Constitualised space in Daniel 9

P M Venter

Department of Old Testament Studies

University of Pretoria

Abstract

The prayer in Daniel 9 theologically paved the way for prayers in the later synagogue. In this chapter the Daniel tradents linked a traditional penitential prayer to an apocalyptic narrative. Through this combination their view that man has to wait upon God to change history, is extended into a life of sanctification, teaching, fasting and the offering of penitence. As these tradents were estranged from the temple, they had to find somewhere else to conduct their liturgical services. Their apocalyptic mythological view of the temple enabled them to constitualise holy space away from the material temple. In this way they paved the way for the synagogue as house of prayer in later times.

1. INTRODUCTION

Prayers played an important role in the liturgy followed at the temple. At least two occasions can be pointed out where liturgical prayers were conducted outside the temple. The prayer in Nehemiah 9:6-37 was presented by the Levites who were standing on the stairs (Neh 9:4) where the Israelites were gathered for fasting outside the temple. The prayer in Daniel 9:4-19 was prayed in similar circumstances. In his prayer Daniel refers to the "desolate sanctuary" (Dn 9:17) and the desolation of the city of Jerusalem (Dn 9:18), both references indicating the unlikeness of these prayers being prayed in the temple area. My proposal is that these occasions at which prayers were offered to God outside the temple itself created in the later synagogue the ideological matrix for communal prayers away from the temple.

In order to substantiate this theory, the *Gattung* of the prayer in Daniel 9:4-19 is studied in the first instance and compared to other prayers belonging to the same genre. Having indicated the tradition history of this penitential prayer, the relation of the prayer to the revelation in Daniel 9:20-27 is indicated. Finally I use the discipline of reconstruction of ancient space to find the socio-historic background of the composition of Daniel 9. An apocalyptic community that prays away from the temple, thereby creating a holy place for the liturgy, is indicated. As penitential community they constitualised a representative space for the temple.

2. THE *GATTUNG* OF THE PRAYER IN DANIEL 9:4-19

Daniel 9:1-27 consists of three sections. In the introduction to the chapter (verses 1-3) the narrative dates the liturgical event in which Daniel partook as being in the first year of Darius the Mede. It introduces the problematical contents of Jeremiah 25:11-14 and 29:10 in which it is prophesied that Jerusalem would lie in ruins for seventy years before being rebuilt. In the second section (verses 4-19) Daniel delivers his penitential prayer for Israel's transgression. The third section (verses 20-27) comprises a revelation by the angel Gabriel on the future restoration of the temple.

In research, the penitential prayer (verses 4-19) is described as ".... an anthological liturgical text in the post-exilic literature..." (Lacocque 1979:182), ".... a mosaic of quotations from Deuteronomy and Jeremiah, and occasionally from 1 Kings, Leviticus and Ezekiel" (Lacocque 1979:182), "... an anthology containing a number of quotations from Deuteronomy and Jeremiah ..." (Anderson 1984:107) and "... a smoothly flowing pastiche of traditional phrases ..." (Collins 1984:90)[1].

On an intertextual level *explicit* intertextuality occurs in verses 11 and 13[2]. The phrase hvm tr/tB bWtK (written in the laws of Moses) explicitly refers to the Pentateuch. In verse 15 *allusive* intertextuality is found with the exodus theme in the phrase "who brought your people out of the land of Egypt with a mighty hand". No direct quotation of older biblical material can be found in the prayer. *Implicit* intertextuality with the contents of Deuteronomy, Jeremiah, 1 Kings, Leviticus and Ezekiel can however be found.

The prayer, however, does not only reflect phrases and ideas from older biblical material, but also the typical form of the penitential prayer. It shares not only a common vocabulary (cf Boda 1999:203-204) with the prayers in 1 Kings 8, Ezra 9:6-15, Neh 1:5-11, Ps 106, Nehemiah 9:6-37 and 1 Baruch 1:15-3:8, but also has the same *Gattung* as the "Penitential Prayer". According to Werline's (2003:3) definition, it " … is a direct address to God in which an individual, a group, or an individual on behalf of a group confesses sins and petitions for forgiveness as an act of repentance." It contains the typical elements of the form of the penitential prayer: praise, supplication, confession of sin, history, and themes like covenant, land and law (cf Boda 1999:30). Comparing the prayer in Daniel 9 with the prayers in Ezra 9:6-15, Neh 1:5-11 and 9:6-37, Towner (1984:130) terms this prayer a "prose prayer of penitence." O'Kennedy (2003:141) calls it a "prose penitential prayer". He highlights the following shared characteristics to be found in all four prayers (O'Kennedy 2003:141-142):

[1] Towner (1984:129) describes the whole chapter as "a meditation of Scripture upon earlier Scripture."

[2] For a technical analysis of the intertextuality of Daniel 9, see Venter (1997a:338-343).

- The Hitpa'el form of hdy (to confess) is used.
- They are more extensive than other prose penitential prayers.
- All four have a penitential character similar to the prayer of Solomon in 1 Kings 8:46-47, 49.
- The narratives in which the prayers are embedded do not give any direct answers or promises of God's absolution.

As is the case in the other penitential prayers, Daniel 9:4-19 indicates a situation of rpaw qcw µ/x µynWnjtw hLpT (prayer, supplication, fasting and sackcloth and ashes – Dn 9:3). What is striking in Daniel's prayer is his solidarity with his people. While the prayer in Nehemiah 9 refers to Israel mostly in the third person (cf Neh 9:7-31) and only changes to the collective first person in the last sentences (cf Neh 9:32-37), Daniel identifies himself with Israel all along. As individual he prays on behalf of all of the Israelite community. Through his prophets God spoke to Israel's kings, princes, ancestors, and to all the people of the land (Dn 9:6). They all sinned. They were all overcome by shame (Dn 9:8). God therefore brought calamity (hldg h[r) upon all of Jerusalem as never before (Dn 9:12). Daniel's penitence is not only on behalf of all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and of all of Israel, near and far in all the lands to which God has driven them (Dn 9:7), but also for the city that bears God's name (Dn 9:19) and for its temple.

When Daniel in his prayer implores Yahweh for a reversal of the fortunes of Jerusalem and its temple, he not only pleads for his people, but also for Yahweh himself. The plea to Yahweh is to bring salvation for "your" city Jerusalem, "your" holy mountain (òvdqArh µlvWry òry[– Dn 9:16) and "your" desolated sanctuary (µmVh òvDq – Dn 9:17). The destiny of the city and the temple is the mutual concern of Yahweh and his people and ties them in a relationship.

The theological contents of this relationship is explored in the structure of the prayer. Here a pattern is used in which God's righteousness (R) is alternated with Israel's transgression (T):

9:4	The awesome God who keeps his covenant with those who love him (dsj) (R).
9:5-6	We did not listen to your prophets who addressed all of us (afj [vr [mv al) (T).
9:7a	You are a righteous God (hqdX) (R).
9:7b-8	Shame came upon all of us, far and near, for we sinned against God (tvB l[m afj) (T).

9:9a	God has mercy and forgives (mjr jls) (R).
9:9b-14a	We did not obey God's laws and calamity came upon Jerusalem (drm [mv al rb[r/s afj h[r) (T).
9:14b-c	God is righteous – we sinned ([mv al, qyDx) (R-T).
9:15	God saved us from Egypt – we sinned (afj, ax/h) (R-T).
9:16	God is right to bring his anger on Jerusalem – we sinned and became a disgrace (hPrj, afj, hqdx hmjw pa) (R-T).
9:17-18	Look upon the desolated sanctuary on the ground of your great mercies (mjr) (R).
9:19	Forgive us because the city and the people bear your name (jls mv) (R).

Daniel acknowledges that Yahweh is righteous (dsj, hqdX, mjr jls, qyDx, ax/h mv). In contrast to God's righteousness, Israel brought shame and disgrace to Jerusalem because they sinned against God's commandments (afj, [vr, [mv al, tvB, h[r, hPrj). As the prayer progresses a shift from an elaboration about Israel's sin to an extensive elaboration about Yahweh's mercy and his forgiveness, occurs. Typical of all penitential prayers, this prayer is theocentric in its focus (cf Boda 2003:20-21). By not listening to God's prophets and disobeying his law, Israel distanced themselves from Yahweh. The agony of their guilt drives them back into God's arms. Their penitential confession is aimed at restoring the covenantal relationship with Yahweh (cf Dn 9:4). This restoration is, however, depicted in a theocentric way. The people of Israel can only present themselves to God as repenting people who wait upon God's actions. Jerusalem's devastation can only come to an end if God himself casts his eyes upon his people and his city. Only through God's great mercy and for his own sake can God's desolated sanctuary and Jerusalem be saved. God's righteousness therefore is conceptualised not only in terms of its opposition to Israel's unrighteousness, but also in terms of his willingness to take Israel back into his covenant and to remove the disgraceful results of their sin. The human partner is used in this instance as a reference point for understanding the divine.

This dialogue between Yahweh's righteousness and Israel's transgression is also present in the way in which interpretation and penitence are connected to each other in the prayer. Daniel reads the inscripturated tradition (µyrps) and understands that Jahwe revealed to the prophet Jeremiah (cf Jr 25:11 and 29:10) that the devastation of Jerusalem would last for seventy years (Dn 9:2). Daniel understands this tradition not only in terms of God's righteousness, but also against the background of the transgression and penitence of God's people. When he prays for the fulfilment of those words,

Daniel understands that such fulfilment is fully dependant upon Yahweh's own decision to bring to fruition his words to the prophet. He can only be persuaded by his own mercy and act for his own sake. The credit can only be his. God is the axis of everything (cf O'Kennedy 2003:145). Israel has no credibility or righteousness that could sway him to do what he had promised. Not even Israel's penitence can act as a persuasive power.[3] Their only "credibility" is their confession of their total failure and entire reliance upon God's clemency (cf O'Kennedy 2003:145). God's redemption is therefore conceptualised not only in terms of God's sovereignty, but also in terms of Israel's unrighteousness. Their penitence confesses to the fact that they are in the wrong and are totally reliant upon God's mercy. God's righteousness is confirmed when he includes unrighteous people in his mercy. It is his city and his people that bear his Name which he will save. His honour will be served when he removes Israel's disgrace from the temple and the city. God's righteousness is confessed in the penitential prayer and is enhanced by using Israel's conduct as a negative contrast to God's action and by including people who humble themselves before the Lord in the redemptive deeds of God.

The penitential prayer in Daniel 9:4-19 uttered in a situation of supplication and fasting was therefore a theological vehicle to conceptualise the faith in Yahweh in terms of a living relationship between a God who shows mercy and a people who are redeemed, because they are included in God's actions although they are unrighteous.

3. TRADITIO-HISTORY OF PENITENTIAL PRAYERS

In its use of the *Gattung* of the Penitential Prayer, the prayer in Daniel 9:4-19 continues a long-standing tradition of using this form of prayer during days of fast and repentance. As was previously mentioned the same *Gattung* was used in 1 Kings 8, Ezra 9:6-15, Nehemiah 1, Psalm 106, Nehemiah 9:6-37 and in 1 Baruch 1:15-3:8.

Boda's (1999:18-19) form-critical and traditio-historical analysis of the *Gattung* to which Nehemiah 9 belongs, aimed to identify the tradent circle(s) that used this type of prayer. Labelling it as *Penitential Prayer*, he linked the *Gattung* to a tradition of prayer which arose after the fall of Jerusalem and which was used in connection with regular days of fasting. The prayers were used as communal and personal responses of the people to the devastating catastrophe of the exile and as opportunities to implore Yahweh for a reversal of fortunes (cf Boda 1999:41). Based on classic Deuteronomistic theology of the justification of God and his blamelessness, the *Gattung* of lament was transformed into a penitential *Gattung* informed by the agenda of confession

[3] Cf Towner's (1984:140) interesting remark to the effect that Daniel was not so bold as to suggest that the new age hung by a mere thread of repentance and that one little word would drop that new aeon into the place of the present evil age.

as it is found in Leviticus 26, I Kings 8 and in Joshua 7. The tradent circles responsible for this development were influenced by both priestly and Ezekielian circles and took "… the Dtr call for justification of God and repentance of the people and express[ed] them in practical terms, showing the implications of Dtr theology for the Gattung of lament: i.e. a particular style of confession, a silencing of lament and a new mode of renewing covenant" (Boda 1999:73). As the agenda of penitential prayers is more closely allied to priestly rather than Deuteronomistic circles, Boda regards this shift as a priestly transformation (cf Boda 2003:3-4).

The various representatives of the *Gattung* used it in their different compositions. The composers of the prayer in Nehemiah 9 applied its form to the early restoration community in the Persian province of Yehud. Most scholars ascribe the prayer in Daniel 9 to the second century BCE along with the rest of Daniel. Towner (1984:130) views it as "a distinct genre of prayer", which occurs only in relatively late texts. It may therefore reflect "prayer practice in the second temple or even nascent synagogue" (Towner 1984:130). Boda (1999:71 note 118) is of opinion that it "… may reflect a much earlier period". Boda finds both Deuteronomistic and priestly influence in the prayer. The word-pair "curse and oath" ([bVhw hlah) in Daniel 9:11 seems to be alluding to Deuteronomy 29:20-21 and 30:7. As [bVh is never used along with hla in Deuteronomy, and as a word-pair only in passages with priestly concerns (Neh 5:21 and Neh 10:30), Boda (1999:71) regards this as priestly vocabulary imposed upon the citation of Deuteronomy. Following Doukhan's and Goldingay's indications of numerous correspondences between Dn 9:24-27 and Ezk 28 Boda uses the similarities as further indication of the use of an existing penitential tradition in Daniel 9. Unfortunately Daniel 9:24-27 does not form part of the prayer, which weakens Boda's argument. Boda (1999:71 note 118) is, however, of the opinion that some have "justifiably" argued for the unity of the prayer with the narrative. The emphasis on penitence in Daniel 9 is unique. This uniqueness of the chapter within the book "… is strong evidence that it reflects different tradents from the rest of the book and may indeed be a piece originally used in a different context" (Boda 1999:72).

While I fully agree with Boda that the prayer in Daniel 9:4-19 has all the characteristics of a Penitential Prayer and could thus be classified as such, I would, however not ascribe all of the chapter to tradents who are different from those who were responsible for the rest of the book of Daniel. The prayer could have had a tradition history of its own. Boda (1999:65) could be correct by relating Daniel 9:12-14 in the prayer to Ezekielian circles as it "… reflects Deut/Dtr/Jeremianic terminology independent of Penitential Prayers". It is in essence an exilic prayer. Lacocque (1976:127) is of the opinion that it has been remodelled in the fourth century BCE by Ezra and Nehemiah. In the

second century BCE it had been remodelled and had "been re-utilized and elaborated upon by the author" (Lacocque 1976:119). It was included in an apocalyptic narrative report.[4] The prayer is written in a typical exilic idiom referring to a desolate sanctuary and a destroyed Jerusalem. The revelation narrative in Daniel 9:20-27 indicates a restoration and rebuilding of Jerusalem after seven "sevens" and sixty-two "sevens" (Dn 9:25). This is followed by another destruction of the city and the sanctuary during the last "seven". A progression is found in the narrative which does not occur in the prayer. We would rather propose that the prayer represents an older prayer tradition, which was then utilised by the apocalyptic tradents who created the narrative and compiled Daniel chapter 9. This will be shown by our investigation into the relation of the prayer to the narrative, which is dealt with in the next section.

4. RELATION TO THE REVELATION IN DANIEL 9:20-27

The three sections of Daniel 9 are interlinked by the reference to Daniel's prayer and the sanctuary in Jerusalem. The 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). Only in the introduction and the narrative is this desolation linked to the number seventy. The introduction refers to Daniel's prayer and petition while he was fasting in sackcloth and ashes. In the first person report both Daniel and the angel Gabriel refer to Daniel's prayer. These references, however, could have been included by a redactor in order to link the different sections of Daniel 9.

Various possibilities have been proposed in respect of the compilation of the chapter. Either an existing penitential prayer was used and was included in the framework of the introduction and the narrative,[5] or the prayer was created simultaneously with the narrative,[6] or the prayer was included at a later stage[7] and was included in an existing apocalyptic narrative. Whatever

[4] Boda (2003:13) discerns a close relationship between "the final redaction of Dan 9 and the Priestly *Yom Kippur* ritual preserved in Lev 16". I would agree that such a relationship could possibly be found between the final form of the prayer in Daniel 9:4-19 and the ritual, but would differentiate it from the final redaction of chapter 9. The obvious apocalyptic theology found in the narrative formed the semantic frame for the final interpretation of the prayer.

[5] Jones (1968:488-493) rejects the idea that the prayer was added at a later stage. He defends the "authenticity" of the prayer assuming it was written by the same author as the rest of the chapter. His argument is mainly based on the language used in both the prayer and the revelation. He however admits that the Deuteronomic understanding of history found in the prayer was insufficient to explain Israel's suffering and had to be rectified by Gabriel's deterministic philosophy of history. This undermines his argument of "authenticity" and indicates that the prayer was older and its theology had to be adjusted.

[6] According to Redditt (2000:236, 240), consensus that it was not written by the author of Daniel 9 but is nevertheless integral to the chapter, is emerging. Cf Redditt's (2000:239-241) summary of the debate on the unity of Daniel 9.

[7] Cf O'Kennedy (2003:136 note 2) for a summary of the debate on the prayer as secondary literature.

theory is followed, the main challenge is to give an acceptable explanation of why a prayer and a narrative so totally different in content, style and theology, had been integrated into one composition. The final composition, after all, "was an expression of the self-understanding of the group standing behind the Book of Daniel" (Redditt 2000:236).

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. According to Wilson (1990:92), the prayer "... is either a rather clumsy attempt to provide an orthodox, Deuteronomic corrective to the deterministic worldview of Daniel, or has undergone a metamorphosis and now serves simply as a substitute for a prayer of illumination". According to Collins (1984:96), "... Daniel 9 entails a rejection of Deuteronomistic theology, not an acceptance of its influence". Towner (1984:135-136) subscribes to the idea of a modification of the older retributional scheme. Restitution and restoration as expressions of the older covenant theology are changed in an apocalyptic setting to become cosmic in scope and eternal in consequence.

The main problem seems to be the theological difference between the prayer and the narrative (cf Collins 1984:91). The theology on history[8] presented by the prayer is formulated in typical Deuteronomistic fashion as it is found in all the other penitential prayers.[9] The deterministic theology of history in the narrative and the rest of the book is conceptualised in typical apocalyptic terms.

In the prayer the restoration of the temple and the city is made reliant upon Yahweh's final decision to realise his words to the prophet and to forgive Israel their transgressions. Only God can reverse the fortunes of Jerusalem and remove Israel's disgrace from the temple and the city. History, however, has an ambivalent potential. God can allow present circumstances to continue for as long as he likes, or he can change it. He can bless his people and let their prosperity continue, even if they test him by their disobedience. According to Deuteronomistic thinking there is a limit to God's patience and he can change his people's fortune. He punishes them by devastating Jerusalem

[8] Other theological aspects. "Compound guilt" (cf Boda 2003:15-20) occurs in both the prayer and the narrative. The notion of corporate guilt that links the present generation with the past generation is one of the foundations of penitential prayer. Compound guilt used in the prayer occurs in Dn 9:6, 7, 8, and 16. In the narrative, compound guilt is only found in verse 20 – which is probably a redactional link between the prayer and the narrative.

[9] Jones (1968:492-493) focuses on "changed interpretation of history" as being at the heart of the chapter's message. As Deuteronomistic retribution was insufficient to bridge the gap between the traditional plea of retribution and the present conviction of innocence, it was replaced by a view on history which sees the calamity as decreed according to a predetermined time which calls for patient waiting. Jones' (1968:493) view invalidates the inclusion of the prayer as prayer in the chapter when he states that the calamity will end at the appointed time "quite apart from prayers and quite apart from previous ideas of retribution."

and by sending his people into exile. Again, he can allow this situation to continue for as long as he likes or he can change it if he so wishes. The penitential prayer expresses the idea that God will change the history for Israel, not because of Israel, but for his own sake and for showing his mercy to those who show penitence. History signifies the righteousness of God enacted in the life of a people who confesses his glory and admits their own unworthiness before their God.

In the narrative all history is "decreed". Seventy "sevens"/weeks are decreed (JTjn 9:24); desolations have been decreed (txrjn 9:26); the end is decreed (hxrjn 9:27). All of history is decided by God. Time is arranged in periods according to God's sabbaths and jubilees.[10] As is the case in the prayer, everything depends entirely on God's decision. There is, however, no ambivalence in this history. When Yahweh's words to Jeremiah are revealed to Daniel as a vision, the contents of that which had already been decided, is disclosed to him, because he is highly esteemed. No future decision is still to be made, nor are any qualifications set down for those for whom God will change events. Daniel is simply informed of what had been decided by God. Purely because God loves Daniel and his people will he redeem them at a time he would choose. History is not a reciprocal event as it is in the prayer, but is rather the result of a unilateral decision taken in heaven and enacted on earth.

In the penitential prayer a specific attitude is expected from God's people. Penitence and humbleness are not set as conditions for circumstances to change. Only God will decide what to do and when to do it. He will, however, act in relation to those who offer repentance and humble themselves before God. They are the candidates for God's deliverance. In the revelatory narrative the history is decreed in favour of those whom God loves. In this instance, however, no qualification is given for those whom God loves, other than them simply being those who believe in God. The disappointment with man and history seems to have bid farewell even to qualities such as those expected in the prayer.

While both the prayer and the narrative accentuate God's autonomy to decide on what will happen in history, they do not share the same view on God's human partners. According to Boda (2003:25-27) the "theology of people" in penitential prayers is marked by five key theological themes that articulate the view of the people of God in these prayers. These are:

[10] For a summary of the debate on the seventy weeks of years, cf Redditt (2000:237-9).

1) The people are defined by the concept of the remnant. This view directly relates to the notion of God as being both gracious and disciplinary.
2) The people are defined in terms of the land.
3) They are defined by covenant and law.
4) They are characterized over against the nations.
5) The people are identified by their relationship to God.

All five themes are found in the prayer in Daniel 9:4-19. In the apocalyptic narrative (9:20-27) the people are articulated only in some of these themes. The theme of defining the people in terms of the city and the sanctuary (the land) appears in both the prayer and the narrative. This spatial notion links the people to the fortunes of Jerusalem and the temple mount. In both the narrative and the prayer, the history of Israel is intertwined with the destruction/ rebuilding of their constructed living space.

However, when it comes to defining the people in terms of a remnant, the contents differ. While the collective guilt, as well as the pain and suffering referred to in the prayer, is exclusively related to Israel's disobedience, the narrative links the abomination at the temple to an anointed prince[11] (dygn jyvm 9:25) and his troops (dygn µ[9:26). Although the people are still praying and confessing their sins in the narrative (a redactional link in 9:20 between prayer and narrative?), they are rather being guided by the knowledge of the decreed seventy periods, revealed to Daniel. Penitence no longer is a primarily inward action, but solely aimed at God's determined program for the reconstruction of the temple, it becomes even more of a theo-centric attitude than in the prayer.

While the people in the prayer are explicitly defined by covenant and law, in the narrative they become the people who received a revelation. This revelation primarily determines their attitude and expectations[12]. Their humiliating relationship with the surrounding nations, as described in the prayer (9:16), is replaced in the narrative by their relation *vis à vis* the prince and his troops and the assertion of the revelation that he will meet a decreed end (9:27). The extensive definition in the prayer, defining the people in terms

[11] Some see two anointed princes in Daniel 9.

[12] Jones (1968:493) focused on the changed interpretation of history. He considered this composition as an attempt of determinism in apocalyptic literature to provide an answer to the problem of suffering. Redditt (2000:236-7) focused on a periodization of history based on sabbaths and jubilees. According to his view the prayer explains to the second-century community that the full restitution promised in Jeremiah 25 and 29 has not materialised, because Israel had not yet become fervent enough. The narrative offers a timetable for such restitution. I would rather focus on the attitude expected from the people in apocalyptic circles, namely penitence and knowledge of God's future.

of belonging to God and defining him as their God (9:9, 10, 13, 15, 17, 19) appears in the narrative as individualisation with Daniel, as the one greatly beloved by God (hTa t/dWmj 9:23), receiving the good news of restoration for "his" people and "his" holy city (9:24) when the time is due.

This brings us to the initial question regarding the combination in the composition. Which one is to be considered as the corrective to the other? Although the prayer is probably older and the connection with a younger apocalyptic narrative dates from more recent times, there is a possibility that neither is intended to be a corrective to the other. What we are dealing with here is typical Semitic thinking in which two phrases, even antithetical positions, are put in juxtaposition to express a central truth. This is a typical *montage*[13] technique where two ideas are put in synchronic relationship with each other to form a semantic frame for a new meaning which is "... beyond the sum of the independent meanings' (Brawley 1992:422). Because an idea is a feat of association a person acquires a new idea "…. by the combination or association of two or more ideas he already has into a new juxtaposition in such a manner as to discover a relationship among them of which he was not previously aware" (Sparke & McKowen 1970:2). Where a *collage* of ideas forms a unity, the *montage* works with the polyphony of dictions which express in their dialogical relationship a new idea unheard of or which cannot be formulated in any other words.

In Daniel 9 God's sovereignty plays the dominant role. By using an existing penitential prayer with its typical Deuteronomistic characteristics influenced by Priestly and Ezekielian circles and by putting it on a synchronic level in montage with an apocalyptic narrative of his/their own time the author(s) enriched his/their apocalyptic theology. The prayer, but not the all of the chapter, comes from older tradents of the penitential prayer. As the author(s)'s were primarily interested in the temple, they took this prayer with its dominant priestly concerns and linked it to their apocalyptic narrative on the temple. Being a priestly transformation (cf Boda 2003:3), the prayer came from a priestly circle with which the tradents of Daniel were either acquainted with, or a circle to which they could even belonged to.

The tradent(s) of Daniel chose for a non-resistant understanding of history, leaving social change exclusively to God. In their view the role of humans, compared to the decisive acts of God, can only be minimal. In contrast to other apocalyptic groups, such as the activist Enoch tradents and the militant Maccabean groups, they opted for an "apocalyptic modification of

[13] For an explanation of the term "montage" see Venter (1997a:336-338) and Venter (1997c:1187-8).

asceticism"[14]. They actively resisted the use of the temple according to Antiocheen prescriptions. They did not take part in any of the social events of their time. They avoided any active confrontation and all action is restricted to the mere knowledge that God is ruling and that man has to wait upon him. The idea in the penitential prayers from their fellow (non-apocalyptic) priests that God acts in relation to those who offer penitence and humble themselves before God, complemented their idea that man has to wait upon God to change history and live a life of sanctification, teaching, and suffering, if need be. Continuous fasting and repentance, offering penitential prayers to God was totally in line with their rather pedagogical orientated style of life.

5. A TEMPLE COMMUNITY WITHOUT A TEMPLE

The *Trägerkreise* of Daniel 9 used the tradition of the penitential prayer and linked it to the concerns of the rebuilding of the temple. Being first and foremost apocalyptic theologians, they took up not only the prophetical theme of the rebuilding of Jerusalem within seventy years as it appears in Jeremiah 25:11-14 and 29:10, but also the question in the first apocalyptic vision of Zehariah (1:7-17) dealing with "how long" it would take before Yahweh would restore the city and the temple as seventy years have already gone past. A progression is found in the narrative in Daniel 9:20-27 which extends the seventy years into seventy time units and indicates a restoration, as well as a destruction of the city and the sanctuary during those years before it will be rebuilt again.

To enhance our understanding of their theology and in order to understand it against the background of their specific circumstances, we can theorise about the tradents of Daniel, reconstruct their socio historic context[15] and demarcate their specific brand of apocalyptic thinking against others, such as those of the Enochic group.[16] In general, scholars use the chronological data in the texts to reconstruct the groups responsible for the texts. As "… a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an other-wordly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial, insofar as it involves another, supernatural world …" (Collins 1996:7), apocalypses point to both a temporal and a spatial reality. This spatial reality is, however, not only transcendent, but

[14] For this characterisation see Venter (1996:624-630).

[15] Cf Redditt's (2000:241) theory that they were a community of scribes that moved to Palestine after the Seleucid takeover in 198 BCE.

[16] For a discussion of the different apocalyptic groups, see Venter (1997b:78-90).

also linked to space on earth. In Daniel 9:1-27 theology is not only conceptualised in terms of chronological Sabbaths and jubilees, but also in spatial terms. The name Jerusalem is explicitly used five times in the passage. Reference to the city occurs four times. The temple is referred to four times. We have previously indicated how the identification of the people in terms of land (city and temple) is one of the main issues in both the prayer and the narrative. In both prayer and narrative Jerusalem and the sanctuary are not mere physical entities, but indicate a mental, sociological, theological space created in prayer and narrative. To understand this, the discipline of critical spatiality can help us. Critical spatiality theory as a tool for social-historical reconstruction (cf Camp 2002) that seeks "to reintroduce spatiality in an ontological trialectic that includes historicality, sociality, and spatiality" (Flanagan1999:26), can by means of analysis of these spatial references to Jerusalem and to the temple, assist us to understand the theology of Daniel 9.

The city and the temple are primarily perceived as destructible and reconstructible constructions. The physical or real city is indicated here in terms of the "devastation of Jerusalem" (µlvWry t/brj – 9:2); and the city which is to be restored and rebuilt (µlvWry t/nblw byvhl – 9:25). City and sanctuary (vdQhw ry[h – 9:26) will again be destroyed after sixty two weeks. The extent of the devastation is hyperbolically described as something that had occurred as had never before happened under the whole heaven (µymVhAlK tjT htc[n 9:12). This devastation is inclusive and includes city and sanctuary (9:16, 9:26) as well as its inhabitants (9:7, 9:16, 9:24).

This devastation is of heavenly proportions and has theological meaning. In terms of critical spatiality a "second space" or "conceived space" linked to Jerusalem and its fate, is indicated in this passage. The devastation is seen in Deuteronomistic terms as God's punishment for Israel's disobedience. When the city was devastated (9:7) shame overcame the inhabitants. The city became a disgrace among all those around it because its devastation was indicative of the displeasure of Israel's God with them (9:16). Yahweh's anger and wrath came upon Jerusalem and it has to be deflected from the city and its sanctuary (9:16). To Daniel the city is holy (9:24) because it belongs to Yahweh and it bears his name (9:18,19). The sanctuary belongs to Yahweh (òvDqm 9:17). It is God's holy mountain (vdqArh – 9:20). He decides on its fortunes and decrees seventy sevens for its rededication (9:27). The city and sanctuary in the second space signify much more than mere entities located in a place known as Jerusalem, which can be destroyed and rebuilt again. A whole theology is created around this location, sometimes also known as Zion theology.

It even goes beyond that. It is not only a physical entity in terms of geography and history, or a construction on earth with theological meaning, that is indicated here, but also a more encompassing third ideological space. The theology of the city and its sanctuary presented here is the product of an ideology, specifically an apocalyptic ideology. Jerusalem and its sanctuary play a central role in the theological conceptualisation of the Daniel *Trägerkreise.* In priestly circles the temple was not simply conceived as the holy centre of the people of Israel, but the holy centre of all of creation. "Heavenly and earthly reality coexist in the Jerusalem temple, and it is expressed symbolically in the Bible's mythology" (Sweeney 2001:135). The whole temple structure, its equipment and its observances are steeped in mythological symbolism. In this building and its surrounding city the realm of Yahweh in heaven and his people on earth, Yahweh and his historical dealings with Israel from the exodus event to the house of David, is represented. It is the microscopically lived space in which the macroscopically space of Yahweh and his creation is represented. Levenson (1984:286) calls it a "cosmic institution" in which the temple and the world were considered as "congeneric". The temple is the world *in nuce* and the world is the temple *in extenso* (cf Levenson 1984:285). According to Levenson (1984:298) the temple presented an ever-present spatial model of spiritual fulfilment alongside the *Heilsgeschichte* -which was the temporal model. The temple is to space what the sabbath is to time.

There is, however, a direct conflict between the temple envisaged in the ideological third space and the experience of the devastated complex. In the lived space of the Daniel tradents inconsistency is experienced. As a result of what had happened to the temple during Nebucadnessar's invasion of Jerusalem (587 BCE) and with Antiochus Epiphanes' promotion of the cult of Ba'al Shamen on the altar of the temple (167 BCE), it became unfit for its role as the sacred centre of Israel. What happened to the temple when Antiochus set up an image of Zeus in the temple and ordered the sacrifice of swine's flesh is superimposed upon the complex of events between 597 and 581 BCE when the city and its sanctuary were destroyed by the Chaldeans. In both instances the temple was "destroyed". Therefore, Israel had to deal with a "devastated" temple, a sanctuary that became totally unfit to function as mythological symbol.[17] As indicated in the narrative of Daniel 1 the book is dealing with the absence of the holy temple as centre and the efforts of Daniel and his companions to function despite its absence (cf Sweeney 2001:129). The liturgical tradition is continued with fasting and penitential prayers. Even the

[17] Another possibility is that the circumstances of their times caused the second century tradents of Daniel to believe that the rebuilding of the temple in 516 BCE was not the ultimate restoration promised in Jeremiah (cf Redditt 2000:243-244).

chronological liturgical pattern is followed. Gabriel appeared to Daniel at the time of the evening sacrifice (Dn 9:21). But all of this takes place away from the physical space of the temple. Even when the temple was decommissioned, they persisted with the temple ordinances.

This cognitive dissonance between idealised temple and "devastated" sanctuary is handled by the Daniel tradents from an apocalyptic viewpoint.[18] The temple of their day is "destroyed", but they believed that "der wahre Tempel mit dem wahren Allerheiligsten erst in der Heilszeit wiedererichtet würde" (Lebram 1984:108). As in 1 Enoch 89:72b-73 and 93:7 "the temple of the glorious kingdom will be built forever" (cf Nickelsburg 2001:434) at the end of time. This expectation is projected back in to their own time. The event of fasting and offering penitential prayers in which they partook was obviously removed from the temple of their day. According to the revelation of the narrative in 9:20-27 the sacrifice and offering have been closed down by the desolator and replaced by an "abomination that desolates" (9:27). It is even plausible that the liturgical service was conducted away from the city of Jerusalem. Regardless of where the occasion was performed, it was done in that third future-projected theological and ideological mythological space created by their apocalyptic view of the temple. It became a space of representation of the temple of the future. They were not at the physical temple, but acted and behaved in terms of the meaning of the temple "spiritually being in the temple and liturgically offering the daily sacrifice" (Lacocque 1976:142). This socially and theologically constructed sense of the temple guided their conduct and obscured the existential reality of the profaned building of the temple. 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 conceptualised as sacred space by their ideological conceptions.

To all of this was added the theological contents of the traditional penitential prayer. Through this addition the confidence in God's sovereignty in bridging the gap between the experienced and the expected sanctuary, is enhanced. It also enriches the experience of the liturgical occasion. Not only does it help the Daniel tradents to cope with a situation of an unusable sanctuary and to produce a new space in which they experience God's peace and hope, but it also promotes the value of their brand of apocalyptic modification of asceticism. The new living space created and influenced by

[18] The idea that the sanctuary in heaven corresponds with the temple on earth could have contributed to the apocalyptic dilemma. This correspondence was suddenly deemed to be null and void. This endangered the symbolic universe of the faithful.

their ideological space is one of sanctification, teaching, and also of continuous fasting and repentance, offering penitential prayers to God. Daniel's community did not only "constitute itself as a penitential movement" (Lacocque 1976:141), but through their liturgical fasting and penitence the place where they were practising these, was constitualised as holy space.

6. A NEW DISPENSATION

This technique in coping with a situation where the temple still existed, but was no longer deemed suitable, paved the way for groups such as those at Qumran. On the cultural map of Israel, the temple was the most holy place in the land. It was the replica of the archetypal temple in heaven[19]. This had now drastically changed. The members of the Dead Sea sect saw themselves as a replacement for the cult of the Jerusalem temple, now regarded as invalid. The priestly leadership was responsible for the hymned literature in the scrolls. They entered the cultic activity of the heavenly world, thereby continuing and extending the ideas found in Enoch and Daniel. According to Collins (1997:148), "The sectarians could no longer go to the temple to behold and praise the glory of God, but they could be transported in their hymns to the heavenly temple, to witness and participate in a more perfect liturgy". The spatial pattern established in Daniel 9 therefore served as matrix for the liturgy among marginalised groups during the pre-Christian era and thereafter.

As early as the third century BCE synagogues were found in Egypt. They were known as places of prayer and houses of learning. The temple in Jerusalem remained to be the central sanctuary in Judaism. In Palestine during the second century BCE the town plaza or gate was used as the forerunner of the eventual synagogue building (cf Horsley 1999:54). In the first century CE either synagogues or houses were used as the local village and town assemblies. These became places for people from each area gathered for common concerns and activities of all sorts, including religious expressions of community identity, solidarity, and loyalty. Here socio-economic life was guided and social conflicts handled according to the local people's customs and cultural traditions (cf Horsley 1999:68). The development from social and religious institution for voluntary gathering to institutionalised structure as a distinct and discrete architectural entity was only accomplished about a hundred years after the destruction of the temple of Jerusalem in 70 CE (cf Kee 1999:25). At that stage the synagogue began to emerge as the central feature of Jewish communal life, replacing the central sanctuary of Jerusalem. Fortunately, the ideological step, whereby the synagogue was regarded as

[19] Cf the contents of the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (4Q400-407, 11Q17, Mas1K) in the Dead Sea Scrolls (cf Davila 2000:83-84).

replacement for the temple, had already been taken decades ago by the Daniel tridents. The temple theology of Daniel 9 has paved the way for the liturgy of both Judaic and Christian religious gatherings.

Works consulted

Anderson, R A1984. *Signs and wonders: A commentary on the book of Daniel.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans. (International Theological Commentary.)

Boda, J J 1999. *Praying the tradition: The origin and use of yradition in Nehemiah 9.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. (Beihefte für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 277.)

Boda, M J 2003. Confession as theological expression: Ideological origins of penitential prayer. Paper prepared for the Society of Biblical Literature Consultation: Penitential Prayer: Origin, Development and Impact Consultation. Saturday, November 22, 2003, at http://macdiv.ca/prayer.

Camp, C V 2002. *Storied space, or Ben Sira "Tells" a temple*. At http://www.cwru.edu/affil/GAIR/Constructions.html

Collins, A Y 1996. *Cosmology and eschatology in Jewish and Christian apocalypticism*. Leiden: Brill.

Collins, J J 1984. *Daniel with an introduction to apocalyptic literature*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans. (The Forms of the Old Testament Literature 20).

Collins, J J 1997. *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. London: Routledge.

Davila, J R 2000. *Liturgical Works*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans. (Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls.)

Flanagan, J W 1999. *Ancient perceptions of space/perceptions of ancient space. Semeia* 87, 15-43.

Horsley, R A 1999. Synagogues in Galilee and the gospels, in Kee, H C & Cohick, L H (eds), *Evolution of the synagogue: Problems and progress,* 48-69. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International.

Jones, B W 1968. The prayer in Daniel IX. *Vetus Testamentum* 18, 488-493.

Lacocque, A 976. The liturgical prayer in Daniel 9. *Hebrew Union College Annual* XLVII, 119-142.

Lacocque, A 1979. *The book of Daniel*. London: 1979.

Kee, H C 1999. Defining the first-century CE synagogue: Problems and progress, in Kee, H C & Cohick, L H (eds), *Evolution of the synagogue: Problems and progress,* 7-26. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International.

Lebram,J-C 1984. *Das Buch Daniel*. Zürcher Bibelkommentare. Zürich:Theologischer Verlag Zürich.

Levenson, J D 1984. The temple and the world. *Journal of Religion* 64, 275-298.

Nickelsburg, G W E 2001.*1 Enoch 1: A commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, chapters 1-36; 81-108*, Minneapolis, MN: Fortress. (Hermeneia Series.)

O'Kennedy, D F 2003. Vergifnis in die gebed van Daniël (Dan 9:4-19). *Acta Theologica* 23(1), 135-149.

Sparke, W & McKowen, C 1970. *Montage: Investigations in language*. London: Collier-Macmillan.

Sweeney, M A 2001. The end of eschatology in Daniel? Theological and socio-political ramifications of the changing contexts of interpretation. *Biblical Interpretation* 9(2), 123-140.

Towner, W S 1984. *Daniel. Interpetation: A Bible commentary for teaching and preaching*. Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press.

Venter, P M 1996. Daniël 7-12 in sosiaal-wetenskaplike perspektief. *HTS* 52(4), 605-632.

Venter, P M 1997a. Intertekstualiteit, kontekstualiteit en Daniël 9. *In die Skriflig* 31(4), 327-346.

Venter, P M 1997b. Daniel and Enoch: Two different reactions. *HTS* 53(1&2), 68-91.

Venter, P M 1997c. Montage, Von Rad en belydenis. *HTS* 53(4),1187-1205.

Werline, R 2003. Defining penitential prayer. Paper prepared for the Society of Biblical Literature Consultation: Penitential Prayer: Origin, Development and Impact Consultation. Saturday, November 22, 2003, at http://macdiv.ca/prayer.