, *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature* (3rd ed.). Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 2005: 870-874, thinks it more likely that the text describes Nabonidus. Of course, for the text of Daniel this does not make a difference since Nebuchadnezzar and Nabonidus have become conflated. See further D.S. Vanderhooft, *The Neo-Babylonian Empire and Babylon in the Latter Prophets* [HSMM 59/Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999]: 41-45 where the following text from among Nebuchadnezzar's inscriptions is cited (p. 42):
"(As for) the widespread peoples whom Marduk, the lord, gave into my hand … I continually strove for their welfare. (In) a just path and correct conduct I directed them … I stretched a roof over

The metaphor of blooming and chopped trees symbolizing the rise, the hubris and subsequent fall of foreign rulers, [183] occurs a number of times in the Hebrew Bible, mostly in prophetic texts, [184] or they may contain a warning and/or promise directed at Israel. [185] The passages referring to foreign rulers are found in the so-called oracles against the nations. [186] This would seem to make some of Daniel's play with the ruler of Babylon, in chapter 4, to be part of this classical prophetic sub-genre. However, the use of a tree to signify royalty and royal might, endurance, and protection, is not unique to the Hebrew Bible but occurs in quite a number of ancient Near Eastern cultures. [187] It is

them in the wind, (and) a canopy in the tempest. I brought all of them under the sway of Babylon. The yield of the lands, the abundance of the mountain regions, the product of the countries, I received within it (Babylon). Into its eternal shadow I assembled all the peoples for good."

[183] See the very systematic listing on the application of the metaphor to various categories of people and groups of people, in T. Stordalen, *Echoes of Eden. Genesis 2-3 and Symbolism of the Eden Garden in Biblical Hebrew Literature.* Leuven: Peeters, 2000: 87-92.

[184] An exception is the Fable of Jotham in Judges 9, which is a parody of domestic kingship.

[185] Ezek. 17 and 19; Is. 6.

[186] Ez. 31; Amos 2:9 for those using the tree metaphor.

[187] M. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21-37* [AB 22A], New York: Doubleday, 1997: 645, in his commentary on Ezek. 31:3, mentions an inscription of Nebuchadnezzar II (= *ANET*3, 307) and an earlier Hittite one in praise of the cedar of Lebanon (= *ANET*3, 357).

In his *Histories* (7.19), Herodotus reports the following "After Xerxes had thus determined to go forth to the war, there appeared to him in his sleep yet a third vision. The Magi were consulted upon it, and said that its meaning reached to the whole earth, and that all mankind would become his servants. Now the vision which the king saw was this: he dreamt that he was crowned with a branch of an olive tree, and that boughs spread out from the olive branch and covered the whole earth; then suddenly the garland, as it lay upon his brow, vanished. So when the Magi had thus interpreted the vision, straightway all the Persians who were come together departed to their several governments, where each displayed the greatest zeal, on the faith of the king's offers. For all hoped to obtain for themselves the gifts which had been promised. And so Xerxes gathered together his host, ransacking every corner of the continent."

Herodotus 1.108 has this on the birth of Cyrus: "Astyages, the son of Cyaxares, succeeded to the throne. He had a daughter who was named Mandane concerning whom he had a wonderful dream. He dreamt that from her such a stream of water flowed forth as not only to fill his capital, but to flood the whole of Asia. This vision he laid before such of the Magi as had the gift of interpreting dreams, who expounded its meaning to him in full, whereat he was greatly terrified. On this account, when his daughter was now of ripe age, he would not give her in marriage to any of the Medes who were of suitable rank, lest the dream should be accomplished; but he married her to a Persian of good family indeed, but of a quiet temper, whom he looked on as much inferior to a Mede of even middle condition. Thus Cambyses (for so was the Persian called) wedded Mandane, and took her to his home, after which, in the very first year, Astyages saw another vision. He fancied that a vine grew from the womb of his daughter, and overshadowed the whole of Asia. After this dream, which he submitted also to the interpreters, he sent to Persia and fetched away Mandane, who was now with child, and was not far from her time. On her arrival he set a watch over her, intending to destroy the child to which she should

then but a small step from praising the tree with all the attributes of royalty to creating a personified royal tree – especially in a dream vision or a metaphoric warning.

The description of the tree as one providing shelter and food (4:9) at the center of a lush garden or field (4:7) evokes images of Eden. In Daniel 4:1, Nebuchadnezzar is described as being at peace in his house (= his palace) and flourishing (רענן) in his palace (היכל). This last word is better translated here as temple, or the sanctuary section of the palace. This very often included an actual garden and/or was decorated with vegetative imagery. *Ra'anan* thus is imbued with the meaning of a double pun. As it is usually applied to describe a "luxuriant green tree," which creates a foreshadowing of the cosmic tree later on, it equally describes a Babylonian semi-deified monarch/gardener prancing in his garden complex. In Genesis 2-3, God is the owner of a perfect garden who expels the occupants. In Daniel 4, however, the situation is somewhat different: Nebuchadnezzar enjoys his own garden and is thrown out into an 'anti-garden' only temporarily.

Ancient Near Eastern gardens are typically found near the royal palace and the temple. They may even connect the two. This brings the person of the king in close proximity to that of the god (or God). [188] Flora and fauna would be brought from all corners of the

---

give birth; for the Magian interpreters had expounded the vision to foreshow that the offspring of his daughter would reign over Asia in his stead. To guard against this, Astyages, as soon as Cyrus was born, sent for Harpagus, a man of his own house and the most faithful of the Medes, to whom he was wont to entrust all his affairs, and addressed him thus- "Harpagus, I beseech thee neglect not the business with which I am about to charge thee; neither betray thou the interests of thy lord for others' sake, lest thou bring destruction on thine own head at some future time. Take the child born of Mandane my daughter; carry him with thee to thy home and slay him there."

[188] The Amanus Mountain was renowned for its cedars. These were widely used in the ancient Near East for the building of temples. This would, of course, include the Temple of Solomon in Jerusalem, which was built with the help of the architects, workmen and cedar wood of King Hiram of Tyre. The mountain was further known for its beautiful flora, which was so liked by the Assyrian kings that they would construct (paradisiacal?) gardens near their palaces in imitation of it. See Lawrence Stager's enlightening study "Jerusalem and the Garden of Eden," *Eretz Israel* 26(1999): 183-194 who traces the development of the royal gardens in the ancient Near East and describes as well their religious overtones and how these were absorbed into the Israelite consciousness. Sandra R. Shimoff, "Gardens: from Eden to Jerusalem," *JJS* 26(1995): 145-155, focuses on the later rabbinic interpretation of the sacred garden motif. In addition, the poignant verse 4:8 of the Song of Songs should be mentioned: "Come with me from Lebanon, my bride, with me from Lebanon; look from the top of Amana, from the top of Senir and Hermon, from the lions' dens, from the mountains of the leopards." See also D. Stronach, "The Garden as a Political Statement: Some Case Studies from the Near East in the First Millennium B.C.," *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 4(1990): 171-180. Further, W. Fauth, "Der

empire into a veritable botanical garden, to emphasize the stretches of that empire and signify the cosmic power of the ruler. The temples and palaces became extensions of such gardens as is evident from the art that decorated these premises. The Temple of Solomon is only one such example where the Garden of Eden and the Temple actually coalesce. [189]

Towards the end of the chapter (4:26) it is written that Nebuchadnezzar "was walking *upon* the royal palace of Babylon" (על-היכל מלכותא די בבל מהלך הוה). The commentators on the verse understand this literally as being on top of the roof of the palace, but then tend to connect it with "perhaps" referring to the "famous hanging gardens." [190] In a number of cases 2 Sam. 11:2 is cited to illustrate the use of the roof for a leisurely walk by the monarch. While this aspect should certainly not be ruled out, another category of use for the palace roof presents itself. Steven Holloway describes rooftop rituals, especially of an apotropaic nature, that took place on top of Neo-Assyrian palaces as well as other buildings. [191] However, he cautions against seeing them exclusively as ritual places. Nevertheless, it would add to the irony of the narrative to see the king walk among his own safe sacred space and then be stricken down by the power of the seemingly defeated rival Deity. This is reinforced by the specific phrasing of this verse

königliche Gärtner und Jäger im Paradeisos," *Persica* 8(1979): 1-53; p. 13 ff. for ancient Near Eastern (pre-Persian) examples.

[189] See e.g. E. Bloch-Smith, "Solomon's Temple and Its Symbolism," *Scripture and Other Artifacts. Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Honor of Philip J. King*. M.D. Coogan, J. Cheryl Exum, and L.E. Stager, eds. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994:18-31, see p. 27. Further, T. Stordalen, *Echoes of Eden*, p. 103. Also, K. Yaron, "The Dirge over the King of Tyre," *ASTI* 3(1964): 29-27, esp. pp. 40-45.

[190] So J.A. Montgomery (1927): 243; J.J. Slotki, (1951): 36. Oddly enough, A. Jeffery (1956) first mistranslates the verse as "he walked *in* the palace of the kingdom of Babylon" but then observes that this should be understood as "on the roof of the royal palace" since this was "the ordinary place for the king to walk." A. Lacocque (1979), too, translates "*in* the palace" and comments: "the roof of the palace or its hanging gardens; see 2 Sam. 11.2." J.E. Goldingay (1989): 89-90, comments extensively on the layout of Nebuchadnezzar's Babylon but also glosses over the significance of the roof setting. M. Delcor (1971): 117) notes the two divergent Greek translations. Theodotion places the king *on the temple* of his kingdom; the LXX locates him *on the walls of his city*. The former is interesting in this context, since it takes a sacred setting and action into account.

[191] There is no reason to assume that this was any different in the Neo-Babylonian style and period. On some other examples within an ancient Near Eastern context, see S. Gitin, "The Four-Horned Altar and Sacred Space: an Archaeological Perspective," *Sacred Time, Sacred Place; Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*. B.M. Gittlen, ed. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2002: 95-123 (at pp. 99, 100, 105, 110).

which contains as well an Eden motif, echoing to some extent Gen. 3:8, where God walks about (מתהלך) in the garden. Of course this setting describes the situation after all has been created and the Deity should, ideally, be overlooking the final results of what He had created. Likewise, Nebuchadnezzar overlooks his creation/building of Babylon. It is clear that in this passage Nebuchadnezzar's hubris does not only prompt him to usurp attributes of Daniel's God, but also those of his own. Since the task of world making was first and foremost part of the act of Marduk's creation of the physical universe, the earth and what is on it, in which capacity he chooses specifically to build Babylon to be his holy abode [*Enuma Elish* V:120-130]. [192] The language of Nebuchadnezzar's discourse in Dan. 4:26-27 is an appropriation of that of Marduk, as laid out in the above reference to the passage from *Enuma Elish*. But here too, there is an echo of the creation account in Genesis, culminating in 1:31, in which God beholds what He created and is satisfied that it was very good. [193] The idea of the garden and gardener of Genesis stands out in Dan. 4, where the gardener is interchangeably God or the king. [194] The persona of divine or royal gardener came especially to fruition during the reign of the Assyrian kings and was further developed by the Neo-Babylonian rulers. The royal garden formed an integral part of the royal palace complex and the larger adjacent temple as well. The format goes back far in history, and developed gradually throughout the ancient Near East, was refined in the Achaemenid era and taken over by the Hellenistic Seleucid rulers. [195] These gardens

[192] B. Landsberger & J.V. Kinnier Wilson, "The Fifth Tablet of Enuma Eliš," *JNES* 20(1961): 154-179 (at 164-167). Further, V.A. Hurowitz, *I Have Built You an Exalted House: Temple Building in the Bible in the Light of Mesopotamian and North-West Semitic Writings*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992: 17, 336. Also, S. Langdon, *Building Inscriptions of the Neo-Babylonian Empire. Part I: Nabopolassar and Nebuchadnezzar*. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1905: 72-74.

[193] It has often been noted that on a literary level the creation account in Genesis corresponds to a traditional building account of a sanctuary. See, e.g., M. Weinfeld, Sabbath, Temple, and the Enthronement of the Lord – the Problem of the Sitz im Leben of Genesis 1:1-2:3 *Melanges biblique et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Henri Cazelles* (Alter Orient und Altes Testament 212). A. Caquot & M. Delcor (eds.), Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981: 501-512.

[194] But see also W.H. Propp's commentary on Ex. 15:17 [AB2, p. 569 ff.].

[195] On the relationship between royal gardens, paradeisos, and Garden of Eden, see J. Bremmer, "Paradise: from Persia, via Greece, into the Septuagint," *Paradise Interpreted; Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity*. G.P. Luttikhuizen, ed. Leiden: Brill, 1999: 1-20. On the archaeology, continuity and interpretation of the architecture see the important volume, *The Royal Palace Institution in the First Millennium BC: Regional Development and Cultural Interchange*

acquired increasingly an aspect of sacred space. Michael Foucault described this very aptly in his exploration of 'heterotopia':

> The heterotopia has the power of juxtaposing in a single real place different spaces and locations that are incompatible with each other. … Perhaps the oldest example of these heterotopias in the form of contradictory locations is the garden. Let us not forget that this astounding and age-old creation had very profound meanings in the East, and that these seemed to be superimposed. The traditional garden of the Persians was a sacred space that was supposed to united four separate parts within its rectangle, representing the four parts of the world, as well as one space still more sacred than the others, a space that was like the navel, the centre of the world brought into the garden (it was here that the basin and het of water were located). All the vegetation was concentrated in this zone, as if in a sort of microcosm. … The garden is the smallest fragment of the world and, at the same time, represents its totality, forming right from the remotest times a sort of felicitous and universal heterotopia. [196]

Rooftops, even of palaces, were conceivably used for sleeping in the summer heat, storage, and the drying of grain and other foodstuffs; in addition, the Great Kings of Assyria were surely not immune to fresh air and a scenic view. Circumstantial and concrete textual evidence for the conducting of apotropaic rites on rooftops for the sake of Neo-Assyrian kings, however, tends to reinforce the impression that palace roofs played a significant role in the religious lives of those who dwelt under them. [197]

---

between East and West. I. Nielsen, ed. Athens: The Danish Institute at Athens, 2001. In this collection, see especially S. Lumsden, "Power and Identity in the Neo-Assyrian World" (33-52); A. Kuhrt, "The Palace(s) of Babylon" (77-94); D. Stronach, "From Cyrus to Darius: Notes on Art and Architecture in Early Achaemenid Palaces" (95-112); I. Nielsen, "The Gardens of the Hellenistic Palaces" (165-188).

[196] M. Foucault, "Other Spaces: The Principles of Heterotopia," *Lotus International* 48/49(1986): 9-17 (at pp. 14-15).

[197] S.W. Holloway, "The Case for Assyrian Religious Influence in Israel and Judah: Inference and Evidence." Diss. University of Chicago, 1992: 89-92, esp. p. 92. Cf. as well a Ugaritic example in the Story of King Keret (Kirta) where we twice find an account of a roof top sacrifice (CTA 14ii 73-79, iv 165-171). After the conducting of some preliminary rituals, "he went up to the top of the tower, he mounted up to the summit of the wall // He lifted up his hands to heaven; he sacrificed to Bull his father, El // He served Baal with his sacrifice, the Son of Dagan with his food // Keret came down [from the r]oof …//" N. Wyatt, *Religious Texts from Ugarit*. 2nd ed. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press / New York: Continuum, 2003: 198 (similarly, p. 188 which has the instructions, p. 198 is the execution of the ritual). See also N. Wyatt, *Religious Texts*, p. 354-55. Here a ritual is described in which the king, in a purified state, brings a sacrifice on the roof (of a temple) to one of the gods. On the roof are built a number of

The continuity of this idea may also be illustrated by the example of the rock tomb of Darius I at Naqsh-I Rustam in Iran. The rock is made to resemble the façade of a palace entrance of sorts. Over the entrance to the tomb a large relief is cut into the rock depicting the king performing a religious ceremony on a platform at a Zoroastrian fire altar, overseen by Ahura Mazda. The platform seems to be lifted up by two rows of miniature carriers that may represent either subject peoples or slaves. While there is no definitive agreement on the question whether the scene depicts an actual ceremony taking place on the roof of the building depicted, some scholars do think this may be the case. [198] It would fit in quite well with similar Achaemenid representations of the monarch towering over his subjects both in stature and elevation. This is evidenced especially in the various throne platforms of actual and depicted thrones.

It is clear that taking this latter function of the rooftop into account enhances the understanding of the scene described in 4:26, thus designating it a sacred space. [199] Nebuchadnezzar's prancing around on the roof puts him in charge of this space. It is therefore very telling that following his self-congratulatory musings, the vision from his bad dream of the previous year becomes activated while he is still on the roof. There is nevertheless, yet another spatial aspect contained in this scene. This has to do with the vantage point of the monarch. He is elevated high above the city, which he can oversee almost in its entirety from his current position. This puts him not only symbolically, but

---

dwellings made of cut branches. The king is to remain on the roof until sunset bringing sacrifices and speaking what is in his heart.

[198] M.C. Root, *The King and Kingship in Achaemenid Art. Essays on the Creation of an Iconography of Empire* (*Acta Iranica*, 3rd Series, 19) Leiden: Brill, 1979: 180. Also, P. Amiet, "L'art achéménide," *Acta Iranica* I, Leiden: Brill, 1974: 163-170 (at p. 168). He adds that celestial deities, such as Anu at his temple in Uruk, were traditionally worshiped on the roof of their temples.

[199] The Hebrew Bible mentions a variety of religious acts taking place on roofs, especially in relation to astral worship, in Jer. 19:13 and Zeph. 1:5a, and further in 2 Kgs 23:12, Isa. 22:1 and Jer. 32:29. All these are, however, mentioned in the context of prohibited and idolatrous cultic activities. D. Conrad ("Zu Jes 65 3b," *ZAW* 80(1968): 232-234) includes Isa. 65:3b. Although his identification of this passage is not certain, he lists a number of pertinent Neo-Babylonian instances of rooftop rituals. See S. Ackerman's criticism, *Under Every Green Tree: Popular Religion in Sixth-Century Judah*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992: 177. See further discussion in M. Weinfeld, "The Worship of Molech and of the Queen of Heaven," *UF* 4(1972): 133-154 (at pp. 151-153). Interestingly, the New Testament (Acts 10:9) has Peter pray on the rooftop of a home, after which he falls into a trance and has a vision.

also physically, in control of a Firstspace setting, which is not unlike the way ancient monarchs are sometimes depicted as larger than their subjects. [200] They are larger than life, even if they still do not measure up to the gods, who usually outsize the monarchs. In fact, the entire episode of the giant golden statue in Daniel 3 is evidence of this phenomenon. Whether the statue represents the king or a god is in this context immaterial. It towers above the plain, which it oversees from high above, as well as above the miniature worshipers. Stephen Lumsden provides an example of the spatial effect of these two images with regard to the layout of Sennacherib's 'Palace without Rival': [201]

> I suggest that the lived experience at Sennacherib's Nineveh would have differed, at least in part, from that of the other two capital cities, and also from that of contemporary and earlier Mesopotamian cities in general. It is the inclusion of the high eastern terrace within the walls, a feature unknown at Nimrud and Khorsabad, which introduced an unprecedented third urban space, and viewpoint. The eastern terrace offered a new urban view which was different from the citadel or temple platform, and from the more common low, horizontal or upward-looking view of most urban dwellers at monuments and raised platforms. This was a more detached and panoramic view of the entire city, including the two citadels and the arrangement of the buildings on them. [202]

This description is remarkably similar to what is suggested in 4:26. We may therefore suggest that perhaps (if the description truly reflects the layout of Nebuchadnezzar's Babylon) some of Sennacherib's architectural innovations were later applied in Babylon. More likely, however, is that our author had conflated various strands of information that he had concerning the building conventions far in his past.

Since Sennacherib's palace was built on a mound, the effect of the created panorama from this viewpoint became even more enhanced. The description

---

[200] For instance in the depictions of the Egyptian Pharaos and the Kings of Persia.

[201] The definitive study of this palace was produced by J.M. Russell, *Sennacherib's Palace without Rival at Nineveh*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1991.

[202] S. Lumsden, "The Production of Space at Nineveh," *Iraq* 66(2004): 187-197, at p. 192.

offered by Lumsden, [203] again, illustrates the very short literary depiction in 4:26-27 very well.

> The city seen from the point of view of the panorama was easier to understand, it was a city perceived from a position of mastery, confirming an "identity" at once of the viewing subject and of the object viewed… So, perhaps this perceptual experience would have served in the creation of shared identities among the new inhabitants of Nineveh from all over the empire, and a connection among them to the new imperial centre.

Further taking into account that, whereas Sennacherib moved his capital to Nineveh from Dur-Sarukkin and rebuilt it in splendor, Nebuchadnezzar also rebuilt Babylon as the resplendent center of the Neo-Babylonian Empire. [204] That it was to function as such a center of the world, if not the universe, is also indicated in chapter 3 when all the peoples and languages found in the empire are to come and pay obeisance to the giant golden statue. The Firstspace interpretation of these royal cities is reinforced by seeing that the monarch understands his sprawling city as an urban utopia – as a creation not only for the gods, but at the same time in competition with them as divine architects.

In a scene that is somewhat reminiscent of the one of Darius' tomb relief, the Book of Chronicles (2 Chron. 2:12-13) offers an interesting picture with regard to an Israelite monarch. In this unique example in the Hebrew Bible, just after the completion of the Sanctuary in Jerusalem, Solomon addresses the people from within the Temple precincts:

> 12] And he stood before the altar of the Lord in the presence of all the congregation of Israel, and spread forth his hands- 13] for Solomon had made a brazen scaffold, of five cubits long, and five cubits broad, and three cubits high, and had set it in the midst of the court; and upon it he stood, and kneeled down upon his knees before all the congregation of Israel, and spread forth his hands toward heaven

---

[203] *Ibid.* See also I. Winter's earlier observations in "'Seat of Kingship'/'A Wonder to Behold': the Palace as Construct in the Ancient Near East," *Ars Orientalis* 23(1993): 27-55 (at p. 51).

[204] Witness the many building inscriptions in his name. Some of these are collected in S. Langdon, *Building Inscriptions of the Neo-Babylonian Empire – Part I: Nabopolassar and Nebuchadnezzar*. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1905. See also D.J. Wiseman, *Nebuchadrezzar and Babylon* [The Schweich Lectures] Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Sarah Japhet notes in her commentary on this passage that the Chronicler has added the scaffold (or platform) to the parallel passage in 1 Kings 8:22, 54 which results in "providing the kneeling Solomon with an elevated position 'above the people'." [205]

It is important to note that in contrast to Assyrian cities in which the royal "palace, main temples and the ziggurat, were set together on a walled-off citadel riding on the city-walls," in Babylon the religious buildings were found in the city center, whereas the palace was situated probably at quite a distance near the edge of the city. This seeming decentralization or unevenness in the geographical division of power between the servant of the gods and the gods themselves was resolved by the Neo-Babylonian ruler and was acted out in the yearly *Akitu* (New Year) festival in which the king played a central role.

> [a]lthough the palace was physically separate from the urban cultic space, it was annexed, as it were, by the Neo-Babylonian kings through the locating of their palace(s), which created a continuous sequence of highly significant, symbolically charged structures, all linked by the processional street. A further feature worth noting is that the processional way gradually sloped upwards on both sides of the city wall, so that the Ishtar gate stood on a level with the palace, seeming from afar to be linked to it directly. Location and elevation, thus, created a powerful image of sacrality intertwined with the exercise of royal power. [206]

Nebuchadnezzar II, the second and most glorious ruler of the Neo-Babylonian Empire, brought the splendor of Babylon to new heights, a fact he boasts of in 4:27. By comparison little is known of the material culture from the preceding ages. It is this later Babylon that is encountered in biblical and classical descriptions and which is informed solely by the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple and the exile of Judah's population to Babylonia. This became the source for the Secondspace imaginary

---

[205] S. Japhet, *I & II Chronicles* [OTL], Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993: 590.

[206] A. Kuhrt, "The Palace(s) of Babylon," *The Royal Palace Institution in the First Millennium BC*. I. Nielsen, ed. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2001: 77-94 (p. 80). Kuhrt adds in a footnote (p. 88, n. 7): " I have given some space to the significance of this aspect of the palace's location because no cultic installations were found inside the palace itself, so that a, to my mind false, separation of temple and palace could be envisaged."

Babylon that inspired fear and abhorrence among biblical writers. It gave rise to the quintessential negative image of the city and in the Book of Revelation it evolved into personified lewdness and evil. In contrast, whereas among the Hellenistic writers its reputation had also grown to legendary proportions, it was positive and one of awe. [207]

5.5   Writing on the Wall

In chapter 1 Nebuchadnezzar had treated the vessels from the Jerusalem Temple with relative honor, under the circumstances accorded to a vanquished God, by placing them in his own temple. [208] But Belshazzar dishonored both the Temple vessels themselves as well as the memory of his father by bringing them out and using them in a feast to toast his own gods. [209] This results in the appearance of a heavenly hand, writing in a mysterious script on the wall of the banquet hall of his palace. Belshazzar shows extreme fear, by being depicted as physically wetting his pants. [210] The humiliation of

[207] See R.J. van der Spek, "'Is dit niet het grote Babylon, dat ik gebouwd heb?'," *Phoenix* 36(1990): 51-63. He explains, for instance, how the enormously long time that it took for the great ziggurat, part of the Esagila temple complex, to be finally completed under Nebuchadnezzar II may have been the inspiration of the Tower of Babel in Genesis 11 (pp. 53-57). See further Section 3.3 on urban spaces.

[208] At least this is how it is apparently understood by the text itself. More likely, Nebuchadnezzar treated the temple treasures as booty, much like his Assyrian predecessor Esarhaddon is known to have done. However, Belshazzar's behaviour can be understood against the phenomenon where foreign gods (or in this case what was considered to be representative of this foreign god) were denied their divine nature which would result in them being smashed to pieces. See, e.g., P.D. Miller, Jr. and J.J.M. Roberts, *The Hand of the Lord: A Reassessment of the "Ark Narrative" of I Samuel.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1977, 10-11. Miller & Roberts attribute this to the fact that "[s]ince most such foreign gods had never been worked into the conqueror's theological system, they would normally lack the protective nimbus of awe with which traditional piety had clothed the native deities, and thus they were more exposed to harsh treatment. *Id.,* p. 93, fn. 82.

[209] The fate of divine statues and paraphernalia was similar to those of vanquished rulers. Sometimes they would be honored, at other times they would be destroyed or mutilated. See Th. Beran, "Leben und Tod der Bilder," *Ad bene et fideliter seminandum: Festgabe für Karlheinz Deller zum 21. Februar 1987.* G. Mauer, ed. Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1988: 55-60. For a postmodern, post-colonialist attempt at understanding the motives for these actions from an ancient Mesopotamian perspective, see Z. Bahrani, "Assault and Abduction: the Fate of the Royal Image in the Ancient Near East," *Art History* 18(1995): 363-382. That this time-honored practice still continues today, is demonstrated by F.B. Flood, "Between Cult and Culture: Bamiyan, Islamic Iconoclasm, and the Museum," *ArtB* 84(2002)4: 641-659, who wraps his description of the situation in present day Afghanistan in a post-colonial reading.

[210] A. Wolters, "Untying the King's Knots: Physiology and Wordplay in Daniel 5," *JBL* 110(1991):117-122. For a different approach, S. Paul, "Decoding a 'Joint' Expression in Daniel 5:6, 16," *JANES* 22(1993): 121-127.

the ineffective ruler, however, is not yet complete. The queen (who is either his wife, or more likely, his mother or even his grandmother) has to be brought specially into the banquet house – and this is presented as something very unusual – in order to suggest a solution (5:10) to the problem. [211] It is she who suggests that Daniel, as the interpreter of dreams and other heavenly messages, be brought forward as the only one who will be able to read and interpret the mysterious writing. Belshazzar attributes Daniel's ability to his own Babylonian gods – *ruah elahin* (5:14). [212] Daniel then explains that it is a verdict spelling the demise of the king. Some commentators think that the murder of the king in the last verse is a direct retribution of his defiling the Temple vessels. [213]

With regard to the theme of sacred space this chapter offers some new insights. There is evidence of a continuity theme of temple and heavenly knowledge. What is unique, however, is the medium used for transmitting this knowledge. Seemingly out of nowhere a disembodied virtual hand appears that writes a virtual message on the wall that is unintelligible to the uninitiated. Daniel, in a manner of speaking, must decode the digital language. [214] This image recalls the finger of God writing the Decalogue on either side of the stone tablets and the midrashic 'virtual' interpretation of these

---

[211] See H.J.M. van Deventer, "Would the Actually 'Powerful' Please Stand. The Role of the Queen (Mother) in Daniel 5," *Scriptura* 70(1999): 241-251. The portrayal of the queen in this chapter is exceptional. Even though she is not mentioned by name, she is accorded direct speech (5:10-12) of unprecedented nature: she actually advises the king in the presence of all his other advisors, adding to his humiliation (247). Van Deventer explains further why it would be the king's mother or grandmother (i.e., the queen-mother) who is presented here, rather than his wife. Also the question of whether the famous mother of Nabonidus, Addad-Guppi, may be reflected in the story is given some consideration.

[212] For some other opinions on translating this term, see B. Becking, "'A Divine Spirit Is in You'. Notes on the Translation of the Phrase *Ruah Elahin* in Daniel 5, 14 and Related Texts," *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*, 1993: 515-519.

[213] E.g. G.Ch. Aalders (1962: 122), D.E. Gowan (2001: 92), E.C. Lucas (2002: 141), C.L. Seow (2004: 84). But see also TB Ned. 62b.

[214] The use of this specific terminology is informed by today's computer culture. For modern readers the imagery in this passage can evoke ideas of computer graphics, holographic laser projections, or other forms of communications that are generated from within the domain known as 'cyberspace'. Not only does this carry strong spatial connotations in itself, it is also able to explain the similar gulf that a message from the heavenly realm needs to bridge in order to reach the earthly realm. A specialist is subsequently required to decode the message.

passages. [215] Both these and the Daniel passage exemplify heavenly knowledge or decisions generated through a virtual mode of writing. An added aspect to this image is the notion of writing down laws or decrees that thereby become immutable. This is of interest especially with regard to narratives relating to the Persian period that refer to the laws of the Medes and Persians that cannot be revoked (e.g. in Daniel 6 and in the Book of Esther). Since these laws generate from the various kings, the written decree from the God of Israel establishes His kingship over that of the mortal kings in this area as well. Furthermore, the fact that it concerns a written message, suggesting immutability, brings it visually within the orbit of ancient Near Eastern art. Many inscriptions were added to pictorial art, either on statues or wall reliefs, or were found on large slabs of stone or actual palace walls. This also contrasts with the example in Daniel 4 where the divine decree comes to the king as an auditory message. In that case the decree is in the form of a warning and the king can still nullify its severity by repentance.

From a spatial perspective it is important to ask from where the hand originated and how it was made visible, not only within the story, but *by* the story. The setting can be visually explained as a tableau with a frame or a panel, much as in a comic strip. Inside the frame the feast takes place on earth and in the palace. The hand appears from *outside* the earthly realm, and thus outside of the frame, and irrupts into the scene, breaking through the frame, and disrupting the event that is depicted.

Furthermore, there is a shifting in Firstspace realities. Whereas initially it is Belshazzar who manipulates this space, it soon becomes clear (as in all the preceding stories) that he is not. But rather it is the God of Daniel who is in charge and who manipulates all from His heavenly Firstspace realm.

---

[215] Ex. 31:18, 32:15-16 and Deut. 9:10. There is a discussion among Jewish medieval commentators whether or not the notion of 'the finger of God writing' is to be taken literally or not. See e.g., N. Sarna, *The JPS Torah Commentary – Exodus*. [Philadelphia: JPS, 1991: 206. Rashi, citing TB Shabbat 104a, explains that the tablets were written "on both their sides" means that on "both sides the letters could be read, and this constituted a miraculous piece of work." This is further explained as, "The letters (not the words) could be read on both sides, because they were cut out right through from one side to the other. On the back, however, the words could only be read reversed (e.g. *ikona* not *anoki*). The miracle to which Rashi alludes was the following: if the letters *final mem* (ם) and *samekh* (ס) are cut out of any material without portions of the letters being left uncut as one does in the case of a stencil, the centers of these letters will fall out, but in the case of the tablets this did not happen." *Rashi's Commentary. Exodus.* M. Rosenbaum and A.M. Silbermann. Jerusalem, 1973: 182-183.

It is of great interest that Daniel's speech contains an almost verbatim repetition of Nebuchadnezzar's greatness and humiliation and repentance as described in chapter 4. Of course, this account recalls Jeremiah's prophecy concerning Nebuchadnezzar (27:5-8), which includes the assurance (v. 7) that "all nations shall serve him, his son and his grandson, until the turn of his own land comes." It should be concluded that Belshazzar was no longer given this option since he should have known better and yet, he openly mocked the God of Israel and desecrated the holy temple vessels. He had sealed his own fate.

With regard to the matter of shadow identities for the narrative characters, it is not unreasonable to suggest that Belshazzar's unspeakable act of sacrilege vis-à-vis the Temple vessels is intended by the final editor of Daniel to reflect Antiochus' acts of desecration. Therefore, it is probably also safe to say that despite certain historical elements in the story going back to the eve of the demise of the Neo-Babylonian Empire, the episode with the vessels is a narrative plot referring to a different period. Further indication of this may be found in 11:24bc, which relates that "that king (= Antiochus IV) shall do that which his fathers have not done, nor his fathers' fathers: he shall scatter among them prey, and spoil, and substance." This could very well refer to the Temple vessels. [216]

---

[216] The fascinating odyssey of the temple vessels throughout Second Temple literature is largely outside the scope of this dissertation. However, it is quite clear that many of the vessels that were lost upon the destruction of Solomon's Temple were not restored to the Second Temple. On this matter, a short word is in order, since in the opinion of certain circles this was one of the causes of the diminished sanctity of this temple compared to its predecessor. Even so, Ezra 6:3-5 reports, "In the first year of Cyrus the king, Cyrus the king issued a decree: Concerning the house of God at Jerusalem, 'let the house be rebuilt, the place where sacrifices are offered and burnt offerings are brought; its height shall be sixty cubits and its breadth sixty cubits, with three courses of great stones and one course of timber, let the cost be paid from the royal treasury. And also let the gold and silver vessels of the house of God, which Nebuchadnezzar took out of the temple that is in Jerusalem and brought to Babylon, be restored and brought back to the temple which is in Jerusalem, each to its place; you shall put them in the house of God.'

Tradition has it that when the Babylonian armies approached, many of the vessels were spirited out of the temple and buried deep in the ground outside Jerusalem. No doubt, this is a clever use of Dan. 1:2 which expressly states that God *gave* some of the vessels into Nebuchadnezzar's hand. Second century *2 Baruch* contains the interesting, seemingly contradictory traditions of, on the one hand, the burial of the vessels (ch. 6) and on the other hand, their safekeeping in heaven (ch. 10). See L.I. Lied, *The Other Lands of Israel: Imaginations of the Land in 2 Baruch*. Leiden: Brill, 2008: 257-260. See further, P.R. Ackroyd, "The Temple Vessels – A Continuity Theme," *Studies in the Religion of Ancient Israel* [SVT 23] (1972): 166-181; M.F. Collins, "The Hidden Vessels in Samaritan Traditions," *JSJ*

5.6   Sanctity at Home while Praying towards Jerusalem

In line with the narrative of ch. 3, duplicitous courtiers of the king (now Darius) have a law created whereby anyone who does not pay proper homage to the king will be thrown into a den of lions and be devoured alive. [217] Added to this is the clause that only the king can be petitioned and no other god or person, which might suggest that the king is considered to be deified. Despite this decree, Daniel continues to supplicate his own God, not in public, but in the privacy of his own home. Significantly, he does so three times a day by directing himself in the direction of Jerusalem through his open window. He is found out and betrayed to the king who has no other choice but to carry out his own recently promulgated law. But there is a twist. In contrast to Nebuchadnezzar, who was surprised at the heavenly intercession with regard to the three men in the furnace, Darius anticipates in v. 17 that this might happen. In fact, he himself calls upon Daniel's God to intercede. The next morning the king finds Daniel alive and well and is told by him that God had sent His angel who disabled the lions. In this narrative there is no vision on the part of the king only a verbal confirmation from Daniel. There is no confusion, and the story ends with the conversion of the king to Daniel's God and his calling upon his subjects to do the same.

The important spatial markers in this chapter are the delimitation of Darius' kingdom (which, it must be noted, he received – it is implied – from God). The subdivision of this kingdom into various provinces (reminiscent of Esther) is important, since Daniel is made the governor of one of them, reconfirming Belshazzar's earlier appointment (ch. 5). The next marker is suggested by Daniel's praying in the direction of Jerusalem within the

---

3(1972): 97-116; I. Kalimi, Isaac and J.D. Purvis, "The Hiding of the Temple Vessels in Jewish and Samaritan Literature," *CBQ* 56(1994): 679-685; I. Kalimi, Isaac and J.D. Purvis, "King Jehoiachin and the Vessels of the Lord's House in Biblical Literature," *CBQ* 56(1994): 449-457; R.P. Carroll, "Razed Temple and Shattered Vessels: Continuities in the Discourses of Exile in the Hebrew Bible – An Appreciation of the Work of Peter R. Ackroyd on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday," *JSOT* (1997)75: 93-106.

[217] On the spatial aspects of the lion's den, see Section 3.1.

confines of his private quarters. This is followed by his confinement to the lion's den. [218] It is of interest that, unlike the case in chapter 3, where the three companions had been thrown in the fiery furnace, Nebuchadnezzar's ambivalent relationship with the Divine had to be tested through the appearance to him alone of a divine being in the furnace, Darius' pious praying and fasting for Daniel's well-being did not necessitate such a vision. In his declaration of gratitude to the Divine at the end of the chapter, Darius sums up the spatial categories that will play a further role in the following second part of the book, Daniel's visions. They include the Kingdom of God that shall not be destroyed and the interrelated workings of the Divine in heaven and on earth.

The question as to whom prayer is to be directed in chapter 6 gains importance in light of the fact that it is with the rise of the later Achaemenids that a level of religious intolerance is introduced – at least in the preserved written records. Xerxes, for instance, boasts of destroying the temples of those who worship other gods than Ahura Mazda, whose loyal servant he is. [219] Since the king is the representative of the god on earth, it is not difficult to see that an author from one of those despised other groups would caricaturize this as worship of the king. This, needless to say, leads the reader once again back to Antiochus IV who thought of himself as deified and was ridiculed for it by his contemporaries.

The other matter of importance to be emphasized is the orientation of Daniel's prayer as described in the chapter. Joseph Tabory [220] writes:

---

[218] Embedded in the text there may be a notion of the den or pit [גוב] as an "anti-space", somewhat like *sheol* or the netherworld, where death and decay rule. This is comparable perhaps to the use of the word בור (*bor*) in Genesis 37:22-24 describing the dry and empty pit in which Joseph is thrown by his brothers. Rashi adds that the pit was filled with snakes and scorpions; a tradition that is already found in Targum Jonathan.

[219] B. Pongratz-Leisten, "'Lying King'" and 'False Prophet': the Intercultural Transfer of a Rhetorical Device within Ancient Near Eastern Ideologies," *Ideologies as Intercultural Phenomena*. Proceedings of the Third Annual Symposium of the Assyrian and Babylonian Intellectual Heritage Project held in Chicago, USA, Oct. 27-31, 2000 [= Melammu Symposia 3] A. Panaino & G. Pettinato, eds. Milano: Universita di Bologna, 2002: 215-243 [esp. pp. 232-242 on the Behistun Inscription and p. 235 for Xerxes.]

[220] J. Tabory, "*Ma'amadot*: A Second Temple Non-Temple Liturgy," *Liturgical Perspectives; Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls; Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center... January, 2000*. E.G. Chazon, ed. Leiden: Brill, 2003: 235-262 (at p. 254).

The report that Daniel directed his prayers towards Jerusalem has a clear antecedent in the prayer of Solomon that prayers be directed through the Temple (1 Kings 8:35, 38, 44, 48). Later rabbinic rulings declared that orientation was affected by distance. A person living some distance from Jerusalem could not pinpoint the location of the Temple and it was deemed sufficient if he would direct his prayers towards Jerusalem. It is not clear why Daniel's prayers were directed towards Jerusalem rather than towards the Temple. It is possible that it was physically and technically difficult to pray towards the Temple and so he prayed to Jerusalem - in the spirit of later rabbinic rulings. It is also possible, and to my mind somewhat more likely, that he prayed to Jerusalem for there was no Temple.

This can hardly be seen as problematic since it may be assumed that Jerusalem and Temple have already coalesced into one unified concept in the mind of Daniel's Hellenistic period author/editor. Moreover, since the Temple occupied the central part of Jerusalem praying towards the one automatically assumes praying towards the other. Tabory leaves out the very significant fact that Solomon's prayer specifically mentions the Land, the City and the Temple together. The narrative either allows for (as Tabory intimates correctly) for a temple-less Jerusalem, or from the point of view of the author/editor, a deficient Temple. Nonetheless, Jerusalem as well as the Temple Mount were certainly by that time both considered to be of the utmost holiness, with or without a functioning Temple. [221]

As mentioned, the precedent for Daniel's praying towards Jerusalem is to be found in Solomon's prayer on the occasion of the dedication of the Temple (I Kgs. 8:44-48, forming the sixth and seventh petition of that prayer).[222] However, in dealing with a late text such as Daniel, the dating of the Kings text becomes irrelevant. It may, however,

---

[221] See the lively account of the temple and its precincts, the mountain and the city in the Letter of Aristeas, esp. §§ 83-88. § 88, specifically mentions that "the house faces east, and the rear of it faces west." §§ 89-91 gives an account of the incredible water reservoirs underneath the temple. This text may, or may not, predate Daniel. The rather wide range is between 250 BCE and first century CE. J.H. Charlesworth, "Letter of Aristeas," *OTP* II, 8. I thank Dr. G.S. Oegema for this reference.

[222] G.N. Knoppers allows for a "preexilic substratum of the seventh petition. See his "Prayer and Propaganda: Solomon's Dedication of the Temple and the Deuteronomists's Program," *CBQ* 57(1995): 229-254 (p. 237 and fn. 31).

very well have been the inspiration for our author/editor, as Tabory notes as well, which only further reinforces the urgent temple concerns in the Daniel passage. [223] Winfried Vogel recognizes the spatial importance of the linkage of both passages. The author of Daniel would have been aware of the dual focus in Solomon's prayer on the temple being a place of prayer as well as being a reminder of God's dwelling place situated in heaven. And although the content of Daniel's prayer concerned the restoration of the sanctuary in Jerusalem, for now he had to make do with the other provision of Solomon's prayer, the notion that it was sufficient to pray in the direction of the temple for God to hear a sincere supplicant. "By directing the prayer towards the temple on the horizontal level the Israelite was mindful of the assurance that [the Lord] would respond on the vertical level." [224]

As to the emphasis in the text that Daniel offered his prayer three times per day, this has often been connected with a perceived similar division of the temple cult. However, the correlation between the sacrificial cult in the temple and communal or individual prayer is not entirely clear. The major sacrifices (*tamid*) were offered in the morning and evening. The *minha*, or meal or cereal offering was part of the *tamid* or burnt offering. There is no precedent for a specific afternoon *minha* sacrifice in the Hebrew Bible. [225] The custom of reciting prayer thrice daily, correlated with a morning and evening *tamid* service and an afternoon *minha*-service, is of rabbinic provenance and therefore late. There is nevertheless evidence of regulated prayers offered twice daily (evenings and

---

[223] D.K. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Leiden: Brill, 1998: 21.

[224] W. Vogel, "The Cultic Motif in Space and Time in the Book of Daniel," 1999: 200. Vogel adheres to the conservative view of dating biblical books, including Daniel, and wants to see a pre-exilic origin for the use prayer orientation toward the temple. He remarks rather unscholarly, "Although there is basically no evidence in the OT for this practice in pre-exilic times, it is not altogether safe to use the argument of silence in order to claim that it did not begin before the Babylonian Exile, as …. Most commentators on Daniel do. … Unless 1 Kgs 8 is taken to have originated in the exile … and thereby made obsolete as an argument in the debate, Solomon's prayer clearly implies that the prayer toward the temple could and should be practiced immediately, since this was to be one of the major functions of God's dwelling place." (p. 201, fn. 2). He overlooks the logic that if Daniel 9 is also dated late (as do all non-conservative commentators) the relevance stands, since 1 Kings would still predate the prayer of Daniel.

[225] See Tabory, "*Ma'amadot*: A Second Temple Non-Temple Liturgy," pp. 253-254. He discusses there Ps. 55:17 ("evening, morning and noon I complain and moan and He will here my voice") and *2 En*. 51:4 ("In the morning and at noon and in the evening of the day it is good to go to the Lord's Temple to glorify the Author of all things").

221

mornings) from the Qumran *Daily Prayers* scroll (4Q503), which is dated on palaeographical grounds to 100-75 BCE. However, it seems to concern only certain days of an otherwise unspecified month, likely the month of Nisan. Due to the fragmentary state of the text not much more can be said about this. Tabory makes the pertinent observation that chapter 6 does not specify the time of day that Daniel said his prayers, but that it would be reasonable to suggest that if evening and morning prayers are accounted for, a third one would logically fit at noon. [226] In this regard John Collins notes,

> [u]ndoubtedly Daniel's practice of praying three times a day was not peculiar to himself but reflected a custom, at least in the eastern diaspora. By the first century C.E. this custom was widespread enough to influence emerging Christianity. It does not, however, appear to have been an established norm before the first century, certainly not at any time when this story could have been written. Daniel, then, should be understood as voluntarily observing a custom rather than observing a law. [227]

Whereas it is clear that the number of times that Daniel prayed cannot be connected with certainty to the temple service, the related discussion of whether prayer served as replacement or augmentation of that service is relevant, since in either case it indicates concern for the welfare of the temple and the correct procedures of the cult. [228] In addition, while it is not narrated what the content of Daniel's prayer was, there is at least one early witness, the Old Greek papyrus 967, that connects it directly with the penitential prayer of chapter 9 (see Section 3.6 and below). [229]

---

[226] *Ibid.*, pp. 254-255.

[227] J.J. Collins, *Daniel* (1993), pp. 268-269.

[228] See D.K. Falk, "Qumran Prayer Texts and the Temple," D.K. Falk, F. Garcia Martinez & E. Schuller (eds), *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran*. Leiden: Brill, 2000: 106-126.

[229] A (likely) direct result of Dan. 6:11 is the sacred orientation of the synagogue (BT *Berakhot* 31a). Although not consistently carried through in the earlier examples it increasingly becomes a tradition to have the building face the Temple Mount. See, e.g., the studies by F. Landsberger, "The Sacred Direction in Synagogue and Church," *HUCA* 28(1957): 181-203; J. Wilkinson, "Orientation, Jewish and Christian," *PEQ* 116(1984): 16-30. However, despite some older opinions to the contrary, there is not much evidence for pre-destruction synagogues and most remains post-date the second century CE into the Byzantine and early Islamic periods. There is one fascinating exception, though, which – if correct – sets an important early precedent. It concerns the Jewish temple at Elephantine. A Persian garrison was stationed on this island in the Nile, consisting of troops of various backgrounds who lived there with their families. A complete archive of this community has come to light, containing the private, business, and religious correspondence of this community, mostly dating from the reign of Darius II. From it we learn

The reference to Daniel's own house, within which he retreats in order to communicate with his God or to receive vital information from the heavenly realm (as in 2:17), together with the additional aspect of the orientation towards Jerusalem in 6:11 indicates that this place, too, is to be seen as a pure and sanctified space. It is cordoned off from the profane or impure space outside, and is therefore the proper place for Daniel to perform his supplications and communications. In this respect it should be noted that the all-important episode of Daniel's prayer in chapter 9 is not introduced by the notion of him entering his private space. One solution for this may be found, once again, in the divergent chapter sequencing of papyrus 967 where chapter 6 is followed by chapter 9 creating a chronological narrative flow. Read thus, chapter 6 forms an introduction to the prayer recorded in chapter 9 and it becomes unnecessary to repeat the circumstances of Daniel's location. But even if we retain the traditional order, another answer could be found in the fact that these latter chapters consist of first-person narratives from Daniel's perspective, whereas the earlier chapters are presented from the (sympathetic) narrator's perspective. In addition, chapter 9 forms part of the Hebrew section, whereas chapter 6 is told from the third-person Aramaic part. Chapter 7, still in Aramaic, shows a shift from third to first person. The introductory third person part in v. 1 of that chapter recounts that Daniel had his dream vision while lying on his bed (which can only be understood as being within his house).

The emphasis on the intimacy of one's home as a prerequisite for the conducting of communication with the divine is remarkable. The first time we encounter this is in 2:17-19, when Daniel specifically retreats into his house in order to pray to God that the meaning of Nebuchadnezzar's dream may be revealed to him; and so it happens in a subsequent vision in the night. By way of contrast, the protection and peace of mind that Nebuchadnezzar thinks the confines of his house will bring him are quite illusory. At the beginning of chapter 4 we read that he was very comfortable and content in his palace, yet this did not shield him from having terrifying dreams. The same applies to

---

that there was a functioning Jewish temple and priesthood. From the layout of the archaeological remains of the settlement it may be deduced that the temple faced north-east, i.e., towards Jerusalem. See B. Porten, "Elephantine and the Bible," *Semitic Papyrology in Context*. L.H. Schiffman, ed. Leiden: Brill, 2003: 51-84 (esp. 73-84) and S.G. Rosenberg, "The Jewish Temple at Elephantine," *NEA* 67(2004)1: 4-13.

his earlier dreams in chapter 2. Curiously, it is only made known to the reader that Nebuchadnezzar had his disturbing dream while sleeping in his bed when Daniel presents him with their solution (2:28, 29). What made Daniel's situation different? One suggestion might be that from the Judean perspective Daniel found himself, so to say, in a *miqdash me'at* (paraphrasing Ezek. 11:16) where purity ruled and where he was thus protected. [230] The Babylonian king, on the other hand (as well as the implied Antiochus) considered themselves on par or above the God of Israel.

5.7   Into the Heavens and Back

Early in Belshazzar's reign Daniel dreams and experiences a symbolic vision in which four monstrous hybrid creatures emerge from the sea and perform a strange display. Next Daniel observes the placing of thrones. On one, described in spectacular terms, someone sits down who is 'ancient of days' and is surrounded by many beings who serve him. Then books are opened in what is the introduction of a judgment scene. The ones judged are the beasts who are to be punished and whose dominion is taken from them. Next, a new humanlike character enters the scene, coming with the clouds of heaven, and who is brought to the Ancient of Days. This 'one like a human' receives power and a mighty kingdom both of which are to be everlasting. The strange and incomprehensible performance causes Daniel to feel dread and physical pain. He asks one of the nearby heavenly beings what it is that he sees. This being explains the symbolism to Daniel: the beasts represent earthly kingdoms that are bound to fall; the saints of the Most High will receive the kingdom and possess it for ever; the fourth and most tenacious kingdom however prevails against the saints at first but is ultimately also terminated and the saints possess the kingdom; in the end it is the people of the saints of

---

[230] It is tempting to ask whether the entrance to Daniel's house was thought to have had a *mezuzah* (or similar sign of recognition and protection). The question as to when exactly *mezuzot* in the form that we know them today as being attached to the upper part of the right door post came into use is not easily answered. This despite the reference in the Letter of Aristeas §§ 158-159, because, as we have seen, the date for this text is not secure. Josephus, *Ant.* iv.8 § 13 also mentions *mezuzot*, but here too, it is not clear how far back the tradition goes. Yet, on the other hand, Isa. 57:8 mentions specifically the function of doors and door posts behind which idolatry is committed. Of the greatest potential interest are the actual *mezuzot* found at Qumran. See the entry on 'Phylacteries and Mezuzot' by L.H. Schiffman, *EDSS*, at p. 677. However, this material evidence still only refers to a period not earlier than the mid-first century BCE.

the Most High who shall receive all kingdoms on earth as one everlasting kingdom. This is Daniel's first person account of his vision which caused him much fright, but he kept silent about it.

The first part of the chapter describes Daniel's dream vision of the four vicious beasts (vv. 3-8). These are all monstrous creatures, two of which are clearly described as hybrids, the third as a gruesome bear and the fourth as a horrific monster that defies description. They surface from 'the great sea', a space which in Eliadian terms could be identified as profane space, the realm of chaos and which is reminiscent of the 'Chaoskampf'. [231] The creatures that emerge could symbolize in that case the secular forces that attack the sacred. In Sojan thought it would represent the forces of competing Secondspace expressions (political forces in the form of kingdoms) in conflict, but the narrative of this conflict is enwrapped in a Thirdspace dream. [232] Collins observes that the emerging of the beasts from the sea involves more than just saying that "kings will arise on the earth … The imagery implies that the kings have a metaphysical status. They are the embodiments of the primeval power of chaos symbolized by the sea in Hebrew and Canaanite tradition." [233]

The focus here is on the question how the spatial components function within the text itself and what they may tell us about the likely temple concerns of the text's framers. The chapter is rich in markers for sacred space, contested spaces, and temple allusions, especially concentrated in the throne vision. But all these are not presented in an

---

[231] See J.J. Collins, "The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and in the Qumran War Scroll: A Point of Transition in Jewish Apocalyptic," *VT* 25(1975)3: 596-612. In the vision of ch. 7 the beasts represent chaos. They are vanquished ultimately by the 'one like a son of man' and the 'ancient of days'. In ch. 8 these forces of chaos and order are signified by the nations/kingdoms and the people of Israel with their respective angelic representatives (at p. 601). As the conflict unfolds in chs. 10-12, Collins writes, "In Daniel, the heavenly counterparts of Israel's enemies are identified as the patron deities of specific nations. Chaos is therefore identified in political terms. There is no suggestion of a cosmological or superhuman principle of evil which is unrelated to ethnic or political identity" (at p. 608).

[232] The discussion of the nature of an eschatological heavenly decreed kingdom that will end all existing earthly kingdoms and herald a rule of justice and peace has taken a new turn in the past few years. For this see chapter 4.2.

[233] J.J. Collins, "Stirring up the Great Sea: the Religio-Historical Background of Daniel 7," *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*, 1993: 121-136. [Repr. in J.J. Collins, *Seers, Sibyls & Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*. Leiden: Brill, 1997: 139-156]: 144-145.

orderly manner but rather follow the chaotic sequence of the dream. The text moves so frantically back and forth between various spaces, from the mundane and earthly to the heavenly and dream worlds, crossing various temporal strata, that in order to precisely distinguish what is going on within the text, its various strands need to be unraveled. This will result in a better structured view of the dynamics of the chapter as well as offer an indication as to how the various spaces interact not only within this chapter but within the entire Book of Daniel.

Daniel's chapter 7 is probably the most commented on of the whole book; and for good reason. It contains by far the most graphic depiction in the Hebrew Bible of the heavenly throne room, its occupants and the activities taking place there. It describes in tantalizing terms the main divine character, the head of the divine household, the Ancient of Days (v. 9 f.), [234] the "thousands times ten thousand who stood before him," and above all, the mysterious character of the 'one like a son of man' (better: 'one like a human being', v. 13 f.), to whom commentators have accorded many possible identities, [235] and in addition the enigmatic collective of the saints of the Most High and the people of the Most High. These are the members of the heavenly council, a body that "in Near Eastern literature represents the most authoritative decision-making

---

[234] It is not specified that this is actually the depiction of a human-like character as is the case with the 'son of man' character as well as the language in which Ezekiel describes the occupant of the throne chariot. However, the similarities that have been noted with the Ugaritic pair of the Father of Years, El and young Ba'al leads one to believe that Daniel's Ancient of Days also represents a divine figure with a human appearance.

[235] On the interpretation of *bar enash/ben adam* in 7:13 as symbol of the primal human in function of (high)priest, compare the language in this verse with Gen. 1:28 (including the Targum) as well as the general idea of Ezekiel 28, see D.E. Callender, *Adam in Myth and History: Ancient Israelite Perspectives on the Primal Human.* Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000, p. 100. Other suggestions range from an echo of the Ugaritic Ba'al in his relationship to El as a reflection of the Ancient of Days, an alias of the Archangel Michael, the Jewish Messiah, to a symbolization of Jesus as the Christian heavenly Messiah. Although the options are too numerous to list here and lie, furthermore, beyond the scope of this study – but see the comprehensive overview in J.J. Collins' *Daniel* (1993): 304-310 – a possible priestly connection of this figure is of interest here. See, e.g., C.H.T. Fletcher-Louis, "The High Priest as Divine Mediator in the Hebrew Bible: Dan 7:13 as a Test Case," *SBLSP* (1997): 161-193. See also the thoughtful remarks on the relationship between the MT and various Greek versions, which show a clear *Tendenz* with serious repercussions for a correct understanding of the passage, by S. Pace Jeansonne, *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7-12.* [CBQMS 19] Washington DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1988: esp. 96-99, 109-114, and finally L. Stuckenbruck's response to Pace Jeansonne, "'One Like a Son of Man as the Ancient of Days' in the Old Greek Recension of Daniel 7, 13: Scribal Error or Theological Translation?," *ZNW* 86(1995): 268-276. See now, most recently, K. Koch, "Der 'Menschensohn' in Daniel," *ZAW* 119(2007)3: 369-387.

agent in the universe and history." [236] As such it is in charge of both spatial and temporal matters while, at the same time, existing outside of those boundaries. It is also clear that this is the ultimate authority in charge of all Firstspace, through all of its Secondspace decisions. These can either be of a judicial nature, they can be creative or destructive, but in whatever way, its effects carry great impact for the earthly realm. Since it exists beyond space and time, humans can only access its space through dreams or visions in which they leave their material and physical bonds behind.

The ever-intensifying eschatological predictions made throughout the chapter still reverberate on believers' minds. With its clear references to the so-called four-empire model a connection with chapter 2 has often been made. Furthermore, the chapter has given rise to often highly speculative ideas about the changed meaning of the various images in the text in light of their possible ancient Near Eastern and especially Ugaritic background.

The importance of the chapter is further highlighted by its transitional placing in the book as it overlaps in two directions, i.e., although thematically it belongs to the latter half consisting of the vision accounts it forms at the same time the last of the Aramaic chapters. In addition the center piece of the entire book, the throne vision occurs in the middle section of the vision in this central chapter. [237] This adds a beautiful spatial aspect to both the text and the imagery, since the divine throne is found at the center of the heavenly temple (or palace), which itself is, likely, situated at the sacred center of the universe. [238] Importantly, the chapter also functions as the pivot around

---

[236] M.S. Kee, "The Heavenly Council and its Type-Scene," *JSOT* 31(2007)3: 259-273 (at 259). Kee draws attention to the fact that all heavenly council descriptions display a similar structure with regard to the positioning of its members, who sit or stand in relation to each other following a strict hierarchy. The supreme God or divine being always occupies the center. He also notes that this set-up very much mirrors the organization of human court scenes (269).

[237] Vv. 2-8 introduce the staging of the vision. The throne scene is in the middle section, vv. 9-10. The judgment scene takes place spread out over vv. 11-16.

[238] I. Winter notes the same with regard to the earthly palaces in the ancient Near East. With regard to the palace decorations of Assurnasirpal II's military victories, she writes: "Through verisimilitude in landscape elements and dress, military narratives are made to be more than generic victories; they refer to actual campaigns of the king's reign. The representation of at least a half-dozen separate campaigns in the reliefs of Assurnasirpal II's throne room confirms the king's account in his Banquet Stele of how he depicted on his palace walls the "glory of my heroism across highlands, plains

227

which the focus swings from the human to the divine point of view. [239] Chapters 5 and 7 (which, incidentally, succeed each other in Pap. 967) belong together since they are both situated in Belshazzar's reign (7 at its beginning and 5 at its end). They are the only two chapters that mention thrones, divine (7:9-10) and human (5:20) respectively. They also mirror each other in the juxtaposition of the desecration of the temple vessels and references to the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem in chapter 5 with the heavenly throne room in its full glory and power in chapter 7. In addition chapter 5 further recounts the contents of chapter 4 and chapter 1 and thus the full array of the court tales' accounts of hubris and misdeeds of the Babylonian kings is recapitulated. Lastly, this chapter also contains a wrapping up of the exilic chronology and rulers before the introduction in chapter 8 to the early Hellenistic and conditions of the author's own time are described.

At the opening of the chapter (7:1), Daniel is clearly located in his bed having dreams *and* visions in the night (7:7). The dreams and visions, therefore, are all part of the same process that takes place while Daniel is asleep. It must be assumed that the vision takes place *within* the dream and that the dream itself is the vehicle or facilitator of the vision. The content of the dream vision has evoked many questions, resulting in a variety of proposed solutions. Those that are of interest to the present study concern the question whether the vision is located on earth, in heaven, or both, [240] to what

---

and seas." … By concentrating them in the throne room … and by placing the throne room itself at the center of the palace, the ninth-century king conveyed the fundamental message that, as the throne room is the heart of the palace, so the palace is the heart of the state." "Seat of Kingship," p. 36.

[239] P.R. Raabe makes a similar observation with regard to the centrality of this chapter, however, based on different criteria than are adduced here. He stresses the references in chapter 7 to chapters 2 and 12 respectively. He does not note the link between chapters 7 and 5, however. He further focuses on its inner chiastic structure. Cf., "Daniel 7: Its Structure and Role in the Book," *HAR* 9(1985): 267-275.

[240] For instance, Hartman and DiLella (1978: 217) are not sure. They write, "The scene is not expressly said to be laid in heaven, but this is implied in vs. 13 ("the clouds of heaven")." Goldingay (1989: 164-165) locates the scene on earth, based on other passages in the Hebrew Bible that have God judging on earth. In an overly forced argument he states, "[I]n Dan 7, there is no reason to suppose that the scene on earth that Daniel had been watching (vv 2-8) has changed. Indeed, the opening phrase of v 9 implies a continuity of perspective: Daniel continues to look in the direction he had been looking. That the scene takes place on earth is presupposed by v 22 (the one advanced in years *came*…)." Lucas (2002: 181) squarely disagrees with Goldingay and follows Collins by placing the scene in the latter's "mythic space." Longman (1999: 187), who also is not certain whether the scene is located on earth or in heaven, offers the following: "Verse 9 is an abrupt transition from the scene by the sea to a courtroom. From its description, we know this is no ordinary courtroom, but again, the vision speaks in

extent the seer's role within his vision is one of action or passivity, and what the connection is between the various actors and spaces of power.

The ambiguity concerning the vision's location is caused by a number of factors. One is the indication that parts of the vision may be understood as taking place on earth. One example is the conflicting display of the activities in the throne room (which seems to be in heaven) and the other the scene of the beasts emerging from the sea (which might indicate earth). However, these two scenes need not be in conflict since, as explained in chapter 3.2, just as in the heavenly realm, in dreams the earthly notion of spatial and temporal boundaries are likewise dissolved. These matters will be analyzed below. The other matter concerns the absence of a clearly described heavenly ascent by Daniel. [241]

Frances Flannery has convincingly demonstrated that the mentioning of an actual ascent is not necessary for a dream or vision narrative to be located in heaven. She writes:

> Within the context of dream research, ascents as a category can actually be limiting, since ascents are only one articulation of how dreamers reach otherworldly realms. The common phrase 'otherworldly journey' is also misleading since it has come into

---

images." Smith-Christopher (1996: 102), too, sees a transition taking place in v. 9, where "the battle shifts to the heavenly arena." D. Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot*. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1988, pp. 81, 526, notes an important clue: the river of fire, which is also present in *1 Enoch* 14. Yet, he is too much on the side of caution when he writes, "[t]here is some very slight evidence that Daniel 7:9-18 may have been set in the heavenly Temple." He adds to this, "There is the 'river of fire', which seems to be a heavenly projection of the river that Ezekiel sees flowing from the eschatological Temple in 47:1-12."

[241] P.R. Gooder presents yet another approach accepting an earlier proposal to identify the human-like figure with a collective people of Israel. The 'one like a man' is depicted as ascending to the Ancient of Days. However, since this is a character within the narrative, it could not make the account qualify as an ascent text. Gooder writes, [i]f it is a text of heavenly ascent … it is an unusual one in comparison to others within the genre. For example, the ascender is an undefined figure 'like a man'. The narrator is not the ascender and no fear is shown during the ascent. Thus while it may describe an ascent of a being to heaven, it cannot be regarded as a 'classic' heavenly ascent text." This observation is not entirely correct since, indeed, no actual ascent is described, the aspect of accompanying fear cannot be described either. Yet, v. 15 describes Daniel as being overwrought with physical and psychological dread after beholding the disturbing scene. Gooder adds, "[a]nother interesting feature of this account is that although the figure Daniel does not record an ascent, he enquires about the vision of the throne to one of the beings around the throne. This may suggest that Daniel has ascended along with the 'one like a son of man'. *Only the Third Heaven? 2 Corinthians 12.1-10 and Heavenly Ascent*. London/New York: T&T Clark, 2006: 37 and fn. 10. These proposals all seem to be problematic in that there is no indication in the text whatsoever that would suggest any kind of relationship between the characters of Daniel and the 'one like a human'.

usage with reference to a specific group of apocalypses and gives the impression that a dreamer must travel to another place in order to enter a different dimension. In stead, there are many formulas by which *dreams provide a dreamer with access to an otherworldly realm* [italics in text], and not all of these occur in apocalypses or involve spatial journeys. … [I]n Dan 7, the dreamer appears to see the interior of the divine throne-room in the eschatological future, although no location is specified. [242]

The confusion with regard to location is no doubt compounded by the fact that the first part of Daniel's dream describes the winds of heaven that disrupt the great sea [ימא רבא], sometimes understood as the Mediterranean, [243] from which subsequently the four terrible beasts emerge. Next, without any further explanatory gloss, this view fades into the judgment scene. This too, is explained by Flannery, when she writes about these dream narratives that "they facilitate *the transcendence or erasure of distinctions between planes of existence* without necessarily employing the imagery of spatial ascent or journey." [244] In other words, when dealing with dreams, no mention of a heavenly ascent is necessary for the contents to play out in the heavenly realm.

---

[242] F. Flannery, *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests*, 170-171.

[243] Indeed, the Hebrew הים הגדול, thought to lie behind the Aramaic term, often refers to the Mediterranean. See J.J. Collins, "Stirring up the Great Sea: the Religio-Historical Background of Daniel 7," *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*, 1993: 121-136. [Repr. in J.J. Collins, *Seers, Sibyls & Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*. Leiden: Brill, 1997: 139-156]: 139-156. Further, A.E. Gardner, "The Great Sea of Dan. VII 2," *VT* 49(1999): 412-415, who interprets it as "a sea redolent of chaos mythology" (415) and names some of the modern proponents of the Mediterranean option, such as M. Casey, and J. Goldingay. C.F. Keil (1865; transl. 1949: 222) also understands it as the sea of chaos, and names some of his predecessors who preferred the earthly Mediterranean. C.L. Seow (2003) considers both options. See also the discussion in E.C. Lucas (2002: 177-178). J.A. Montgomery (1927[1989]: 285) invokes *Enuma Elish*, and rather than reading הים הגדול, prefers תהום רבה, the great deep. Gardner points out, however, that these two terms are never used to translate each other. But she points to three passages where the concepts of ים and תהום are used together, blurring it into a mixed metaphor for an actual and mythological sea. Similarly suggesting a connection with the Babylonian is M.J. Mulder in his commentary on I Kings (Leuven: Peeters, 1999): 329-330 and likewise S.S. Tuell in his commentary on I & II Chronicles (Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 2001): 128. By adducing both historical as well as mythological sources, A. Malamat has shown convincingly how ultimately very early conceptions of the Mediterranean as a sacred body of water not only underlie the Ugaritic combat myths but likely also the Babylonian *Enuma Elish*. This is important as he is able to show that the conceptions of sacred and mundane, cosmic and earthly, as well as Eastern and Western provenance became blurred over time. "The Sacred Sea," *Sacred Space: Shrine, City, Land; Proceedings of the International Conference in Memory of Joshua Prawer*. B.Z. Kedar and R.J.Z. Werblowsky, eds. London: Macmillan; Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities/NYU Press, 1998): 45-54.

[244] F. Flannery, *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests*, 277.

The dream state itself provides the vehicle of an instantaneous non-physical 'transportation' back and forth to otherworldly spaces.

Even when the scene shifts toward the actual throne vision, Collins is not sure where to locate it. Although he acknowledges a continuation with other biblical examples (such as I Kgs. 22:19, Isa. 6:1-9, Ezekiel 1, 3:22-24, 10:1) and the one in *1 Enoch* 14 (which is clearly situated in heaven), he cautiously writes that the location of the thrones in Daniel (7:8) "is unclear." [245] However, these examples concern arguably throne visions that are observed either from earth or in heaven, or concern the movement of the throne towards or away from earth, regardless of the position of the visionary. It has been argued that since Isaiah's vision took place within the temple, the content therefore was also earthly. This is, however, incorrect. Although the position of the prophet is clearly on earth, he must be looking upward, since not only is the divine throne said to be "high and lifted up," the seraphim are described as fluttering *above* it. Furthermore, although the hem of the divine robe is said to fill the temple, at the same time the Deity seems to move away up and out of the building. Daniel, on the other hand, is in the vicinity of the divine throne and clearly looks straight ahead.

An obvious link has been noted between the throne visions in Daniel and the Enoch corpus. The Qumran fragment from the Enochic *Book of Giants*, 4Q530 (col. ii, ll. 17-19) displays a remarkable similarity with Dan. 7:9-10. The beginning of the relevant passage from the *Book of Giants* (16b-17b) reads: "[Be]hold, the ruler of the heavens descended to the earth, and thrones were erected and the Great Holy One sat d[own]." Dan. 7:9a-c has: "I was looking until thrones were set up and an Ancient of Days sat down." In putting these two texts side by side, Loren Stuckenbruck notes that, apart from the obvious similarities, a remarkable divergence exists between them as well. Whereas Daniel is unclear as to the location of the vision, the Qumran fragment specifies that "the ruler of the heavens *descended to the earth*". He writes: "In the Daniel text, there is no attempt to locate the theophany, though its interest in the

---

[245] *Ibid.*, p. 300.

details of the divine throne (see *1 En.* 14.18-22) suggests that the vision is concerned with the execution of judgment in a *heavenly* court." [246]

The narrative presented in the fragment from the *Book of Giants* is closely related to a number of passages in the *Book of the Watchers* in *1 Enoch* and it is instructive to look at these. In *1 En.* 25:3 a likely allusion is made to Mount Sinai as the throne of God. The context seems to be the impending judgment of the Watchers and it is the judgment aspect of the Lawgiving in later history that seems to be used as a model here. This notion is reinforced by the parallel verse 1:3. Thus, from the point of view of narrator and other narrative characters this is a future prediction. *1 Enoch* contains, however, more passages that are suggestive of an earthly setting for the throne, especially where elements of judgment are involved. Mount Hermon had already been linked to the descent of the Watchers, who, according to *1 En.* 6:6 landed there. Paul Hanson calls attention to the connection of these images and illustrates that the first affront of the Watchers was the very place they chose for their descent. He writes: "Mount Hermon is one of the cosmic mountains, and hence descent upon it by the rebellious angels symbolized an attack on the Divine King enthroned thereupon." [247] The judgment scene in Daniel is unrelated to these events. The imagery is only partly similar; the mention of the Deity descending and the mountain motif are altogether absent.

About the judgment scene (7:10 ff.), that is introduced by the setting up of the thrones, Collins writes, "The closest parallel to this passage in Daniel is found in the *Animal Apocalypse* of *1 Enoch* (90:20). In the Enochic passage the judgment clearly takes place on earth. No location is given for the scene in Daniel; it is simply in *mythic*

---

[246] L.T. Stuckenbruck, "The Throne-Theophany of the Book of Giants: Some New Light on the Background of Daniel 7," *The Scrolls and the Scriptures; Qumran Fifty Years After*. S.E. Porter and C.A. Evans, eds. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997: 211-220 (at p. 218).

[247] P. Hanson, "Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel, and Euhemeristic Heroes in 1 Enoch 6-11," *JBL* 96(1977): 195-233. In the parallel narrative in the *Book of Jubilees* the descent of the Watchers is not quite so negatively portrayed as in *1 Enoch* as is shown by J. VanderKam, "The Angel Story in the Book of Jubilees," *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha & Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. E G Chazon & M Stone (eds.) Leiden: Brill, 1999: 151-170 (at p. 155). It is therefore interesting to note that the Qumran fragments of the Book of Giants present an almost intermediate portrayal of the Watchers who are completely bewildered by what is happening to them and then ask Enoch for an explanation (as opposed to legal intercession in *1 Enoch*).

space [italics mine]." [248] It seems, however, that the Enochic scene should be placed as much within Collins' mythic space as the Danielic one – since both take place *within a dream*! In addition, unlike Daniel's dream which is a mixture of symbolic dream and throne vision which becomes a judgment scene, Enoch's is purely a symbolic dream leading up to a judgment scene (90:20) with no admixture of a throne room vision. Furthermore, Enoch's vision, while indeed not in heaven, also is not situated on the known, real earth, [249] but rather an allegorical and future world. The throne is set up in 'the pleasant land' (a designation for the Land of Israel) and the Deity who takes place upon it himself appears in the allegorical guise of Lord of the Sheep. The characters that fill the scene are metaphoric, shape-shifting beings that resemble earthly animals operating in a simulated earth environment where they enact the course of history in a moving tableau that was unfolded for Enoch by means of heavenly intervention. In a similar way Daniel, within his dream, finds himself in heaven where he is shown a tableau with the four beasts and the sea. The throne scene itself then represents the true heavenly setting. [250] One consequence of the tableau format of Daniel's vision is that he himself does not enter into progressively increased sacred spaces. This progression is very often found both in physical descriptions of the Jerusalem Temple, be it the physical one or an eschatological or utopian one. This begins in the building account in 1 Kings 6, is also found in Ezekiel, and in later texts such as the *Temple Scroll* and *New Jerusalem text* from Qumran. It is also very clearly at play in *1 Enoch* 14, which is reinforced by various terms for movement. Thus, the reader, the narrator, or a traveler

---

[248] *Ibid.*, p. 303. 'Mythic space' is a rather nondescript category to pin down and does not really work in the context of apocalyptica since it is too broad and merely indicates liminal space, the in-between places between one world and another. As defined in chapter 3.5, one way to understand this particular trope is narratologically as a 'naturally impossible world'. Critical spatiality would see this scene first of all as a thirdspace expression, in which the victims are righted and the oppressors punished. It is thus very much reflective of the interests of the Judaean opponents to Antiochus and the Hellenizers in the real world and also indicates that this should be the end of any foreign oppression. The time has arisen for complete sovereignty under the protection and leadership of heavenly rule (with or without an earthly king).

[249] Hence, F. Flannery's emphasis that these spaces be understood rather as otherworldly spaces, whether they are thought to be in heaven, on earth, on top of a mountain, or in the netherworld. *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests*, passim.

[250] K.M. Lopez's arguments for locating Daniel's vision on earth are not convincing. Likewise, as indicated above, the judgment scene in *1 En*. 90 does not take place on the Firstspace earth, so to say, but rather in an imaginary Secondspace location that only *resembles* an earthly setting. After all, both cases describe visions and not physical experiences. See, "Standing before the Throne of God: Critical Spatiality in Apocalyptic Scenes of Judgment" (2008: 147).

enter the sacred space from the outside and advance ever further until they reach the most holy place. In Daniel's case, the traveler is dumbfounded as he *is only shown* what transpires as in a play on stage or in a movie – he is not invited in. This actual display and the scene in which Daniel asks clarification from the heavenly being are clearly separate. In fact, the heavenly being, too, is portrayed as a spectator in this scene. This is possibly what prompted Collins' point about Daniel's non-participation within his own vision, but as will be demonstrated, the non-acting on Daniel's part is only up to a certain extent and is an integral part of the entire vision in which he himself is very present.

This brings us to the other seemingly unresolved issue, namely the role of Daniel within his vision. Many commentators make a point of his presumed passivity in comparison, for instance, to Enoch in his vision (*1 Enoch* 14). Although Daniel is indeed passive, he is still present and looking on, peeking inside as it were. And as he does so, he engages one of the heavenly beings in conversation and inquires what it is that he sees. The heavenly being indulges him and answers elaborately. Thus, up to the level within the dream where he is allowed into the sacred precincts Daniel does participate in the dream sequence. Not being a priest, Daniel would not be able to progress further into the scene and approach the actual space of the divine Presence. This would also solve the contrast, noted by commentators, between Enoch's and Daniel's roles in their respective throne room visions. Enoch is observed to be actively approaching the Deity upon his invitation, although he makes sure not to look at him. [251] In other parts of the Enoch traditions Enoch is known to be a scribe, but never a priest. The question then is why could he approach? It seems that this may be simply due to the fact that the figure Enoch represents a pre-Sinaitic, and in fact a pre-Patriarchal, character from a time that not only was there no priesthood yet, it would not even have been relevant.

---

[251] R.S. Stokes made a point of this in a recent article, "The Throne Visions of Daniel 7, 1 Enoch 14, and the Qumran Book of Giants (4Q530): An Analysis of Their Literary Relationship," *DSD* 15(2008): 340-358 (at pp. 350-351). He considers the similarities between Enoch in *1Enoch* 14 and the 'son of man' figure in Daniel 7. Both are said to approach the Deity, using the same verb (קרב, *qarba* [Eth]), which he notes, is unique in Daniel for all throne visions contained in the Hebrew Bible. He further observes that the language of approaching in the Enoch passage resembles the terminology known from the priestly temple service. He does not propose a full identification between the two, only a borrowing of motifs.

John Collins distinguishes sharply between 'the otherworldly journeys of Enoch' and the 'symbolic vision of Daniel'. He notes that in Daniel's case the dreamer is not involved in the action of the dream. He explains further, "Daniel is not said to move in front of the throne [contra H. Kvanvig]. He acts within the dream, to ask for the interpretation, but this action is outside the frame of the symbolic vision." [252] In fact, the only movement that is noted on Daniel's part is in v. 16 when he approaches one of the angelic throne attendants.

5.7.1. Individual Elements: the Sea

How may all this disparate information be organized into a coherent whole? First of all it was determined that the throne vision takes place in heaven and not on earth. It was also found that Daniel was only passive up to a certain point since he actively engaged a heavenly being in conversation. While surely more than one reason could be suggested for his relative passivity, the one that would make the most sense is that Daniel was not allowed further in since he found himself near the entrance of the heavenly replica of the Holy of Holies. He could watch, but had no access. The spectacle that he witnesses flows from the scene with the beasts straight into the one in which thrones are set and the Ancient of Days appears. The beasts are in the height of their arrogance and violence when they are, in a way, interrupted by the introduction of the throne setting. It may therefore also be concluded, that the location of the sea from which they emerged was in the vicinity of the throne room. If it is correct that the heavenly throne room is the animated, living, version of the one in the earthly temple (as is suggested also in chapter 3.2 above), then a more direct candidate for the great sea can be found in the Molten or Bronze Sea of Solomon's temple. [253] This installation was among the temple vessels that were dismantled and carried off as booty by Nebuchadnezzar after the destruction of

---

[252] J.J. Collins, *Daniel* (1993), p. 284 and fn. 63. Contra H. Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: the Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988: 446. Collins' observation is important in pointing out that the vision is *part* of the dream.

[253] Similar comparisons have been made with regard to the glass sea in front of the divine throne in the vision of John of Patmos in Rev. 4:6 and 15:2. See D.F. Watson, "Sea of Glass, Glassy Sea," *ABD* V (1992): 1058-1059. See further B.W. Snyder, "Combat Myth in the Apocalypse: The Liturgy of the Day of the Lord and the Dedication of the Heavenly Temple," [Diss., University of California at Berkeley, 1991: 165-168].

the temple in 587 BCE (2 Kings 25:13, Jer. 52:17). According to 2 Chron. 4:5 its use was for the priestly ablutions. [254] However, due to its enormous size this might be hard to imagine. Carol Meyers notes that "[t]he cultic purpose of the Sea may lie more in its symbolic nature rather than as a ritual vessel." In addition, the basin was supported by four sets of three bronze oxen, each set facing the four corners of the earth. Such a basin as part of the temple furnishings is also known from other ancient Near Eastern Temples. Meyers writes:

> One of the features of ANE temples was their utilization of artistic and architectural elements relating to the idea of the temple as the cosmic center of the world. The great deep, or cosmic waters, is one aspect of the array of cosmic attributes of such a holy spot. The temple of Marduk at Babylon, for example, had an artificial sea (*ta-am-tu*) in its precincts; and some Babylonian temples had an *apsu*-sea, a large basin. Such Features symbolize the idea of the ordering of the universe by the conquest of chaos; or they represent the presence of the "waters of life" at the holy center. Ancient Israel shared in this notion of watery chaos being subdued by [the Lord] and of the temple being built on the cosmic waters. The great 'molten sea' near the temple's entrance would have signified [the Lord's] power and presence. [255]

Apart from other functions that it may have had, the molten sea was a reminder of the waters of the primeval chaos tamed and held under control by God. [256] These waters were

---

[254] The reason that the Chronicler lists priestly purification as its function might be due to the fact that he was no longer familiar with its purpose since it was likely not part of the vessels of the Second Temple of the Persian Period, nor of Ezekiel's visionary temple. Another reason given for this as well as the fact that in I Kings no purpose at all is given, might be a result of the mythical and non-Israelite undertones that it carried. See S.I. Kang, "The 'Molten Sea', or Is It," *Biblica* 89(2008)1: 101-103. He is of the opinion that מוצק does not refer to the material that the basin was made of but that it is derived from a different root, meaning 'to constrain'. The word then would refer to 'sea' and be part of an annual ritual (much like the Babylonian *Akitu*) in which the sea would be declared as having been constrained by the king. While this latter part is highly speculative, the rest of Kang's analysis as to the symbolism of the 'sea' is of interest.

[255] C. Meyers, "Sea, Molten", *ABD* V (1992): 1061-1062.

[256] This is a recurrent theme especially throughout the poetic parts of the Hebrew Bible. See, e.g. Jer. 5:22, Pss. 24:1-2; 29:3, 10; 33:7; 74:13; 104: 3, 5-9; Job 7:12. It is therefore hard to agree with M.A. Sweeney, "The End of Eschatology in Daniel? Theological and Socio-Political Ramifications of the Changing Contexts of Interpretation," *Biblical Interpretation* 9(2001)2: 123-139 (at p. 135) who suggests that "the molten sea represents the Red Sea of the Exodus tradition." This proposal does not explain the meaning of similar structures at Mesopotamian temples and, moreover, there are sufficient indicators within the biblical text itself that stress the important symbolism of the waters of chaos, their being the habitat for monsters, and the divine victory over these waters. Only very secondarily may

the Israelite version of the Mesopotamian *apsu*, the primeval sea of chaos subdued by the gods, but also the ocean that surrounds the earth, forming the upper and lower waters. [257] In addition it is, as part of or entrance to the netherworld, home to terrifying monsters that may emerge from it. In order to garner its force and as a constant reminder of its presence, temples in Mesopotamia also had a version of the molten sea, called *apsu*. [258] Thus, while in most cases the heavenly sea would be tranquil and under divine control, in extreme circumstances the evil forces could rear their heads, only to be once more subdued. [259]

---

perhaps the Red Sea theme be derived from the chaos waters concept in that they became the watery grave of the pursuing Egyptians and the powerful deeds of God to tame these waters to allow the Israelites passage. See on a connection between the 'sea of chaos' and the sea of the Exodus, J. Moo, "The Sea That is No More. Rev. 21:1 and the Function of the Sea Imagery in the Apocalypse of John," *NovT* 51(2009): 148-167 (at pp. 156=157, fn. 22).

[257] See 'apsu' under 'Cosmology' in *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery*. L. Ryken, J.C. Wilhoit, T. Longman III, eds. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1998: 172. See the *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary* [*CAD*](Oriental Institute, 1964), Vol. I.2: *apsû* 1.

[258] See *CAD* Vol. I.2: *apsû* 3. Further, V.A. Hurowitz, "YHWH's Exalted House: Aspects of the Design and Symbolism of Solomon's Temple," *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*. J. Day, ed. London: T & T Clark International, 2005: 63-110 (at pp. 78-82) and the literature cited there. An early discussion is found in E. Burrows, "Problems of the Abzu," *Orientalia* n.s. 1(1932): 231-256 (esp. pp. 238-239). More recently, W. Zwickel, "Das eherne Meer (1 Kön 7,23-26)," *Der Salomonische Tempel*. Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1999: 125-136.

[259] J.J. Collins is reluctant to accord a possible Mesopotamian origin to the imagery of malevolent hybrid beasts emerging from the sea, preferring a Canaanite background. He especially considers obsolete H. Gunkel's once popular thesis of a connection with the Babylonian creation epic, *Enuma Elish*. (*Daniel* , 1993), 288-289. Of course, Collins is correct to state that in the first place one should turn to the Hebrew Bible itself for the source of inspiration for the author of chapter 7. But then we get stuck on the question what the sources for those passages would have been. Moreover, they do not really present a precedent for the combination of the type of hybrids in Daniel 7 and other creatures that rise up from the sea. When Gunkel wrote his *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit: eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen 1 und Ap Joh 12*, [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1921], the texts from Ugarit had not yet come to light. Once they had emerged, beginning in 1929, they elicited great enthusiasm among biblical scholars. Not only was the language of this long forgotten civilization Western Semitic and remarkably close to Hebrew, its poetry resembled Israelite psalms and much of the mythology was also thought to have its counterpart in the mythological portions of the Hebrew Bible. Yet, however many connections and lines of influence may indeed be demonstrated, this should not automatically rule out a Babylonian connection for 7:3-6. One reason has been adduced above, the nature of the sea as the heavenly version of the temple appurtenance known respectively as the molten sea of Solomon's temple and the *apsu* basin known from Babylonian temples. There is, however, an even more compelling additional motivation for considering this. Gunkel did not regard a more obvious intermediate agent for transmitting the imagery: Berossus the Chaldean, the author of the *Babyloniaca*, although he uses him to explain the inner chronology of chapter 1. Surprisingly, neither does Collins in "Stirring up the Great Sea: the Religio-Historical Background of Daniel 7," consider Berossus as a possible tradent for the animal imagery although he lists him among those who preserved ancient myths in the Hellenistic age (p. 153, fn. 60). This work is a history of Babylon, written by a 3rd century BCE priest of Bel (Marduk), the first part of which is a retelling of the creation epic *Enuma Elish*. Although slightly embellished and hellenized (and unfortunately only preserved fragmentarily in the work of other writers), it is remarkably close to what is contained in the first two tablets of the Babylonian version. Reading it, one can only be

A parallel development can be found in the descriptions of artificial or natural water sources originating underneath the Temple, which evolve into miraculous life-giving streams that find their origin underneath the Temple. [260] In Ezekiel's temple vision this water source seems to have replaced the bronze laver. Likewise, despite the claim in the Book of Revelation that its New Jerusalem does not contain a temple, it does have a miraculous life-giving water source, a description which is likely influenced by Ezekiel 47. The significance of this imagery is further analyzed below in sections 5.7.3.2 and 5.7.4.

5.7.2. The Beasts

The various commentaries do not agree on whether the beasts represent kings or kingdoms. From a spatial perspective this distinction is not relevant as these terms represent either powers or spaces of power. Whatever they may have meant to the author and his intended audience, it should not be ruled out that they represent some form of territorial conflict which takes place on a horizontal and a vertical level. Wherever animal imagery is used in Daniel (as well as in *1 Enoch*) their actions reflect existing or imagined violent conflicts between nations. But that is not the only, or even most important clue. The conflict always involves dominion over Judah / the Land of Israel. In Daniel 8 similar imagery is used albeit that the animals in that vision are a 'conventional' ram and a goat.

---

struck by the resemblances between these two versions and the verses from chapter 7. It should be stressed that it is a borrowing and rewriting of existing imagery. As Collins puts it (with regard to his Canaanite option), "The basic character and significance of the beasts, then, is determined by the fact that they rise from the sea. The description of the individual beasts, however, cannot be explained from any Canaanite sources now available. Daniel 7 is not simply a reproduction of an older source, Canaanite or other. It is a new composition, which is not restricted to a single source for its imagery" (289). This is certainly correct. In this light, it might be even more worthwhile to take a look at Berosussus' work. First of all, it provides a reliable and direct point of access to ancient Babylonian lore. Secondly, although belonging to the vision accounts, chapter 7 (apart from being written in Aramaic) is otherwise also deeply saturated with links to the eastern diaspora which forms the backdrop for the court tales.

[260] See M. Tilly, "Geographie und Weltordnung im Aristeasbrief," *JSJ* 28(1997)2: 131-153 (specifically on the water reservoirs, 135-136 and water source, 143, 145).

As we have seen, the mythological beastly metaphors describing those kings emerge from a mythologized sea, a *representation* (Secondspace) of something that is known from the real world (Firstspace). The real physical sea (Firstspace) is wild, unruly, and does not belong to any particular political power (be it a modern nation state or an ancient empire). This does not exclude that parts of it may be and have been claimed for a variety of reasons by different nations in history. Seen in this light, the narrative suggests that the royal types that are thus described have no claim to any dominion and come out of nowhere (Non-space). Whatever they have, they either obtained unlawfully or (as the biblical tradition indicates) received it from the God of Israel. This is borne out by the explanation of the vision in 'plain Aramaic' by the angel to Daniel. As is usually the case, here too details that were not mentioned in the initial vision account are added or modified in the explanation. We learn, for instance, that while their beastly counterparts emerge from the sea, the human kings or kingdoms that they represent are to be set up on the earth.

Finally, the role of the beasts and their connection with the sea must be addressed. Although, as Collins notes, the sea as a location from which the beasts emerge only occurs once in the beginning of the chapter, the question must be asked why it is there in the first place. As I have suggested above, the sea as a symbol in relation to temple space in this vision represents the heavenly version of the gigantic 'molten sea' of Solomon's temple, which in turn is a symbolic representation of the primordial sea of chaos, to be conquered and tamed by the divine. As shown, before it was conquered by the divine, the primordial sea in its Babylonian guise teemed with monstrous hybrid creatures. Only the killing of these creatures by a creator-god, his subsequent taming of the waters and the bringing of order out of chaos, would produce a bounded and secure maritime environment. For this control to remain in place, a balance needed to exist between the heavenly and earthly domains. In the ancient Near East this was usually accomplished by the establishing of a temple through a joint effort between the human and heavenly rulers. The creatures in the vision represent the regimes that bridge the time from the narrative, exilic, Daniel to the present of the author – the vision takes place in the reign of the last (fictive) Babylonian king. This is

significant since the rise of the first beast, that is the Babylonian Empire, initiated the unraveling of the heavenly and earthly equilibrium. It is only with the destruction of the fourth beast that the author and his contemporaries dare look forward to a full restoration of the connection between heaven and earth.

5.7.3. The Thrones

The central object of attention is, without a doubt, the magnificent throne of the Ancient of Days, painted in all its wondrous glory. To begin with, a throne is a symbol of power, whether it is heavenly or earthly. It can metaphorically refer to a dynasty or the function of kingship. But it is also the physical seat of the ruler and, to stress this notion, we know from ancient examples of pictorial art and artifacts, that it is often elevated above surrounding more regular seats. [261] In addition, the very act of sitting implies a position of power. Only the ruler, be he human or divine, and perhaps the most important members of the divine household, sit. Everyone else stands. This is part of all descriptions as well as depictions of royal ideology. Thus, the expression 'to stand before [עמד לפני] the king' in Dan. 1:5 is not only a sign of honor, it is at the same time a token of submission. The same phrase is used with regard to entering the presence of God. Another class that traditionally is said to be sitting is that of the judiciary (Dan. 7:9-10, implied). In the passage there is mention of multiple thrones that are placed and it suggested that the one that the Ancient One took a seat upon arrived along with the other thrones. No occupants of the other thrones are specifically mentioned, but it is likely that these would have been heavenly beings acting as judges.

The only other biblical instance of a detailed description of the divine throne is the chariot throne of Ezekiel 1 and 10. [262] In those chapters the throne is in motion

---

[261] E.g., J.E. Wright, *The Early History of Heaven*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000: 36, 74, 79, 80, 81. Further, J.B. Pritchard, *ANEP* (2nd ed., 1969), *passim*. This is especially so for the depictions of the thrones of the Achaemenids. See M.C. Root, *The King and Kingship in Achaemenid Art: Essays on the Creation of an Iconography of Empire*. Leiden: Brill, 1979: plates 17, 25a and 29.

[262] The passage in Exod. 24:10 only hints at the throne. Moses, Aaron and his sons and the elders of Israel ascended Mount Sinai and as they looked up, "they saw the God of Israel: under His feet there was the likeness of a pavement of sapphire [or: lapis lazuli], like the very sky for purity."

between the heavenly and earthly realms. The other pertinent case of a wheeled throne is offered in *1 Enoch* 14. However, that one is at rest when Enoch arrives into the inner sanctum. Before analyzing the wheeled throne in Daniel and matching it up with the function of an actual chariot, a brief look at thrones and royal chariots in a more general sense is warranted

5.7.3.1 Solomon's Throne and Thrones in Battle and Judgment Scenes

The one earthly royal throne that is described in painstaking detail is Solomon's throne in 1 Kgs. 10:18-20 and 2 Chron. 9:17-19. [263] The two accounts differ very slightly; instead of 'the back with a rounded top' in 1 Kgs. 19b, Chronicles has 'and the throne had a golden footstool attached to it' in 18b.

> 18] The king also made a large throne of ivory, and he overlaid it with refined gold. 19] Six steps led up to the throne, and the throne had a back with a rounded top, and arms on either side of the seat. Two lions stood beside the arms, 20] and twelve lions stood on the six steps, six on either side. No such throne was ever made for any other kingdom.

The throne's design reflects those known from Phoenicia and Syria, rather than Mesopotamia or Persia. This is not surprising, since the entire design and construction of the temple and likely also the palace had been carried out by Phoenician craftsmen. The materials too were primarily imported from the north. Similarly, what seems to be the divine cherub throne in the Holy of Holies (1 Kgs. 6:23-27) has likewise been traced to Syria-Phoenicia. [264] In contrast, the divine throne depicted in the Ezekiel passages shows more of a mixture of Phoenician and Mesopotamian elements.

---

[263] See *TDOT* 7, 247-248.

[264] See O. Keel and C. Uehlinger, *Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God in Ancient Israel*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1998: 167-169. Further, E.M. Bloch-Smith, ""Who Is the King of Glory"? Solomon's Temple and its Symbolism," *Scripture and Other Artifacts; Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Honor of Philip J. King*. M.D. Coogan, et al. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994: 18-31 (at pp. 25-26). Depictions of thrones with ivory cherub decorations as armrests are known from Megiddo

The figures in atlas position holding up the throne of Sennacherib in the Lachish relief and those holding up the gigantic platform layers of Xerxes' throne on the Persepolis relief represent, especially in the latter, the various nations that have been incorporated into the Empire. They thus truly identify the Persian king as the King of Kings and Lands and function as an expression of Empire.

The function of the earthly and heavenly thrones overlap in an important sense: not only are they the actual seat of the royal person, figuratively they are also the seat of justice. [265] For instance, 1 Kgs. 7:7 continues the earlier passage with, "He [Solomon] made the throne portico, where he was to pronounce judgment – the Hall of Judgment [אלם המשפט]."

Jer. 1:15 tells of an account whereby foes from the north are summoned by God to set up their thrones at the entrance of the gates of Jerusalem (and presumably other walled cities), after which a divine judgment against Judah is rendered. [266] It is not clear whether these thrones should be understood as thrones of rulers or whether they resemble closer the multiple thrones that are set up in Daniel's throne vision.

In a different passage (1 Kgs. 22:10) the earthly royal thrones have a vague connection with judgment, while their heavenly counterpart in v. 19 most definitely has. In addition, v. 10 suggests that just as the divine throne royal thrones, too, may be moved. It reads,

> The king of Israel and King Jehoshaphat of Judah were seated on their thrones, arrayed in their robes, on the threshing floor at the entrance of the gate of Samaria; and all the prophets were prophesying before them.

The context is the inquiring about the outcome of a military conflict with Aram. The two kings, who have concluded an alliance, require from a host of prophets a divine judgment as to what the outcome of the battle will be. Since the Judean king sits on a

---

[265] Z.W. Falk, "Two Symbols of Justice," *VT* 10(1960)1: 72-74. He responds to H. Brunner, "Gerechtigkeit als Fundament des Thrones," *VT* 8(1958)4: 426-428, who sees Egyptian influence in the throne and justice imagery. Falk argues for an inner-biblical and Israelite origin.

[266] See J.R. Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1-20* [AB 21A]. New York: Doubleday, 1999: 243.

throne in the Israelite capital, it should be assumed that it was brought along in royal procession from Jerusalem. It is known that thrones and chariots formed part of the royal convoy that was brought to battle scenes. [267] Only one of the prophets, Micaiah, succeeds in actually attaining a vision, which is narrated in v. 19,

> But [Micaiah] said, 'I call upon you to hear the word of the Lord! I saw the Lord seated upon His throne, with all the host of heaven standing in attendance to the right and the left of Him.

This description evokes contrasts as well as similarities with the previous passage and maybe even parodizes it. It furthermore stands in the tradition reflected in other throne scenes (such as Daniel and Enoch) that depict the Deity robed in His divine and royal attire and surrounded by the angelic heavenly council.

The mobility of the earthly and also the heavenly thrones can be connected with their function of being the seat of dispensing judgment. On the one hand, the earthly thrones are found to be placed in battlefield situations or symbolizing the placement of power of one kingdom over another. An example would be Nebuchadnezzar's throne that is set up in Egypt (Jer. 43:10) and the one given above of Sennacherib's presence at the siege of Lachish. Clearly, warfare is connected with the delivering of a judgment over a conquered nation. An odd passage occurs in Jer. 49:34-39, the Oracle against Elam. [268]

---

[267] An example is found in the Lachish relief from Sennacherib's palace in Nineveh. See D. Ussishkin, *The Conquest of Lachish by Sennacherib*. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, Institute of Archaeology, 1982 which depicts the king enthroned before his military royal tent (pp. 88-89, 109, 114-115) and the king's battle and ceremonial chariots (pp. 88-90, 116-117). From the detailed depiction of the throne and its footstool it seems that both were decorated with elaborate ivory plaques. This recalls aspects of the description of Solomon's throne. The lavish robes of the king occupying the throne are also outlined in great detail. It is not clear, but likely, that this was not the actual throne from the palace throne room, but rather a special and somewhat smaller and portable 'travel throne'. The caption underneath the object in the relief reads, "Sennacherib, king of all, king of Assyria, sitting on his *nimedu*-throne while the spoil from the city of Lachish passed before him" (p. 109). This term means provided with an armrest, backrest, or footstool (*pace* R.M. Whiting, e-mail exchange 5/5/09). It seems that Sennacherib's throne has all three components. Ussishkin suggests that this particular design with ivory decoration was especially popular at the time in Syria and Phoenicia, from which the style was imported to Assyria (115).

[268] For suggestions why the remote nation of Elam is singled out here, see E. Peels, "God's Throne in Elam: the Historical Background and Literary Context of Jeremiah 49:34-39," *Past, Present, Future; the Deuteronomistic History and the Prophets* [OTS 43]. J.C. de Moor and H.F. van Rooy, eds. Leiden: Brill, 2000: 216-229. See also D. Nam, "The 'Throne of God' Motif in the Hebrew Bible,"

In 49:38 God says that He will set up His throne in Elam and ultimately wipe out its rulers. It is not likely that reference is made here to the impressive chariot throne of Ezekiel's vision, but rather that a throne is meant as in the passages above. It also shows that God's throne, whether or not it appears on earth in one form or another, is intimately involved with the meeting out of punishment, often in the form of military defeat and conquest. Very significantly, further imagery in this oracle links it to instruments of divine fury that occur as well in Daniel 7: the four winds of heaven in 49:36. This verse reads, "And I shall bring four winds against Elam from the four quarters of heaven, and scatter them [the Elamite elite] to all those winds."

5.7.3.2 The Divine Throne and Chariots of Fire

When not out on a mission, as in Ezekiel, the Deity's throne itself is most logically at rest and placed in the heavenly counterpart of the Holy of Holies, to which only God and, perhaps, the heavenly high priest have access. It is significant that the throne in Ezekiel is in active motion, the one in Daniel arrives for a specific session of the heavenly court (which implies that afterwards it may leave again), while the one in *1 Enoch* is stationary at the time of the vision.

The throne is reminiscent of the one Ezekiel saw descending from heaven, if not the same. In contrast to the out of control beasts, who represent the out of control kingdoms in Daniel's vision, the throne of the God of Israel would only be supported by the 'domesticated', in control, kind of hybrids as observed in Ezekiel. Needless to say, this heavenly menagerie has its non-animated counterpart in the earthly temples in Jerusalem as well as in Babylon. As to what they represent, it is interesting to note that their behavior mirrors action that takes place on the earthly plane. The conflicts that are coming to a head in the heavenly scene, will happen or are already taking place on earth. It must be kept in mind, though, that there is no linear time reckoning in heaven. Therefore, the 'now' in heaven might well be synchronized with another 'now' on earth.

Diss. Andrews University, 1989: 236-241, who highlights the eschatological aspect of the passage, especially with regard to its use of באחרית הימים (last, or latter days) in 49:39.

The human observer simply does not have the capacity to integrate this and must see both 'nows' as being separated in earth time.

The divine throne itself almost defies description. From under the throne a fiery river comes forth. This part of Daniel's dream bears great resemblance to Enoch's vision (*1 Enoch* 14). In comparison, in Ezekiel's vision of the restored temple (47:1) water rather than fire is seen coming from underneath the structure. As the vision unfolds, Ezekiel sees that this is not regular water, but that it has miraculous life-giving and healing powers. It is known that both fire and water are agents of purification. [269] Obviously, earth has different needs than the heavenly environment. The constant in these accounts, however, is that thrones that are located exclusively in heaven (or temporarily descend from heaven and return), have rivers of fire originating underneath or are surrounded by fire (Daniel, Enoch, Ezekiel's throne chariot, Revelation), [270] whereas earthly thrones or temples (even if they originate in heaven but are meant to be located on earth) display rivers of water, albeit it miraculous water (Joel 4:18, Zech. 14:8, Ezekiel's visionary temple, [271] the Letter of Aristeas, the Qumran New Jerusalem Text, [272] Revelation's New Jerusalem). Ultimately, this imagery goes back to the four rivers that emerge from the Garden of Eden (Gen. 2:10 ff). [273] In Second Temple period

---

[269] Cmp. also the account of God's throne in the New Jerusalem of Rev. 22:1. This description borrows much of the imagery of Ezekiel 47. See D. Aune on this passage. *Revelation* [WBC 52C], Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1998: 1176-1177. He notes the fact that there are two traditions, one having water coming out from under the temple or the throne, and the other one having fire streaming out. See likewise the comments on 15:2

[270] In fact, the *seraphim* that Isaiah observes in his vision are fiery beings.

[271] On the imagery and its significance in Joel 4:18, Zech. 14:8 and Ezekiel 47, see T. Stordalen, *Echoes of Eden. Genesis 2-3 and Symbolism of the Eden Garden in Biblical Hebrew Literature.* Louvain: Peeters, 2000: 366-36372.

[272] New Jerusalem Text, 4Q554 4: 1-2, 11Q18 10 i: 1, 3. See L. DiTommaso, *The Dead Sea New Jerusalem Text*, 114 (fn. 89) and 119-120.

[273] M. Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 17, prefers to see here the borrowing of ancient Canaanite myth in which rivers stream from El's holy mountain. However, she has difficulty accounting for the fiery rivers in Enoch and Daniel. Although the imagery is possibly related, it makes more sense to understand it within an Eden-Temple connection. See also B. Ego's important study, "Die Wasser der Gottesstadt: zu einem Motiv der Zionstradition und seinen kosmologischen Implikationen," *Das biblische Weltbild und seine altorientalischen Kontexte*. B. Janowski und B. Ego, eds. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001: 361-389. She treats the various occurrences of the imagery of water streams that originate from the city of Jerusalem and/or the temple in the biblical text (esp. Psalms and Ezekiel) and

texts the Garden is often equated with a primeval temple (*Jub*. 3:12, 8:19) and conversely, almost all ancient Near Eastern descriptions of temples contain edenic imagery.

It is stated explicitly that an integral part of the throne is a set of fiery wheels, an aspect that is not further elaborated upon. However, this feature is also known from the chariot throne of Ezekiel where it is described as a necessary function of its mobility. [274] There the wheels are not stationary but turn in every direction as the throne moves. But it will be argued that this is not the only *raison d'être* for the wheels. No attention has been given, to my knowledge, to the fact that the context in which the wheels appear in Ezekiel is one of war. The vision in Ezekiel 1 is introduced with the appearance of a storm cloud. This is traditionally seen as a portent of war. [275] Granted, the obvious purpose of wheels is to provide mobility, and the throne-chariot of Ezekiel is extremely mobile (1:5-24, 3:13; 10:9-13, 16-19). [276] However, it is equally reasonable to surmise that if God wanted to move His throne, He would not need wheels to do so. The throne could simply fly, float or appear wherever and whenever the Divine willed it. Therefore, the wheels must have special significance for the visionary and for his readership. Again, it is the context that provides the solution. The account is not one just of a moving divine throne, impressive though this may be, but of a fully armed divine war chariot. This fits

---

ties it up with the geographical conditions of the area and the real physical water sources (natural and artificial) in Jerusalem's vicinity.

[274] There is some evidence in the archaeological record for wheeled royal seats. See M. Greenberg, *Ezekiel* (1983): 57. He specifically mentions a depiction on the Balawat Gates of a "high-backed wheeled sedan chair" belonging to Assurnasirpal II and adds, "a device normally carried by bearers may thus be furnished with wheels." For an illustration, see J.E. Curtis and N. Tallis, eds. *The Balawat Gates of Ashurnasirpal II*. London: The British Museum Press, 2008: 169. The depiction is part of the richly decorated bronze doors that were part of the Mamu temple gates in Imgur-Enlil (modern Balawat), just south of Nineveh.

[275] See "Cloud," *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery*. L. Ryken, J.C. Wilhoit, T. Longman III, eds. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1998: 157.

[276] See L.C. Allen on Ezek. 1:19-21. *Ezekiel 1-19* [WBC 28] Dallas: Word Books, 1994: 34. See also on 3:12, where Allen notes that the description of the noise made by the moving wheels is similar to that "used of the war chariots in Jer. 47:3 and of their wheels in Nah. 3:2" (p. 43). However, he does not note the relevant connection for the account in Ezekiel. See also M. Greenberg on 10:13. *Ezekiel 1-20* [AB 22], New York: Doubleday, 1983: 182. Cf. as well Ps. 77:19.

quite well with the iconography from the period and the area. [277] As seen, the introductory element is the imagery of the storm cloud. But the historical political situation is even more clear-cut. Jerusalem has been attacked; the Temple is endangered and will soon be sacked by the Babylonian enemy which implies the defeat of Israel's God. But from the divine point of view the situation is quite the opposite. It all belongs to the greater divine plan in which God, as enraged warrior, takes vengeance on His own people and willingly abandons His divine habitat with great pomp and circumstance as behooves a divine royal warrior. Much of this imagery has proven to be very persistent over time and it can be seen to be evolving. In the vision of *1 Enoch* the heavenly throne is displayed with the wheels that were first encountered in Ezekiel, however, now they are stationary. [278] In Daniel 7 the throne seems to have freshly arrived and is temporarily at a stand still. Would that indicate that they have been reduced to a mere, if imposing, ornament? In view of the surrounding imagery in 7:13, such as the 'one like a human' arriving with the clouds, it must rather be assumed that the chariot throne is temporarily at rest, but ready to attack at any time if called upon. [279] The positioning of this vision in Daniel's narrative frame is near the end of the exile and close to the Persian conquest of the Babylonian Empire. In the real world of the author, the time of Antiochus' wished-for end is drawing near. It is therefore reasonable to expect the defeat of the wicked

---

[277] See B.A. Power's extensive study, "Iconographic Windows into Ezekiel's World." [Diss., University of Toronto, 1999], esp. pp. 343-346, 358-362, 408-418. The examples that he adduces for Ezekiel are largely also valid for Daniel's imagery. A related image is provided by Psalm 77:19, which recounts God's warrior-like actions when splitting the sea for the Israelites during the exodus. Violent weather phenomena are combined with chariot wheels to describe God's march through the sea. Hab. 3:8, 15 has similar imagery. See further on a comparison with Canaanite Ba'al as storm rider, M. Smith, *The Early History of God*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002: 80-82.

[278] This offers perhaps a clue for the date of composition of this part of *1 Enoch* being before the onset of the Antiochian crisis which was a relatively conflict-free period in the Land of Israel.

[279] M. Himmelfarb does not consider this possibility when she writes, "[t]he line of descent is made clear by the wheels of the throne, which appear only in Ezekiel among biblical works and which no longer have a function in Enoch's ascent, where the throne sits fixed in heaven." *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993: 10. She has refined this argument in a later article, "Ezekiel's visions set the stage for the developments in the Book of the Watchers, Since God is no longer present in the Temple on earth, the seer must ascend to His presence. The Site of Enoch's vision is the heavenly abode of God. … Because Enoch ascends to heaven, the chariot throne is not needed as a means of transportation. It stands stationary in the heavenly house of God." "From Prophecy to Apocalypse: The *Book of the Watchers* and Tours of Heaven," *Jewish Spirituality*. [Vol. I]: *From the Bible through the Middle Ages*. A. Green, ed. New York: Crossroad, 1986: 151.

oppressive nations to be imminent, both within the narrative and in reality. Chapters 8, 10-12 also bear this out since the historical review that is offered there serves to set the stage for the last and final war which will result in the establishing of the eschatological kingdom on earth. The role that the angelic forces are to play in this armed conflict finds it ultimate realization in the *War Scroll* from Qumran.

As indicated, the element of fire is of great importance for recognizing the originating milieu of certain narrative components. Thus, 2 Kings offers two significant examples that are relevant in the present context. The first is 2 Kgs 2:1, 11 which tells of the departure of Elijah in a heavenly fiery chariot that descended in order to pick him up and take him into the heavenly realm. The second is part of the Elisha narratives. In 2 Kgs. 6: 13-17 concerns a situation of war with Aram and Elisha and his attendant suddenly see a whole army of horses and chariots of fire covering the surrounding hills. These were the heavenly forces that had come in answer to Elisha's prayer in aid of the heavily outnumbered Israelite army. Usually, the horses and chariots of the other nations are seen as a negative power, an agent of oppression of Israel and opposition to God. Their fate is thrown in with the thrones of their kings – they are to be destroyed (Haggai 2:22); just as also the horses and chariots of the Egyptians were destroyed at the exodus.

A different, but concurrent, trajectory of the development of the wheels [*'ofanim*] is found in the *Shirot 'Olat ha-Shabbat*, also from Qumran, where the wheels have evolved into autonomous heavenly beings serving in the heavenly temple. [280] This transition from the wheels in Ezekiel, Enoch and Daniel to full-fledged angelic beings is not far-fetched. Already in Ezekiel the wheels are described as animated and almost having a life of their own. [281] In addition, they are not the ordinary wheels of an earthly chariot. The comparisons to the most exquisite precious materials are inadequate to describe their extraordinary appearance and nature. This entire array of

---

[280] 4Q404, 1, 2:1-16 and 4Q405, 20-21-22; 4Q405 Frags. 21-22:10-11; 4Q405 Frag. 20 Col. 2 and Frags. 21-22: 8-10. This development continues into the school of Hekhalot mysticism, where the *ofanim* have become a distinct angelic class and form an integral part of the entourage surrounding the heavenly throne.

[281] D.I. Block, *The Book of Ezekiel. Chapters 1-24* [NICOT] Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997: 101, the wheels seem to be infused with "their own source of vitality."

imagery is geared toward establishing the rule of God versus that of earthly kings. It sets parameters for a distribution of power as well as the standards of behavior and relationships within these boundaries. This means that, on a psychological level, human kingship can only work as long as it recognizes the superior kingship of God. On a phenomenological level it appears that human and divine kingship are each other's counterpart. They use the same imagery and dispense or remove power in a similar way as those below their own level of authority. On a spatial level the playing field of the heavenly throne room mirrors that of the earthly palace and temple, however, with the difference that all the static architectural components of the earthly setting have come to life in the heavenly counterpart. As to the functioning of the imagery it may be added that the divine throne room has not only been turned into a court of law, but also into the central command post of the commander-in-chief of the heavenly forces (*tzeva'ot*). Certainly in the ancient Near East as well as in biblical narrative these two often go hand in hand. The judging of rulers and nations most often result in war which will either spell their doom or declare them victorious.

5.7.4. Conclusion

To sum up, it has been shown that there is a link between the use of the visionary sea from which the beasts emerge and the molten sea of Solomon's temple on the one hand and the primeval sea of chaos, or Mesopotamian *apsu* on the other. The connection with the temple implement is made due to its location vis-à-vis the heavenly throne room and the same applies to comparable heavenly bodies of water in other apocalyptic texts. The much later text of Revelation borrows much from the imagery of Daniel. It takes the symbolism to a more developed level by unraveling some of the various meanings that are still used interchangeably within the Daniel vision and placing them in a newly evolved context. In order to understand this development it must be recognized how much the imagery is spatially charged. The oldest layer is found in the Mesopotamian *apsu* which is at the same time the model for the sea of chaos which contains abhorrent monsters that constantly need to be kept under control but also of the temple vessel which symbolizes this same sea in its tamed state and the control of the Divine over it. As such this appurtenance appears in Mesopotamian temples and is also called *apsu.* In

Solomon's temple it appears as the molten sea and in the heavenly temple it is found as an animated actual sea which may consist of water or water-like substances and is at times mixed in with fire. As part of the combat myth it also functions as a judgment ground where the monsters of chaos are punished by the forces of the Divine. On the other hand, the rivers of fire and rivers of life-giving water that come out from under the temple edifice and specifically the divine throne go back to the four rivers that spring from Eden. Although this imagery ultimately also may be derived from the earth-water cosmology of the ancient Near East the rivers and the bronze sea imageries have split off from that basic concept and taken a different trajectory, which can be seen, for instance, in the evolving of a river of fire. I propose that this latter development served to indicate the different environments of the earthly and heavenly realm. Thus, when a throne room scene is presented with a river of fire and other fiery elements we are dealing with a heavenly scene. In the cases where a water course is described instead, an earthly scene or destination is implied.

The larger frame of Daniel 7 reveals an intense exchange in power relationships. It is shown that the heavenly domain is divided into various areas that are charged with levels of greater and lesser sanctity. This affects their accessibility accordingly. The degree of sanctity for these areas can be measured against the power level they represent. This pattern reflects the graded holiness known from the earthly temple. Thus, the center is formed by the divine throne, surrounded by the highest counselors, minor attendants, onlookers and finally, the periphery. The language used in 7:10 for the attendants that stood before the Ancient One [קדמוהי יקומון] is the equivalent of 1:5 where Daniel and his friends, once properly prepared are to stand before the Babylonian king [יעמדו לפני המלך].

The action that is described is heavily informed by the dictum that was introduced in 2:21, namely that it is God and no one else who sets up kings and removes kings. Within the narrative world this process is presented as being contested. The divine authority that is said to allocate kingship is confronted by forces who question His power to do so. These are painted as monstrously deformed creatures that rise up from

the peripheral area of the sea, which is part of the Firstspace of the heavenly domain. Yet, ultimately it is the Divine that orchestrates the entire action. The four winds of heaven break open the sea of chaos, which makes it seem that the creatures rise up by divine fiat. Furthermore, to a certain extent their entire self-assertion is manipulated from the outside, since they are told to do terrible things and are even given dominion. However, the creatures seem to overstep their power and are subsequently judged and destroyed. This Secondspace manipulation by the divine ultimately has consequences not so much in the heavenly sphere, but on earth, in a slow drawn-out process. There is a rapid succession of those that receive dominion and loose it. They are all represented by beastly images that mimic human characteristics. This picture changes when a number of true human-like characters are introduced. The first one, the 'one like a human being' [כבר אנש] comes in with the clouds of heaven (seemingly untouched by anything earthly) and is straight away brought into the presence of the Ancient One. He receives all the power and glory that are associated with rulership. Moreover, this is to be everlasting (7:14). Later, in the explanation of the angel to Daniel, it is suggested that this *bar enash* possibly describes a collective, since he says that it is Saints of the Most High [קדישי עליונין] who will receive this eternal kingdom. This is to happen after they defeat the beast representing the fourth kingdom with the help of the Ancient One (7:21-22). Finally, at the end of this long conflict, as the fourth kingdom looses its dominion, the power, glory and dominion is handed to a new group, the 'people of the Saints of the Most High' [עם קדישי עליונין] (7:27). These three groups seem to be intertwined, and even though they receive the same measure of permanent power, they are ultimately not identical.

This may become clear when we step out of the narrative world into the real-world of the author and a different picture emerges. The above was described from the heavenly perspective. A sequence of events that had not yet transpired on earth was laid out before a befuddled Daniel. Needless to say, from the perspective of the author, these events were in full swing, but also not yet concluded. An attempt can now be made to unravel the 'who is who' in this heavenly drama – even though there is not really a unanimous answer from among the commentators. One thing is fairly certain, however.

The group indicated by *qadishin* most likely refers to angelic beings. It has been asked by those scholars who prefer this as also descriptive for the Jewish people, how it could be that angels receive dominion, since this ought to be irrelevant to them. [282] However, John Collins has, in my opinion rightly, pointed out that the angelic forces under the leadership of Michael are the heavenly counterpart of the Jewish people. [283] This should be understood in the same way that other nations are also represented by heavenly princes. This also leads him to think that the *bar enash* is actually Michael. [284] The 'people of the Saints of the Most High', then, are the Jewish people on earth.

Thus, the beastly characters automatically represent the powers of opposition whereas those that resemble human beings are in the same league as the angels and under the protection of the Ancient One (God). These are not only to rule in a restored autonomous homeland but their rule is to extend beyond this in a glorious everlasting dominion. John Collins points out the consequences of the important notion in chapter 10, "where angelic 'princes' are said to rule the various nations. In the terminology of chap. 10, the kingdom of the holy ones means that the rule of Michael and his angels is extended beyond Israel to include the realms of the other angelic princes." [285] Once this entire scenario has been laid out, it is clear that there is no real autonomy, in modern terms, involved. In the end, what seems to be proposed is that God is (to be) the ultimate ruler who directs and dictates what happens on an earth where all

---

[282] The *War Scroll* (1QM 10, 8b-12a) is very instructive: "Who (is) like you, God of Israel, in the hea[ven]s or on earth, …. And who (is) like your nation, Israel, whom you chose for yourself from among all the nations of the earth, a nation of holy ones of the covenant [עם קדושי ברית], learned in the law, wise in knowledge, […] hearers of the glorious voice, seers of the holy angels [מלאכי קודש], with opened ears, hearing profound things? [... *You created*] the dome of the sky, the armies of the luminaries [צבא מאורות], the task of the spirits, the dominion of the holy ones [ממשלת קדושים]…"

[283] J.J. Collins, *Daniel* (1993). See the excursus with overview of previous scholarship on the identity of the 'Holy Ones' (313-317) and the meaning of the phrase in Daniel (317-318).

[284] *Ibid.*, pp. 318-319.

[285] *Ibid.*, p. 319. I would only take issue with Collins' description of Daniel's universe here. Concerning the national angelic mediators he states, "Such angelic mediators may seem superfluous to modern critics, but they are an integral and important part of the symbolic universe of Daniel." The point is that this *is* Daniel's universe and it is quite real not only to the Daniel group but its contemporaries as well, whether those who produced the Enoch texts, various Qumran texts, or the Books of the Maccabees. It seems to me to be clear that these all fervently believed this to be reality and to actually unfold imminently.

opposition has either been destroyed or silenced. This picture is very much in line with the later one presented in the New Jerusalem of Revelation and the various visionary stages in between. They represent not the total political philosophy of Second Temple Judaism or earlier biblical religion, although that trajectory is clearly available. What can be learned here is what happens when one strand of a total philosophy is taken out of the greater texture, is privileged, and takes on a life of its own. The proponents of this approach, often themselves in a position of Thirdspace marginalization and oppression, can then in a Secondspace act reformulate the entire universe. Their often justified frustration with real life causes them to turn to other forces for help. The result, however, is a vision of a society that is no longer truly human. They looked for a perfect security under the wings of divine protection in the face of the vicissitudes of ever changing hostile powers. This is in flagrant contrast to the visions of other contemporaries, with the Hellenizers at the opposite end of the spectrum. But even the Maccabean forces, who shared many of the concerns with the Daniel group, still envisioned a human society that stood on its own in seemingly a more equal partnership with the Divine in such a way that the Covenant principle could also be explained and carried out.

5.8   Dance of the Goat and the Ram and the Demise of an Evil King

Unlike all the other chapters that presumably are situated in Babylon, the narrative frame of this chapter is provided by the city of Shushan (Susa). [286] The opening references place Daniel in the third year of Belshazzar and in Susa. He says about himself: "I was in Shushan the castle, which is in the province of Elam; and I saw in the vision, and I was by the stream Ulai." As so many seeming historical references in Daniel, this one too has given rise to suspicion. Susa (Shushan), while an ancient and important Elamite city, was utterly destroyed by Ashurbanipal and only restored to its former glory under the Achaemenids by Darius I who made it into one of his royal residences. Seleucos I turned Susa into a Hellenistic city and renamed it Seleucia-on-the Eulaios, the latter the Greek rendering of Ulai. John Collins notes that this was an artificial canal,

---

[286]   City located in south-western Iran. For an overview of its history, see *ABD* VI: 242 ff.

already known from Akkadian sources. [287] The region became known as Elymais, the Greek form of ancient Elam.

The location of Daniel's vision in this chapter has given rise to varying opinions. The question is, was he physically in Susa, or was that reference part of his vision? John Collins cites a number of the opinions, and sides with those who favor the view that he was 'transported in spirit' only. According to Collins this view "is generally held by modern commentators." [288] Similarities between Ezekiel's spiritual transportation to Jerusalem while he was physically at the Khebar river add to this opinion. Donald Gowan, however, simply notes that the discussion concerning Daniel's actual location does not have much merit, since it "may tend to overlook the conclusion that Daniel is a legendary figure, and as such the author has simply placed him 'in Susa' and said nothing more about him." [289] Yet, when looking at the verse closely, another conclusion becomes plausible; not only because the text allows it, but because it makes more sense within the narrative itself. The verse reads, "And I saw in the vision; now it was so, that when I saw, I was in Shushan the castle, which is in the province of Elam; and I saw in the vision, and I was by the stream Ulai". It consists of five parts:

- And I saw in the vision
- And it was as I was seeing,
- I was in Shushan … Elam
- And I saw in the vision
- And (there) I was by the stream Ulai

In other words, the activity of 'seeing' can be understood as taking place in Susa. However, the passage remains ambiguous and ultimately it can probably not be determined what was in the mind of the author. In the end it matters little with regard to the content of the actual vision and Daniel's divine encounter.

---

[287] J.J. Collins, *Daniel* (1993), 329.

[288] *Ibid.*, 329. Collins names Josephus as one voice in support of Daniel having his vision while physically in Susa. Syriac Daniel favors Susa as being part of the dream. This is taken up by Calvin, and many modern commentators.

[289] D.W. Gowan, *Daniel* (2001): 118.

In the next verses (3-12) the actual vision unfolds and it is reiterated that the angelic being that Daniel encounters is also at the stream Ulai (13-16). To begin with, the structure is reminiscent of the introduction to earlier dreams and visions. First the reader is told where the dreamer or visionary is at the time that he has his experience. Then the reader is introduced along with the dreamer into the dream or vision. Further, since it concerns a vision here, rather than a dream, it is important that the appropriate surroundings are created. This can be a hill top, a tree, or a stream. It is not usually a sprawling capital city. The problem with this scenario could be, as Collins also notes, that this vision takes place in the reign of Belshazzar, and it is only in the Achaemenid era that Susa reaches its zenith. [290] He writes,

> The location of the vision in Susa, while still in the reign of a Babylonian king, is a clue
> from the author that the vision concerns the Persian Empire. It is integral to the strategy
> of the book that Daniel is supposed to see things that happen at a much later time.

However, that need not preclude the earlier scenario. Either way the reference to Susa as major capital city takes place under Belshazzar. Furthermore, the author was clever enough to emphasize that it was the capital of Elam, not of Persia. And that is indeed what it had been for a very long time. The problem would be that it had been razed by the Assyrians in 639 BCE and never regained its former splendor. [291] But it was certainly there on the map. In addition, as we are dealing with 'future history', the connection between Susa and the death of Antiochus III and the death of Belshazzar was the real purpose of stressing the location.

It is generally thought that the Book of Daniel was completed somewhat before the demise of Antiochus IV in 164 BCE. This is deduced from the fact that Daniel describes a different, and unhistorical, end of this king. [292] Collins deals with this issue in his commentary on 8:25 and 11:45. What is interesting to note, however, are the

---

[290] J.J. Collins, *Daniel* (1993), p. 329.

[291] J.G. Westenholz, ed., *Royal Cities of the Biblical World,* Jerusalem: Bible Lands Museum, 1996: 238.

[292] Collins, *Daniel* (1993), 341, 389-390.

following data that can be derived from the text and based on which one might wonder what may have prompted the author to use them they way he did.

- Susa was an important city for the Achaemenids, not the Neo-Babylonians, prior to which it was a capital of the Elamite kingdom.

- It was also important to the Seleucids – even renamed after their dynasty with the suffix of the Ulai canal appended to it.

- The elements of Susa as an old Elamite center and the presence of the Ulai canal are noted in Daniel 8.

- Antiochus III was assassinated near Susa (Seleucia) in 187 BCE after an attempt to rob its Bel temple. [293]

- Antiochus IV also died in Iran, in late 164 BCE. Even if this salient fact was not known to the author/editor of Daniel, it is well possible that the example of Antiochus III (which must have been known to him) was turned into a wished for reality with regard to Antiochus IV. On the real circumstances of the latter's death, see Collins on 11:45.

- Dating the chapter to Belshazzar, who is unconnected to Susa, might also reinforce the wish of an imminent violent death of Antiochus IV and using that of his predecessor as an example. After all, in Daniel 5 Belshazzar meets a similar end as does Antiochus III after an act of desecration. [294]

---

[293] *Ibid.*, 381 for 11:19 and 389 for 11:45.

[294] The relevance of dating this vision to the reign of Belshazzar in connection with his sacrilegious act described in ch. 5 and the actions of Antiochus IV is also noted by J. Goldingay (1989: 206). Although he also concludes that this connection with Belshazzar implies the hope for a similar fate for Antiochus, he does not address the question why this episode is situated in Susa in the first place. Although he notes the death of Antiochus III at Susa earlier on, he misses the importance of the circumstances of his demise (1989: 219). A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White write about the pitfalls of Antiochus III and his continuous being strapped for cash because of heavy annual tribute he had to pay Rome. He resorted therefore to removing temple treasuries. "This was done by both Antiochus III and Antiochus IV in Elymais at terrible cost to themselves (i.e. deaths) in Iran." *From Samarkhand to Sardis. A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire.* London: Duckworth, 1993: 215. See also the classical sources cited there. See also J. Goldstein, *II Maccabees* [AB 41a], New York: Doubleday, 1983: 368. Further, R. Doran, *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees* [CBQMS 12]. Washington, DC: The Catholic Bible Association of America, 1981: 6-7 on the possible confusion of the accounts of the death of Antiochus III and IV. See also S. Weitzman, "Plotting Antiochus's Persecution," *JBL* 123(2004): 219-234 (p. 230, fn. 45).

It becomes clear that interpreters have had to perform many complicated acrobatics to place this chapter in 'its proper historical context'. And this is exactly why they have not been successful. Who is to say that the author wanted to produce proper history? What if he produced a fictional situation to elucidate another historical reality, outside of the narrative world of Daniel? If read in the traditional manner a collision takes place of what literary theorist Lubomír Doležel [295] calls actual-world and fictional-world encyclopedias. The interpreters come to the text expecting the information that pertains to the perceived real world to conform to what they know of it. Therefore, when suddenly time or place seem partly out of joint, a tour de force is necessitated to harmonize the information or attribute it to mistakes and, in the process, lose the intention of the story. Following Doležel's analysis we can understand the opening passage in chapter 8 to provide a situation of what he calls "minimal departure … because the fictional and the actual-world encyclopedia overlap to a large degree. Fantastic fiction provides us with numerous examples of fictional encyclopedias that contradict the actual-world counterpart, as any visitor to the nonnatural or supernatural worlds quickly discovers. As he or she crosses from the natural into the nonnatural world, his or her encyclopedia has to be modified. The visitor has to learn the encyclopedia of the alien world." [296] This not only applies to the reader, but also to the narrative character that is reported to make such a journey. The book of Daniel contains a number of stories that exemplify this shift from textual actual-world to fictional-world (a possible world) and these cases provide both reader and protagonist the means, as a rule through the guidance of an angelic being, to cross the boundaries between otherwise strictly demarcated worlds. These usually concern traffic between the heavenly and earthly spheres. This chapter highlights the opposition between these two realms by providing for the reader an unexpected and very detailed setting, namely earth. But is it really earth? The opposition between realms is then continued for the protagonist in his encounter with the interpreting angel.

---

[295] L. Doležel, *Heterocosmica: Fiction and Possible Worlds*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998: 177 ff. See also chapter 3.5.

[296] *Ibid.*, p. 178-79.

As in the previous chapter, the reader is presented with yet another vision in which animal imagery figures prominently. It is very unclear where exactly the vision takes place. It seems that, much as in Ezek. 8:3, a case of instant (mental) transportation from one location to the other is described. And likewise, it seems to happen near a river (also traditionally a potent place for hierophanies); although the possibility should not be ruled out that the transportation to the riverbank was part of a vision beginning in Susa, which, as already pointed out, was situated on a waterway. It should be stressed, though, that expressions like 'located in heaven' or 'located on earth' are relative terms. Even if an earthly setting is suggested, such as in this particular vision, it is not the earth that Daniel knows and certainly not the earth with which the reader is familiar. Daniel is allowed a glimpse into a different realm which is temporarily projected or superimposed, so to say, on to the earthly setting where Daniel last found himself before the vision was initiated. In other words, it looked the same as before, but it was not. Although the visions that are described in the Book of Daniel share many elements in common, the conditions under which they take place do not necessarily. In the case described in this chapter, Daniel seems to experience a waking vision. It is not told that he was asleep in his bed and having visions in the night, or was simply dreaming. However, this only applies to the first part of the vision. While still in a visionary trance, Daniel experiences fear and falls to the ground (v. 17). This is followed by the pertinent notice that he fell into a deep sleep while facing the ground and, in that condition, is set up right by the angel (v. 18). The explanation that he seeks from the angel about the vision that he saw is received in a deeper 'state of altered consciousness.' The disturbing content of the angel's message causes Daniel to be unwell for a number of days after which he returned to his daily affairs without having reached understanding.

The vision is rife with spatial imagery including a conflict spanning the entire earth. Members of the divine household also appear and it is not clear whether Daniel only hears their exchange or also sees them, or whether he himself is still within earthly confines or transported to the heavenly realm. A little further into the vision he is clearly back at the riverbank in the company of none less but the archangel Gabriel

who is commanded to explain the vision to Daniel. He is clearly understood by Daniel as not being a real man, but only appearing as one – or as we would suggest today: a virtual man. The identity of the voice is not elaborated upon, but clearly it must have belonged to a force superior to Gabriel – and that leaves few candidates. Was it the voice of the Ancient of Days? In any case, Daniel is here given a time schedule for the unfolding of the effectuation of the victorious divine kingdom. Most importantly, the first sign of the demise of the evil king (generically all evil kings – but Antiochus in particular) is described. He is to be broken "without a hand" (באפס יד ישבר), a phrase which immediately recalls chapter 2.

5.9 A Prayer for Jerusalem

Chapter 9 proves to be an especially complicated text. It is particularly rich in allusions to, if not citations from, earlier biblical texts, Pentateuchal as well as prophetic.[297] Most commentators note specifically that the structure of the chapter, consisting of the introduction (vv. 1-3), the prayer (4-19), and the narrative conclusion (20-27), displays discrepancies in its theology. A typical penitential prayer with a Deuteronomistic outlook seems to be planted onto an apocalyptic and deterministic conclusion.[298] It will be argued below that this seeming inconsistency neither needs to disrupt the narrative flow

---

[297] M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1985: 479-491 traces Jeremiah's seventy-year prophecy through later prophetic texts and Dan. 9. He also provides a thorough listing of the allusions to other texts that can be found throughout Daniel's prayer.

[298] P.M. Venter, "Constitualised Space in Daniel 9," *HTS* 60(2004): 607-624 (at 613-14). So also, J.J. Collins, *Daniel with an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature* [FOTL 20], Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984, 95 and id., *Daniel* (1993), 359. He cites approvingly B.W. Jones, "The Prayer in Daniel IX," *VT* 18(1968): 493 who writes, "the calamity was decreed and will end at the appointed time, quite apart from prayers." Collins sums up the problem as follows: "[the] attempt to assimilate Daniel to the Deuteronomic tradition loses sight of a crucial difference between the theologies of history implied in the prayer and in the angel's discourse, a difference which has been well demonstrated [by Jones]. The prayer, like the entire Deuteronomic tradition, assumes a causal connection between the people's repentance and supplication and the divine deliverance… The deliverance promised by the angel, however, is in no sense a response to Daniel's prayer. It will not even come for almost five hundred years; moreover, the word went forth at the *beginning* of Daniel's supplication. The end will come at the appointed time because it is decreed, not because of Daniel's prayer or any act of repentance by the people. This deterministic, apocalyptic view of history is in fundamental contrast to the Deuteronomic theology of the prayer." *Daniel with an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature*, 95.

nor needs to be indicative of a conflicting theology and propose a resolution to the perceived tension between the two parts. Just looking at the raw data in the chapter reveals that it is as much concerned with place as it is with time. However, the temporal is subservient to the spatial. The gravitational center is Jerusalem and the temple. The temporal axis serves to transform the spatial into what it ideally should have been. The temporal, moreover, also serves to transform the ontology of the people, from those who sinned to those who repent and return (the word for the latter pair in Hebrew incidentally being the same, שׁוב). The temporal also functions as a beacon that flickers over the desolate holy place which will, one day, shine again with full force.

In v. 2 of the opening narrative, it is said that it occurred to Daniel that in the words of the prophet Jeremiah seventy years were decreed for Jerusalem's despoliation. It has generally been noted in the commentaries that the reference is to Jer. 25:11-14 and 29:10 where such prophecy can, in fact, be found. [299] Observing that with the defeat of the Babylonian Empire these seventy years should now have ended, Daniel is prompted to pray (9:4-19) that this might indeed be so and that the restoration of Jerusalem and the Temple may soon follow. However, noting that nothing is happening towards either a return of exiles, let alone a rebuilding of city and Temple, he is very concerned that perhaps something is amiss. Not wanting to blame the Divine, [300] this leads to the

---

[299] 25:11-14 is actually a pronouncement over Babylon itself. After the seventy years servitude in Babylon of the nations that surround Judah is complete, Babylon will be permanently destroyed. Chapter 29 is also known as the Letter to the Exiles. On the other hand, 29:10 is addressed to the exiled Judean leadership, confirming that as soon as the seventy years over Babylon are completed, the Exile will end.

[300] The process of not wanting to lay blame on a (failing) authority but rather oneself individually or collectively is often seen as one possible coping mechanism in the wake of intense trauma. See on this K.M. O'Connor, "Jeremiah's Two Versions of the Future," *Utopia and Dystopia in Prophetic Literature*, E. Ben Zvi, ed. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006: 86-104. She writes: "Self-blaming is a common survival strategy among people who have lived through disaster, trauma or abuse. … Self-blaming in the aftermath of disaster or trauma is 'an adaptive impulse' because it rebuilds a meaningful world even when that meaning later appears reductionistic or wrong because it claims that the world is not wholly random." Using the example of Jeremiah's parable of the broken family (2:1-4:2), she continues, "[I]nterpreted as a survival strategy, Jeremiah's version of the broken family reminds the community of its pre-disaster relationship with God and its former identity as a covenanted people. In the broken family poems God is angry and broken-hearted, neither weak nor overcome by more powerful Babylonian deities. This God acts according to the expectations of the culture. It was not divine failures or governance or power that brought the disaster upon them; it was their intransigence. Against expectation, the assumption that the disaster was their own fault offers the people a sense of agency. If they caused their suffering by their sinful life, they can also escape from it by means of their

communal confessions of sin and repentance (in Deuteronomic style), hoping that this may sway the Deity to honor His promise. The prayer is followed by a narrative conclusion (vv. 20-27) in which the angel Gabriel explains to Daniel that the exile is far from over and that it is not seventy years that were decreed but seven jubilees or seven times seventy years.

This last statement in which, in true apocalyptic vein, a decree has been cemented for almost half a millennium, seems indeed to be in stark contrast to the content of the prayer, which allows for a Deity who listens to supplications and amends His judgments accordingly. Most modern commentators recognize this and suggest that the apocalyptic element negates the Deuteronomic one, [301] rather than the reverse, [302] thus staying within the generally more deterministic outlook of Daniel. The subsequent overwhelming amount of chronological data and chrono-calculations has led many commentators to try and reconstruct the time line towards the past that underlies the text as well as attempt to calculate where the future predictions are supposed to end up. Not

---

repentance" (at pp. 96-97). See also the contemporary examples from other cultures illustrating this phenomenon in D.L. Smith-Christopher, *A Biblical Theology of Exile*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002: 80-81.

[301] E.g., J.J. Collins, *Daniel* (1993), 360, "There is an implicit rejection of the Deuteronomic theology of history in Daniel 9, although the author does not polemicize against it." L. DiTommaso, "4Q*Pseudo-Daniel*$^{A-B}$ (4Q243-4Q244) and the Book of Daniel," *DSD* 12(2005): 123, goes even further. He writes, "Daniel 9 is … an explicit, purposeful rejection of the Deuteronomic theology of history, and not merely an implicit rejection, as Collins states." He suggests that "the broadly determinist theology of history of the Book of Daniel is deliberately promoted at the expense of the Deuteronomic theology of history under which Israel has operated for so long."

[302] But see H.J.M. van Deventer, "The End of the End; or, What Is the Deuteronomist (Still) Doing in Daniel?," *Past, Present, Future; the Deuteronomistic History and the Prophets*. [OTS 44] J. C. de Moor and H.F. van Rooy, eds. Leiden: Brill, 2000: 62-75, who argues strongly that a prayer voiced according to an older deuteronomistic theology was indeed fitted onto a more general apocalyptic grid as a "critical reflection on a later line of thought – the apocalyptic school," since it failed to explain new realities vis-à-vis "the loss of the temple and adherence to foreign rule." (75).

Also P.M. Venter, "Constitualised Space," p. 614, who sums up, "Most of the explanations offered by scholars either see the prayer as a correction on the theology of the narrative, or the narrative as correcting the theology of the prayer. He cites G.H. Wilson, "The Prayer of Daniel 9: Reflection on Jeremiah 29," *JSOT* (1990)48: 92, summarizing some of the attempts to resolve the discrepancy, who writes: "It is either a rather clumsy attempt to provide an orthodox, deuteronomistic corrective to the deterministic worldview of Daniel, or has undergone a metamorphosis and now serves simply as a substitute for a prayer for illumination." The last phrase attempts to reconcile the fact that the angel's explanation does not serve as a logical response to the prayer.

only has this proven to be notoriously difficult, it may not even be possible, [303] which prompts the question of whether this was the topmost priority on the author's mind. Could the chronological quagmire created in the text perhaps serve a different purpose? Most scholarly voices agree that the focal point for Daniel's author is the short period immediately preceding the Maccabean victory and the demise of Antiochus. [304] In other words, the angel's answer is directed at the original audience to explain why the exile had not ended but now it soon will. This creates a pivotal point in time from which to manipulate past and redirect the future within the narrative. However, that notion has not convinced most to let it rest there. Since this tremendous interest in the chronology was created by the singular focus of Jeremiah's seventy-year prophecy, possible connections with other parts of Jeremiah's wider prophecy of exile have been overlooked, passages that could shed light on the relationship between the two parts of Daniel 9 and also function as a necessary preamble to the later Jeremianic chapters. One such passage is found in the so-called Temple Sermon in Jeremiah 7, specifically v. 16. Here, God enjoins Jeremiah expressly *not* to pray for the people, as such prayer will be ignored by God. This, however, describes the situation *before* the Exile. In Jer. 29:12-14 we find that, after the prophesied seventy years have elapsed, prayer for the end of exile and restoration will once again be effective. Therefore, no doubt in response to this passage, Daniel prays fervently at the end when the seventy-year period has seemingly passed. As certain similarities in wording between Dan. 9:4-19 and Jeremiah 7 have been noted, we may safely assume that our author was aware of this chapter. Yet the broader ramifications of Daniel 9 actually being a response to this part in Jeremiah, have to my knowledge so far gone unnoticed. [305]

---

[303] As pointed out by e.g. J. Goldingay (1989: 231, 257, 267) who lists some of the pitfalls of interpreting the future predictions as pointing to eras far beyond the reality of the author in the 2nd c. BCE, calling them "exegetically mistaken." (267) However, this has been done by both Jewish and Christian interpreters, ancient and modern.

[304] N. Porteous (1979: 133-34) opines that "the author's original intention was not to provide any such calculations of distant events, but merely to reinforce his own conviction that in the immediate future God's transcendent power would manifest itself on his people's behalf. The relevance of the supposed revelation made to Daniel was confined to the expected crisis in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes."

[305] For instance, P. Redditt, "Daniel 9: Its Structure and Meaning," *CBQ* 62(2000): 236-249, who also ignores Jer. 7, writes with regard to 9:3-4a, 20 where Daniel confesses his sins and those of his community: "[n]or did Jer. 29:12-14 direct the exiles to repent, though it might be said to have implied

When the reader is reminded of the seventy-year period, it should be noted that at that stage in the narrative the end of this period is imminent and the author/editor of Daniel is asking almost in despair what is going to happen now. The opening verses of the sermon in Jeremiah 7, in fact, give some answers as to what is expected of a repenting people and an eventual definitively positive outcome is at that point not precluded. One could wonder whether not the references to the Exodus from Egypt, the disregard of prophetic advice, the general Deuteronomistic character and the role of Exile in Jeremiah 7-10 (and in addition, ch. 16) were not formative to the mindset of Daniel's author.

Thus, if chapter 7 announces at the outset of the exile that prayer and repentance will no longer be effective until seventy years have passed, and it is then effectively reinstated in the later chapter, how much more so would it be for Daniel that certainly after the seven times seventy years have passed, prayer would once more be answered. Both Jer. 7:25-26 and Dan. 9:15 introduce the Exodus from Egypt in relation to subsequent transgressions by the people, in spite of the miraculous deeds displayed by God. In the Exodus narrative this resulted in a prolonged stay in the desert for a full forty years. This was a permanent (if not preordained) decree that could not be countered by any prayer or penitence. It had to happen for a variety of reasons, one of which being to have a new generation that had not known Egypt enter the Land. This is not so dissimilar to the seventy years that needed to be decreed upon the people of Judah. Here too there is certainly a purification aspect involved as well.

It seems that the privileging of the temporal over the spatial in the study of biblical and Second Temple period texts has led to a potentially stultifying and static situation especially with regard to the genre of early apocalypticism. The consequences of this classical understanding as well as the need for a fresh look are well articulated by Jon

---

such." Yet, Jer. 7:1-7 expressly enjoins the people that repentance and amending their ways will prevent the destruction from coming to pass. When this does not happen, the people are again given the chance after the period of seventy years has passed, exactly in Jer. 29:12-14 to pray and search with all they have for the way of God. This is more than just "implying" a call to repentance: it is a direct response to 7:1-7!

Berquist when he speaks of the pitfalls that are involved when attempting to write a history of space:

> Any history of space immediately falls into the chrono–logical. Despite our perception that time is one of the four dimensions, it has received nearly all of the attention from the guilds of biblical studies and religious studies. For a century and longer, the historical-critical method has mesmerized the majority of scholarship, and even now I would assert that the majority of scholars have not begun to question the historical-critical assumptions that contemporary intellectual movements have eroded. Even scholars who strive to move toward different assumptions feel the temptation to explain processes in traditional, historical, time-based terms. … Although I do not support the neglect of time or the abandonment of history, I would rather that we start without sorting theories into a temporal order—even though that is inevitable. Until we have reached a better understanding of space, we will be at risk of losing our concentration on it, or letting space disappear into time once more. [306]

As noted, the presence of Deuteronomistic themes in Daniel 9 has been widely recognized. [307] There is a clear spatial aspect to this. In vv. 18 and 19 we find the combination of שם (name) with קרא על (to call upon). John Collins explains this in light of Deut. 12:5 which tells of the place which God will choose for a habitation and upon which He will place His name. Similar language as displayed in Daniel is found in Jer. 7:10-11, "this house, which is called by My name." [308] Moshe Weinfeld

---

[306] J. Berquist, "Theories of Space and Construction of the Ancient World," http://www.case.edu/affil/GAIR/papers/99papers/jberquist.html

[307] H.J.M. Van Deventer, "The End of the End; or, What Is the Deuteronomist (Still) Doing in Daniel?": 62-75. In his seminal study on the subject, M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972: 325, recognizes no fewer than ten instances of Deuteronomic language in Dan. 9:2-20. While most commentators have noted this as well, it generally has led to a certain measure of perplexity, since it seems to be in such stark contrast with the latter part of the chapter as well as with the general drift of the entire Book of Daniel. P.M. Venter, "Constitualised Space," 614, lists some of the options that have been suggested for the relationship between both parts.

[308] J.J. Collins, *Daniel* (1993), 351. Since S.L. Richter's recent study, *The Deuteronomistic History and the Name Theology*. Lešakkēn šemo šam *in the Bible and the Ancient Near East* [Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002] strictly deals with the related phrases of "to let His name dwell there", "where he will put His name," and "where His Name will be," derivative phrases such as those in Jer. 7:10-11 and Dan. 9:18-19 are not treated. Since, e.g., the passage in Jeremiah clearly occurs in a

explains this further with regard to Dan. 9:18-19. He notes the occurrence of the term in 1 Kings 8:43 as well as in Jer. 7:10, 11, 14, 30; 25:29; 32:34 and 34:15. "[T]he expression קרא שם על (in the sense of ownership and protection … is itself ancient … and as such cannot be considered to be deuteronomic. It is the application to Israel on the one hand and the application to city and temple on the other that makes the term deuteronomic." [309] The use of this particular language points to a deep concern with Temple, cult, and centrality of Jerusalem. But this is not the only indicator.

A spatial analysis of Chapter 9 thus reveals a strong focus on Temple imagery, but also sheds light on the social context of the author's reality, as has recently been shown by P.M. Venter. [310] He notes specifically that despite the obvious differences in style and theology between the three parts of the chapter (introduction, prayer, angelic revelation) what they do have in common, and therefore what binds them together, is their focus on the Temple, and "[t]he desolation of Jerusalem is referred to in the introduction 9:1-3), the prayer of Daniel (9:4-19) and the apocalyptic narrative (9:20-27)." [311] However, whatever the compositional history of the chapter, all three parts communicate the intense concerns about the desolated sanctuary and the city. [312] This focus becomes even more reinforced if the prayer in this chapter is seen against the narrative of Chapter 6. Firstly, it is indicative that both narratives take place under, most likely, the same narrative Darius and in both cases at the beginning of his reign. In Chapter 6 Daniel prays in the direction of Jerusalem and the Temple, something for which he is then punished. It is not told what the prayer consisted of. However, there are some very strong semantic links between two relevant passages. In 6:12 Daniel is said to be "petitioning and making supplication

---

Deuteronomistic context, and is one of the sources for Dan. 9, the link in the latter with the Name theology becomes clear.

[309] M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972: 325. This finding is affirmed by W. Schniedewind, "The Evolution of Name Theology," *The Chronicler as Theologian; Essays in Honor of Ralph W. Klein*. M.P. Graham, S.L. McKenzie & G.N. Knoppers, eds. London: T & T Clark, 2003: 228-239 (at p. 230-1).

[310] P.M. Venter, "Constitualised Space in Daniel 9," *HTS* 60(2004): 607-624.

[311] P.M. Venter, "Constitualised Space," p. 613.

[312] P.M. Venter, "Constitualised Space," pp. 613, 614 ff.

before his God" (בעה ומתחנן) while in 9:3 he is said to "seek by prayer and supplication" (לבקש תפילה ותחנונים). The root representing "supplication" in both the Aramaic and Hebrew text are identical, whereas the other two roots operate within the same semantic range. [313]

The question of the lost inviolability of the Temple is very much at issue here. Venter explains this weighty theological issue, also known as Zion theology, in light of critical spatial theory and in particular a Thirdspace approach. [314] In his words "[t]he city and the temple are primarily perceived as destructible and reconstructible constructions." He sees in God's destruction of the city and the sanctuary as well as its rebuilding and subsequent threatened repeated destruction in response to the people's behaviour, a Secondspace act on the part of the Deity who, being in charge of the fate of the city thus really occupies Firstspace. In addition there is the immense symbolism connected with the Temple as representing the centre of creation, and God's heavenly realm, as well as His dealings throughout history, "from the exodus event to the house of David." "It is the microscopically lived space in which the macroscopically [*sic*] space of [God] and his creation is represented." This perfect picture, then, represents the Thirdspace ideology of the Daniel circle. But the reality of the devastation disrupts the picture. Just as in 587 BCE with the actual destruction, the situation in the 160s has left the people with a sanctuary that for all intents and purposes had become unfit to function; this time because of it having been defiled by a foreign ruler. In either case, the people were bereft of their religious and national centre. The text is furthermore filled with references to liturgical acts: fasting, praying and doing penance, but there is also mention of the evening offering (v. 21). These are meaningful in the sense that they indicate a longing (and expectation) of these to continue, but also the verbal remembrance of them, much as would be the case later in history in the liturgy of the synagogue where part of the service consists of the recitation of entire parts of the Temple service. This process is

---

[313] J. Montgomery, *Daniel* (1927), 360, mentions the similar wording but draws no conclusions from it. Hartman & DiLella (1978): 241, do note the similarity, and in addition suggest that the notion of "turning my face to the Lord God" may reflect the prayer direction that is clearly spelled out in 6:11. Strangely, J.J. Collins, *Daniel with an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature*, 90, fails to mention that the root חנ"ן also occurs in Ch. 6.

[314] P.M. Venter, "Constitualised Space," pp. 619-620.

very much representative of an idealized Thirdspace perspective. Thus, again in Venter's words: "Drawing upon the tradition of the now defunct temple and focusing on the expected temple of the last days they experienced the place where they performed their liturgy as representative of God's heavenly temple. In this way they constituted the locus where they were as sanctuary where God's sovereignty is confessed. It is a generic space conceptualized as sacred space by their ideological conceptions." [315] By performing the liturgical acts outside Jerusalem, outside of the Holy Mountain – and this applies to both the narrative context as well as the historical referent – the place where this community practiced these, "was constitualised as holy space." This development in turn opened up possibilities for later break-away groups such as the one that would become the Qumran sect. [316]

It is of interest to note the spatial themes that would normally be expected but are lacking in Daniel's prayer: the graphic description of the destruction of Jerusalem and of the Temple. While implied, the terminology that is usually found in either supplication or lament texts is not there. However the cryptic remark in v. 12 describing the curse that has been realized as "a great evil," something that "under the whole heaven has not been done as has been done to Jerusalem" seems like a hyperbolic summary of, for instance, the seeming eyewitness account in Lamentations. Compare also 4Q179 (4Q Apocryphal Lamentations A), [317] the beginning of which text is strongly reminiscent of the beginning of our chapter 9, but is followed immediately by a detailed outline of the ravaging of Jerusalem, unlike Daniel 9. Maurya Horgan's suggestion concerning the possible setting of this poem is of interest. While not excluding

---

[315] P.M. Venter, "Constitualised Space," p. 621.

[316] P.M. Venter, "Constitualised Space," p. 622.

[317] On this text see M. Horgan, "A Lament over Jerusalem (4Q179)," *JSS* 18(1973): 222-234; J. Høgenhaven, "Biblical Quotations and Allusions in 4Qapocryphal Lamentations (4Q179)," *The Bible as Book; the Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*. Edward D. Herbert & Emanuel Tov (eds.). London: British Library; New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll Press, 2002: 113-120; A. Berlin, "Qumran Laments and the Study of Lament Literature," *Liturgical Perspectives; Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls; Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center... January, 2000*. E.G. Chazon, ed. Leiden: Brill, 2003: 1-17. On paleographical grounds Horgan dates it to around 30 BCE, prior to the Herodian period. Reference to the destruction of 70 CE should therefore be excluded (222).

the notion that it might commemorate the fall of Jerusalem in 587 BCE (which comes to mind easily as the language and content of the poem are so close to the Book of Lamentations), she thinks it more likely that the referent is the plundering of the Temple by Antiochus IV and the subsequent partial destruction of Jerusalem by Apollonius in the 160s BCE. She notes the similarities between the poem and the description of these actions in 1 Macc. 1:29-32 which even contains brief poetic laments. [318] The ease with which this text can be read in light of the first destruction as well as future calamities places it within the orbit of Daniel which is set in the wake of the first destruction but truly concerns the Maccabean era. This style remained useful also in the Rabbinic period where the pattern is repeated in the midrash *Lamentations Rabbah*, which by then included references to the destruction of the Temple by the Romans.

In Dan. 9:11, 13 the term תורת משה is mentioned twice. According to some this clearly implies a reliance on the authority of the Five Books of Moses. [319] Although this is not necessarily a proven fact, at issue is certainly a legislative text, which derives its authority from Moses. Therefore, even if we are not (yet) dealing with the canonical Pentateuch as we know it, some kind of proto-Pentateuch should be considered especially since the references clearly allude to passages in Deuteronomy and Leviticus. [320] The phrases are found in the middle of a penitential prayer informed by

---

[318] M. Horgan, "Lament over Jerusalem," pp. 222-223. But see A. Berlin, "Qumran Laments," (p. 10). She lists a few reasons why the poem need not be restricted to a Second Temple setting only to conclude that the most natural setting is likely the Qumran community that preserved it and read it in light of its own conflict with the Temple and Temple hierarchy of its day.

[319] P.M. Venter, "Constitualised Space," p. 608 ("'written in the laws of Moses' explicitly refers to the Pentateuch"). However, in his "Intertekstualiteit, konstekstualiteit en Daniel 9," *In die Skriflig* 31(1997)4: 327-346 (at p. 339), he cautions that the book containing the words of Jeremiah should not be seen as the canonical book that we know today, and neither should the "law of Moses" be understood as our present day Pentateuch. Either way, it must be clear that even if so, our author was clearly familiar with the proto texts that would become the canonical books. See, e.g., D. Rom-Shiloni, "Facing Destruction and Exile: Inner-Biblical Exegesis in Jeremiah and Ezekiel," *ZAW* 117(2005)2: 189-205. She convincingly shows that at the time of the writing of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, around and into the Exile, authoritative texts that we now know as part of the Pentateuch were already in circulation (190). It is therefore not hard to imagine that all of these, the pentateuchal as well as the prophetic texts were in one form or another available to our much later author/compiler of the Book of Daniel.

[320] Deut. 29:20, 27 (curse and oath), Deut. 29:20-21 (calamity, רעה). Other passages are Deut. 28:15-53 (with its curses when God's law is disobeyed) and Lev. 26:34-35 (applying Sabbath rest to condition of exile). See Redditt, "Daniel 9", p. 245.

the dreary condition of the Jewish people, caused – in Daniel's mind – by the disregarding and nonobservance by the leadership (and the people) of this same Torah of Moses. Incidentally, in Jer. 32:32 all layers of the population have sinned: the kings, the princes, the priests, the prophets, and the men of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Dan 9:7 reduces this to the kings, the priests, the fathers and the people of the land, with the men of Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem implicated in the next verse. The priests and prophets are curiously left out of the group that incurred the divine wrath. Lacocque's answer to this question is not really helpful. He writes, "The expression 'those who are near' (cf. v. 16: 'all who surround us') in v. 7 requires comment. It indicates that the original author of this poem was in Jerusalem and not in Babylon or Susa as in the fiction maintained by the Book of Daniel. Only a Judean author could simply affirm that the dispersion (important because it concerned several countries) was a divine punishment. *This also accounts for the absence of priests and prophets from the guilty social classes* [italics in original]." [321]

Concern for the wellbeing of Jerusalem, the Temple and the Land of Israel forms the almost singular focus of the entire chapter. This intense concern may be the reason that the author seems to reveal so much of himself as to nearly blow his pseudonymous identity as an exile living in Babylon, since by specifically referring to "the men of Judah and the citizens of Jerusalem" [322] a spatial-temporal conflict ensues. After all, how could Daniel be praying for the "inhabitants of Jerusalem" if Jerusalem had not yet been restored? John Goldingay observes that "even in the time of Nehemiah the city lacks inhabitants and requires a semi-compulsory repopulation (Neh. 11:2). The prose confessions in Ezra-Nehemiah do not focus on Jerusalem, despite the context of Neh. 1 in concern for Jerusalem, and the Jerusalem setting of Ezra 9 and Nehemiah 9. Although itself set in the exile, Dan. 9 thus contrasts with these. Politically, the city increased in significance in the Hellenistic period" (248). He notes

---

[321] A. Lacocque, (1979): 183. This is indeed odd, since 9:6 implies explicitly that the prophets spoke in the name of God and it was the other parties, the lay leadership and the people, who had not listened.

[322] Jer. 11:2, 9; 17:25; 32:32; 35:13 and very few other places also address the "men of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem." However, this is not followed by "all Israel."

further: "its Palestinian perspective *is* the author's perspective, and here he simply omits to conceal it" (237). However, having said that, he suggests a third option, which could potentially resolve the conflict: "The form of the revelation suggests it is a quasi-prophecy, whose setting would then be Jerusalem between the introduction of new forms of worship in 167 B.C. and their abolition in 164 B.C. (cf. chap. 8)" (237). Likewise, Paul Redditt, commenting on v. 7, argues: "[the] contrast [between near and far] betrays the place of origin of this prayer. The phrase *to us* stands in apposition to the list of people that follows. Within that list, however, the prayer distinguishes those who are *near* (i.e., those who live in Judah, Jerusalem, and Israel) from those who are *far away* (i.e., those who live *in all the lands to which you have driven them…*). It is clear from this distinction that the prayer was compiled by and for people living in Palestine for use in the temple." [323]

However, the very ambiguity of the language also allows for a very obvious explanation, which does neither harm to the narrative setting nor to the actual time frame. Daniel specifically includes in the "us" himself as well as the men of Judah, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and all of Israel, both far and near. The focus here is on people, and only secondarily on place, although at the same time the people remain psychologically linked to those places – yet for now the physical link is broken. When this passage is seen as (ex eventu) prophecy the focus on people too is understandable since, at the time of the writing, the Temple is out of reach as it has been desecrated by Antiochus.

It is, in fact, not the first part of the verse that is problematic. Another solution to the three demographic categories that are mentioned is that the author wants to highlight the unbroken unity of the people of both the former monarchies. Both the people of the Kingdom of Judah and the Northern Kingdom of Israel form the people of Israel. In the (eschatological) future it is hoped that these will become united once more. While the phrase referring to "those that are far off, through all the countries where You have driven them…" could reflect a 2nd century reality with a large and growing

---

[323] P.L. Redditt, *Daniel* (1999): 154.

diaspora both in the East, but also in Egypt and elsewhere, it is more likely that our author points to the past. By including Israel as a referent to the former Northern Kingdom, he is pointing to the dispersion of 722 BCE. The ten tribes of the Kingdom of Israel were scattered throughout the immense Assyrian Empire. [324] Hope had never dissipated that the unity of the twelve tribes of Israel would be restored. Thus, the text points both to the past and the future. The present of the author is secondary and remains at the level of subtext. In addition, the narrator prays in the first person singular and plural, which would include exiled "men of Judah" and the "inhabitants of Jerusalem" to which he reckons himself and are included in the "confusion of *our* face", [325] followed by "all Israel" that is indicated by the third person plural, namely "where You have driven *them*." This makes the exile of Judah by the Babylonians a part of a larger scheme that was set in motion by the exile of Israel more than a century earlier. With this in mind, the subtext of enduring exile becomes more relevant. The next verses revert to the immediate reality of the narrator and return to first person forms. The reference to "all Israel" in verse 11 is meant to be inclusive again of all the tribes of Israel. Thus, the entire history of Israel is encapsulated within a continuum of ongoing exile, which is explained through the seventy-year scheme of Jeremiah with its seven-fold intensification extending the exile right into the present of the author.

The reference to the exodus in v. 15 is placed in a context where it might put weight to the request for an end to the exile. Just as God led the Israelites out of Egypt into their land, so it is hoped, will He act again and bring the exile in Babylon to an end. The reference in Jer. 7:22 has an opposite effect. There it rather echoes the beginning of exile and slavery. Just as God facilitated the slavery in Egypt, so He also facilitates the exile in Babylon. Since the author of Daniel obviously was so familiar with Jeremiah's text, this cannot have escaped his attention. The thread of this verse may therefore also

---

[324] This too can be seen as a response to Jeremiah 7, which refers to the expulsion of Ephraim, meaning the Northern Kingdom (v. 15).

[325] Venter, "Constitualised Space," p. 609, notes that "the solidarity with his people" distinguishes Daniel's prayer from that in Neh. 9, which is for the most part phrased in the third person.

be implied: if the people do not act the way they should, it could happen all over again. The exodus theme is called upon to prevent it from being repeated.

In vss. 16-19, Daniel tellingly includes the Deity in his prayer. Not only does he pray for the restoration and well being of Jerusalem, Zion and the Temple, but he stresses the fact that these are God's very own city, mountain, and sanctuary. We may, perhaps, hear a faint echo in these lines of the intimate relationship between the gods and their cities as expressed in the much older ancient Near Eastern city laments. [326] Although in the older examples of the genre the citizens are generally the hapless victims of the whims of the gods and no specific reason is given for the destruction, the net psychological effect on both the human population and the lesser gods whose cities and sanctuaries are laid waste, is comparable. Ultimately the more powerful gods give in to the pleas of either the human or divine party, end the destruction, and effectuate restoration. However, another side of the genre, more in line of what is seen in the Israelite penitentiary prayer tradition, can also be seen. Jacob Milgrom cites the following example. "Human transgressions are widely thought in ANE cultures to be responsible for the departure of the deity from his sanctuary. Thus in a Babylonian stele, dedicated to the mother of Nabonidus (dated 547 BE), we find, 'Sin, the king of all the gods, became angry with his city (i.e., Harran) and his temple, and went up to heaven and the city and the people within it became desolate' (ANET, 560). Thus the sack of Harran (610 BCE) is attributed not to the attacking forces but to the failings of its citizens." [327]

To this we may add the findings of F.W. Dobbs-Allsopp who connects texts such as we see in Daniel 9 with "the theme of divine abandonment which pervades the literature of the ancient Near East." [328] He writes, [i]n mythological terms, a city can be destroyed only after its god has left. The vanquished used this theme (which includes within it the notion of divine anger) to rationalize 'misfortunes suffered at the hands of an enemy.' A defeated

---

[326] See e.g. P. Michalowski, *The Lamentation over the Destruction of Sumer and Ur*, Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1989.

[327] J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16* (Anchor Bible, 1991), p. 259 (cited within a discussion of the consequences of impurity entering temple spaces).

[328] See further under section 4.1.2, "Divine Abandonment and 'Godnapping'."

people preferred to attribute their loss to the anger and subsequent abandonment of their own gods rather than to the power of the victor's gods." [329]

Finally, what are we to make of the concluding vv. 24-27? As noted above, the deterministic character of the passage is seen in the fact that the initial seventy years and the subsequent increase to seven weeks of years had been preordained from the beginning of the Exile. A general comment made is that the explanation by the angel is not really a response to Daniel's prayer, because of the preordained decree. However, since it is very obvious that the end of the period laid out by the angel is imminent, the timing of Daniel's prayer is very opportune. Perhaps the concern expressed by the commentators should be turned around and we should ask, what would have happened had Daniel not uttered his prayer at this time? If we go back to the passages in Jer. 7 and 29 it becomes clear that prayer is always an effective manner to counter divine decrees. Only in this case, retroactively, it is learned that for the entire period of the seventy weeks no prayer would have ended the exile as perceived by those groups that adhered to the chronographical thought that we see displayed in Daniel, but also in Enoch.

However the general character of this prayer does not emphasize that God's decrees are final or that repentance would not be an effective way to try and have the divine decrees turned around. On the contrary! What happens in this particular text indicates that there has been a series of transgressions and each time when these were followed by repentance, forgiveness would follow. [330] Yet, in each case the people would again transgress. Daniel prays for a true restoration of all segments of the population so that God may forgive and restore for once and for all; that this restoration would prove the one that could last for eternity.

---

[329] F.W. Dobbs-Allsopp, *Weep, O Daughter of Zion: A study of the City-Lament Genre in the Hebrew Bible,* Rome: Ponteficio Istituto Biblico, 1993: 45. See also P.D. Miller, Jr. and J.J.M. Roberts, *The Hand of the Lord: A Reassessment of the "Ark Narrative" of I Samuel.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1977, 11. This is, of course reflected already in 1:2, where it is God who *allows* Nebuchadnezzar to seize the temple vessels.

[330] Contra J. Goldingay, 259, "The fact that the oracle issues before the prayer (and is to be fulfilled centuries after it) points away from the suggestion that relief from affliction relates directly to the confessional content of the prayer."

There is a short review of history – each time culminating in sin and punishment, repentance and forgiveness Daniel wonders how, again now in the second century, his people fell into this repetitive loop. He hopes, that this time around, the defeat of Antiochus, the reclaiming of the Temple, and restoration of autonomy will bring the long awaited era of tranquility with earth and heaven in sync and the cosmos in order. We should, therefore, not ask *when* Daniel was expecting the אחרית הימים to commence, but *what* he thought that would entail and *what was needed* to bring this about. Starting with the last issue, what was needed on the part of those repenting was the instituting of a program of social justice from leadership down to the common people. This is a point that is repeatedly hammered down by all prophets, also very clearly in Jer. 7, that was adduced earlier and throughout the rest of that book, all of which ultimately go back to passages such as Ex. 22:2-23 and Deut. 14:29; 24:14-22. [331] In this connection it is not unimportant to note that in chapter 4:24 Daniel enjoins Nebuchadnezzar that the only way out of the predicament that he dreamt would befall him is the alleviation of poverty! This entire issue is then wrapped up in Dan. 9:24 where one of the categories listed as constituting the renewed conditions is the "bringing in of everlasting righteousness" (להביא צדק עלמים). [332]

Having addressed the question of what needed to be done, we can now move to the matter of what was expected. This may be approached at a number of levels by the exceedingly moving passage of Isa. 60:20-22 (which is part of a longer eschatological vision). We find herein a concise vision of a perfect future (in a temporal sense) or perfect place (in a spatial, utopian sense). V. 22c contains the perplexing phrase that

---

[331] On the relationship between these phrases in Deut. and Ex., see M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*, "Humanism," 282-297 (esp. pp. 288-289). For more occurrences within Deut., see p. 356, # 6. Further e.g. Is. 9-10. Zech. 7:8-10 likewise connects the lack of care for the weak in society with the refusal of God to listen to them any longer (7:13) and the resulting exile as punishment. In 8:16-17 it is then pointed out to the people that their society will eventually be restored if they execute justice. See further the entry *'almanah* (widow) in *TDOT* 1: 287-291. See on the relationship between acceptable sacrifices and social justice also Mal. 2:13.

[332] On this phrase see D. Dimant, "The Seventy Weeks Chronology (Dan 9,24-27) in the Light of New Qumranic Texts," *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*, 1993: 57-76 (at p. 60).

God "will hasten [the fulfillment of the prophecy] in its time (בעתה אחישנה)" [333] The Soncino commentary notes here: "When the appointed hour of deliverance has struck. The Rabbis detected an apparent contradiction in the last clause: if an event is to happen *in its time*, how can God *hasten it?* They explain: if Israel is worthy, God will hasten its coming; if not, it will happen *in its* (destined) *time*. [Italics in original]." [334] Apart from the main focus of her study, namely the Pseudo-Ezekiel text from Qumran (4Q385), Dimant uses a number of pseudepigrapha to illustrate the issue of time curtailing or acceleration. These are specifically 4 Ezra (4:33-36, 6:59) and 2 Baruch (24:4; 41) in which the seer asks the question "when these will be." Along these lines Dan. 8:13 and 12:6 are also mentioned. (543). However, it should be pointed out that in the latter it is not the seer, but a minor angel asking the question to one superior in rank! Also, the earlier documents listed here are some two hundred and fifty years later than the Daniel text. Much must have changed in outlook between the Antiochene crisis and the actual destruction of the Temple and the city by the Romans. Thus, the points of view of the authors of the Ezra and Baruch pseudepigraphical works and the one of Daniel were directed towards differing 'future histories'. Daniel does not mention the notion of the hastening of redemption, whereas the other two texts struggle with the concept within an intricate dialogue between the seer and the angel. Perhaps the reason may be found in the notion that for Daniel, indeed the redemption was so imminent that a further time-curtailing was not necessary. The author only had to account for the fact that it had not happened earlier in the past. The past he could not change, but the future lay wide open. Here the promised renewal of

---

[333] On the notion of time acceleration to bring the moment of restoration (national or individual) closer in the context of Qumran, see D. Dimant, "Resurrection, Restoration, and Time-Curtailing in Qumran, Early Judaism, and Christianity," *RQ* 19(2000)nr. 76: 527-548.

[334] A. Cohen, *Isaiah* [The Soncino Books of the Bible], New York: Soncino Press, 1949: 297. J. Blenkinsopp (*Isaiah*, AB, 2003: 218) misses the point entirely, and in my opinion turns it flatly on its head, ignoring completely the drift of the verb חו"ש, when he writes: "All that has been described will indeed come about, it is guaranteed by the simple self-declaration 'I am [the Lord],' but it will come about in God's good time, meaning at its appointed and predestined time (*be-'itti*). Only God knows the day and the hour. This is the only answer to the dismay and perplexity of people at that time, and at other times, faced with the 'delay of the parousia' and the silence and absence of God in the troubled affairs of humanity."

individual repentance and responsibility could be activated again as promised in Jeremiah 29.

The seventy weeks of years is a symbolic time frame, which is superimposed on the actual historical sequence of events, the exact details of which may no longer have been known to the author. [335] However, even if they were known, they were not of real interest to him, since he was measuring in cosmic time. Therefore, while clear allusions to real-time events are made, and roughly the correct sequence of events is followed, the number of years between them is irrelevant. A similar process can be seen in the Rabbinic chronography *Seder Olam Rabba*, which, among other things, compresses the Persian period to a mere thirty years. This is not only because, likely, the author was not aware of the historical detail, but rather because he had a chronological agenda. These chronographies are more concerned about the future; and thus the past can be freely adjusted to fit the future expectation. The overwhelming religious importance that was attached to the concepts of sabbatical and jubilee years would become the structure by which to measure in what they ultimately had to say about the relationship between the people and the Land. This can be seen from their integration and reapplication in later texts and finally in Daniel as well. It becomes clear that the rather practical rules

---

[335] J. Goldingay (257-258), too, is of the opinion that not only is it not possible to recover a historically sound time frame from Daniel's chronological data and therefore to predict (after the fact!) when the end of the period of hardship would be inaugurated, he thinks that this was never the intention of the text. The author was not writing a chronology, but a chronography. The periods of jubilees "do not necessarily correspond numerically to chronological periods." They are rather of symbolic and cosmological import. N. Porteous (1979: 134) considers the attempts to reconstruct any historically sound chronology from Daniel as based on "wrong-headed arithmetical calculations" on the part of Daniel's author who had mixed it up with divine revelation. In a recent article, G. Athas deconstructs the 70 weeks of years scheme by suggesting that the weeks are not to be understood as running consecutively but rather in part concurrently. He sees the 70-years math primarily as a narrative device, in the sense that the author is working back from his own present and in order to have the cake (i.e., 7x70 years) and eat it too (i.e., it has to match a few crucial historical markers) he needs to crunch it and make the three separately mentioned time frames happen partly concurrently, rather than consecutively. Counting back from his present he would indeed land in c. 653, which is a year that is meaningless in either the lives of Jehoiakim or Nebuchadnezzar (probably not yet born); there was no assault on Jerusalem, and most importantly, the alter ego of the author too was not yet (even narratively) born. Counting in the other direction would stretch the time frame beyond his own present into his future. Since I also think that all the math is meant to indicate a very imminent redemption and does not refer to an undisclosed future (from the point of view of the author and addressees), Athas' calculation would indeed solve this conundrum. Thus, the starting date of 606/5 BCE for the entire narrative in 1:1 is arrived at artificially as at least fitting the sequence of the following events, even though in real time history no such events happened at this particular point in time. See his "In Search of the Seventy "Weeks" of Daniel 9," *JHS Online* 9(2009).

formulated in pentateuchal texts, gained new meanings in the later prophetic texts and Chronicles. Once the seventy years became attached to the duration of the Exile in Jeremiah 25, Chronicles no longer saw it as simply meaning seventy years but reformulated it to mean ten sabbatical years connecting it to the text in Leviticus 26. [336] Once that step had been taken and the desired restoration had not been fully realized, it was a minor leap for a later text like Daniel to turn the sabbatical years into jubilee years. By this time, this chronographical construct had fully taken over the writing of history. Not only was there a shift from the simple chronicling of events to penetrate their meaning, the events themselves became subservient to the time scheme itself. This can be seem, e.g., in the *Book of Jubilees* where the entire pre-history of Israel is presented in such a way as to fit the jubilees structure, with pivotal events taking place on the junctions between full jubilees. Likewise, in the *Apocalypse of Weeks* in *1 Enoch* the same can be observed. This system seems to be inherited by the author of Daniel who applies it to his future history cast.

For Daniel, the only relevant point in time was his own present from which he counted backward in order to impact his *immediate* future. After all, events where still unfolding at the time of his writing. The only reason that later readers were able to usurp his vague predictions was because they had not happened, which they could interpret as having not happened *yet*.

Seen in this light the traditional obstacles encountered by interpreters can be overcome. Clarity will be reached when the temporal becomes informed by the spatial, rather than the other way around. Thus, once the spatial parameters are established the temporal dimension of the narrative falls into place.

---

[336] See on the process of the reworking of earlier texts specifically in 2 Chron. 36:21, S. Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*. [OTL] Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993: 1075-1076.

5.10 Virtual War Games / Star Wars

The first scene in the chapter describes Daniel purifying himself initially to mourn the hard times that seem to have arrived. [337] Yet at the same time his ritual preparations enable him to receive major visions. Again we find him at a riverbank, now indeed physically so, at the bank of the Tigris [338] [הנהר הגדול]. [339] Here he sees a man dressed in what must have looked like the attire of a high priest, but in addition, this being is

---

[337] The mourning that is described in v. 2-3 does not imply that Daniel was observing a complete fast for three weeks (as is implied by Slotki [1951: 80], Collins [1993: 372], Gowan [2001: 143]). It merely points to the notion that he ate and drank the minimum required to sustain his health and it likely resembled more the diet that he requested in chapter 1. See e.g. Longman III (1999: 247), Seow (2004: 155) who note the same pattern for the passage here and the beginning of chapter 1. He suggests that this was not part of his long-term diet but would be undertaken in special circumstances in order to effectuate an urgent communication with the Divine. This would often also be accompanied with prayer (as indicated in v. 12). See also the medial solution of Lucas (2002: 274) who, based on other examples, suggests that a "fast is not always total." This is somewhat problematic, however, since the term typically applied to indicate a fast (צום) as in Dan. 9:3 is not found here. Moreover, a 'complete fast' and 'partial abstention' are not identical and although their function may overlap they do not necessarily serve the same purpose. See *TDOT*, vol. 12: 298. Despite the suggestion in the entree צום, that also partial abstinence is included under this term, all cases in the Hebrew Bible can be understood as referring to full fasts.

[338] Although the reason for his presence near the Tigris is not given, the preceding narratives have sufficiently indicated that Daniel, as a prominent government functionary, often traveled on the king's behalf. Since *nahar hagadol* usually indicates the Euphrates, most commentators believe (also based on the Syriac version which has Euphrates) that Tigris here is a mistake. Collins (1993, *ad loc.*) agrees with this position since Daniel was most likely situated in Babylon. Another possibility to be considered is that perhaps this is a reference to the reality of the author's day, however, namely Seleucia-on-the-Tigris. This was the city constructed by Seleucus I around 305 BCE to replace Babylon as royal capital. This part of the Tigris was connected with a canal to the Euphrates. The city was officially known as 'city of kingship' (*āl šarrūti*) in accordance with Assyrian and Babylonian usage. See S.M. Sherwin-White, "Babylonian Chronicle Fragments as a Source for Seleucid History," *JNES* 42(1983): 265-270 (269-270). See also, *id.*, "Seleucid Babylonia: a Case Study for the Installation and Development of Greek Rule," *Hellenism in the East*. A. Kuhrt & S. Sherwin-White, eds. London: Duckworth, 1987: 1-31 (at 18-20). See also T. Boiy's important study, *Late Achaemenid and Hellenistic Babylon*. [OLA 136] Louvain: Peeters, 2004, pp. 135-136 where he shows the consequences of the shift in importance of the Euphrates to the Tigris on their respective urban environments and the function of the canal connecting both rivers.

It is of interest that Calvin (ca. 1570) in his commentary on the passage considers the possibility that Daniel was either transported in spirit to the riverbank or that he was given a glimpse of that region through divine intervention. He suggests that the fasting and abstaining from pleasant things may have contributed to bringing him in the proper state for this.

[339] D. Halperin observes an important connection here in 10:4 but also in 8:2 with Ezekiel 1:1. In all three passages the seers receive their visions while at a river bank. "like Ezekiel (1:28-2:2) , he reacts by falling on his face, and a supernatural agency must set him on his feet (8:17-18, 10:9-11). His delayed reaction, like Ezekiel's (3:15), is to fall into a stupor (8:27). In 10:18-19, he describes how an angel 'strengthens' him, using the root *hzq* [חז"ק] five times in two verses; this repetition … leads me to suspect that the author is subtly alluding to Ezekiel's name, *Yehezqel*, 'God strengthens." In addition he notes that the 'River Chebar' in Ezekiel means 'the great river' in Akkadian and it suggests that it is "perhaps more than coincidence that Daniel 10:4 uses this phrase of the Tigris." *Faces of the Chariot*, 75.

luminous (5-6). [340] It is stressed that only Daniel sees the vision, although his companions sensed a great dread which caused them to flee. [341] The vision that Daniel undergoes seems to happen in real space and real time. However, a peculiar visionary device is also applied in this section. Daniel is to experience a vision within a vision. At first he is at the river bank accompanied by a number of otherwise unspecified people. He lifts up his eyes and sees the man who, it turns out, is only observed by himself. As the vision continues, Daniel faints and ultimately falls into a deep sleep. It is then, when the vision has turned into a dream, that the man's hand touches him and raises him up. [342] The rest of the conversation takes place at this level. Within the dream, Daniel once more grows faint and dumb (v. 15), upon which another one looking like a man restores him. Throughout this chapter we learn how complex the direct communication between an earthly and heavenly being is. The author is very careful to show each time at which plane of consciousness the narrative takes place. The intensity of the vision increases as Daniel enters into a deeper altered state of consciousness. [343]

---

[340] Even though the angelic being is not identified by name here, it is generally assumed that he is Gabriel. See Collins (1993: 373). C. Rowland disagrees and suggests, especially in light of the similarities with Ezek. 1, that the heavenly being is a manifestation of the divine *kavod* and that Daniel more likely experiences a theophany. He notes furthermore the Peshitta of Dan. 10:5, which reads, "And behold, a man who was clothed with clothes of honour, and his loins girt with honour of glory. And his look was changed and he had no form." See "A Man Clothed in Linen: Daniel 10:6 ff. and Jewish Angelology," *JSNT* 24(1985): 99-110 (at pp. 100, 109-109). The added notion of *kavod* can possibly be connected with its meaning of 'radiance' or 'splendor' to emphasize the notion of luminosity suggested in the MT. The description of the angel's external attributes contains some elements of priestly attire and otherwise recalls the luminous character often associated with heavenly beings. As portrayed in Exodus 34 with regard to Moses, we know that human beings can also partake of the heavenly luminosity. Since priests are the officers who maintain the connection between the earthly and heavenly realms, they too may become subject to developing this radiance. An example predating Daniel by several decennia comes to mind in Ben Sira's description of Simon the High Priest (50:5-11). Aristeas (96-99) emphasizes that beholding the glory of the High Priest in his magnificent vestments is like stepping from this world into another one. On many of these issues, see most recently, J. Angel, "Victory in Defeat: The Image of the Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls," (Diss., New York University, 2008). See also M. Himmelfarb, "A Kingdom of Priests," (1997): 103-104.

[341] Cf. Dan. 3:25 when Nebuchadnezzar alone sees a fourth 'man' in the fire with Mishael. Hananiah and Azariah. See further fn. 167 above.

[342] cf. 1 Kgs 19, which reports a similar instance with regard to Elijah.

[343] See also section 3.2: "The nature of Daniel's heavenly realm and its inhabitants." For a further explanation on the use of some dream state and visionary vocabulary and categories, see A.F. Segal, "Apocalypticism and Life after Death," *Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association* 22(1999): 42-63.

The narrative continues into chapter 11, since the same speaker as in 10:21 continues in 11:1 throughout the chapter into 12:1. This long angelic monologue ends in 12:5, when Daniel speaks again – but still within the vision. He now sees two more angelic beings positioned on either side of the river. In 12:13 the angel tells Daniel to go about his business until the wondrous times of restoration and beyond are manifested. We may assume (but cannot be certain) that indeed Daniel then wakes up. The heavenly being, likely Gabriel, says that he has come in answer to Daniel's prayer and he recounts the goings on of what must have been known as a political conflict between Persia and enemy forces of Greece. He refers clearly to the archangel Michael, who is traditionally seen as the acting commander-in-chief of the heavenly forces that fight on behalf of Israel.

The timeframe of this chapter, the third year of Cyrus, is the very last of Daniel's activities (notably extending beyond the first year of Cyrus as mentioned at the end of chapter 1). Since all three last chapters (10-12) are anchored in this year and in addition they offer a somewhat continuous narrative and subject matter scholars have been prompted to see these three chapters as a single narrative unit. The opening of chapter 11 in the first year of Darius the Mede seems to interrupt this. However, this is not actually the case. First, it is the angel speaking and his speech follows immediately upon the last verse of chapter 10, where he promises to reveal what will happen. Then, in chapter 11 he reverts back to the end of his revelation in chapter 9, yielding a review of history of what we know as the Persian and early Hellenistic periods. The review of history in this chapter and the next are clear cut and mundane, in the sense that they simply sum up the activities of very earthly powers under very earthly conditions. This is in stark contrast with the reviews in chapters 7 and 8 that are both symbolic vision accounts. Yet there is a important difference between the two. The first is part of Daniel's dream vision where he is allowed a peek into the heavenly realm. The animals that play out the future political events are highly fantastic hybrid creatures and are part of the heavenly, other-dimensional reality. However, the vision in chapter 8 is not specified as being a dream, and may well have started out as a waking vision. Daniel is solidly situated in earthly circumstances (be it on the real or an alternative earth) and the animals, though displaying strange behaviors, are simply

an earthly goat and a ram. In this way, the animal imagery that is used in chapter 8 to depict the nations and their rulers bears a striking resemblance with that of the *Animal Apocalypse* in *1 Enoch*, which likewise plays out on (*an*) earth. There is thus a clear progression noticeable in the nature of the messages that Daniel receives about events that will happen. These range from those communicated by means of the other-dimensionally and highly symbolic and fantastic hybrids to the earthly, but still symbolic well-known animals, and on to the matter of fact verbal recitation by the angel. Unlike the earlier visions that themselves needed an explanation or translation, we have now reached the part where the urgency has heightened and only the straight forward raw facts will do.

At the same time that the symbolic visions have made way for the angel's dispassionate summing up of the things to come, war is looming on Daniel's narrative horizon which comes even closer in the next chapter. Once we have reached chapter 12 the war has erupted in full force and from the great wars between nations the conflict has now zoomed in on Judea. This is where the story began and this is where it will end.

In order for the war to play out according to the divine plan that was just revealed to Daniel, we are introduced to the commander-in-chief of the heavenly forces, the angel Michael who will fight on behalf of Israel. [344] 'Gabriel' meanwhile explains to Daniel that he must leave to fight the heavenly protectors of Persia and Greece. All these angelic beings carry the title *sar*, which is often translated as 'prince' but in the context is probably better understood as 'commander', much like the angel who identifies himself as the commander [שר] of God's army [צבא] to Joshua (Josh. 5:14). [345]

---

[344] Some of the prerequisites to be taken by the human fighters in the 'holy war' are listed in Deut. 23:15 which emphasizes that "the Lord walks [מתהלך]in the midst of your camp [בקרב מחנך], to deliver you, and to give up your enemies before you; therefore shall your camp be holy [והיה מחנך קדוש]; so that He will see no unseemly thing in you and turn away from you [ושב מאחריך]." This notion may be recognized in the Qumran War Scroll as well.

[345] T.J. Meadowcroft proposes a different reading and suggests that the 'princes' may as well refer to "human figures as to participants in some celestial battle," based on the ambiguity of the term 'sar'. See his "Who Are the Princes of Persia and Greece (Daniel 10)? Pointers towards the Danielic Vision of Earth and Heaven," *JSOT* 27(2004)1: 99-113 (109). However, this ignores the fact that the term is not so much ambiguous but rather has a wide, yet clearly defined, semantic range, which makes his argument seem forced. One of those clearly defined meanings deals with the military. See *TDOT* 14:

In chapters 1, 9 and 10, Daniel was seen dealing with forms of voluntary food deprivation or even straight out fasting. Some of the rationales for these behaviors were provided above. These range from defiance (1:5, 8-16, refusal of the king's delicacies), to preparation of procuring wisdom or divine communication (1:17) or more generally an expression of a state of mourning (1:4, 7; 9:3). In conjunction with prayer fasting also serves to intensify supplications to the Divine for deliverance. However, moving from the fasting and mourning rituals at the opening of chapter 9 to that at the beginning of chapter 10 a new development takes place. After the sincere confession of guilt and the passionate plea for an end of the captivity in chapter 9, the angel tells Daniel that indeed this will happen but not without new trials and military upheavals. In the following two chapters the ensuing conflict is recited dispassionately by the angel. We see here that there is an association between fasting, mourning rituals and battle preparation. Daniel Smith-Christopher provides a convincing argument [346] supported by many examples from biblical pre-exilic narratives as well as post-exilic examples which all display elements that return in the relevant passages in Daniel which contribute to the proposal that Daniel is far from being the pacifistic text that it is often suggested to be. Gordon Zerbe distinguished between the concepts of strict pacifism (which would exclude taking up arms) and passive resistance (which would not exclude this at all cost). His conclusion that Daniel is definitely not rejecting every call to arms but yet projects passive resistance is probably too simple. [347] It is not a narrative of earthly and

---

205-206, *sar*, 2c. 'The Military'. The examples given there concern both human and angelic military contexts. For the rest the respective narratives are very clear on whether human or angelic military activity is indicated.

[346] D.L. Smith-Christopher, "Hebrew Satyagraha," 1993: 276-279. Aside from his examples of 2 Chron. 20; Esther 4:15-16; and the Temple Letter from the Elephantine Archives, the following must be added. I Macc 3:38-4:25 vv. 3:46-60 and 4:10-11, which seems to be in imitation of I Sam 7:3-5 and also Judith 4. Oddly, D. Lambert in his extensive treatment of the subject overlooks the notion of 'fasting as battle preparation'. "Fasting as a Penitential Rite: A Biblical Phenomenon?" *HTR* 96(2003)4: 477-512.

[347] G. Zerbe, "'Pacifism' and 'Passive Resistance' in Apocalyptic Writings: A Critical Evaluation," *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*. [JSPSS 14] J.H. Charlesworth and C.A. Evans, eds. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993: 65-95 (at 65-75, 93-95). Likewise, K.M. Lopez's statement that "Dan 7-12 advocates a passive response to oppression" is surprisingly uncritical in an otherwise insightful essay. See her "Standing before the Throne of God: Critical Spatiality in Apocalyptic Scenes of Judgment" (2008: 143).

contemporary military action, as are for example 1 and 2 Maccabees, which provide a straightforward history of the Antiochian crisis and the military response. Yet, it should be borne in mind that the perspective in Daniel is different. It focuses actively on the heavenly equation in the conflict and is concerned with causes and resolutions that work. Despite this, there are sufficient grounds to interpret the language and idiom used in Daniel as not just not being opposed to armed resistance, but at certain points even accepting its necessity (even if not openly advocating it). These points are duly noted by Zerbe. However, the issue raised by Smith-Christopher with regard to fasting as battle preparation throws a completely new light on the text, which would suggest that even if Daniel does not actively advocate human military action it at least covertly supports the fact that it needs to happen. The author's concern is with the fact that the forces are of uneven strength and that the Judeans are far outnumbered in warriors as well as weaponry. Therefore the losses to be expected are going to be very high, and victory will be unimaginable without the help of the heavenly armies. Furthermore, it can hardly be argued that the hope expressed throughout the book of the ultimate and bloody demise of the enemies through a violent crackdown by the divine forces is evidence of a pacifistic stance. Lastly, as pointed out in section 5.7 and 5.12, the role of the heavenly armies in Daniel has been grossly underrated and the covert military terminology indicates strongly that the author is situated at the defining moment where the, likely joint, battle is exceedingly imminent.

5.11   Mapping Future History

The opening paragraphs contain the continuation of Gabriel's discourse [348] in which he gives a further outline of the immediate future, namely the unfolding of the Seleucid dynasty and their conflict with the Ptolemies in Egypt. Reference (v. 16, but see also vv. 41, 45) is made to one of those kings who will "stand in the beauteous

---

[348] J.J. Collins (1993: 376) confirms that 11:1a, "And as for me, in the first year of Darius the Mede," does not function as a temporal introduction similar to the other chapters. That notion "is undermined by 4QDan^c, because this verse does not begin a new unit in the scroll. The date serves to identify the speaker with Gabriel (cf. 9:1)."

land" (ארץ-הצבי), a cognomen for the Land of Israel, where he will wield his destructive power. But he will stumble and disappear. Eventually the account reaches the times of Antiochus IV Epiphanes (vv. 21-45). The description of the Hellenizers and opposition within Judean society begins in v. 31. It is here, that a direct trajectory is made to the descriptions of the future life in chapter 12. The fate of the just minority will be difficult, but ultimate reward is assured. Vv. 36-37 (reflecting 7:25), describing the self-elevation of Antiochus, reveal a uniquely vertical First-/Thirdspace dynamic. Antiochus is not just content with the desecration (or revamping from his own point of view) of the Sanctuary in Jerusalem which indicates a political conflict fought on a horizontal level in which he represents a Secondspace power and the beleaguered loyal Judeans Thirdspace. At the same time he launches an assault against the powers of heaven in a vertical strike, by aggrandizing himself into a semi-divine being worthy of such contest. He does this by desacralizing the Sanctuary in Jerusalem, the earthly habitat of Israel's God and at the height of his actions by proclaiming his probable self-deification. While it may be assumed that his royal position was initially granted by the God of Israel as was the case with all other foreign kings in Daniel, he soon breached the political and power boundaries that were set by this specific Divine Secondspace act. By doing this, Antiochus attempted to take over as well the heavenly prerogative of (re-)designing Firstspace. [349] As if to prepare for the grand finale in chapter 12, v. 45 gives an account of Antiochus' expected demise. Even if the given circumstances of his death do not tally with actual history, which according to most opinions is an indication that the Book of Daniel was completed before his actual end, in real time his passing was indeed near. [350] Yet it is of interest that at this critical

---

[349] A famous example of a rebellious heavenly being who challenges the power of God is the well known case of Helel ben Shahar in Isa. 14:12. From Qumran we have the so-called Self-Glorification Hymn (4Q427 7 i and 4Q491c), a text with a seeming similar content of self-aggrandizement. However, even though scholars do not agree on the identity of the speaker the depiction is clearly within acceptable Jewish parameters. Thus, the depiction of Antiochus' hubris in 7:25 and 11:36-37 could almost be seen as a parody of the Qumran text.

[350] On the various reports of Antiochus' death, see J. Sievers, "Antiochus. Antiochus IV," *Encyclopaedia Iranica Online*, 2005, available at www.iranica.com.
     Towards the end of 164 B.C., "Antiochus died at Tabae (Gabae?) in Persis of an unknown disease (Polybius *Histories* 31.9; Porphyry, in Jacoby, *Fragmente*, no. 260 F56; cf. Appian *Syriaca* 66; differently 2 Maccabees 1:13-16). Most of the details surrounding the attempted temple robbery and death of Antiochus as reported in 1 Maccabees 6:1-13 (cf. Josephus *Antiquitates Judaicae* 12.354-59)

juncture where Daniel's fictional future history and the course of real historical events permanently part ways, the removal of Antiochus is the *sine qua non* for both to enable the unfolding of a great military conflict and the redemptive events that are to follow. In real history the Maccabean uprising is being prepared with as goal the cleansing of the Temple and the regaining of national independence. Although the Books of the Maccabees certainly do not shun language to indicate that the war was fought with God on their side, the action most surely takes place on earth and with real people. The subsequent outcome is also straight-forward and political. However, the literary translation of these developments in the Book of Daniel turns them into a mega-event of true cosmic proportions. As it does so, it builds upon time-honored biblical and later beliefs with regard to angelic participation in human conflicts and the role of God as divine warrior. [351] In this light it is highly relevant that the Book of Daniel (v. 45) situates Antiochus' demise "between the seas and the beauteous holy mountain" [הר צבי-קדש] rather than in Persis, the heartland of the Achaemenid Empire, which is more than merely ironic. The term [הצבי] *ha-tzewi* [352] was earlier invoked to describe the Land with reference to the actions of Antiochus IV in 8:9 and in 11:16 [ארץ-הצבי] concerning to the campaigns of Antiochus III and 11:41, with regard to Antiochus IV. This creates a direct and punitive link between his sacrilege towards the Temple and his lonesome death.

---

and 2 Maccabees 9 are legendary and cannot be used as historical evidence. From the Babylonian King List (Sachs and Wiseman, "A Babylonian King List," pp. 204, 208) it seems that the news of his death arrived in Babylon between November 19 and December 19, 164 B.C. This accords with the dates given by 1 Maccabees 6:16 (149 Seleucid Macedonian Era [began October, 312] = 164-63 B.C.) and Porphyry, in Jacoby, *Fragmente*, no. 260 F32.12 (Olympic calendar [01., began summer, 776]154, 1, i.e., the first year after the 154th quadrennial Olympic cycle = 164-63 B.C.). However, Granius Licinianus (ed. M. Flemisch, Leipzig, 1904, pp. 5-6) dates Antiochus's death to 163 B.C. (consulship of T. Sempronius Gracchus)."

[351] An important witness to the cosmicization of human warfare is found in the War Scroll from Qumran, which is likely contemporaneous to Daniel, and the later Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, in which the angelic forces are grouped under military banners.

[352] This had become a particular term of endearment to describe the Land of Israel, the City of Jerusalem as well as the Sanctuary. See *TDOT* 12: 236-237.

5.12   The Sky Is the Limit [353]

The first part of this chapter deals with the first pericope in Daniel 12, which contains the only unmistakable reference to resurrection and a life after death in the Hebrew Bible, albeit only for a select group. It is found at the beginning of chapter 12. Verses 2 and 3 read as follows: *2) And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to reproaches and everlasting abhorrence. 3) And they that are wise* [maskilim] *shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn the many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever*.

A few problems arise immediately from the text. To begin, since it seems that not everyone will merit what seems to be a resurrection or to shine as stars, who then are those elite who will? Furthermore, it says that "the wise shall shine *as* the brightness," etc. and those who "turn many to righteousness" *as* stars. What is the implication of the comparative particle here? Before analyzing these linguistic issues the historico-political groups that gave rise to the creation of the Book of Daniel should first be considered so that the identity of the resurrectees and the shining ones may be more clearly established.

The final composition and editing of the Book of Daniel took place in a time of turmoil in which Judean society was politically and culturally dominated by the Seleucids, the Syrian heirs of Alexander the Great. Its likely purpose was both the clarification of these turbulent times as well as providing a glimmer of hope for the immediate future. During the 160s BCE, as the severity of this stranglehold on Judea increased, some Judeans showed compliance, some took up arms and others displayed more passive resistance. These groups can roughly be identified as the Hellenizers, the Maccabees, and the *hasidim* [354] and/or the *maskilim* (the Pious or Wise Ones). The ultimate fate of these

---

[353]   An earlier version of this section was presented at the AAR-Eastern Region meeting of May 2005 in Montreal.

[354] This group is only known from I and II Maccabees and the allusion to *hasidim* in Daniel is debatable. However, P. Hanson states bluntly with regard to the Book of Daniel that its "*hasidic* background" is an established theory. "Apocalyptic Literature" in D.A. Knight & G.M. Tucker, *The Hebrew Bible and Its Modern Interpreters.* Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985, p. 481. In line with this is R. Albertz, who likewise sees the *hasidim* behind the creation of the Book of Daniel. See his "The

three or four groups are reflected in the above passage. The identity of the righteous in this passage (and naturally "they that turn the many to righteousness" themselves must be righteous) has been discussed many times, but some commentators believe this applies to the martyred *hasidim* in particular, [355] although this identification is now mostly seen as problematic. [356] Others have seen in them the Maccabean martyrs who fell in the struggle against Antiochus and are likely those referred to in 11:34 as a "little help". In fact, the entire passage of 11:32-35 is reflected in 12:1-3 with the attaining of a luminous angelic state described as becoming refined, purified, and being made white. The wearing of washed, white clothes is generally seen as symbolizing angelic purity and luminosity. [357] John Collins points out that "Daniel 12:3 does not say that only the martyred *maskilim* will shine like stars. Presumably this is the destiny of all the wise teachers. Fellowship with the angels is the fulfillment of a life of wisdom and purity." [358] However, he does not take fully into account that the very act of teaching was an act of defiance as it specifically concerned the very teachings that Antiochus and the Hellenizers would have considered subversive and sought to outlaw.

Questions that this section seeks to answer are: what is the nature of the luminous afterlife accorded to the righteous? And what is the place of the astral imagery used in attempting to answer these existential questions? The matter of the theodicy that informs this passage, as well as its dependency on especially parts of Isaiah [359] will not be addressed here. Nor will the relationship between permanent burial in the earth

---

Social Setting of the Aramaic and Hebrew Book of Daniel," *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* I: 200-201.

[355] W.S. Towner, *Daniel* (1984: 182) calls them "hasidic saints."

[356] J.J. Collins, *Daniel*, pp. 66-69 for problems with that identification. See in that regard also esp. J. Sievers, *The Hasmoneans and Their Supporters. From Mattathias to the Death of John Hyrcanus I.* Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990: 38-40. See further Ph.R. Davies, "Hasidim in the Maccabean Period," *JJS* 28(1978): 127-140.

[357] E.J. Tigchelaar, "The White Dress of the Essenes and the Pythagoreans," *Jerusalem, Alexandria, Rome. Studies in Ancient Cultural Interaction in Honour of A. Hilhorst.* F. Garcia Martinex & G.L. Luttikhuizen, eds. Leiden: Brill, 2003: 301-321.

[358] J. J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination.* (2nd edition). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998: 113.

[359] Is. 26:19; 33; 53; 66:22-24.

(i.e., the residence in *sheol*) versus bodily resurrection be explored here. All this has been expertly dealt with by others. [360] This section will presume that those spoken of in the Daniel text are righteous, and probably died an unjust and premature death as martyrs in the struggle against the policies and forces of Antiochus IV and in defense of maintaining an undiluted Jewish life style. Thus, the focus will be on the astral imagery used for the last group in v. 3.

Returning to the observation of the use of the comparative particle *as* in v. 3, this "*as the stars*" has prompted some commentators to prefer understanding the phrase metaphorically [361] rather than seeing it as an actual transformation. In light of the wider Hellenistic culture and ancient Near Eastern cognates, I believe reading it as a transformation is warranted. [362] What makes Daniel stand out here is the amalgam of images and themes that the author was undoubtedly familiar with and wove together to create a unique tapestry from which a new image arose.

In the ancient Near East the notion of stars being the visual aspect of messengers of the gods was already known from Ugarit, a city state on the coast of Syria that was destroyed around 1190 BCE and which thus predates the earliest biblical texts. There is also evidence in the Ugaritic texts of divine messengers in conjunction with stars and light imagery known by the very designation of *mlak šmm*, which is quite similar to the Hebrew terminology. [363] In the Ugaritic pantheon these form the fourth and lowest level of a four-tier divine hierarchy. [364] As such they have no power of their

---

[360] See e.g. G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1972 [2006, expanded edition].

[361] J. Goldingay, (1989): 308; P.R. Davies, (1985): 117 ff.

[362] As does Collins very clearly as well. See his *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel*. Missoula, MO: Scholars Press, 1977: 136-138.

[363] On the occurrence of the term, see *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*. G. del Olmo Lete & J. Sanmartin. Leiden: Brill, 2003; p. 546. The most important text containing these references is KTU 1.13, "A Hymn to Anat." See N. Wyatt, *Religious Texts from Ugarit*. 2nd ed. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003: 169-173. Further, J.C. de Moor, "An Incantation against Infertility (KTU 1.13)," *UF* 12(1980): 305-310.

[364] L.K. Handy, "Dissenting Deities or Obedient Angels: Divine Hierarchies in Ugarit and the Bible," *Biblical Research* 35(1990): 18-35.

own, cannot display initiative, but only act by the command of higher divinities. However, the mythologies bear out that although these messengers cannot actually dissent, they can possibly malfunction. [365] Also, as they are under the control of the higher gods, and taking into account that the heavens are also inhabited by malevolent divine beings, it is logical that these evil forces employ their own minions of evil angels. When these categories occur in Daniel, the Enoch corpus as well as in various Qumran texts, it is seen that the dualistic character of their respective worldviews intensifies. In the Hebrew Bible we find a number of passages that bear out the Israelite response to or absorption of these ideas. One such passage is found in Job 38:7 where stars and angels are equated in a parallellistic phrase: "when the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God [*bnei elohim*] shouted for joy?" [366] The Septuagint modifies this to "when the stars were made, all my angels ['αγγελοι] praised me with a loud voice." The Qumran Targum of Job, the composition of which may date to the mid-second century BCE, [367] has "when the morning stars shone together and all the angels of God shouted together." The later Syriac Peshitta tones down the equation when it translates: "He created the morning stars together and all the sons of angels cheered." In all these cases we see that the biblical translators and/or paraphrasers grapple with the idea of animated singing stars suggested by the biblical text and resolve it by silencing the stars and making them shine (as they should) and make them even less autonomous by stressing the fact that they were created. [368]

A biblical example of 'malfunctioning' astral angelic beings may be recognized in the story of the "fallen angel" Helel ben Shahar in Isaiah 14 whose behavior is used there

---

[365] L.K. Handy, p. 24.

[366] Again, there is a parallel for this in Ugaritic literature. See R. Hendel, "The Nephilim Were on Earth: Genesis 6:1-4 and its Ancient Near Eastern Context," *The Fall of the Angels.* C. Auffarth & L.T. Stuckenbruck, eds. Leiden: Brill, 2004: 11-34 (p. 24).

[367] A.S. van der Woude, "Job, Targum of," *EDSS*, pp.413-414.

[368] J. Wilson, "11QtgJob and the Peshitta Job," *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery*, L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov & J.C. VanderKam eds. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000: 413-414. And see S.L. Gold, "Targum or Translation: New Light on the Character of Qumran Job (11Q10) from a Synoptic Approach," *Journal of the Aramaic Bible* 3(2001)1-2: esp. pp. 107-109.

as a metaphor for that of the King of Babylon. [369] However, the most famous account is likely that of the fallen 'Sons of God' in Genesis 6 who later became known as the Watchers of *1 Enoch*. [370] But neither of these suggest an actual transformation of a deceased human being into an astral entity. As far as the Hebrew Bible is concerned, Daniel seems to tread entirely in undiscovered territory. Yet, there are links with other, extra-biblical texts that contain similar imagery from roughly the same period as Daniel.

1 Enoch 104 is the text that is probably closest to the Daniel passage in language and is actually much more detailed, although there are some very significant differences in the content. For instance, the afterlife is described as the reward for the righteous in society in general who have been victimized by the wicked who have commited societal sins. The luminous afterlife is thus not restricted to martyrs. This could suggest that this passage predates Daniel and was not written during the height of the military conflict, much like the Wisdom of Ben Sira to which it also bears resemblance. [371]

The *Qumran War Scroll* (1 QM) describes a struggle between the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness. Angelic armies come to the aid of the human armies who are fighting an eschatological war. On paleographic grounds it is usually dated to the late 1st c. BCE or even early 1st c. CE and the contents are seen as directed against the Romans. There is, however, good reason for the assumption that the contents rather refer to the Maccabean uprising, placing the composition in the mid-second century BCE. In addition it is also noted that much of the imagery fits the other Maccabean related literature. What stands out in the first column of this text is the number of clear allusions to Daniel 11 and 12. [372] The theme of angels coming to the aid of human armies is known from elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible as well. Examples are Ju. 5:20

---

[369] See W.R. Gallagher, "On the Identity of Helel Ben Sahar of Is. 14:13-15," *UF* 26(1994): 131-146, for some suggestions as to where this enigmatic character may figure among ancient Near Eastern astral deities.

[370] See on this further section 5.3 above.

[371] G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *I Enoch I* [Hermeneia], 8, 427-428.

[372] See most recently the treatment by J. Duhaime, *The War Texts. 1QM and Related Manuscripts*. New York: Continuum, 2004. For the Daniel allusions, see pp. 65-72.

where the angel forces are clearly identified as stars and Joshua 5:13-15, where at the Battle of Jericho Joshua meets the angelic general in the form of an armed man. In the two centuries or so following the completion of Daniel, we find that both the military and astral imagery are developed much further and take a firm hold in the consciousness of the faithful. This is not in the least due to the fact that conditions under which martyrdom may occur increase dramatically during that period. [373]

The genre used in the passage under discussion belongs to the ascent literature of the wider Hellenistic east. One must differentiate however between texts that describe trips to the heavens of a seer in which he returns and those describing the final journey of a deceased individual (be it in bodily form or only of the soul). The same applies to the aspect of transformation of such an individual. A few chosen ones, such as Enoch, Moses, and perhaps Jacob, experienced temporary transformation into an angelic being during their elevation. After their return among the mortals, they lost that status (probably to regain it again upon re-entering the divine realm). The account of Moses' shining face, in Ex. 34: 27-35 following his descent from Mount Sinai is a case in point. He needs to cover the radiance when he is among the people and uncovers it in the presence of God. [374]

Some texts also distinguish between the fate of the body and the soul of the righteous after death. [375] Whereas the Daniel passage is suggestive of the transformation of the entire individual, others display this only with regard to the soul. Yet another category is found especially in a number of Qumran texts that describe the entering into the community of the righteous (or perhaps even the entrance into the Qumran group) as that of entering into the community of the heavenly hosts. [376] It will be seen however, that the superficial points of contact between these texts and those, such as Daniel, that

---

[373] In fact, part of the passage under discussion has found a place in Jewish liturgy in the prayer (*El Malei Rachamim* = God full of mercy) for remembering those who have passed on, including also those who were martyred during the Shoah, and those fallen in subsequent wars.

[374] See further section 3.2, The nature of Daniel's heavenly realm and its inhabitants.

[375] *Jub*. 23, *I En* 104.

[376] Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, pp. 147-48 and p. 167 points to e.g. 1QH vii 22-25. See also text in *DSSSE*, pp. 178-79.

clearly deal with post-mortem conditions, go deeper than just the use of similar imagery.

A related issue is that both in ancient Near Eastern and later Greco-Roman religions, which incidentally offered another venue of entrance into later strata of post-exilic Judaism, the heavenly hosts (צבאות) actually *are* the visible heavenly bodies. It may be doubted whether such is ever so blatantly the case in Israelite religion and later Second Temple Judaism – although a notable exception may be Dan. 8:10 which in turn shows links with the Isaianic version of the theme. It has been noted, "the gods are not simply identical with the stars; they are hidden behind the visible manifestations." [377] Although this quote was applied to the ancient Near Eastern pantheon, it seems to fit the later biblical approach better. One must distinguish between the use of metaphor and attributing actual independent powers to these bodies. While the biblical metaphor undoubtedly is derived from the earlier and contemporary ancient Near Eastern cognates, especially those of Ugarit, the images have been neutralized and made subject to the last remaining members of the heavenly household: the various classes of angels. There seems to be great reluctance in ancient Jewish culture to accord such values to heavenly bodies, and in fact, there are warnings against this in later rabbinic literature. However, this is always phrased in the sense that they not be worshiped. In Second Temple literature the same applies to angels: they exist, but are not to be worshiped. But the general attitude is ambiguous.

We may now further inquire, based on what we have seen from a number of control texts, what might be the lot of the martyrs-turned-star-angels. From both Daniel and the War Scroll we see that one of the functions of the angels is to fight in God's army on the side of the righteous (or, for that matter, in Belial's army on the side of the adversaries). If it is indeed the martyred heroes who will enjoy a transformed celestial existence it is likely that those very same heroes who will make up part of the angelic army will henceforth fight the heavenly war on the side of the righteous of Israel. In 1QM 1:8-9a the Sons of Light, also labeled as Sons of Justice, are said to be shining to

---

[377] Collins, *Daniel* (1993), p. 331 on 8:10, citing H. Bietenhard, *Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum*, 1951.

all directions of the earth, following their victory in the great war against the Sons of Darkness. They will do so in the company of God, whose exalted greatness is described as shining for all eternity. [378]

From Qumran we learn, however, that angelic forces also have a different function in the celestial realm. The *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* [*Shirot 'Olat ha-Shabbat*] describes the angelic liturgy as it is to take place in the heavens and it is assumed that the worshipers at Qumran followed this service in a synchronized way with their heavenly counterparts. It is clear that inanimate parts known from the Jerusalem Temple architecture come to life in adoration of the Heavenly Ruler. They become, in a way, living heavenly furniture. Dale Allison points out in a very insightful, but unfortunately little known article, [379] that along these lines a passage from Rev. 3:12 may be easier to understand. In it Jesus assures the faithful that they will find their ultimate reward in becoming "a pillar in the temple of my God; never shall he go out of it…." The prospect of becoming a static pillar does not seem quite desirable, even if it is in the Heavenly Temple. However, in light of the Qumran text, which predates Revelation by at least a century if not more, it may possibly be understood as transforming into *living* pillars, or another class of architectonic angelic being. Going back to the Daniel passage we could then probably safely argue that, based on for

---

[378] Unfortunately the first letters of l. 8 have been lost and various reconstructions have been suggested. Notably, not all support reading "and [the sons of jus]tice. For instance, D. Wenthe ("The Use of the Hebrew Scriptures in 1QM," *DSD* 5(1998): 298) restores 1:8 to read ['emet ve]tsedeq ya'iru – which he sees as an allusion to Is. 62:1. Y. Yadin (*The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962) reads [knowledge and] justice (d['at ve-tse]deq) and in his commentary suggests even z[iq uva]raq as a possible reading. In the preceding line he does restore "the sons of darkness." The *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition, Vol. I* (Leiden: Brill, 1997: 113), on the other hand, does have "And [the sons of jus]tice shall shine to all the edges of the earth, they shall go on shining ….," restoring u[vnei ts]edeq. This would juxtapose the line nicely with the preceding one that speaks of (again restored): "…and there will be no escape for [any of the sons] of darkness" – le[khol bn]ei hoshekh. This would allow for seeing an allusion to Dan 12:3 in this passage, following the *DSSSE* reading. In fact, that case could be supported by the fact that, as Wenthe himself recognizes, in the passage 1:1-7 a string of allusions to Daniel 11 is found. J. Charlesworth (*The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Texts with English Translation, Volume 2 - Damascus Document, War Scroll and Related Documents* [Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls – PTSDSS 2].also restores the way *DSSSE* reads it and adds a note justifying the reading by pointing to 4QM 6 frg.3. J. Duhaime (*The War Texts – 1QM and Related Manuscripts*. London: T&T Clark, 2004: 66) likewise understands the passage this way.

[379] D. Allison, "4Q403 Fragm. I, Col. I, 38-46 and the Revelation to John," *RQ* 12(1986): 409-414.

instance, the *War Scroll*, one of the functions of the angelic stars is enlistment in the heavenly army. An additional function, based on *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, would then be illumination of the entire area of the Heavenly Temple and thus function as divine ceiling lights. However, a curious fact occurs in this latter text. In 4Q *Shirot* (4Q405 20 ii 21-22, ll. 13-14), the angels are grouped in camps [מחני אלוהים] and divisions [דגלים], and appear as [פקודים] 'mustered troops' in a military style station [מעמד] and thus have a clearly military connotation, bearing names of categories known from the Hebrew Bible. [380] At the same time, they do not seem to have any military function. Yet, in conjunction with other texts, such as the *War Scroll*, the meaning becomes clear. Perhaps they were a standing army, which could be activated in times of conflict or crisis. [381] It is interesting to note that Baruch Levine, in his treatment of the terminology in light of the Aramaic Enoch fragments (4Q209 = 4Q*Enastr*[b] ar), does not sufficiently note the connection between constellations and angelic forces. [382] Even though he observes that similar terms are used for the latter in 4Q*Shirot*, with regard to the Enoch fragments he prefers a purely astronomical interpretation. While not in and of itself wrong, the meaning of these texts would become even clearer if it were recognized that in much of Second Temple literature astronomical objects and phenomena have become personified and therefore have also come to mean angelic forces.

The passage 12:1-3 implies that the souls of the righteous rise up and take their place among, or transform into, luminous heavenly bodies. The larger context of Daniel allows us to interpret this as not only becoming part of the heavenly household, but most literally of the heavenly Temple. All through the Hebrew Bible it is suggested

---

[380] C. Fletcher-Louis, "Heavenly Ascent or Incarnational Presence? A Revisionist Reading of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*," *SBLSP* 1998: 376-399. Listing on p. 368. See also, *ibid.*, *All the Glory of Adam*. Leiden: Brill, 2002: 427. On the application of terms of military rank for heavenly bodies (be they angels or constellations!), see esp. Baruch A. Levine, "From the Aramaic Enoch Fragments: the Semantics of Cosmography," *JJS* 33(1982): 314-315. For the occurrence in 4Q *Shirot*, Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, 320-321.

[381] Cf. also the notion of *tsevaot* or *tseva hashamayim* with its military connotations and in *DDD*, 428-30. Further, Ronald Hendel, "The Nephilim Were on Earth: Genesis 6:1-4 and its Ancient Near Eastern Context," *The Fall of the Angels*. C. Auffarth & L.T. Stuckenbruck, eds. Leiden: Brill, 2004: 11-34 (pp. 19-20).

[382] But Levine, "From the Aramaic Enoch Fragments," *JJS* 33(1982): 311-326 (at 313 and 325).

that the heavens are the domain of the divine. It is only in the later texts though that we are permitted a glimpse inside of that domain. The Book of Daniel is one of those, even if not the most blatant one, that guides the readers through the heavenly courtroom and lets them participate in the proceedings that take place there. Having traced the possible backgrounds and meanings of the imagery used, it could now possibly be argued from the passage under discussion that the visible universe was considered to be the heavenly temple and that it could in fact be approached under certain circumstances. It was also an anchor, which ideally would be synchronized with an earthly temple in Jerusalem, but even if that place was not able to function, the heavenly counterpart could be relied on to be there. It has moreover been demonstrated that the heavenly temple, while never static by its very nature, at times could function as a heavenly command post from which the fiery angelic warriors would sweep down to earth to aid in the struggles of their human counterparts, the people of Israel. The imagery applied to angels is often that of stars. There are a number of biblical and extra-biblical sources that illustrate the military aspect of the stars, the heavenly bodies, or angels. One such text is Ju. 5:20, "The stars fought from heaven, from their courses they fought against Sisera." Thus, when in 12:3 the wise and the righteous are said to shine as the stars they literally do become part of the divine household, which, at times may imply being called to war. Thus, within the context of these passages another piece of evidence is provided that the Book of Daniel is hardly a pacifistic text. It rather supports the idea that the wise and the righteous who become like stars have been martyred in the conflict, and many of them will certainly have shown active resistance. And once again, in their new state, they will be able to continue to do battle against the forces of evil (or plain Hellenizers). [383]

In light of the above, what can be said about the whole chapter as well as its placement as closure of the Book of Daniel? First of all, there is a repetition of themes which are carried over from the previous two chapters, which is not surprising since it is a clear continuation of the narrative unfolding there. Once again, Daniel has a vision at the

---

[383] See M. Weinfeld, "Divine Intervention in War in Ancient Israel and in the Ancient Near East," *History, Historiography and Interpretation: Studies in Biblical and Cuneiform Literatures*. H. Tadmor and M. Weinfeld (eds.). Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1983: 121-147.

river (the same as in 10:4) from which he had not moved. He now sees two new angelic beings on either side of the river in addition to the 'man clothed in linen' that had been introduced in 10:5. The latter seems suspended over the river in between the two others. They conduct a conversation which deals with Daniel's questions concerning the length of the exile and when the redemption and rebuilding might begin. When he subsequently asks the 'man clothed in linen' what they meant, he is told to be patient and that these matters belong to the future but they will come to pass. With this answer the reader is seemingly left as much in the dark and as little consoled as is Daniel. Yet, for the intended readership as well as the first interpreters of Daniel there was no such riddle. In the first place, the book reached its final form just before the final outcome of the Maccabean revolt. Thus, the exact circumstances of Antiochus IV's demise have eluded the author and the cleansing of the Temple has not yet taken place. However, both are expected to be imminent. From the perspective of the narrative character Daniel this is, of course, far in the future and not to happen within his lifetime. However, the author has created quite a brilliant example of narrative 'future history' which also accommodates the 'reality' for our protagonist. After all, it will not be long before Cyrus' edict is proclaimed that will set in motion the return of the temple vessels and the rebuilding of the temple and the return of the exiles to Yehud. That all this did not work out as gloriously as hoped for by the post-exilic prophets was known all too well by Daniel's author. This may be one more reason why these salient points are left out of Daniel's story. But that was no reason to despair, because again and again God had shown that He would relent and allow the covenantal relationship with the people to resume.

In the end what Daniel was asked to wait for and trust in was the ultimate assurance that God would set matters straight and restore the balance of the universe. In this case that implied a fully functioning Temple service in a purified City in an autonomous Land. This is a far cry from the notion of a new heaven and a new earth that is found in Revelation, but just the same a rearrangement of Firstspace in a grand Secondspace act instigated from the heavenly realm.

Conclusions

The Book of Daniel has always been considered as an important book worthy of study. This is illustrated by the fact that for almost two thousand years it has been the object of commentaries from a wide range of perspectives. Yet, despite the appearance of many partial studies dealing with various themes or individual chapters, until fairly recently not many monographs have appeared that deal with the book in its totality or follow one particular theme throughout the entire book. The past roughly ten years have seen an important increase in the appearance of dissertations on Daniel, a number of which have also been published. In these studies a variety of approaches have been applied to the text, ranging from the traditional textual and historical to the anthropological, social-scientific and postmodern literary. However, save for very few exceptions, broad attention to the occurrence of the sacred and of temple imagery in Daniel has been conspicuously absent. In a parallel development the field of biblical studies has seen a surge of new and very productive methodologies. One of these deals with the spatial analysis of narrative. It concerns specifically so-called critical spatiality as formulated by Edward Soja, who draws on the thought of Henri Lefebvre. Although these theorists worked in particular in cultural geography and philosophy, the members of the Constructions of Sacred Space Group that operated under the aegis of the SBL have been active in modifying this approach so that it could be usefully applied to the world of ancient texts and it has since been introduced into the wider field of biblical studies. One fortunate result of the seminar, for instance, was the coming together of spatial and feminist studies, especially on Lamentations. In another occurrence, spatial theory further enlightened a utopian literary reading of Chronicles. However, with regard to Daniel, very little has been done so far, except for a handful of articles by one particular scholar. Yet, in these too, the aspect of sacred space and temple imagery has been underrepresented. Perhaps this is due – as was indicated – to the misperception that the Book of Daniel is not overly concerned with temple imagery, but more with eschatology, the afterlife, and the heavenly worlds.

This dissertation has sought to remedy this deficiency. The above methodology, in conjunction with insights from the phenomenology of religion school as well as the 'possible worlds' concept from narratology, aimed at bringing to the fore exactly these neglected areas. It set out to analyze the various sacred spaces in the Book of Daniel and in particular determine the role of temple imagery within these spaces. Not only has it been shown that the temple is very much a concern of both the character Daniel as well as the authors/editors of the text, but also that the earthly and heavenly abodes of the divine are profoundly intertwined through a vertical linkage and that these sacred spaces define each other. Thus, not only has it been demonstrated that the narrative contains a spatial structure that is wrapped around the notion of Temple and sacred domains, but in addition the critical spatial approach has been able to draw the heavenly and earthly realms within each other's orbit. They interact intensively, depend on one another, and define each other. They can be traversed by each other's residents under particular conditions, the rules of which are clearly understood by all participants in the drama. It was furthermore shown that the sacred spaces of the earthly opponents in the narrative are of significance and that these too display a connection with the heavenly realm. The question of 'the place of the sacred' runs throughout all the chapters and apart from isolated allusions and straightforward references a broader pattern traversing the totality of the book can also be identified. The large narrative structure which covers chapters 1 through 12 is located in the exilic past. It moves away from Jerusalem and the Temple, in broad strokes painting an intensifying international conflict which stretches out over almost the entire ancient Near East. In the last two chapters the focus returns to localized Judean issues dealing with the present of the author. At the same time the vision accounts, chapters 7 through 12, move gradually from the heavenly throne room and temple area to the earthly endangered temple of the author's time.

Chapter 1 introduced the methodology, defined the concept of sacred space and delineated what constitutes temple imagery. The foundation of critical spatial theory is the notion that space is not a neutral, static container within which human action plays out. Instead, it is thought to be 'socially produced' and is thus intimately connected

with this action, if not even dependent upon it. This means that the same space can have a variety of meanings simultaneously for the various individuals occupying it, depending on their point of view. The original concept of critical spatiality emerged in the social sciences and describes real-life situations. Members of the SBL's Constructions of Sacred Space Group had already realized that for the theory to be applicable to literary context certain aspects had to be slightly reformulated. This dissertation builds on their findings and proposes further refinements in order to account for the multileveled and multifaceted worlds of Daniel and similar texts. The trialectic of three spaces that was introduced by Henri Lefebvre and further developed by Edward Soja forms one single dynamic in which the spaces are intertwined and relative to one another and are subject to change depending on the point of view. A vital element contained in the notion of the three spaces is that they also represent levels of power, oppression, suppression, and defiance. This applies to societal spaces as well as to those created in or by literature. Likewise, space is subject to change over time. Since space can thus be seen as individuated, its 'social production' can be seen to start with any individual occupying a space who thereby determines its character. In principle, this personal space is that three-dimensional area that is as wide and high as the body can reach. Personal space can be extended by the creation of boundaries such as walls, doors, and other architectural features. However, psychological and hierarchical boundaries can also be laid. Furthermore, spaces can be contested by those simultaneously occupying it. The 'space of self' is the minimum space that anyone can lay claim to and which remains intact as long as a person is alive. Seen thus, it is also understandable that were this space to be violated, an erasure of self would be conceivable.

This contest forms the basis of the opening chapter of the Book of Daniel which, within a literary format, displays the friction between the forces of power represented by Nebuchadnezzar and the four Judean exiles, i.e., Daniel and his friends. They all occupy the court of the Babylonian king, who has determined the character of the space. He prides himself expressly on having created this wonderful space in chapter 4. The Judean lads, it seems, have nothing but their 'spaces of self' and even this they

299

have to struggle to hold on to; but it will turn out that Daniel has much more than that as the heavenly realm opens up for him. It has been pointed out that the personal space can be breached through the natural openings of the body. With regard to those openings in the head, the mouth (intake of food, control of speech), the ears (perception of sound) and the eyes (visual stimuli) come to mind. These can, in principle, make the 'space of self' vulnerable to the penetration of the stimuli that are controlled by the force that has control over these individuals, which is exactly what happens in Daniel.

It is made clear that although some of the rules of the production of space as it occurs in the 'real world' are adhered to, many others are transgressed. This is the luxury of the spaces of the imagination as they are represented in works of literature or visual art. In these spaces, even if they resemble their real counterparts, it is the point of view of the author, as projected onto various characters that determines the nature of the spaces with which the reader is confronted. The author is free to manipulate the commonly accepted spatial relationships to any degree that is necessary for the narrative to work, regardless whether this leads far away from the 'real world' expectations or stays close to them. In Daniel we can see thus that the projected world in the court tales remains relatively close to the 'real world' even if the distribution of power is off in comparison. In the vision accounts, however, there is hardly any resemblance left and the characters as well as the reader are plunged into a fantasy world.

Chapter 2 surveyed research on the Book of Daniel. Apart from the standard questions concerning date, authorship, genre, the role of history and apocalypticism were considered. The overview indicated the dearth of book length studies approaching Daniel's narrative world in relation to that of the book's compilers. Furthermore, the character Daniel as a pseudonymous hero and the possible ancient Near Eastern as well as biblical background for his identity were examined. Suggestions were given why the name Daniel was particularly suited to the narrative without having to take recourse to the ancient Near Eastern materials that are rather far removed from the world of the book's creators. Chapter 3 mapped the various realistic and imagined

spaces that form the settings for Daniel's narrative situations. The intricate exchange between narrative message and the author/editor's real world conditions and concerns were pointed out. The relationships between narrative real and fantastic worlds as well as the author's world and how it is interpreted were highlighted.

In chapter 4 two issues were studied. The first part dealt with the exilic setting which is normally not given any special attention beyond the notion that it would provide lessons for Jews of later centuries how to live in diasporic conditions and under foreign rule. It has been demonstrated that this setting, which also frames the narrative of the character Daniel, was eminently important to the author and the lessons to be derived from it have little to do with a quiescent acceptance of exilic circumstances. The second part looked at how the concept of kingdom figures in Daniel. It is seen that earthly and heavenly kingship operate at different ends of the same scale and can be explained in light of each other, rather than in contrast. Spatial theory is able to untangle the power relationships within the narrative and assign a somewhat new role to the characters in Daniel's narrative universe in order to better understand the actions that are being contemplated or even carried out in the author's real world.

Lastly, chapter 5 undertook a spatial reading of Daniel's narrative, which showed the persistent presence of temple imagery in a wide variety of formats. The temple is literally the point of departure at the opening of the book and the efforts to regain it in an even better reality come full circle at the end in chapters 10 through 12. It has been shown that not only is the general mood of the narrative not one of quiet acceptance, and an exclusive reliance on God's intervention at God's convenience; the latter is actively sought. Even the distinction between pure pacifism and passive resistance does not sufficiently explain the actions of the characters and the ideas behind the book. Daniel, although very pious is also a very shrewd and pragmatic individual who is confronted with issues clearly greater than himself. The protagonist is actively seeking not only answers to an inexplicable reality; he seeks immediate action and realizes that it is not only up to the Divine to accomplish this. Appropriate human action is also required. This is why Daniel is allowed into the heavenly court of justice and is told of soon to unfold events by the angelic messengers. What we see is a

preparation for war on earth fought by humans and in heaven by the angelic forces in a synchronized effort to restore the balance in the universe. In this respect Daniel is ahead of the related mindset at Qumran.

In the end, what the dissertation has been able to show – it is hoped – is that temple imagery is a pervasive and evolving concept which may occur openly or be concealed, depending on the circumstances and the dating of the text under investigation. This notion opens up prospects for future research into the development and function of temple in the Pseudepigrapha, Qumran and the New Testament. Reading these texts along the lines suggested in the dissertation will surely not only reveal new insights with regard to the individual texts but demonstrate a closer interconnectedness that transcends time and place.

Bibliography

Commentaries

Aalders, G.Ch. *Daniel*. Kampen: J.H. Kok, 1962

Baldwin, Joyce G. *Daniel. An Introduction & Commentary* [Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries]. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 1978.

Bauer, Dieter. *Das Buch Daniel* [Neuer Stuttgarter Kommentar Altes Testament 22]. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwek GmbH, 1996.

Behrmann, Georg. *Das Buch Daniel übersetzt und erklärt*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1894

Bentzen, Aage. *Daniel*. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1937.

Braverman, Jay. *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel: A Study of Comparative Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Hebrew Bible* [CBQMS 7] Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1978.

Brown, Raymond Edward. *The Book of Daniel with a Commentary*. New York, NY: Paulist Press, 1962.

Collins, John J. *Daniel* [Hermeneia]. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

Davies, Philip R. *Daniel* [Old Testament Guides] Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1985.

Delcor, M. *Le livre de Daniel*, Paris, J. Gabalda et Cie, 1971.

Farrar, F.W. *The Book of Daniel* [The Expositor's Bible]. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1901.

Goldingay, John E. *Daniel* [Word *Biblical Commentary* 30]. Dallas: Word Books, 1989.

Goldwurm, Hersh. *Sefer Daniel* [ArtScroll Tanach Series]. New York: Mesorah Publ., 1980.

Gowan, Donald E. *Daniel* [Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries]. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2001.

Haag, Ernst. *Daniel*. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1993.

Hartman, Louis F. & Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Book of Daniel* [AB 23]. New York: Doubleday, 1978.

Heaton, E.W. *The Book of Daniel* [The Torch Bible Commentaries]. London: SCM Press, 1956.

Jeffery, Arthur *The Book of Daniel* [The Interpreter's Bible VI]. New York: Abingdon Press, 1956: 341-552.

Keil, Carl Friedrich. *Biblical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Grand Rapids" Eerdmans, 1949[1877] (transl. by M.G. Easton from the German edition of 1869).

Koch, Klaus. *Daniel* [Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testaments]. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1986-2001 [so far pts XXII/1-4 up to Dan. 3:30].

Lacocque, André. *The Book of Daniel*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979.

Longman III, T. *Daniel* [The NIV Application Commentary] Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1999.

Lucas, Ernest C. *Daniel* [Apollos Old Testament Commentary]. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2002.

Marti, Karl. *Das Buch Daniel* - Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1901.

Montgomery, James A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1927.

Pace, S. *Daniel.* Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary 17. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys Publishing, Inc., 2008.

Plöger, Otto. *Das Buch Daniel* – Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, G. Mohn, 1965.

Porteous, Norman. *Daniel.* London: SCM Press, 1979.

Redditt, Paul L. *Daniel* [The New Century Bible Commentary]. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Seow, C.L. *Daniel* [Westminster Bible Companion]. Louisville / London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003.

Slotki, J., *Daniel.Ezra.Nehemiah.* Soncino Books of the Bible. London: Soncino Press, 1951. Repr., 1978.

Smith-Christopher, Daniel L. *The Book of Daniel* [The New Interpreter's Bible VII]. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996: 19-194.

Towner, W. Sibley. *Daniel* [Interpretation]. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1984.

Reference Works

Botterweck, G.J., and H. Ringgren, *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. J. Botterweck and. Translated by J. T. Willis, G. W. Bromiley and D. E. Green. 15 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974-.

Brown, F., S.R. Driver, C. A. Briggs, et al., *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1906. Repr., Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers Inc., 2000.

Buttrick, G.A., ed., *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. 4 vols. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962. Supplemental vol. printed 1976.

Del Olmo Lete, G., and J. Sanmartin, *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition.* Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Elliger, Karl, *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. 5th improved ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997.

Freedman, D.N., ed., *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Koehler, L., W. Baumgartner, and J.J. Stamm, eds., *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated and edited under the supervision of M. E. J. Richardson. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1994-1999.

Leick, G., *A Dictionary of Ancient Near Eastern Architecture*. London: Routledge, 1988.

Onions, C. T., G. W. S. Friedrichsen, and R. W. Burchfield, *Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Ryken, L., J. C. Wilhoit, and T. Longman III, eds., *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1998.

Schiffman, L.H. and J.C. VanderKam, eds. *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Van der Toorn, K., B. Becking, P.W. van der Horst, eds. *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. 2nd extensively rev. ed. Leiden ; Boston : Brill, 1999

Monographs / Articles

Abegg, M., Jr., P.W. Flint, and E.C. Ulrich, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*. San Francisco: Harper, 1999.

Abusch, T. "Marduk." Pages 543-549 in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. Edited by K. van der Toorn, B. Becking and P.W. van der Horst. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Ackerman, S., *Under Every Green Tree: Popular Religion in Sixth-Century Judah*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

Ackroyd, P.R. "The Temple Vessels – A Continuity Theme." Pages 166-181 in *Studies in the Religion of Ancient Israel*. Vetus Testamentum Supplements 23. Leiden: Brill, 1972.

Afzal, C.F. "Wheels of Time in the Apocalypse of Jesus Christ." Pages 195-210 in *Paradise Now: Essays on Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism*. Edited by April De Conick. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.

Albertz, R. "The Social Setting of the Aramaic and Hebrew Book of Daniel." Pages 200-201 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Vol. I. Edited by J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Alexander, P.S. "The Targumim and Early Exegesis of 'Sons of God' in Genesis 6." *JJS* 23 (1972): 60-71.

Allen, L.C., *Ezekiel 1-19*. World Biblical Commentary 28. Dallas: Word Books, 1994.

Alles, G.D., ed., *Rudolf Otto: Autobiographical and Social Essays*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1996.

Allison, D. "4Q403 Fragm. I, Col. I, 38-46 and the Revelation to John." *RQ* 12 (1986): 409-414.

Amiet, P. "L'art achéménide." *Acta Iranica* I, Leiden: Brill, 1974: 163-170.

Angel, J. "Victory in Defeat: The Image of the Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Ph.D. diss., New York University, 2008.

Applegate, J. "Jeremiah and the Seventy Years in the Hebrew Bible." Pages 91-110 in *The Book of Jeremiah and Its Reception - Le Livre de Jérémie et sa reception*. Edited by A.H.W. Curtis and T. Römer. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997: 91-110

Arnold, B.T. "Word Play and Characterization in Daniel 1." Pages 231-248 in *Puns and Pundits; Word Play in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near Eastern Literature*. Edited by S.B. Noegel. Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 2000.

Athas, G. "In Search of the Seventy "Weeks" of Daniel 9." *JHS Online* 9 (2009). Cited 28 July 2009. Online: http://www.arts.ualberta.ca/JHS/abstracts-articles.html#A104.

Aune, D., *Revelation.* World Biblical Commentary 52C. Nashville: Nelson, 1998

--, and E. Stewart. "From the Idealized Past to the Imaginary Future: Eschatological Restoration in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature." Pages 147-201 in *Restoration; Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*. Edited by J.M. Scott. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Bahrani, Z. "Assault and Abduction: the Fate of the Royal Image in the Ancient Near East." *Art History* 18 (1995): 363-382.

Baillet, M., J.T. Milik and R. de Vaux, *Les 'petites grottes' de Qumrân*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert III. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1962.

Baines, J. "Palaces and Temples of Ancient Egypt." Pages 303-317 in *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*, edited by Jack M. Sasson. Hendrickson Publishers, 2000 (1995): 303-317.

Barker, M., *The Older Testament: the Survival of Themes from the Ancient Royal Cult in Sectarian Judaism and Early Christianity*. London: SPCK, 1987.

Bar-Kochva, B., *Pseudo-Hecataeus*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.

Barthélemy, D., and J. T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 1*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert I. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.

Bauckham, R. "Tobit as a Parable for the Exiles of Northern Israel." Pages 140-164 in *Studies in the Book of Tobit; a Multidisciplinary Approach*. Edited by M. Bredin. London: T & T Clark, 2006.

Beale, G.K., *The Use of Daniel in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature and in the Revelation of St. John*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1984.

--, *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004.

Beasley-Murray, G.R., *Jesus and the Kingdom of God.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.

Beaulieu, P.–A, *The Reign of Nabonidus, King of Babylon 556-539 B. C.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

--. "The Babylonian Background of the Motif of the Fiery Furnace in Daniel 3." *JBL* 128 (2009)2: 273-290.

Becking, B. "'A Divine Spirit Is in You'. Notes on the Translation of the Phrase *Ruah Elahin* in Daniel 5, 14 and Related Texts." Pages 515-519 in *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*. Edited by A.S. van der Woude. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1993.

Beran, Th. "Leben und Tod der Bilder." Pages 55-60 in *Ad bene et fideliter seminandum: Festgabe für Karlheinz Deller zum 21. Februar 1987*. Edited by G. Mauer. Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1988.

Berkovits, E. "The Concept of Holiness." Pages 247-314 in *Essential Essays on Judaism*. Edited by D. Hazony. Jerusalem: Shalem Press, 2002.

Berlin, A. "Qumran Laments and the Study of Lament Literature." Pages 1-17 in *Liturgical Perspectives; Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls; Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center... January, 2000*. Edited by E.G. Chazon. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

--. "Psalms and the Literature of Exile; Psalms 137, 44, 69, and 78." Pages 65-86 in *The Book of Psalms; Composition and Reception.* [VTS 99]. Edited by P.W. Flint and P.D. Miller Jr. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Berquist, J.L.."Theories of Space and Construction of the Ancient World." No pages. Online: http://www.case.edu/affil/GAIR/papers/99papers/jberquist.html.

--. "Constructions of Identity in Postcolonial Yehud." Pages 53-66 in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*. Edited by O. Lipschits and M. Oeming. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006.

--, and C.V. Camp, eds., *Constructions of Space I.* New York: T & T Clark, 2007.

--, and C.V. Camp, eds., *Constructions of Space II*. New York: T & T Clark, 2008.

Bickerman, E.J., *The God of the Maccabees. Studies on the Meaning and Origin of the Maccabean Revolt*. Leiden: Brill, 1979. Translation of *Der Gott der Makkabäer: Untersuchungen über Sinn und Ursprung der makkabäischen Erhebung,* Berlin: Jüdischer Buchverlag, 1937.

Bidmead, J. "The *Akitu* Festival: Religious Continuity and Royal Legitimation in Mesopotamia." Ph.D. diss., Vanderbilt University, 2002.

Bietenhard, H., *Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum*. [WUNT 2]. Tübingen: Mohr, 1951.

Black, J.A. "The New Year Ceremonies in Ancient Babylon: 'Taking Bel by the Hand' and a Cultic Picnic." *Religion* 11 (1981)1: 39-59.

Black, M., *The Book of Enoch*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985.

Blenkinsopp, J. "A Jewish Sect of the Persian Period." *CBQ* 52 (1990): 5-20.

--. "The Second Temple as House of Prayer." Pages 109-122 in *"Où demeures-tu"? (Jn 1,38); la maison depuis le monde biblique. En hommage au professeur Guy Couturier à l'occasion de ses soixante-cinq ans*. Edited by J.-C. Petit. Saint-Laurent, Québec: Fides, 1994.

--, *Isaiah*. Anchor Bible 19-19B. 3 vols. New York: Doubleday, 2000-2003.

Blidstein, G.J., *In the Rabbi's Garden: Adam and Eve in the Midrash*. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson Inc, 1999.

Bloch-Smith, E. "Solomon's Temple and Its Symbolism." Pages 18-31 in *Scripture and Other Artifacts. Essays on the the Bible and Archaeology in Honor of Philip J. King*. Edited by M.D. Coogan, J. Cheryl Exum, and L.E. Stager. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994.

--. "'Who Is the King of Glory'? Solomon's Temple and its Symbolism." Pages 18-31 in *Scripture and Other Artifacts; Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Honor of Philip J. King*. Edited by M.D. Coogan, et al. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994.

Block, D.I., *The Book of Ezekiel. Chapters 1-24*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997.

--. "Divine Abandonment: Ezekiel's Adaptation of an Ancient Near Eastern Motif." Pages 15-42 in *The Book of Ezekiel: Theological and Anthropological Perspectives*. Edited by M. Odell and J. Strong. Atlanta: SBL, 2000.

Blum, E. "Der 'Schiqquz Schomem' und die Jehud-Drachme BMC Palestine S. 181, Nr. 29." *BN* 90 (1997): 13-27.

Boccacini, G., *Enoch and Qumran Origins. A New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005.

Boda, M.J. *Haggai, Zechariah* [The NIV Application Commentary]. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2004.

Bogaert, P.–M. "Relecture et refonte historicisantes du livre de Daniel attestées par la première version grecque (Papyrus 967). Pages 197-224 in *Etudes sur le judaïsme hellénistique; Congrès de Strasbourg (1983)*. Edited by R. Kuntzmann and J. Schlosser. Paris: Cerf, 1984.

Boiy, T. "Royal Titulature in Hellenistic Babylonia." *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 92 (2002): 241-257.

--, *Late Achaemenid and Hellenistic Babylon*. [OLA 136] Louvain: Peeters, 2004.

Bokser, B.M. "Approaching Sacred Space." *HTR* 78 (1985): 279-299.

Botha, P.J. "The Relevance of the Book of Daniel for Fourth-Century Christianity According to the Commentary Ascribed to Ephrem the Syrian." Pages 100-122 in *Die Geschichte der Daniel-Auslegung im Judentum, Christentum und Islam. Studien zur Kommentierung des Danielbuches in Literatur und Kunst*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 371. Edited by K. Bracht, K. and D.S. Du Toit, D.S Berlin: De Gruyter, 2007.

Branham, J.R. "Sacred Space under Erasure in Ancient Synagogues and Early Churches." *ArtB* 74 (1992): 374-394.

Braun, R. L. "Cyrus in Second and Third Isaiah, Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah." Pages 146-164 in *The Chronicler as Theologian; Essays in Honor of Ralph W. Klein*. Edited by M. Patrick Graham, Steven L. McKenzie and Gary N. Knoppers. London: T & T Clark, 2003.

Bremmer, J. "Paradise: from Persia, via Greece, into the Septuagint." Pages 1-20 in *Paradise Interpreted; Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by G.P. Luttikhuizen. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Briant, P., *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2002.

Brooke, G.J., et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam, *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXII. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.

Broshi, M. "The Gigantic Dimensions of the Visionary Temple in the Temple Scroll." *BAR* 13 (1987)6: 36-37. Repr. as pages 113-115 in *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by H. Shanks. New York: Random House, 1992.

--. "Visionary Architecture and Town Planning in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 9-22 in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls*. Edited by D. Dimant and L. Schiffman. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995.

Bruce, F.F. "Josephus and Daniel." *ASTI* 4 (1965): 148-162.

Brunner, H. "Gerechtigkeit als Fundament des Thrones." *VT* 8 (1958)4: 426-428.

Burrows, E. "Problems of the Abzu." *Orientalia* n.s. 1 (1932): 231-256.

Callender, D.E., *Adam in Myth and History: Ancient Israelite Perspectives on the Primal Human*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000.

Camp, C.V. "Storied Space, or, Ben Sira 'Tells' a Temple." Pages 64-80 in *'Imagining' Biblical Worlds; Studies in Spatial, Social and Historical Constructs in Honor of James W. Flanagan*. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.

Carroll, R.P. "Razed Temple and Shattered Vessels: Continuities in the Discourses of Exile in the Hebrew Bible – An Appreciation of the Work of Peter R. Ackroyd on the Occasion of his Eightieth Birthday." *JSOT* (1997)75: 93-106.

Casey, M. "Porphyry and Syrian Exegesis of the Book of Daniel." *ZNW* 81(1990): 139-142.

--. "Porphyry and the Origin of the Book of Daniel." *JTS* 27 (1976): 15-33.

Charlesworth, J.H. "Introduction for the General Reader." Pages xxi-xxxiv in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha I*. New York: Doubleday, 1983.

--, ed., *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983.

--, and F. M. Cross, et al., eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Texts with English Translation, Volume 2 - Damascus Document, War Scroll and Related Documents.* Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls 2. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994.

Chernus, I., *Mysticism in Rabbinic Judaism: Studies in the History of Midrash.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1982.

Chester, A., *Messiah and Exaltation*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 207. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2007.

Chia, Ph. "On Naming the Subject: Postcolonial Reading of Daniel 1." *Jian Dao* 7(1997): 17-35. Repr. as pages 171-185 in *The Postcolonial Biblical Reader*. Edited by R.S. Sugirtharajah. London: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.

Chilton, B. "The Kingdom of God in Recent Discussion." Pages 255-280 in *Studying the Historical Jesus. Evaluations of the State of Current Research*. Edited by B. Chilton & C.A. Evans. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Clarke, K.D. "The Problem of Pseudonymity in Biblical Literature and its Implications for Canon Formation." Pages 440-468 in *The Canon Debate*. Edited by L.M. McDonald and J.A. Sanders. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002

Clifford, R.J. *The Cosmic Mountain in Canaan and the Old Testament*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 4. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Coblentz Bautch, K., *A Study of the Geography of I Enoch 17-19: 'No One Has Seen What I Have Seen'*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Cogan, M., *Imperialism and Religion: Assyria, Judah and Israel in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B. C. E.* Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1974.

Cohen, A., *Isaiah.* The Soncino Books of the Bible. New York: Soncino Press, 1949.

Colless, B.E. "Cyrus the Persian as Darius the Mede in the Book of Daniel." *JSOT* (1992)56: 113-126.

Collins, J.J. "The Court-Tales in Daniel and the Development of Apocalyptic." *JBL* 94 (1975): 218-234.

--. "The Mythology of Holy War in Daniel and in the Qumran War Scroll: A Point of Transition in Jewish Apocalyptic." *VT* 25 (1975)3: 596-612.

--, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel*. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.

--, *Apocalypse: the Morphology of a Genre.* Semeia 14. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979.

--, *Daniel with an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature.* Forms of the Old Testament Literature 20. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.

--, "Daniel and His Social World," *Interpretation* 39(1985)2: 131-143.

--. "The Meaning of 'the End' in the Book of Daniel." Pages 91-98 in *Of Scribes and Scrolls. Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins.* Edited by H.W. Attridge, J.J. Collins, and Th.H. Tobin. Lanham: University Press of America, 1990.

--. "Stirring up the Great Sea: the Religio-Historical Background of Daniel 7." Pages 121-136 in *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*. Edited by A.S. van der Woude. Leuven: Peeters, 1993.

--. "'Pseudo-Daniel" Revisited." *RQ* 17 (1996)1-4: 111-135.

--, *Seers, Sibyls & Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

--, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. Second ed., Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998.

--. "Pseudepigrapha and Group Formation." Pages 43-58 in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by E. G. Chazon and M. Stone. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

--. "Temporality and Politics in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature." Pages 26-43 in *Apocalyptic in History and Tradition*. Edited by Chr. Rowland & J. Barton. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.

--. "Response: The Apocalyptic Worldview of Daniel." Page 62 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection.* Proceedings of the Second Enoch Seminar, 2003. Edited by G. Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

--. "Kingship in Deuteronomistic and Prophetic Literature." Pages 25-47 in *King and Messiah as Son of God. Divine, Humanm and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature*. Edited by A.Y. Collins and J.J. Collins. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008.

Collins, M.F. "The Hidden Vessels in Samaritan Traditions." *JSJ* 3 (1972): 97-116.

Conrad, D. "Zu Jes 65 3b." *ZAW* 80 (1968): 232-234.

Coogan, M.D. "Life in the Diaspora: Jews at Nippur in the 5th Century." *BA* 37(1974): 6-12.

--, *West Semitic Personal Names in the Murašu Documents*. Missoula, MO: Scholars Press, 1976.

Cook, E.M. "'In the Plain of the Wall' (Dan 3:1)." *JBL* 108 (1989): 115-116.

Crow, L.D. "Holy Precincts, Holy City, Holy Land: the Orientation of Diaspora Jews toward Jerusalem in the Persian Period." Paper presented at the 1998 meeting of the Constructions of Ancient Space Seminar. Cited 28 July 2009. Online: http://www.gunnzone.org/constructs/crow.doc.

Curtis, A.H.W. "The Just King: Fact or Fancy? Some Ugaritic Reflections." Pages 81-92 in *Reflection and Refraction. Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*. Edited by R. Rezetko, T.H. Lim & W.B. Aucker. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Curtis, J.E. and N. Tallis, eds. *The Balawat Gates of Ashurnasirpal II*. London: The British Museum Press, 2008

Dahood, M. "Is 'Eben Yisrae'el a Divine Title? (Gn 49, 24)." *Biblica* 40 (1959): 1002-1007.

Danrey, V. "Winged Human-Headed Bulls of Nineveh: Genesis of an Iconographic Motif." *Iraq* 66 (2004): 133-139.

Davidson, M.J., *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1-36, 72-108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.

Davies, G.I. "Apocalyptic and Historiography." *JSOT* (1978) 5: 15-28.

Davies, P.R. Daniel Chapter Two." *JTS* 27 (1976): 392-401.

--. "Hasidism in the Maccabean Period." *JJS* 28 (1978): 127-140.

--, *In Search of Ancient Israel*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.

--. "Food, Drink, and Sects: the Question of Ingestion in the Qumran Texts." *Semeia* (1999)86:151-163.

Davies, W.D., *The Gospel and the Land. Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974. Repr., with new preface, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.

Davila, J. "The *Hodayot* Hymnist and the Four Who Entered Paradise." *RQ* 17 (1996) 1-4, nrs. 65-68: 457-478.

Dean-Otting, M., *Heavenly Journeys: A Study of the Motif in Hellenistic Jewish Literature*. Judentum und Umwelt 8. Frankfurt a/Main: Peter Lang, 1984.

De Moor, J. C. "An Incantation against Infertility (KTU 1.13)." *UF* 12 (1980): 305-310.

Demsky, A. "Double Names in the Babylonian Exile and the Identity of Sheshbazzar." Pages 23-40 in *These Are the Names; Studies in Jewish Onomastics*. Vol. 2. Edited by A. Demsky. Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1999.

Dijkstra, M. "The Altar of Ezekiel; Fact or Fiction?" *VT* 42 (1992)1: 22-36.

Dimant, D. "New Light from Qumran on the Jewish Pseudepigrapha - 4Q390." Pages 405-448 in *The Madrid Qumran Congress; Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, March 1991. Vol. II.* Edited by J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

--. "The Seventy Weeks Chronology (Dan 9,24-27) in the Light of New Qumranic Texts." Pages 57-76 in *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*. Edited by A.S. van der Woude. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1993.

--."Resurrection, Restoration, and Time-Curtailing in Qumran, Early Judaism, and Christianity." *RQ* 19 (2000)76: 527-548.

Di Lella, A.A. "The Textual History of Septuagint-Daniel and Theodotion-Daniel," Pages 586-607 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*; Vol. 2. Edited by J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

DiTommaso, L., *The Book of Daniel and the Apocryphal Daniel Literature*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigraphica 20. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

--, *The Dead Sea* New Jerusalem *Text: Contents and Contexts*. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 110. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

--. "4Q*Pseudo-Daniel*[a-b] (4Q243-244) and the Book of Daniel." *DSD* 12 (2005)2: 101-133.

--. "Apocalypses and Apocalypticism in Antiquity." *CBR* 5 (2007): 235-286; 367-432.

--. "Apocalypses"; "Apocalypticim". Forthcoming entries in the *Encyclopedia of the Bible and Its Reception*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009-.

Dobbs-Allsopp, F. W., *Weep, O Daughter of Zion: A Study of the City-Lament Genre in the Hebrew Bible*. Rome: Ponteficio Instituto Biblico, 1993.

Dohmen, C. "Mizbeah." Page 221 in *TDOT* 8.

Doležel, L., *Heterocosmica. Fiction and Possible Worlds*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.

--. "Narrative Modalities." *Journal of Literary Semantics* 5 (1976): 1-15.

Doran, R., *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 12. Washington, DC: The Catholic Bible Association of America, 1981.

Douglas, Mary, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Ark, 1966.

Dozeman, Th.B. "The Holiness of God in Contemporary Jewish and Christian Biblical Theology."
Pages 24-36 in "*God's Word for Our World; [...] Studies in Honor of Simon John De Vries*."
Vol. II. Edited by J. H. Ellens [et al]. London: T & T Clark International, 2004.

Dressler, Harold H.P. "The Identification of the Ugaritic Dnil with the Daniel of Ezekiel." *VT* 29
(1979): 152-161.

Dreyer, H. "The Roots qr, `r, gr and s/tr = 'Stone, Wall, City' etc." Pages 17-25 in *De Fructu Oris Sui;
Essays in Honour of Adrianus van Selms*. Edited by I.H. Eybers [et al.]. Leiden: Brill, 1971.

Driver, S.R. *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. New York: Scribner, 1897. Repr.,
Cleveland: Meridian Books, 1967.

Duhaime, J., *The War Texts. 1QM and Related Manuscripts*. New York: Continuum, 2004.

Duke, R. "Moses' Hebrew Name: The Evidence of the *Vision of Amram*." *DSD* 14 (2007)1: 34-48.

Duling, D.C. "Kingdom of God, Kingdom of Heaven." Pages 50(a)-52(a) in Vol. 4 of the *Anchor Bible
Dictionary*. Edited by D. N. Freedman. New York, 1992.

Dunn, J.D. "The Danielic Son of Man in the New Testament." Pages 528-549 in *The Book of Daniel:
Composition and Reception*; Vol. 2. Edited by J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Ego, B. "Die Wasser der Gottesstadt: zu einem Motiv der Zionstradition und seinen kosmologischen
Implikationen," *Das biblische Weltbild und seine altorientalischen Kontexte*. B. Janowski und
B. Ego, eds. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001: 361-389.

Eddy, S.K., *The King is Dead: Studies in the Near Eastern Resistance to Hellenism 334-31 B. C.*
Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.

Edzard, D.O. "Deep-Rooted Skyscrapers and Bricks: Ancient Mesopotamian Architecture and its
Imagery." Pages 13-24 in *Figurative Language in the Ancient Near East*. Edited by M.
Mindlin et al. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, 1987.

Elgvin, T. "4Q474 - a Joseph Apocryphon?" *RQ* 18 (1997)1: 97-108.

Eliade, M., *The Myth of the Eternal Return; or, Cosmos and History*. Princeton: Princeton University
Press, 1991. Reprint of *The Myth of the Eternal Return; or, Cosmos and History*. Translated
by Willard R. Trask. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1954. Translation of *Le mythe de
l'eternel retour*. Paris: Gallimard, 1949.

--, *Patterns in Comparative Religion*, Cleveland/New York: Meridian Books, 1966. Reprint of
Patterns in Comparative Religion. Translated by Rosemary Sheed. New York: Sheed and
Ward, 1958. Translation of *Traité d'histoire des religions*. Paris: Payot, 1949.

--. *The Sacred and the Profane: the Nature of Religion*. Translated by Willard R. Trask. New York:
Harcourt, Brace & Company, 1959. Translation of *Das Heilige und das Profane*. Hamburg:
Rowohlt Taschenbuch-Verlag, 1957.

--. "The Prestige of the Cosmogonic Myth." *Diogenes* 23 (1958): 1-13.

Ellwood, R.S. "Mircea Eliade and the Nostalgia for the Sacred." Pages 79-126 in *The Politics of Myth.
A Study of C.G. Jung, Mircea Eliade, and Joseph Campbell*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1999.

Eshel, H. "Josephus' View on Judaism without the Temple in Light of the Discoveries at Masada and
Murabba'at." Pages 229-238 in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel; zur Substituierung und Transformation
des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen
Christentum*. Edited by B. Ego, A. Lange & P. Pilhofer. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.

Evans, C.A. "Daniel in the New Testament: Visions of God's Kingdom." Pages 490-527 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*; Vol. 2. Edited by J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Fabry, H.–J. "Melek," Pages 366-367 in *TDOT*, Vol. 8.

Falk, D.K., *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

--. "Moses, Texts of," Pages 580-581 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls I*. Edited by L. H. Schiffman and J. VanderKam. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

--. "Qumran Prayer Texts and the Temple." Pages 106-126 in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran*. Edited by D.K. Falk, F. Garcia Martinez and E. Schuller. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Falk, Z.W. "Two Symbols of Justice." *VT* 10 (1960)1: 72-74.

Fauth, W. "Der königliche Gärtner und Jäger im Paradeisos." *Persica* 8 (1979): 1-53.

Feldman, L. "Josephus' Portrait of Daniel." *Henoch* 14 (1992): 37-94.

Fensham, F.C. *The Books of Ezra-Nehemiah* [NICOT] Grand Rapids, MI.: Eerdmans, 1982.

Ferch, A.J. "Porphyry: An Heir to Christian Exegesis?" *ZNW* 73(1982): 141-147.

Fewell, D.N., *Circle of Sovereignty. A Story of Stories in Daniel 1-6*. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1988.

Finkelstein, J.J. "The Antediluvian Kings: a University of California Tablet." *JCS* 17(1963): 39-51.

Fishbane, M., *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Fitzmyer, J.A., *Tobit*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003.

Flanagan, J.W. "Mapping the Biblical World: Perceptions of Space in Ancient Southwestern Asia." Pages 1-18 in *Mappa Mundi: Mapping Culture/Mapping the World*. Edited by J. Murray. Windsor: University of Windsor, 2001.

Flannery, F., *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests: Jewish Dreams in the Hellenistic and Roman Eras*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Fletcher-Louis, C. "The High Priest as Divine Mediator in the Hebrew Bible: Dan 7:13 as a Test Case." *SBLSP* (1997): 161-193.

--. "Heavenly Ascent or Incarnational Presence? A Revisionist Reading of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*." *SBLSP* 1998: 376-399.

--, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Flint, P.W. "The Daniel Tradition at Qumran." Pages 329-367 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*; Vol. 2. Edited by J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Flood, F.B. "Between Cult and Culture: Bamiyan, Islamic Iconoclasm, and the Museum." *ArtB* 84 (2002)4: 641-659.

Ford, D., *The Abomination of Desolation in Biblical Eschatology*. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1979.

Foster, B.R., *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature.* 3rd ed. Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 2005.

Foucault, M. "Other Spaces: The Principles of Heterotopia." *Lotus International* 48/49 (1986): 9-17.

Frank, D., *Search Scripture Well: Karaite Exegetes and the Origins of the Jewish Bible Commentary in the Islamic East*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Freedman, D.N. "Temple Without Hands." Pages 21-30 in *Temples and High Places in Biblical Times*. Jerusalem: Hebrew Union College, 1981.

Freedman, H., *Jeremiah*. London: Soncino, 1949.

Fried, L.S. "Cyrus the Messiah? The Historical Background to Isaiah 45:1." *HTR* 95 (2002)4: 373-393.

--. "The High Places (Bamot) and the Reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah: An Archaeological Investigation." *JAOS* 122 (2002): 437-465.

--. "The Land Lay Desolate: Conquest and Restoration in the Ancient Near East." Pages 21-54 in *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period*. Edited by O. Lipschits and J. Blenkinsopp. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003.

--, *The Priest and the Great King. Temple-Palace Relations in the Persian Empire*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004.

Gallagher, W.R. "On the Identity of Helel Ben Sahar of Is. 14:13-15." *UF* 26 (1994): 131-146.

Gardner, A.E. "The Great Sea of Dan. VII 2." *VT* 49 (1999): 412-415.

Gelb, Ignace J., University of Chicago. Oriental Institute, et al., *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. 19 Vols. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago; Gluckstadt: Augustin, 1956-.

George, A.R., *Babylonian Topographical Texts*. Louvain: Peeters, 1992.

--, *House Most High: The Temples of Ancient Mesopotamia*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1993.

Gibson, J.C.L., *Canaanite Myths and Legends*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1978.

Ginzburg, L., *Legends of the Jews*. vols. IV, V, and VI. Philadelphia: Jewish Pub., 1913-1938, 1968.

Gitin, S. "The Four-Horned Altar and Sacred Space: an Archaeological Perspective." Pages 95-123 in *Sacred Time, Sacred Place; Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*. Edited by B.M. Gittlen. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2002.

Gnuse, R.K., *The Dream Theophany of Samuel: Its Structure in Relation to Ancient Near Eastern Dreams and Its Theological Significance*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1984.

Gold, S.L. "Targum or Translation: New Light on the Character of Qumran Job (11Q10) from a Synoptic Approach." *JAB* 3 (2001)1-2: 101-120.

Goldin, J., *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955.

Goldstein, J., *II Maccabees.* Anchor Bible 41a. New York: Doubleday, 1983.

Gonen, R. "Urban Canaan in the Late Bronze Period." *BASOR* (1984)253: 61-73.

Gooder, P.R., *Only the Third Heaven? 2 Corinthians 12.1-10 and Heavenly Ascent*. London/New York: T&T Clark, 2006.

Gooding, D.M. "The Literary Structure of the Book of Daniel and its Implications." *TynBul* 32 (1981): 43-79.

Goodman, D. "Do Angels Eat?" *JJS* 37 (1986)2: 160-175.

Gordon, C.H., *Ugaritic Glossary*. Analecta Orientalia 38. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965.

Gowan, D.E. "The Exile in Jewish Apocalyptic." Pages 205-223 in *Scripture in History & Theology: Essays in Honor of J. Coert Rylaarsdam.* Edited by A.L. Merrill and Th.W. Overholt. Pittsburgh: The Pickwick Press, 1977.

Grabbe, L.L. "'The End of the Desolations of Jerusalem': From Jeremiah's 70 Years to Daniel's 70 Weeks of Years." Pages 67-72 in *Early Jewish Exegesis. Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee*. Edited by C.A. Evans & W.F. Stinespring. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

--. "Another Look at the *Gestalt* of 'Darius the Mede.' *CBQ* 50 (1988): 198-213.

--. "The Belshazzar of Daniel and the Belshazzar of History." *AUSS* 26 (1988): 59-66.

--. "'The Exile' under the Theodolite: Historiography as Triangulation." Pages 80-100 in *Leading Captivity Captive; 'the Exile' as History and Ideology*. Edited by L.L. Grabbe. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

--, ed., *Leading Captivity Captive; 'the Exile' as History and Ideology*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

--. "A Dan(iel) for All Seasons: For Whom Was Daniel Important?" Pages 229-246 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Vol. I. Edited by J. J. Collins, and P. W. Flint. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Gray, R., *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine: The Evidence from Josephus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Grayson, A.K. "Mesopotamia." Page 767 in *ABD*, vol. 4. Edited by D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York, 1992.

Greenberg, M., *Ezekiel 1-20*. Anchor Bible 22. New York: Doubleday, 1983.

--, *Ezekiel 21-37*. Anchor Bible 22A. New York: Doubleday, 1997.

Gruen, E. "Diaspora and Homeland." Pages 18-46 in *Diasporas and Exiles; Varieties of Jewish Identity*. Edited by H. Wettstein. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

--. "Persia through the Jewish Looking-Glass." Pages 53-75 in *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers*. Edited by T. Rajak et al. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.

Gruenwald, I., *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, Leiden: Brill, 1980.

--. "God the 'Stone/Rock': Myth, Idolatry, and Cultic Fetishism in Ancient Israel." *Journal of Religion* 76 (1996): 428-449.

Gunkel, H. *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit: eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen 1 und Ap Joh 12*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1921.

Gunn, D.M., and P.M. McNutt, eds., *'Imagining' Biblical Worlds; Studies in Spatial, Social and Historical Constructs in Honor of James W. Flanagan*. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.

Gurevitch, Z., and G. Aran. "The Land of Israel: Myth and Phenomenon." Pages 195-210 in *Reshaping the Past: Jewish History and the Historians*. Edited by J. Frankel. Oxford: OUP, 1994.

Hallo, W.W., *Early Mesopotamian Royal Titles : A Philologic and Historical Analysis*. New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1957.

--. "Beginning and End of the Sumerian King List in the Nippur Recension." *JCS* 17(1963): 52-57.

--. "Antediluvian Cities." *JCS* 23 (1970): 57-67.

--. "Royal Titles from the Mesopotamian Periphery." *Anatolian Studies* 30(1980): 189-195.

--, and K. L. Younger, eds., *The Context of Scripture: Monumental Inscriptions from the Biblical World. Vol. II.* Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Halperin, D., *The Faces of the Chariot*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988.

Halpern, B. "The Ritual Background of Zechariah's Temple Song." *CBQ* 40 (1978): 167-190.

Halpern-Amaru, B. "Exile and Return in Jubilees." Pages 127-144 in *Exile; Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*. Edited by J.M. Scott. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Hamlin, E.J. "The Meaning of 'Mountains and Hills' in Isa. 41:14-16." *JNES* 13 (1954): 185-190.

Handy, L.K. "Dissenting Deities or Obedient Angels: Divine Hierarchies in Ugarit and the Bible." *Biblical Research* 35 (1990): 18-35.

Hanson, P. "Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel, and Euhemeristic Heroes in 1 Enoch 6-11." *JBL* 96 (1977): 195-233.

--. "Apocalyptic Literature." Pages 465-488 in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Modern Interpreters.* Edited by D.A. Knight & G.M. Tucker. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985.

Hartman, L.F., and A. A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel*. Anchor Bible 23. New York: Doubleday, 1978.

Hayward, C.T.R., *The Jewish Temple, a Non-Biblical Sourcebook*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Heger, P., *The Three Biblical Altar Laws*. [BZAW 279]. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999.

Heimpel, W. "The Sun at Night and the Doors of Heaven in Babylonian Texts." *JCS* 38 (1986): 127-151.

Hendel, Ronald. "The Nephilim Were on Earth: Genesis 6:1-4 and its Ancient Near Eastern Context." Pages 11-34 in *The Fall of the Angels*. Edited by C. Auffarth and L. T. Stuckenbruck. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Herdner, A., ed., *Corpus des tablettes en cuneiforms alphabétiques découvertes à Ras Shamra-Ugarit de 1929 à 1939*. Mission de Ras Shamra 10. Paris: P. Geuthner, 1963.

Himmelfarb, M., "From Prophecy to Apocalypse: The *Book of the Watchers* and Tours of Heaven." Pages 145-165 in *Jewish Spirituality*. Vol. I: *From the Bible through the Middle Ages*. Edited by A. Green. New York: Crossroad, 1986.

--, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

--, "A Kingdom of Priests: The Democratizing of the Priesthood in the Literature of Second Temple Judaism," *JJTP* 6(1997)1: 89-104.

--. "Earthly Sacrifice and Heavenly Incense: the Law of the Priesthood in *Aramaic Levi* and *Jubilees*." Pages 103-122 in *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities in Late Antique Religions*. Edited by R. S. Boustan and A. Y. Reed. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Hogan, K.M., *Theologies in Conflict in 4 Ezra: Wisdom Debate and Apocalyptic Solution*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Høgenhaven, J. "Biblical Quotations and Allusions in 4Qapocryphal Lamentations (4Q179)." Pages 113-120 in *The Bible as Book; the Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*. Edited by Edward D. Herbert & Emanuel Tov. London: British Library; New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll Press, 2002.

Holloway, S.W., "The Case for Assyrian Religious Influence in Israel and Judah: Inference and Evidence." Ph.D. diss. University of Chicago, 1992.

--, *Aššur is King Aššur is King! Religion in the Exercise of Power in the Neo-Assyrian Empire*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Holm, T.L. "A biblical story-collection: Daniel 1-6." Ph.D. diss. The Johns Hopkins University, 1997.

--. "The Fiery Furnace: Daniel 3 in Its Ancient Near Eastern Context." *JAOS* 128 (2008)1: 81-100.

Horgan, M. "A Lament over Jerusalem (4Q179)." *JSS* 18(1973): 222-234.

Humphreys, W.L. "A Life-Style for Diaspora; a Study of the Tales of Esther and Daniel." *JBL* 92 (1973): 211-223.

Hurowitz, V.A., *I Have Built You an Exalted House: Temple Building in the Bible in the Light of Mesopotamian and North-West Semitic Writings*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.

--. "Temporary Temples." Pages 37-50 in *Kinattutu sa Darati. Raphael Kutscher Memorial Volume*. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, Institute of Archaeology, 1993.

--. "YHWH's Exalted House: Aspects of the Design and Symbolism of Solomon's Temple." Pages 63-110 in *Temple and Worship in Biblical Israel*. Edited by J. Day. London: T & T Clark International, 2005.

Ilan, T. "The Greek Names of the Hasmoneans." *JQR* 78 (1987)1-2: 1-20.

Jacobsen, Th., *The Treasures of Darkness*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976.

--. "The Eridu Genesis." *JBL* 10 (1981): 513-529.

--, *The Harps that Once… Sumerian Poetry in Translation.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987.

Japhet, S. *I & II Chronicles*. Old Testament Library. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993.

Jeansonne, S. Pace, *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7-12*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 19. Washington DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1988.

--. "Diaspora Dangers, Diaspora Dreams." Pages 21-59 in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich*. Edited by P.W. Flint, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Jenner, K.D. "Syriac Daniel." Pages 608-638 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*; Vol. 2. Edited by J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Jenson, Ph.P., *Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.

Jones, B.W. "The Prayer in Daniel IX." *VT* 18 (1968): 493.

Josephus. Translated by R. Marcus. 10 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937. Repr., 1995.

Kalimi, Isaac, and J.D. Purvis. "The Hiding of the Temple Vessels in Jewish and Samaritan Literature," *CBQ* 56 (1994): 679-685.

--. "King Jehoiachin and the Vessels of the Lord's House in Biblical Literature." *CBQ* 56 (1994): 449-457.

Kang, S.I. "The 'Molten Sea', or Is It." *Biblica* 89 (2008)1: 101-103.

Kaplan, L.J. "Israel Under the Mountain: Emmanuel Levinas on Freedom and Constraint in the Revelation of the Torah." *Modern Judaism* 18 (1998): 35-46.

Karahashi, F. "Fighting the Mountain: Some Observations on the Sumerian Myths of Inanna and Ninurta." *JNES* 63 (2004): 111-118.

Kasher, R. "The Conception of Angels in Jewish Biblical Translations." Pages 555-584 in *Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2007: Angels*. Edited by F.V. Reiterer et al. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007.

Kee, M.S. "The Heavenly Council and its Type-Scene." *JSOT* 31 (2007)3: 259-273.

Keel, O., and C. Uehlinger, *Gods, Goddesses, and Images of God in Ancient Israel*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1998.

Keown, G.L., et al., *Jeremiah 26-52*. World Biblical Commentary 27. Dallas: World Books Pub., 1995

Kessler, M., *Battle of the Gods: The God of Israel Versus Marduk of Babylon. A Literary/Theological Interpretation of Jeremiah 50-51*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 2003.

Kiefer, J., *Exil und Diaspora: Begriffkichkeit und Deutungen im antiken Judentum und in der hebräischen Bibel*. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlangsanstalt, 2005.

Kippenberg, H.G., *Discovering Religious History in the Modern Age*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Klawans, J. "Temple as Cosmos or Temple in the Cosmos: Priests, Purity, Sacrifice, and Angels." Pages 111-144 in *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple. Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Knibb, M.A. "'You Are Indeed Wiser than Daniel' Reflections on the Character of the Book of Daniel." Pages 399-411 in *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*. Edited by A.S. van der Woude. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1993.

Knight, G.A.F. "'Thou Art Peter'." *Theology Today* 17 (1960/61): 168-180.

Knoppers, G.N. "Prayer and Propaganda: Solomon's Dedication of the Temple and the Deuteronomists's Program." *CBQ* 57(1995): 229-254.

Koch, K., *Das Buch Daniel*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980.

--. "Is Daniel Also Among the Prophets?" *Interpretation* 39(1985): 117-130.

--. "Der 'Menschensohn' in Daniel." *ZAW* 119 (2007)3: 369-387.

--, and M. Rösel, *Polyglottensynopse zum Buch Daniel.* Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2000.

Kohn, R. Levitt. "In and Out of Place: Physical and Social Location in the Bible." Pages 253-262 in *"From Babel to Babylon: Essays on Biblical History and Literature in Honour of Brian Peckham."* Edited by J. Rilett Wood et al. New York: T & T Clark, 2006.

Korpel, M.C.A. "Disillusion among Jews in the Postexilic Period." Pages 136-157 in *The Old Testament in Its World; Papers Read at the Winter Meeting, January 2003, the Society for Old Testament Study...* Old Testament Studies 52. Edited by R. P. Gordon & J.C. de Moor. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Kraus, Th.J. Review of L. Carlsson. *Round Trips to Heaven: Otherworldy Travelers in Early Judaism and Christianity*. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*. 2007.01.36. Online: http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2007/2007-01-36.html.

Kravitz, K. Frakes. "Divine Trophies of War in Assyria and Ancient Israel: Case Studies in Political Theology." Ph.D. diss., Brandeis University, 1999.

Kugel, J. "The Ladder of Jacob." *HTR* 88 (1995): 209-227.

--, *The Ladder of Jacob. Ancient Interpretations of the Biblical Story of Jacob and His Children*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.

Kuhrt, A. *From Samarkand to Sardis. A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire*. London: Duckworth, 1993.

--. "The Palace(s) of Babylon." Pages 77-94 in *The Royal Palace Institution in the First Millennium BC*. Edited by I. Nielsen. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2001.

--, and S. Sherwin-White. "Aspects of Seleucid Royal Ideology: The Cylinder of Antiochus I from Borsippa." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 111 (1991): 71-86.

Kunin, Seth, *God's Place in the World. Sacred Space and Sacred Place in Judaism*. London: Cassell, 1998.

Kvanvig, H., *Roots of Apocalyptic: the Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988.

Laato, A. "Zachariah 4,6b-10a and the Akkadian Royal Building Inscriptions." *ZAW* 106 (1994)1: 53-69.

Ladd, G.E. "The Kingdom of God – Reign or Realm?" *JBL* 81 (1962): 230-238.

Lambert, D. "Fasting as a Penitential Rite: A Biblical Phenomenon?" *HTR* 96(2003)4: 477-512.

Lambert, W.G. "Nebuchadnezzar King of Justice." *Iraq* 27(1965): 1-11.

Landsberger, B., and J.V. Kinnier Wilson. "The Fifth Tablet of Enuma Eliš." *JNES* 20 (1961): 154-179.

Landsberger, F. "The Origin of the Winged Angel in Jewish Art." *HUCA* 20 (1947): 227-254.

--. "The Sacred Direction in Synagogue and Church." *HUCA* 28 (1957): 181-203.

Lang, B. "No Sex in Heaven: the Logic of Procreation, Death, and Eternal Life in the Judaeo-Christian Tradition." Pages 237-253 in *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Mathias Delcor*. Edited by A. Caquot [et al.]. Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1985.

Langdon, S., *Building Inscriptions of the Neo-Babylonian Empire. Part I: Nabopolassar and Nebuchadnezzar.* Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1905.

Launderville, D. "Anti-Monarchical Ideology in Israel in Light of Mesopotamian Parallels." Pages 119-128 in *Imagery and Imagination in Biblical Literature; Essays in Honor of Aloysius Fitzgerald*. Edited by L. Boadt and M.S. Smith. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2001.

--, *Piety and Politics: The Dynamics of Royal Authority in Homeric Greece, Biblical Israel, and Old Babylonian Mesopotamia*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

Lawson, J.N. "'The God Who Reveals Secrets': the Mesopotamian Background to Daniel 2.47." *JSOT* 74(1997): 61-76.

Lefebvre, H., *The Production of Space*. Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith. Oxford: Blackwell Publ., 1991. Translation of *La production de l'espace*. Paris: Éditions Anthropos, 1974.

Lemke, W.E. "Nebuchadrezzar, My Servant." *CBQ* 28 (1966): 45-50.

Lenzi, A.,"Secrecy, Textual Legitimation, and Intercultural Polemics in the Book of Daniel," *CBQ* 71(2009): 330-348.

Levenson, J., *Sinai and Zion: an Entry into the Jewish Bible*. Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1985.

Levine, B. "From the Aramaic Enoch Fragments: the Semantics of Cosmography." *JJS* 33 (1982): 311-326.

--. "The Language of Holiness: Perceptions of the Sacred in the Hebrew Bible." Pages 241-255 in *Backgrounds for the Bible*. Edited by M. P. O'Connor and D. N. Freedman. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1987.

Levtow, N.B., *Images of Others: Iconic Politics in Ancient Israel.* Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2008.

Levy, B. Barry, *Fixing God's Torah*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Lichtenberger, H. "Zion and the Destruction of the Temple in 4 Ezra 9-10." Pages 239-249 in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel; zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by B. Ego, A. Lange and P. Pilhofer. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.

Lieber, A.B. "Jewish and Christian Heavenly Meal Traditions." Pages 313-339 in *Paradise Now: Essays on Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism*. Edited by April De Conick. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.

Lied, L.I., *The Other Lands of Israel: Imaginations of the Land in 2 Baruch*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Lincoln, B. "The Role of Religion in Achaemenian Imperialism." Pages 221-242 in *Religion and Power*: University of Chicago Oriental Institute Seminars 4. Edited by Nicole Maria Brisch. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2008.

Lipschits, O., and J. Blenkinsopp, eds., *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003.

Liverani, M. "Ancient Near Eastern Cities and Modern Ideologies." Pages 85-106 in *Die Orientalische Stadt*: *Kontinuität, Wandel, Bruch.* 1. Internationales Colloquium der Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft 9.-10. Mai 1996 in Hall. Edited by Gernot Wilhelm. Saarbrücken: Saarbrücker Druckerei und Verlag – SDV, 1997.

Livingstone, A. "New Dimensions in the Study of Assyrian Religion." Pages 165-177 in *Assyria 1995. Proceedings of the 10th Anniversary Symposium of the Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project Helsinki, September 7-11, 1995*. Edited by S. Parpola and R.M. Whiting. Helsinki: Department of Asian and African Studies, University of Helsinki, 1997.

Loewe, R. "The Divine Garment and Shi'ur Qomah." *HTR* 58 (1965): 153-160.

Loewenstamm, S.E., *The Evolution of the Exodus Tradition*. Jerusalem: Magness Press, 1992. Translated by B. Schwartz. Translation of *Masoret yetsi'at Mitsrayim be-hishtalshelutah*. Jerusalem: Magness Press, 1987.

Lopez, K.M. "Standing before the Throne of God: Critical Spatiality in Apocalyptic Scenes of Judgment." Pages 139-155 in *Constructions of Space II:The Biblical City and Other Imagined Spaces*. Edited by J.L. Berquist and C.V. Camp. London: T&T Clark, 2008: 139-155.

Luckenbill, D.D., *Annals of Sennacherib*. The University of Chicago Oriental Institute Publications, vol. 2. Chicago: Univerasity of Chicago Press, 1924.

Lumsden, S. "Power and Identity in the Neo-Assyrian World." Pages 33-52 in *The Royal Palace Institution in the First Millennium BC: Regional Development and Cultural Interchange between East and West*. Edited by I. Nielsen. Athens: The Danish Institute at Athens, 2001.

--. "The Production of Space at Nineveh." *Iraq* 66(2004): 187-197.

Lundbom, J.R., *Jeremiah 1-20.* Anchor Bible 21A. New York: Doubleday, 1999.

--, *Jeremiah* 37-52. Anchor Bible 21C. New York: Doubleday, 2004.

Lust, J. "The Septuagint Version of Daniel 4-5." Pages 39-53 in *The Book of Daniel in the Light on New Findings*. Edited by A.S. van der Woude. Leiden: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1993.

--. "Cult and Sacrifice in Daniel: the Tamid and the Abomination of Desolation." Pages 283-299 in *Ritual and Sacrifice in the Ancient Near East*. Edited by J. Quagebeur. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1993. Updated and repr. as pages 671-688 in *The Book of Daniel; Composition and Reception*. Vol. II. Edited by J. J. Collins and P.W. Flint. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

--, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Part I). Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992.

Macdonald, N. "Food and Drink in Tobit and Other 'Diaspora Novellas.'" Pages 165-178 in *Studies in the Book of Tobit; a Multidisciplinary Approach*. Edited by M. Bredin. London: T & T Clark, 2006.

Mach, M., *Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabinischer Zeit*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992.

MacRae, G.W. "A Kingdom That Cannot Be Shaken: The Heavenly Jerusalem in the Letter to the Hebrews." *Tantur Yearbook* (1979-80): 27-40.

Madden, S.C., "Josephus's Use of the Book of Daniel: A Study of Hellenistic-Jewish Historiography." Ph.D. diss., University of Texas, 2001.

Magness, J. "The Arch of Titus at Rome and the Fate of the God of Israel." *JJS* 59 (2008)2: 201-217.

Maier, C..M., *Daughter Zion, Mother Zion: Gender, Space, and the Sacred in Ancient Israel*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008.

Maier, J. "Self-Definition, Prestige, and Status of Priests towards the End of the Second Temple Period." *BTB* 23 (1993): 139-150.

Malamat, A. "The Sacred Sea." Pages 45-54 in *Sacred Space: Shrine, City, Land; Proceedings of the International Conference in Memory of Joshua Prawer*. Edited by B.Z. Kedar and R.J.Z. Werblowsky. London: Macmillan; Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities/NYU Press, 1998.

Malina, B. "Exegetical Eschatology, the Peasant Present and the Final Discourse Genre: the Case of Mark 13." *BTB* 32 (2002): 49-59.

Martinez, F. Garcia, and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, eds., *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition.* 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997-1998.

Mastin, B.A. "The Reading of 1QDan a at Daniel II 4." *VT* 38 (1988): 341-346.

Matthews, V.H. "Physical Space, Imagined Space, and 'Lived Space' in Ancient Israel," *BTB* 33 (2003): 12-20.

McLay, R. T., *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 43. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1995.

--. "It's a Question of Influence: The Theodotion and Old Greek Texts of Daniel." Pages 231-254 in *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers Presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies*, [July] 25th-3rd August 1994. Edited by Alison Salvesen. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1998.

--. "The Old Greek Translation of Daniel iv-vi and the Formation of the Book of Daniel." *VT* 55 (2005)3: 304-323.

Meadowcroft, T.J., *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel. A Literary Comparison*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Suppl. Series 198. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

--. "Who Are the Princes of Persia and Greece (Daniel 10)? Pointers towards the Danielic Vision of Earth and Heaven," *JSOT* 27(2004)1: 99-113.

Mendels, D., *The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in Hasmonean Literature*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1987.

Meyers, C. "Sea, Molten". Pages 1061-1062 in the *ABD*, vol. 5. Edited by D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York, 1992.

--, and E.M. Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8.* Anchor Bible 25B. New York: Doubleday, 1987.

--, and E.M. Meyers, *Zechariah 9-14.* Anchor Bible 25C. New York: Doubleday, 1993.

Michalowski, P. "History as Charter: Some Observations on the Sumerian King List." *JAOS* 103 (1983)1: 237-248.

--, *The Lamentation over the Destruction of Sumer and Ur*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1989.

--. "The Mortal Kings of Ur: A Short Century of Divine Rule in Ancient Mesopotamia." Pages 33-46 in *Religion and Power: Divine Kingship in the Ancient World and Beyond*. Oriental Institute Seminars 4. Edited by Nicole Maria Brisch. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2008.

Milgrom, J., *Leviticus.* Anchor Bible 3, 3a, 3b. New York: Doubleday, 1991-2001.

--. "The Concept of Impurity in *Jubilees* and the *Temple Scroll*." *RQ* 16 (1993): 277-284.

Miller, J.E. "The Redaction of Daniel." *JSOT* (1991) 52: 115-124.

Miller, P.D., Jr, and J.J.M. Roberts, *The Hand of the Lord: A Reassessment of the "Ark Narrative of I Samuel*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1977.

Moo, J. "The Sea That is No More. Rev. 21:1 and the Function of the Sea Imagery in the Apocalypse of John," *NovT* 51(2009): 148-167.

Morray-Jones, R.A. "The Temple Within." Pages 145-178 in *Paradise Now: Essays on Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism*. Edited by April De Conick. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.

Morris, P. "Exiled from Eden: Jewish Interpretations of Genesis." Pages 117-166 in *A Walk in the Garden; Biblical, Iconographical and Literary Images of Eden*. Edited by P. Morris and D. Sawyer. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.

Mulder, M.J., *I Kings*. Leuven: Peeters, 1999.

Mullen, E.Th., *The Assembly of the Gods. The Divine Council in Canaanite and Early Hebrew Literature*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980.

Murray, R. "The Origin of Aramaic *'ir*, Angel," *Orientalia* 53(1984): 303-317.

Na'aman, N. "The Trowel vs. the Text. How the Amarna Letters Challenge Archaeology." *BAR* 35 (2009)1: 52-56; 70-71.

Nam, D. "The 'Throne of God' Motif in the Hebrew Bible." Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, 1989.

Nelson, D.W., "Responses to the Destruction of the Second Temple in the Tannaitic Midrashim." Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1991.

Neusner, J., *Judaism in Society: the Evidence of the Yerushalmi*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Newman, J.H., *Praying by the Book: The Scripturalization of Prayer in Second Temple Judaism*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999.

Newman, R.C. "The Ancient Exegesis of Genesis 6:2, 4." *Grace Theological Journal* 5 (1984)1: 13-36.

Newsom, C., *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition.* Harvard Semitic Studies 27. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.

Nickelsburg, G.W.E, *1 Enoch – Vol. 1*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.

--. "Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee." *JBL* 100 (1981): 575-600. Repr. as pages 427-457 in *George W.E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning*. Edited by J. Neusner and A. J. Avery-Peck. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

--, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1972. Expanded edition, 2006.

Nielsen, I. "The Gardens of the Hellenistic Palaces." Pages 165-188 in *The Royal Palace Institution in the First Millennium BC: Regional Development and Cultural Interchange between East and West*. Edited by I. Nielsen. Athens: The Danish Institute at Athens, 2001.

Oblath, M.D. "'To Sleep, Perchance to Dream…': What Jacob Saw at Bethel (Genesis 28.10-22)." *JSOT* 26 (2001)1: 117-126.

O'Connor, K.M. "Jeremiah's Two Versions of the Future." Pages 86-104 in *Utopia and Dystopia in Prophetic Literature*, Edited by E. Ben Zvi,. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006.

O'Connor, M.P. "The Human Characters' Names in the Ugaritic Poems: Onomastic Eccentricity in Bronze-Age West Semitic and the Name Daniel in Particular." Pages 269-284 in *Biblical Hebrew in Its Northwest Semitic Setting. Typological and Historical Perspectives*. Edited by S.E. Fassberg & A. Hurvitz,. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006.

Oded, B. "'Yet I Have Been to Them 'lemiqdash me`at' in the Countries Where They Have Gone" (Ezekiel 11:16)'." Pages 103-114 in *Sefer Moshe: the Moshe Weinfeld Jubilee Volume; Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East, Qumran, and Post-Biblical Judaism*. Edited by Ch. Cohen, A. Hurvitz, and S.M. Paul. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004.

--, "The Judean Exiles in Babylonia: Survival Strategy of an Ethnic Minority," *For Uriel; Studies in the History of Israel in Antiquity, Presented to Professor Uriel Rappaport*. M. Mor [et al.], eds. Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 2005: 53-76.

Oegema, G.S. *The Anointed and His People*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

O'Kennedy, D.F. "The Meaning of 'Great Mountain' in Zechariah 4:7," *OTE* 21(2008)2: 404-421.

Olyan, S. "Why an Altar of Unfinished Stones? Some Thoughts on Ex 20,25 and Dtn 27:5-6." *ZAW* 108 (1996): 161-171.

Oppenheim, A.L. "The Golden Garments of the Gods." *JNES* 8 (1949): 172-193.

Otto, R. *The Idea of the Holy: An Inquiry into the Non-Rational Factor in the Idea of the Divine and its Relation to the Rational*. Translated by J.W. Harvey. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1950. Translation of *Das Heilige: über das Irrationale in der Idee des Göttlichen und sein Verhältnis zum Rationalen*. Breslau: Trewendt und Granier, 1917.

Overholt, Th.W. "King Nebuchadnezzar in the Jeremiah Tradition." *CBQ* 30 (1968): 39-48.

Oxtoby, W. "The Idea of the Holy." Pages 413-438 in *The Encyclopedia of Religion*. Edited by M. Eliade et al. 1 vol. New York, NY: Macmillan, 1987.

Paden, W.E. "The Concept of World Habitation: Eliadean Linkages with a New Comparativism," Pages 249-259 in *Changing Religious Worlds: The Meaning and End of Mircea Eliade*. Edited by B. S. Rennie. Albany: SUNY Press, 2001.

Pakkala,J. *Ezra the Scribe: the Development of Ezra 7-10 and Nehemiah 8*, [BZAW 347]. Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2004.

Paley, S.M., *King of the World: Ashur-nasir-pal II of Assyria 883-859 B.C.* Brooklyn: The Brooklyn Museum, 1976.

Patrick, D. "The Kingdom of God in the Old Testament." Pages 67-80 in *The Kingdom of God in 20th-Century Interpretation*. Edited by W. Willis. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1987.

Paul, S. "Decoding a 'Joint' Expression in Daniel 5:6, 16." *JANES* 22 (1993): 121-127.

--. "From Mari to Daniel: Instructions for the Acceptance of Servants into the Royal Court." Pages 161-163 in *Eretz Israel* 22(1993): Abraham Malamat Volume. Transl. from the Hebrew and repr. in *Divrei Shalom. Collected Studies of Shalom M. Paul on the Bible and the Ancient Near East 1967-2005*. Leiden: Brill, 2005: 205-211.

--. "The Mesopotamian Babylonian Background of Daniel 1-6." Pages 55-68 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Vol. I. Edited by J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint,. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Peels, E. "God's Throne in Elam: the Historical Background and Literary Context of Jeremiah 49:34-39." Pages 216-229 in *Past, Present, Future; the Deuteronomistic History and the Prophets*. Old Testament Studies 43. Edited by J.C. de Moor and H.F. van Rooy. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Pfandl, G. "Interpretations of the Kingdom of God in Daniel 2:44." *AUSS* 34 (1996): 249-268.

Pongratz-Leisten, B. "'Lying King'" and 'False Prophet': the Intercultural Transfer of a Rhetorical Device within Ancient Near Eastern Ideologies." Pages 215-243 in *Ideologies as Intercultural Phenomena*. Proceedings of the Third Annual Symposium of the Assyrian and Babylonian Intellectual Heritage Project held in Chicago, USA, Oct. 27-31, 2000. Melammu Symposia 3. Edited by A. Panaino & G. Pettinato. Milano: Universita di Bologna, 2002.

Porten, B. "Elephantine and the Bible." Pages 51-84 in *Semitic Papyrology in Context*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Porter, B.N. *Images, Power and Politics: Figurative Aspects of Esarhaddon's Babylonian Policy*. Philadelphia: American Philological Society, 1993.

Portier-Young, A. "Theologies of resistance in Daniel, the Apocalypse of Weeks, the Book of Dreams, and the Testament of Moses." Ph.D. diss. Duke University, 2004.

Postgate, J.N. "Royal Ideology and State Administration in Sumer and Akkad." Pages 395-411 in *Civilizations of the Ancient Near East*. Edited by J.M. Sasson. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2000.

Power, B.A. "Iconographic Windows into Ezekiel's World." Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1999.

Pritchard, J.B., ed., *The Ancient Near East in Pictures Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1954. 2nd ed., 1969.

--, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. 3rd ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.

Propp, W.H.C., *Exodus*. Anchor Bible 2. New York: Doubleday, 1998.

Qimron, E., and J. Strugnell, eds., *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert X. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.

Raabe, P.R. "Daniel 7: Its Structure and Role in the Book." *HAR* 9 (1985): 267-275.

Raviv, R. "On the Original Position of the Book of Daniel in the Jewish Bible." *JSIJ* 6 (2007).

Redditt, P. "Daniel 9: Its Structure and Meaning." *CBQ* 62 (2000): 236-249.

Reed, A.Y. "Heavenly Ascent, Angelic Descent, and the Transmission of Knowledge in 1 Enoch 6-16." Pages 47-66 in *Heavenly Realms and Earthly Realities in Late Antique Religions*. Edited by R. S. Boustan and A. Y. Reed. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Reiterer, F.V., et al., eds., *Angels: The Concept of Celestial Beings – Origins, Development and Reception*. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2007. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2007.

Rennie, B.S. "*Illud Tempus*, Time By Another Name." Pages 77-87 in *Reconstructing Eliade: Making Sense of Religion*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1996.

Richter, S.L., *The Deuteronomistic History and the Name Theology.* Lešakkēn šemo šam *in the Bible and the Ancient Near East.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2002.

Roberts, J.J.M. "Myth Versus History." *CBQ* 38 (1976): 1-13.

Rom-Shiloni, D. "Ezekiel as the Voice of the Exiles and Constructor of Exilic Ideology." *HUCA* 76 (2005): 1-45.

   --. "Facing Destruction and Exile: Inner-Biblical Exegesis in Jeremiah and Ezekiel." *ZAW* 117 (2005)2: 189-205.

Ronen, R., *Possible Worlds in Literary Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Root, M.C., *The King and Kingship in Achaemenid Art: Essays on the Creation of an Iconography of Empire*. Leiden: Brill, 1979.

Rosenberg, S.G. "The Jewish Temple at Elephantine." *NEA* 67 (2004)1: 4-13.

Rosenfeld, B.Z. "Sage and Temple in Rabbinic Thought after the Destruction of the Second Temple." *JSJ* 28 (1997): 437-464.

Roth, M.T., *Law Collections from Mesopotamia and Asia Minor.* 2nd ed. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.

Roth, S., "Sanctity and Separation." *Tradition* 14 (1974)4: 29-45.

Routledge, R.L. "The Siege and Deliverance of the City of David in Isaiah 29:1-8." *Tyn Bul* 43 (1992)1: 181-190.

Rowland, C. "The Visions of God in Apocalyptic Literature." *JSJ* 1 (1972)2: 137-154.

   --. "A Man Clothed in Linen: Daniel 10:6 ff. and Jewish Angelology." *JSNT* 24 (1985): 99-110.

Rowley, H.H. "The Unity of the Book of Daniel." *HUCA* 23 (1950/51): 233-273.

Russell, J.M., *Sennacherib's Palace without Rival at Nineveh*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

Ryan, M.-L., *Possible Worlds, Artificial Intelligence and Narrative Theory*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1991.

Sachs, A. J., and J. Wiseman. "A Babylonian King List of the Hellenistic Period." *Iraq* 16 (1954): 202-212.

Sarna, N., *The JPS Torah Commentary – Exodus*. Philadelphia: JPS, 1991.

Schäfer, P., *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism*. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2009.

Schaudig, H., *Die Inschriften Nabonids von Babylon und Kyros' des Grossen samt den in ihrem Umfeld entstandenen Tendenzschriften : Textausgabe und Grammatik*. [AOAT 256]. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2001.

Schechter, S. *Aspects of Rabbinic Theology. Major Concepts of the Talmud*. New York: Macmillan, 1909. Repr. New York: Schocken, 1961.

Schniedewind, W.M., *Society and the Promise to David. The Reception History of 2 Samuel 7:1-17*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

--. "The Evolution of Name Theology." Pages 228-239 in *The Chronicler as Theologian; Essays in Honor of Ralph W. Klein*. Edited by M.P. Graham, S.L. McKenzie and G.N. Knoppers. London: T & T Clark, 2003.

Schwartz, B.J. "Torah from Zion - Isaiah's Temple Vision (Isaiah 2:1-4)." Pages 11-26 in *Sanctity of Time and Space in Tradition and Modernity*. Edited by A. Houtman et al. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

--. "Israel's Holiness: the Torah Traditions." Pages 47-59 in *Purity and Holiness: the Heritage of Leviticus*. Edited by M. J. H. M. Poorthuis and J. Schwartz. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Schwartz, D.R. "Antiochus IV Epiphanes in Jerusalem." Pages 45-56 in *Historical Perspectives from the Hasmoneans to Bar Kohkba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Edited by D. Goodblatt et al. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Schweitzer, S.J. "Reading Utopia in Chronicles." Ph.D. diss. University of Notre Dame, 2005. Printed as *Reading Utopia in Chronicles*. London: T & T Clark, 2007.

--. "Exploring the Utopian Space of Chronicles: Some Spatial Anomalies." *Hermeneutics Task Force, CBA,* August 3, 2003: 3. Cited 28 July 2009. Online: www.case.edu/affil/GAIR/cba/schweitzer.pdf.

Scott, J.M., *On Earth as in Heaven: The Restoration of Sacred Time and Sacred Space in the Book of Jubilees*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

--, ed., *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish and Christian Conceptions.* Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Segal, A. F. "Apocalypticism and Life after Death." *PIBA* 22 (1999): 42-63.

Selman, M. J. "The Kingdom of God in the Old Testament." *TynBul* 40 (1989): 161-183.

Seow, C. L. "The Rule of God in the Book of Daniel." Pages 219-246 in *David and Zion; Biblical Studies in Honor of J.J.M. Roberts*. Edited by B.F. Batto and K.L. Roberts. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004.

Seux, M.–J., *Épithètes royales akkadiennes et sumériennes*. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1967.

Shea, W.H. "Unity of Daniel." Pages 165-255 in *Symposium on Daniel.* Daniel & Revelation Committee Series, vol. 2. Edited by F.B. Holbrook. Washington DC: Biblical Research Institute, 1986.

Sheriffs, D.C.T. "A Tale of Two Cities' – Nationalism in Zion and Babylon." *TynBul* 39 (1988): 19-57.

Sherwin-White, S.M. "Babylonian Chronicle Fragments as a Source for Seleucid History," *JNES* 42(1983): 265-270

--. "Seleucid Babylonia: a Case-Study for the Installation and Development of Greek Rule." Pages 1-31 in *Hellenism in the East*. Edited by A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White. London: Duckworth, 1987.

Shimoff, Sandra R. "Gardens: from Eden to Jerusalem." *JJS* 26 (1995): 145-155.

Shiner, L.E. "Sacred Space, Profane Space, Human Space." *JAAR* 40 (1972): 425-436.

Siegman, E. "The Stone Hewn from the Mountain." *CBQ* 18 (1956): 364-379.

Sievers, J., *The Hasmoneans and Their Supporters. From Mattathias to the Death of John Hyrcanus I*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.

--. "Antiochus. Antiochus IV." *Encyclopaedia Iranica Online*, 2005. No pages. Cited 28 July 2009. Online: http://www.iranica.com.

Sjöberg, A.W., *Der Mondgott Nanna-Suen in der sumerischen Überlieferung.* Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1960.

--, and E. Bergmann, *The Collection of the Sumerian Temple Hymns.* Locust Valley, NY: J.J. Augustin Publisher, 1969.

Smelik, K.A.D. "Mijn knecht Nebukadnessar in het Boek Jeremiah: een provocatie aan de lezer." *Amsterdamse Cahiers* 16 (1997): 44-59.

Smith, J.Z., *To Take Place. Toward Theory in Ritual*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

--. "The Wobbling Pivot." Pages 88-103 in *Map is Not Territory*. Leiden: Brill, 1978. Repr., Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.

Smith, M., *The Ugaritic Baal Cycle. Volume 1*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

--, *The Early History of God*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002.

Smith-Christopher, D.L.. "Hebrew Satyagraha: The Politics of Biblical Fasting in the Post-Exilic Period." *Food and Foodways* 5 (1993): 269-292.

--. "Resistance in a 'Culture of Permission'." Pages 15-38 in *Truth's Bright Embrace: Essays and Poems in Honor of Arthur O. Roberts*. Edited by Howard Macy & Paul N. Anderson. Newberg: George Fox University Press, 1996.

--. "Prayers and Dreams: Power and Diaspora Identities in the Social Setting of the Daniel Tales." Pages 266-290 in *The Book of Daniel; Composition and Reception*. Vol. I. Edited by J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint,. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

--., *A Biblical Theology of Exile*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.

Snyder, B.W. "Combat Myth in the Apocalypse: The Liturgy of the Day of the Lord and the Dedication of the Heavenly Temple." Ph.D. diss. University of California at Berkeley, 1991.

Soesilo, D. "Why Did Daniel Reject the King's Delicacies? (Daniel 1.8)." *The Bible Translator* 45 (1994)4: 441-444.

Soja, E.W., *Thirdspace. Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publ., 1996.

--, *Postmetropolis: Critical Studies of Cities and Regions.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Publ., 2000.

--. "Thirdspace: Expanding the Scope of the Geographical Imagination," Pages 13-31 in *Architecturally Speaking. Practices of Art Architecture and the Everyday*. Edited by A. Read. London: Routledge, 2000.

Stager, Lawrence, "Jerusalem and the Garden of Eden." *Eretz Israel* 26 (1999): 183-194.

Stokes, R.S. "The Throne Visions of Daniel 7, 1 Enoch 14, and the Qumran Book of Giants (4Q530): An Analysis of Their Literary Relationship." *DSD* 15 (2008): 340-358.

Stone, M.E., *Fourth Ezra*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

--. "Pseudepigraphy Reconsidered." *Review of Rabbinic Judaism* 9 (2006): 1-15.

Stordalen, T., *Echoes of Eden. Genesis 2-3 and Symbolism of the Eden Garden in Biblical Hebrew Literature.* Leuven: Peeters, 2000.

Stronach, D. "The Garden as a Political Statement: Some Case Studies from the Near East in the First Millennium B.C." *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 4 (1990): 171-180.

--. "From Cyrus to Darius: Notes on Art and Architecture in Early Achaemenid Palaces." Pages 95-112 in *The Royal Palace Institution in the First Millennium BC: Regional Development and Cultural Interchange between East and West*. Edited by I. Nielsen. Athens: The Danish Institute at Athens, 2001.

Stuckenbruck, L.T.. "'One Like a Son of Man as the Ancient of Days' in the Old Greek Recension of Daniel 7, 13: Scribal Error or Theological Translation?" *ZNW* 86 (1995): 268-276.

--. "The Throne-Theophany of the Book of Giants: Some New Light on the Background of Daniel 7." Pages 211-220 in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures; Qumran Fifty Years After*. Edited by S.E. Porter and C.A. Evans. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

--. "The Book of Daniel and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Making and Remaking of the Biblical Tradition." Pages 135-172 in *The Hebrew Bible and Qumran: The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls (Proceedings of the Jubilee Celebration at Princeton Theological Seminary)*. Vol. 1. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. N. Richland Hills, TX: BIBAL Press, 2000.

--. "Daniel and Early Enoch Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 368-386 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*; Vol. 2. Edited by J. J. Collins and P. W. Flint. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

--. "'Reading the Present' in the Animal Apocalypse (*1 Enoch 85-90*)." Pages 91-102 in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretation*. Edited by K. De Troyer & A. Lange. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.

Sullivan, K.P., *Wrestling With Angels: A Study of the Relationship between Angels and humans in Ancient Jewish Literature and the New Testament*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

--. "Sexuality and Gender of Angels." Pages 211-228 in *Paradise Now: Essays on Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism*. Edited by April De Conick. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.

Sulzbach, C. "Nebuchadnezzar in Eden? Daniel 4 and Ezekiel 28." Pages 125-136 in *Stimulation from Leiden. Collected Communications to the XVIIIth Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament, Leiden 2004*. Edited by H.M. Niemann and M. Augustin. Frankfurt a/Main: Peter Lang Verlag, 2006.

Swartz, M.D. "Like the Ministering Angels'; Ritual and Purity in Early Jewish Mysticism and Magic." *AJSR* 19 (1994)2: 135-167.

Sweeney, M.A. *The Twelve Prophets, Volume Two*. [Berit Olam] Collegeville, Minn: The Liturgical Press, 2000.

--. "The End of Eschatology in Daniel? Theological and Socio-Political Ramifications of the Changing Contexts of Interpretation," *Biblical Interpretation* 9(2001)2: 123-139.

Tabory, J. "*Ma'amadot*: A Second Temple Non-Temple Liturgy." Pages 235-262 in *Liturgical Perspectives; Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls; Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center... January, 2000*. Edited by E.G. Chazon. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Taylor, R.A., *The Peshitta of Daniel*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

--. "The Peshitta of Daniel: Questions of Origin and Date." *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 247 (1994): 31-42.

Teugels, L. "Midrash in the Bible or Midrash on the Bible? Critical Remarks about the Uncritical Use of a Term." Pages 43-63 in *Bibel und Midrasch: zur Bedeutung der rabbinischen Exegese für die Bibelwissenschaft*. Edited by Gerhard Bodendorfer and Matthias Millard. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Thompson, H.O., *The Book of Daniel. An Annotated Bibliography*. New York: Garland Publishing Inc., 1993.

Thompson, T.L., *The Mythic Past: Biblical Archaeology and the Myth of Israel*. New York: Basic Books, 1999.

Tigay, J.H., *You Shall Have No Other Gods. Israelite Religion in the Light of Hebrew Inscriptions*. Harvard Semitic Studies 31. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.

Tigchelaar, E.J.C., *Prophets of Old and the Day of the End: Zechariah, the Book of Watchers, and Apocalyptic*. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

--. "The White Dress of the Essenes and the Pythagoreans." Pages 301-321 in *Jerusalem, Alexandria, Rome; Studies in Ancient Cultural Interaction in Honour of A. Hilhorst*. Edited by F. García Martínez and G.P. Luttikhuizen. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Tiller, P.A., *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of I Enoch*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.

Tilly, M. "Geographie und Weltordnung im Aristeasbrief." *JSJ* 28 (1997)2: 131-153.

Tomasino, A.J., "Daniel and the Revolutionaries: The Use of the Daniel Tradition by Jewish Resistance Movements of Late Second-Temple Palestine." Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1995.

Tomabechi, Y. "Wall Paintings from Dur Kurigalzu." *JNES* 42 (1983): 123-131.

Trever, J.C. "Completion of the Publication of Some Fragments from Qumran Cave 1." *RQ* 5 (1965)3/19: 323-336.

--. "1QDan[a]; the Latest of the Qumran Manuscripts." *RQ* 7 (1970)2/26: 277-286.

Tromp, J. "The Davidic Messiah in Jewish Escatology of the First Century BCE." Pages 179-202 in *Restoration; Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*. Edited by J.M. Scott. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Tuell, S.S., *I & II Chronicles*. Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 2001.

Turner, S. "The Interim, Earthly Messianic Kingdom in Paul." *JSNT* 25 (2003): 323-342.

Tuschling, R.M.M., *Angels and Orthodoxy*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.

Ulrich, E. **"Daniel Manuscripts from Qumran."** *BASOR* (1987)268: 17-37; (1989)274: 3-26.

--. "Orthography and Text in 4QDan[a] and 4QDan[b] and in the Received Masoretic Text." Pages 29-42 in *Of Scribes and Scrolls; Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins, Presented to John Strugnell*. Edited by H.W. Attridge [et al.]. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1990.

--. "Orthography and Text in 4QDan[a] and 4QDan[b] and in the Received Masoretic Text." Pages 149-162 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*, Edited by E. Ulrich. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans; Leiden: Brill, 1999.

--. "Daniel, Book of". Pages 171-172 of the *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* I. Edited by L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

--, et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XVI. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.

Ussishkin, D., *The Conquest of Lachish by Sennacherib*. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, Institute of Archaeology, 1982.

Valeta, D.M. "Lions and ovens and visions, oh my! A satirical analysis of Daniel 1-6." Ph.D. diss. The Iliff School of Theology and University of Denver, 2004 [Publ. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2008].

--. "The Book of Daniel in Recent Research (Part I)." *CBR* 6 (2008)3: 330-354.

Vanderhooft, D.S., *The Neo-Babylonian Empire and Babylon in the Latter Prophets.* Harvard Semitic Monographs 59. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999.

VanderKam, J.C., *The Book of Jubilees*. Louvain: Peeters, 1989.

--. "Exile in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature." Pages 89-109 in *Exile; Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*. Edited by J.M. Scott. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

--. "The Angel Story in the Book of Jubilees." Pages 151-170 in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha & Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by E G Chazon & M Stone. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Van der Spek, R.J. "'Is dit niet het grote Babylon, dat ik gebouwd heb?'," *Phoenix* 36(1990): 51-63.

Van der Toorn, K. "Een pleisterplaats voor de goden: het verschijnsel 'heilige stad' in het oude Nabije Oosten." Pages 38-52 in *Jeruzalem als heilige stad; religieuze voorstelling en geloofspraktijk*. Edited by K.D. Jenner and G.A. Wiegers. Kampen: Kok, 1996.

--. "In the Lions' Den: the Babylonian Background of a Biblical Motif." *CBQ* 60 (1998): 638.

--. "Scholars at the Oriental Court: The Figure of Daniel against its Mesopotamian Background." Pages 37-68 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Vol. I. Edited by J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

--, B. Becking, and P. W. van der Horst, eds., *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Van der Woude, A.S. "Job, Targum of". Pages 413-414 of the *EDDS*.

Van Deventer, H.J.M. "Would the Actually 'Powerful' Please Stand. The Role of the Queen (Mother) in Daniel 5." *Scriptura* 70(1999): 241-251.

--. "The End of the End; or, What Is the Deuteronomist (Still) Doing in Daniel?" Pages 62-75 in *Past, Present, Future; the Deuteronomistic History and the Prophets*. Old Testament Studies 44. Edited by J. C. de Moor and H.F. van Rooy. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Van Henten, J.W., and F. Avemarie, *Martyrdom and Noble Death. Selected Texts from Graeco-Roman, Jewish and Christian Antiquity*. London: Routledge, 2002.

Venter, P.M. "Daniel and Enoch: Two Different Reactions." *HTS* 53 (1997): 68-91.

--. "Intertekstualiteit, konstekstualiteit en Daniel 9." *In die Skriflig* 31 (1997)4: 327-346.

--. "Constitualised Space in Daniel 9." *HTS* 60 (2004): 607-624.

--. "Spatiality in Enoch's Journeys (1 Enoch 12-36)." Pages 211-230 in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*. Edited by F. Garcia Martinez. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.

--. "A Study of Space in Daniel 1." *OTE* 19 (2006)3: 993-1004.

Vermes, G. "Josephus' Treatment of the Book of Daniel." *JJS* 42 (1991): 149-166.

Vogel, W., "The Cultic Motif in Space and Time in the Book of Daniel." Ph.D. diss., Andrews University, 1999.

Wahl, H.–M. "Noah, Daniel und Hiob in Ezechiel XIV 12-20 (21-3): Anmerkungen zum traditiongeschichtlichen Hintergrund." *VT* 42 (1992): 542-553.

Waldman, N.M. "A Note on Ezekiel 1.18." *JBL* 103 (1984): 614-618.

Watson, D.F. "Sea of Glass, Glassy Sea". Pages 1058-1059 in *ABD*, vol. 5.

Weinfeld, M., *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.

--. "The Worship of Molech and of the Queen of Heaven." *UF* 4 (1972): 133-154.

--. "Sabbath, Temple, and the Enthronement of the Lord – the Problem of the Sitz im Leben of Genesis 1:1-2:3." Pages 501-512 in *Melanges biblique et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Henri Cazelles*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 212. Edited by A. Caquot & M. Delcor, Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981.

--., "Divine Intervention in War in Ancient Israel and in the Ancient Near East," *History, Historiography and Interpretation: Studies in Biblical and Cuneiform Literatures*. H. Tadmor and M. Weinfeld (eds.). Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1983: 121-147

Weis, R.D. "Angels Altars and Angles of Vision: The Case of אראלם in Isaiah 33:7." Pages 285-292 in *Tradition of the Text; Studies Offered to Dominique Barthélemy*. Edited by G.J. Norton, and S. Pisano. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.

Weitzman, K. and H.L. Kessler, *The Frescoes of the Dura Synagogue and Christian Art*. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1990.

Weitzman, S. "Plotting Antiochus's Persecution." *JBL* 123 (2004): 219-234.

Wenell, K. "'The Kingdom' as Sacred Space: Issues for Interpretation – The Kingdom: Present/Future and Earthly/Heavenly." Paper presented at the annual conference of the British New Testament Society, 2005.

--. "Contested Temple Space and Visionary Kingdom Space in Mark's Gospel." *Biblical Interpretation* 15 (2007)3: 291-305.

Wenthe, D. "The Use of the Hebrew Scriptures in 1QM," *DSD* 5 (1998): 298.

Werman, C. "God's House: Temple or Universe." Pages 309-320 in *Philo und das Neue Testament: Wechselseitige Wahrnehmungen* 1. Internationales Symposium zum Corpus Judaeo-Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti (Eisenach/Jena, Mai 2003). Edited by R. Deines & K.-W. Niebuhr. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2004.

Wesselius, J.-W. "The Literary Nature of the Book of Daniel and the Linguistic Character of its Aramaic." *Aramaic Studies* 3 (2005)2: 241-283.

--. "'De steen die door de tempelbouwers...'; een beschouwing over de leeftijd van Darius de Meder in Daniël 6:1." Pages 221-224 in *Een boek heeft een rug; studies voor Ferenc Postma*

op het grensgebied van theologie, bibliofilie en universiteitsgeschiedenis, ter gelegenheid van zijn vijftigste verjaardag. Edited by Margriet Gosker. Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1995.

Westenholz, J.G., ed., *Royal Cities of the Biblical World,* Jerusalem: Bible Lands Museum, 1996.

Wettstein, H. "Coming to Terms with Exile." Pages 47-59 in *Diasporas and Exiles; Varieties of Jewish Identity*. Edited by H. Wettstein. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

Wharton, A. "Erasure: Eliminating the Space of Late Ancient Judaism." Pages 195-214 in *From Dura to Sepphoris: Studies in Jewish Art and Society in Late Antiquity*. Journal of Roman Archaeology Suppl. Series 40. Edited by L.I. Levine and Z. Weiss. Portsmouth, RI: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 2000.

Wiegand, A. "Der Gottesname צור und seine Deutung in des Sinne Bildner oder Schöpfer in der alten jüdischen Litteratur." *ZAW* 10 (1890): 85-96.

Wilkinson, J. "Orientation, Jewish and Christian." *PEQ* 116 (1984): 16-30.

Williams, M.H. "The Use of Alternative Names by Diaspora Jews in Graeco-Roman Antiquity." *JSJ* 38 (2007)3: 307-327.

Wilson, G.H. "The Prayer of Daniel 9: Reflection on Jeremiah 29." *JSOT* (1990)48: 92.

Wilson, J. "11QtgJob and the Peshitta Job." Pages 413-414 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov & J.C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000.

Wilson, R.R. "The City in the Old Testament."Pages 3-13 in *Civitas: Religious Interpretations of the City*. Edited by P.S. Hawkins. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.

Winter, I., "'Seat of Kingship'/'A Wonder to Behold': the Palace as Construct in the Ancient Near East," *Ars Orientalis* 23(1993): 27-55.

Wiseman, D.J., *Nebuchadrezzar and Babylon.* The Schweich Lectures. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Wolfson, E.R. "'Yeridah la-Merkavah': Typology of Ecstasy and Enthronement in Ancient Jewish Mysticism." Pages 13-44 in *Mystics of the Book; Themes, Topics, and Typologies* Edited by R.A. Herrera. New York: Peter Lang, 1993.

Wolters, A. "Untying the King's Knots: Physiology and Wordplay in Daniel 5." *JBL* 110 (1991):117-122.

Wong, C.G.I. "On 'Visits' and 'Visions' in Isaiah XXIX 6-7." *VT* 45 (1995)3: 370-376.

Wooden, R.G. "The Book of Daniel and Manticism: a Critical Assessment of the View that the Book of Daniel Derives from a Mantic Tradition." Ph.D. diss. St. Andrews University (UK), 2001.

Wright, A.T., *The Origin of Evil Spirits*. [WUNT 198]. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2005.

Wright, J.E., *The Early History of Heaven*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Wyatt, N. "Where Did Jacob Dream his Dream?" *SJOT* 2 (1990): 44-57.

--, *Religious Texts from Ugarit*. 2nd ed. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003

Yadin, Y., *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962

--, *The Temple Scroll: the Hidden Law of the Dead Sea Sect*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1985.

Yaron, K. "The Dirge over the King of Tyre." *ASTI* 3 (1964): 29-47.

Younger, K.L. "The Deportations of the Israelites." *JBL* 117 (1998)2: 201-227.

--. "'Give Us Our Daily Bread': Everyday Life for the Israelite Deportees." Pages 269-288 in *Life and Culture in the Ancient Near East*. Edited by R.E. Averbeck, M.W. Chavalas and D.B. Weisberg. Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 2003.

Zadok, R. "On Five Iranian Names in the Old Testament." *VT* 26 (1976): 246-247.

Zerbe, G. "'Pacifism' and 'Passive Resistance' in Apocalyptic Writings: A Critical Evaluation," *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*. [JSPSS 14] J.H. Charlesworth and C.A. Evans, eds. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993: 65-95.

Zwickel, W. "Das eherne Meer (1 Kön 7,23-26)." Pages 125-136 in *Der Salomonische Tempel*. Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1999.