The HEBREW and the ARAMAIC of DANIEL

by Florin G. Lăiu

1999

CONTENTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to briefly review the history of the development of Hebrew linguistic studies and to do some preliminary investigations on the Hebrew of *Daniel*. The results may be used to attempt a modest checkout of the critical assumptions concerning the date of *Daniel,* from a linguistic viewpoint; to improve the personal understanding of Daniel's vocabulary, grammars and spelling and to prepare for more thorough and extensive studies in this fascinating field.

Daniel – a bilingual book

The most striking linguistic peculiarity of the book is its bilingual composition. As it is known, the introductory chapter and the first verses of the second one are written in Hebrew. Then, after the mention that "the Chaldeans answered the king – in Aramaic –" (Dan 2:4a), not only is their reply rendered as naturally in Aramaic, but the text keeps on the Aramaic track down to the end of chap. 7, resuming afterward to Hebrew for the chapters 8-12. Though some possible explanations have been offered, it is still a defiant reality for all theological or philological camps. [1] However, we have the book of Ezra in the canon, with precisely the same problem. We cannot explain this one without the other one. This apparent complication of the problem may contribute to its solution. Accordingly, whatever the justification found, we must apply with the same force to the book of Ezra.

The bilingual composition of Ezra (Hebrew 1:1 – 4:6; Aramaic 4:7 – 6:18; Hebrew 6:19 – 7:11; Aramaic 7:12 – 26; Hebrew 7:27 – 10:44) cannot be explained only on the basis of the presence of some official Aramaic letters, because the Aramaic text often extends beyond those letters intended to be rendered in their original language, just as in the book of Daniel. And the first official letter (the famous decree of Cyrus) is rendered in Hebrew. Moreover, the first change from Hebrew to Aramaic occurs in precisely the same literary manner (Ezra 4:6-7 cf. Dan 2:4), which is a proof that the term אֲרָמִית in Dan 2:4 cannot be considered a later insert to indicate a late redaction, say, after the "lost" of the original language text. It is rather a mark of authenticity. Both authors lived in a strong bilingual milieu. It must have been so natural for them to switch from their native tongue to that acquired in the Exile (which in short time became the second, or even the first mother tongue of the Jewery) that it could have happened to change from one to another for the most banal motives. We see this natural phenomenon in our day, in similar circumstances; why not suppose it for the late exilic and post-exilic Jews? Anyway, it is a serious irony that while most scholars believe in a late timing of the book, and both languages become better known and there are an alarming number of signs and features indicating not so late Hebrew and Aramaic, we don't yet know this elemntary fact: why two languages? All explanations given are not satisfying. And certainly we cannot now make Angel Gabriel responsive for this seeming caprice.

Biblical Hebrew and the Hebrew of Daniel

The scientific research on the Hebrew of Daniel developped, naturally, with the study of Biblical Hebrew in general. After long centuries of basically mystical approach to Hebrew, and after some pioneer scientific works in the field, the actual birth of the modern

---

[1] J. A. Soggin, *Introduction to the Old Testament,* 2nd rev. ed. (Philadelphia, 1980), p. 410. A theological / literary content explanation (Aramaic for stories in pagan setting, Hebrew for revelations about Israel) is not convincing, because of some chapters' dissent. Zimmerman's opinion (now developed by many other theologians), about an original Aramaic book being later translated partially in Hebrew, seems not acceptable to me. We have no "complete" Aramaic text discovered, and the Danielic manuscript fragments of Qumrân (1QDan[a] and 1QDan[b]) indicate the shift from Aramaic to Hebrew and back at exactly the same places as in the Masoretic text. Cf. Gerhard Hasel, pp. 141-143.

linguistic approach to Hebrew was in 1815, with the publication of a History of the Hebrew Language and Writing, by **Wilhelm Gesenius**.[2] His research was ahead of his time, in view of some elementary diachronic study of Hebrew. D. S. Margoliouth, Leo Metmann, and especially **S. R. Driver** carried it on only later, at the beginning of 20th century. These scholars made the first observations on the linguistical difference of books like Ecclesiastes, Daniel, Esther, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemia, from earlier books of the Hebrew Bible. Driver called the language of these later writings, "New Hebrew."[3] However, Mark Rooker, himself a good contemporary Hebrew scholar from Criswell College, Dallas, is right in deploring a delay of about one century in the historical analysis of Hebrew and other Semitic languages, since the method itself was already applied successfully to the study of other languages.[4] The delay was due, basically, to the influence of the fundamentalist view of Hebrew as a sacred language.

Close to our times, the diacronic study of Hebrew knew a greater impetus through the landmark work of **Arno Kropat**.[5] His comparative linguistic study of Chronicles in parallel with Samuel-Kings, is considered of a tremendous importance in the development of this linguistic field.[6] After the discovery of the Ugaritic tablets (1929), the interest of the hebraists turned to the comparative study of the Ugaritic and Hebrew, and the way of the diachronic studies opened by Kropat was nearly lost for the time. But, whith the Qumran discoveries of ancient Jewish scrolls (1947-1956), the question of the diachronic study of Hebrew came into focus again. Famous Israeli scholars like **Abba Bendavid, Eduard Yehezkel Kutscher, Avi Hurvitz, Robert Polzin** made a great contribution to this field,[7] followed less prominently by A. R. Guenther, Andrew E. Hill, Ronald Bergey et al. Avi Hurvitz, a former student of Kutscher and currently Professor of Hebrew Language at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, is viewed today in the top of this research field.

Reviewing the evidence brought by the previous scholars, **Mark Rooker** mentions a number of characteristic features that help us distinguish between the pre-exilic and post-exilic Hebrew. First, he lists the evidence from orthography. For example, the name of David (occurring 671 in Samuel-Kings) is spelled דוד in Samuel and Kings, except three occurences in 1 Kings, while in Ezra, Nehemiah and Chronicles, all the 271 occurences have a plene spelling דויד. The comparison is extended to the Qumran manuscripts and it is shown that in places where the received text has דוד, the text of the Scrolls has דויד. After such examples Rooker concludes, with Freedman, "that early biblical Hebrew (i. e., Genesis-Kings) reflects a more conservative (or defective) spelling, as scholars such as Kutscher, Blau, Anderson and Forbes have noted,"provided that one does not limit his / her study on the orthographic criterion.[8] It sounds convincing.

---

[2] M. F. Rooker, "The Diacronic Study of Biblical Hebrew", in *Journal of Nortwest Semitic Languages,* XIV (1988), p. 205.

[3] Rooker, 207.

[4] Mark F. Rooker. "Diachronic Analysis and the Features of Late Biblical Hebrew", in *Bulletin for Biblical Research,* 4 (1994) 135.

[5] Arno Kropat, *Syntax des Autors der Chronik,* BZAW, Giessen, 1909.

[6] Rooker, "The Diacronic Study of Biblical Hebrew" 207.

[7] Rooker, "The Diacronic Study of Biblical Hebrew" 208-211. Bendavid published in Hebrew a two-volume study (1951) on *The Biblical Language and the Rabbinic Language.* Kutscher made titanic efforts in studying a Dead Sea Scroll of Isaiah and wrote a monumental *History of the Hebrew Language,* published in 1982 (Jerusalem). Hurvitz, a former student of Kutscher, made similar studies on Psalms and published his thesis, *Biblical Hebrew in Transition,* in 1972. Very important, his main insistence was to shape an objective methodology for this diachronic approach to TNK. Polzin published in 1976 his work on the Late Biblical Hebrew, and, using the studies of Kropat, tried to establish 19 features of LBH. Guenther's thesis on LBH (Toronto, 1977) deals with parts of Jeremiah and Esther, Hill was concerned with the book of Malachi (Michigan, 1981), and Bergey applied his efforts on the book of Esther (Dropsie, 1983).

[8] Rooker. *Diachronic Analysis*, p. 138-139.

The second evidence mentioned by Rooker is the noun morphology. The diachronic shift is illustrated by the occurrence of the terms מלכות / ממלכה. In passages where the parallel text of Samuel employed ממלכה, the Chronicler prefers מלכות (Comp. 2S 5:12 ‖ 1Ch 14:2, 2S 7:12 ‖ 1Ch 17:11, 2S 7:16 ‖ 1Ch 17:14).[9] To be noted, in some overt post-exilic books (Esther, Daniel), מלכות only is employed.[10] This trend can be measured through the postbiblical literature, where in Mishnaic Hebrew is employed מלכות only. The Aramaic influence in this case is obvious, because the latter is exactly the Aramaic term for *kingdom.*

Then Rooker illustrates the evidence from verb morphology, with הֵקִים (Hiphᶜil) form in early Hebrew versus קִיֵּם (Piᶜel) in late Hebrew (2K 23:24 ‖ Est 9:32, 1K 2:4 ‖ Ez 13:6). And the fact is confirmed by the evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls and the rabbinic literature, where the Piᶜel form is further prefered.[11] According to many scholars, this tendency to consonantalise the middle radical root of hollow verbs is also the result of Aramaic influence.

The evidence from syntax is further illustrated by Rooker, using as example the formula בֵין .... וּבֵין... , frequently used in preexilic times (Gn Ex Lv N Dt Jos Jg S K Jr – with rare exceptions), versus its post-exilic equivalent בֵין.....ל... (beginning in Ez, beside the former, on a par, is prefered in Ch and is employed exclusively in Jonah, Daniel, Malachi and Nehemia).[12]

Then Rooker, in a good attempt to account for this measurable linguistic changes, concludes that they must have been demanded by the use of an unceasingly spoken Hebrew (a mother language of the Mishnaic Hebrew that was a spoken language in the first century CE), and that the major shift was prompted by the Babylonian exile with its natural and specific factors of change. "It was then (*i. e.* in the Babylonian exile) that late Biblical Hebrew came into being."[13]

But serious challenges to the interpretations above were not long overdue. One of those who questioned the diachronic methodology of the Israeli scholars and of those (such as Mark Rooker) who follow it, was **J. A. Naudé**.[14] Using the constraint theory of Mark Hale (1997) on language change and diffusion, Naudé evaluated critically the assumption of Hurvitz and Rooker that the language of Ezekiel represents BH in transition. He calls our attention to lacunae in conceptualisation and method of study in two areas: 1. "a marked failure to utilise a coherent conception of the nature of language", and 2. "obscurity surrounding the notion of change."[15]

It is noteworthy that these modern studies, however impressive they are, from a scientific viewpoint (and *this* is the point ! – apparently they will resist the time), are not yet wholly in agreement. This fact makes them less than convincing. Especially in order to overtrow conservative theological positions, critical scholars should agree on more than philosophical premises. Not all scholars agree with the conclusions and sometimes even the method is questioned. There is methodological difference between Polzin and Hurvitz (who follows Kropat),

---

[9] Rooker, Diachronic Analysis, 139-140.

[10] This fact can be ready confirmed when someone appends separately these terms to the command line of the computer program Bible Works for Windows. The verse list displays for ממלכה 133 of occurences most of them in the earlier writings, from Genesis through Deuteronomy, Joshua, Samuel-Kings, but more than 30 in Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah. On the other hand, מלכות is employed 103 times, predominantly in the post-exilic books, except some rare occasions that, certainly need some reasonable justification (1S 20:31, Jr 10:7, 49:34, Q 4:14, Ps 45:7, 103:19, 145:11.12.13).

[11] Rooker, Diachronic Analysis, 140-141.

[12] Id. 141-142.

[13] Id. 142-143.

[14] J. A. Naudé, "The Language of the Book of Ezekiel. Biblical Hebrew in Transition?" (UFS) p. 1-36.

[15] Naudé, p. 1.

the former emphasising the importance of the syntactical differences, and the latter, working according to the lexicographical criterion. And Rooker, an overt follower of Hurvitz questions the position of Polzin

> It is curious, however, that Polzin not infrequently uses the differences in the parallel texts from Chronicles with Samuel-Kings to indicate late language. See Late Biblical Hebrew: Towards An Historical Typology Of Biblical Hebrew Prose, pp. 41, 46, 53, 58, 62. How Polzin is sure that non-synoptic portions of Chronicles are not borrowed from a source of unknown date is not stated.16

Again in contrast with Hurvitz, **Robert Polzin** minimizes the influence of Aramaic on Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH),[17] which means, in my opinion, to go too far. However questioning for the school of Hurvitz, the studies of Polzin deserve our attention. He offers the following list of LBH features:[18]

A[1]   Radically reduced use of אֵת with pronominal suffix.
A[2]   Increased use of אֵת before noun in the nominative case.
A[3]   Expression of possession by prospective pronominal suffix with a following noun, or לְ + noun, or שֶׁל + noun.
A[4]   Collectives are construed as plurals.
A[5]   Preference for plural forms of words and phrases which the earlier language used in the singular.
A[6]   Less frequent use of the infinitive aboslute in immediate connection with a finite verb of the same stem or as a command.
A[7]   More frequent use of the infinitive construct with בְ and כְ not preceded by (הַ) וַיְהִי .
A[8]   Repetition of a singular word = Latin quivis.
A[9]   Merging of the third feminine plural suffix with the third masculine plural suffix.
A[10]   Seldom occurrence of lengthened imperfect or cohortative in first person singular.
A[11]   וַיְהִי is rare.
A[12]   Subtantive occurs before the numeral and in the plural.
A[13]   Increased use of the infinitive construct with לְ.
B[1]   Order of material weight or measured + its weight or measurement.
B[2]   לְ is often the mark of the accusative.
B[3]   ן in the preposition מִן is often not assimilated before a noun without an article.
B[4]   Use of לְ emphatic before the last element of a list.
B[5]   רִבְבוֹת used attributively before the substantive.
B[6]   Use of עַד לְ.

Applying these features to the Hebrew Scriptures, Polzin found all of them in Chronicles, and in in a less measure in decreasing order, in Ezra, N[2], Ezekiel. In P[S] and P[G] only three and respectively two of them are present. They are totally lacking from JE, CH, Dtr. I have some doubts regarding his methodology, as with the others. If one works with certain artificial division or predetermined datation of the books, using such notions and titles like Jahwist, Elohist, Priestly Code, – which are creations fashioned by old critics after their image, – he / she is not fair to the text itself as it stands.

Why not give a better chance to Moses and, finally, to God? Why challenge first the claims of sacredeness of these unique books and not challenge and doubt first our own philosophical assumptions? Methodologies should avoid any feature involving circular reasoning. The first assumption of a good critic is the "assumption of innocence" applied to the sacred writing, when that is seen as being something else than its claims – younger, ignorant, "politically" interested, reflecting no real supernatural relation with God, totally culture-conditioned, that is completely natural, as well as we are.

---

[16] Rooker, "The Diachronic Study of Biblical Hebrew", footnote 42.

[17] Rooker, "The Diachronic Study of Biblical Hebrew." p. 210.

[18] Naudé, p. 5, 5a, 5b.

The main goal of Naudé's scientific contention is the position of Rooker. On the basis of Polzin's criteria listed above, Rooker study showed that the book of Ezekiel[19] proves to be a superior model of linguistic state of transition between EBH and LBH. This was in harmony with Hurvitz's opinion who had shown that the language of Ezekiel is later than the language of the so called Priestly Code. Rooker insists on the Aramaic influence upon Ezekiel's language[20] and he offers some distinctive features of this influence on the grammar and on the vocabulary of Ezekiel. The tables illustrating the distribution of Ezekiel's LBH features are very interesting. The Book of Daniel has its column among others in the tanakhic order: Jer, Est, **Dan,** Ezra, Neh, Ch.[21] From the total of 20 LBH grammatical features of Ezekiel, 14 are found in Daniel too, less than in Chronicles (18), or in MH (15). And for a total of 17 late lexical features, he founds 5 only in Daniel.[22]

LBH Feature of Ezekiel	Daniel	LBH Lexeme of Ezekiel	Daniel
דויד	0	על	X
אני	X	מקטרת	0
ארצות	X	זעק	0
הם	X	כתב	X
חיה		ניתץ	0
קים		קהל	0
חללוהו	X	כעס	0
את הנשיא	X	עמד	X
בבאו...	X	הילךּ	X
וראו...		בנס	
כפר ל	X	בוץ	0
והוליד	X	רצפה	0
בצאת	X	הדיח	0
לבוא עתה	X	מהלךּ	0
היה עמד	X	עזרה	0
ידע אשר	X	למען לא	
חמש אמות ורחב	0	זהב וכסף	X
על.....ל			
בין ל	0		
כי....ימות	X		

But Rooker finds also in Ezekiel EBH features, for example, שׁבט for LBH שׁרביט; בז // יום ויום // 0 ;יותר מ// מ ;אין לבוא // לבלתי הוציא ;יעשׂה // עשׂה יעשׂה ;ירושׁלים// ירושׁלם // משׁל ;יקר // כבוד ;שׁאר // יותר ;זוע // חרד ;דת // חק ;תקף // חזקה ;יום טוב // חג ,מועד ;בזה // מלכות // ממלכה ;כתר // עטרה ;קבל // לקח ;שׁלט.[23] Since Ezekiel, according to Rooker, con-

---

taines many LBH features, but less than other recognised late biblical Bebrew books, it should be understood as a transitional work.

But Naudé, after reviewing systematically the postition of Rooker, puts down his own conclusions, contradicting not only Rooker but the linguistic school where that one belongs to: a) the language of Ezekiel cannot be Biblical Hebrew in transition;[24] b). the grammars of LBH is a direct continuation of the grammars of EBH; c), variation is not a mechanism of language change; d). Aramaic influence is not a cause of language change; e). analogical mechanism is not a mechanism of language change. Naudé proposes instead the principles of the so-called minimalist program, more sophisticated and needing much time to understand its logic.[25] But it is not a rhetorical exercice, it is an attempt to arm the researcher with a more scientific and safe methodology, to develop a constrained theory of language change based on the linguistic vision of Chomsky.[26]

Another scholar who challenged the methodology of the Israeli school with its diachronic analysis, was **Frederick Cryer** (Copenhagen). One of his articles deals with the Hebrew of Daniel.[27] Cryer makes first an observation that the Hebrew of Daniel was not seriously studied, in spite of the intense research made in the last time in the field of Biblical Hebrew in general.[28] He is right in this assertion, but his first interest in that article does not seem to be as much Daniel and his Hebrew. It is rather a scholarly cry against the diachronic studies, and I could not find something concrete in his article about the Hebrew of Daniel, in spite of his promising title. Cryer's decree is that TNK reveals a quite unitary language that, naturally, proves that it was not written and redacted gradually through the centuries (or a millenium). No language can remain so unitary over that time span.[29] The Hebrew Bible does not reveal the expected wealth of forms.[30] Some changes considered Aramaic influences, as it is ן (as in MH, Moabite and Aramaic) instead of ם as a sign of plural masculine noun, might "have been the scribal grapheme of choice to express some indeterminable sound between *m* and *n,* and wich in turn represented the masculine plural. Thus it is possible that scribes wrote *n* in one tradition and *m* in another to realise what was more or less the same sound."[31] The influence of Aramaic is reduced to "only faint and few traces".[32]

Cryer's option in solving the problem of BH consists in two hypotheses: 1) the BH text has been systematically "updated" as to language, so that the end result is a Hebrew not far removed from the generation for whom the text became sacred and inviolable; and 2). the HB "was *written* more or less at one go, or at least over a relatively short period of time." However challenging may be these hypotheses, from the methodological perspective of the diachronic study school, it is encouraging that Cryer directs us to more than one possibility, and he even says that "both... should be regarded as working hypotheses....Regardless of

---

[24] "Only a few (syntactic) changes are expected in the language of Ezekiel (if change is imperfect transmisssion of the architecture of the language). However, the language of Ezekiel already shows a large diffusion of forms that changed in the transition of Hebrew towards Late Biblical Hebrew. The language variation of Ezekiel and Late Biblical Hebrew is rather due to a situation where different grammars exist next to each other in the author's / speaker's mind." (Naudé, p. 34).

[25] Naudé, p. 18-22.

[26] This appeal to the highest authorities in matter of linguistic is to be commended. If specialists in biblical languages had consulted earlier the right sources in the general field of linguistics, they would have been saved from many errors.

[27] Frederick H. Cryer. "The Problem of Dating Biblical Hebrew and the Hebrew of Daniel," in K. Jeppesen *et al.* (eds.), *In the Last Days* – On Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic and its Period. Aarhus, 1994. p. 185-198.

[28] Cryer, p. 185.

[29] Cryer, p. 186-187.

[30] Cryer, p. 187.

[31] Cryer, p. 189.

[32] Cryer, p. 191.

which hypothesis should ultimately carry the day...”[33]. I would choose immediately the first one, but without abandoning the diachronic studies, even though this middle path would complicate the matter.

One of the Cryer's assertions which I'm not so ready to accept is about the dating of the Book of Daniel. He proposes to date the language of Daniel according to the date which the traditional historical-critical school gave to Daniel....“as Daniel is one **of the few** books in the Old Testament for which problems of dating are **not acute**...”[34] This statement reflects certain philosophical and psycho-sociological cultural patterns allowing the modern scholar to advance on the easiest way. If it is pardonable, from a strictly religious point of view, I'm not sure that it is pardonable from a strictly scientific perspective. To strengthen this belief, he gives two classical arguments: 1) Daniel refers back to the works of Jeremiah (Dan 9:2)“as something that took place in the distant past”; and 2) Daniel's “numerous thinly-veiled allusions” that “lead us without fail towards the middle of the second century BCE.”[35] His arguments are far from being convincing. First, Daniel's reference to Jeremiah has no feeling of distant past. It only indicates that the writer and possible many other Jews in that time, considered Jeremiah a genuine prophet (which, after all, it was easier to see in the exile or afterwards, than before. It was no need to pass a lot of generations to give Jeremiah such credit. Compare similar statements about contemporary Christian authors in NT (2Pt 3:16 Peter about Paul's writings). In fact, if we think to those c. 70 years of Daniel's exile, and to the accelerating effect of the new circumstances, we may agree that 70 years back is a ”far distant past.” The second argument which Cryer maintains, that the author's historical sight led him down to and stopped in the Epiphanes' episode is to be thoroughly revised. Except of some features in chap. 8 and a good part of chap. 11, no other Danielic account or prophecy suggests an intentional link with that drammatic episode.

Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar or Darius the Mede of the first chapters has no other sinilarity with Antiochus but which is common to all dictators. And the book's heroes who learned Babylonian culture do not ressemble any *hassid* of the 2nd century BC. The first apocalyptic prophecies (chap. 2 and 7) go certainly far beyond the Hellenistic era, through the Pagan-Christian Roman Empire down to God's glorious kingdom. None of the exegeses devised by the historical-critical scholarship to avoid the supernaturalist claim of the book is so forcefully and historically applicable as the old Rabbinic-Patristic-Protestant view, that Rome is the main hostile force in Daniel, and Antiochus is but its modest foreshadow. The prophecy of the 490 years of chap. 9 is much better applicable to Jesus of Nazareth, the Messiah, both chronologically and theologically, while the historical-critical applications are but painful guesswork. The only prophecies reflecting something about Antiochus (chap. 8 and 11) have a lot of elements that don't fit that framework and, most of all, they lack visible and unmistakeble cultural-historical traces from the 2nd century BCE: Where are the elephants in the detailed description of those battles? And why Kittim instead of Romans? Why Moab, Edom and Amon to be so important in the 2nd century BCE? And finally, why no time period fits the actual history, if they were devised *post eventum*? Such questions may be multiplied.

To date the Hebrew of Daniel according to a merely philosophical dating of its authorship, is not a scientific idea. It rather should go viceversa: to date the book according to its language. And Cryer, seemingly cautious, adds:

> Of course, no dates are assured: it is always possible that an original older Hebrew-language Daniel has been revived and reworked by, among other things, the addition of the Aramaic sections in the second century. The assumption, however, requires proof, while the **clear signs**

---

[33] Cryer, p. 192.

[34] Cryer, p. 193. Underlines mine.

[35] Ibid.

> **of secondy century dating are primary data**; hence the assumption **must** be that the text **is a second-century text, until decisive evidence to the contrary should arise**.[36]

I simply cannot understand why Cryer needs decissive evidence only for an earlier date of Daniel, while he takes for granted the late date (2nd century BCE), before any decissive linguistic evidence. However, Cryer's approach to the studies of Rooker and **Verheij**[37] are certainly more critical and they deserve consideration. Cryer put Verheij's statistic results of his verb studies of Samuel-Kings and Chronicles along with his own results for the Hebrew sections of Daniel and showed that results lead to little above nothing, because ofVerheij's questionable methodological premises. According to this statistic results that Cryer exposed as misleading, the form *qatol* has the lowest rate in Daniel (0.4 % from the total of verbs), and for the other forms he found 12.1 % (medium) for *qetol,* 14.8 % (of the highest) for *qotel,* 3.3 % (the lowest rate, sharply distinguished) for *qtol,* 16.7 % (the lowest, but close to Samuel!) for *0qatal,* 14.0 % (the highest, nearly thrice than Samuel's), 16.1 % (much closer to Samuel-Kings than to Chronicles) for *0yiqtol,* 6.0 % (the highest, sharply distinguished by Samuel-Kings and Chronicles – 1.5 % and respectively 1.2 %) for *wyiqtol*, 16.3 % (the lowest, half or even less than the other ones) for *wayiqtol.* The total number of verbs versus the total amount of words is 18.7 % (602 from 3227) in the Hebrew of Daniel, a rate closer to Samuel (18.2 %) than to Chronicles (c 12 %).[38]

Looking to some too close figures in Daniel compared with Samuel-Kings, as if Daniel would be so early, Cryer is willing rather to relegate Samuel-Kings with Daniel in the 2nd century BCE, than to see such absurd statistic results seeming to indicate that Daniel is early than Chronicles, for example.[39] Forgetting that his own opinion about the date of Daniel is nothing else that a hermeneutical-exegetic result, predetermined by philosophical criteria, Cryer says about Verheij's studies:

> Admittedly, many Old Testament scholars would affirm without hesitation that Samuel and Kings are much older than Chronicles and Daniel. Such assignments, however, are the results of exegesis and not linguistic facts, and it is the facts of language for which a linguistic study must render an account. For this reason, Verheij's impressive statistical apparatus is capable of characterising the *differences* between two different types of Hebrew; it does not entitle us to claim that one or another of them is in fact the older.[40]

Indeed, any scientific school needs a watching Cryer, in order to sharpen its own methodological tools and exercise the deepest care in such studies. Cryer regrets that the sample provided by the Hebrew of Daniel is "too limited to permit a useful analysis of the distinction between "narrative" and "discursive" text," and he maintains that this distinction would lead to more relevant results, because the discursive language is closer to the spoken language than is the narrative, and to include a comparative study of the *syntax* of the Biblical books, though – ironically observes Cryer – one needs more sophisticated software "than Verheij has at his disposal".[41]

The critical position of Cryer is then critically approached by **Martin Ehrenswärd** (Aarhus) in an article written in short time afterwards (1997).[42] Ehrenswärd is obviously in

---

[36] Cryer, p. 193. (Underlines mine). Thus the inner claims of the book itself, and many other "clear signs", including language features, lead us to just an assumption that Daniel is older than we believed, but when we come to certainty, the 2nd century escape is "primary data." This might be that faith which overthrows the mountains! To abandone it, one really needs much "decisive evidence to the contrary."

[37] Cryer, p. 193-197. A. J. C. Verheij, *Verbs and Numbers* (Assen 1990).

[38] Cryer, p. 196.

[39] Cryer, p. 197.

[40] Cryer, p. 198.

[41] Ibid.

[42] Martin Ehrenswärd, "Once Again: The Problem of Dating Biblical Hebrew". In *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament,* vol. II, no. I (1997).

the camp of Hurvitz with the diachronic school. He adresses the following searching question to Cryer's objections:

> If Cryer is right in his assumption that there has been no historical development within Biblical Hebrew, he should, in order to demonstrate this, have to address specifically the question of why–and how–there seem to exist in the Biblical corpus two linguistically distinct layers, only one of which – that recorded in the indisputed post-exilic compositions (Chronicles, Ezra Nehemiah, Daniel etc.) – is familiar with numerous "neologisms" not attested in Biblical texts commonly assigned to the pre-exilic period.[43]

Ehrenswärd refutes the hyper-criticism of Cryer, pointing to a lot of modern studies that, corroborated, amount to the same result: a distintion between the Standard Biblical Hebrew and LBH. Then he points to the inscriptions discovered, which show clear features of SBH. For example, he takes the temporal construction [ו]בעוד... from the Siloam Tunnel inscription and states that it fits the pattern of SBH and is not found in LBH.[44] Then he adds the example of the idiom כסף וזהב found in the Siloam Royal Steward inscription and states that there is a clear tendency in SBH for this order (with כֶּסֶף preceding זָהָב), while in LBH the reverse order is preferred.[45] I would add that Daniel uses both orders: the SBH order in Dan 11:8 and the LBH order in 11:38.43. And even his Aramaic has the "early" order in 2:35.45, 5:23 and the "late" order only in 5:4. I can imagine what Cryer would reply.

In his study, Ehrenswärd points to grave dificiencies in Cryer's article, both on the factual and the interpretative levels. And...

> ...it is very strange indeed, that in a paper specifically devoted to "the Problem of Dating Biblical Hebrew and the Hebrew of Daniel", not one *single* concrete Hebrew example – neither from Daniel nor from any other composition – is cited and discussed for purposes of illustration..... This turns the entire discussion in Cryer's paper into a purely theoretical exercise hardly significant... for "dating Biblical Hebrew".[46]

Thus Ehrenswärd (followed by Verheij in the same issue of SJOT) deffends the diachronic school against the minimalist school represented by Cryer and others. In this titanic battle between two schools quite different in their methodological approaches, the modest paper of a student has no weight. But neither the scientific results issuing from at least two conflicting laboratories seem more credible to settle so important problems like the Hebrew of Daniel and the precise time when it was spoken and written.

One of the best studies in the field, published in 1993, is the book of **Angel Sáenz-Badillos** (Madrid).[47] It deserves much more attention than I can allow myself to do in this paper, especially because he gives not only general ideas or a few examples, but a strong array of concrete evidence, each having its Biblical reference and writing the Hebrew words in Hebrew characters to make them immediately observable.[48] Sáenz-Badillos is clearly in the camp of the diachronic school. However we may doubt some of his premises or assumptions like this:

---

[43] Ehrenswärd, p. 34.

[44] Ehrenswärd, p. 37. This is immediately measurable today, as I did while reading Ehrenswärd's article. The computer program BibleWorks displays in less than one second the following occurences of [ו]בעוד...: Gn 25:6, 40:13.19, 48:7, Dt 31:27, Jos 1:11, 2S 3:35, 12:22, Jb 29:5, Ps 104:33, Ps. 146:2, Pr 31:15, Is 7:8, 21:16, Is 28:4, Jr. 28:3.11, Am 4:7.

[45] Ehrensärd, p. 37.

[46] Ehrenswärd, p. 39-40.

[47] Angel Sáenz-Badillos, *A History of the Hebrew Language,* Cambridge University Press, 1993.

[48] I feel very indebted and grateful to Prof. Izak Spangenberg from UNISA, for mailing to me this book, with some recent articles on dating Biblical Hebrew.

>As an exclusively literary language [LBH], isolated from the real world, nothing prevented the authors of later works, like Esther and Daniel or some of the Dead Sea Scrolls, from trying to adhere more closely than earlier, exilic, works, like Chronicles and Ezra, to the Language of the Torah.[49]

When so little is known about the real vernaculars spoken in the period of the second temple, how he knows that LBH was "exclusively literary" and "isolated from the real world"? All LBH books show clear signs of their pragmatic character, and they were surely addressed to their contemporary people, not to develop a scribal Double Dutch. This logic of assuming an imitative style for some post-exilic books is a very polite manner of escaping the real problem (i.e. that Esther was written under Xerxes I or shortly thereafter, or Daniel was indeed written in the time of Cyrus I). Thus we give no chance to these books to defend themselves.

Sáenz-Badillos thinks that our "first major difficulty is to establish exactly what the LBH 'corpus' is". He recognises what is obvious, that "there are often serious disagreements among the experts." Arguments from linguistic alnalysis are also dilemmatic sometimes. For example, if we accept the Aramaic influence as a sign of lateness, how can we interpret the presence of aramaisms in some archaic poetic texts? And Sáenz-Badillos has a good answer prepared, "Aramaisms of themselves cannot be used as proof that a work is post-exilic... Practically every biblical book in its present state has some trace of Aramaic, in vocabulary, morphology, or syntax."[50]

Sáenz-Badillos says further that a similar position took E. Kautzsch (1902), an even a better analysis is that of Hurvitz (1968) who "establishes the rule that an Aramaism may be used as evidence that a work is late only if it occurs with some regularity in late Hebrew", and not isolated, but in context of other Aramaisms, with no other explanation possible for its presence within a text. "For example, the Aramaisms of Job and Proverbs may derive from Old Aramaic, and are, therefore, very different from post-exilic Aramaisms, whereas the language of the Song of Songs may appear to have Aramaic features because of its origins in the northern kingdom." (ibid. footnote 6). And I would add: Why not possible for Israelites to inherit some old Aramaisms from their Aramaean ancestry (Dt 26:5)? That they took some loanwords from their northern neighbours, as other Canaan peoples did, even before the Babylonian exile, is not magic.

Aramaisms abound, says Sáenz-Badillos, especially in Esther, Qoheleth, Song of Songs, Ezra, Job, Daniel, Nehemiah and Chronicles. The conservative believer may be soothed, however, by assertions like this:

>We should bear in mind, though, that some books written after the exile, like Ruth and Lamentations [sic] contain hardly any Aramaisms, and that a number of Psalms, as well as some post-exilic sapiential and prophetic works, are not especially affected by them. (id. 115)

Concerning Job, Sáenz-Badillos takes a prudent stand to say it " is peculiar in that archaic elements appear alongside features that are late and perhaps dialectal, and so it is advisable at present to set this book apart from other works that are clearly post-exilic."

About the Hebrew of Daniel, Sáenz-Badillos mentions first an already old opinion[51] that the Hebrew sections of Daniel represent a translation from Aramaic. He expresses some doubts on it, and adds: "Whatever the case, in their present form these sections display an attempt to imitate BH." (Ibid.) No hope for the possibility that the book have the age it claims. If signs of earliness occur, then they must be attempts to imitate Early Biblical Hebrew.

---

[49] Sáenz-Badillas, 114.

[50] Sáenz-Badillas, p. 114-115.

[51] Rowley (1932), Zimmermann (1938) and Ginsberg (1948) are cited for this opinion. Sáenz-Badillas, p. 122.

Sáenz-Badillos treats extensively the Hebrew of Qumran, and after considering the long time span during which the language(s) undoubtedly developed at Qumran as anywhere, he shows that...

> Between the earliest and the latest documents an evolutionary process has undoubtedly taken place, ... so that the language has become gradually more distant from BH and more under the influence of Aramaic and RH.[52]

It readily appears, from Sáenz-Badillos' study, that the Hebrew spoken and written during the last centuries BCE was not at all unitary.

As for me, without force any conclusion, I'd like to quote the contention of the old W. J. Martin against the old S. R. Driver. "There is nothing about the Hebrew of Daniel that could be considered extraordinary for a bilingual or, perhaps in this case, a trilingual speaker of the language in the sixth century BC." Martin disassembles successively all the arguments raised by Driver. For example, the term מַלְכוּת, interpreted as specific to the late Hebrew, is found by Martin in earlier texts too (Nu 24:7, 1 Sam 20 31 et al.) and it is amazing that nobody (in the right camp!) saw it before. The expression אָמַר לְ, used where "older Hebrew would prefer the *direct* narration" is also found by Martin in the oldest known Hebrew (Dt 9:5, Jos 22:33 1Sa 30:6 et al.). The definite elliptic expression הַתָּמִיד (for עוֹלַת הַתָּמִיד) though exclusively present in *Daniel* and late Hebrew writings, is also shown by Martin to be part of a normal linguistic process found already in the oldest Hebrew books as in practically all languages.*[53]*

> …the historical-critical scholars now take a more temperate stand: Koch, for example, cautiously noted that in the Hebrew of the book, "nothing speaks against a date in the Maccabean time."*[54]* This assertion betrays the existence of other motivations not to accept the full authenticity of the book. But Archer has demonstrated more favourable that the Hebrew sectarian documents of Qumrân, practically contemporary with the supposed 2nd century author(s) of Daniel, have not so much in common with the Hebrew of Daniel. Therefore, the Hebrew of Daniel must be older.*[55]* Understandably, Aramaic influenced the Hebrew of Daniel and Hebrew influenced his Aramaic.

Studies on the Hebrew of Daniel

The Hebrew of Daniel 1:1 — 2:3

The following personal study of the Hebrew of Daniel is an attempt to discover and display Biblical references indicating correspondences to the respective terms or phrases or syntactic patterns found in Daniel. The interest was often to have a more thourough study of the meaning of a certain unit of speaking or expression. I didn't draw sharp conclusions for each observation and comparison because I have to better evaluate part of the evidence. I didn't translitterated usually the Hebrew script, considering the exclusive academic purpose of this paper, and in most cases I didn't translate from Hebrew, from the same motive. I marked with an asterisk (*) the words that I found to be certainly late, especially loanwords.

---

[52] Id. 132.

[53] W. J. Martin, *The Hebrew of Daniel,* in D J Wiseman etc. pp. 28-30.

[54] Koch, Klaus. *Das Buch Daniel,* Unter Mitarbeit von Till Niewisch und Jürgen Tubach, Ertrâge der Forschung, Bd..144; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980, p. 48.

[55] Gleason Archer, "The Hebrew of Daniel Compared with the Qumran Sectarian Documents", *The Law and the Prophets,* ed. J. Skilton (Nutley, NJ, 1974), pp. 470-486. The use of an old Hebrew name for Babylonia (שִׁנְעָר) found seven times only in the OT, is not so easy to explain in terms of a late date. The only post-exilic occurrence of the term is in Zc 5:11, still in the 6th century BC.

Daniel 1:1

בִּשְׁנַת .... לְמַלְכוּת .... cf. 1 Ch 26:31, 2Ch 3:2, 16:1, Dan 1:1, 2:1, 8:1, Jr 52:31, 2Ch 32:1 Est 2:16, Aram. Ezra 4:24. בָּא נְבוּכַדְנֶאצַּר מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל in Ez 17:12 the same expression, without preposition for Jerusalem. 2K 25:1.8, Jr 52:4 the same phrase, but with עַל, Jr 39:1 with אֶל (*King X went to...* 1S 12:12, 2K 15:19.29, Jr 36:29, 52:12). The verb בָּא is commonly used for military invasions (Gn 14:5, 1S 17:43, Is 10:28, 20:1, 30:27, Jr 37:19, 50:41, 51:56, Ez 38:13, Dan 8:5, 10:20, 11:13, 2 Ch 20:2, 25:10, 32:2). בָּא יְרוּשָׁלַם (2K 25:8, 2Sa 19:26) cf. v.2 הֵבִיא בֵית אוֹצָר אֱלֹהָיו . (and Jg 1:7, 1S 17:54, 2S 8:7, 10:14, 14:23, 15:37, 16:15, 20:3, 24:8, 1K 3:15, 12:21, 14:13, 18:17, 2K 23:30, 1Ch 18:7, 19:15, 21:4, 2Ch 11:1.16, 20:28, 25:3, Ezra 7:8, 8:32, Ne 13:15, Jr 27:3, 35:11). וַיָּצַר עָלֶיהָ old common phrase (2K 17:5, 18:9 and 1K 20:1, 2K 6:24, 2S 6:25, 2K 16:5, 24:11, Jr 32:2, Zc 12:2).

Daniel 1:2

וַיִּתֵּן אֲדֹנָי בְּיָדוֹ אֶת־יְהוֹיָקִים 2 Jr 27:6, 32:3-4.28, 34:2, (Nu 21:2, Dt 2:24, 7.24, 20:13, Jos 2:24, 6:2, 8:1.7, 21:22, Jg 1:2, 2:23, 3:10.28, 4:7.14, 7:7.14.15, 8:3, 11:30, 16:23.24, 1S 14:12, 23:4, 24:5.11, 26:23, 30:23, 2S 5:19, 1K 18:19, 20:13.28, 2K 3:18, 18:30, 12:14, 1Ch 22:18, 2Ch 24:24, 36:17, Jr 20:5, 44:30, Ez 29:19, et al.). כְּלֵי בֵית־הָאֱלֹהִים 1Ch 28:13.24, 2Ch 36:7.10.18, (Ezra 1:7, Ne 13:9, Jr 27:16, 28:3.6) וּמִקְצָת. Ne 7:69, Dan 1:5. Cf. Aram. Dan 2:42. בֵּית אֱלֹהָיו, 2Ch 32:21, 2K 19:37, Ezra 1:7, Is 37:38, Ho 9:8 בֵּית אוֹצָר Ne 10:39, Ml 3:10. אֶרֶץ־שִׁנְעָר An old biblical name for Babylonia (Gn 10:10, 11:2, Jos 7:21, Gn 14:1.9, Jos 7:21, Is 11:11), but it is found once more in Zc 5:11. It is related to the Egypt *Sangar,* and the *Shanḫar* of the tablets from Tel el Amarna.[56] וַיְבִיאֵם 1S 9:22, 2S 8:7, 2K 24:16, 1Ch 5:26, 1Ch 18:7, Ps 78:54, Jr 28:3, Dan. 1:18.

Daniel 1:3

וּמִפְּזַרַע הַמְּלוּכָה שַׂר הַסָּרִיסִים Dan 1:8.9.10.11.18. רַב סָרִיסָיו 2K 18:17, Jr 39:3.13, cf. v.6 2K 11:1, 25:25, 2Ch 22:10, Jr 41:1, Ez 17:13. וּמִן־הַפַּרְתְּמִים Est 1:3, 6:9.

Daniel 1:4

יְלָדִים with the meaning *young men*, in 1K 12:8.10.14, 2Ch 10:8.10.14. מוּם Lv 22:21, Dt 15:21 (Lv 21:17.18.21.23, 22:20.21, Lv 22:25, 24:19.20, Nu 19:2, Dt 17:1, 2S 14:25) / כָּל־מְאוּם Jb 31:7, a possible older spelling? וְטוֹבֵי מַרְאֶה Dan 1:15 (Gn 24:16, 26:7, 2S 11:2, Est 1:11, 2:2.3.7). וּמַשְׂכִּילִים בְּכָל־ cf. Dan 1:17, *be successful (skillful) in* Jos 1:7, 1S 18:5, 2K 18:7, Ps 101:2, Dan 9:13 (Amos 5:13, 2Ch 30:22, Dan 11:35, 12:3, 12:10, 1S 18:14.15, Jb 22:2, Ps 14:2, Ps 32:1 et al., Pr 10:5.19, 14:35, 15:24, 16:20). בְּכָל־חָכְמָה cf. Dan 1:17.20, Ps 107:27, 1K 5:10-14, **10:4.**23-24, 11:41, 2Ch 9:22-23, Pr 8:11, Q 1:13.16, 2:9, 7:23, 9:10. דַעַת וְיֹדְעֵי Nu 24:16, Pr 17:27 (Dan. 12:4, Gn. 2:9.17, Ex. 31:3, 35:31, 1 K. 7:14, Jb 21:14, Jb 13:2, 33:3, 34:35, Ps. 119:66, Pr 2:5.10, 5:2, 8:10.12, 9:10, 14:6, 22:20, 30:3, Pr 3:20, 11:9, 13:16, 24:4, Q 1:16.17, 2:21, 2:26, 9:10, Is 33:6, 44:25, 47:10, 58:2, Jr 10:14, 22:16, Ho. 4:6, 6:6). וּמְבִינֵי מַדָּע (associated with חָכְמָה 2Ch 1:10.11.12, Q 10:20, Dan 1:17 from the Aram. מַנְדַּע? Dan 2:21, 4:31.33, 5:12).

הֵיכַל הַמֶּלֶךְ *on the royal palace* 1K 21:1, 2K 20:18, Ps 45:16, Is 39:7. וַאֲשֶׁר כֹּחַ בָּהֶם 1S 30:4, 28:20.22, 2Ch 20:12, Is 50:2, Dan 10:8.17. לַעֲמֹד בְּהֵיכַל הַמֶּלֶךְ cf. v. 19.

וַיַּעַמְדוּ לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ Gn 41:46, 1K 1:2.28, 2Ch 10:6, 34:31, Est 8:4, Jr 52:12, Dan 2:2. וּלְלַמְּדָם Jg 3:2.

---

[56] BDBG, 1042. See the preceding endnote.

Daniel 1:5

אֲשֶׁר מָנָה עַל־ Dan 1:11 .(Ex 29:26, Lv 7:33). Jon 2:1, 4:6.7.8 וַיְמַן לָהֶם.

דְּבַר־יוֹם בְּיוֹמוֹ Ex 5:13.19, 16:4, Lv 23:37, 1K 8:59, 2K 25:30, Ezra 3:4, Ne 11:23, 12:17, Jr 52:24.

* פַּת־בַּג *portion of food for the king, delicacies, (fine) food.* A Persian loanword occurred only in Daniel (1:5.8.13.15.16, 11:26). According to BDBG (834), it derives from the Zend (Middle Persian) *pati-baga* and it was known in Sanskrit as *prati-bhâga.* It was transliterated in Greek as ποτί-βαζις. וּמִיֵּין מִשְׁתָּיו Dan 1:5.8 (מִשְׁתֶּה c 45 times, יַין c. 150 times). שָׁנִים שָׁלוֹשׁ 2Ch 11:17 with the numeral in the secondary position (cf. Ne 5:14, Gn 32:16, Jos 15:41, 21:41,1Ch 12:40, 25:5, 2Ch 3:11). Usually שָׁלוֹשׁ שָׁנִים (1Ch 21:12, 13:2, 31:16) according to the most frequent position of the numeral. See also v.12.14 יָמִים עֲשָׂרָה and Dan 9:26. וּלְגַדְּלָם *to rear*, *cause to grow up* Is 1:2, 49:21, 51:18, Ho 9:12, *to exalt* Est 3:1. מִקְצָת Ne 7:69, Dan 1:2:5:15.18. וּמִקְצָתָם יַעַמְדוּ לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ cf. v. 15 וּמִקְצָת יָמִים עֲשָׂרָה and v. 18 וּלְמִקְצָת הַיָּמִים.

Daniel 1:6

דָּנִיֵּאל 74 times in the book of Daniel. The name "Daniel" appears in Biblical genealogical lists only for the son of David from Abigail (1Chr 3:1), and a post-exilic priest (Ezra 8:2, Ne 10:6-8). Some names are traditional in genealogical lines, and Daniel at least is said to have been of the royal family (Dan 1:3) – note that the royal house is mentioned first here, as Daniel is mentioned before his fellows (Dan 1:6). According to Josephus: "Now, among these there were four of the family of [king] Zedekiah, of most excellent dispositions; the one of whom was called Daniel…"[57] חֲנַנְיָה מִישָׁאֵל וַעֲזַרְיָה are common Hebrew names. When we come to the names of his kinsmen (Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah), we see that their names, where we can identify their ancestry, occur prominently in Judahite/ Davidic or in Levitic/priestly lineage, just as the name "Daniel". The name "Azaria" first occurs in the genealogies of Judah's posterity (1 Chr 2:8.38), then as different priests (Ezra 7:1.3, 1 Chr 6:10.13.66), one of king Joshaphat's sons (2Chr 21:2), and the king Uzziah-Azaria (2 K 14:21). In post-exilic times it is still a prominent name (Ne 7:7, 8:7). Mishael is found only two times: a prominent Levite, Aaron's cousin (Ex 6:22) and a post-exilic leader, maybe a scribe, a Levite (Ne 8:4). Hananiah is the most common of these names, from which derived other forms (Hanani, Iohanan, et.al.). Besides many occurrences where it is hard to identify the genealogical line, the name is found as a benjaminite (Ne 12:41), a Levite (1Chr 25:4), a priest (Ne 12:41), a Davidic descendant (1 Chr. 3:19). This interesting preference of these names for levitic/priestly or judahite/kingly descent may suggest some matrimonial relations between the Davidic house and the priestly order (as in Lk 1:5.27.36). Yet I must recognise that all these are merely conjectures and even Josephus's statement seems to be not more than a believing insight in the danielic text.

Daniel 1:7

וַיָּשֶׂם לָהֶם שֵׁמוֹת Jg 8:31, 2K 17:34 (Cf. Aram. Dan 5:12). Usually, קָרָא ל... (Gn 1:8, 2:19, cf. Dan 10:1). עֲבֵד־נְגוֹ ,מֵישַׁךְ ,שַׁדְרַךְ, בֵּלְטְשַׁאצַּר prove to be genuine Babylonian names. For example, P. R. Berger interprets Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego from Babylonian onomastics. Shadrach is from Akkadian *shaduraku* ("ich bin sehr in Furcht versetzt"), a shortened form in which the name of the deity is omitted. Meshach is from the Akkadian *Meshaku* ("ich bin gering geachtet"), also omitting the theophoric component. It has a striking similarity with the known Akkadian term *mushkennu*, "ordinary people", and with the French *mesquin* – ital. *meschino* – rom. *meschin,* "base", "mean".

---

[57] *Ant.* X, x:1.

Daniel 1:8

וַיָּשֶׂם דָּנִיֵּאל עַל־לִבּוֹ Dt 11:18, Is 42:25, 47:7, 57:1.11, Jr 12:11, Ml 2:2.

אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִתְגָּאַל בְּ Nowhere in Hithpaᶜel, but it occurs in other forms (Ezra 2:62, Ne 7:64,. La 4:14, Is 59:3, 63:3, Ml 1:7.12). וַיְבַקֵּשׁ מִן and v. 20 בִּקֵּשׁ מֵהֶם Gn 31:39, 43:9, Ezra 8:21.23, Est 4:8, 7:7 et al.

Daniel 1:9

9 וַיִּתֵּן ..... לְחֶסֶד וּלְרַחֲמִים לִפְנֵי 1K 8:50, Ne 1:11, Ps 106:46.

Daniel 1:10

אֲדֹנִי אֲנִי אֶת־ יָרֵא הַמֶּלֶךְ Gn 42:18, Jon 1:9. Scores of occurrences in 1-2 Samuel and 1-2 Kings. See also 1Ch 21:3.23, Isa. 36:8, Jr. 37:20, 38:9. אֶת־מַאֲכַלְכֶם וְאֶת־מִשְׁתֵּיכֶם Ezra 3:7 לָמָה c. 170 times לָמָה in all books of OT, (double than מַדּוּעַ). יִרְאֶה אֶת־פְּנֵיכֶם Gn 31:5, Ex 34:35, et al. זֹעֲפִים Verb and noun used in 1K 21:4, 2Ch 26:19, 28:9.

* כְּגִילְכֶם The noun גִּיל *age, circle* is attested in this verse only. BDBG (162) indicates its presence in Arabic, Samaritan and Late Hebrew.

* וְחִיַּבְתֶּם *you inculpate (my head).* The root חוב *to be guilty, indebted* is not attested in the OT (except that סבתי in 1S 22:22 is emmended to חבתי *I am guilty,* according to Θ (BDBG 295), and the noun חוֹב *debt* in Ez 18:7. The root is present in Aramaic whence, according to the suggestion of BDBG, it entered Hebrew and Arabic. It is usual in the Syriac (e.g. Mt 6:12, 18:28, Lk 7:41, as in the modern Hebrew).[58]

Daniel 1:11

* הַמֶּלְצַר *keeper, guardian, warden, overseer.* Only in Dan 1:11.16. BDBG (576) gives it as a Babylonian title, a loanword from the Assyrian *maṣṣaru.* The Greek translators did not understand it and rendered it as a proper name (LXX Αβιεσδρι, Θ Αμελσαδ). This may be understood as a mark of *Daniel*'s authenticity.

Daniel 1:12

נַס־ from נִסָּה *to try, test, prove* Gn 22:1, 1S 17:39, Ex 17:7. Dan 1:14 (וַיְנַסֵּם)

* זֵרְעֹנִים / זֵרְעִים *vegetables* (v. 16). In Daniel only, derived from זֵרוּעִים *things which are seed* (Lv 11:37, Is 61:11). The singular forms (זֵרְעוֹן / זֵרוּע) could have emerged from the old root זרע at any time. וְנֹאכְלָה Cf. Nu 11:13, Ne 5:2, instead of לֶאֱכֹל [...]. Gn 28:20, Ex 16:8, 18:12, Ps 78:24. ⬚מִים וְנִשְׁתֶּה *water, that we drink* (Cf. Ex 17:2, Am 4:1) instead of ⬚מִים לִשְׁתּוֹת (Ex 7:24, Nu 33:14, Am 4:8).

Daniel 1:13

עֲשֵׂה עִם־עֲבָדֶיךָ Ps 119:65.124, 1K 3:6.

Daniel 1:14

וַיִּשְׁמַע לָהֶם לַדָּבָר הַזֶּה 1S 30:24, Gn 19:21, 2S 13:20, 2K 5:18, Ezra 10:18.

Daniel 1:15

נִרְאָה מַרְאֵיהֶם טוֹב וּבְרִיאֵי בָּשָׂר Gn 41:2.4.18, Zc 11:16

---

[58] See *The New Covenant Aramaic Peshitta Text, with Hebrew Translation,* The Aramaic Scriptures Reserach Society, The Bible Society, Jerusalem, 1986.

Daniel 1:16

וְנָתַן ....נָשָׂא....וַיְהִי Periphrastic conjugation: היה + participle (Gn 39:22, Ex 19:19, 1S 2:11, 2S 15:32, 1Ch 15:29, 2Ch 17:12, Ez 43:6 et al.). וַיַּיִן מִשְׁתֵּיהֶם Is 5:12 the same idiom – and many times separately.

Daniel 1:17

אַרְבַּעְתָּם Ez 1:8.10.16.18, 10:10.12, 46:22-23 (2S 21:9 numeral + pronominal suffix).

נָתַן לָהֶם הָאֱלֹהִים Q 5:17.18, 8:15, Gn 27:28, Dan 1:9. הַשְׂכֵּל *insight,* an infinitive Hiphᶜil used as a noun (Pr 1:3, 21:16, Jr 9:23). וְדָנִיֵּאל הֵבִין Cf. 8:27, 9:22, 10:1.11.12.

בְּכָל־חָזוֹן וַחֲלֹמוֹת *visions and dreams* Jb 7:14, 20:8, 33:15, Is 29:7, Jl 3:1.

Daniel 1:18

אֲשֶׁר־אָמַר הַמֶּלֶךְ לַהֲבִיאָם וַיְבִיאֵם שַׂר הַסָּרִיסִים וּלְמִקְצָת הַיָּמִים See on Dan 1:2.5. A suggestive syntax of clauses for the encoded reply in Dan 8:14.

Daniel 1:19

וַיְדַבֵּר אִתָּם Gn 23:5, 34:8, 42:7, 17:3, 2K 25:28, Jr 39:5, 52:32, Nu 26:3, Ez 3:24 et.al. וְלֹא נִמְצָא מִכֻּלָּם כְּ.... Jb 42:15, Gn 31:37

Daniel 1:20

בִּינָה ......Dan בִּקֵּשׁ מֵהֶם Q 8:1, Ps 49:4, Pr 1:6, 22:17, Q 9:17, 10:12, 12:11. דְּבַר חָכְמַת 8:15, Pr 14:6, 15:14, 18:15, 23:35, Q 7:25. וַיִּמְצָאֵם עֶשֶׂר יָדוֹת 2S 19:44, Gn 37:17, 2Ch 25:5. הַחַרְטֻמִּים Gn 41:8.24, Ex 7:11.22, 8:3.14.15, 9:11. According to BDBG (355) it is an old Hebrew noun derived, probably from חֶרֶט+ם (*graving-tool*), and meaning initially *engraver, writer,* whence the usual meaning *magician, one possessing occult knowledge.* Holladay (116) *soothsayer-priest.* * הַחַרְטֻמִּים וְהָאַשָּׁפִים Dan 2:2 (Aram. Dan 2:10.27, 4:4.6, 5:11).

* אַשָּׁף *conjurer, necromancer* is, according to BDBG (80), from *a ∗ipu,* an Akkadian (Asyro-Babylonian) loanword. In Daniel only, probably borrowed from the Imperial Aramaic.

Daniel 1:21

וַיְהִי......עַד־שְׁנַת אַחַת לְ... *and he remained (continued) there till the first year of* 1K 11:40. כּוֹרֶשׁ הַמֶּלֶךְ (cf. Hg 1:1.15, Zc 7:1) instead of כּוֹרֶשׁ הַמֶּלֶךְ (Ezra 1:7, 4:3), accordimg to the usual Hebrew formula: e.g. הַמֶּלֶךְ דָּוִד (2S 6:16 et al. 1Ch 15:29 et al. scores of occurences, 1K 1:53 הַמֶּלֶךְ שְׁלֹמֹה 2K 18:17, Is 6:1, 36:2, 37:1.5 et al.). According to the Aramaic of Daniel and Ezra, the king's name is called first, then his function, כּוֹרֶשׁ מַלְכָּא (Ezra 5:13.14.17, 6:3; Ezra 4:8.11.23 Ezra 5:6.7, 6:1.13.15, Dan 6:7.26). In Chronicles we find both usages, while in Kings, the old Hebrew usage prevails.

Daniel 2:1

חֲלֹמוֹת...חָלַם Usual old Hebrew phrase (Gn 37:6, 37:9.10, 41:15, Jg 7:13, Jl 3:1, Jr 29:8, Dan 2:3). וַתִּתְפָּעֶם רוּחוֹ cf. 2:3 וַתִּתְפָּעֶם רוּחִי לָדַעַת אֶת־הַחֲלוֹם A usual Hebrew formula (Gn 41:8, Ps 77:5). וּשְׁנָתוֹ נִהְיְתָה עָלָיו While the meaning of נִהְיְתָה in OT is *it was, happened, occured* (Ex 11:6, Jg 19:30, 20:3.12, Jr 5:30, 48:19, Ez 21:12, 39:8, Dan. 2:1, Dan. 12:1), here is thought to mean *be done, finished* (cf. Dan 8:27). This meaning is exclusive to *Daniel.*

Daniel 2:2

מְכַשְּׁפִים *sorcerers, wizards,* an old Hebrew term (Ex 7:11, 22:17, Dt 18:10, 2K 9:22, 2Ch 33:6, Is 47:9.12, Jr 27:9, Mi 5:11, Na 3:4, Ml 3:5) from an old Semitic root (cf. Asyr. *K ∗pu, ka ∗ᵖu, ka ∗ ∗apu,* according to BDBG).

כַּשְׂדִּים as a professional Babylonian elite in Daniel, is considered an anachronism for the 6th century BC. But there are later uses of the term with ethnic connotation, even to Strabo (d. AD 24) who uses both connotations, just like Daniel.[59] And the specialised, second use (which some scholars limit to later writings), is found in Herodotus (d. 425 BC)[60] where it designates the priests of Bel. The term was found even in Assyrian records with ethnic connotation, while the professional connotation was not found so far prior to the Persian era. While the Babylonian records are still silent, Daniel uses the term with both meanings. This hyper-critical argument is only an inference *e silentio*.[61]

Though the linguistic research on Daniel cannot suppress the objections of the unbelieving criticism, as a striking and indubitable evidence for an early date of composition, none of the signalled difficulties precludes the acceptance of an earlier date, or force us to accept the second century (BC) thesis. The philosophical-psychological bias is manifest in the linguistic research too.

לְהַגִּיד לַמֶּלֶךְ חֲלֹמֹתָיו cf. Gn 41:25, Jr 51:31

Daniel 2:4

וַיָּבֹאוּ וַיַּעַמְדוּ לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ

וַיְדַבְּרוּ....לְ... Usually, וַיְדַבְּרוּ...אֶל.. (Gn 34:20, 2Ch 34:22 et al.). Here it may be modeled by the expression וַיֹּאמְרוּ....לְ and הַגֵּד....לְ (2K 17:26, Jos 2:2, 1S 18:25, 2S 2:4, 17:17, 18:21, Jr 36:16, 51:31, Dan 2:22, Aram. Dan 3:16.24).

דִּבֶּר....אֲרָמִית Cf. 2K 18:26, Is 36:11.

The Hebrew of Daniel 8 and 9

Daniel 8:1

מַלְכוּת See Dan 1:1; בְּלֵאשַׁצַּר הַמֶּלֶךְ See Dan 1:21; נִרְאָה אֵלַי [חָזוֹן] A usual expression referring to divine manifestations (revelations) Gn 48:3, Ex 3:16, Jg 13:10. אֲנִי דָנִיֵּאל A phrase specific to *Daniel* (Dan 8:15.27, 9:2, 10:2.7, 12:5, Aram. Dan 7:15.28 cf. Dan 12:4) comparable to Q 1:12, Rev 1:9, 22:8.16 (*I, Qoheleth*; *I, John; I Jesus*), and emphasising authority and authenticity (Cf. אֲנִי יהוה Lv 19:28 + c. 300 occurences).

בַּתְּחִלָּה Dan 9:21, Gn 41:21, 43:18.20, Is 1:26. Though the adverbial phrase בַּתְּחִלָּה means usually: *at the beginning, at first, at the commencement,* and the ancient translations remained faithful to that meaning, I think that in this context it means *previously, earlier, before, priorly,* because the usual meaning doesn't make sense in this place.[62] The same expression links the vision of chap. 8 with the visit of Gabriel in chap. 9:21. There are some scholars who think that in 9:21 Daniel refers to his **first** vision recorded in chap. 7, where it is said in v. 16 that an *angelus interpres* gave him explanations. However, in chap. 7, the name of this angel is not disclosed, and the totally different reaction of Daniel in chap. 8, does not suggest that it is the same personage. I cannot reject decidedly this possibility, but if Daniel in chap. 9:21 refers to the vision in chap. 8, as it appears, that vision was not his first one, but a previous one. And if one translates the phrase in 9:21 with *previously,* then he / she should gave it

---

[59] Strabon, *Geografia,* vol. III, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, Bucharest, Cluj-Napoca, 1983, p. 716. For ethnic connotation see book XVI, 1:6.8, 3:1.3, 4:1. For the professional use see book XVI, 1:6, 2:39, and book XVII, 1:29.

[60] Herodotus, *Histories* 1:181-83.

[61] Hasel, 124-126. It is interesting the observation of the French large dictionary of J. Planche & A. Pillon, *Dictionnaire Grec-Francais,* Librairie Hachette et C[IX] , Paris, 1872, p. 1470: "**CHALDEEN,** *nom de peuple; et par ext.* **astrologue, tireur d'horoscope,** *de même que chez nous* **bohème, bohémien, -enne."** (my underline)

[62] To what beginning would the author refer? The beginning of Belshazzar's reign, as it is said in Dan 7:1 ? Or the beginning of Daniel's visions?

the same meaning in 8:1. There are some precedents of using בַּתְּחִלָּה with a meaning closely related to this: Jg 1:1, 20:18.[63] In spite of the classic solution rendered by the majority of Bible translations, there are some translations that render the phrase in the adapted form, in both verses.[64] If the author wanted to say "before", he had not a better option than to use בַּתְּחִלָּה. There are indeed other phrases used in Hebrew and translated into English, in different versions, as: *previously, before, already etc.,* but they are either of the same basic meaning as בַּתְּחִלָּה (e.g. בָּרִאשֹׁנָה 2S 7:10, 1Ch 17:9, lit. *in the beginning;* כָּרִאשֹׁנָה Dt 9:18, Dan 11:29, lit. *like the first [time];* לָרִאשֹׁנָה Gn 28:19, Jg 18:29, lit. *at the beginning;* הָרִאשֹׁנִים Nu 6:12, Ps 79:8, lit. *the first things*) or a meaning of precedence that does not match the idea the author had to convey in Dan 8:1 and 9:21. For example, תְּמוֹל שִׁלְשֹׁם (cf. Gn 31:2, 2K 13:5), combined from תְּמוֹל lit. *yesterday;* and שִׁלְשֹׁם lit. *three days ago;* commonly used as meaning *heretofore, beforetime, formerly,* and referring to repeated actions or continual state up to the moment of speaking; לְפָנִים Dt 2:10, Ps 102:26, lit. *in face, forward, before,* referring to long time ago, and in *status constructus,* usually with spatial meaning.

כְּבָר Q 2:12.16, 9:6.7 lit. *already, being here since long time.*

Daniel 8:2

חָזוֹן – an old Hebrew term, meaning first *vision, dream* Ps 89:20, Is 29:7, Dan 1:17, 8:1.2.15.17, Dan 9:21, Mi 3:6, whence: **1.** *profetic vision / revelation* 1S. 3:1, 1Ch 17:15, La 2:9, Ez 12:22.23.24.27, 13:16, **2.** *revelation given by vision* Pr 29:18, Jr 14:14, Dan 8:13.26, 10:14, Ho 12:11, Hab 2:2.3, Ez 7:13.26, synonym to מַרְאֶה **3.** *disclosure of a received vision* Jr 23:16, Ez 7:26, **4.** *written record of a vision(s)* 2 Ch 32:32, Is 1:1, Dan 9:24, 11:14, Ob 1:1, Na 1:1. Verb חזה used as synonym to ראה *to see, look, view* (Ez 12:27, 1Ch 29:29).

וַיְהִי בִּרְאֹתִי & v. 15. In Daniel only, possible emphasising prophetic vision (cf. 2Ch 26:5). [בְּשׁוּשַׁן] הַבִּירָה *in Susa, the fortress (castle, palace, royal city).* In post-exilic writings only. Ne 1:1, Est 1:2.5, 2:5, 3:15, 8:14, 9:11.12, Dan. 8:2. (בִּירָה & 1Ch 29:1, Ne 2:8, 7:2, Aram. Ezra 6:2). Another form is the pl. בִּירָנִיּוֹת in 2Ch 17:12, 27:4).

[בְּעֵילָם] הַמְּדִינָה Cf. Aram. Ezra 6:2; מְדִינָה is attested in Ezra. 2:1, 7:16, Ne 1:3, 7:6, 11:3, Est. 1:1.22, 3:12.14, 4:3, 8:9.11.13.17, 9:28.30, Q 5:7, Dan. 8:2, Dan. 11:24. Aram. Dan. 2:48.49, 3:1.12.30.

Daniel 8:3

וָאֶרְאֶה בֶחָזוֹן[65] וָאֶרְאֶה וְהִנֵּה וָאֶשָּׂא עֵינַי It is possible to consider with Collins the repetition of the phrase וָאֶרְאֶה בֶחָזוֹן as a dittography.[66] However, it is likely that the speaker would stress his visionary, not actual presence at Susa. Repetition, even pleonastic expression is a usual Hebrew figure of speech. וַאֲנִי הָיִיתִי עַל Dan 10:4; וַאֲנִי הָיִיתִי Ne 1:1.11, Dan 8:5, 10:9, Jg 12:2, Jr 46:2.

[עַל-] אוּבַל אוּלַי *the canal Eulaeus.* אוּבַל *canal, stream, river.* With this spelling, only in Dan 8:2.6. See, however, Jr 17:8 (יוּבַל), and Is 30:25 (יָבָל *watercourse, stream).* With the preposition עַל-, synonyms are used in Jr 17:8 (עַל-מַיִם, עַל-יוּבַל), Is 44:4 (עַל-יִבְלֵי-מָיִם), Nu 24:6 (עֲלֵי-נָהָר), 2K 23:29, Jr 46:2.6 (עַל-נְהַר-פְּרָת), Ez 1:1.3, 3:23, 10:22 (עַל-נְהַר-כְּבָר). The verbal

---

[63] That which is the first, as the front of an army, stands *before.*

[64] NIV, NAS, NAB, LSG, NÉG, Cornilescu (Romanian), Nitzulescu (Romanian). Some translators give this meaning in Dan 9:21 only, while in 8:1 they keep the usual meaning. e.g. LUT, NRS.

[65] Though Josephus (*Ant.* 10.11.7) says that Daniel was actually in Susa, the Syriac stresses the fact that the לִפְנֵי הָאֻבָל prophet was there in vision (Montgomery, 325).

[66] John Collins. *Daniel,* Fortress Press, Minneapolis, 1993: 329

stem הובל/יבל *to conduct, bear along* , derives from an old Semitic root ובל, attested in Assyr. *abâlu,* as in Aramaic and Arabic.[67]

Ez אֶל־הַנֶּגֶב וְאֶל־הַמִּפְזרָח In this order in 1Ch 9:24, Zc 14:4, Dt 3:27; יָמָּה וְצָפוֹנָה וָנֶגְבָּה 42:19, Jl 2:20 (אל + point of compass); [וְאֶל־]הַצֶּבִי] Elliptical phrase, see Dan 11:16.41.45 (הַר־צְבִי־, אֶרֶץ הַצֶּבִי). The noun צְבִי *beauty, adornment, glory, honour* is used in 2S 1:19, Is 4:2, 13:19, 23:9, 24:16, 28:1.4, Jr 3:19, Ez 7:20, 20:6.15, 25:9.

Daniel 8:4

רָאִיתִי אֶת־הָאַיִל מְנַגֵּחַ Compare the use of the participle in the same syntactical situation in v. 6 עֹמֵד רָאִיתִי אֲשֶׁר v. 7 וּרְאִיתִיו מַגִּיעַ v. 13 מְדַבֵּר אֶחָד־קָדוֹשׁ וָאֶשְׁמְעָה (Cf. Dan 12:5). מְנַגֵּחַ is participle Piᶜel of the verb נגח to push, thrust, gore (Ex 21:29.36, Dt 33:17, 1K 22:11, 2Ch 18:10, Ps 44:6, Ez 34:21, Dan. 11:40).

וְכָל־חַיּוֹת לֹא־יַעַמְדוּ – disagreement of gender. See in v.22 both the usual feminine form תַּעֲמֹדְנָה and a single, unusual form יַעֲמֹדְנָה , which looks like a mixture of feminine and masculine forms. Concerning the gender disagreements in this chapter, compare with Ez 1:5-25, where the same subject (חַיּוֹת) receives both masculine and feminine verbs and pronominal suffixes. The disagreements in Ezekiel 1 are so many and seemingly "regular" (not at random), that it is very difficult to explain them as scribal errors. Waltke and O'Connor[68] point out that this kind of "concord" is quite usual in the OT Hebrew, which gives priority to the masculine and in a lot of cases has masculine verbs for feminine nouns (Lv 26:33, Jg 21:21, Jr 13:16). A possible explanation concerning the agreement with חַיּוֹח *living, animal, beast* is the logical gender of this plural noun. Both players of this vision (the ram and the he-goat) are male creatures. If we imagine a multitude of beasts – male and female – , the plural noun חַיּוֹח feels comfortable if one refers "them" in the feminine (cf. Gn 1:27, 32:1). Or, we may even think of the actual meaning of these "beasts" as kings, or hosts of warriors.

וְאֵין מַצִּיל מִיָּדוֹ – an old and common expression, see Dt 32:39, Jb 10:7, Is 43:13, Dan 8:7 et al. וְעָשָׂה כִרְצֹנוֹ – an expression attested only in the books claiming datation in the 6ᵗʰ-5ᵗʰ centuries BCE (Ne 9:24, Est 1:8, 9:5, Dan. 11:3.16.36), while the variant without the particle כְּ (עָשָׂה רְצוֹן) is found especially in Psalms Ps 40:9, 103:21, 143:10, 145:19 and in an exhortation of Ezra (possible reminiscent from Psalms or other older writings: Ezra 10:11).

Daniel 8:5

צְפִיר־הָעִזִּים הָיִיתִי מֵבִין See הָיָה+participle in Dan 10:2.9, Ps 30:8, La 1:11, Ne 1:11. *the he-goat.* The phrase has the definite article, even though this is a new personage introduced, which is unusual. צְפִיר־הָעִזִּים is, literally, "the buck of the goats" a phrase common in the form שְׂעִיר [הָ]עִזִּים (Gn 37:31, Lv 4:23.28, 5:6, 9:3, 16:5, 23:19, Nu 7:16.22.28.34.40.46. 52.58.64.70.76.82.87, 15:24, 28:15.30, 29:5.11.16:19.25, Ez 43:22, Ez 45:23). While the classic Hebrew uses the term שְׂעִיר (Lv 16:9.18.20.21 et al.), the postexilic Hebrew borrowed the term צָפִיר from Aramaic (2Ch 29:21, Dan 8:5.8.21, צְפִירֵי עִזִּין Ezra 6:17, 8:35). פְּנֵי כָל־הָאָרֶץ עַל Old and frequent phrase (Gn 1:29, 7:3, 8:9, 11:4.8.9.25, 1S 30:16, 2S 18:8, Zc 5:3). בָאָרֶץ וְאֵין נוֹגֵעַ Old phrase (Am 9:5; cf. + other participles: Gn 41:8.24, Lv 26:6, Dan 11:16).

קֶרֶן חָזוּת cf. v. 8, lit. *horn of sight.* The term חָזוּת is used elsewhere with the meaning of *prophetic vision* (Is 21:2, 29:11, 2Chr 9:29), and only in the Aramaic with the meaning of *sight, seeing, view (aram. Dan 4:8.17).* In Is 28:18 is usually translated as *provision, pact, agreement* (according to the Vulgate), but Theodotion renders it as ἐλπὶς *hope/trust,* so that this use in Is 28:18 is unique and quite obscure. The use in Dan 8 is seemingly under Aramaic

---

[67] According to BDBG, p. 384-385.

[68] Op. cit. 109-110.

influence and the noun is used adjectivally to emphasize the prominence, conspicuousness of the horn. What this horn has to do with "sight" is its notable length (visibility), notable position (on the goat's forehead, between its eyes בֵּין־עֵינָיו cf. Ex 13:9.16, Dt 6:8, 11:8, Dan 8:21). Maybe the writer wanted to emphasize its position between the goat's eyes, in order to suggest that the "first king" it represented dominates the view of the goat-kingdom.

Daniel 8:6

וַיָּבֹא עַד־ Nu 13:22, Jg 7:13, 19:10, 1S 15:5, 19:22, 20:37, 2S 19:16, 1Ch 21:21, 2Ch 12:4, 14:8. Always a locative expression.

הָאַיִל בַּעַל הַקְּרָנַיִם in Daniel only (Dan 8:20). Compare with עַשְׁתְּרֹת־קַרְנַיִם "the two horned Ashtarte" (Gn 14:5) for a possible pun in בַּעַל הַקְּרָנַיִם lit. "the two-horned Baal" (in fact, *possessing two horns*). Note also the phonetic and graphic similarity between אַיִל *ram* and אֵל *god*. The he-goat is also seen as a pagan god (See on 8:21.). וַיָּרָץ אֵלָיו Common phrase: Jb 15:26, Gn 24:20.29, Nu 17:12, 1S 3:5. בַּחֲמַת כֹּחוֹ *in the fury (heat) of his power.* Both words are very frequent in the oldest Hebrew texts, but this construction is exclusive to this verse.

Daniel 8:7

וּרְאִיתִיו Gn 44:28, Dt 33:9; אֵצֶל One of the oldest prepositions, see Gn 41:3, Lv 6:3, 11:30, 1K 21:2, Am 2:8, Ez 33:30, 43:8, Dan 8:17, 10:13; וַיִּתְמַרְמַר אֵלָיו *and was enraged against....* A Hithpalpel exclusive in Daniel (Dan 8:7, 11:1), with its basic form מרר *be bitter, show bitterness*; וַיַּךְ אֶת־ Scores of occurences (Ex 2:12, Jg 3:13, 20:32, 2S 8:1, Jb 2:7, Ps 60:2); וַיַּשְׁלִיכֵהוּ אַרְצָה Ex 4:3, Dan 8:12, Comp. La 2:1, Ez 19:12, 28:17;.....וְלֹא־הָיָה כֹחַ בְּ 1S 28:20.22, 30:4, Is 50:2, 2Ch 20:12, 25:8, Dan 1:4, 10:17; לַעֲמֹד לְפָנָיו Ex 9:11, Jg 2:14, Jr 40:10 et al.

Daniel 8:8

הִגְדִּיל עַד־מְאֹד Gn 26:13, 27:33.34, 1S 11:15, 25:36, 2S 2:17, 1K 1:4, Ps 119:8.43.51, Is 64:8.11, La 5:22, Dan 11:25. וּכְעָצְמוֹ The verb is common with the meaning *to be strong (in number or power),* see Gn 26:16, Ex 1:7, Is 40:29, et al. and the morphologic pattern occurs with a lot of verbs (e.g. וּכְשָׁמְעוֹ Gn 24:30), Ex 11:1, 2Ch 24:22, Ne 8:5, Dan 10:19, 11:4 et al. For וַתַּעֲלֶנָה, the regular spelling is וַתַּעֲלֶינָה (Is 65:17). The *Kethîb* in text may indicate an old spelling.

חָזוּת אַרְבַּע Here חָזוּת is used elliptically, instead of קַרְנֵי חָזוּת. The use of such ellipses occurs in Dan 8:11 etc, הַתָּמִיד instead of עוֹלַת־הַתָּמִיד (Nu 28-29, Ne 10:34) and in Dan 9:23.: חֲמֻדוֹת instead of אִישׁ חֲמֻדוֹת (Dan 10:3.11.19), הַצְּבִי instead of אֶרֶץ־הַצְּבִי (cf. Dan 11:16.45). This is a mark of authenticity – of using a living Hebrew. לְאַרְבַּע רוּחוֹת הַשָּׁמָיִם A phrase found only in exilic and postexilic books (Jr 49:36, Ez 37:9, 42:20, Dan 11:4, Zc 2:10, 6:5, 1Ch 9:24, Aram. Dan 7:2). However, different names for each point of compass, associated with winds blowing from respective directions were known from the earliest times (Ex 10 13, Dt 33:23, Pr 25:23, Ez 42:17.18).

Daniel 8:9

וּמִן־הָאַחַת מֵהֶם – gender disagreement between the pronominal suffix of the preposition [מֵהֶ]ם (masculine) and the preceding numeral אַחַת (feminine). The logical subject seems to be קֶרֶן although some scholars[69] are nearly convincing in their attempt to explain this disagreement as a parallel agreement (*A* רוחות *B* הַשָּׁמַיִם *A'* הָאַחַת *B'* מֵהֶם) – thus indicating that the

---

[69] William H. Shea, *Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation.* Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, vol I, Ed. by The General Conference of SDA, College View Printers, Lincoln, Nebraska, 1982 : 41-43.

author meant that the new horn's origin was "from one of the [four winds]" spoken of in the previous clause, and not "from one of the [four horns]". While this possibility should not be ruled out without a closer study, I think it's too heavy theological cargo laid on a poor "mem", which could easier be changed into a "nun", to indicate the feminine, as suggested by some manuscripts[70]. It's better to see here an old scribal error, a *kethîb* prserved by the Massoretes, especially because this kind of error is so common in the OT and in Daniel we meet other grammatical disagreements too. In the light of other OT text containing the same kind of disagreement, we may even say that it is not a scribal error, but a quite regular sort of "concord". There are other similar cases, and I think they must be genuine (and even a mark of earliness and authenticity), because it is always the masculine "mistaken" for the feminine (Ex 1:21, Ez 1:6.18, see also on 8:4: וְכָל־חַיּוֹת לֹא־יַעֲמֹדוּ). The feminine מֵהֶן seems to be systematically avoided (present only in Ez 16:47.52). There is even an interesting phonetic alternance ן/ם) כִּמְהָן 2S 19:41 / כִּמְהָם 2S 19:38.39 – personal name; Aram. Jr לְהוֹם Jr 10:11 / לְהוֹן Ezra 4:20, Dan 2:35 et al.). Furthermore, the coming forth of this horn from air, from a point of compass that is not even indicated, is quite strange. It is true, in Zc 1:18-21 we have 4 horns appearing simply in the air. But Zechariah has no horned beast in his vision, while in this vision each horn is rooted in an animal head. Finally, if the seer meant "winds" and not "horns", he must have avoided any ambiguity. To any reader, the logical precedent of the ambiguous Hebrew pronoun is "conspicuous [horns]" form the previous verse. The adverbial phrase "toward the four winds of heaven" cannot make us get rid of the feeling that the logical subject is still those wretched horns.

מִצְּעִירָה Maybe the best understanding of the phrase מִצְּעִירָה is "from smallness / littleness / youth / insignificance". This noun occurs once elsewhere (Gn 43:33), to mean *youth,* and as adjective: *young / small / little / insignificant* is represented in Gn 19:31-38, 29:26, Mi 5:1. To make this phrase mean "from the small one [horn]" (as it would stand in apposition with the preceding: וּמִן הָאַחַת) is unwarranted, because this noun has no definite article and it does not stand next to the first phrase, as it would, if it had stood in apposition. Up to this point, the narrator didn't speak about any difference in age or rank among the four horns of the goat, (as he did about the two horns of the ram) so that he may legitimately refere to the youngst / smallest / most insignificant of them. Some suggest (see BHS, the critical apparatus) it is a scribal error and cut out the preposition [וְ]מִ to read it as it would be an adjective (*little / small / insignificant*) and to make it sound similar to the phrase קֶרֶן אָחֳרִי זְעֵירָה from the Aramaic of Dan 7:8.But we don't need to resort to emendations, if the text as we have it, does make sense. We don't need exactly the same wording in both visions, in order to recognize the similarity, even the identity of the two little horns. But it is OK to translate the phrase as "a little horn", because if we punctiliously want to translate "one horn [come out] from littleness", it doesn't mean something else but "a little horn", further described as growing exceedingly great. The Greek versions have a "strong (ἰσχυρὸν) horn", showing that they had somehow interpreted this phrase, or used another basic manuscript. The Vulgate gives in the simplest way: *cornu unum modicum* ("one little horn").

[וַתִּגְדַּל־]יֶתֶר] The study of this term is important in the later identification of the little horn. The noun יֶתֶר (from a verbal root, *to remain over / above),* is used in the OT with the following derived connotations: 1). remaining, remainder, remnant, residue, rest, other part, leftover, leave (most of occurrences); 2). excess, surplus, abundance; 3). preeminence, superiority, excellency. Hence the term is used adjectivally *(superior, abundant, excessive)* and theoretically it might be used with adverbial meaning *(exceedingly, excellently, plentifully, abundantly, superiorly, excessively, more, beyond measure).* Its only adverbial occurrence, beside

---

[70] According to BHS, critical apparatus.

this one in Daniel, is found in Is 56:12, and also next to the root גדל (יוֹם מָחָר גָּדוֹל יֶתֶר מְאֹד
וְהָיָה כָזֶה *tomorrow will be like today, even much greater*). Shemariahu Talmon finds a good parallel of this adverb in the *Commentary on Habakkuk* from the Dead Sea Scrolls.[71] Does *Daniel* intend to compare the greatness of this horn with the preceding powers? The ram became "great" (v. 4), the goat became "exceedingly/very great" (v. 8, cf. Gn. 27:33-34, Dan 11:25), and this initially small horn became "great beyond measure/excessively". Its feats depicted further, truly exceed those of its forerunners. So it seems that the author aligned them in a crescendo. Did the verb גדל refers to political achievements, or rather to the increasing attitude of arrogance, which is the topmost sin in *Daniel?* The use of this verb in the literary context in Dan 8 does not allow us to avoid the idea of political/military greatness. This is the basic meaning, though condemnation of hubristic exploits fits as well the context. No matter who is this horn, his foreshadow depicts him at least as great as the goat kingdom itself.

הַצֶּבִי If it is related to the Aramaic root צבה / צבא (to wish, to desire), then it meant first *desire, longing,* which is a fitting word used by the Exiles. This phrase is elliptical (see on 8:3 – [וְאֶל־]הַצֶּבִי) and surely refers to the "Promised Land". The term is used in *Isaiah* with the meaning of *glory / beauty / splendour* (Is 23:9 of any power, Is 4:2 of Israel, Is 24:16 of Yahweh, Is 13:19 of Babylon – the city desired by all kingdoms) and in the exilic Scriptures is used with the same meaning, mostly for Judea (Jr 3:19, Ez 20:6.15 the glorious heritage, the most beautiful country, Ez 25:9 of the choicest places in Moab).

Daniel 8:10

וַתִּגְדַּל עַד־ Common expression: Mi 5:3, Ps 57:11, 2Ch 17:12. צְבָא הַשָּׁמָיִם In view of the observations in the preceding note, the proximity of and the seemingly paronymous relationship between צְבָא and צְבִי suggests that it is not accidental. (צְבָא is also a rare form for צְבִי with the meaning *gazelle:* 1Chr 12:9, SS 2:7). In fact, both terms apply to the people of God and both are rich in meanings to play with: צָבָא means *host, army,* (cf. LXX δύναμις, *force),* whence is derived the meaning *battle, war* (Dan 10:1) and *military service* (Nu 1:2) and, as an army suggests *order, regular service, hierarchical structure*, this term is applied to all celestial and terrestrial bodies / beings (Gn 2:1); and the same root, to the *Sanctuary service / attending* (Nu 4:3. 23, 8:25, 1 Sam 2:22) which fits our context. The term is here used in a metaphorical sense, to mean *stars / angels* (2 K 17:16, Is 24:21)**,** later explained to symbolise the "people of the saints" (v. 24, cf. Ex 12:41). The sacred name of God Himself in the OT, יהוה צְבָאוֹת (Yahweh [the God] of the hosts / the Warrior, the Powerful) is connected to this term (Is 47:4, 54:5, Jr 10:16, 51:19.57, Am 4:13). The host of heaven is used metaphorically, when it refers to natural order, the heavenly bodies. In other contexts, it refers to the heavenly beings (angels). Here it is applied to God's people (the faithful, the wise), seen as His light-bearers and time-guides to the nations (Dan 12:3, 8:24).

וַתַּפֵּל אַרְצָה has some related forms in 1S 3:19, Is 14:12, Ez 38:20, Am 3:14. The pre-positive *waw* in the construction מִן־הַצָּבָא וּמִן־הַכּוֹכָבִים is not a usual conjunctive here, but it is obviously epexegetic, indicating an apposition[72], and it stands for a comma or for "*even*", though most translators render it as a copulative "and". וַתִּרְמְסֵם *and it trampled them (trod them underfoot),* as in 2K 7:14.20, 9:23, 14:9, 2Ch 25:18, Ps 91:13, Is 26:6, 28:3, 41:25, Ez 26:11, 34:18, Dan 8:7, Mi 5:7, Na 3:14, or in a figurative sense (*one's life* Ps 7:6, *the Temple courts* Is 1:12, *God's enemies* Is 63:3).

---

[71] Talmon, Shemariahu. *The World of Qumran from Within.* Collected studies. Jerusalem-Leiden, E. J. Brill, Magnus Press, The Hebrew University, 1989, p. 144-145.

[72] See SVV, NIV and RSV at Dan 8:10.

Daniel 8:11

וְעַד שַׂר־הַצָּבָא Some translators make שַׂר־הַצָּבָא the subject of the clause, because of the gender disagreement in text, but the verb גדל is consistently used in the context as predicate of the subject *horn,* and to have שַׂר־הַצָּבָא the subject, the Hebrew use would have read הַצָּבָא־ שַׂר [כִּין / אֲשֶׁר] וְעַד (see Mi 7:9, Zc 8:20, Gn 41:49, 49:10 et al.).

הַגְדִּיל / הִגְדִּיל The problem of this passage is that, while the feminine subject קֶרֶן keeps on acting, the verbs' series show masculine *Kethib* forms and some of them were bungled by the Masoretes to a passive *Qere.* The minor emendation proposed here is to read the first two verbs in v. 11 as infinitive (absolute / construct)[73] standing for finite verbs (cf. some uses in Ps 75:7, Jr 22:19, 36:23, Dan 9:5.11). The infinitive absolute may have been intended to emphasise the sinful and grotesque exploits of the horn. For the use of the Hiphᶜil הגדל as *to show oneself great, to be arrogant,* or to put a special emphasis on the preceding verb, see ZP 2:8.10 and 1 Sam 20:41. Considering all grammatical disagreements in this chapter, and the fact that in these seeming scribal errors stands always the masculine for the feminine, and not viceversa.[74]

הֵרִים /הָרִים – instead of הֵרִים, that is, preserving the *Kethîb.*This use of the Hebrew verb is illustrated in Is 57:14, Ez 21:31/26 et.al., or even in a Sanctuary service context: Lv 2:9, 4:8.19, 6:8, Nu 31:28 (to lift something for cultual purposes, for example: a part of the sacrifice for the priest. This cultual usage is worthy of some further research). It might be, either an infinitive (standing for indicative), or a perfect Hiphᶜil that requires a final ה to be in agreement as feminine.[75]

* הַתָּמִיד ”*the continual*”, the *daily burnt-offering.* This is an elliptical phrase. Basically, תָּמִיד is a noun, meaning *extent, continuity,* but it is used mostly as adverb: *continually, continuously.* According to the Torah, there were a lot of holy things or rites to be performed in a *regular* way, i.e. *continually*: the sacred bread (Ex 25:30, Lv 24:8, 2 Chr 2:4), the candlestick's light (Ex 27:20, Lv 24:2-4), bearing the breastplate of judgement by the high priest (Ex 28:29-30), the holy diadem on the high priest's forehead (Ex 28:38), the daily sacrifice (Ex 29:38.42, Nu 28:3, 2 Chr 24:14, Ps 50:8, Ez 46:15), the daily bringing of the frankincense (Ex 30:8), continual fire on the altar (Lv 6:6), the daily flour offering (Lv 6:13), the daily blowing of the sacred trumpets (1 Chr 16:6), the regular sacred music of the Sanctuary (1 Chr 16:37), the regular daily service at the Temple (1 Chr 23:31). As a noun, in full construct phrases, the noun is used mostly of the *daily (continual) burned sacrifice* (Nu 28:10.15.23-24.31, 29:6.11.16.19.22.25.28.31.34.38, Ne 10:34), and in few instances, of the *continual bread of the Presence* (Nu 4:7), or *the regular grain offering* (Nu 4:16, Ne 10:34). The chapter *Tamid* from *Mishnah* describes only the daily (i.e. morning and evening) offering as it took place at the Temple, consisting in the daily whole sacrifice of the lamb and the related daily ritual (rekindling the candlestick's lights, the incense offering etc.). See Jacob Neusner, *The Mishnah, A New Translation,* Yale University Press, New Haven 1988, pp. 862-873. Since this phrase is mostly used in the OT for the daily offering and its related ritual, and we find the same use in *Mishnah,* even in its elliptic form, we may conclude that in Daniel, the term refers to the same daily ritual that took place in each morning and evening: the wholly burned sacrifice of the lamb to which the offering of grain and wine was added, together with the trimming of the

---

[73] If this solution proves to be the best, it is in the same time a sign of an early date for the book. The use of the absolute infinitive (especially נתן) appears as a stereotyped formula on the Hebrew Ostraca from Arad, and this is an archaic form . Y. Aharoni, "Hebrew Ostraca from Tel Arad", in *Israel Exploration Journal,* vol 16, nr. 1, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1966, p. 2.

[74] Waltke and O'Connor, 109-110.

[75] Waltke and O'Connor, *ibid.*

candles and bringing the incense offering within the temple. These rituals were regarded as one and they are typologically related to various aspects of the same antitypical Reality.

וְהִשְׁלִיךְ emmended to וַתַּשְׁלֵךְ to make consecution of "tense", and gender agreement with the feminine subject. However, it is possible that the original spelling was והשלך [qerî וְהִשְׁלִיךְ for וְהִשְׁלִיכָה or even forוְהִשְׁלִיךְם, since the gender agreement has some peculiarities in the old Hebrew.[76] The Massorettes' attempt to indicate a better qerî, adds to the evidence that they may have not been conscious of these old peculiarities. The usual meaning of הִשְׁלִיךְ is *cast (off, down), throw (away), hurl, fling, shed, drop* (2 K 2:16), or in a figurative sense: *abandone, reject, cast* (Ne 9:26, 1 K 14:9, Gn 21:15, 2 K 13:21.23, Jr 26:23, La 2:1). Since here is related to a building, the verb seems to mean *overthrow, pull down, cause to fall in ruins, destroy,* as in Jr 9:18 (הִשְׁלִיכוּ מִשְׁכְּנוֹתֵינוּ). However, if we consider the action taking place imaginarily "in heaven", as shown in the vision, the meaning of throwing down (from heaven to earth, of the sanctuary, to symbolise rejection – as with the *truth* in v.12) seems to fit as well, as NIV reads: "and the place of his sanctuary was brought low".

מְכוֹן מִקְדָּשׁוֹ. The noun מָכוֹן *settlement, position, fixed place,* is sometimes used as a synonym for מְכוֹנָה or מְכוֹנָה *base, pedestal, foundation, esplanade,* usually related to the Sanctuary, altar, God's throne (Ps 89:15. 97:2), the building place (the esplanade) of the Temple in Jerusalem (Ezra 2:68), the holy site on the Mt Zion (Is 4:5) even the earth as built by God (Ps 104:5). The term is used elsewhere meaning *dwelling place [of God]* (Is 18:4), that is the earthly Sanctuary (1K 8:13, 2 Chr 6:2, Ps 74:7), or the heavenly one (1 K 8:39.43.49, 2 Chr 6:30.33.39, Ps 33:13-14, 96:6). The noun מִקְדָּשׁ basically means *consecrated portion:* a part (Nu 18:29, Ez 45:4), or a place – *sanctuary* – even for pagan deities (Is 16:12, Ps 73:17, Ez 28:18, Am 7:9.13). The term is used for the Tabernacle (Lv 19:30, 20:3, 21:12.23, Jos 24:26), and the Temple (2 Chr 36:17, Ez 48:12, Dan 9:17, 11:31), or any of its holy places (Jr 51:51, Ez 21:7), e.g. for the most holy place (Lv 16:33, Ez 45:3). Yahweh Himself is metaphorically seen as a Sanctuary (Is 8:14, Jr 17:13, Ez 11:16) .

When מָכוֹן is associated with מִקְדָּשׁ , like in *Daniel*, it refers to the heavenly abode of God, His celestial Sanctuary (Ex 15:17). Sometimes, this use seems to be hyperbolic of the sanctuary in Jerusalem (Ps 78:69). But the OT theology of the actual Sanctuary of Yahweh in heaven, while that in Jerusalem was seen rather its terrestrial projection/reflection, a symbolic palace of God's Name (1K 8:13.28-30, 32a.34a.36a.39a.43a.45a. 49a, 2 Chr 2:6, Is 6:1, 66:1-2, Jr 23:23-24), is well attested (2 Sam 22:7-11, Ps 11:4, 15:1,18:7-10, 29:9-10, 102:20, Mi 1:2-4; cf. Ac 7:49, 17:24).[77] It seems that the pagan temples also represented a similar concept of earth-heaven relation. For example, the old Etruscan meaning of the latin term *templum* (whence derived the corresponding words in our modern languages), was *the terestrial projection of a particular zone on the sky.*[78]

The related phrase, מְכוֹם מִקְדָּשׁ is used about the Jewish Temple (Is 60:13) and about Yahweh Himself as Sanctuary (Jr 17:13, Ez 11:16). The Temple (הֵיכָל), God's palace, is also used in a profound messianic passage (Zc 6:12-13.15, cf. 1 Chr 17:9-14) where it seems to refer to the prophetic, messianic Qahal of Israel, including Gentiles. A similar form, קָדוֹשׁ מְקוֹם is also used sometimes for the Sanctuary (Q 8:10). The phrase in *Daniel* finds also a synonym in מְעוֹן קֹדֶשׁ *holy habitation, refuge* used rarely for the earthly Sanctuary (Ps 68:6),

---

[76] *ibid.*

[77] Important NT scriptures elaborate on the metaphore of the Sanctuary (2:19-22, 1 Cor 3:16-17, 6:15-19, 2Cor 6:16, Eph 2:19-22, Heb 3:6, 1 Pt 2:4-6) or on its typical rite (Mt 27:50-51, Jn 1:29-36, Rom 12:1, Eph 5:2) and particularly *Hebrews* and *Revelation* theologise on its messianic-christologic typology (Heb 4:14 – 10:31, 12:22-29, 13:10-14, Rev 3:12, 4:5, 5:6, 6:9, 7:15, 8:3-5, 9:13, 11:1-4.19, 14:15.17, 15:5-8, 16:1.7.17, 21:3.22,22:3-5).

[78] www.ukans.edu/history/index/europe/ancient_rome/E/Roman/Texts/secondary/SMIGRA*/Templum.html

and usually for the heavenly one (Dt 26:15, 2 Chr 30:27, Jr 25:30, Zc 2:17). Anyway, in Daniel's vision, the Sanctuary is seen in the realm of stars. But the interpretation may go to both the heavenly Sanctuary and its terrestrial shadow. The common Hebrew concept of the real heavenly Sanctuary of Yahweh is materialised in verses like these, using expressions similar to Daniel's: 2Ch 30:27, Dt 26:15, Ps 102:20, Jr 25:30, Ps 11:4, Is 63:15, Ezra 9.8, Ps 24:3, Mi 1:2, Hab 2:20, Zc 2:17, Ex 15:13, Ps 68:6, Ps 46 5.

Daniel 8:12

תִּנָּתֵן [?וּצְבָאת נָתְנָה] / וְצָבָא תִּנָּתֵן]   The text requires emmendation. The Masoretes gave תִּנָּתֵן וְצָבָא which creates further problems: no agreement between subject and verb, and a seemingly unjustified presence of the passive (Niphᶜal) form of the verb. The Old Greek translation seems to reflect manuscripts more corrupt than the MT in this passage. However they are helpful, because of their earliness. The Vulgate, on the other hand, is obviously close to the MT, so that it shows some dependency.

In the same time we have to recognise that the MT is not too much clearer. While the emendation suggested by Ozanne is reasonable and do not operates dramatic changes in the text, we are left with some obscurities. Logical contextual considerations require to have a full justification for the reading נָתַן עַל־הַתָּמִיד בְּפָשַׁע and for the mention of שֹׁמֵם in the question asked in v. 13, where we also have the verb נתן connected probably with פֶּשַׁע (as in 11:31 and 12:11, but having שִׁקּוּץ instead of פֶּשַׁע) and not with צָבָא. Furthermore, the presence of צָבָא to begin v. 12 is not only uncertain, but it gives some obscure idea which does not agree with the use of this term in context. Therefore, to consider וְצָבָא in this case, as a corruption from a possibly original form base on the root צדא / צדה (of Aramaic origin) as we have in LXX, has a higher degree of probability. This latter verb is found elsewhere in the Bible in ZP 3:6 only and referes to **desolated** cities, as a synonym with השם *to desolate* (further employed in *Daniel*), and with הכרת *to destroy* and החרב *to lay waste* (both used by Daniel in 9:2.26). In its context, as a Niphᶜal in *Zephaniah* נִצְדּוּ, it means *to be devastated, laid desolate, laid waste, ravaged, depopulated.* In the same time, the possible use of this term in connection with [מ]קדש seems to be paronomastic with the phrase וְנִצְדַּק קֹדֶשׁ from v. 14. The possibility for this term to have been the original form is yet to be studied on linguistic, syntactical and literary basis. It might be explored also the use of צבאת נתן as in Is 34.2, Jg 4:7 *(host given to death)* and a proposal of emendation inserted in the critical apparatus of BHS (וּצְבָאָה נִתַּן).

This תנתן cannot be a Niphᶜal, as the Masoretic puctuation indicates, but rather an archaic Qal spelling for תִּתֵּן. It is recognised the Aramaic's influence on *Daniel*'s Hebrew, and therefore, we must note the Aramaic spelling of נתן that preserves the initial נ in the imperfect of Qal . See Ezra 7:20, cf. 4:13, and Dan 2:16 except 4:14.22.29). This solution is only valid if we add a consecutive *Waw* וַתִּתֵּן that forces the preceding word וצבא to connect with the previous sentence:

11.... וְ[הַ]צָּבָא 12. וַתִּתֵּן (implied subject) הַקֶּרֶן) עַל הַתָּמִיד הַפָּשַׁע

Collins[79] is, however, against such an emendation, in spite of its agreement with the Greek versions, because he sees in this verse, like in vs. 10, poetical tricola that should not be disrupted.

The reading וצבאת נתן proposed by Ozanne[80] is a solution closer to the MT, and it might be accepted despite its gender disagreement, as a continuation of the verbal chain of the

---

[79]John Collins, *Daniel,* Fortress Press, Minneapolis, 1993: 334 .

[80] C. G. Ozanne, in "Three textual problems in Daniel", *Journal of Theological Studies,* Ed. Chadwick, Sparks; Oxford, Clarendon Press. 16, 1965: 445-446.

preceding verses, where all are masculine instead of feminine forms. Another emendation proposed in the critical apparatus of BHS (וּצְבָאָה נִתַּן *and its host was given / set*, is in perfect agreement, but it breaks the chain of active verb clauses, which is quite unnatural. It is preferable to maintain the logical subject of the compound sentence, which is קֶרֶן.

Since the term צָבָא *host, regular service* (e.g. *at the Temple:* Ex 38:8, Nu 4:3.23.30.35.39.43, 8:24, 1S 2:22) appears in the context of the Sanctuary service in Dan 8 (connected to תָּמִיד *continual offering* and to קֹדֶשׁ *sanctuary*), why not translate the clause accordingly ? The phrase נתן על means *to appoint over,* if it refers to persons (Dan 11:21, 1S 12:13, Gn 41:41, 1K 1:48; Dt 28:1). And BDBG 681 gives for נתן על in Dan 8:12 the meaning *was appointed.* For reasons shown above, I prefer the active sense: *it appointed over.* For the expression בְּפֶשַׁע we have examples like **Pr 28:2**, Pr 12:13, Pr 20:6, were פֶּשַׁע is taken simply as sin (by speaking) or as rebellion. In Mi 1:5, the rebellious sin (of Israel) is personified and called Samaria and Jerusalem. The term פֶּשַׁע must be idolatrous worship, because in the parallel line it corresponds to בָּמוֹת *high place (of pagan cult).*

In 2Ch 2:10b we have a sentence containing the verb נתן followed by the same prepositions as in Dan 8:12: עַל and...בְּ (" Yahweh **appointed** you...**over** Israel, **because of / in** His love..."). All these convincingly unite to help us translate: *it (i.e. the wicked horn) appointed hosts (i.e. of regular ministers) over the continual offering, in (because of) [its] rebellion.*

If this is correct, it shows in what consists the rebellious sin "set over the continual". To better imagine the vision, let's divide it in acts like a drama. In the background, the sanctuary and all its heavenly host are safe under the supreme authority of their Captain (as a Celestial Prince and High Priest), who owns the full right and ministry over the continual offering. In the first act of the drama, the wicked horn exalts itself up to the heavenly (ministering) host, which is naturally called "stars" (see Dan 12:3) and throws down part of them to the earth to tread them underfoot. In the second act, the wicked horn magnifies itself even to the Captain-Priest of the ministering host, takes out of Him the continual offering and . This is sin of rebellion at the highest degree. But a third act follows: the wicked horn overthrows (or brings low) to the earth the Sanctuary of the Divine and Priestly Captain of the host. In the fourth act, the wicked horn appoints over the continual offering (now set in the earthly order and cultus, in "its" honour, like the sanctuary brought down), its own ministering hosts. This is *the rebellion* – the horrifying sin that boldly replaced the heavenly cultus by an earthly order. Now, to ensure its victory over the heavenly Sanctuary through its earthly lies, in the fifth act, the wicked horn throws down the Truth itself (here the Law, God's revelation). It keeps on working like this and it suceeds and prevails long time, ...until one day....

This in no case can be a dogmatic position, since צבאת *hosts*, might very naturally be military forces, armed people.that the wicked horn *set over* (or, *against*) the continual offering. In Ez 4:2, the prophet is called to play his oracle, to **lay** camped armies for **siege around** (נתן על) Jerusalem. Speaking about the continual offering, and not about Jerusalem or Temple, such a meaning is not quite convincing prima facie. But it should be kept in view, because this classic "desolating abomination" is usually associated with armed forces (Dan 9: 27, 11:31.38, cf. Mk 13:14 comp. Lk 21:20).

The context dealt so far with the heavenly host (of the stars); some of it was cast down and trodden. But here we have a new צָבָא lacking the definite article and in plural that stresses the difference. These hosts might be understood as forces sent or appointed by the wicked horn over / against the daily Sanctuary service (cf. 11:31). As the term means usually "armies", we may translate the phrase as "he set armies around the continual etc" (as to lay siege works; cf. Ez 26:8). But the phrase נתן עַל means usually *put over, set over, set on, appoint over,* and this suggests a careful translation to speak not of a violent action against the contin-

ual offering. From a strictly linguistic perspective, rather we may see here hosts (divisions) appointed (to minister) over the continual offering, such as the Sanctuary language requires (Nu 4:3. 23, 8:25, 1 Sam 2:22).

וַתַּשְׁלֵךְ אֱמֶת אַרְצָה *it"cast down" the truth.* For figurative use see 1K 14:19 (*God*), Ne 9:26 (*God's Torah*), Ps 50:17 (*the words* of God). וְעָשְׂתָה וְהִצְלִיחָה For those instances where both verbs are related, see 2Ch 31:21, Dan 8:24, 11:36, Ps 1:3, Gn 39:3, Jos 1:8, 2Ch 7:11, 32:30, Is 55:11.

Daniel 8:13

וָאֶשְׁמְעָה (instead of וָאֶשְׁמַע) is a pseudo-cohortative used seemingly for stylistic reasons. There are are a lot of similar cases.[81] Waltke and O'Connor counted about 90 occurences of pseudo-cohortative with *waw*-relative referring to past time. They say,

> The presence of this construction in a text cannot be used to date it because, on the one hand, *yaqtula* is used in Byblian Canaanite for past tense, and, on the other hand, the combination is used extensively in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The combination also occurs in some pre-exilic texts but not in some post-exilic books (and is even lacking in post-exilic texts synoptic with preexilic texts evincing the form).[82]

Further occurences of this pseudo-cohortative in the Hebrew of Daniel are following: Dan 8:15 (וָאֲבַקְשָׁה), Dan 9:4 (וָאֶתְפַּלְלָה וָאֶתְוַדֶּה וָאֹמְרָה), Dan 10:16 (וָאֲדַבְּרָה וָאֹמְרָה).

אֶחָד־קָדוֹשׁ The OT substantival usage of the term קָדוֹשׁ is *holy / sacred person*, chosen of God, such as the priest in Isarel, or as the Israelite among the pagan people,[83] people consecrated to God, saints;[84] God – the Holy Being par exellence,[85] any hevenly being, such as the "watchers" of Dan 4.[86] The use of the corresponding Aramaic term in Dan 7 and the context itself indicates heavenly beings, later identified in chap. 8-10 as Gabriel, Michael and possible others (12:5).

פַּלְמוֹנִי According to BDBG, this term is a contraction or conflation of אַלְמֹנִי + פְּלֹנִי., meaning *a certain [unnamed] one, such a one, such and such.*[87] The Greek translators curiously rendered it as a transliteration, by a meaningless word φελμουνι. These not rare blunders of those "phelmones" who translated the Prophets and the Scriptures into the Greek, speak a lot about their Jb. Centuries later, Jerome found yet, presumably among the Jews, the correct meaning: *alteri nescio cui.*

עַד־מָתַי It is important to find the best English correspondent for the adverbial phrase עַד־מָתַי. While the usual translation is "how long…?" or "for how long…?" (which is inexact, or at least ambiguous, because it refers rather to a period from its beginning to its end, a meaning diverging with the Hebrew phrase). Theodotion found the best Greek equivalent in ἕως πότε *(till when?),* followed by Jerome (usquequo…?, *till when?*) as do some modern translations: *bis wann...?* (ELB), *jusqu'à quand...?* (several French translations; LSG followed by the Romanian D. Cornilescu put it in parallel with: *Pendant combien de temps*

---

[81] e.g. Jg 12:3, Jb 1:15, 29:17, Ps 73:16, 119:55....163, Is 8:2, Jr 32:9, Ne 6:12, 7:5, 13:17. Compare also אֶרְדְּפָה in 2S 22:38 and אֶרְדֹּף in Ps 18:38.

[82] Waltke and O'Connor, p. 576. They also cite the argumentation of Morag who "recently argued that the *w'qtlh* forms in Qumranic Hebrew are to be taken not as archaisms but as reflections of a later stage of Hebrew, 'a continuation…..not necessarily….literary'" (ibid. note 29). Sáenz-Badillas, speaking about the Late Biblical Hebrew, says, "cohortatives, for example, are hardly used at all." (Sáenz-Badillas, op. cit. p. 118)

[83] Nu 16:5.7, Ps 106:16.

[84] Ps 16:3, Dan 8:24, cf. 7:18.22.25.27.

[85] Is 1:4, 10:17, 49:7, Ez 39:7.

[86] Dan 4:10.14.20. Cf. Jb 15:15, Ps 89:6.8, Zc 14:5.

[87] Rt 4:1, 1S 21:3, 2 K 6:8.

s'accomplira ...?). Pfandl also emphasised in his thesis this understanding required by the Hebrew phrase.[88]

To speak of a period with reference to both its beginning and end, Hebrew would use the phrase ... מַה יְמֵי כַּמָּה *how many days...?, how much time...?,*[89] or even הַשָּׁנִים/הַיָּמִים מִסְפַּר מָה.[90] On the other hand, the question עַד־מָתַי is commonly used with no regard to a starting point, but just pointing anxiously to an end, a longed *terminus ad quem*: "until when?/ till when?". This is consistently true concerning **each of** OT references.[91] Daniel uses elsewhere the phrase with precisely the same meaning as in all these refereneces (Dan 12:6). None of these biblical references point to a period of time impling its starting point. The phrases עַד־מָה[92] and עַד־אָנָה[93] are used in exactly the same situations.

A careful translation of this inquiry is essential here, because the reader must not confuse the long time given in v. 14 (2300 days) with the special time allotted to the little horn's "war against the saints" (which is referred to in Dan 7:25, 12:7 as *three times and a half*). From the setting of that "abomination" until the fixed time of the end must pass "1290.... up to 1335 days". Because the Hebrew usage of the phrase "until 2300 evening-mornings" does not allow any expedient artifice to halve this strange period (see on Dan 8:14), we cannot consider it as an approximation to the other apocalyptic periods in the book. To emphasise the actual use of עַד־מָתַי in Daniel, one should carefully read Dan 12:6-12, where the equivalent of this question is אֵלֶּה אַחֲרִית מָה (what *will be* the end of these things?) and that the periods further referred extend עַד־עֵת קֵץ to the time of the end, that is to "attain the 1335 days".

הֶחָזוֹן הַתָּמִיד וְהַפֶּשַׁע שֹׁמֵם תֵּת וְקֹדֶשׁ וְצָבָא מִרְמָס All these are common terms of the oldest Hebrew vocabulary, as we already noted. מִרְמָס is a noun derived from רמס *to trample* (*trampling / treading-place / something trodden* Is 5:5, 7:25, 10:6, 28:18, Mi 7:10, Ez 34:19). The infinitive construct of נתן should be linked with הַפֶּשַׁע שֹׁמֵם not with הֶחָזוֹן (cf. 8:12, 11:31, and especially 12:11), however strange might appear this syntactical use. This unusual location of the article in *status constructus* is extremely rare in Hebrew, but it is found in old Phoenician: e.g. הברך בעל (the blessed one of Baᶜal).[94] The same structure is found in 11:31, so it should not be thought of as an error, but rather as a mark of authenticity and of earliness of Danielic Hebrew. As the "desolator" is a principal personage of the drama in these prophecies, and the similar phrases point to him (9:24, 11:31, 12:11), it is preferable to retain this unusual form of *constructus*.

The definite article for both nouns (הֶחָזוֹן הַתָּמִיד) bound in construct chain is unusual. However, there is no better solution (for example, to tread תָּמִיד as an adjective, or to imply the interogation before each definite noun in the clause, as some suggest).

Daniel 8:14

עַד עֶרֶב בֹּקֶר אַלְפַּיִם וּשְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת (See also Dan 1:8 for a similar syntax of clauses). One could legitimately render the clause as "till the passing of 2300 days…", as some of the tradi-

[88] Gerhard Pfandl, *The Time of the End in the Book of Daniel,* ATS Publications, Berrien Springs, MI. 1992, pp. 258-259.

[89] Gn 47:8, 2 S 19:35, Ps 119:84.

[90] Cf. 2 Sam 2:11, Ez. 4:4-9, Dan 9:2, Lv 25:15.16.50, Nu 14:34.

[91] Ps 6:4, 94:3, Ne 2:6, Ex 10:3.7, N 14:24, 1S 1:14, 16:1, 2S 2:26, 1K 18:21, Ps 80:4, 82:2, Ps 90:13, Pr 1:22, 6:9, Is 6:11, Jr 4:14.21, 12:4, 23:26, 31:22, 47:5, Ho 8:5, Hab 2:6, Zc 1:12.

[92] Ps 74:9-10, N 24:22, Ps 4:3, 79:5, 89:47.

[93] Ex 16:28, N 14:11, Jos 18:3, Jb 18:2, 19:2, Ps 13:1-2, 16:3, Jr 47:6, Hab 1:2.

[94] The text of the famous inscription of Karatepe, beginns with the following words: Col. I. *'nk 'ztwd hbrk bᶜl ᶜbd bᶜl.*= "I am Azitawadda, the blessed of Baᶜal, servant of Baᶜal." See Johs. Pedersen, "The Phoenician Inscription of Karatepe", in *Acta Orientalia,* vol. XXI, pars. 2., apud Ejnar Munksgaard, Havnlae, 1951, p. 38-39.

tional versions have it (KJV, WEB, NKJ), following the LXX and Theodotion (ἕως ἑσπέρας καὶ πρωὶ ἡμέραι δισχίλιαι τριακόσιαι *until evening and morning are days 2300*).. But the author deliberately chose cryptic language, so that we should not try to make it all clear by a more telling translation.

The answer stresses the same *terminus ad quem*, borrowing the preposition עַד *until*, from the question. The Hebrew religious concept about the succession of days and nights is established in the OT, where we found that the natural days were thought to begin in the evening (Lv 23:32, Ex 16:8.13, Ps 55:18.), according to the established pattern in Genesis account, where **each "evening-morning" succession equals a day** (Gn 1:5.8.13.19.23. 31). And this counting of the day as beginning in the evening was common in ancient Mesopotamia.[95] When it comes to the workday, morning is always mentioned first (Q 11:6, Dt 28:67, 1 K 17:6) except when it is spoken of activities specific for the night: Ex 27:21, Est 2:14, ZP 3:3. The same is said about the Sanctuary daily service, particularly when it deals with the *tamid*. Its cycle is **always** spoken about as **morning and evening**.[96] When in texts like N 28:3-6 we read about the daily sacrificial service, it is stated that this service was understood as a unit, "two lambs…..day by day, as a continual offering". On the other hand, the use of the two nouns in Daniel in the singular (evening and morning), emphasises the natural reference to the succession of days.

Schwantes argues against A. Bentzen, J. Montgomery, N.W. Porteous, O. Plöger, M. Delcor, A. Lacocque et.al., that there is no way to make the phrase *ereb-boqer* to refer to a number of sacrifices, two per day.[97] This linguistic evidence rules out any possiblity to consider the phrase "evening morning 2300" as being "2300 individual sacrifices of evening and morning" thus amounting to exactly 1150 full days – which is a good example of '**eis**egesis', followed not only by a series of modern commentators, but even carried into translations like TEV, to help it fit the Maccabean thesis. However, nowhere are these terms for evening and morning used ellipticaly for the corresponding turn of sacrifices. Even in Daniel (where occurs the elliptical form תָּמִיד), yet the evening offering is not eliptically written (Dan 9:21). The Hebrew usage would require a formula similar to "40 days and 40 nights", "3 days and 3 nights" et.al.. As Keil fittingly remarked,

> A Hebrew reader could not possibly understand the period of time [of] 2300 evening-mornings …[to be] 2300 half days or 1150 whole days, because evening and morning at the creation constituted not the half but the whole day… We must therefore take the words as they are, i.e., understand them of 2300 whole days.[98]

The Hebrew syntax allows the numeral to stand before as well as behind its noun. In the Hebrew OT both situations are richly illustrated.[99] There are very few instances where the noun preceding the numeral is singular and indefinite, like in Dan 8:14 (e.g. 1Ch 5:21, 2Ch 29:23, 35:8-9). Nowhere the preceding nouns are found like here, indefinite, singular and juxtaposed without conjunction. The only possible explanation is that this unusual phrase reflects the formula coined in Gn 1:5.8.13.19.23.31, which shows that each Creation weekday was considered to begin its cycle with an evening. This is the classic Hebrew delimitation of the natural day (Lv 23:32, Ps 55:18). Paralleling the expression of Dan 8 with that from Gn 8, one may see its true origin and meaning:

Gn 1:5	אֶחָד	יוֹם	וַיְהִי־בֹקֶר	עֶרֶב	־	וַיְהִי

---

[95] See. E. J. Bickermann, *Chronology of the Ancient World,* London, 1968, pp.13-14.

[96] 2K 16:15, 1Chr 16:40, 23:30, 2 Chr 2:3, 13:11, 31:3, Ezra 3:3.

[97] Siegfried J. Schwantes, ᶜ*Ereb Boqer of Daniel 8:14 Reexamined,* in Frank Holbrook, ed. pp. 465-474.

[98] C.F.Keil, *Biblical Commentary on the Book of Daniel,* Grand Rapids, 1949, p. 303.

[99] BDBG, 432.

Dan 8:14	עַד	עֶרֶב	בֹּקֶר	אַלְפַּיִם וּשְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת	
Dan 8:26	וּמַרְאֵה	הָעֶרֶב	וְהַבֹּקֶר	[...] לְיָמִים רַבִּים	

The specific expression in Daniel is terse, yet remindful and telling. It suggests an emphasising of the evening-morning daily cycle on a long period. To say "2300 days" is a very unusual manner of speaking in Hebrew, like in every language. A period expressed in days cannot be longer than 150 days. To keep the author's intention and, if possible, his style, we should translate like these: until evening morning roll on 2300 times, till shall be evening and morning 2300 times, until the 2300th coming of an evening and morning, till even and morning come 2300 times.

וְנִצְדַּק While the root צדק conveys the general meaning of *right, righteous, just,* appears in OT as verb, adjective and noun more than 700 times, this Niph°al use in Dan 8:14 is a hapax. LXX and Theodotion translate it as καθαρισθήσεται *shall be cleansed / purified.* Jerome understood it the same way (mundabitur – *shall be cleansed*), possibly following the LXX. Especially older translations[100] reflect this understanding. The use of καθαρίζω in LXX might be due to a Maccabean orientation of the translators,[101] but it's interesting that LXX translated the root צדק as καθαρίζω in Jb 4:17 too. This might reflect a Judeo-Aramaic understanding attested in Targums, where half of the total 405 cases, צדק was translated by the Aramaic זכה *be clean, pure*.[102] A similar wording in Heb 9:23-24, were we have the "true", that is "heavenly" Sanctuary to be "cleansed", deserves our attention.

Other Bible translations render this verb according to some critical approach to the Hebrew root, and translate it as *declared right* (YLT), *gerechtvaardigt* (SVV), *...wieder zu sein recht kommen* (Menge), *restored to its rightful state* (RSV, NRS), *reconsecrated* (NIV), *certainly ...brought into its right condition* (NWB), *be restored* (TEV), *be properly restored* (NAS, NAB), *<wieder> gerechtfertigt* (ELB), *have again its condition* -tr.- (Romanian BOR 1994), *have its rights restored* (JB), *emerged victorious* (NEB), et.al. Among the old translations we have Peshitta using *nzk'* "justified", "freed from guilt", from the common Hebrew Aramaic root that means *to be clean[sed]*.

Niels-Erik Andreasen notes some extended meanings of the verbal root: be innocent / guiltless (Gn 20:4, 2K 10:9, Jb 9:15), fair, accurate (Lv 19:36, 2S 8:15, Ez 45:10), justice done, deliverance (Is 51:5, 32:17, 46:13). He further displays a wide range of parallel associated terms to help find the burden of the extending meaning, and among these parallel terms associated he finds also זכה be pure, purify and טהר be clean, cleanse (Jb 4:17, 15:14, 17:9, 25:4, Ps 51:4). Among other notions commonly associated with the root צדק, the closest is שפט to judge (Ps 97:2, 106:3, Is 59:14, Am 6:12) and צדק. itself has legal connotations in a lot of passages (Ps 82:3, Is 43:9, 45:24, 50:8, 59:14, 63:1). Andreasen attempted to determine the use of צדק in the apocalyptic literature, and citing 2 Esd 5:2.11, 7:114, Dan 9:24, Ml 4:2, 1 En 10:16-17, 38:3-4 and 1QM 17, he says that צדק "is used to refer to the conditions brought about by God's redemption in the eschaton".[103] This idea is confirmed also by apocalyptic passages in NT (2 Pt 3:13).

A classical Jewish work, *Miqrae qodesh*,[104] containing MT and Targums in parallel, with Rashi, and *Metsudath Tsion,* and *Metsudath Dawid*, and Yidish commentaries, gives for

---

[100] KJV, WEB, DRB, NKJ, ASV, LSG, NEG, Neo-Greek Translation 1919, Rumanian Cornilescu, et al.

[101] See 1Mac 4:36.41 where we find the same term.

[102] Niels-Erik Andreasen, "Translation of Nisdaq / Katharisthesetai in Daniel 8 14", in Holbrook, Frank Holbrook, editor, *Symposium on Daniel,* vol 2, Biblical Research Institute, GC of SDA, Washington DC, 1986, pp. 486-491.

[103] In Frank Holbrook ed., p. 492

[104] Druck und Verlag von Pessel Balaban, Lemberg 1860 (?).

this נִצְדַּק in Dan 8:14 the interesting interpretation מְכֻפַּר (being made atonement / expiation for it), which suggests some eschatological-typological connections between Yom Kippur (Lv 16) and the Judgement / justice-oriented "**that day**",[105] because that ceremonially final disposal of sin, the peak of all Mosaic ritual, pointed to the Day of Judgement.[106] This understanding can be compared with the parallel vision in Dan 7, where the Judgement scene (9-14.23.26-27) corresponds certainly to Dan 8:14.25d.

The root צדק is a static verb in Qal, and most static verbs lack the Niphᶜal form. But where the Niphᶜal is present (e.g. אור בעל ,חרב ,כבד ,פתה ,קדש ,שבע ,שמם), it has generally a passive meaning. And because Niphᶜal functions usually as a passive form for either Qal, or Piᶜel or Hiphᶜil, we should consider the corresponding static / active forms of צדק attested in OT. According to BDBG, we have in Qal the meaning *be just, be righteous, be right, be in the right, have a just cause, be justified;* in Piᶜel it means *justify, make appear righteous;* and in Hiphᶜil *do justice, justify, declare righteous, vindicate the cause of, save, cause to become righteous, turn to righteousness.* Therefore, as the root of the verb itself would require, we should have the translation *be given justice, be restored through judgement, be vindicated.*[107]

Finally, it is possible to find that this נִצְדַּק is not really a hapax. According to the LXX rendition of Ps. 51:6 לְמַעַן תִּצְדַּק בְּדָבְרֶךָ תִּזְכֶּה בְשָׁפְטֶךָ (so quoted also in Rm 3:4 Ὅπως ἂν δικαιωθῇς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου καὶ νικήσῃς ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε – *that You may be **declared righteous / justified** in Your words, and may overcome when You are judged*), this root, together with all verbs in the stich is read as passive – and confirmed by Jerome also (ut justificeris in sermonibus tuis et vincas cum judicaris). Bible translations follow the Massoretic reading, but many of them render תִּצְדַּק as a passive (You are justified / declared righteous). In the same line of Ps 51 we find the two verbs צדק *be / make right* and זכה *be / make pure,* understood as synonyms and connected to the idea of judgement. So that even though LXX translators in Dan 8:14 understood נצדק as זכה,[108] the two seem to be somehow related and if someone optates for "cleansed", he / she must not forget the forensic-eschatological understanding of this cleansing in the light of the Yom Kippur typology, which is a high symbol for expiation / vindication.

קֹדֶשׁ Though normally the noun קֹדֶשׁ in such instances should be translated as *something holy (sacred, consecrated)*, and is not usual to have this term indefinite when the Sanctuary is spoken of, there are rare occurrence of it with no article, in Biblical poetry:: Ps 134 :2 – שְׂאוּ־יְדֵכֶם קֹדֶשׁ, *raise your hand to the Sanctuary;* Ps 20:3 – יִשְׁלַח־עֶזְרְךָ מִקֹּדֶשׁ *May He send you help from the Sanctuary.* But the most convincing argument is its contextual use in the previous verse Dan 8:13, as a synonym for the phrase מְכוֹן מִקְדָּשׁוֹ in v. 11.

וְנִצְדַּק קֹדֶשׁ The specific syntactic pattern of this verse (comp. Is 39:6, Am 4:2, Jr 31:38, Dan 12:9.10) suggests the following translation: *[till evening and morning will have been rolled on 2300 times], and (or, when) the Sanctuary will be vindicated / cleansed.*

---

[105] Is 34:2.8, 59:20, 61:2, 63:4.6, Jr 33:15-16, 50:28.29-32.34, **51:6.10-11.51-53.56, Ez 40:1** etc., 43:1-8, Ob 1:15.16, Hab 2:13-14.20, Hg 2:9, Ml 3:1-6, Ps 9:6-7.11.14-19, 46:7-11, 50:2-7, 96:13, 98:9, 110.

[106] A judgement vicariously assumed by the Servant of Yahweh in favour of the repentant (cf. Is 53, Jn 12:31-33, Heb 9:23-24.) and eventually involving the universal summoning before the "great white throne" of the same Messiah, to account for everyone's attitude toward God and fellow humans (Dan 7:7-11, Rev 20:11-15, Rm 2:16, 14:10-12, Q 3:17, 12:13-14, Rev 14:6-7, Is 53:12, Heb 9:27-28).

[107] Cf. 2S 15:4, 1K 8:32, 2Ch 6:23, Jb 34:5, Ps 7:9, 94:15, 103:6, Jr 23:5, Mi 7:9.

[108] Cf. Jb 15:14, 25:4, Dan 6:23, Mi 6:11.

Daniel 8:15

וָאֲבַקְשָׁה בִינָה. While בִינָה is a frequent term in the Wisdom literature (*Jb, Proverbs, Daniel*),[109] and the root בקשׁ *to ask, request* appears 239 times from *Genesis* through *Chronicles*, this syntagm pertains to the Hebrew of *Daniel,* as a stylistic element (Dan 1:20).

וְהִנֵּה עֹמֵד לְנֶגְדִּי Jos 5:13, Gn 24:30, 41:1, 2Ch 23:13, Est 6:5, SS 2:9, Ez 3:23, Dan 8:3, 10:13. כְּמַרְאֵה־גָבֶר *one with a human face* – similar expressions in Ez 1:26, Dan 10:16.18. גֶּבֶר *man* is used as a synonym for אָדָם, אִישׁ, אֱנוֹשׁ Except its Aramaic equivalent in Dan 2:25, 5:11 (גְּבַר) and a single legal verse in Pentateuch (Dt 22:5), all occurences of the term are in poetic books or passages (Nu 24:3.15, Jg 5:30, 2S 23:1), most of them in the Book of Jb (15 times),[110] in Psalms (10 times),[111] in Proverbs (8 times)[112], in the books of Jeremiah (10 times).[113] It is also used by some pre-exilic and post-exilic prophets in their poetic oracles (Is 22:17, Mi 2:2, Jl 2:8, Hab 2:5, Zc 13:7).

Daniel 8:16

קוֹל־אָדָם 2K 7:10; בֵּין אוּלָי lit. "between (among) Eulaeus", that is *between the banks of the river...*, a unique and unusual expression. However, the same preposition and logic appears when speaking of city sqares (Pr 23:13). The only difference is that Eulaeus (Ulai) is in the singular, simply because it is a proper name. וַיִּקְרָא וַיֹּאמַר Jon 3:4 (Cf. Ex 32:5, 1K 17:20, 2K 4:36 et al.).

גַּבְרִיאֵל This is for the first time one meets in the OT an heavenly being called by name. There is an obvious relationship between the hearing of his name גַּבְרִיאֵל (*man of God*)[114] and his man-like כְּמַרְאֵה גֶּבֶר appearance as Daniel saw him. His name and appearance are a message for / through the prophet. One cannot infer that angels are sexual beings who bear Hebrew names! It is to be observed in the Bible, that these heavenly messengers, and especially this "man" Gabriel, perform the mission of a prophet, conveying God's messages to people (Lk 1:19.26, 24:4, Act 1:10, Rev 1:1, 19:10, 22:6). Names of Michael and Gabriel are intentionally modelled by the heavenly speakers on the pattern of Daniel's name and pointing to their mission or identity. Since the root of the noun גֶּבֶר is גבר *to be strong, powerful*, some infer that the meaning of the angel's name must be "warrior of God", or that even the term גֶּבֶר must mean *strong man,* emphasising strength or ability to fight. But this is not just a scientific reasoning. No matter what the etymology of the term is (and the derivation from גבר is beyond any doubt),[115] its pragmatic meaning is clearly *man* (cf. Jb 3:3, Dt 22:5)*,* and by extension, *human* (Jb 4:17, 10:5).

הָבֵן לִ Jb 6:24, Dan 11:33, 2Ch 35:3. הַלָּז *this, that,* a shortened form of הַלָּזֶה = [116][הַ]זֶה an archaic construction[117] used only once in Daniel (comp. Jg 6:20, 1S14:1, 17:26, 2K 4:25, 23:17). However it was preserved until post-exilic times (Zc 2:8, note the identic use in Daniel).

---

[109] In other Biblical places, the term is also used in a Wisdom context (*re King Solomon* 1Ch 22:12, 2 Ch 2:11, *re King Messiah* Is 11:2) with some exceptions.

[110] Jb 3:3.23, 4:17, 10:5, 14:10.14, 16:21, 22:2, 33:17.29, 34:7.9.34, 38:3, 40:7.

[111] Ps 18:26, 34:9, 37:23, 40:5, 52:9, 88:5, 89:49, 94:12, 127:5, 128:4.

[112] Pr 6:34, 20:24, 24:5, 28:3.21, 29:5, 30:1.19.

[113] Jr 17:5.7, 22:30, 23:9, 30:6, 31:22, La 3:1.27.35.39.

[114] See also BDBG 150.

[115] In Romanian, par example, the word *bărbat* (man, male) derives from the Latin *barbatus* (bearded). But nobody thinks of its etymology when uses it, and most even are ignorant about it. Too much is made sometimes of etymology.

[116] Gn 24:65, 37:19, Is 58:5, and Ez 36:35 (הַלָּזוּ).

[117] Cf. BDBG 229.

Daniel 8:17

* אֵצֶל עָמְדִי lit. *beside my stand* (i.e. *beside where I was standing*). The exact phrase is nowhere used but here. The two terms are, however, common in old Hebrew and they are even used in connection (1K 10:19, 13:24-25.28, 2Ch 9:18). The use of עמד as a noun is found in the post-exilic Hebrew only (Dan 8:17-18, 10:11, 2Ch 30:16, 34:31, 35:10, Ne 13:11).

נִבְעַתִּי *I became frightened.* This Niphᶜal form is found in late Hebrew prose only (Dan 8:17, Est 7:6, 1Ch 21:30), but the root is present in verb or in noun forms in the earliest claimed scriptures[118]. וָאֶפְּלָה עַל־פָּנָי . The expression is used exactly in Ez 9:8 (see Dan 8:13 on pseudo-cohortative). The usual form shows minor differences Ez 1:28, 3:23, 11:13, cf. Gn 17:3.17, Lv 9:24, Nu 14:5, Jos 6:7, Jg 13:20, Rt 2:10, 1S 17:49, 1Ch 5:10.

בֶּן־אָדָם The Hebrew phrase as an appellation in the singular is found only in the exilic books of *Ezekiel* (93 times) and Daniel (once). It is found elsewhere in N: 23:19 (once), in Psalms (2 times), in Isaiah (2 times), in Jb (3 times), and in Jeremiah (4 times), meaning *human being*. The common translations give *son of man* and some of them have *mortal man*. אָדָם is both the human species and a proper name in the Hebrew Bible, and בֶּן־ *son of, young...* is one specimen of any species (similar to בְּנֵי־הַגּוֹלָה ,בְּנֵי־אַשּׁוּר, בְּנֵי־חֵת, בְּנוֹת־יַעֲנָה et.al.). The best rendition would be *human being[s],* and is obviously intended to underline the nature of this being as opposed to the celestial one speaking. The poetic equivalent, closer to Hebrew, is *son of Adam.* The prophet is not addressed as a son of his people, or as a son of his father, but as a son of Adam, as any human being.

לְעֶת־קֵץ For the preposition לְ, we have good examples of using it with the meaning *until,* or *to* (Dan 12:13, 9:24, Dt 16:4, cf. עַד) that is fitting in this case: *[the events shown in] the vision have to go on to the time of the end,* or *the things envisioned extend to the time of the end,* or *the vision foresees events until the time of the end,* or *the vision expires in the time of the end.* Probably the best parallel of this phrase is in Ez 12:27, in a context dealing with the prophecy about "the end" ... הֶחָזוֹן .... לְיָמִים רַבִּים וּלְעִתִּים רְחוֹקוֹת *the vision ... points to (extends to) many days hence], and of times far off ....*If we pay attention to the context and to the Hebrew usage of the preposition [לְ] it is quite clear that the author would say that the dramatic events foreseen in the vision – including the statement about the 2300 evening-mornings – **extend to the time of the end,** because the period indicated (which involves at least all the exploits of the wicked horn) points to the time of the end.

The phrase עֵת־קֵץ belongs to the apocalyptic language (Dan 8:17, 11:35.40, 12:4.9). The basic meaning of קֵץ is *end, extremity, limit, termination, stop* (e.g. Jb 6:11, Ps 39:5 death – end of life), and it used with this general meaning in both temporal and spatial sense (synonym of קֵץ ,קָצָה, קְצֵה and קִנְיָן[119]). In some OT places, it is used with a special emphasis on the greatest catastrophic events met by God's people, with typological-eschatological dimensions. The Flood, was "the End" of the archaic world (Gn 6:13). The fall of Israel's kingdom under Assyria, was "the End" for the majority of Yahweh's people (Am 8:2). The fall of Judahite kingdom and of Jerusalem under Babylon was "the End" in an even more dramatic sense (Ez 7:2-3.6). The fall of Babylon was "the End" for the head kingdom of this world, which heralds the fall of all subsequent powers opposing to God and His Kingdom (Hab 2:3, Jr 51:13). The second (post-exilic) great destruction of Jerusalem, of its temple and its people, was "the end" for the Jewish nation (Dan 9:26).

---

[118] Jb 3:5, 6:4, 7:14, 9:34, 13:11.21, 15:24, 18:11, 33:7, 1S 16:14.15, 2S 22:5, Ps 18:5, 88:17, Is 21:4, Jr 8:15, 14:19.

[119] Which so strangely resembles the Russian (Slavic) *konets – "end."*

The Danielic visions are quite clear about the final end, standing in some relations with some classical Prophets, but going beyond them. Summarising his research on the time of the end in *Daniel*, Pfandl (p. 272) concludes

> ...the expression *ᶜeṯ qes* in Dan 8:17, seems to belong to apocalyptic eschatology and refers to **the time prior to the absolute End**. [...] ...for contextual reasons, therefore, the expression *ᶜeṯ qes* in the book of Daniel seems to be a ***terminus technicus* of the final period of human history leading up to the final eschaton** when the old aeon gives way to the new one when God's Kingdom will be established 'without human hands'. *My underlining.*

When the term קֵץ is used in the Qumran manuscripts, even in the famous *Pesher of Habakkuk,* it means often *time, while, period*.[120] Here we see again a mark of earliness of the Hebrew of *Daniel*, because everywhere in the OT this term has a terminative meaning: *end, limit, boundary.*

Daniel 8:18

וּבְדַבְּרוֹ עִמִּי Ex 19:9, 20:19.22, Nu 22:19, Dt 5:4, Q 1:16, Dan 8:18, 10:11.15.

Dan וַיִּגַּע־בִּי Dan 10:9. נִרְדַּמְתִּי עַל־פָּנַי אָרְצָה Jg 4:21, Ps 76:4, Pr 10:5, Jon 1:5.6. נִרְדַּמְתִּי 10:18 (cf. Gn 32:26, Jg 6:21, 1K 19:7 et al.). וַיַּעֲמִידֵנִי עַל־עָמְדִי cf. 2Ch 30:16, 34:31, 35:10.

Daniel 8:19

הִנְנִי מוֹדִיעֲךָ Cf Jr 16:21, Is 47:13, 1S 16:3, 28:15 et al. אֵת אֲשֶׁר־יִהְיֶה Dt 21:16 et al. בְּאַחֲרִית הַזָּעַם has eschatological echoes. LXX translated the phrase as: ἐπ᾽ ἐσχάτου τῆς ὀργῆς τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ λαοῦ σου – *[what shall happen]* **at the end of the wrath** – adding , probably from 10:14 and 12:1 – *to the sons of your people*. This reflects a parallel connection they made between Dan 8:19 and 10:14, which is a valuable observation:

הִנְנִי מוֹדִיעֲךָ אֵת אֲשֶׁר־יִהְיֶה בְּאַחֲרִית הַזָּעַם כִּי לְמוֹעֵד קֵץ

וּבָאתִי לַהֲבִינְךָ אֵת אֲשֶׁר־יִקְרָה...בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים כִּי־עוֹד חָזוֹן לַיָּמִים

The verbal root זעם (be bitter, menace, threat, angry, sad, furious, indignant, express wrath in condamnation and curse; detest, abhor, hate) is practical synonym with זעף (be angry, storming, raging, in trouble, sad). But, while זעף is seldom used in connection to God, זעם is commonly used of God's wrath in an explicit way (Ps 7:12, 38:4, 69:25, 78:49, 102:11, Is 30:27, 66:14, Jr 10:10, 50:25, La 2:6, Ez 21:36, 22:31, Na 1:6, ZP 3:8, Zc 1:12, Ml 1:4) or in an implicite way (Is 10:25.22-23, 26:20.21-23 LXX: ἡ ὀργὴ κυρίου, Jr 15:17?, Ez 22:24.21-22.30-31, Hab 3:12). There are, however, a few occurences of this root having people as subject (N 23:7-8 the prophet Balaam to utter זעם in the name of God, Pr 24:24 nations' *indignation* against an unjust leader, Dan 11:30 the great persecutor's *fury* against the true religion, Ho 7:16 political *threat* or *defiance* of Israelite leaders, Pr 25:23 grievous face/looks, cf. Dan 1:10). The Vulgate has: *in novissimo **maledictionis*** (in the last **curse**).

In Daniel, this root is used once about Antiouchus' rage (11:30), but in those places where this *indignation* has no explicit subject, we should take it as God's final wrath, because: 1) the term is applied to God in all passages where the immediate context only helps us understand its logical subject; 2) most of explicit occurences apply to God, and all occurences where the term has a human subject makes it explicit; 3) the immediate and larger context in Daniel points clearly to God's Judgement time. In Dan 11:36d, the phrase כִּי נֶחֱרָצָה נֶעֱשָׂתָה עַד־כָּלָה זַעַם (*till [God's] wrath shall have been completely manifested, for what is determined will certainly happen*) is apparently built form the same eschatological bricks as Is 10:23, 28:22 (כִּי־כָלָה וְנֶחֱרָצָה .....עַל־כָּל־הָאָרֶץ see v. 21 too, about God's strange work against

---

[120] See Collins 337.

His enemies), and Dan 9:27, which applies this consummation of God's wrath on the desola-tor: וְעַד־כָּלָה וְנֶחֱרָצָה תִּתַּךְ עַל־שֹׁמֵם *until complete destruction, a determined punishment will be poured out on the desolator.* The immediate context of Dan 11:36d speaks about the appoint-ed time of the end (v. 35b) when the desolator will launch his last attack (v. 40a) and finally will be broken (45b). In Dan 8:19, the immediate context points to *the appointed time of the end* (19b) and is obviously related to the "2300 evening-mornings" (v. 14.26a).

The term אַחֲרִית refers usually to time and what is relating to time, (except in Ps. 139:9 extremity). Its basic meaninc is what comes later, the last part, in contrast with the first, the end in contrast with the beginning,[121] the end as outcome or result,[122] the end as final,[123] the end as finality, destiny,[124] the end as future,[125] the end as good destiny,[126] posterity[127], the last survivors (remnant),[128] the last in rank[129]. The term is used largely as prophetic future, "es-chaton", the last time (Isa. 46:10), which is especially true with the consecrated phrase הַיָּמִים בְּאַחֲרִית in the latter days, in the future distant time (occuring 14 times in the OT,[130] once is found as בְּאַחֲרִית הַשָּׁנִים ... מִיָּמִים רַבִּים after many days....in the latter years (Ez 38:8). Talmon shows that, even so late in the Dead Sea Scrolls, אחרית and אחרון have not a final meaning (*end*, *the last*), but a relative meaning (*future, later*). [131]

Since the verb (and the corresponding noun) כָּלָה *to complete, come to an end; com-pletion, termination, full end* has so much in common with the noun אַחֲרִית, it seems that the phrase בְּאַחֲרִית הַפַּזַעַם is a contracted combination of the two usual eschatological formulas: כָּלָה זַעַם (Is 10:25, Dan 11:36) + בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים . Thus the meaning of this phrase in Dan 8:19 should be *in the final manifestation of [God's] wrath* or: *in the following manifestations of [God's] wrath.* Most translations indicate here an end, a term, the latter/last time.[132] Some translations use ambiguous words, and some of them emphasise the idea of future / later time.[133] The contextual logic of vv. 19-20 seems to emphasise not the end itself but the snow-ball development leading to it.

The desolating horn seems to be an instrument of God's indignation (v. 23-25), and little is said about God's wrath on the desolator (v. 25d). A "tallionic" principle is seen in what happened to the ram and to the he-goat (v. 5c.7c), then to the conspicuous horn (v. 8a) and to the desolating horn (v. 25d). In all these things is seen God's judgment (indignation). Yet, since most of the depicted calamities come upon God's people, it is altogether possible that God's wrath foreseen in this vision be upon them.[134]

If not, a last possiblity remains: that the wrath mentioned here is rather the Gentiles' wrath toward God's people (cf. 11:30c) and one may rethink this problem, despite the fact

---

[121] Dt 11:12, Jb 8:7, 42:12 , Pr 5:11, Am 8:10, Jr. 17:11, Q 7:8, Dan. 8:23.

[122] Nu 24:20, Ps. 73:17.

[123] Dt 8:16, Pr 5:4, 14:12.13, 16:25, 20:21, 23:18.32, 25:8, Q 10:13, Is 41:22, Dan 12:8.

[124] Dt 32:20.29, Pr 29:21.

[125] Nu 23:10, La. 1:9, Pr 19:20, Is 47:7, Jr 5:31, 12:4.

[126] Pr 24:14.20, Jr 29:11.

[127] Ps. 37:37.38, 109:13, Jr 31:17, Dan 11:4, Am 4:2.

[128] Ez 23:25, Am 9:1.

[129] Jr 50:12.

[130] Gn. 49:1, Nu. 24:14, Dt 4:30, 31:29, Is 2:2 , Jr. 23:20, Jr 30:24, 48:47, 49:39, Ez 38:16, **Dan 2:28-29**, 10:14, Ho 3:5, Mi 4:1.

[131]Talmon, Shemariahu, *The World of Qumran from Within,* collected studies. Jerusalem-Leiden, E. J. Brill, Magnus Press, The Hebrew University, 1989, p. 295.

[132] e.g. LUT, NKJ, NAB, WEB, RSV, ELB, SVV, DRB.

[133] e.g. NIV, NRS.

[134] Which Dan 11:14.30bc.31c.34b, Dan 12:7d.10b. seem to justify (because of high treason – breaking of the covenant and joining the desolator's politics. See also 1 Th 2:15-16.

that the bulk of evidence cited above favourises a reference to God's wrath. In view of this latter possibility, we have in both testaments of the Bible, apocalyptic references to the Gentiles' wrath toward one another and toward God's people, until His full wrath is poured on these instruments of God's wrath.[135] There is even an interesting Biblical concept of passing God's judgement from one another until final destruction is poured out upon the last and greatest enemy (Jr 25:15-26, Ob 1:16, ZP 3:6-8, Zc 1:15, Is 33:1, Dan 9:27d). This concept should not be avoided, at least by any conservative eschatological approach to the Bible.

* The clause כִּי לְמוֹעֵד קֵץ is probably elliptic: *for [the vision / what shall happen] extends to the appointed time of the end.* (For the meaning of preposition לְ in this phrase, see Dan 8:17 on לְעֵת קֵץ). It is similar to that in v. 17, but here we have מוֹעֵד *appointed time* instead of עֵת *time*. If the phrase is not seen as elliptic, then one could translate it: *for the appointed time has an end.* This noun comes from the root יעד *to appoint, designate, decide,* and is always used as **appointed** [time / place / meeting / sign et.al.]. The linguistic and theological pattern of all these related expressions of Daniel is obviously Hab 2:3. Habakkuk claims to having received from God two messages. The first one (Hab 1) deals with the right judgement of God against the Jews, using Babylonians as executive agents. The second one (Hab 2) deals with the right judgement of God against Babylonians, to reward their true motivation and their over zeal in doing that Jb (Hab 1:11, cf. Is 47:5-6). Since this is essentially the message of Jeremiah too (Hab 1:6-11, cf. Jr 5:6.16, 25:11-12), I infer that in Hab 2:3, the prophet speaks about the appointed time of the 70 years that were to pass till the fall of Babylon and the liberation of the Jews.

Habakkuk claims to having received from God two messages. The first one (Hab 1) deals with the right judgement of God against the Jews, using Babylonians as executive agents. The second one (Hab 2) deals with the right judgement of God against Babylonians, to reward their true motivation and their over zeal in doing that Jb (Hab 1:11, cf. Is 47:5-6). Since this is essentially the message of Jeremiah too (Hab 1:6-11, cf. Jr 5:6.16, 25:11-12), I infer that in Hab 2:3, the prophet speaks about the appointed time of the 70 years that were to pass till the fall of Babylon and the liberation of the Jews.

Dan 8:17	כִּי		לְעֵת קֵץ
Dan 8:19	כִּי		לְמוֹעֵד קֵץ
Dan 10:14	כִּי־עוֹד		חָזוֹן לַיָּמִים
Dan 11:27	כִּי־עוֹד	[קֵץ?] קֵץ לַמּוֹעֵד	
Dan 11:35			עַד־עֵת קֵץ
	כִּי עוֹד לַמּוֹעֵד		
Dan 8:26			וּמַרְאֵה [הָעֶרֶב וְהַבֹּקֶר] אֱמֶת הוּא [וְאַתָּה סְתֹם] הֶחָזוֹן
	כִּי		לְיָמִים רַבִּים
Hab 2:3	כִּי	עוֹד חָזוֹן לַמּוֹעֵד	וְיָפֵחַ לַקֵּץ[136] וְלֹא יְכַזֵּב

If *angelus interpres* borrowed this language of Habakkuk, it might be for an intended typological parallel between the end of the 70 years (ushering in the time of Israel's restoration through the quasi-messianic advent of Cyrus), and the end of the 2300 days, in "the time of the end", with the vindication of God's Sanctuary, His final Judgement leading to the Great

---

Messiah's Advent.[137] The parallel between Dan 8:19.26 and Hab 2:3 is further stressed by the emphasis on truth: אֱמֶת הוּא (*it is truth* – Dan 8:26), וְלֹא יְכַזֵּב (*it does not lie* – Hab 2:3, see in the table above).

Daniel 8:20

מַלְכֵי מָדַי וּפָרָס Compare the expression "Medes and Persians" in Daniel (5:28, 6:9.13.16, 8:20), with the oracles of Isaiah and Jeremiah about "Media and Elam"as conquerers of Babylon[138], while the late post-exilic writings speak about "Persia and Media".[139]

Daniel 8:21

וְהַצָּפִיר הַשָּׂעִיר The two nouns standing in apposition הַצָּפִיר הַשָּׂעִיר may simply represent a stylistic emphasis. We should not take הַשָּׂעִיר as adjective to have: *and the shaggy he-goat*…(!), which adds to nothing. When someone reflects on the demonic role of the he-goat (especially through its wicked horn) and on the Sanctuary-sacrifice theme of the vision, this goat reminds us Yahweh's adversary, Azza'zel, represented by a he-goat in opposition with the other he-goat chosen for Yahweh in the feast of Yom Kippur.[140] Or, the term שָׂעִיר is used sometimes to refer to goat-gods identified by the Jews with demons.[141] In the Greek-Roman culture, this kind of mythological creature was called **satyr, Pan and Faunus.**

מֶלֶךְ יָוָן is the Hebrew term for Greeks (cf. assyro-babylonian *Iawana* or *Iamana*). The Bible mentiones[142] the Greek people as among the traders with Phoenicians (Ez 27:13.19) and one of those peoples whom God have to punish (Jl 4:6, Zc 9:13) and also to enlighten in the "latter days" (Is 66:19). In *Daniel*, the name applies to the Greek-Macedonian forces united under Alexander, who founded the first "Greek" Empire.

Daniel 8:22

וַתַּעֲמֹדְנָה .... תַּחְתֶּיהָ מִגּוֹיוֹ Jg 7:21; Emmended according to LXX and Theodotion ([ἐκ] τοῦ ἔθνους αὐτοῦ) and Vulgate (*de gente eius*). The reference is to the ethnic roots of the first king. Concerning יַעֲמֹדְנָה see on v. 4.

Daniel 8:23

וּבְאַחֲרִית מַלְכוּתָם For the more probable meaning of אַחֲרִית as *late, future,* in most occurences, see on v. 19.

הַפֹּשְׁעִים (cf. Is 33:1 כַּהֲתִמְךָ שׁוֹדֵד) The Masoretic Text has הַפֹּשְׁעִים – *the rebellious sinners* . However, LXX: (πληρουμένων τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν) and Vulgate (cum creverint **iniquitates**) support our translation. A similar word association might be seen in Dan 9:24, if we consider the following phrases in apposition and read them in chiastic order (B' – B):

B	הַפֶּשַׁע	לְכַלֵּא	A
A'	חַטָּאות	וּלַחְתֹּם	B'

It's somewhat difficult to understand **whose** sins the angel considers. Are the Hellenistic powers in question, or God's people? I think that there are theological and exegetical motives to understand the speaker's intention to imply God's people. This was always a key prophetic statement in strong relation to the covenant connditions (Dt 28:15, Ez 7:6-8, 21:30/25, 35:5, Am 3:2, Mt 23:32, 1Th 2:16) and to God's historical dealings with all nations (Gn 15:16b, Jr 46:21, 47:4). The following scriptures are also very useful parallels to be studied. If Jb 14:17 חָתֻם בִּצְרוֹר פִּשְׁעִי is understood like in Dt 32:34 חָתֻם בְּאוֹצְרֹתָי ......הֲלֹא־הוּא. it seems to use חתם to stress the idea of a legal dealing with sin (see the context, Dt 32:33.35).

מֶלֶךְ עַז־פָּנִים The phrase עַז־פָּנִים means literally, "hard-faced", that is *callous*, and is used about the prophetic foreign invasion predicted in Deuteronomy, a people with fierce (bold) countenance, knowing no fear, reverance, respect, shyness, or shame (Dt 28:50), and about impudent, shameless, cheeky, insolent people (Pr 7:13, Ecl 8:1).

וּמֵבִין חִידוֹת – lit. "understanding (skilled in) sharp things". Etymologically, חִידָה (like Aram. אֲחִידָה) is something "sharp", "acute", and its pragmatic, common meaning is: *riddle, enigma, dark saying, problem, charade, difficult question, acute saying, figure of speech, taunting proverb* (Nu. 12:8, Jg 14:12-19, 1 K. 10:1, 2 Chr. 9:1, Pr 1:6, Ps. 49:5, 78:2, Ez 17:2, Dan 5:12.16, Hab 2:6). It was an antique custom of displaying wisdom, by playing with difficult questions which were usually uttered in a poetic form, like proverbs. Kings and famous sages used to compete on this kind of "acute sayings". Being able to make or understand חִידוֹת, means to be sharp, keen, shrewd, astude, clever (a quality, which in many languages reflects not only a high IQ, but also arrogance, malice and perfidy). Compare with the demonic intelligence of the Lord of Tyre, Daniel's adversary (Ez 28:3 and the whole literary context).

Daniel 8:24

וְעָצַם כֹּחוֹ The roots of the two terms are sometimes associated (Dt 8:17, Ps 31:11, Is 40:29). וְנִפְלָאוֹת יַשְׁחִית [יְחַשֵּׁב] Though נִפְלָאוֹת means usually *wonders, miracles,* here is used adverbially: *wondrously, marvellously, in an extraordinary manner,* like the synonym פְּלָאִים in La 1:9. In Dan 11:36, the same participle means *incredible / amazing / stupendous / awesome things.* However, Collins (340) cites Charles who emmends יַשְׁחִית to יְחַשֵּׁב, to have a more natural expression: *he will make extraordinary plans.* A similar corruption is attested for 2S 20:15. Cf. Dan 11:24-25, Ps 40:6.

וְהִשְׁחִית עֲצוּמִים (v. 25 יַשְׁחִית רַבִּים). Both terms are very known:. 2S 24:16, 1Ch 20:21, Nu 32:15; Dt 7:1, Jos 23:9, Ps 135:10, Is 8:7, 53:12, Zc 8:22.

Daniel 8:25

וְעַם קְדֹשִׁים [v. 24] וְעַל־שִׂכְלוֹ [v. 25]. וְעַל־קְדֹשִׁים שִׂכְלוֹ (instead of The text is probably corrupt in this line, and this reconstruction, is suggested by the LXX (καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἁγίους τὸ διανόημα αὐτοῦ *and his mind shall be against the holy ones.* This emendation fits very well the rythm of verses and at least is inofensive, because the basic meaning of the clause is preserved.[143] Pr 12:8, 1S 25:3, 1Ch 22:12. The preposition עַל is here used expressing the direction of the mind (Ps 146:5, Is 10:25, Jr 32:31) and implying a hostile sense (Gn 50:20, Dt. 13:6, Jr 11:19).

וְהִצְלִיחַ..... בְּיָדוֹ Gn 39:3, Is 53:10, Aram. Ezra 5:8; מִרְמָה בְּיָדוֹ *by deceit* Ho 12:8, Gn 27:35, 2K 9:23 (*treason*), Is 53:9, Mi 6:11, ZP 1:9, Jr 5:27, 9:5, Dan 11:23.

וּבִלְבָבוֹ יַגְדִּיל Is 9:8, 10:12, Dt 8:14, Ez 31:10, Dan 11:12, Cf. Aram. Dan 5:20.

---

[143] See Collins (340-341).

וּבְשַׁלְוָה *at ease* Dan 11:21.24, Ps 122:7, Pr 17:2. שַׂר־שָׂרִים lit. *the commander of com-manders* or, *the prince of princes.* It means *the supreme commander of an army,* the person next to the king, acting in the name of the king, or the king himself in front of his generals of army. See chap. 8:11, Gn 21:22, Jos 5:14-15. יַעֲמֹד עַל־ *will stand up against* 1Ch 21:1, or *above* (Ez 10:18). וּבְאֶפֶס *without* Jb 7:6, Pr 26:10, Is 5:8, 34:12, 52:4, Am 6:10, 9:8.

Daniel 8:26

וּמַרְאֵה means usually *appearance, sight, vision, spectacle, phenomenon.* However, in this and in another two instances in Daniel (9:23, 10:1, cf. Ex 25: 9.40, Ez 40:4, Nu 8:4), the most probable meaning, as the literary contextual logic implies, is that of *revelation* (some-thing shown or revealed in a vision).[144] Hence its adverbial use in Nu 12:8.: [to speak] *appar-ently,* as opposed to the speaking in riddles. Unfortunately, lexicons didn't mention this dif-ferent meaning.[145] This semantic evolution of מַרְאֶה from *sight / vision,* to *revelation / proph-ecy,* might be understood by comparing this term with the synonym חָזוֹן *vision,* which is often used to mean *oracle, revelation* (see Pr 29:18, Is 1:1, Dan 10:14, 11:14, Ob 1:1 et.al.).. It seems that the phrase אֲשֶׁר נֶאֱמַר *which has been spoken about,* refers to this מַרְאֶה, and this would be another argument that we should translate here מַרְאֶה as *[spoken] revelation* or *prophecy,* not *vision.*

[וּמַרְאֵה] הָעֶרֶב וְהַבֹּקֶר .lit: *the revelation about the "evening and morning"* (=days, im-plying 2300). All three words are of the most common. The peculiarity of this phrase is its syntax of the construct nouns. Comp. with הֶחָזוֹן הַתָּמִיד וְהַפֶּשַׁע שֹׁמֵם in Dan 8:13. The 2300 *evenings and mornings* are expressed as הָעֶרֶב וְהַבֹּקֶר in the singular, because the first refer-ence to them is in the singular. See Dan 8:14. אֱמֶת הוּא Dt 13:15, 17:4, 22:20, 2S 7:28, Dan 10:1, 11:2..

סְתֹם *shut up, close up, stop up, cover up, seal up* – one of the basic Hebrew roots (Gn 26:15.18, Lv 26:44, 2K. 3:19.25, 2Ch 32:3.4.30, Ne 4:1, Ps 51:8, Ez 28:3, Dan. 12:4, Dan. 12:9) הֶחָזוֹן seems to be here a synonym for the previous word מַרְאֶה, referring to the heaven-ly audition, that angelic prophecy / revelation about "2300 evening-mornings". Thus it should be translated *prophecy* or *revelation.*

[כִּי לְ]יָמִים רַבִּים *"many days"* =*long time,* that is more than usually, more than previ-ously, more than expected: Gn 21:34, 37:34 *for many years*, Nu 20:15 *centuries,* Dt 2:1, Jos 24:7, *tens of years,* Dt 20:19 *weeks, months,* 1K 3:11 *long life,* 1K 18:1 *about three years,* Est 1:4 *six months,* Jr 32:14 *seventy years,* Jr 35:7 *for ages,* et al.

Daniel 8:27

* נִהְיֵיתִי Niphᶜal from היה, according to BDBG, meaning *to occur, come to pass, be done, brought about, be done, be finished, be gone, wear out* (Dan 2:1, 12:1). From the same root came הֹוָה *affliction, calamity,* disaster, *accident* (Is 47:11, Ez 7:26). נִהְיֵיתִי may be con-nected to the following Niphᶜal form (וְנֶחֱלֵיתִי) to mean *I became sick.* In fact, LXX translates both verbs like a hendiadys, by ἀσθενήσας – *was sick,* and YLT says, *I... have been, yea, I became sick.* But the literalist Theodotion has ἐκοιμήθην καὶ ἐμαλακίσθην –-*I... fell asleep and was sick.* Jerome translates it like *langui et aegrotavi* ("I... fainted and was sick"). While the simplest way is to consider the phrase "I... became and I was sick", to mean "I became sick", the logic of the sentence provides an explanation of this sickness: Daniel was very af-flicted because of the prophecy, not only because of what it understood as bad news, but also

---

[144] As deriving from the Hiphᶜil הַרְאָה = *to show, make known.*

[145] Cf. René Péter-Contesse & John Ellington, *A Handbook on The Book of Daniel,* UBS, New York, 1993, p. 251

because of what he couldn't understand. The verbal form is usual in the oldest Hebrew texts (e.g. Jg 19:30, 20:3.12), but this meaning in Dan 8:27 seems to be exclusive to *Daniel*. The two verbs are connected in Jg 16:7.11.17, 1K 17:17, but in a different way; וָאָקוּם וָאֶעֱשֶׂה Ex 32:1, 1Ch 22:16; אֶת־מְלֶאכֶת הַמֶּלֶךְ 1K 7:14, 1Ch 4:23, 26:30; וְאֵין .... וָאֶשְׁתּוֹמֵם Is 59:17, 63:15, Ps 143:4, Is 59:18, Aram. Dan 4:16.

וְאֵין מֵבִין A lot of translations render וְאֵין מֵבִין as an impersonal clause,[146] (cf. Is 57:1, 1S 26:12) as if Daniel would have been so much affected by other people's failure to understand. The use of the negation אֵין is not so common with personal subjects, except that it receives pronominal suffix..The author should have said וְאֵינֶנִּי מֵבִין (cf. Ex 5:10) or וְלֹא אָבִין (see Dan 12:8). Collins[147] is ready to see that the versions' rendition, *there was no one who understood,* has no reason, because nobody else was expected to understand. Thus it is a peculiarity of Daniel, needed to be explained.

a). It is obvious, from the logic of the clause, that Daniel was affected by his own failure to understand (*I...couldn't understand it*), not by an impersonal problem. Most English translations follow this thought.

b). TOB renders a different idea: *no one could understand [why I was so upset].*

c). A third possiblity, reflected in NJV, REB, NIV is *no one could explain it (the vision).* Péter-Contesse and Ellington assert,

> The first of these three possibilities is the most commonly accepted and the most likely to be the correct understanding of the text. It is unlikely that the text would focus on the inability of others to understand the vision or why it was to be kept secret, since at this point no one else knew about it".[148]

This is true, in principle, but one may imagine a forth possibility, which is a logical combination of a). and c). I feel that it matches better, both the regular Hebrew grammar (or, at least, Daniel's) and the logic of the clause: *and there was none to make [me] understand,* like BDBG prefers for this instance (and for Dan 9:22, where the causal participle also lacks the pronominal direct object, comp. with Dan 10:14, 11:33). This is possible because the participle מֵבִין may have a simple, direct sense, *understanding,* or a causal one, *making understand.* Vulgate understood like this: *et non erat qui interpretaretur* ("and there was non to interpret [for me]", comp. with Gn 41:8 VUL). For practical purposes, we may translate *I...couldn't understand* or *I... didn't understand,* because Daniel is concerned with his own failure to understand, and even if he refers to somebody (impersonal) who would give understanding, it is an indirect way to refer to the same problem.

The impersonal clause echoes desperation, because, after the angel's sudden close of explanation and Daniel's waking from the vision, it is normal to ask, Whoever else is to explain me this life and death prophecy, if God and His angels left me cope in the dark with such unexpected bad news about my people's future? Who will make me understand the mysterious revelation of "2300 evening-mornings", and what is the real time to elapse until all captivity and ceaseless conflicts are gone?

Daniel 9:1

מִפַּזְרַע מָדָי Cf. Lv 21:21, Est 6:13, Ez 43:19, 44:22, a usual Hebrew expression.

הָמְלַךְ as it was preserved by the Massoretes, this Hophᶜal cannot mean anything else but "he was made king".[149] Other numerous translations prefer the reading of LXX, Θ and VUL, which, using manuscripts without vowel signs, could not see but the general idea of

---

[146] See LXX, LXT, YLT, NKJ, DRB, ELB, ASV, WEB.
[147] John Collins, 342.
[148] Op. cit. p. 228.
[149] Cf. KJV, YLT, WEB, NAB, NJV, REB, ASV, NAS, DRB, NIV.

"reigning". It was especially difficult, because this is the only Hoph^cal form of the verb in the OT. Thus modern translators felt that the text must be corrected to express an active form.[150] BDBG accepts it as a hapax. Holladay recognises it as a Hoph^cal, but suggests that it should be rendered as *became king,,* because "no indication of subordinate position" is given in the text. Davidson reads this hapax Hoph^cal as *to be made king,* without adding any commentary. עַל מַלְכוּת [כַּשְׂדִּים] Ne 12:22, Aram. Dan 6:2, Ezra 7:23.

Daniel 9:2

בִּשְׁנַת ...x... לִמְלְכוֹ 2K 24:12, 25:1, 2Ch 16:13, Est 1:3, Jr 51:59.

* [בִּינֹתִי בַּ[סְּפָרִים] lit., "I understood in / through [the books]". Dan 9:23, Ne 8:8, 13:7, 2Ch 34:12, Ezra 8:15. Only in post-exilic books is found this verb with the prep...בְּ. Otherwise, both the verb and the preposition occur hundreds of times separately.

סֵפֶר is used in the OT with the meaning of *letter, official letter, document,* and sometimes as *divine book / record* (Dan 7:10, Ex 24:7, 32:33, Dt 24:1, Ps 69:29, Ez 2:9), scroll (Is 34:4) or a certain *writing* or *literature* (Dan 1:4). The OT speaks about "The Book of the Covenant" (Ex 24:7, 2K 23:2), "The Book of the Law" (Dt 31:26, Jos 1:8, 2K 22:8), different noncanonical books (Jos 10:13, 1K 11:41, 14:19.29, Nu 21:14), any lay book (e.g., annals or chronicles, wisdom and science, poetry, et.al. Est 10:2, Is 29:11), heavenly memorial book (Ml 3:16), scroll of a Holy Scripture (Ps 40:8, Is 29:18, Jr 30:2, 36:2.4, Ex 17:14), a special document / message written by a prophet (1 Sam 10:25, Jr 51:60, Na 1:1, Dan 12:4), Holy Scriptures in their totality (Is 34:16). This is, however, the first occurrence of סְפָרִים to mean Holy Scriptures, like the Greek *Biblia* ("Books"). For a Hebrew writer, this is a natural use of the term, so that we could not suspect a technical use. The NT has also a single occurrence of the equivalent τὰ βιβλία in 2 Tim 4:13 with the meaning *The Holy Books / Biblical writings.*

מִסְפַּר הַשָּׁנִים Lv 25:15.16.50, Jb 15:20, 36:26, 2S 2:11, Jl 1:6, Ez 4:5.

אֲשֶׁר הָיָה דְבַר־יְהוָה אֶל־ A formula borrowed from Jr 46:1, 47:1, 49:34, 14:1, used also by or about many other prophets (Ho 1:1, Jl 1:1, Mi 1:1, ZP 1:1). יִרְמְיָה הַנָּבִיא the usual apellation found in the Book of Jeremiah which Daniel refers.[151]

לִמְלֹּאות 2Ch 36:21, Lv 12:6; לְחָרְבוֹת יְרוּשָׁלָם Is 52:9 (חֲרָבוֹת Jb 3:14, Ps 9:7, 102:7, Is 5:17, 58:12, 61:4, Jr 49:13, Ez 13:4, 26:20, 29:10, 33:24, 36:4.10.33.35, 38:12, Ml 1:4). שָׁנָה שִׁבְעִים Jr 25:11.12, 29:10, Zc 1:12, 7:5, 2Ch 36:21, Is 23:15.17, (cf. Ps 90:10, Gn 5:12.31, 11:26, 12:4, 25:7).

Daniel 9:3

אֶל־אֲדֹנָי הָאֱלֹהִים cf. Gn 18:27.31, 24:39, La 2:18. But the וָאֶתְּנָה אֶת־פָּנַי אֶל־ cf. Jl 2:20. exact phrase here is unique to Daniel. לְבַקֵּשׁ (implied object ?) cf. Ho 5:6, Am 8:12, Zc 8:12; 2Ch 7:14, Ne 2:4, Est 4:8. תְּפִלָּה וְתַחֲנוּנִים 1K 8:28.30.33.38.45.49.54, 9:3, 2Ch 6:19 et al., Ps 6:10, 55:2, 86:6, 143:1, Dan 9:17. בְּצוֹם וְשַׂק וָאֵפֶר Is 58:5, Est 4:1.3, Jr 6:26, Jon 3:6.

Daniel 9:4

לַיהוָה אֱלֹהַי Ps 13:4, 30:3, 35:24, 109:26, Jon 2:7, Jr 31:18, Zc 11:4, 13:9, Ezra 9:5, Is 49:4, Pr 30:9 et al.; וָאֶתְפַּלְלָה......וָאֶתְוַדֶּה Dan 9:20, Ezra 10:1; Gn 20:7, Dt 9:20, 1S 7:5; Lv 5:5, 16:21, 26:40, Nu 5:7, Ne 9:2; אָנָּא Gn 50:17, Ps 118:25, Ne 1:5.11. All terms and phrases in this prayer are found in the early OT books.

---

[150] Péter-Contesse and Ellington, .p. 230.

[151] Exclusively in the following places: Jr. 20:2, 25:2, 28:5.6.10.11.12.15, 29:1.29, 32:2, 34:6, 36:8.26, 37:2.3.6.13, 38:9.10.14, 42:2.4, 43:6, 45:1, 46:1.13, 47:1, 49:34, 50:1, 51:59, 2Ch 36:12.

אֲדֹנָי הָאֵל הַגָּדוֹל וְהַנּוֹרָא Dt 10:17, Jr 32:18, Ne 1:5.11, 4:8, **9:32**, Dt 7:21, Ps 68:36, 89:8. שֹׁמֵר הַבְּרִית וְהַחֶסֶד לְאֹהֲבָיו וּלְשֹׁמְרֵי מִצְוֹתָיו Dt 7:9.12, 1K 8:23, 2Ch 6:14, Ne 1:5, **9:32,** Ps 89:29.

Daniel 9:5

חָטָאנוּ וְעָוִינוּ וְהִרְשַׁעְנוּ וּמָרָדְנוּ 1K 8:47, 2Ch 6:37, Ps 106:6, Jr 14:20.

וְסוֹר מִמִּצְוֹתֶךָ וּמִמִּשְׁפָּטֶיךָ Dt 17:20, 9:12, Ml 2:8.

Daniel 9:6

וְלֹא שָׁמַעְנוּ בְּקוֹל יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ cf. v.10. וְלֹא שָׁמַעְנוּ אֶל־ Jr 3:25, 44:23, Dt 28:45.52, 1S 15:19, 1K 18:12. With the prep. אֶל see Jr 29:19, Ex 6:9, Dt 3:26, Ne 9:16, Zc 1:4.

בְּיַד עֲבָדָיו הַנְּבִיאִים cf.v. 11 עֲבָדֶיךָ הַנְּבִיאִים and 2K 9:7, 17:13, Jr 7:25, 44:4, Zc 1:6.

אֲשֶׁר דִּבְּרוּ בְּשִׁמְךָ אֶל־ Jr 26:16, 44:16, Dt 18:19, 1Ch 21:19, 2Ch 33:18.

לִמְלָכֵינוּ לְשָׂרֵינוּ וְלַאֲבֹתֵינוּ cf. v.8 מְלָכֵינוּ שָׂרֵינוּ וַאֲבֹתֵינוּ Jr 44:17, Ne 9:32.34. An obvious influence of Jeremiah on the postexilic liturgics. וְאֶל כָּל־עַם הָאָרֶץ Zc 7:5, Gn 23:7.12.13, 42:6, Lv 4:27, 20:2, Jr 34:19, Hg 2:4.

Daniel 9:7

לַאדֹנָי אֱלֹהֵינוּ הָרַחֲמִים וְהַסְּלִחוֹת Dt 33:21, a similar syntax in Dan 9:9: לְךָ אֲדֹנָי הַצְּדָקָה. וְלָנוּ בֹּשֶׁת הַפָּנִים Dan 9:8, Ps 44:16, Jr 7:19, 2Ch 32:21, Ezra 9:7. כַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה Dt 29:27, Jr 35:13, לְאִישׁ יְהוּדָה וּלְיוֹשְׁבֵי יְרוּשָׁלַם Gn 50:20, Dt 2:30, 1S 22:13, 1K 3:6, Jr 11:5, 44:6.23. וְהָרְחֹקִים 4:3.4, 11:2.9, 17:25, 18:1, 44:27, Jud 15:10, 1S 11:8, 2S 20:4, 2K 23:2, Is 5:3; אֲשֶׁר הִדַּחְתָּם שָׁם Jr 8:3, 23:3.8, 29:14.18, 32:37. הַקְּרֹבִים Dt 13:8, Is 33:13, Jr 25:26, Est 9:20. Obviously, an influence of Jeremiah's book. בְּמַעֲלָם אֲשֶׁר מָעֲלוּ־בָךְ Lv 26:40, 1Ch 9:1, 10:13, Ez 20:27.

וְלֹא־חִלִּינוּ אֶת־פְּנֵי יְהוָה // אֲשֶׁר חָטָאנוּ לָךְ as a refrain; see v.12.14.15. Comp. כִּי מָרַדְנוּ בּוֹ // חָטָאנוּ רָשַׁעְנוּ // וְלֹא שָׁמַעְנוּ בְּקֹלוֹ // – the confession formula (as in a prayer of Yom Kippur) is a refrain of this prayer.

אֲשֶׁר נָתַן לְפָנֵינוּ 1K 10:31, Jr 26:4, 2Ch 6:16, Ne 10:30; לָלֶכֶת בְּתוֹרֹתָיו Dt 2:36.

Daniel 9:11

וְסוֹר לְבִלְתִּי שְׁמוֹעַ בְּקֹלֶךָ Is 24:5, Ho 8:1; עָבְרוּ אֶת־תּוֹרָתֶךָ Cf. Dan 9:5, Dt 17:20, Jos 23:6, Jr 17:23, 19:15, 32:40; וַתִּתַּךְ עָלֵינוּ Dan 9:27, Na 1:6, Jr 42:18, 44:6, Ez 22:2, 2Ch 12:7, 34:21, 34:25; הָאָלָה וְהַשְּׁבֻעָה Nu 5:21, Ne 10:30; אֲשֶׁר כְּתוּבָה cf. Dan 9:13;

בְּתוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה Jos 8:31.32, 23:6, 1K 2:3, 2K 14:6, 23:25, Dan 9:13, 2Ch 23:18, Ezra 3:2, Ne 8:1, Ml 3:22; עֶבֶד־הָאֱלֹהִים 1Ch 6:34, 2Ch 24:9, Ne 10:30; Dt 34:5, Jos 1:1, 22:5, 2K 18:12, 2Ch 1:3.

Daniel 9:12

וַיָּקֶם אֶת־דְּבָרָיו 1K 8:20, 2Ch 6:10, 1S 1:23, Jr 28:6, 29:10, 35:14, Ne 9:8;

וְעַל שֹׁפְטֵינוּ אֲשֶׁר שְׁפָטוּנוּ 1S 8:5.6, 8:20, Mi 4:14, Is 33:20. דִּבֶּר עָלֵינוּ Jr 16:10;

לְהָבִיא עָלֵינוּ רָעָה גְדֹלָה Mi 3:11, Jr 5:12, Jr 16:10, 32:42, Dan 9:13.14, Ne 13:18.27, 1S 6:9, 2S 13:16; חִלִּינוּ אֶת־פְּנֵי Q 4:3, 1:13, Gn 7:19, Deut 2:25; אֲשֶׁר לֹא־נֶעֶשְׂתָה תַּחַת כָּל־הַשָּׁמַיִם וְלֹא Ex 32:11, 1K 13:6, 2K 13:4, Jr 26:19, Zc 7:2, 8:21-22, Ml 1:9; לָשׁוּב מֵעֲוֺנֵנוּ Ez 3:19, 18:27, 33:12.14.19, Ml 2:6, 2Ch 6:26; וּלְהַשְׂכִּיל בַּאֲמִתֶּךָ Cf. Dan 1:17 and Dan 2:2 (בִּין בְּ), Jb 34:27, Ps 106:7, Jr 23:5, Dan 9:22, Ne 8:13.

Daniel 9:14

כִּי־צַדִּיק יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ Ex 9:27, Ps 11:7, וַיִּשְׁקֹד יְהוָה עַל־הָרָעָה Jr 1:12, 31:28, 44:27; 145:17, ZP 3:5, Jr 12:1, La 1:18, 2Ch 12:6, Ezra 9:5.15; עַל־כָּל־מַעֲשָׂיו אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה Dt 11:7, Jos 24:31, Jg 2:7.

Daniel 9:15

וְעַתָּה has more than 200 occurences (Dan 9:17, 10:20, 11:2); אֲדֹנָי אֱלֹהֵינוּ Ps 90:17, Dan 9:9.15.17; אֲשֶׁר הוֹצֵאתָ אֶת־עַמְּךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם בְּיָד חֲזָקָה Ex 13:9, 32:11, Dt 5:15, 6:21, 7:8, 9:26, 26:8, Jr 32:21; וַתַּעַשׂ־לְךָ שֵׁם Ne 9:10, Is 63:12.14, Jr 32:20, Gn 11:4, 2S 7:9.

כַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה See on Dan 9:7.

Daniel 9:16

כְּכָל־צִדְקֹתֶךָ – phrase peculiar to *Daniel,* but its basic elements are from the most usual old Hebrew terms; יָשָׁב־נָא אַפְּךָ וַחֲמָתְךָ Is 12:1, Geb 27:44, 44:33, Nu 25:11, Jb 9:13, Ps 78:38, Jon 3:9, Jr 18:20, 23:20, 30:24; מֵעִירְךָ יְרוּשָׁלַם הַר־קָדְשֶׁךָ Ps 2:6, 3:5, 15:1, 43:3, 46:5, Is 11:9, 56:7, 60:14, Jl 2:1, Ob 1:16, ZP 3:11, Ez 20:40, Dan 9:20, 11:45;

יְרוּשָׁלַם וְעַמְּךָ בַחֲטָאֵינוּ וּבַעֲוֹנוֹת Nu 27:3, Mi 1:5, Ez 16:52, Ezra 9:7, Ne 9:37; לְחֶרְפָּה לְכָל־סְבִיבֹתֵינוּ Jr 24:9, Jl 2:17, Ne 6:16, Gn 34:14, 35:5, Ps 89:42 et al.

Daniel 9:17

וְהָאֵר פָּנֶיךָ עַל־ מִקְדָּשְׁךָ Ps 74:7, Is Ps 31:17, 57:2, 80:4.8.20, 119:135, Nu 6:25, Q 8:1; שָׁמֵם 63:18; לְמַעַן אֲדֹנָי Ps 25:11, 109:21, 143:11, Is Mi 6:13, La 3:11, 5:18, Dan 8:13, 9:27; 42:21, 49:7, 55:5.

Daniel 9:18

הַטֵּה אֱלֹהַי אָזְנְךָ וּשֲׁמָע פְּקַחָה [...] וּרְאֵה 2K 19:16, Is 37:17, Ps 72:6, Pr 22:17, Ne 1:6; שֹׁמֵמֹתֵינוּ Is 49:8.19, 61:4, Jr 25:12, 51:26.62, Ez 35:9, 36:4, Dan 9:26;

וְהָעִיר אֲשֶׁר־נִקְרָא שִׁמְךָ עָלֶיהָ Dt 28:10, 1K 8:43, Jr 15:16, 25:29, Dan 9:19, 2Ch 7:14, אֲנַחְנוּ מַפִּילִים תַּחֲנוּנֵינוּ לְפָנֶיךָ Jr 36:37, 37:20, כִּי לֹא עַל־צִדְקֹתֵינוּ Ez 33:13, Dt 9:5.6, Ez 3:20; 38:26, 42:2.9, Dan 9:20; כִּי עַל־רַחֲמֶיךָ הָרַבִּים Ps 119:156, Ne 9:19.27.28.31, Ps 51:3, 69:17.

Daniel 9:19

אֲדֹנָי הַקְשִׁיבָה וַעֲשֵׂה Am 7:2; אֲדֹנָי סְלָחָה Ps 130:2; אֲדֹנָי שְׁמָעָה Ps 5:3, Ps 17:2, 61:2, Jr 18:19, Ps 109:21, Jr 14:7; אַל־תְּאַחַר Ps 40:18, 70:6; לְמַעֲנְךָ אֱלֹהַי Ez 36:22.32.

Daniel 9:20

וְעוֹד אֲנִי מְדַבֵּר וּמִתְפַּלֵּל וּמִתְוַדֶּה וּמַתֹּרֶה ...וּמַפִּיל תְּחִנָּתִי Dan 9:21, Ne 1:6, Gn 29:9, Jb 1:16;

Daniel 9:21

וְעוֹד אֲנִי מְדַבֵּר בַּתְּפִלָּה v. 20. Repetition is characteristic to the style of *Daniel* (see also v:1.2). וְהָאִישׁ גַּבְרִיאֵל Daniel calls him a „man", not to ascribe him human nature. This is because Daniel saw him in the previous vision having a human appearance (Dan 8:15-16). In fact, in most instances, heavenly appearances in the OT are marked by **human** appearance. This is an interesting aspect of the OT concept about the heavenly intelligences. See Gn 18-19, 32:24-30 and 48:16, Nu 22:23, Jg 6:11-23, 13:6.10.15-18, 2S 24:16. The only exception is the visionary description of the *kerubim* as composite "living creatures" (Ez 1:5-10, 10:14-15), as bearers of the divine *merkabah* (2S 22:11).

בַּתְּחִלָּה *at the commencement, at the first, in the beginning, the first time,* or *previously* (as in NASV, NAB of Dan 8:1), see on Dan 8:1; כְּעֵת מִנְחַת־עָרֶב Ezra 9:4-5, 2:K 16:15, Ps 141:2, Ex 29:41, Lv 6:13, Nu 28:8; כָּעֵת 1S 4:20, 2Ch 21:19.

מֻעָף בִּיעָף   The two terms, as they are spelled by the Massoretes, allow some confusion. מֻעָף (or מוּעָף according to some variant manuscripts) is, literally, "wearied", "tired", from the root יעף, *to grow weary, to be fatigued,* and בִּיעָף, *in weariness,* from the same root. The syntactic construction of the phrase, its lexical elements and the taste for repetition or wordplay, is genuine old Hebrew (lit. *weary with weariness*), and should be translated, according to BDBG, as *utterly weary.*

But the old translations reflect another reading: τάχει φερόμενος – *quickly brought along* (LXX), πετόμενος – *flying* (Θ), cito volans – *swift flying* (VUL), from the root עוף *to fly.* To express the idea, the spelling should be emmended to מוּעָף בְּעוּף (or מְעוֹפֵף?) *caused to fly in flight* ("being sent in swift flight").

In Hoph^cal, the verbs **a).** middle geminate, **b).** י⬜פ ↔ו⬜פ, and **c).** ו⬜ע, have the same form. However, the text might reflect Daniel's own dialect and spelling. As we have in Hebrew parallel verbs (or nouns) like יָגוֹר↔גּוּר *to be afraid,* יָאַב↔אָבָה *to want / desire,* יְבוּל↔בּוּל *produce,* יָטַב↔טוֹב *to be good,* יְדִיד↔דּוֹד *beloved, darling,* et.al.., it is not unexpected to have a double form יָעֹף↔עוּף, even if the variant ^II יָעֹף *to fly,* is not attested elsewhere. With the meaning *grow weary,* this form is not so frequent either – four occurences: Jg 8:15, 2S 16:2, Is 40:29, 50:4. The common verb expressing weariness is יָגַע.

To ascribe wings and flight to heavenly beings is a familiar idea in the OT,[152] because in the Biblical context, like in many other cultures, birds and wings symbolise spirits (Gn 1:2, Mk 1:10, Rev 18:2). Daniel, however, does not say that Gabriel had wings, in fact he stresses his humanlike appearance.

The translation *being utterly weary*, though more natural, is objected especially because one cannot see how angels could be so weary. But we must not assume such exact attributes for beings that the Bible says so little about. The completely human appearance of the angel is, actualy, an adaptation to the prophet's condition, a sign of condescension. To think seriously, a number of majestic wings for an angel,[153] is not more than dramatic, apocalyptic language. So why could not Daniel describe this "man", entering his prayer room as a wearied courier-messenger who had taken a ran, in a short break within his "starwars" missions[154], to deliver in time the divine message to the prophet. Both translations are relevant and fit the literary context, and for the time is difficult to decide what was the original expressions.

נֹגֵעַ אֵלָי   Cf. Jr 51:9, Is 16:8. The verb נגע means "touch" (e.g. Dan 8:18, 10:16), usuallz with the prep. בְּ, and sometimes even when followed by the prep. אֶל (Gn 20:6, Jb 2:5, Nu 4:15, 1K 6:27, Ho 4:2, Hg 2:12). However, here is preceded by the image of flight, which force us to translate it as "reach", "approach", without being dogmatic on this point.

Daniel 9:22

וַיָּבֶן וַיְדַבֵּר – a syntactic pattern present in 2Ch 11:23 (וַיָּבֶן) may be a Qal or a Niph^cal וַיְדַבֵּר 2K 18:28, Ex 6:2, Ez 3:24 (a common old Hebrew clichè); וַיְדַבֵּר עִמִּי Gn 29:9, 31:24, Dt 9:10, 1S 9:25, 17:23, Dan 8:18, Ne 9:13. וַיֹּאמֶר...!);

עַתָּה יָצָאתִי *just now I came* – While the verb has the force of *go out of one place and entering another,* the adverb עַתָּה is an actual emphasis; Comp. Nu 22:38, בָּאתִי אֵלֶיךָ עַתָּה; Jg 11:7 אֵלַי עַתָּה; בָּאתִי אֵלֶיךָ וְעַתָּה אָשׁוּב Dan 10:20; אֲנִי שַׂר־צְבָא־יְהוָה עַתָּה בָאתִי Jos 5:14; הִנֵּה; 2K 5:22 עַתָּה זֶה בָּאוּ אֵלַי שְׁנֵי־נְעָרִים בָּאֲתֶם. The author stresses both God's promptitude to answer his prayer from its start, and the promptitude of the heavenly messenger to fulfill God's

---

[152] 2 Sam 22:11, Is 6:2.6, Ex 37:9, Rt 2:12, Ps 91:4, 1 Chr 28:18, Ez 1:6-9, 10:19, 11:22-23, 28:14, Ml 4:2.
[153] See Isaiah 6 and Revelation 4.
[154] As described in Dan 10.12-13.20-21.

command and the need of the praying. So this understanding seems more appropriate than supposing the meaning "this time" as opposed to the previous visit, as some do.

הַשְׂכִּיל with transitive use (*make someone understand, give insight*) in Gn 3:6, Ne 9:20: לְהַשְׂכִּילְךָ בִּינָה both roots are often associated Dt 32:39, 1Ch 22:12, 2Ch 2:11, Ne 8:8, Ps 94:8, Is 44:18, Dan 1:4.17, 11:3, 12:10.

Daniel 9:23

בִּתְחִלַּת used here with its common meaning, *in the beginning of...* (cf. 2S 21:9, see also Dan 10:12, Is 65:24); יָצָא דָבָר lit. *a word came out*. According to BDB, דָּבָר may be understood, in different logical contexts, as *utterance, order, matter, fact* et.al. Here is clearly a message, a prophetic message, cf 1S 3:15.17; וַאֲנִי בָאתִי Dan 10:12, Jg 20:4, Ne 6:10, לְהַגִּיד בָּאתִי 1K 18:12, 1S 4:13; חֲמוּדוֹת אָתָּה – lit: *because you are 'treasures'*. The phrase, usually אִישׁ חֲמוּדוֹת is defective in this verse (comp. with Dan **10:3**.11.19, 11:43) but it obviously has the same meaning. While חֲמוּדוֹת is used elswhere as a noun (Dan 11:38.43, Hg 2:7), and as an adjective derived from a Qal participle passive (Gn 27:15, 2Ch 20:25, Ezra 8:27), in Daniel it is used two times adjectivally, as an attributive noun in plural, in construct syntagma (Dan 10:11.19, 11:43 אִישׁ חֲמוּדוֹת *precious man,* Dan 10:3 לֶחֶם חֲמוּדוֹת *precious bread*).

וּבִין בַּדָּבָר וְהָבֵן בַּמַּרְאֶה: See on Dan 8:26. מַרְאֶה / מַרְאָה is given here as a synonym for דָּבָר *word, message,* which is, obviously, the *message* spoken about in the previous clause. The clause וְהָבֵן בַּמַּרְאֶה stands in apposition or in a synonymic parallelism with וּבִין בַּדָּבָר . Compare the similar clause in Dan 10:1:

| Dan 9: 23 | בַּמַּרְאֶה | וְהָבֵן | וּבִין בַּדָּבָר | | imperative |
| Dan 10:1 | בַּמַּרְאֶה | וּבִינָה לוֹ | אֶת־הַדָּבָר | וּבִין | indicative |

[Now] perceive the message, and understand this revelation !
He perceived the message, and [got] understanding in that revelation.

Because this parallel use of the phrase was not observed, some translations are different in Dan 10:1, e.g., *the understanding of the message, came to him in a vision* (NIV), or *it was explained to him in a vision* (TEV), possibly according to LXX, *[and great power] and understanding in the vision was given to him.* Collins[155] keenly observed that "word" and "vision (revelation)" in v. 23 are equivalent. And Baldwin[156] says:

> In the light of what follows, *vision* may seem a strange word to use, for in the context the Hebrew *mar'eh* like *hazôn* in verse 21, refers to what is heard rather than what is seen: it has acquired the general meaning 'revelation' (Ob. 1:1; Na. 1:1).

Hence the term refers to *the revelation / prophecy* yet to be delivered by Gabriel in the following verses, and not to the previous vision (Dan 8:26a-27) or to the prophecy of Jeremiah alluded to in v.1-2, in spite of the apparence caused by all present translations. This observation, however, does not invalidates other obvious links of this new oracle to the previous vision (e.g. v. 21 → chp. 8:15-16; v. 22 → chp. 8:27; v. 24 → chp 8:14, v. 27 → chp.8:24-25).

Daniel 9:24

* שָׁבֻעִים שָׁבוּעַ The Hebrew שָׁבוּעַ is a noun developed from a passive participle ("besevened") and its pragmatic meaning is, everywhere, *week, a cycle of seven days.* There is a tendency to translate שָׁבוּעַ as a "*seven*", a period of seven, suggesting that the term itself was used in a more general meaning, for any cycle of seven: *heptad, seven periods.* This spe-

---

[155] John Collins, 352.
[156] Joyce G. Baldwin, *Daniel,* Intervarsity Press, 1978, p. 168.

cial meaning is given as basical in Holladay's Lexicon. The only evidence provided is Ez 21:23/28, whith the phrase שְׁבֻעֵי שְׁבֻעוֹת, which is rendered by all translators as *oaths,* (except Jerome, who reads *sabbatorum* – "of the sabbaths"). It is possible, that Holladay borrowed the idea from a Targum: ואנון לא ידעין דארבעין ותשע זמנין הוה = "and they didn't know that there were 49 times…" Rashi refers to *a period of 49*, and this interpretation is repeated in the Yiddish commentary, while *Metsudath Dawid* refers to *oaths.*[157]Anyway, we cannot take a rabbinic exegesis as the actual meaning of a term. BDBG and Thayer's Lexicon relate this phrase to the radical שׁבע *to take an oath*.

Davidson and BDBG also attach to the term שָׁבוּעַ the meaning of *week of years* and *period of seven (days, years),* that is *heptad, week*. No indisputable evidence is given for this general meaning, except Dan 9:23 (which is not conclusive in itself, since it must have, in all probability, the usual meaning of week, as it is in Gn 29:27 too. Translators should not make the mistake of interpreting the hidden, apocalyptic language, for the reader. The task of disclosing figurative or symbolic meaning should be left rather to exegetes.

The Greek equivalent in LXX, borrowed by Vulgate, is ἑβδομάς, rendered in some lexicons as a period of seven (days, years, etc), and in Planche's Lexicon (p. 374) as *number seven, week, seventh day (Sabbath).* It is obvious that in Hebrew, as in Greek, the name of the week is etimologically related to the number seven (שָׁבַע↔שָׁבוּעַ; ἑβδομάς↔ ἑπτά, ἕβδομος), as it is in Latin or the Romanic languages (e.g. Romanian: *săptămână* – "week", lat. *septimana* ↔ *septem, septima* – "the seventh"). However, in Hebrew, at least, as in Romanian, the term is always used only as a determined period of seven, *the week,* not in a general sense. It is an avoidable fallacy to confuse the etimologicaly meaning with the pragmatic sense of a term.

There is another aspect of the term in this verse. While the usual form of plural for שָׁבוּעַ is שָׁבֻעוֹת, in this instance we find a masculin form in the plural: שָׁבֻעִים. Some exegetes[158] find relevant the fact that the masculin plural appears in *Daniel* only and they reason as it follows: Because this noun in Dan 10:2 is qualified by יָמִים (days), this is to specify that the author means a *heptad of days,* not a general heptad that might have been formed of months or years. After a thourough analysis yet, this is not that great argument, because of two certain facts, at least: a) In *Daniel*, the use of plural or gender for some other nouns is also unusual, b). the addition יָמִים (days) in 10:2, to qualify the "heptads", never means in Hebrew the time units, but it always means that the writer emphasise a full period, numbered in days, not an approximate one, Halladay and Davidson recognise. BDBG also gives Dan 10:2-3 to illustrate the general meaning of time, not to specify days as contrasting with years et.al.This scientifically proven meaning of שָׁבֻעִים יָמִים in Dan 10:2-3 as *weeks* or *full weeks*, is reflected in most translations. LXX, KJV and NKJ, ASV and NAS, NAB, WEB, LUT, ELB, LSG, DRB, NEG, RSV and NRS, NIV, Menge, Cornilescu, et al. Few translations inserting "of days"are: Θ, followed by VUL, SVV, some Romanian Orthodox translations, et.al. But this is not a proof that they meant to stress any distinction as some modern scholars do. For example, phrases expressing units of time with the addition "of days" are usual in the Romanian common language, with the same meaning as in Biblical Hebrew, just stressing the length of that time, never to distinguish periods of days from periods of years or months.

To exemplify the qualificative use of יָמִים in Dan 10:2, the following comparisons are very helpful: Gn 29:14, Nu 11:20.21 ("month *of days*"—to distinguish it from a "month of years"?), Gn 41:1, 2S 13:23, 14:28, Ier 28:3, 28:11, ("years *of days*"— did Hebrews have "years of years", too?). See also Lv 25:8, where we have "Sabbaths (weeks) of years". It was

---

[157] Cf. *Miqraé Qodesh, Propheten, Tom 8,* Lemberg, Druck und Verlag von Pessel Balaban, p. עז verso.

[158] E.g. E. J. Young , Leupold, Moses Stuart, Desmond Ford, Broadman Bible Commentary, et.al.

not sufficient for the author to say only *sabbaths / weeks* (שָׁבֻתוֹת); he even added that they mean "seven times seven years".

Moses Stuart and Tregelles suggest that the author may have been influenced by the attached numeral שִׁבְעִים in his use of this uncommon masculine plural of the term. Moses Stuart even launches a very acceptable idea: the term may have been the author's dialectal variant. Concerning its meaning he gives (like Tregelles) a more attractive argument, linking these "70 weeks" with the "70 years" of v. 2. Thus, after his logic, the meaning runs like this: not 70 years, as in Jeremiah's prophecy, but 70 weeks of years. Smart, but not convincing. He also refers to Gn 29:18.20.27 arguing that, in the phrase "fulfil her week", we have a week of years, heptade. But this is not so obvious in the text, even though the marriage deal between Laban and Jacob involved two periods of seven years. (It is known that wedding feasts customarily lasted one week – see Jg 14:12 – , and Jacob was to have Rachel also at the close of Leah's marital festivities – see Gn 29:28-30. It is plain that Jacob did not serve another seven years before Rachel became his wife. This occurred at the close of Leah's festal week). Walvoord takes for granted the meaning of *heptade*, advancing the argument of a Latin use: Marcus Varro, in Aul. Gellius, *N.A.* III., 10: *undecimam annorum hebdomadem…diem septuaginta hebdomadas.*[159] I simply cannot understand how could a Latin use prove an occult meaning of a Hebrew term.

Actually, all this frantic search for a new linguistic sense of שָׁבוּעַ was determined by a strong reaction of the exegetes against a traditional Protestant hermeneutical tool, which was called "the year-day principle" Tregelles, for example, makes war against those who take this term as meaning a *week,* which then they understand as a *heptade (seven years)* on the year-day principle only, and not on a linguistic basis. He compared שָׁבוּעַ *week / period of seven,* with עָשׂוֹר (*decade* – see Gn 24:55). The phrase עָשׂוֹר לָחֹדֶשׁ *the decade of a month*, *the tenth day,* occurs at least 11 times in the OT, nowhere may we find an עָשׂוֹר of years..Then he cites Gesenius saying that שָׁבוּעַ is applicable sometimes to days and sometimes to years, as if we have a comparable number of occurences for both meanings, while the actual score is 8 / 0 in *Daniel* only, and 26 / 0 in all OT, for the usual meaning of *week*. The only place where the meaning *week of years* would fit the context is Dan 9:24-27, but not on strict linguistic basis. Therefore, I think we would better translate the term with its usual meaning of *week*, as most Bible versions do, then let exegetes do their best with it.

Since many exegetes find the masculine plural ending of שָׁבוּעַ to be relevant for the meaning *unit of seven* in Dan 9:24-25 and 10:3, it is helpful to refer to the most comprehensive study made on double-gender Hebrew nouns by D. Michel. He discovered a very instructive rule: whereas plural in -וֹת indicates an entity or grouping which is made up of individual parts, the plural in - יִם is to be understood as a plural of quantity or a plural of groups. Compare for instance, the noun שָׁנָה *year*, which has both forms of plural: Ps 90:4.9, and Ps 90:10.15, Jb 10:5, 16:22). Hasel verified and applied Michel's results to שָׁבוּעַ in Dan 9:24-25, showing that this masculine plural form is intentional, placing emphasis on the sum total of the 70 weeks as a whole time unit.[160] To confirm this idea, we may add the significance of the singular ending of the verb נֶחְתַּךְ (instead of the plural נֶחְתְּכוּ for a normal agreement) as it is shown below.

* נֶחְתַּךְ The verb of this sentence is in singular, while the subject is in plural. This is a known syntactic device to mean the subject's plurality as a unity, a multitude taken as a

---

[159] Cited in Desmond Ford, *The Day of Atonement, and the Investigative Judgment.* Euangelion Press, Casselberry, FL, p. 206.

[160] See Diethelm Michel, *Grundlegung einer hebraischen Syntax* 34-39,49, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1977; and Gerhard F. Hasel, "The Hebrew Masculine Plural for Weeks in the Expression 'Seventy Weeks' in Daniel 9:24." in *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, 31 (1993) 107-120.

whole. Otherwise, "cutting" the 70 weeks, would possibly mean to cut them up, cut them into pieces. As Charles explained: " The singular verb after the plural subject is to be explained on the ground that the seventy weeks are regarded as a unit of time."[161] Among the authors agreeing on this point are: C. F. Keil, Moses Stuart, and James A. Montgomery.[162] Heb. נֶחְתַּךְ is a hapax, a Niphᶜal form of the verb חָתַךְ that might be an Aramaic loanword. Its basic meaning is fully attested in different sources, as well as in related words of semito-hamitic origin. While LXX render it as ἐκρίθησαν ("are determined"), from κρίνω ("to separate / sever", "decide", "judge", "punish", et.al.), and Theodoret comments, συνετμήθησαν, ἀντι τοῦ, ἐδοκιμάσθησαν, καὶ ἐκρίθησαν· οὕτω γαρ τίνες τῶν ἑρμηνευτῶν ἐκδεδώκασιν.[163] Theodotion, usually more scrupulous, translates it as συνετμήθησαν ("are cut short [from]"), followed by Jerome (adbreviatae sunt – "are cut off [from]").[164]

The root חתך is found also in Akkadian (hatakum = cut off, sever).[165] In Arabic, hataka (cut up, dismember) keeps the same basic idea.[166] In Egyptian, two similar roots are found: hsq – to cut off, sever, separate, set apart, and hsk – to cut, sever, dismember. The presence of **"s"**, instead of **"th",** is a common linguistic phenomenon in the history of many languages, and it might be a particularity of Egyptian: compare the Egyptian term sbn ("straw") with Hebrew tbn.[167] It is interesting to observe the pervasive character of this primitive root. In the dictionary of Orel and Stolbova[168] these root seems to have been split early in at least three branches: 1. *hᵃtshuk, to cut (attested in Egypt hsk.t, "knife"; West-Chad, tshuk "knife"; Angas and Mupun, tshuk), 2. *hᵃsik, to cut, to pierce (wherefrom the Semitic radical hᵃshik, to pierce, cf. Arab hsqⁱ, East-Chad, and Rift, sik, to cut; Birgit, sikki, Iraqw, siq), and 3. *hᵃtik to cut, divide, separate (well attested in Semitic, hᵃtᵃk "cut off", Akk. Hataku, Ebr. htk, and Chadian languages: tik, tik-t, tikk, tikkya, to divide, half, et.al.).

Whereas this occurrence of חתך is unique in the OT, the root is well attested in the later Hebrew and Judeo-Aramaic writings. Köhler-Baumgartner Lexikon gives for it the meanings cut off and decide. The two meanings are close related. And this phenomenon of deriving an abstract sens from a concrete image is found with other roots and terms. For instance, גזר (see Is 9:19 וַיִּגְזֹר עַל־יָמִין, Est 2:1, Dan 2:27.34, 4:4.14.21) and חרץ (1 Sam 17:18, Is 28:22, Dan 9:26-27, 11:36).The same mutation from the concret meaning to cut off, or sever to the abstract decide occurred in other languages too, e.g. Lat. decido, Fr. trancher et al.

---

[161] R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament.* 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913, p. 240.

[162] C. F. Keil, *Biblical Commentry on the Book of Daniel.* Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1950, p. 339; Moses Stuart, *Hints on the Interpretation of Prophecy.*Andover, MA: Allen, Morrill and Wardwell, 1842, p.268; James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel.* The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1927, p. 376.

[163] See F. Field, *Origenis Hexapla*, II, Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, Hildesheim 1964, p. 925, and BHS, critical apparatus to Dan 9:24.. In translation, "*were cut off*, standing for *were approved and determined;* for some of the interpreters rendered in this manner".

[164] Among the few Bible translations, beside Θ and VUL, that retain the basic meaning of חתך is the Romanian old translation, The Şerban's Bible: *s-au tăiat preste* – "are cut off upon…"

[165] Bruno Meissner and Wolfram von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch,* Band I, A-L, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, Germany, 1965, p. 335.

[166] Ludwig Köhler and Walter Baumgartner, *Hebraisches und Aramaisches Lexikon zum Alten Testamenten*, Leiden, (Lieferung I, א – טבח), E. J. Brill, 1967, p. 349.

[167] E. A. Wallis Budge, *An Egyptian Hierogyiphic Dictionary,* vol. 1, Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., New York, p. 512.

[168] See Vladimir Orel, Olga Stolbova. *Hamito/Semitic Etymological Dictionary–Materials for a Reconstruction,* E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands. New York, Köln. 1995.(p. 1293, 1391-1392).

The Hebrew-Romanian Dictionary of Menahem P. Mandel gives different words from the root חתך, indicating the Middle-Hebrew (*) or the modern (⁰) use of the term: *חֲתָךְ cutting, חִתּוּךְ cutting*, utterance⁰ (in certain phrases), *חֲתִיכָה piece, cut, part; ⁰חֲתִיכִית little part, bit; ⁰חִתְכוֹת [שִׁנַּיִם] incisor [teeth], *חָתַךְ to cut off, sever, cut slice, cut out, whence *בִּשְׂפָתָיו חָתַךְ to express clear, utter, decide, determine, prescribe, order, *חִתֵּךְ to cut, to express, *הִתְחַתֵּךְ to be cut / cut. The same meaning is attested for all these late Hebrew words in the dictionary of Gustaf H. Dalman (Aramäisch-neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch, Götingen, Eduard Pfeiffer, 1938, p. 163-164). Sokoloff gives for the root חתך only the meaning to cut, sever (Michael Sokoloff, A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic, Bar-Ilan University Press, 1990, p. 218). And note the survival of this basic meaning through the medieval Jewish Hebrew & Aramaic, up to day. Thus the Niphᶜal form, נֶחְתַּךְ is rendered as to be cut off, or be decided, the latter meaning being preferred by the lexicograph for this singular Biblical occurrence. Now, what are the criteria that any exegete should consider, to decide between the the basic, concrete meaning of the term, and the derived, abstract meaning? Especially those holding to a 6ᵗʰ century BC origin of the book should be more careful to express the oldest, basic meaning. This concrete meaning is so powerful, that after centuries, in the Talmudic Hebrew or Aramaic, and even in the modern Hebrew, is preserved. Theodotion and Jerome, chose the same concrete meaning, to sever, cut off. While this root expresses sometimes, in later Hebrew only, the meanings to utter, decide, determine, the author Daniel[169] uses the verb חרץ in context (v. 25.26.27, cf. Dan 11:36), to express the idea of decision, and elsewhere he uses the verb מנה (in Hebrew as in Aramaic, chap. 1:10, 5:25-26), when he wants to express the idea of asign, apportion, determine, count, which would fit very well this context. He could also use גזר, which is a synonym, used in both his languages, and had got already the abstract meaning of decide[170]. But, if the speaker wanted really to give further explanation to Daniel on that misterious revelation of a longer period in the preceding vision, he chose a special term to mean that the "70 weeks" are severed from the "2300 evening-mornings". This is confirmed by the use of the verb in singular, to stress the unitary nature of the "70 weeks", and by the ex abrupto approach of the angel to the subject itself, resuming actually, in this verse, his explanation after the interruption made in chap. 8:26.

The scarcity of the renditions of נֶחְתַּךְ with cut off (severed) in the Bible translations is explicable from a rather psychological perspective, very well reflected in A Handbook on the Book of Daniel authored by Péter-Contesse and Ellington of UBS:

> **Are decreed:** the verb used here does not occur elsewhere in the Old Testament, but it does appear in other Jewish literature, and the meaning is clearly "to decide" or "resolve"[171]

Practically, most translators see no need of resorting to the contextual evidence, to connect the term with the vision partially explained in chap. 8, and so be prepared to appreciate the unique match of this happax's basic meaning. While the common translation ("are determined") is quite fitting, as often do extended and derived meanings, nevertheless it weakens the force of the time clue, which the angel so powerfully expressed, and tends to dim the reader's understanding. עַל־עַמְּךָ concerning (in favour of, or against) your people. Dan 9:19, Ps 3:9, 83:4, Is 7:17, Jl 2:17, Dan 9:19, 12:1. וְעַל־עִיר קָדְשֶׁךָ Dan 9:19.

לְכַלֵּא הַפֶּשַׁע – The basic meaning of the root כלא is to shut up, stop, restrain, withhold, hinder, arrest, make cease, close, confine, imprison.[172] It is never used in Piᶜel form, as

---

[169] Or Gabriel himself, would say a conservative scholar.

[170] See Est 2:1 נִגְזַר עָלֶיהָ, Dan 2:27.34, 4:4.14.21.

[171] Op. cit. p. 252.

[172] See Gn 8:2, Nu 11:28, Ps 40:10.12, 88:9, 119:101, Jr 32:3, 37:15, Hg 1:10.

indicated here by the Massoretes. Their indication seems to be a *Qerî* for כַּלֵּה *to complete, bring to and end, finish, make an end with*, since a number of manuscripts read clearly כַּלֵּה. Now, if we consider the variant manuscripts, we may read the following phrases as synonym:

לְכַלֵּה הַפֶּשַׁע = *until the completion of the rebellion*

וּלְהָתֵם חַטָּאוֹת = *until the full measure of sins*

This reading is cogent, since phrases expressing such or similar thought and words are common in the Bible: הָתֵם הַפְּשָׁעִים *reach the full measure of rebellious sins* (Dan 8:23), עֲוֹן שָׁלֵם *the wrongdoing / guilt... is ... complete* (Gn 15:16), בְּעֵת עֲוֹן קֵץ *when the wrongdoing comes to an end* (Ez 35:5), וַהֲתִמֹּתִי טֻמְאָתֵךְ *I will consume / remove your impurity* (Ez 22:15), תַּם־עֲוֹנֵךְ *your iniquity is finished / your punisment is complete* (La 4:2), πληρώσατε τὸ μέτρον... *you fill the measure [of sins]* (Mat 23:32), ἀναπληρῶσαι...τὰς ἁμαρτίας *fill up ... the misdeeds* (1Th 2:16).

However, the most difficult reading is often the best one. And in this verse, the difficult spelling seems to make a special sense:

לְכְלֹא הַפֶּשַׁע = until the confinement of the rebellion

וְלַחְתֹּם חַטָּאוֹת = until the sealing of sins

To confine (close up) the rebellion and (or) seal the sins is an equally biblical metaphor, though less known. A few examples for comparison are the following: Zc 5:8, Jb 14:17, Dt 32:34 (in context, v. 1-43). This is a forcefully expressive metaphor of God's dealing with Israel's sin, and it is more comprehensive, going beyond the usual meaning *to reach the full measure / ending of the sin*. The sin is here seen like Rebellion (personified) to be confined in view of the Judgment day, or like a legal deed (bound and sealed) for the same purpose, if we take both phrases as synonym. But we may take them as complementary, and thus we could imagine Israel's transgression like in Zechariah's vision (chap. 5) – first confined, then sealed up – or like in any other important thing / person closed and sealed.[173] This is an image specific to *Daniel*. It is poetic, appropriate, following the *Kethîb*.[174] The usual meaning of חתם in OT is *to seal, affix seal (attest, confirm, sign), seal up*,[175] but other shades of meaning or figurative senses are derived: *to fasten up, keep securely, shut up, stop*. In the late Jewish Aramaic (sec. III-VII AD), this verb meant *to seal, sign, engrave, close up, conclude (give a closing talk).*[176]

...לְ The common meaning ascribed to the preposition "לְ" in most places is *to, for, at,*or *of the* (thus indicating direction, purpose, result, place and belonging) and LXX use of infinitive (or infinitive preceded by article in genitive in LXT), followed by VUL (*ut consumettur* et.al.), indicate *purpose*. Many translations reflect this meaning.[177] However, the preposition "לְ " in plenty of occurrence, denotes time lapse,[178] to mean *until,* or *up to*. The author makes a similar use in Dan 8:17d.(v.19b?). The logical context of the clause in Hebrew makes obvious this meaning of the preposition.[179] While both translations (*to / until*) are eventually convergent, I feel that the second is more precise and matches better the syntax of the sentence.

---

[173] Documents: Jr 32:10-14, Is 8:16, Dan 8:26, 9:24h, 12:4.9. Persons: Dan 6:16-17, Mt 27:66, Rev 20:3.

[174] And followed at least by YLT, NJB, ROV.

[175] According to BDBG, 367-368.

[176] Michael Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic*, Bar-Ilan University Press, 1990, p. 218.

[177] WEB, ASV, NAS, RSV, NRS, KJV, NKJ, NAB, NEG, LSG, ELB, NIV, Menge, New Greek 1919 et.al..

[178] Ex 34:25, cf. 23:18, Dt 16:4, 1 S 13:8, Am 4:7.

[179] Among the few ones to confirm this meaning are TEV and some Romanian versions (Cornilescu, ROV).

כַּפֵּר עָוֹן *to atone for iniquity* – a usual phrase in OT (1S 3:14, Ps 78:38, Pr 16:6, Is 22:14, 27:9, Jr 18:23). כַּפֵּר means *"cover", pay ransom for, propitiate for, atone for, expiate,*or even, *blot out, purify, abssolve, forgive*. The frequency of the root in the OT raises to about 180. Much ink has run to explain the origin of this Hebrew term, but its pragmatic sense is clear from the respective contexts and from the old translations. In LXX / LXT is usually rendered by ἱλάσκομαι / ἐξιλάσκομαι, "atone"; in VUL *expio, propitio* "expiate" / "atone". While some scholars are very uncomfortable with this idea, out of philosophical concern, translation is simple yet, and the pragmatic use of the term, in different contexts, indicate removing of sin through a ritual-symbolic payment (sacrifice) to satisfy justice and be reconciled to God. עָוֹן means, literally, crookedness, wryness, thence moral distorsion, perversion: unrighteouseness, injustice, iniquity, wrongdoing, sin; guilt.

The three terms in this verse are the most common names for the sin. Where they are all used, a complete and diverse manifestation of the sin is meant.[180] Each of their basic (etymological) sense suggests a fine distinction of meaning. פֶּשַׁע is the sin as rebellion against God's suzerainty, act of independence, violation or breaking of God's covenant (cf.1K 12:19). חַטָּאת is the sin as wrong use of our free will, abuse of moral freedom, erroneous choice, missing the right or omiting it.[181]

עָוֹן is the sin as moral perversion, opposing justice / righteousness / law / right (Pr 12:8,). פֶּשַׁע is sin against a personal and sovereign God, חַטָּאת is sin against our own reason and conscience (as God given, spiritual image). עָוֹן is sin against the revealed law of God – the universal right.

צֶדֶק עֹלָמִים lit. *justice of ages (aeons),* everlasting justice, is a phrase peculiar to Daniel, having the closest resemblance in the Messianic expectation from Is 9:6.[182] Its general use, as the *divine justice (righteousness)* is found in Ps 103:17, 106:31, **119:142**.144. 160, Is 51:6.8.

וְלַחְתֹּם חָזוֹן וְנָבִיא – LXX has καὶ συντελεσθῆναι τὸ ὅραμα, *and to be finished the vision*, while Θ has καὶ τοῦ σφραγίσαι ὅρασιν καὶ προφήτην, *and to seal up vision and prophet*. VUL renders it as *et impleatur visio et prophetes,* "and to be fulfilled the vision and the prophet." Many English translations have the definite article here ("**the** vision and…"), or have rendered *prophecy* instead of *prophet*. However, the Hebrew text is quit clear and we don't need to do any emendation. NRS is right in translating the phrase "to seal both vision and **prophet**" (my underlining), and the same idea is followed by YLT, NEG, LSG, ELB, DRB and RSV. This may be understood as an attestation or confirmation of all prophetic revelation. My "raw" translation of this text is confirmed also by its chiastic structure as it follows.

לְכַלֵּא הַפֶּשַׁע	**A**	2 words	to confine the rebellion,
וּלַחְתֹּם חַטָּאות	**B**	2 words	to seal all sins,
וּלְכַפֵּר עָוֹן	**C**	2 words	to expiate any iniquity,
וּלְהָבִיא צֶדֶק עֹלָמִים	**C¹**	3 words	to bring in eternal rightness
וְלַחְתֹּם חָזוֹן וְנָבִיא	**B¹**	3 words	to seal any vision and prophet
וְלִמְשֹׁחַ קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים	**A¹**	3 words	to anoint a Sanctuary system

William Shea emphasises the thematic relevance of the chiastic center (C – C¹), where the removal of iniquity by atonement brings in eternal righteousness (note that עָוֹן and צֶדֶק are the best antonyms for one another) then he shows the verbal link between the lines B – B¹

---

[180] See Ex 34:7, Jb 13:23, Lv 16:21, Ps 32:5, Is 59:12, Jr 33:8, Ez 21:29.

[181] Jb 5:24, Pr 19:2 NRS.

[182] See also the references to the dynasty of David (1K 10:9, 2Ch 9:8).

(both lines have the same verb וְלָחַתֽם). Lines A and A¹ share the contrast between the first three lines (bicola) and the next three lines (tricola), the first one being the initiation of the subject, and the last one being the conclusion of the subject.[183]

וְלִמְשֹׁחַ קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים – lit., *and [up] to the anointing of a most holy thing.* קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים is a periphrastic superlative from קֹדֶשׁ (holiness, sacredness, holy / hollowed / sacred or conse- crated thing) and from its plural קָדָשִׁים. The phrase קֹדֶשׁ [הַ]קָּדָשִׁים was used in reference to anything God said it is *most holy,* such as were the sacred objects, places and rites of the Sanctuary: altars, utensils, sacrifices, bread, vows, the second apartment of the Sanctuary (the Most Holy Place), and the whole site of the eschatological Temple.

קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים *a most holy thing, act, place* (**1Ch 23:13), any thing consecrated by priestly ministry:** Ex 29:37, Ex 30: 28 (the altar of sacrifices and all its utensils), Lv 6:18-22/25-29, 7:1-6, 10:12.17, 14:13 (any sin / guilt / cleansing offering sacrificed in the place for the continual holocaust), Ex 30:8.10 (the golden altar for incense), Ex 30: 35-37 (the incense), Lv 6:10/17 (the unleavened bread for the priest), Lv 2:3.10, Nu 18:9 (what was left from the offerings for priests to eat), Lv 24:9, (the "bread of the presence"), Ez 45:1-5, 48 10-12 (area of the land consecrated to the Temple / priests / Lord). Ez 43:12 (whole area of the new tem- ple on the mountain), Lv 27:28 any *herem* – vow (in fields, animals, persons), Ex 30:25. 29-32 (the sacred ointment).

When this szntagm is definite, קֹדֶשׁ הַקֳּדָשִׁים **Nu 4:4.19,** *the most holy thing(s) / place (s) of the Sanctuary:* Nu 18:9-10 (parts of the sacrifices that were not burnt offerings, eaten by the priests (males) only. Ezra 2:63, Ne 7:65 (the grain / sin / or guilt offering, belonging to the priests), Ez 42:13 (pl: קָדְשֵׁי הַקֳּדָשִׁים). The second (inner) apartment of the Sanctuary, **The Most Holy Place** (Ex 26:33-34, Nu 4:4.19, 7:50, 8:6, 1K 8:6, 1Ch 6:34, 2Ch 3:8-10, 4:22, 5:7, Ez 41:4).

Much of the same objects, rites, places, are also named, simply, [הַ]קֹּדֶשׁ *holy, sacred thing,* but the latter is also used for holy days, times, seasons, persons (priests). הַקֹּדֶשׁ / קֹדֶשׁ *(the) holy thing* was used to mean any sacred thing / time / place / person (Lv 12:4), Nu 6:20 (the Nazirite's offering), Ex 30:35-37 (the incense), Lv 22:10.14 (the sacred food that the priest only and his household could eat), Ex 29:33-36 (the meat and bread left from the priest- ly consecration offering), Lv 23:20 (the first fruits and the 2 lambs of Pentecost), Lv 27:30.32 (any tithe), Ez 45:1-5 (area of the land consecrated to the Temple / priests / Lord), Ex 40: 9 (God's earthly dwelling, **the Sanctuary**), Ex 26:33 (the first apartment of the Sanctuary, **The Holy Place;** sometimes is difficult to distinguish between reference to Sanctuary, in general, and reference to the Holy Place). 1K 8:8 (the place in front of the דביר. *the Inner Sanctuary*), Ex 29:30, Lv 16:2.17.20.23, cf. Heb 8:2, 9:2-3.8.12.25, 10:19, Nu 4:16 (the second apartment of the Sanctuary, **The Most Holy Place** (when it stands in conjunction with מִשְׁכַּן or אֹהֶל *tabernacle,* as **The Holy Place**, especially in the Yom Kippur terminology) = מִקְדַּשׁ הַקֹּדֶשׁ). Any thing vowed or consecrated to God: Lv 19:24 (the fruits from the 4th year left on the trees), Lv 27:21 (the field during the jubilee), Lv 27:23 (the price of certain things whom the priest reckoned as against the jubilee), Lv 27:9-10.33 (things or animals that could not be sub- stituted), Lv 27:14 (a house consecrated to God and assessed by the priest), Ex 31:14.15, 35:2 (the Sabbath day), Lv 25:12 (the 50th year, jubilee), Ex 30:31, Ex 37:29 (the sacred oil), Lv 21:6 (the priest who shares in the altar's sacrifices), Ex 28:36-68 (the high priest as sin- bearer).

Nowhere is the phrase קֹדֶשׁ [הַ]קָּדָשִׁים applied to persons, therefore Jerome's transla- tion (*et unguatur sanctus sanctorum*), possibly following the LXX, whose ambiguity allowed

---

[183] Cf. William H. Shea, *Unity of Daniel,* in Frank B. Holbrook, Editor, *Symposium on Daniel*, p. 241-242.

such understanding, followed by some translations,[184] *to anoint the Most Holy [One]*, is not reliable in this instance. The author should have written קָדוֹשׁ [הַ]קְּדוֹשִׁים if he intended to refer to a person.

The best understanding of this phrase in Dan 9:24 is grasped when one considers the whole expression (including the preceding verb): לִמְשֹׁחַ קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים *to annoint a most holy thing*, or, *to annoint some thing to become most holy*. And this expression has a unique usage in the Bible, in those places only where it deals with the first consecration of the Sanctuary ceremonial system. Never was annointed another Sanctuary or Temple in Israel.

See Ex 40:9.11 and 30:26 וּמָשַׁחְתָּ... וְקִדַּשְׁתָּ... וְהָיָה קֹדֶשׁ. The **anointing of the priests** was **included** in the same rite of Sanctuary dedication (Ex 28:41, 29:21.29-31, 30:30, 40:13, Lv 8:12.30, Nu 35:25). Lv 16:32 the annointed high priest only could make atonement on Yom Kippur. Nu 4:16 the high priest was in charge with the holy oil. Lv 21:12 the annointed high priest owned **so sacred position** that he could not go out of his Sanctuary task, not even to attend his parents' funeral.

Lv 8:10	וַיִּמְשַׁח .. וַיְקַדֵּשׁ,
Nu 7:1	וַיִּמְשָׁחֵם וַיְקַדֵּשׁ אֹתָם...וַיִּמְשַׁח...וַיְקַדֵּשׁ,
Ex 29:36	וּמָשַׁחְתָּ [הַמִּזְבֵּחַ] לְקַדְּשׁוֹ,
Ex 40:10	וְקִדַּשְׁתָּ וּמָשַׁחְתָּ [הַמִּזְבֵּחַ] וְהָיָה קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים

Concluding, we may see in the phrase לִמְשֹׁחַ קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים a Sanctuary system dedication, with all its furniture and utensils, because the Sanctuary and a lot of things related to it are called *most holy*. We may include a **priesthood** dedication (annointing), for though priests are never called *most holy*, their annointing occurred with the Sanctuary's first dedication. Moreover, we have the Messiah (The Annoint and the Holy One *par exellence*) in this context, Whose "annointing" is attested by the NT.[185] But the most direct and precise application of the prophetic expression is in Ex 40 10, where the **altar of sacrifices**, annointed in the same time with the Sanctuary, is expressely called *most holy*. The altar was the center of all ceremonial system. Gabriel's words do not specify which is to be annointed and made most holy, but these OT use of this expression was sufficient for a Jew to understand all its Sanctuary force, as a promise of a new altar and sanctuary dedication, related to Messiah, the Sacrifice and Priest. It is worthy of notice that the first Sanctuary (the tabernacle) only, was dedicated by annointing. The Temple was not dedicated by holy ointment, but through blood only. This suggests that the first and second temples were considered as pragmatic forms of perpetuation of the tabernacle's Sanctuary system. Presence of the *atonement for iniquity* in the preceding phrases, and of Messiah being cut off in v.26 are strong evidence toward this conclusion.

Daniel 9:25

וְתֵדַע וְתַשְׂכֵּל *know, [then,] and understand.* In all other similar instances, after such injunction follows the cj. כִּי *...that.*[186] In this case, the subordinate conjunction is either implied (expressed by a pause, or by a colon), or its absence tends to put a greater emphasis on the information (the expected message) that is to be delivered: *Know thou, and understand [the following] ! [From the ....].*

מִן־מֹצָא דָבָר *lit.from the issue of a word.* The phrase מֹצָא דָבָר is, practically, identical with יָצָא דָבָר a word went out, from v. 23. Since the word דָבָר *word*, has different connotations, and contextual use is the best indication of its pragmatic meaning, I prefer to translate it *message* in v. 23, because the angel (messenger) who was speaking about it, said that it went

---

[184] KJV, DRB, LSG et.al.

[185] AA 3:14, 4:27, 10:38, Heb 3:1-4, 1Jn 2:20, Rev 3:7 et.al.

[186] Gn 15:13, Ex 7:17, 8:6.18, 9:14, 10:7.20, 1S 28:1, 1K 2:37.42, Is 45:3, Jr 40:14, Is 43:10 et al.

out from a higher authority before he came to make it known to Daniel. This is, clearly, a message, so I translated accordingly the verb יָצָא "came out" as *was delivered [to me]*. The phrase may have different contextual meanings, as the word דָּבָר is meant as *utterance, saying, answer, matter, thing, deed, promise, sentence, resolution, decree, order*, et.al. These are a few examples of different use: Gn 25:50 מֵיהוָה יָצָא הַדָּבָר *from YHWH came this matter / sentence*; Nu 30:3 דְּבָרוֹ ַ הַיֹּצֵא *the promise / vow that he made* (Is 51:3, 55:11, Jr 44:17); Est 1:17 יֵצֵא דְבַר־ *the news ... will go forth* or *the deed will be made know*; Ez 33:30 מֵאֵת יְהוָה ;הַדָּבָר הַיּוֹצֵא *the message / resolution come out from YHWH*: Q 5:1-6 אַל־יְמַהֵר לְהוֹצִיא דָבָר *don't haste to utter a word / vow;* Ne 6:19 וּדְבָרַי הָיוּ מוֹצִיאִים לוֹ *and they were making my words come out to him* (i.e.carried out / reported my words to him).

The meaning of royal order / decree is well attested.[187] And this is the best translation in Dan 9:25. The "word" "coming out" in this instance is not hearsay, not even a message only, but an authoritative word (a royal order / decree), because it deals with the political authorisation of whole civil restoration of Jerusalem. In fact, many older or contemporary translations render this meaning of order, commandement, decree.

LXX reads: καὶ εὑρήσεις προστάγματα *and you will find orders*. This seems to be a confusion of מֹצָא (Kethîb for מוֹצָא *issue*) with מָצָא *to find*, which was corrected by Theodotion into ἀπὸ ἐξόδου λόγου *from issue of word*. However, LXX is, practically, right when understands rb'D' as "orders". And even its reading of מֹצָא is rooted in the OT Hebrew. First, the spelling ac'mo instead of מוֹצָא is not common; from a total of over thirty occurrences in the OT, this deffective spelling is attested in Jb 38:27 and Dan 9:25 only. Second, the verb מָצָא *find, receive, discover, secure, acquire, get, meet, encounter, learn, devise, find out, detect, guess, come upon, befall* is well attested in combinations with דָּבָר: Dt 4:30 הַדְּבָרִים וּמְצָאוּךָ *these words will found / reach you*; 2Ch 19:3 דְּבָרִים ַ נִמְצְאוּ *[good] things / words were found*; Est 2:23 הַדָּבָר וַיִּמָּצֵא; *... the word / matter [was searched] and it was found*; Jb 19:28 דָּבָר נִמְצָא *... word / matter is found..*; Ecl 12:10 ...לִמְצֹא דִּבְרֵי־ *...to find / discover words of...*; Jr 15:16 נִמְצְאוּ דְבָרֶיךָ *Your words were found;* Ne 5:8 וְלֹא מָצְאוּ דָּבָר *they didn't find any word [to answer]*.

The syntagm מָצָא דָּבָר (actually, מְצֹא דָּבָר to adapt it to the sentence's syntax), would mean to find (or, finding of) a word, i.e. learning, receiving, getting of a word. This would allow for the period to be reckoned by the arrival of that word, not by its inception. However, since Theodotion, Jerome and, practically, all Bible translators up to this day followed the reading attested later by the Massoretes (מוֹצָא דָּבָר) it is wisest to give it the first consideration. It sounds more natural, anyway, and is attested in the danielic context.

According to BDBG, the meanings of מוֹצָא / מֹצָא is act / place of going out / forth, issue, export, source, spring (of water), rising (sun), east (of sun), way out, that which goes forth, utterance, place of departure, mine (of silver). Since it derives from the verb יצא to go (come) out, we may add from the latter, other usual nuances: outgoing, outcome, forthcoming, appearance, departure, going forth (to a place / with purpose / for result), going forward, proceeding to (or toward something), lead-off, introduction, bringing out (of), leading out, deliverance. Holladay understands it as outlet, exit, act of going out and even **import** (2K 10:28). For the latter example (2K 10:28), Davidson has **origin (or race)** while BDBG has **export**. The apparent contradiction between the three translations (origin, export, import) calls our attention to an interesting but natural phenomenon with the verbal root יצא which expresses not only the act of going out, as start of a movement, but often, the whole way to a certain place or end. This is similar to some English verbs like go or come, whose precise meaning is

---

[187] Est 1:19, 2S 24:4, 1Ch 21:4, Est 3:15, 8:14 et.al.

indicated by prepositions (out, on, in, at, et.al.). יצא is often used with prepositions. There-fore, contrasting notions as export–import, outcome-income, departure-arrival, exit-entrance, spring-inflow are normally expressed by this verb, to illustrate its broad and elastic pragmatic meaning.

There are many instances where יצא could be as well translated by its opposite – *ar-riving, (or at least coming, going)* instead of *leaving*, like in the following places: Ez 47:8 [waters] are caused to go out (= enter) into the sea; 1S 17:55 going out (= coming forth) to the …encounter…; 1S 26:20 went out (=came forth / in) to search for…; Is 51::5 [My salvation] went out (= is on the way, is near)…; Gn 24:59 [the matter] went out (and came) from Yah-weh…; Ex 2:11 he went out (=came) to his brethren…; Ex 15:22 [after thir departure from the Red Sea] they went out (=reached) the wilderness…; Nu 11:26 they didn't went out (come) to the tabernacle…; Nu 22:32 I went out (=came to you) as an adversary…; Is 37:36 [an angel] went out (=came, appeared) and struck…; Jr 9:2 they went out (= proceed, go, reached) from evil to evil…; Jr 25:32 [an evil] is going out (=is going on) from nation to na-tion…; Zc 5:5 [the angel] went out (=came) and said to me. In Daniel, this use is also instruc-tive: 9:22 I now went out (=and came) to give you understanding…; 9:23 a word went out (=a message was sent to me) and I came to deliver it to you.

From this point of view, מוֹצָא דָבָר the coming out of a word (i.e. the issue of a de-cree), does not necessarily mean the departure of the "word" only, because the verb may legit-imately indicate the whole process of its deliverance (sending out, putting forth, issuing, pub-lishing, delivering, officially anouncing), carrying and turning it over, **as a letter**.

This may appear as a pedantic pleading for naught, but if one thinks to Daniel's times, he / she may understand the need for this precision. An ancient decree was actually an imperi-al letter that had to travel long time, usually a couple of months, before reaching its destina-tion place. And yet, one could not say that the "word" was published until a first convocation was possible, to officially announce the addressees.

לְהָשִׁיב וְלִבְנוֹת יְרוּשָׁלַם lit., to make come back, in view of bringing back (from לְ to + הָשִׁיב Hiphᶜil of שׁוּב come back). The direct object of this verb is Jerusalem: to bring back (=restore the property of) Jerusalem. BDBG Lexicon 998-999 gives the following meanings of this Hiphᶜil: *bring back, answer, turn, return, recover, put back, give back, pay back, turn back, repulse, reverse, revoke, restore,* and for its meaning in Dan 9:25 it recommends *re-store,* in opposition to Driver (138) and Collins (355) who would apply the verb to the return of the exiles. We should not forget that the direct object of this verb is explicitly Jerusalem.

LXX and Θ have rendered it as ἀποκριθῆναι to answer (cf. 2 Sam 3:11, 1K 12:6), which is a legitimate meaning of the verb, but it doesn't fit here. Jerome didn't consider it separately, but read it, probably, like שׁוּב (that sometimes means again)[188], linked it to the following verb לִבְנוֹת to build, construct, edify, and translated ut iterum aedificetur Hierusa-lem ("to be built again Jerusalem"). However, most translations give the best understanding of restore[189] while some of them follow the Vulgate.[190] Origen's Hexapla[191] also quotes the Latin version reading, restituere et aedificare, "to restore (restitute) and build".

Owusu-Antwi[192] shows that this two verbs in v. 25 לְהָשִׁיב…וְלִבְנוֹת to restore and build have distinct meanings. They are not a hendiadys, are not epexegetic, since their respective meanings are completely different. Moreover, their distinct meanings reveal the logical order:

---

[188] See Holladay, 362.

[189] KJV, NKJ, NAB, WEB, ASV, NIV, NAS, RSV, ELB, DRB, NRS.

[190] LUT, TEV, some French and Romanian translations.

[191] F. Field, 926.

[192] Brempong Owusu-Antwi, *The Chronology of Daniel 9:24-27*, ATS Publications, Berrien Springs, MI, 1995, p. 131-144.

first restore (political), then build (physical). The 44 occurences of infinitives construct as well as the seven infinitives absolute of הָשֵׁיב never apply to the physical reconstruction of a city.[193]

It were expectable for the infinitive לְהָשֵׁיב to speak about the exiles' returning, as some Biblical occurences and the historical context suggest.[194] But this is a different case, because the direct object of both verbs is clearly Jerusalem. Thus Jerusalem only is here considered to be "brought" / "given" / "put" back. The Hiph͏ʿil stem of שׁוּב, when used in connection with things like **land, kingdom, cities,** means always restoration of the ownership and governance or control to the indirect object (the right owner) as one may check out the following references: land,[195] cities,[196] kingdom.[197] The translation recover or make restitution of, is sometimes more appropriate. The term restore is though acceptable.[198] However, because some of the possible connotations of restore, in relation to a city, (misleadingly suggesting reconstruct, repair, renew, rather than restoring ownership), we should stress the idea, translating to restore the control over, to recede, or to politically restore.

מָשִׁיחַ The meaning of מָשִׁיחַ in v.25 is actually to be understood on the basis of its juxtaposition with the noun נָגִיד ruler, leader, which is roughly a synonym. Since מָשִׁיחַ is also an adjective, some scholars preferred to translate the phrase an annointed prince (NRS). Plöger, for instance, says, bis zu einen Gesalbten (als) Oberhaupt.[199] This translation, however, lacks the usual syntactical concern. Hebrew does not put the attributive adjective before its noun. The only exceptions do some attributive adjectives with probable affinity with numerals. And scholars give no other example of this kind, but the adjective רַב when it means many.[200] Neither can be this expression a hendiadys, which would require a waw between the two nouns.[201] The best choice is to take both nouns as titles with the same referent (ibid.), as they are both used in an absolute sense.[202] That means to render the phrase as (until) Messiah the Ruler.

The noun נָגִיד derives form the root נָגַד to be conspicuous, be in front of and consequently means one in front: leader, ruler, prince,[203] an exalted one,[204] chief, leader, sovereign,

---

[193] This is confirmed by S. R. Driver, *The Book of Daniel,*Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922, p.138, and William L. Holladay, *The Root ✶űbh in the Old Testament,* Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958. p. 87-105.

[194] 1K 8:34, Jer12:15, 16:15, 23:3, 24:6.14, 30:3, 32:37, Zc 10:10, 2Ch 6:25. Cf. Holladay, 88. See also JB and NJB to Dan 9:24 (*to return*). .

[195] Jg 11:13, 2S 9:7.

[196] 1K 20:34, 2K 13:25, **14:22.25**, 16:6, 25, 28, 2 Ch 26:2.

[197] 2S 16:3, 1K 12:21, 2Ch 11:1, 2 Sam 8:3.

[198] Especially according to the point 5 of the entry **restore** in Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary: 1. to bring back into existence, use, or the like; reestablish: to restore order. 2. to bring back to a former, more desirable condition: to restore a painting. 3. to bring back to a state of health, soundness, or vigor. 4. to put back; return, as to a former place, position, or rank: to restore books to a shelf; to restore a monarch to a throne. 5. **to give back; make return or restitution of (anything taken away or lost).** 6. to reproduce or reconstruct (an ancient building, extinct animal, etc.) in the original state.

[199] E.g. Otto Plöger, "'Siebzig Jahre.'" *In Festschrift Friedrich Baumgärtel*, ed. J. Herrmann. Erlangen: Universitätsbund, 1959. 132.

[200] See Paul Joüon and T. Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew,* Subsidia Biblica. Vol. 14. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1991.2:521

[201] See Gerhard F. Hasel, *"nagîd."* Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Edited by G G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1986. 5:218

[202] Marinus de Jonge . "Messiah." *Anchor Bible Dictionary.* Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York:Doubleday, 1992. 4:779.

[203] BDBG, the entry for נגיד.

[204] Hasel, *ibid.*

prince,[205] superior, president, head. The term is applied largely to all kind of leaders and representatives (1Ch 13:1, 2 Ch 32:21, Jb 29:10), such as were heads over the tribes or clans, over the cities, over the royal palace, over the temple, over the army et.al. The high priest also is called נָגִיד as one in charge with all Temple's affairs and with all religious life in Israel (2Ch 31:10.13, Dan 11:22?). He was annointed too.

The term seems to have helped make some distinction between priest and king,[206] though the two offices were complementary, and the high priest was also a spiritual (messianic-typological) king. Anyway, the king as political power was the supreme leader, in charge with all Israel's affairs. Therefore the Israelite king, beginning with Saul and going on through both israelite kingdoms, was naturally named נָגִיד (as the king of Tyre is also called in Ez 28:2). And still, God's Annointed one, the providential-typological-prophetic ruler, was David and his dynasty down to universal King Messiah.[207] The only scriptures where the root מָשַׁח to anoint and נָגִיד applies to the same person, refer to israelite kings.[208]

There is however, a last example, a strange but instructive one, by contrast. The Tyrian נָגִיד from Ez 28:2 has some striking characteristics related to the book of Daniel, especially through the theme Christ-Antichrist (he exalts himself as God v. 2.6.9, feels wiser than Daniel v.3, "because" he was a perfect wise and beautiful cherub, dwelling by God v. 12-14, was long time a perfect righteous being v.15, annointed מִמְשַׁח as a special guardian of God's throne v.14, adorned with the high-priestly precious stones on God's mountain v. 13-14, prophaned his sanctuaries by iniquities v. 18, and by no human hand will be destroyed v. 18b-19). Without entering the exegetic kitchen of these two oracles in Ez 28:1-10.11-19, it is interesting to observe that there are similarities and dissimilarities between them. The Christian tradition and some modern studies indicate that v. 11-20 deal with that spirit who was a splendid, loyal and exalted being before he became, by sin, the hidden force of such kingdoms like Tyre (the wicked metropolis of the seas) and Babylon (the wicked metropolis of the lands, Is 14:4.12-22) et.al. Thus the difference between the Tyrian נָגִיד of. v. 2 and the Tyrian מֶלֶךְ of v. 12, would be a close relationship of vassalage man / leader – cherub / king. Anyway, the two meet different dooms; one is killed by foreigners in v. 9-10, the other is destroyed by a fire from himself in v. 18b.[209] This is an illustration of possible nuances of meaning when we meet נָגִיד instead of מֶלֶךְ.

But there are other noticeable opinions, like that of Tomoo Ishida. As general meaning, נָגִיד is "the appointee as the head of a certain group or organization". While used as a royal title, a synonym of מֶלֶךְ, for all practical purposes, it has nevertheless a distinctive meaning. "one who is designated as ruler of the people", emphasising the "legitimization of the kingship".[210]

From strict linguistical perspective, the best understanding is that the two terms joint in apposition mean "King Messiah", that is, the expected King-Priest, who is certainly the legitimate, God-appointed, King.

---

[205] Holladay, the entry for נגיד.

[206] 1Ch 29:22, 2Ch 19:11, 2Ch 31:10.13.

[207] 1Ch 5:2, 28:4, 2Ch 6:5-6, **Is 55:4.**

[208] Saul 1S 9:16, 10:1, Solomon 1Ch 29:22 et.al..

[209] Cf. Richard M. Davidson, "Satan's celestial slander", *Perspective Digest,* ATS, Hagerstown, MD, 1/1996, 31-34.

[210] Tomoo Ishida. "נגיד : A Term for the Legitimization of the Kingship", *Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute,* vol. III, Tokyo, editors: Masao Sekine & Akira Satake. Yamamoto Shoten, 1977, p. 35-47.

Collins[211] compares this syntactic construction with that of Jr 20:1 (פָּקִיד נָגִיד chief officer). If this parallel is taken seriously, again we cannot have a certain annointed, but only the Annointed One, par excellence.

עַד־מָשִׁיחַ נָגִיד There is no doubt about the basic meaning of the noun. מָשִׁיחַ, *annoint one.* According to Owusu-Antwi,[212] it is used 38 times in the OT for different persons who became, by the sacred rite of annointing, *the annointed [of the Lord].* The term is applied 30 times to kings (Saul, David, Cyrus and others), 6 times to different high priests, and twice to the patriarchs. One prophet is reported to have been anointed (1K 19:16) and twice, this divine *anointing* is attributed to non-Israelite kings (Cyrus Is 45:1, and 1 K 19:15). Because the noun has no article in Dan 9:25, and nowhere in the OT was discovered an eschatological Saviour called, simply, מָשִׁיחַ (like a name, with no article), – or, maybe more accurately, because of the rationalistic theology with its deep antichristian thrust – , the Christian Saviour was nearly left out of this prophecy by lexicographers and liberal exegetes. Holladay,[213] for instance, after a total silence about Dan 9:25, assigns the meaning *high priest* for the occurrence in Dan 9:26, then closes his מָשִׁיחַ entry with the remark: "N.B. 'Messiah' as eschatological savior-figure not in O.T.". BDBG[214] gives as special meaning of the term in Dan 9:25-26, *Messianic Prince,* according to Briggs (Messianic Prophecy), then refers to others who shuffled in v. 25 Cyrus the Great or the high priest Joshua, and in v.26, the Syrian king Seleucus IV or the high priest Onias III. This is a serious challenge for any Christian scholar, because it is the only place in the OT to refer directly to the Eschatological Saviour. To meet it, I proposed a number of reasons, which can substantiate the traditional Christian exegesis.

Some common nouns (like titles and apellations) become, in time, proper names or, at least, function as proper names. They are often used in parallel as definite and indefinite nouns. For instance, nouns like תַּרְתָּן, רַב־סָרִיס, רַב־שָׁקֵה, רַב־מַג, רַב־טַבָּחִים are best translated in NRS and many other modern translations, **the** Tartan, **the** Rabsaris, **the** Rabshakeh, **the** Rabmag, **the** captain of the guard 2K 18 – 19, Is 20:1, Is 36 – 37) . A similar origin has the term פַּרְעֹה.(lit."great house", the common title of the king of Egypt BDB) that sounded like a proper name for the Jews, and is invariably transliterated as such (Pharaoh). If the title מָשִׁיחַ has any definite application to the eschatological Saviour in OT, then this unique indefinite occurrence, should be understood as a title-name, definite by itself – *Messiah.*

While Canaanite male local divinities are always refered by the definite noun הַבַּעַל *the Baal,* (*i.e. the Possessor / Owner / Lord / Master* Jg 6, 1K 18, 2K 10 et.al.), it is universally translated as a name, in striking contrast with Yahweh, a veritable name who needs no article definite. However, the common name of the Divinity (God) is found in both indefinite and definite forms (אֱלֹהִים Gn 1-3, אֱלֹהִים Gn 5 – 6) and is always translated as a proper name, definite by itself – *God.* The common name אֱלֹהַּ / אֱלוֹהַּ (*a god* – Ps 18:32, 114:7, Is 44:8, Ne 9:17, 2Ch 32:15, Dan 11:37-39) the true singular form of אֱלֹהִים has an indefinite form when used like a proper name – *God* – with most occurences in the book of Jb (40 times, against 5 times in other books: Dt 32:15, Ps. 50:22, Ps. 139:19, Prov. 30:5, Hab. 3:3). Occurences with definite article are found in Aramaic only (Ezra 4 – 7, Dan 2.3.5.6). The noun lae *"power", chief, a god,* is found also with the definite article (laeḥ *the [true] god, God,* e.g. Dt 10:17, Dan 9:4). But it often has an indefinite form, yet with definite meaning (lae *God,* e.g. Jb 20:29, Ps 104:21, Ml 1:9) The divine titles, שַׁדַּי *Allmighty* (52 occurences, most of them in *Jb* and *Genesis*) and עֶלְיוֹן *Most High* (34 occurences, most of them in *Psalms* and *Pentateuch*)

[211] John Collins, p. 355.
[212] Op. cit. 162.
[213] Op. cit. p. 219.
[214] Op. cit. p. 603 .

are **always** used as proper names. The latter is used 14 times adjectivally, sometimes with the definite article, with the common, basic meaning: *upper, higher.* Even God's cosmic adversary, Satan, usually appears with definite article (*the Satan = the Adversary, the Enemy,* all 11 occurences in Jb, and Zc 3:1-2). When is indefinite, it has a general meaning, refering to human beings (שָׂטָן *an adversary, enemy,*1S 29:4, 2S 19:23, 1K 5:18, 11:14.23.25, Ps 71:13, 109:6.20, or it can be a divine being, as in Nu 22:22.32). In one place only, in the post-exilic Biblical Hebrew (1Ch 21:1) the appelation שָׂטָן has no article and proved to be used as a proper name too, which is attested by all Biblical translations. Even though it is the only occurrence, it is clear enough to consider it. This is a good linguistic lesson to learn to deal properly with the title-appelation מָשִׁיחַ. The LXX's strange reading of the phrase עַד מָשִׁיחַ נָגִיד as πόλιν κυρίῳ *a city for the Lord,*seems to indicate such an identification, which is not so difficult to make on OT basis only, since the King Messiah is a divine being too, not only the last and supreme Davidic Ruler (Cf. Is 9:6-7, 10:21, Ps 45: 6-8, Ps 110). The preposition עַד *until,* was obviously misread as עִיר *city,* so that κυρίῳ *to The Lord,* seems to be a Targum-like translation of מָשִׁיחַ נָגִיד as "The Lord / YHWH" (Cf. LXX in Gn 12:7, 13:18, Ex 8:4, Bel 1:25 et.al.). If the eschatological Messiah is spoken of in OT as sharing the true divinity, or at least as a supernatural being, it would be no wonder to find this title in indefinite form, as a proper name – *Messiah.* (In favor of the LXX' translation, compare with Χριστός Κύριος from Lk 2:11, wich an angel – Gabriel? – anounces, v. 1:19.26, 2:9).

In a like manner, an epithet applied to the Messiah, צֶמַח *a branch, scion, shoot* (Jr 23:5, 33:15, and Is 4:2?)*,* which synonyms had been applied by Isaiah to messianik King (שֹׁרֶשׁ *root, growth* Is 11:10, 53:2, חֹטֶר *branch, twig* Is 11:1, נֵצֶר *sprout, branch* Is 11:1) is used **later, in postexilic times** as a name (Zc 3:8, 6:12). No wonder that מָשִׁיחַ, which became more frequently used, could dispense with the article and yet name a definite person, "the Messiah".

NT applies the Greek equivalent term Χριστός as a title-appelation of the eschatological Davidic king, "The Annoint One", to Jesus of Nazareth, the true Christ ("The Christ", or "Christ"). The Greek equivalent was used in LXX for the Davidic Ruler (Ps 2:2, Ps 132/131:17 etc, La 4:20, 2Ch 6:42, PS 17:32 et.al.). Indeed, patriarchs and prophets predicted the advent of a unique Ruler over Israel and Nations, from David's dynasty (Gn 49:10, 2S 7:12-16, 23:3-5, Mi 5:5, Is 4:2, 7:14, 9:6-7, 11:1-10, Jr 23:5-6, 33:14-16, Zc 3:8-9, 6:12-13 et.al.). If we accept that the Greek of NT (as with LXX) reflects a lot the Jewish thought-language patterns, then we should consider that from the approx. 530 occurences of the Greek equivalent of Messiah, approx. 60% are without article (e.g. Lk 2:11, Heb 3:6 1Pt 3:18), though definitely used as mission name, often beside the personal name Jesus. The rest have definite article and are used as a title: ὁ Χριστός *the Christ, the Messiah* (e.g. Mt 2:4, 16:16.20, 24:5). Thus usage of the indefinite form מָשִׁיחַ is attested first in Daniel 9:25-26, and afterward reflected in NT.

This is not only a good probability, but it is confirmed by the Hebrew-Yiddish Jewish editions of the OT, where the Danielic phrase reads: *bis auf Maschiach, den Fursten.*   Also *The Jewish Encyclopedia* (vol. 8, KTAV Publishing House, Inc., New York, 1901, p. 505) does state: "Messiah […]: The name or title of the ideal king of the Messianic age; **used also without the article as a proper name—'Mashiah' (in the Babylonian Talmud and in the midrash literature)**…" . *My underlining.*

It is known that often in Hebrew poetry, nouns usually receiving the definite article stand without article, and yet they should be understood as definite (e.g. אֶרֶץ *[the] earth,* שָׁמַיִם *[the] sky,* Jg 5:4.20, אוֹיֵב *[the] enemy* Pl 2:17). According to Gesenius (402-403), there are a number of nouns that stand always without article, such as the archaic / poetic terms אֱנוֹשׁ *man,* צַלְמָוֶת *the deep darkness,* רֹזֵן *the prince,* שְׁאוֹל *the Hades,* שָׂדַי *the field,* תְּהוֹם *the ocean,*

the abyss תוּשִׁיָּה *the effectual working,* תֵּבֵל *the world.* Since the prophetic part of this chapter is written in poetry like most of the prophetic oracles in OT, no wonder to meet a word like x;yvim' without article. Rather one wonders if the presence of the article would put more messianic emphasis on this prophecy so rich in soteriologic-eschatological terminology.

The indefinite form of the noun מָשִׁיחַ in v. 25 is not the only case in this prophecy. In v. 24, in similar situations are חַטָּאות *the sins,* עָוֹן *the iniquity,* חָזוֹן *the prophecy,* נָבִיא *the prophet,* קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים *the most holy Sanctuary.* In v. 25 we find רְחוֹב *the square,* חָרוּץ *the decision.* In v. 27, the last word would normally had article: שֹׁמֵם *the devastation.* In the previous prophecy, chap. 8, we meet other nouns skipping the rule: אֱמֶת *the Truth* (v.12), צָבָא *the host* (v.13), קֹדֶשׁ *the Sanctuary* (v. 13.14). But the most striking comparison in the literary context is a second occurrence of this "indefinite" noun מָשִׁיחַ in Dan 9:26. If the first occurrence had been intended to mean *a certain annointed,* then the reccurrence of the noun should have had the definite article, according to the syntactical usage. But since both occurrences are morphologically indefinite, yet contextually connected, there results that in both cases the word מָשִׁיחַ has a use similar with a personal name. In v. 26 מָשִׁיחַ was translated as *Messiah* (YLT, KJV, NKJ, NEG, NAB, WEB, DRB), *the annointed one* (ASV, NIV). TEV has in both verses *God's chosen leader.* Other translations (e.g. LUT, ELB, RSV, NRS, LSG) rendered *an anoint one.* Jerome's Vulgate has *Christus* (Christ) in both cases. The messianic identity of the "annointed" in v. 25 is still emphasised by the juxtaposed term נָגִיד.

שָׁבֻעִים שִׁבְעָה וְשָׁבֻעִים שִׁשִּׁים וּשְׁנַיִם Concerning the syntax of this numeral expression, comp. with Dan 8:14, where the object stands also, before the numeral. A number of translations[215] insert a period or a semicolon after the "seven weeks", while other translations insert a comma or nothing, before the conjunction[216] "and", the Hebrew *waw,* which, obviously joints the two numerals. This difference in puctuation has a major exegetical role in the chronology of this prophecy. Those who insert a semicolon or a full stop, interpret the Massoretic *athnach* ( ) under שִׁבְעָה *seven,* as a full disjunctive. Though grammarians usually give the *athnach* this significance,[217] there is important evidence that it was not always used as a full disjunctive. For instance, in Gn 3:3, and even in Dan 9:24, so close to our example, it cannot have at all a disjunctive function:

Gn 3:3   לֹא תֹאכְלוּ מִמֶּנּוּ וְלֹא תִגְּעוּ בּוֹ פֶּן־תְּמֻתוּן

Dan 9:24c   וּלְכַפֵּר עָוֹן וּלְהָבִיא צֶדֶק עֹלָמִים
וְלַחְתֹּם חָזוֹן וְנָבִיא וְלִמְשֹׁחַ קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים

In the light of such evidence it is amazing that eminent scholars, like Collins,[218] assert with so certainty: "There can be no doubt that the MT punctuation is correct". The same critics are ready to delete or emend a whole phrase, if necessary, and here they are found kneeling to the sacred *athnach.* Owusu-Antwi's full treatment of this challenging *athnach* displays a lot of other good examples, scholarly analysed: Gn 1:1.21, 22:10, 1K 8:42, Dan 9:2.[219] In some places, the *athnach* has the same position as in Dan 9:25, in the middle of an enumeration: *70 talents* [athnach] *and 2400 skekels* (Ex 38:29), *...the sons of Benjamin: .....Rosh*

---

[215] E. g. LUT, RSV, NRS, LSG, ELB, TEV, Romanian Cornilescu.

[216] E.g. KJV, NKJ, YLT, NEG, NAB, WEB, ASV, NAS, DRB, NIV, Menge, Cornilescu-GBV.

[217] See Gesenius 59.61, "the principal divider within the verse".

[218] John Collins, 355.

[219] Owusu-Antwi, 186-196.

[athnach] and Muppim… .(Gn 46:21), *and they were a total number of 603,000 [athnach] and 550* (Nu 1:46).

Translators have to make sure for themselves the actual punctuation and even the vowel signs, from the syntax and logic of the clause and its sentences. We should observe, for example, that Messiah is placed "**after** the 62 weeks" in Dan 9:26, therefore we should translate in. v. 25, *until Messiah, the Ruler, there will be 7 plus 62 weeks.* The whole periode of 70 weeks is obviously divided in 7+62+1 weeks. The first period of 7 weeks is cut off first, without asigning a special event to its end, because such a period had a classic, legal end in the 50th year, the jubilee (Lv 25:8-55), in close thematic relationship to our text. Moreover, it seems to be in parallel with the previous assertion, to make the first 7 weeks apply to the political and physical restoration of Jerusalem:

> **A** to restore and rebuild Jerusalem **B** until Messiah, the Ruler [there will be]
>
> **A¹** seven weeks   **B¹** and sixty-two weeks

Origen's Hexapla[220] quotes Aquilas ('A) and Symmachus (Σ) reading in Dan 9:26a, καὶ μετὰ τὰς ἑπτὰ ἑβδομάδας (or, τὰς ἑβδομάδας τὰς ἑπτὰ) καὶ ἑξήκοντα δύο, *and after the 7 and 62 weeks...* This is a witness of an old reading, before the Masoretic punctuation. Even in LXX, the corrupted text reminds us the reading of 'A and Σ (καὶ μετὰ ἑπτὰ καὶ ἑβδομήκοντα καὶ ἑξήκοντα δύο).

תָּשׁוּב וְנִבְנְתָה The Hebrew phrase תָּשׁוּב וְנִבְנְתָה obviously parallels the previous one לְהָשִׁיב וְלִבְנוֹת *to (politically) restore and rebuild*

> **A** לְהָשִׁיב   **B** וַלִבְנוֹת
> **A¹** תָּשׁוּב   **B²** וְנִבְנְתָה

This observation requires a similar translation in both cases. תָּשׁוּב is a Qal impf. fem. form of שׁוּב, and it is noteworthy one of the meanings indicated for it in BDBG (998, 7b): = *be brought back,* Gn 43:18, 1S 5:11, hence *be restored, revert in ownership, be receded.*[221] We may add 1K 13:6 (*be restored, recover*). The use of תָּשׁוּב in this place was commonly understood adverbially (cf. Gesenius, §120c), to express a repetitive action of the second verb, and is rendered accordingly in most translations. Thus the whole phrase is translated *to build again.* While this reading may be correct in itself, the parallel displayed above is eloquent in favour of the translation here emphasised.

The second verb, וְנִבְנְתָה from hnb *to build,* involved in the first phrase also, to indicate the physical restoration of the city, applies to the *square,* while *restoration* seems to be applicable to the *decision-making.* Beside the common meaning of *to build,* BDBG (124.**i. 2,** 125. **2.a.**) assigns to the verb hnb the meanings: *rebuild* (Is 58:12)*, repair and enlarge,* (Jos 19:50, 1K 9:24); **fig. *restore, reestablish* (Am 9:11, Ps 89:5), *cause (a household) to flourish* (Pr 14:1 opp. 27:18), *reestablish, make prosper* (Jr 12:16, Ml 3:15, Jb 22:23), *establish, make permanent* (Ps 89:3, Pr 24:3)**, These underlined meanings are especially fitting to illustrate the probable enlarged use of hnb in Dan 9:25. It is not only physical rebuilding, which applies to the *square,* but also in a figurative sense, a reestablishing (restoration, making permanent and prosper, causing to flourish) of the decision-making at the city square.

רְחוֹב וְחָרוּץ *[both] city square and decision-making.* The first term, רְחוֹב *city-square* (etymologically, *wideness, broadness*) is understood as a *broad open space in a town or village,* translated as street, square or plaza. Owusu-Antwi (149-150) insists on its precise meaning of *square* or *plaza* (see Dt 13:17/16, 2Ch 29:4, 32:6, Ne 8:1), not street. And he quotes Montgomery, p. 380, who says: "By…'broadway, plaza,' are meant the broad spaces, generally just inside the city gates, the center of the city life, and by synecdoche standing for the

---

[220] See Field, 926.

[221] (Ez 46:17, 1K 12:26, 1S 7:14, Ez 35:9, Lv 27:24, Dt 28:31.

city." Therefore, it should be understood as the Hebrew equivalent for the *forum (agora), the marketplace* or *public square* of the city, the center of judicial and business affairs and place of assembly.

The second term, חָרוּץ derives from the root חרץ to cut, to sharpen, to decide, and it is used in the OT with various meanings, according to BDBG: *cut* (*mutilated,* Lv 22:22 pass. part.), *sharp* (Is 28:27), *diligent, determined* (*'sharp'* Pr 13:4); **strict decision** (Jl 4:14); *gold* (Ps 68:14). Like other lexicons and commentators, BDBG gives a special meaning of the term for Dan 9:25: trench, moat, a possible Aramaic loan-woard (חריצא ↔ Assyr. *ḫaritsu, ḫiritsu*). Davidson has *ditch, trench* for Dan 9:25.

Theodotion translated it as τεῖχος wall, followed by VUL (platea et muri, *plaza and walls*) and by many translations. But, despite Theodotion's translation, it is no linguistic basis for such a meaning. Never in OT the term is translated as wall. Others see it as rampart (JB, NJB), or conduit (NEB, REB). The latter seems more acceptable, though it might not be the best solution. Collins (356) contends for the meaning *moat* and cites in support the Aramaic Zakir inscription from Hamath (8th century) and from the Qumran *Copper Scroll.* But whatever good is brought to the Hebrew knowledge by those inscriptions, it is important to note that the pair *square and moat* is not at all satisfactory. Why associate the city plaza with a moat? If the author had intended to refer to the city's defense, he surely would have shosen the wall. And to my knowledge, Jerusalem was not famous because of its moats.

Owusu-Antwi[222] observed the close connection between the two nouns of this pair and the idea of restoration and argues for the meaning *decision-making* as it relates to the broad site (*square*, *plaza*) inside the city gate. The *square* was the place of meeting for the city's officials, 'the elders' (or old men), and that was the place of decision-making about all things concerning the community: justice, economy, politics etc.[223] Thus the phrase *square and decision-making* is a powerful symbol of a full civil restoration that conditioned the application of all civil laws of the Torah (comp. Ne 8:1-4). The presence of the root חרץ with the meaning *decide, determine,* in other places of this prophecy (v.26, Dan 11:36) tends to confirm this translation. Anyway, it is more natural for the Biblical Hebrew, since the root חרץ is frequently used with the meaning *to decide, to determine* (Is 10:22.23, 28:22, 1K 20:40, Jb 14:15). The example in Joel 3/4:14, places Yahweh's court in a large *valley of decision[s]* חָרוּץ analogue with a city square , with all nations arround. That prophetic valley is also called the *valley of Jehoshapat* ("Yahweh **judged**").

צוק – וּבְצוֹק הָעִתִּים derives from the verb צוק *to constrain, bring into straits, press upon.* Though this noun is a hapax, diferent related forms are found, with the same meaning:

- מָצוֹק *straitness, stress, distress* (Dt 28:53.55.57, 1 Sam 22:2, Ps 119:143, Jr 19:9),
- מוצָק *constraint, distress* (Jb 33:16, Is 8:23),
- מְצוּקָה *straitness, distress, stress* (Jb 15:24, Ps 25:17, 107:6.28, ZP 1:15),
- צוּקָה constraint, distress, anguish, pressure (Pr 1:27, Is 8:22, 30:6).

Thus צוק would be the masculine pair of צוּקָה with a similar meaning that fits very well this context. This family of nouns deriving from the verb צוק is often used close to, or in parallel with the root צור *to be narrow, distressiing, adverse,* like a an actual synonym. The phrase וּבְצוֹק הָעִתִּים *in the distress of the times* is best to be understood as *in the distressing times, in times of distress.*

LXX is corrupt in this verse, but the corresponding words are found in v. 27 (κατὰ συντέλειαν καιρῶν .... *to the end of times),* with Theodotion having a similar phrase: καὶ ἐκκενωθήσονται οἱ καιροί *and the times shall be exhausted..* According to the critical appa-

---

[222] Owusu-Antwi, p. 149-150.
[223] **Is 59:14**, Dt 16:18, 17:8, 2S 15:2, Jr 26:10, Am 5:15, Zc 8:16.

ratus of BHS, this is followed by the Syriac (לשולם זבנא *at the fulfillment of time*), which gives a good support for an old Hebrew text, having a different reading from the MT: הָעִתִּים וּבְקֵץ. *and in the end of time.* Obviously, וּבְקֵץ. and וּבְצֹק / וּבְצֹק are very liable to confusion. BDBG cites A. A. Bevan and K. Marti, proposing an emendation of the Hebrew text in harmony with these ancient translations, and the phrase הָעִתִּים וּבְקֵץ be considered to begin the next verse (where the *waw* from וְאַחֲרֵי is to be deleted). This proposal is still worth of further study. However, it is more likely for copyists to read in a phrase more familiar as הָעִתִּים וּבְקֵץ. (cf. Dan 11:13 הָעִתִּים וּלְקֵץ) than changing a so natural phrase in another less usual. Special studies of verse structure are necessary to definitely solve the dilemma. For the time, to keep the Hebrew reading seems to me the wisest option. It is written there, and it perfectly fits the logical context. Thus it is no need of emmendation. It is rather a mark of genuine old Hebrew.

Daniel 9:26

וְאַחֲרֵי הַשָּׁבֻעִים Cf. Jr 31:33.

יִכָּרֵת From כָּרַת (BDBG: *to cut, cut off, cut down, cut off a body part, cut out, eliminate, kill, cut a covenant*). Here is used as a passive (Niphᶜal imperfect) that supports the basic meaning: *to be cut off, cut down,* and naturally the passive of other meanings of Qal, unattested yet in the Niphᶜal form: e.g. *cut as covenant sacrifice.*[224] The primary meaning intended is, most probably, **to be given to death penalty,**[225] and a special case might be made for the meaning **cut as a covenant sacrifice**. The meaning *cut off,* or *cut down* finds a synonym in the use of נִגְזַר in Is 53:8, where the major theme of the Messiah's (Servant of Yahweh's) sacrificial death was already developped. We should also consider not only the thematic, but (see Owusu-Antwi 166) even some terminological connections: פֶּשַׁע (Is 53:5.8.12, Dan 9:24), עָוֹן (Is 53:5-6, Dan 9:24), חַטָּאת (Is 53:12, Dan 9:5.8.11.15.20.24), עַם (Is 53:8, Dan 9:6.24.26), צֶדֶק (I53:11, Dan 9:7.14.18.24). We might consider also נָשָׂא and סָבַל (Is 53:4.12), as synonymous with כִּפֶּר (Dan 9:24). We also find in the messianic oracles of Isaiah the term בְּרִית (Is 42:6, 49:8. See the literary context: Is 42:1 etc, 49: 5 etc. and comp. Is 49:7 and 53:3) like in Dan 9:27, and joint to it, in Dan 9:27, we have רַבִּים, just as in Is 52:14-15, 53:11-12 and in some fundamental christological verses of NT (Mt 20:28, 26:28, Heb 9:28 et.al.).

וְאֵין ❑ ❑ וְהָעִיר וְהַקֹּדֶשׁ According to a different syntactic approach to the Hebrew text, by dividing the text and reading it without any consideration for the *athnach* under ❑ ❑.[226] This solution is found also in YLT and is argued for by C. G. Ozanne[227] who cites R.H. Charles commenting that "…M.T.[the Massoretic Text] is defective, it reads וְאֵין לוֹ. This is sometimes rendered 'and shall have nothing'. But this is the questionable rendition of an uncertain text." Then Ozanne comments,

> The expression as it stands is not absolutely impossible, since it occurs in Exod. xxii. 2 with the meaning 'and (if) he has nothing.' Nevertheless it is normal for these words to be followed by an indication of what the subject is lacking. Again, the singular suffix וְקִצּוֹ is problematic. If it refers to the city and the sanctuary as the context would suggest (so A. V., R. V. mg.), the plural would be expected. If, on the other hand, it refers to the prince that is to come (so R. V., R. S. V., and most moderns), we are introduced prematurely to an event which does not take place until the end of verse 27…[…] If the two words וְהָעִיר וְהַקֹּדֶשׁ are linked to the preceding clause, this may now be rendered as follows: 'And after 62 weeks an Anointed will be cut off, having neither the city nor the sanctuary.'

---

[224] Cf. Jr 34:18 and Gn 15 10, Ps 50:5 et.al.

[225] E.g. Gn 17:14, Ex 12:15, Lv 7:20-27 et.al.

[226] See also on chap. 9:24 for other cases of difficult placement of *athnach.*

[227] C. G. Ozanne, pp. 446-447.

A similar reading ("when the city is no longer his"), after deleting the *waw* prefixing the עִיר *city,* is supported by Hartman and DiLella,[228] and by Martin McNamara.[229] However, it is no need to delete a *waw.* The Hebrew syntax uses sometimes expressions of the type וְ.. וְ.. (either…or, both…and) like in Dan 1:3, 8:13. Ozanne says:

> The Anointed, it seems, is viewed as the natural possessor of the city and the sanctuary, and it is stated that he would die in possession of neither. Whether this is more applicable to the Messiah or to Onias III the reader may judge.[230]

Applying it to Messiah, to be consistent, we may recognise that, since Messiah was expected as legitimate Ruler of both the City and the Sanctuary, a King-Priest, even a divine figure (e.g. Ps 110, Is 9:6), it is understandable that by applying to Him death penalty, He was denied any messianic claims: *and shall not be for Him* (or, *shall not belong to Him,* or, *He shall not* have) *both the City and the Sanctuary.*

In order to compare the different readings of v. 26ab in some old translations (LXX, Theodotion and The Vulgate), we might align them as it follows.[231]

LXX καὶ οὐκ ἔσται and it will not be [anymore] = וְאֵינֶנּוּ

Θ καὶ κρίμα οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ
and condemnation is not in it (Him?) = וְדִין אֵין לוֹ

ʼA καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῷ = וְאֵין לוֹ
   and it will not be for Him

Σ καὶ οὐχ ὑπάρξει αὐτῷ = וְאֵין לוֹ
   and it will not belong to Him

VUL et non erit eius = וְאֵין לוֹ
   and [it?] will not be His (for Him)

The MT defective reading וְאֵין לוֹ could be defended on the OT use in Ex 22:2 and thus, probably, implying a participle similar to עוֹזֵר.[232] However, since this is unusual and because the reading proposed by Ozanne satisfies very well, 1) the necessity of a direct object for the verbal expression וְאֵין לוֹ, 2) a better syntax for the next clause, and 3) the messianic application, I am satisfied with Ozanne's reading, that Messiah "will be cut off, having neither the city nor the sanctuary."

יַשְׁחִית To be consistent with the preceding, the sentence יַשְׁחִית עַם נָגִיד הַבָּא וְקִצּוֹ בַשֶּׁטֶף may be translated *the people of the Coming Ruler will become corrupt, and his end will be in a flood of armies.* To my knowledge, nobody proposed yet such a solution, and this could be its main weakness. Ozanne proposed the following translation of this sentence: *The prince that is to come will destroy [the] people, and its* (i.e. the people's) *end will be with a flood.*[233] He cites in support Dan 8:24. If someone wants to take עַם as the direct object for יַשְׁחִית thus

---

[228] Hartman and DiLella, *The Book of Daniel.* Anchor Bible. Vol 23. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1978, p. 240.

[229] Martin McNamara "Daniel", in *The New Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture.* Ed. Reginald C. Fuller; London: Nelson, 1969, p. 669.

[230] Ozanne. *ibid.*

[231] Aquilas and Symmachus are quoted according to Origen's Hexapla. See Field, p. 926. The Hebrew terms in the scheme reflect the different texts or readings used by the old translations, as is also indicated in BHS (critical apparatus).

[232] Cf. Ps 22:12, 72:12, Dan 11:45, La 1:7, Ps 142:5, Is 63:5.

[233] Ozanne, p. 447.

having נָגִיד הַבָּא the subject of the sentence (i.e. *a [the?] coming Ruler shall destroy [the?] people…*), will find a lot of good examples[234] even with *people* as indefinite noun.[235]

However, נָגִיד הַבָּא is best understood as identical with מָשִׁיחַ נָגִיד and he cannot be the destroyer. Note the arrangement of these titles in the text, as Professor Shea has convincingly shown.[236]

vs. 25	נָגִיד	מָשִׁיחַ	A + B
	Ruler	*Messiah*	
vs. 26a	—	מָשִׁיחַ	A —
		Messiah	
vs. 26b	נָגִיד	—	— B
	Ruler		

The use of the root שׁחת with the meaning *to be (become) corrupt, to act perversely,* in the Hiph‘il form, as in Pi‘el and Niph‘al,[237] even with the subject עַם[238] is worthy of our consideration. It seems to me the best solution to take עַם נָגִיד הַבָּא as subject of the sentence. Thus עַם is properly defined by this construct chain, and consequently יַשְׁחִית is the only possible predicate, an intransitive verb. The resultant logic of the sentence is obvious: God's people, called "your (Daniel's) people" in v. 24, and "the people of the Coming Ruler (= Messiah)", that is "the people awaiting for their Messiah", or "the people whose legitimate Ruler is Messiah" had to becom corrupt, or to act perversely.

Preserving the classical reading of this clause, with the phrase וְהָעִיר וְהַקֹּדֶשׁ taken as the direct object of יַשְׁחִית[239] scholars like Gerhard Hasel[240] and Owusu-Antwi[241] understand that people as the people of Messiah, which, by their rebellious attitude toward God and Rome, became responsible for the befallen disaster upon the city and temple.[242] Owusu-Antwi even relates the participle הַבָּא with the Messianic verse of Ps 118:26. Anyway, it should be understood as in Ml 3:19 (הַיּוֹם הַבָּא) or as the eschatological idiom הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא of the late Hebrew.

The old translations, however, differ in some respects with the late Massoretic reading, possibly reflecting some efforts to shape the prophecy and adapt it to the Antiochus thesis (reading עִם *with [the coming Ruler]* instead of עַם *people,* or: וּבָא קִצּוֹ *and its end shall come,* for הַבָּא וְקִצּוֹ *…who is to come, and its end…*).

LXX reads, <καὶ βασιλεία ἐθνῶν> φθερεῖ τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὸ ἅγιον μετὰ τοῦ χριστοῦ καὶ ἥξει ἡ συντέλεια αὐτοῦ μετ' ὀργῆς *and a kingdom of Gentiles will destroy the City and the Sanctuary with the Annointed one. And will come his end in a downpoor of anger* קִצּוֹ וּבָא… [מָשִׁיחַ] עִמְסַנָּגִיד…., Θ καὶ τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὸ ἅγιον διαφθερεῖ σὺν τῷ ἡγουμένῳ τῷ ἐρχομένῳ καὶ ἐκκοπήσονται ἐν κατακλυσμῷ *and the City and the Sanctuary will he destroy with the Leader who is to come and they will be cutt off by flood* … עִמְסַנָּגִיד הַבָּא … וְקִצּוֹ, **VUL** et civitatem et sanctuarium dissipabit populus cum duce venturo et finis eius vastitas

---

[234] E. g. Dt 9:26, 2Ch 24:23, Is 14:20, **Dan 8:24-25,** Gn 18:24.31.32, 19:14, 2 K 8:19, 2Ch 21:7, Jr 4:7, **36:29.**

[235] E. g. Jb 12:2, Jb 34:20, Is 42:6, 43:8, Joel 2:16; *to corrupt*: Pr 11:9.

[236] See William Shea, "The Prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27", in *70 weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy,* F. B. Hollbrook editor, Biblical Research Institute, Washington DC, 1986, 93.

[237] See Gn 6:12, Dt 4:16, 31:29, Dan 10:8, Jg 2:19, Ps 14:1, 53:2, Ez 16:47, 23:11, ZP 3:7.

[238] See Ex 32:7.15, Dt 9:12, **2Ch 27:2,** Is 1:4.

[239] i.e. *and the people of the prince who is to come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary,* see NKJ, ARS, NAB et.al.

[240] Gerhard Hasel ("Interpretations of the Chronology of the Seventy Weeks."In *The Seventy Weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy,* ed. Frank B. Hollbrook, 25), William Shea (ibid. 92-94.

[241] Owusu-Antwi, 167-170.

[242] See 2S 20:5, 24:16, for instances where people is the subject of this predicate.

[both] City and Sanctuary will destroy a people with a leader to come and its end will be devastation.

Origen's Hexapla translates this sentence, *et urbem et sanctuarium perdet populus principis qui venturus est* ("and the people of the coming prince shall destroy the city and the sanctuary"), which agrees word by word with Aquilas (καὶ τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὸ ἅγιον διαφθερεῖ λαός ἡγουμένου ἐρχομένου).[243]

The solution that I have chosen for this verse cannot be dogmatic, but it has the adventage of satisfying more than one syntactic and logical requirements, and even allows the predicate יַשְׁחִית to be read as Niphᶜal יִשָּׁחֵת *shall be corrupted,* or: *shall be destroyed* (the latter meaning is attested by The Syriac). The two meanings are connected, overlapped or even confused in some instances (Pr 6:32, Jr 51:25 and 2K 23:13). Chosing the meaning *shall become corrupt, shall act perversely,* has the advantage of explaining both Messiah's putting to death and the unfortunate destiny of His people. If the Niphᶜal form is to be prefered, it may have been intended to be parallel with יִכָּרֵת in the previous sentence and, in the same time, to constitute in itself a wordplay on the theological concept that Israel's corruption equals its destruction.

וְקִצּוֹ בַשֶּׁטֶף The noun שֶׁטֶף is used elsewhere for all kind of overflowing: usually, of rivers, water or even blood, and figuratively as *military invasions*[244], or *anger* (Pr 27:4). The same image is used about the end of Nineveh in Na 1:8, which has also the term כָּלָה in common with Dan 9:26. Taken as it was intended, as a divine judgement, the use of this root here might be understood as a wordplay on שפט *to judge.*[245] The "end" foreseen in this verse is defined as "its end", a historical end (cf. Dan 11:45) not the eschaton.

The passage in Is 10:22-25 is worthy of examination in connection with Dan 9:24-27 et.al.,[246] because of its striking verbal and thematic similarities, as it follows:

For though **your people** עַמְּךָ (comp. Dan 9:24.26) Israel were like the sand of the sea, only a remnant of them will return. **Destruction is decreed** כִּלָּיוֹן חָרוּץ (Dan 9:25-27), **overflowing** with righteousness שׁוֹטֵף צְדָקָה (Dan 9:26). For Yahweh, God of hosts **will make a full end, as decreed** כָלָה וְנֶחֱרָצָה (Dan 9:27, Dan 11:36, cf. Is 28:22), in all the land / earth.[…] **For yet** כִּי־עוֹד (Dan 11:27.35) a very little while, and my **wrath will come to an end** וְכָלָה זַעַם (Dan 8:19, 11:36), and my anger will be directed to their destruction.

וְעַד קֵץ *to the End.* This time, it seems to be the final end.[247] Anyway, קֵץ is an absolute noun here.

In Jesus's Olivet prophecy, which is roughly a *midrash* on Daniel 9:24-27, the end of Jerusalem is practically concurrent with the end of this eon (cf. Mt 24:6.14, Lk 21:9). However, we should distinguish such conditional prophecies (concerning the time, as understood by Jesus and His apostles: Mt 24:14.34.36, 2Pt 3:4.12, Rev 14:15.18, 22:12.20 et.al.) from other prophecies foreseeing an end *after* the end of Jerusalem. The LXX translations reflect an absolute reading of קֵץ in the Hebrew text (followed by YLT, NAB, ASV, NAS, RSV, NRS, LUT, ELB, Menge, DRB, NIV et.al.), while Theodotion and Jerome took it as a construct with מִלְחָמָה a solution followed by KJV, NKJ, NEG, LSG, WEB et.al.

---

[243] See Field, 926-927.

[244] Is 8:8, 28:2.15.18, 30:28, Jr 8:6, 47:2, Dan 11:10.22.26.40.

[245] The inversion of root consonants is known even in synonym roots (נשׁף – נפשׁ; חלק– חקל et.al.).

[246] No wonder that this prophetic passage is quoted by Paul with reference to God's judgemnet with Israel (Rom 9:27-28). Another pauline passage related to God's judgment with Israel and to Daniel is 1Th 2:16 (cf. Dan 8:19.23, 9:24, 11:36).

[247] See Dan 11:35, 12:4.9, Hab 2:3, cf. 1Cor 1:8, 15:24, 1Pt 4:7).

LXX   καὶ ἕως καιροῦ συντελείας ἀπὸ πολέμου πολεμηθήσεται
       and till the time of the end they will face war after war

Θ   καὶ ἕως τέλους πολέμου συντετμημένου τάξει ἀφανισμοῖς
       and till the end, war had been cut (determined), in a succession of desolations.

VUL   et post finem belli statuta desolatio
       and after (to?) the end of war was determined desolation.

מִלְחָמָה נֶחֱרֶצֶת שֹׁמֵמוֹת (נֶחֱרֶצֶת is used as such in Is 10:23, 28:22, Dan 11:36, cf. 1K 20:40) The syntax of this clause is best satisfied if we consider the natural agreement in number of the subject noun מִלְחָמָה and the verb predicate נֶחֱרֶצֶת. Actually the subject may be seen as multiple, מִלְחָמָה and שֹׁמֵמוֹת.The term שֹׁמֵמוֹת (sing. שֹׁמֵמָה *desolation*) is applied to places devasted by war[248], and to women deserted, destitute, afflicted and isolated, or metaphorically to women-cities.[249] The term may also be understood as *horrifying, astonishing fact / thing*. Since the plural of participles may have sometimes an adjectival or even adverbial sense,[250] we might very well translate, *and to the end was determined a desolating war.*

Daniel 9:27

וְהִגְבִּיר בְּרִית – perfective Hiphᶜil הִגְבִּיר = prevail, be strong (Ps 12:4). Cf. LXX δυναστεύσει it (the covenant) will be master (to many), and κατισχῦσαι prevail, be dominant, be victorious, win, conquer, triumph over; Q, ᾽A, S, δυναμώσει he will strengthen, make strong, VUL confirmabit…pactum [he] will confirm / strengthen a / the covenant.

This is not the usual verb to express the making of a covenant. In Hebrew, a covenant is always "cut" כרת. See Is 34:18, Gn 15:10, Ps 50:5, Ezra 10:3 et.al. According to BDBG, other verbs used with בְּרִית covenant, are: maintain (הקים Lv 26:9), give (נתן Gn 17:2), set (שים 2S 23:5), order (צוה Ps 111:9), take (נשא Ps 50:16), enter (בא Jr 34:10), keep (שמר Dan 9:4, נצר Dt 33:9), hold (החזיק Is 56:4.6), remember (זכר Ps 111:5). The best way to understand this verb here is to let its basic meaning appear, as oldest translations do. It may be understood as a confirmation for an older covenant, or its prevailing over an opposite one, prove strong, show powerful. "The force of this verb *higbîr* excludes the notion that the covenant referred to in Daniel 9:27a is some arrangement imposed by a future antichrist".[251] And one can add on the same basis, that neither Antiochus could be the referent of this covenant to be strengthened. Concerning the use of בְּרִית in Dan 9:27, BDBG confirms the Messianic application:

> **k.** the prophetic covenant, a divine promise through a series of prophets to establish a new constitution, בְּרִית חֲדָשָׁה Jr 31:31, with new institutions and precepts Is 42:6, 49:8, 55:3, 59:21, 61:8, Jr 31:31.33, 32:40, 50:5, Ez 16:60.62, 20:37, 34:25, 37:26, Ho 2:20. In Is² the Messianic servant is ברית עם Is 42:6, 49:8, cf. מלאךְ הברית Ml 3:1.[252]

Goldingay also says, "the covenant….could refer to the covenant between God and Israel referred to in 9:4, 11:22.28. 30.32." Thus the "cutting off" of Messiah in vs. 26, and the prophecy about His cancelling all sacrifices system in the middle of the last "week", points to the powerful NT assertions that interpret Christ's unjust condemnation as a gracious expiatory sacrifice – a new covenant sacrifice that cancelled, by its absolute force, all symbolic sacrifices of the old covenant.

---

248 Is 49:8, 61:4, Ez 36:4.

249 2S 13:20 Tamar, Is 54:1 La 1:13, Jerusalem.

250 E.g. חֲמוּדוֹת precious in Dan 9:23, 10:11.19, and נִפְלָאוֹת extraordinarily in Dan 8:24.

251 Kline, Meredith G. "The Covenant of the Seventieth Week." In The Law and the Prophets: Old Testament Studies Prepared in Honor of Oswald Thompson Allis, ed. John H. Skillton. Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian Reformed Publishing Co., 1974. p. 465.

252 BDBG p. 137.

The verb וְהִגְבִּיר is in the 3rd pers. masc. sing. Since Messiah dominates the previous two verses / stanzas, being the logical subject, it is normal to understand the pronoun *He* as referring to Him. When the literary structure is analised, this intent of the prophecy becomes more obvious. As shown by Owusu-Antwi's (173-178) schemes of parallel and chiastic structure of these lines, the safest coclusion is that the author had the Great Messiah in his in mind:

25a A city restored, Messiah comes	from […] restore […] **Jerusalem** until **MESSIAH the Ruler**,
25b B time	*there will be* **7** weeks **plus 62 weeks** […]
26a B' time	and **after the 62 weeks**,
26b A' Messiah killed, city estranged	**MESSIAH** will be cut off , **City** and **Sanctuary** not for **HIM**
27a A a covenant confirmed	**HE** shall prove strong *His* **covenant** for many people,
27b B time	through **one week**,
27c B' time	and in the middle of **that week**
27d A' [a covenant] cancelled	**HE** will cause all *ritual* **sacrifice and offering** to cease. […]

This is strengthened by the fact that the direct object בְּרִית *covenant*, is used 7 times (9:4.27, 11:22.28.30.32) in *Daniel,* referring always to God's covenant. Therefore, He who causes this covenant to triumph must be One in close connection with God, that is Messiah.

לָרַבִּים Unfortunately, scholars who understand the subject of this sentence to be an enemy of the Jews (Antiochus or Antichrist) do not see the powerful Messianic import of the phrase בְּרִית לָרַבִּים *a covenant for many people,* and of other thematic words that Dan 9:24-27 shares with some prominent OT and NT christologic scriptures.[253] Thus the "covenant for many" from Dan 9:27 is the messianic covenant made first for Israel and then for all peoples. Christ's statement in Mk 14:24 is clearly an application of the Danielic prophecy.

שָׁבוּעַ אֶחָד The syntactic use of שָׁבוּעַ gives no support to the translation "[make a…covenant] **for** one week" (as if the covenant is made to last one week or is valid for one week only). It should be understood, "**through** one week / **during** one week / **in** a single week." It deals about the time of making the Covenant prevail / proove strong, not about a time for the covenant validity. Cf. Ex 29:35 שִׁבְעַת יָמִים תְּמַלֵּא יָדָם *through seven days you shall ordain them,* not "for seven days…". 1K 6:38 וַיִּבְנֵהוּ שֶׁבַע שָׁנִים *he was seven years in building it,* it took to him seven years to build it, Ex 29:37, Lv 8:33, 2Ch 7:8, Ez 43:26 et.al.

וַחֲצִי הַשָּׁבוּעַ is rendered by Θ ἐν τῷ ἡμίσει τῆς ἑβδομάδος *in the middle of the week.*(though ἡμίσυς means usually *half*, the used preposition suggests rather the meaning *middle* like in Jg 16:12). The noun חֲצִי has both meanings, *half* and *middle (midst, halfway, midpoint), even in Daniel* (Dan 9:27, 12:7). In most of occurences has the meaning *half.* However, according to BDBG (p. 345) it means *middle* in many places.[254] In poetic passages it might be used without preposition. Cf. Jb 34 20 where חֲצוֹת is a synonym, fem. pl. from the same root. The author obviously used חֲצִי because of its temporal common usage and because its implied idea of midpoint. This translation is attested in YLT, LXE, LUT, KJV, NKJ, WEB, NEG, DRB, NAB, ASV, NAS, NIV. Other terms meaning middle (תוֹךְ midst, קֶרֶב midst, inward part) have no temporal meaning, or they lack the necessary precision to stress the middle of the span.

יַשְׁבִּית The Hiphᶜil form of שָׁבַת has the meaning *to make cease, stop, put an end, let cease.* From this root comes the noun שַׁבָּת *sabbath,* which means (etymologically) *repose,*

---

253 Is 53:11.12, see also Is. 52:14.15, Is 55:1-5, see also 56:6-8, cf. 42:1.6, 49:5-8, 2:3, 61:1.8 etc, Gn 17:2.4, Acts 3:25, Mat 26:28, Mk 14:24, Mat 20:28, Heb 9:15.28.

254 e.g. Ex 12:29, Jg 16:3, Rt 3:8, 2S 10:4, 1Ch 19:4, Zc 14:4, Ps 102:25, Jr 17:11.

ceasing activity, stopping work. The action of stopping or silencing is stressed, without respect to the manner of stopping.

The following examples are speaking: Lv 2:13 let cease the salt of the covenant, Pr 18:18 put an end, cause to cease the strife, Dt 32:26 blot out, make cease the memory of someone, Rt 4:14 leave without next-of-kin redeemer, 2K 23:5 depose, remove idolatrous priests, Ps 8:3 still, silence the enemy through babes' "speech", Jr 36:29 cause to cease people and animals by killing; Lv 26:6, Dan 11:18 put an end to insolence, Is 30:11 cause to cease God from before…; Is 13:11, Ez 7:24 make cease the arrogance of the proud; Is 16:10, Jr 7:34, 48:33, Ez 26:13 cause to cease the joyful voices through war; Jr 48:35, Ez 30:13 make cease pagan rites by war, Ez 23:27.48 put an end to lewdness and whoring, Ez 30:10 put an end to people by war, Ho 1:4 put an end to the kingdom of Israel, Ho 2:13 put an end to degenerated feasts of Israel, Ez 34:10 put a stop to the false shepherds' activity, Is 21:2 make cease sighing, Ez 12:23 put an end to a proverb, Ez 16:41 stop her from playing the whore, Ne 4:5, Ex 5:5 cause someone cease the activity. Though the use of this verb involves sometimes a violent manner of acting, this meaning springs not from the verb itself, but from the context.

It is worthy of noting that when the book of Daniel deals with the wicked king and his removal of the daily / continual service, it uses הֵסִיר remove, put aside, put away (Dan 8:11), or הֵרִים take away, lift up, remove (Dan 11:31, 12:11). In similar places of the Bible, where the Jewish ceremonies are said to be stopped, the form הֵסִיר like in Daniel is used: 2K 18:22, 2Ch 30:14, 32:12, Is 36:7.

For the use of יַשְׁבִּית in Dan 9:27 it is interesting to note a comparable situation in Ez 34:25. Dan 9:26b.27ab (Messiah .. cut off …confirm …covenant for many. …He will make cease the sacrifices and offerings…), cf. Ez 34:25ab (I will "cut" …a covenant …I will make cease wild beasts from the land).

Even though it is not the same situation, both references deal with the Messianic / new covenant, which has the force of causing to cease certain things. Those things that are caused to cease, deserve to disappear in both cases.

זֶבַח וּמִנְחָה lit. *sacrifice and offering,* became a technical phrase in the Hebrew culture. Taken separately, זֶבַח means *animal slaughter, sacrifice,* and מִנְחָה means *gift, tribute, offering, present, oblation,* and it could refer either to the grain offering added to the daily burnt sacrifice, or to any gift to God or to other people, including meat offerings.

The latter term is used also in the expressions like מִנְחַת־עֶרֶב (evening [grain] offering Dan 9:21, 2K 16:15, Ezra 9:4-5, Ps 141:2), מִנְחַת־הַבֹּקֶר (morning [grain] offering Ex 29:41, Nu 28:8), or even מִנְחַת־הַתָּמִיד (continual / daily [grain] offering Ne 10:34, Lv 6:13, Nu 4:16). The two terms are used in the same context in Lv 7:37, Jr 17:26, 33:18, among other types of ritual offerings. When the phrase is used alone, it is inclusive for all sanctuary sacrifices and oferings (1S 2:29, 3:14, Is 19:21, Am 5:25. In LXX: 1 Esdra 5:51, Od 7:38, Dan' 3:38, 4:37. In NT: Eph 5:2.).

It is especially interesting to note Ps 40:7 (quoted also in Heb 10:5.8), a Messianic-christological verse showing that the principle of the acceptable worship with God consists in giving self (body and soul) as a living sacrifice, not just "sacrifice and offering" (Cf. Eph 5:2, Rom 12:1). Prophets were conscious about God's requirements when said, For genuine love I desire, not sacrifice, and knowledge of God rather than burnt offerings (Ho 6:6-7, quoted also in Mt 9:13, 12:7). Even within the old covenant, "sacrifices and offerings" were received only as expression of knowing God as gracious (Is 19:21).

This idiom or similar expressions are often used about a degenerated worship through ritual offerings as opposed to the basic requirements of God.[255] In Ho 6:6-7 the sacrificial worship is contrasted with God's covenant as in Dan 9:27. The concept of the didactic and

---

255 Am 5:21-25, Is 1:10-15, Mi 6:6-8 et.al.

temporary use of the ceremonial system of the Sanctuary, and its insuffience to justify the sinner, as taught in the NT (Heb 8 – 10, Rom 3:21-30) is not a sectarian or Christian innovation, but it is an underlying principle of the OT scriptures. No wonder that the NT writers used to quot the OT to prove their Gospel message. Jeremiah who, according to traditions hid the ark of the covenant in a safe and unknown place (2Mac 2:4-7), prophesied that one day even the ark will not be necessary longer in the time of the great and universal restoration,[256] certainly because God's "ten commandaments" of the covenant had to be engraved on human hearts, not on stone (Jr 31:31-34).

The mention of a covenant, of a half-week, and of putting an end to sacrifices and oferings in Dan 9:27 proved so tempting for a lot of exegetes to see in these the historical actions of Antiochus or the prophectic actions of Antichrist. However, as it was shown, both the terminology and the message are different. The slight similarities that are seen, may be due to an intention of contrasting Christ with Antichrist.

וְעַל כְּנַף שִׁקּוּצִים מְשֹׁמֵם [כָּנוֹ] שִׁקּוּצִ־י־ם־מְשֹׁמֵם As it stands in MT, the phrase וְעַל כְּנַף שִׁקּוּצִים מְשֹׁמֵם has some textual and syntactical difficulties. So it is necessary to analise it through a synoptic view of some old translations. The next table compares the old translations of this phrase:

MT	וְעַל כְּנַף שִׁקּוּצִים מְשֹׁמֵם	ועל כנף שקוצים משמם
	*and on (by) the wing of **abominations**, a **desolation/ desolator**?* (see NKJ, NAB, NAS, RSVet.al.)	
LXX	καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερὸν βδέλυγμα τῶν ἐρημώσεων ἔσται ...	ועל קדש שקוץ המשמם
	καὶ (ἕως) πτηρυγίου ἀπο ἀφανίσμου. (in Lucian's recension)	ועד כנף...........מְשֹׁמֵם
	*and on the Sanctuary, will stand an **abomination of the desolations**... and until wing... from **desolation***	
Θ	καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ἱερὸν βδέλυγμα τῶν ἐρημώσεων	ועל קדש שקוץ המשמם
	*ανδ ον της Σανχτυαρψ αν **αβομινατιον οφ της δεσολατιονσ***	
'A, Σ	καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν βδελυγμάτων ἐρημωθήσεται	ועל־כנף־שקוצים משמם
	*and on the top of the **abominations** he **will be desolated***	
LHex	et super fastigio (templi) erunt **abominationes vastatoris**	ועל־כנף שקוצי־ משמם
	var. et super alam (militum) **abominationum** erit **vastator**	ועל־כנף־שקוצים משמם
	and on the (temple's) pinnacle will be *the **abominations of the desolator*** *var. and on the flank (of the army)* **of the abominations** shall be **a desolator**	
VUL	et in templo erit **abominatio desolationis**	ועל קדש שקוץ המשמם
	and in (the) Temple shall be (the) abomination of (the) desolations	

---

256 In those days, says Yahweh, they shall no longer say, 'The ark of the covenant of Yahweh.' It shall not come to mind, or be remembered, or missed; nor shall another one be made (Jr 3:16.14-18).

It is easy to observe that the Masoretic text of this verse, as it stands, is not reflected in any ancient translation. Even if it seems to be some uncertainty in the reading or translation of וְעַל כְּנַף, the reading of "שקוציממשמם" as if were "שִׁקּוּץ הַמְשֹׁמֵם" is in unanimity attested. However, it is possible to understand שִׁקּוּצִים מְשֹׁמֵם as a construct + genitival idiom, if we read it שִׁקּוּצֵי־ם־מְשֹׁמֵם with *enclitic Mem.*[257] This is an archaic particle that is found also in the old cognate languages. Waltke and O'Connor say – citing Horace Hummel, D. N. Freedman, M. Dahood, et.al., – that "it has sometimes an emphatic force, while at other times it serves as a morpheme for indetermination. …Most common are its uses in the middle of the construct chain."[258]

I cannot find a better solution, taking into consideration both the Masoretic consonant characters and the considerable majority of the old translations. The following table adds further information on the topic, comparing this verse with other parallel verses in *Daniel* or in other books (Apocrypha and NT):[259]

The phrase עַל־כְּנַף is reflected in LXX, Θ, and VUL as עַל־קֹדֶשׁ, except Lucian's recension of LXX (see BHS and Rahlf's LXX, critical apparatus of Dan 9:27), which reflects MT. In Hexapla (927), the Latin translation reads, *et super fastigio (templi)*, "and **on the pinnacle** (of the temple)" / *et super alam* (militum) "and **on the wing (flank** of the army)". The other comparable sources show also some uncertainty in the rendition of this phrase: "on the altar", "on the temple", "on (the) holy place", "where it ought not stand", as it may be seen in the previous table. It is possible that all these translations developped from the Masoretic reading עַל־כְּנַף *on the wing of…,* because this notion is associated with the Temple (Sanctuary, קֹדֶשׁ – which may be understood also as any holy place, that is "where (an abomination) ought not stand". It is less probable to have been there older manuscripts with קֹדֶשׁ instead of כְּנַף, because קֹדֶשׁ can be explained as an interpretation of כְּנַף and as an influence of Dan 8:13 and 11:31. Moreover, the more difficult reading כְּנַף should be taken as earlier than the reading קֹדֶשׁ. Since כְּנַף means *wing, extremity, edge, pinnacle, outermost edge*, Owusu-Antwi pleads in behalf of its genuineness, and translate the whole phrase וְעַל כְּנַף שִׁקּוּצִים מְשֹׁמֵם , *with the end of abominations will be a place of desolations,* indicating an extremity (limit, summit) of the abomination.[260] This translation is worthy of further examination, since '' A and Σ rendered, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν βδελυγμάτων ἐρημωθήσεται ("and on the top of the abominations he will be desolated"). However, such reading is quite unusual and not compatible to be connected with the construct + genitive understanding of the phrase שִׁקּוּצֵי־ם־מְשֹׁמֵם attested by all ancient translations, as it was shown above.

The phrase itself is often found in the plural: עַל־כַּנְפֵי [נְשָׁרִים] *on [eagles'] wings* (Ex 19:4 i.e. indicating protection and training with God: Dt 32:11), עַל־כַּנְפֵי [בִּגְדֵיהֶם] *on the "wings" (corners) [of their garments]* (Nu 15:38 make fringes), עַל־כַּנְפֵי־[רוּחַ] *on the wings [of the wind]* (God flying, riding a cherub, 2 Sam 22:11, Ps 18:1, 104:3), עַל־כַּנְפוֹת [הָאָרֶץ] *to the extremities [of the earth]* (Jb 37:3 God's lightning). It may be admited that this single occurrence in Dan 9:27 would have the same meaning, despite its use of the singular. In this case, the whole expression would be read עַל־כְּנַף־שִׁקּוּצֵי־ם־מְשֹׁמֵם *and on the wings of the abominations of the desolation,* – which is not bad (especially when compared with Lv 11:13: *the eagle* is the first "abomination" mentioned among unclean fowl, and also it is the Torahic

---

[257] Cf. Gn 14:6, Dt 33:11, Ps 59:6, 89:51 et.al

[258] Bruce K. Waltke & M. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax,* Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake, Indiana, 1990: pp. 24. 158-160.

[259] See Dan 8:12.13, 11:31, 12:11, 1 Mac 1:54, (vs. 57 in VUL), Mt 24:15, Mk 13:14, Lk 21:20.

[260] See Owusu-Antwi, p. 327-330. In favour of this meaning he cites Sirach 38:11 ("Give a meal-offering with a memorial and offer a fat sacrifice to the utmost of thy means") in R. H. Charles, *The Apochrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament,* 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), 450.

metaphore of the prophesied doom: the Babylonian, then the Roman, i.e. *new Babylonian invasions*: Dt 28:49-50 comp. גּוֹי עַז פָּנִים in Dan 8:23). So it could be seen as a prophecy of the Jerusalem's final doom under the Roman power, whose actual *signum* – idol banner – was the *eagle – Jove's bird*). However, if we read the phrase as a four words construct, we have no predicate, nor it is implied in the context.

Probably it should be found a better understanding for וְעַל־כְּנַף for example, among the proposed emendations. The critical apparatus of BHS suggests the reading בַּעַל הַכָּנָף the winged being (cf. Pr 1:17 Q 10:20 – an allusion to the Syrian god בעל שמים? Lord of heaven, by wordplay called שִׁקּוּץ שֹׁמֵם) instead of וְעַל־כְּנַף. The solution is ingenous indeed, but it cannot be harmonised with our conclusions about the actual construct שִׁקּוּצֵי־ם־מְשֹׁמֵם mentioned above, and it lacks the necessary predicate. BHS and BDBG (489) cite A. Kuenen for a more credible suggestion of emendation, reading וְעַל־כַּנּוֹ *and in its / his stead (position, station, place)*, which is more natural and well attested in Daniel (Dan 11:20.21.38, Gn 40:13, 41:13). This reading is followed by Bevan, Montgomery, Hartman & Di Lella and NRS (and in their place).[261] This emendation was translated, *in their place*, as a plural, probably to agree with the double object זֶבַח וּמִנְחָה of the previous clause.

If this emendation is correct, (i.e. represents the original form, intended by the author), some new questions must be answered. For instance, What is the referent of the pronominal suffix of כַּנּוֹ ? Is it the double object of the previous clause, זֶבַח וּמִנְחָה *sacrifice and offering* ? Or is it Messiah – the great subject of this whole prophecy? The expression עַל־כַּנּוֹ, specific to Daniel, always refers to a person, indicating a substitution (legal or illegal) in the same office, place, stand, position, stead. This observation points rather to Messiah, the main subject of the whole oracle, and predicts an illegal substitution of Messiah, the Covenant Leader, by "the abomination of the desolation". One could object against, because this substitution appears to be in other words the same as in Dan 8:12-13, 11:31, 12:11, i.e. the "continual (daily) sacrifice" replaced by the "rebellion / abomination of the desolation". This is an advantage point for those who see an adversary of Israel (Antiochus, Antichrist, et.al.) as subject of this verse. However, as it was shown in the previous notes, Messiah is certainly the subject of all this prophecy, and even though Messiah and Antiochus-Antichrist are found doing some comparable things, this could be only to emphasise the contrast between Christ and Antichrist.

Following are the possible meanings of the phrase וְעַל כְּנַף [כנו] שִׁקּוּצ(י)־ם־מְשֹׁמֵם:

- and on the wing of abominating [foul idols], a desolator [will be, *or* come]
- and by the wing of abominations [he] is making desolate (YLT)
- and on the [Temple's] wing [will be, *or* stand] the abomination of the desolation
- and in His stead [will be, *or* stand] the abomination of the desolation
- and in their place [will be, *or* stand] the abomination of the desolation

It is a hard trial to definitely choose among these options. I favour nr. 3, without being dogmatic. The last two options seem to be related by the fact that putting Messiah to death meant putting and end to all sacrificial system because of Messiah's covenantal sacrifice. The abomination that had to stand in His (or their) place is an idolatrous worship of the vilest kind, worshipping a man (the "man of sin") as God: Dan 8:23-25, 11:36-39 (cf. 2Th 2:3-4, Rev 17:5-6).

Apart from the question whether the phrase שִׁקּוּצֵי־ם־מְשֹׁמֵם represents two unrelated absolute nouns or a genitival construction with *mem* enclitic, there is another difficulty about the precise meaning of the noun מְשֹׁמֵם (and its synonym שֹׁמֵם see Dan 8:13, 9:27d, 11:31,

---

[261] A. A. Bevan (A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel. Cambridge: The University Press, 1892: 160), Montgomery (The Book of Daniel 386), Hartman & Di Lella (240).

12:11) The old translations render it invariably as *desolation* in all its occurences (LXX, Θ or NT). Owusu-Antwi (329) stresses this stative meaning of the term everywhere, citing Bevan (161) and Farris,[262] pointing also to the Syriac (חבלא – *desolation*) and to the most probable significance of the term in Dan 8:13, 9:18.26.27a. Thus an important case might be made in favour of this stative meaning (*desolation or desolated place*). However, some of the best translations rendered this noun as if it be active (*desolating, that desolates, makes desolate, desolator*:[263] In Origen's Hexapla,[264] this participle is rendered fientive-active, according to a Latin translation (*vastator, vastatoris* — desolator, desolator's). And there are two ways at least to contend for an active meaning: The regular active forms of this root are scarcely found in the OT, only in Hiph͞il.[265] But even in Hiph͞il, the participle– מַשְׁמִים –shows itself stative.[266] This may indicate a need to express an active meaning through common stative stems. Since the same verbal stem can be both fientive and stative in some cases, e.g. מלא, חכם, הבין[267] it is not impossible that שׁוֹמֵם / מְשׁוֹמֵם have a fientive, active meaning in this construction. Anyway, in BDBG (1031), in all cases where the phrase שִׁקּוּץ־מ־מְשׁוֹמֵם and the parallel forms are found, this participle is seen as transitive, meaning *appalling, causing horror,* that is an adjectival use of the participle.

If this Qal / Po͞lel participle is taken as a substantive, as LXX and other old translations did (= *desolation*), the practical meaning of the phrase would reveal a quasi active sense, in the construct relationship. Thus *the abomination of the desolation* means really, *the desolating abomination* (YLT Dan 11:31), *the appalling abomination, the astonishing foulness* et.al.

שִׁקּוּץ.– *filth, dirt, dung, abomination, detestable thing,* Na 3:6, like the variant שֶׁקֶץ.[268] The term appears often in parallel with תּוֹעֵבָה *disgusting thing (fact), abomination*[269] and גִּלּוּלִים *"faeces", foul idols,*[270] possibly derived from גָּלָל *excrements, dung.*[271] While שֶׁקֶץ is used of various pagan facts or things (physical, ritual and moral), שִׁקּוּץ is reserved for deities represented by their images (idols).[272] The phrase שִׁקּוּץ־מ־מְשׁוֹמֵם points to an idol whose presence indicates desolation, devastation, horror.

עַד־כָּלָה פָּזַעַם כִּי נֶחֱרָצָה נֶעֱשָׂתָה See also Dan 11:36d, where the phrase כָּלָה וְנֶחֱרָצָה (*till [God's] wrath shall have been completely manifested, for what is determined will certainly happen*) is apparently built from the same eschatological bricks as Is 10:22-23, 28:21-22 (כִּי־כָלָה וְנֶחֱרָצָה [...] עַל־כָּל־הָאָרֶץ), about God's "strange work" of punishment against His enemies among His people, as well as against the adverse nations.

* שָׁמֵם In Dan 9:27, this consummation is applied, seemingly, to the desolated Israel: וְעַד־כָּלָה וְנֶחֱרָצָה תִּתַּךְ עַל־שֹׁמֵם *until complete destruction, a determined punishment will be poured out on the desolated one.* Usually, the term שָׁמֵם means *desolated, desolated place* or *desolation.*[273] The uncertainty of the translation of this strange participle is attested also in the

---

[262] Michael Herbert Farris. "The Formative Interpretations of the Seventy Weeks of Daniel." Ph. D. dissertation, University of Toronto, Canada, 1990: 360-361.

[263] See NRS, RSV, ASV, KJV, NAB, ELB, YLT, WEB, LSG, DRB. NEG.

[264] Field, p. 927.

[265] See BDBG 1031.

[266] See Ez 3:15, cf. Jr 49:20 comp. Ez 32:10 et.al.

[267] See Waltke & O'Connor, p. 365-366.

[268] Lv 11:10-42 et.al.

[269] Dt 7:26, Jr 16:18 et.al.

[270] e.g. Dt 29:16, 2 K 21:11, 23:24, Jr 50:2, Ez 37:23, Ez 30:13.

[271] See Ez 4:12.15, 8:10, 14:6, 1K 14:10 and BDBG, p. 165.

[272] See Dt 29:16, 2 K 23:13, Jr 7:30, 32:34, 51:25-26, Ez 20:8, 33:28-29; 7:20, 11:21, 37:23.

[273] e.g. 2 Sam 13:20, La 1:13, 3:11, Is 49:8, 61:4, Dan 8:26, in Dan 9:17.

Latin variants in Hexapla (927), *super vastatorem, s. vastatum* (on the *desolator / desolate one*).

It is possible that the term שֹׁמֵם have in *Daniel*, a fientive-active meaning (*desolating* or *desolator*.[274] It is quite difficult to decide which is the logical object of the divine punishment here.[275] While the OT evidence outside the book of Daniel is unanimously for the meaning *desolated,* and the oldest translations of this last word of the prophecy[276] render it *desolation,* it is more acceptable to understand שֹׁמֵם here as *desolator*,[277] at least because such idea that "the desolation / destruction will be poured out ...upon the destroyed /desolated" does not make mush sense. The *desolate[d]* is a result of *desolation*, or an exponent of it. To pour out desolation upon a desolate one, or upon desolation, is too much. Since all Danielic prophecies end with a final judgment on God's (and Israel's) enemies, one might expect the prediction reach the same finals in this verse too. If this Qal / Po‘lel participle is taken as a substantive (= *desolation*), as LXX and other old translations actually did, the practical meaning of the phrase would reveal a quasi active sense, in the construct relationship, because of the adjectival use of this second term. Thus *the abomination of the desolation* means really, *the desolating abomination*,[278] *the appalling abomination, the astonishing foulness* et.al.

The Hebrew of Daniel 10-12

Daniel 10:1

Dan 10:1 דָּבָר נִגְלָה לְדָנִיֵּאל בִּשְׁנַת שָׁלוֹשׁ לְכוֹרֶשׁ מֶלֶךְ פָּרַס See on Dan 1:1. 1S 3:7.21, Am 3:7 (cf. Aram Dan 2:47 וְגָלֵה רָזִין). Here דָּבָר *word, matter* is synonym to *prophecy, secret revelation, divine message* (See on Dan 9:23). אֲשֶׁר־נִקְרָא שְׁמוֹ – the most usual phrase for naming persons or things (Dan 9:18, Gn 2:19, 5:29, Dt 25:10, Q 6:10, Am 9:12, Jr 7:10 et al.).

The use of his Babylonian name בֵּלְטְשַׁאצַּר relates this account to the Aramaic part of the book (Dan 2:26, 4:5.6.15.16, 5:12) and it is difficult to understand why a late writer would have insisted on the Babylonian name of his Jewish hero. The Babzlonian name of the hero could not be invented later. And if such a need appeared, why choose a name practically identical to that of the most impious and doomed king of Babylon? Always spelled distinctly from Belshazzar in Hebrew: בֵּלְטְשַׁאצַּר distinct from בֵּלְשַׁאצַּר / בֵּלְאשַׁצַּר) *Belteshazzar* is proprably from *Bel-balatshu—utsur* ("May Bel protect his life"), while Belshazzar, is from *Bel-shar-utsur* ("May Bel protect the king"). [279] This important distinction reflects not only the author's care to avoid any confusion, but the name, as it stands, is a Hebrew-Aramaic transliteration of a genuine Babylonian name. I cannot see the practical purpose of a late writer to use such a "device".

וֶאֱמֶת הַדָּבָר *the matter is true* 2Ch 9:5, Dt 13:15, 17:4, 22:20, 1K 10:6. וְצָבָא גָדוֹל Both terms are from the most usual in the OT, but this phrase belongs exclusively to *Daniel*. While צָבָא means usually *host, army* (Dan 8:10-13, Jg 8:4, 9:29, Jos 5:14 et al. hundreds of occurences)*, and sometimes *regular service (at the Sanctuary*–see Dan 8:12) none of these meanings fit the context in this verse. To speak about a *great army,* it is used צָבָא רָב (Ps 68:12). The best meaning to fit the context here is *war, conflict.* According to following translations: YLT *and the **warfare {is} great**;* NRS *and it concerned **a great conflict**;* RSV *and it was a **great conflict**;* NAB *and one of **great conflict**;* NAS *and one of **great conflict**;* ASV

---

[274] Comp. Dan 11:40 and Is 33:1).

[275] See also on Dan 8:13, for שׁמם.

[276] e.g. LXX, Θ, VUL.

[277] In agreement with NAB, NAS, RSV, NRS, ELB, LSG, NEG, et.al.

[278] Cf. YLT to Dan 11:31.

[279] Cf. SDA Bible Dictionary, entry **Beltshazzar,** SDA Bible Commentary 4:759.

even a great warfare; NIV *and it concerned a **great war***.   This meaning is attested in Jos 22:12.33, Nu 31:14, 1Ch 7:40 et al. Indeed, the whole prophetic message that follows – the word of Gabriel – contains information about celestial שָׂרִים *commanders* who lead different nations and world empires (v.13.20.21, cf. 12:11) and a seemingly unended war between North and South, Jews and Nations, Heaven and Earth (11:1 – 12:2).

The only problem of this phrase, is its elliptic construction, linked to the implied verb (*to be*) of the preceding phrase (וֶאֱמֶת * הַדָּבָר), coordinated by an interclausal disjunctive *waw*[280] preceding a noun. The role of this *waw* in this case is to indicate that the true message received by Daniel *is about*[281] or *contains* a great warfare. It is possible even to understand this disjunctive *waw* as *since,* or *because* (cf. Gn 24:56, Ex 23:9), which is suggested by Jeremiah's prophetic criterion (Jr 28:8-9).

וּבִין אֶת־הַדָּבָר In the books claiming exilic and postexilic date, when it is transitive and bearing the meaning *to understand (something),* the verb בין is used with the preposition בְּ... (בִּין בְּ...) Ezra 8:15, Ne 8:8, 13:7, 2Cr 26:5, 34:12, Dan 1:17, 9:1, 10:11). But in most cases, in books claming early, preexilic date, this verb is used, when transitive, with a direct object in accusative (with the particle אֵת or without it: Jb 6:30, 36:29, 38:20, 42:3, Ps 19:13, 92:7, Pr 2:5.9, 19:25, 20:24, 21:29, 23:1, 29:7). The only occurences of this kind in postexilic books are in Dan 8:16, 10:1, which suggests an early date for the Hebrew of *Daniel*. This is the only book containing both forms of this transitive verb.

וּבִינָה לוֹ בַּמַּרְאֶה and he has got insight perception in the vision / revelation – instead of וַיָּבֶן בַּמַּרְאֶה and he understood (perceived) the revelation.[282]

Daniel 10:2

בַּיָּמִים הָהֵם One of the most common Hebrew phrases: Gn 6:4, Est 1:2.[283]

הָיִיתִי מִתְאַבֵּל Cf. Dan 8:5, Ne 1:11. On this temporal form see on Dan 8:5.

שְׁלֹשָׁה שָׁבֻעִים יָמִים Unlike the common use in the OT, Daniel has.the noun שָׁבוּעַ *week* in the masc. plural form. The classic plural שָׁבֻעוֹת, though it has a feminine plural ending, it is nevertheless, a masculine noun.(Dt 16:9). יָמִים is commonly added to emphasise the exact length of the period. See comments on the term שָׁבוּעַ in Dan 9:24.

Daniel 10:3

לֶחֶם חֲמֻדוֹת Phrase peculiar to Daniel. Yet both terms are from the oldest. While חֲמוּדוֹת is used elswhere as a noun (Dan 11:38.43, Hg 2:7), and as an adjective derived from a Qal participle passive (Gn 27:15, 2Ch 20:25, Ezra 8:27), in Daniel it is used two times adjectivally, as an attributive noun in plural, in construct syntagma (Dan 10:11.19, 11:43 חֲמֻדוֹת אִישׁ *precious man,* Dan 10:3 לֶחֶם חֲמֻדוֹת *precious bread*). וּבָשָׂר וָיַיִן – sometimes are associated to indicate intemperance: Pr 23:20, Q 2:3?, Is 22:13 לֹא־בָא אֶל־פִּי Comp. Jos 10:18, Jg 7:6, 1S 14:26.27, Jb 40:23, Pr 19:24. וְסוּךְ לֹא־סָכְתִּי Dt 28:40, 2S 14:2, Rt 3:3, Mi 6:15. עַד־מְלֹאת Lv 8:33, 12:4, 25:30, Nu 6:5.

Daniel 10:4

וּבְיוֹם .... לַחֹדֶשׁ הָ. .... The exact syntactic pattern of the phrase may be found in postexilic books only (2Ch 7:10, 29:17, Ne 9:1), deriving from the oldest Hebrew writings (Ex

---

[280] See Waltke and O'Connor, p. 650-652.

[281] Cf. Ex 24:12, Gn 24:15 et al.

[282] See comments on Dan 9:23.

[283] See also Ex 2:11.23, Dt 17:9, 19:17, 26:3, Jos 20:6, Jg 17:6, 18:1, 19:1, 20:27.28, 21:25, 1S 3:1, 28:1, 2S 16:23, 1K 3:2, 2K 10:32,15:37, 18:4, 20:1, 2Ch 32:24, Ne 6:17,13:15, 13:23, Est 2:21, Isa. 38:1, Jr. 3:16.18, 5:18, 31:29:33.15.16, 50:4.20, 38:17, Joel 3:2, 4:1, Zc 8:6.10.23.

40:2, Lv 23:39). וַאֲנִי הָיִיתִי Ps 109:25, Dan 8:2.5, 10:24.9, Ne 1:1.11, Jg 11:35, 2S 7:24, 14:27, 1Ch 17:22, Ps 10:14, 90:1, Gn 4:20, 39:22, Jos 17:1, 1S 6:9, Ez 22:17, 1Ch 11:13, 2Ch 22:11. עַל יַד הַנָּהָר הַגָּדוֹל Ex 2:5, Nu 13:29, Jos 15:46, Jr 46:6, Gn 15:18, Dt 1:7, Jos 1:4. הוּא חִדָּקֶל Gn 2:4.

Daniel 10:5

וָאֶשָּׂא אֶת־עֵינַי וָאֵרֶא וְהִנֵּה Zc 2:1, 5.9, Gn 13:10, 43:29, Nu 24:2; Gn 31:10, Dt 9:16, Ez 44:4, Zc 5:9 et al. לָבוּשׁ בַּדִּים Ez 9:2.3.11, 10:2.6.7, Dan 12:6.7, Lv 6:3, 16:4.23.32. Specific priestly linen garments, which the high priest put on at Yom Kippur. וּמָתְנָיו חֲגֻרִים Ex 12:11, 2S 20:8, 2K 9:1, Pr 31:17, Ez 23:15; Gn 3:7, 37:34.

כֶּתֶם אוּפָז (LXX φῶς, *light* Θ χρυσίῳ Ωφαζ, *gold of Ophaz,*VUL auro obrizo, *refined gold*) – phrase built from old Hebrew terms: **1.** כֶּתֶם, *pure gold,* in Jb 31:24, Pr 25:12 (כֶּתֶם), Jb 28:16, Ps 45:10 (כֶּתֶם אוֹפִיר) SS 5:11 (כֶּתֶם פָּז), Jb 28:19 (כֶּתֶם טָהוֹר), La 4:1 (כֶּתֶם הַטּוֹב), Is 13:12 (כֶּתֶם אוֹפִיר = פָּז). **2.** אוּפָז *Uphaz,* in Jr 10:9 (וְזָהָב מֵאוּפָז) כֶּסֶף מְתֻרְשִׁישׁ..., LXX χρυσίον Μωφαζ, VUL aurum de Ofaz; **Tg.** דַּהֲבָא מֵאוֹפִיר). Despite its ressemblance to פָּז *chrysolite (olivine)*[284] / *refined, pure gold*[285], and to אוֹפִיר *Ophir,* אוּפָז Uphaz seems to be a place (like Ophir, also unknown)[286] as is suggested by Jr 10:9. On the other hand, terms like פָּז *fine gold? / chrysolite?* (Jb 28:17, Ps 19:11, 21:4, 119:127, Pr 8:19, SS 5:11.15, Is 13:12, La 4:2), זָהָב מוּפָז / מֵאוּפָז *refined? gold,* (1K 10:18, LXX χρυσίῳ δοκίμῳ *tested gold,* VUL auro fulvo nimis, *most dazzling gold*), suggests the existence of an old root פזז (be dazzling ↔ nimble), and it is possible to take מֵאוּפָז and אוּפָז[287] as a mistaken spelling for מוּפָז. In this case, אוּפָז כֶּתֶםof Daniel should be read כֶּתֶם פָּז *fine gold* ? or כֶּתֶם מוּפָז *refined (dazzling?) gold.* In any case, this phrase is quite atypical for the late Hebrew. כֶּתֶם is considered a loan-woard in Hebrew and in Egyptian (*kaθáma*), according to BDBG (508), it is possible that its name was imported together with the product itself, from Ophir / Uphaz. Despite the assertion of BDBG, that it is a Late Hebrew word, its occurence in old, poetical passages indicates the contrary.

Daniel 10:6

וּגְוִיָּתוֹ *and His body* – Gn 47:18, Jg 14:8, 1S 31:10, Na 3:3, Ez 1:11, Ne 9:37 et al.

כְּתַרְשִׁישׁ θαρσις[288] chrysolite? yellow jasper? topaz? See Ex 28:20 (χρυσόλιτος beryl? chrysolite?), SS 5:14 (θαρσις jewels?, hyacinth?), Ez 1:26 (θαρσις beryl?), Ez 10:9 (ruby?

---

[284] See Holladay, p. 290.

[285] See BDBG, p. 808.

[286] According to James Newell, in *Holman Bible Dictionary for Windows* (1.0c), Parsons Technology, 1994, Ophir is mentioned outside the Bible, on a piece of broken pottery found at tell el-Qasileh, north of Tel Aviv on the plain of Sharon. This inscription reads, GOLD OF OPHIR FOR BETH HORON, 30 SHEKELS. The geographical location of Ophir still awaits to be discovered. Scholars placed it in India The available evidence with regard to trade practices indicates that Egyptian, Phoenician, and Greek fleets obtained eastern goods indirectly through ports in South Arabia and East Africa. While the Arabian location is not proved but through the Arabic relatives of the patriarch called bz this name (Gn 10:29), one location in Africa has been suggested, in the vicinity of Somaliland. The distance of this location from Palestine and the products that are characteristic of Africa, mentioned in Biblical texts (1 Kings 9:28; 10:11,22) seem to support this hypothesis. For the name Uphaz (Awpaz), I would suggest also an old African place of gold (Obuasi), known from books of history about the old African civilizations. And it is interesting that the Targum mentions Africa instead of Tarshish in Jr 10:9.

[287] A written form like כֶּתֶם מוּפָז could become, by scribal error, כֶּתֶם אוּפָז, as *Mem* may not be heard distinctlz in this position.

[288] The LXX "translation" of this term is a good indication of its earlness. In their times, those translators did not understand it anymore.

gleaming beryl? chrysolite?), Ez 28:13 (ruby? chrysolite? beryl?). The name of this uncertain gem may have been derived from the ethnonym-toponym Tarshish.[289]

בָּרָק Ez 1:13, Dt 32:41, (Jos 19:45 and Jg 4 – 5 as old name) 2S 22:15, Jb 20:25, Ps 144:6, Na 3:3, Hab 3:11, Ez 21:33, Zc 9:14 et al. [וְעֵינָיו] כְּלַפִּידֵי אֵשׁ *as burning torches* Gn 15:17, Na 2:5, Zc 12:6, Ex 20:18. וּזְרֹעֹתָיו Dt 33:27, Jg 15:14, 2S 22:35, Ho 11:3, Ps 18:35, Ez 30:22 et al. וּמַרְגְּלֹתָיו *His feet,* a very old term, used elswhere in the book of Rt only (3:4.7.8.14). כְּעֵין נְחֹשֶׁת Ez 1:7; Nu 11:7 (כְּעֵין), Ez 1:4, 10:9 et al., Gn 4:22 (נְחֹשֶׁת more than 100 occurences, with the oldest passages), Ex 27:4 et al., קָלָל *polished, burnished* – only here and in Ez 1:7. הָמוֹן 1K 18:41, Is 13:4, 33:3, Jr 10:13, 51:16, Ez 23:42, Gn 17:4, Ex 24:3, Dt 4:12.

Daniel 10:7

אֲנִי ... לְבַדִּי 1K 18:22, 19:10, Is 49:21 et al. עִמִּי *with me,* a less usual form than עִמָּדִי but present in the Biblical Aramaic: Dan 3:32, Ezra 7:28, 8:1 and many other Hebrew passages, even in the oldest writings: Gn 31:31, Gn 7:12.14, Nu 22:19, Ps 42:9, Rt 1:11. Daniel uses this shorter form only: Dan 3:22, 8:18, 9:22, 10:7.11.15.19.21. אֲבָל *however* Gn 17:19, 2S 14:5, 2K 4:14, 2Ch 33:17, Dan 10:21, Ezra 10:13. חֲרָדָה גְדֹלָה נָפְלָה עֲלֵיהֶם Gn 27:33, 1S 14:15, 2K 4:13, Is 21:4, Jr 30:5, 1S 26:12. בְּהֵחָבֵא Gn 3:10, 31:27, Jos 6:17, 10:16, 1S 19:2, Jb 5:21, Am 9:3, 2Ch 18:24.

Daniel 10:8

וַאֲנִי נִשְׁאַרְתִּי לְבַדִּי Is 49:21, 1K 18:22, Gn 42:38. הַמַּרְאָה הַגְּדֹלָה הַזֹּאת Ex 3:3, Nu 12:6, 1S 3:15, Ez 1:1, 8:3, 40:2, Dan 10:7.8.16. וְלֹא נִשְׁאַר־בִּי כֹּחַ Dan 1:17, Is 17:6. עָלַי לְמַשְׁחִית וְהוֹדִי נֶהְפַּךְ lit: *my glory changed into corruption,* Comp. Aram. Dan 7:28 זִיוַי יִשְׁתַּנּוֹן עָלַי lit. *my brightness changed on me* – an expression peculiar to Daniel. Comp. Nu 27:20, Jb 30:15, Ps 21.6, 32:4, Jr 30:6, 96:6, 145:5, Pr 5:9, Dan 11:21, Zc 6:13; 1S 4:19 (cf. Dan 10:16), 2K 21:13, Ho 11:8, Jl 3:4; Ex 12:13, Ez 25:15. וְלֹא עָצַרְתִּי כֹּחַ 2Ch 2:5, 13:20, 14:10, 22:9, Dan. 10:16, 11:6; 1Ch 29:14, Gn 16:2, 2K 17:4.

Daniel 10:9

וַאֲנִי הָיִיתִי נִרְדָּם עַל־פָּנַי Dan 8:18, Jg 4:21, Ps 76:7, Pr 10:5, Jb 4.13, Jon 1:5.6.
וּפָנַי אָרְצָה Dan 10:8.9.15, Jos 5:14, 1S 5:4, 17:49, 2S 14:22.33.

Daniel 10:10

וַתְּנִיעֵנִי *caused me to tremble, made me shake (totter)* Ps 59:12.16, 2K 19:21, Jb 16:4, ZP 2:15. עַל־בִּרְכַּי וְכַפּוֹת יָדָי Jg 7:5.6, 1K 8:54, Ezra 9:5, 1S 5:4, 1K 5:17.

Daniel 10:11

אֲשֶׁר אָנֹכִי דֹבֵר אֵלֶיךָ Ex 6:29, Dt 5:1, Jon 3:2, Jr 32:42, 38:20 an old phrase expressing direct, authoritative message (divine or prophetic).[290]

* וַעֲמֹד עַל־עָמְדֶךָ Ne 13:111, Dan 8:17.18, 2Ch 34:31, 35:10, Ne 8:7, 9:3. A phrase found in post-exilic writings only. כִּי עַתָּה שֻׁלַּחְתִּי אֵלֶיךָ Pr 17:11, Gn 44:3, Ex 9:15, Pr 29:15, 2Ch 2:12, Gn 43:4 et al. מַרְעִיד Ezra 10:9; Ps 104:32, Ex 15:15, Ps 2:11.

---

[289] Probably Tartessos, Turdetania, in Southern Spain, the extreme western limit of the Phoenician-Punic fleets.

[290] This Qal stem of the root דבר is used mainly in the active participle. See also Gn 16:13, Nu 32:27, Am 5:10, Jb 2:13, Ps 15:2, 101:7, Pr 16:13, Is 9:16, 33:15, 45:19, Mi 7:3, Jr 28:7, 40:16, Zc 1:9.13.14, 2:2.7, 4:1.4.5, 5:5.10, 6:4, Est 10:3. Comp. אֲנִי מְדַבֵּר in Dan 9:20-21, 8:13, Ez 2:8, 44:5.

Daniel 10:12

אַל־תִּירָא[דָּנִיֵּאל] Very common expression.[291] מִן־הַיּוֹם הָרִאשׁוֹן Ne 8:18, Nu 15: 13.

וּלְהִתְעַנּוֹת Ezra 8:21, Gn נָתַתָּ אֶת־לִבְּךָ לְהָבִין Q 7:21, 1S 9:20, Ez 28:2.6, 1K 3:9,Pr 1:2.
16:9, 1K 2:26, Ps 107:17. בִּדְבָרֶיךָ 1K 18:36.

Daniel 10:13

[מַלְכוּת פָּרַס] שַׂר 412 times (*chief, captain, commander, head, prince*). Never used to designate kings. Since the angel introduces a vision of warfare (see on 10:1 and ch.11), and he is speaking obviously about heavenly beings (Dan 10:20.21, 12:1). These are seen like patronizing spirits over the terrestrial kingdoms: Michael is the Archangel (the great שַׂר) inspiring and empowering His people Israel, and the other two (the astral commanders of Persia, and respectively Greece) play the traditional role of the Satanic genii behind the pagan powers (Is 14:4.12-14, 24:21-22, 27:1, Ez 28:12-19 et al.). This concept and terminology are further developed in the NT. The NT writings use the LXX corresponding term for שַׂר which is ἀρχή *principaliy, prince, first, captain,* reffering to angels (good or evil): Rm 8:38, 1Co 15:24, Eph 1.21-22, 3:10, 6:12, Col 1:16, 2:10.15, or ἄρχων for Satan as ruler of this world 1P 3:22. In 12:31, 14:30, 16:11. And here is not a new idea, because the special Messenger of Yahweh is already called שַׂר־צְבָא־יהוה (Jos 5:13-14), implying the concept of a quasy-military organisation of the angels. Above the human battles, there are heavenly "stars" involved in the terrestrial wars.[292]

עֹמֵד לְנֶגְדִּי *standing before / against me,* Jos 5:13, Q 4:12, Dan 8:15, 10:16.

עֶשְׂרִים וְאֶחָד יוֹם a common formulation, cf. Gn 7:4, Nu 11:19, 20:29, Dt 34:8.

מִיכָאֵל *Michael* ("Who is like God?"). This is a common Israelite name. At least eight different persons are reported by this name in genealogies.[293] In Daniel only, a heavenly Being is called by this name (Dan 10:13.21, 12:1), which is further conveyed to the NT apocalyptic. (Jude 9, Rev 12.7). The heavenly linen clothed Man, who is seen in this visionary theophany, is called now Michael, not as if would be His actual name, but because the interpreting angel wants to disclose more of His identity. This name directs us to the Captain (Prince) of the host of Yahweh (Jos 5:13-14), usually called The Messenger of Yahweh (Ex 3:2, Zc 3:1),[294] and is alternatively referred to as God, Yahweh (the Lord), and "the angel (messenger) of the LORD". אַחַד הַשָּׂרִים הָרִאשֹׁנִים *one of the first princes / one of the chief commanders.*[295] בָּא לְעָזְרֵנִי 1Ch 12:18, 1Ch 12:23, 2S 8:5. נוֹתַרְתִּי שָׁם 1K 18:22.(remained as sole reprezentative), Ez 14:22 אֵצֶל מַלְכֵי פָרָס *beside the kings of Persia.*[296]

---

[291] Gn 15:1, 26:24, 46:3, Nu 21:34, Deut. 1:21, 3:2, Jos. 8:1, 10:8, 11:6, Jg. 4:18, 6:23, 1 Sam. 22:23, 23:17, 2 Sam. 9:7, 2 K. 1:15, 6:16, 19:6, 1 Chr. 22:13, 28:20, Jb 5:22, Ps 49:17, Pr 3:25, Is 7:4, 10:24, 37:6, 41:10.13, 43:1.5, 44:2, Jr. 1:8,30:10, 46:27.28, La 3:57, Ez 2:6, Dan. 10:19.

[292] Jg 5:20, cf. Jb 38:7, Is 14:12, Rev 12:4. et al.

[293] Nu 13:13, 1Ch 5:13.14, 6:25, 7:3, 8:16, 12:20, 27:18, 2Ch 21:2, Ezra 8:8. It is synonym with מִיכָיְהוּ or מִיכָיָה *Who is like Yahweh?* in Jg 17:1, Jr 26:18, Mi 1:1 et al..

[294] It is interesting to note that this "Angel" (Messenger) shares God-like attributes and even demands worship to Him, while the highest of the angels refuse worship (Comp. Ex. 3:5, Jos 5:14, Rev 19:9-10, 22:8-9).

[295] YLT *first of the chief heads,* LXX and Θ εἷς τῶν ἀρχόντων τῶν πρώτων, VUL unus de principibus primis. The same syntactic pattern in Gn 22:2 אַחַד הֶהָרִים *a certain one of these mountains,* 2S 2:18, 6:20, 2K 2:16, Ez 48:8. הַשָּׂרִים הָרִאשֹׁנִים may be taken temporally as in 2K 1:14, Ne 5:15, but in this context it is rather indicated the rank (cf. 1Ch 18:17, 2Ch 22:1 where the adjective denotes the highest (eldest) princes, rozal sons.

[296] It is possible that the orginal text contained the term שַׂר, or else Theodotion would not likely preserved the idea of LXX. LXX μετὰ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως Περσῶν, *with the commander of the king of Persians;* Θ μετὰ τοῦ ἄρχοντος βασιλείας Περσῶν, *with the prince of Persians' kingdom.*

Daniel 10:14

יִקְרָה לְ... *will happen to, face, meet* Q 2:14, 9:11, Gn 42:29 Usually, this verb requires the sign of the direct object, in accusative. In Daniel only, it requires the prep.לְ for dative. כִּי־עוֹד חָזוֹן לַיָּמִים This is an expression taken from Hab 2:3. See on Dan 8:19.   Dan 11:27.35, Jb 36:2, Gn 45:11, 46:30, Ps 42:6, Ps 141:5, Is 10:25, Ho 1:4. לַיָּמִים297 refers back to the period mentioned in the previous vision (8:26 *evening-morning... many days hence*)..

Daniel 10:15

כַּדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה *words like these, such words* Gn 24:28, 39:17, 1S 17:23, Jr 38:4, Ne 6:8 et al. וְנֶאֱלָמְתִּי Ps 39:21, 39:10, Ez 33:22.

Daniel 10:16

כִּדְמוּת *in the likeness of..., like, as,* Gn 1:26, Ps 58:5. נֹגֵעַ עַל־ Jg 20:34.41, Jr 48:32.

בַּמַּרְאָה *because of this vision (appearance)* – see the use of the prep. בְּ with causal meaning. וְלֹא עָצַרְתִּי כֹּחַ *labor pains overwhelmed me* 1S 4:19, La 1:20. נֶהֶפְכוּ צִירַי עָלַי See on v. 8.

Daniel 10:17

וְהֵיךְ יוּכַל 1Ch 13:12, the usual form is וְאֵיךְ Gn 26:9, Ex 6:30, Is 20:6, Ez 33:10 et al.

אֲדֹנִי זֶה 1S 26:18, 1K 18:7 (זֶה אֲדֹנִי). מֵעַתָּה Is 9:6, Ps 113:2. The last two phrases are peculiar to Daniel: וּנְשָׁמָה לֹא נִשְׁאֲרָה־בִי 10:8, Is 17:6. לֹא־יַעֲמָד־בִּי כֹּחַ (11:6.15).

Daniel 10:18

וַיֹּסֶף 1S 19:21, Jb 36:1 common old Hebrew syntax. כְּמַרְאֵה אָדָם (subj. though indefinite, it must be understood as definite, since it was introduced). וַיְחַזְּקֵנִי Jg 16:28.

Daniel 10:19

שָׁלוֹם לָךְ Jg 6:23, 19:20, 1Ch 12:19. חֲזַק וַחֲזָק Dt 31:7.23, Jos 1:6, Is 41:6, Hg 2:4, Ezra 10:4, Dt 12:23. הִתְחַזָּקְתִּי Ezra 7:28, 1S 4:9. וָאֹמְרָה a pseudo-cohortative. אֲדֹנִי כִּי חִפַּזְקְתָּנִי יְדַבֵּר Cf. Gn 44:7, 2S 14:18, Ez 34:4.

Daniel 10:20

הֲיָדַעְתָּ לָמָּה־בָּאתִי אֵלֶיךָ 1K 2:3, Jr 40:15, Nu 22:38. וְעַתָּה אָשׁוּב Gn 50:5, Jg 15:18. וַ...יוֹצֵא וְהִנֵּה... בָּא 2S 16:5. לְהִלָּחֵם עִם־שַׂר פָּרָס Jos 9:2, Jr 41:12.

Daniel 10:21

אֲבָל Gn 17:19, 2S 14:5, 2K 4:14, 2Ch 33:17, Dan 10:21, Ezra 10:13.

הָרָשׁוּם * loan-word, (Aram. רשם *to inscribe,sign,write* Dan 5:24.25, 6:9.10.11.13. 14).

בִּכְתָב אֱמֶת this phrase and the concept is peculiar to Daniel; כְּתָב in later writings only 1Ch 28:19, 2Ch 2:10, 35:4, Ezra 4:7, Est 3:14, 4:8, 8:8.13, Ez 13:9. מִתְחַזֵּק עִם... (a post-exilic phrase)1Ch 11:10, 2Ch 16:9. כִּי אִם־מִיכָאֵל שַׂרְכֶם 2Ch 1:1, 17:1. מִתְחַזֵּק עַל־ see on v. 13. It is also, interesting to note that the Great Messiah, the antitype of Immanuel, who was to sit on the throne of David, is called by Isaia שַׂר־שָׁלוֹם (Is 9:5).

Daniel 11:1

בִּשְׁנַת אַחַת לְדָרְיָוֶשׁ הַמָּדִי usual formula in old Hebrew. See on 10:1. עָמְדִי Jr 18:20, infinitive construct used instead of indicative. [לוֹ] לְמַחֲזִיק 2S 15:5, Mi 7:18; (with בְּ Ex 9:2, Pr 3:18, Is 41:13 et al.). וּלְמָעוֹז לוֹ Na 1:7, Jl 4:17 (stronghold), Ps 28:8, 31:3 (refuge, defense),

---

297 Gn 7:4 *after the days...*, Dt 4:32 *concerning the days...,* Jg 17:10 *per year,* 2Ch 29:17 *for the days..*Ez 12:27, *the vision...is for / concerns many days hence* et al.

60:9 (helmet), Is 25:4, 30:2.3 (protection). The presence of *Mem* seems to be an influence of the Aramaic infinitive construct.[298] In this case, the phrase is to be understood as וּלְהָעִיז לְהַחֲזִיק *to strengthen and to shelter [him]*.

Daniel 11:2

אֱמֶת אַגִּיד לָךְ Cf. Dan 8:26, 10:1.21. ...מְלָכִים עֹמְדִים 2K 11:14, 15:20, 2Ch 34:31, Dan 11:3.4.6.7.8.14.15.17.20.21.25. לְפָרַס *to / for /in Persia* (preposition unusual here).

וּכְחֶזְקָתוֹ בְעָשְׁרוֹ 1S 17:25, Pr 21:17. עֹשֶׁר־גָּדוֹל יַעֲשִׁיר 2Ch 12:1, 26:16, Is 8:11.

אֶת הַכֹּל299 יָעִיר *will stir up all [against?]* the kingdom of Greeks / will stir up all the kingdom of Greeks[300] Ps 78:38?

Daniel 11:3

מִמְשָׁל רַב 1Ch 26:6 a late masc.form, synonym to מֶמְשָׁלָה *dominion* v.5. (Gn 1:16, 1K 9:19, Ps 103:22 et al.). וְעָשָׂה כִרְצוֹנוֹ Dan 8:4, 11:16.36, Est 1:8, 9:5, Ne 9:24; in pre-exilic writings, without כ Ps 40:9, 143:10 et al.

Daniel 11:4

(וּכְעָמְדוֹ תִּשָּׁבֵר מַלְכוּתוֹ) (Comp. Dan 8:8... וּכְעָצְמוֹ נִשְׁבְּרָה). Dan 8:22, 11:20, Ez 30:21. Verb שבר is unusual to describe the fall of one's kingdom. Perhaps the speaker employs language reminiscent of chap.8. לְאַרְבַּע רוּחוֹת הַשָּׁמָיִם וְתֵחָץ 2 K 2:8.14, Jb 40:30, Ez 37:22 et al. See on Dan 8:8. לְאַחֲרִיתוֹ *to his posterity (descendants)* See on Dan 8:19. ...וְלֹא כְמָשְׁלוֹ Cf. Dan 8:22c. תֵּנָתֵשׁ Am 9:15, 1K 14:15, Ps 9:7, Jr 12:14. וְלַאֲחֵרִים implied or missing verb (תִּנָּתֵן?). מִלְּבַד־אֵלֶּה Nu 28:23..

Daniel 11:5

וְיֶחֱזַק Gn 41:56, Jr 52:6. מֶלֶךְ־הַנֶּגֶב 8 times, in this chapter only (= מִצְרַיִם *Egypt*, v. 8). וּמִן־שָׂרָיו Comp. Dan 10:13, it should have normally the adjective אֶחָד ; וְיֶחֱזַק עָלָיו Ex 12:33? Jg 3:12; 1S 17:50.

Daniel 11:6

וּלְקֵץ שָׁנִים *after some years* 2Ch 18:2, Ne 13:6, Dan 11:13. A late use, probably borrowed from Aramaic (Dan 4:26 לִקְצָת יַרְחִין /יוֹמַיָּא 4:31). Comp. with the older phrase מִקֵּץ (1K 17:7, Jr 13:6). יִתְחַבָּרוּ Dan 11:23, 2Ch 20:35.36.37, Ml 2:14; Gn 14:3, 26:9, Jg 20:11, Jb 34:8, Ps 94:20, 119:63 et al. מֵישָׁרִים *equity,* Ps 99:9, Pr 1:3, *regulation* (according to Holladay 193) Ps 99:4 עֲשׂוֹת מֵישָׁרִים *come to an agreement,* in Daniel only. וְלֹא־תַעְצֹר כֹּחַ see on Dan 10:8.16 כֹּחַ הַזְּרוֹעַ Is 44:12, Dt 9:29, 2K 17:36, Jb 26:2.

וְלֹא יַעֲמֹד וּזְרֹעוֹ / וּפַזְרֹעוֹ ? Is 66:22, Dan 11:15.31. בָּעִתִּים (with the next verse? Cf. NRS) Ne 13:31, Gn 21:22, Is 18:7 / Dan 8:17, Jr 8:15, from √ בעת ? *be terrified, terror.* וְתִנָּתֵן *she (it) will be given* [into the hand of...], 2K 18:30, Is 36:15 et al. וְהַיֹּלְדָהּ Θ καὶ ἡ νεᾶνις, VUL adulescentes eius (וְהַיַּלְדָּהּ), prop. וְיַלְדָּהּ *her child.* וּמַחֲזִקָהּ Is 4:1, 51:18, 56:4, Jg 16:26.

---

[298] See Dan 2:9.18.27, 3:2.19.20, 4:23, 5:8.16. In the Hebrew of Daniel it is also interesting to note the inf. cstr. לְמֵרַע *to be evil, to do evil.*

[299] According to the critical apparatus in BHS, there are some manuscript reflecting uncertainty about this formulation. While two have אֶל or עַל, other two omit completely this particle. However, it is safer to preserve it, because often the most difficult form is genuine. The main difficulty in this construction is that the particle אֶת functions usually as sign of the direct object, and when it is preposition, it means *with, alongside, togeher with. .*

[300] It is also possible to reconstruct or understand the text as יָעִיר אֶת כֹּל מַלְכוּת יָוָן.

Daniel 11:7

כַּנּוֹ ......וְעָמַד Dan 11:20.21.38, Ex 30:28 et al. מִנֵּצֶר שָׁרָשֶׁיהָ Is 11:1, 14:29, Ez 17:9.
אֶל־וַיָּבֹא Gn 31:33, 2Ch 32:1, Ps 55:6. ....בְּ Dt 8:17, Jos 1:14, 1S 10:26 הַחַיִל Gn 27:18. מָעוֹז Jg 6:26, Ps 27:1, Is 23:4. בָּהֶם וְעָשָׂה Ps 149:9, Jg 16:11, Ne 9:24. וְהֶחֱזִיק Dan 11:21, 2Ch 26:8.

Daniel 11:8

כֶּסֶף וְפָזְהָב Gn 13:2 עִם־כְּלֵי חֶמְדָּתָם Ho 13:15, Na 2:10, 2Ch 32:27. עִם־נְסִכֵיהֶם Ps 16:4. always in this order, (except in Nu 31:22, 1K 10:22, 2K 14:14, Ne 7:70.71, Est 1:6, Dan 11:43, Hab 2:9 et al.). יַעֲמֹד מִ.. .בַּשֶּׁבִי Dt 28:41. cf. Jon 1:15. שָׁנִים *some / "a couple of" years* See on Dan 9:27 (שבוע) and 8:27 (יָמִים).

Daniel 11:9

וְשָׁב אֶל־אַדְמָתוֹ Jr 42:12, Gn 28:15, Gn 3:19, Ps 146:4, 1K 8:34.

Daniel 11:10

יִתְגָּרוּ Dt 2:9.19.24, 2K 14:10.

Daniel 11:11

* וְיִתְמַרְמַר See on Dan 8:7.

Daniel 11:12

וְהִפִּיל רִבֹּאוֹת Ezra 2:69. רָם / יָרוּם לְבָבוֹ Jr 48:29, Ez 31:10. וְנִשָּׂא הֶהָמוֹן Ez 29:19. וְלֹא יָעוֹז Jg 3:10, 6:2, Ps 68:29, 89:14.

Daniel 11:13

יָבוֹא בוֹא / בוֹ? in apposition. הָעִתִּים=שָׁנִים 2Ch 18:2. וּלְקֵץ הָעִתִּים Ez 44:2, 1S 9:6. בְּחַיִל גָּדוֹל 2K 7:6, Ez 37:10. וּבִרְכוּשׁ רָב 2Ch 20:25, 32:29, Gn 12:5, 14:11; or רֶכֶשׁ ? 1K 5:8, Est 8:10 et al..

Daniel 11:14

יַעַמְדוּ Nu יִנָּשְׂאוּ וּבְנֵי פָּרִיצֵי עַמְּךָ Ez 18:10, Ps 17:4, Is 35:9, Ez 7:22. עַל־ 23:24, 24:7, 1K 1:5, Pr 30 32, Ez 29:15. וְנִכְשָׁלוּ Dt 9:5. cf. הָקִים דָּבָר לְהַעֲמִיד חָזוֹן Ps 104:6. 1S 2:4, Dan 11:19.33, Zc 12:8.

Daniel 11:15

וְלָכַד עִיר Dt 2:34, Zc 14:2. וְיִשְׁפֹּךְ סוֹלֲלָה 2S 20:15, 2K 19:32, Jr 6:6, Ez 4:2, 26:8. לכד ערים בצרות Ne 9:25, Dt ? עִיר מִבְצָרוֹת Jos 19:29, 2K 10:2, Ps 108:11, Jr 1:18. Or 5:3. וְעַם מִבְחָרָיו Ex 15:4, Jr 48:15. וְאֵין כֹּחַ לַעֲמֹד Ezra 10:13, Dan 1:4, 8:7, 1S 30:4, Is 50:2.

Daniel 11:16

וְאֵין עוֹמֵד לְפָנָיו 2Ch 25:10, Jg 3:20, 2S 12:4, 2S 12:1. הַבָּא אֵלָיו cf Dan 8:4. בְּאֶרֶץ וַיַּעֲמֹד 2K 15:20. וְכָלָה בְיָדוֹ (וְכָלָה reads NRS) Jos 2:24.

Daniel 11:17

וְיָשֵׂם פָּנָיו לָבוֹא וְיָשֵׁב / Jr 42:17, 44:12, Gn 31:21, 2K 12:17, Lv 2:5, Ez 6:2, 13:17, 38:2, Dan 11:18. בְּתֹקֶף כָּל־מַלְכוּתוֹ Est 9:29, 10:2, Aram. Dan 2:37, 4:8, 27. וְיָשָׂרִים עִמּוֹ וְעָשָׂה LXX καὶ συνθήκας (alliance) μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ, Θ καὶ εὐθεῖα (at once) πάντα μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ, cf. Pr 23:21 = smoothly, at once, VUL et recta faciet cum eo, Cf. v. 6 = מֵישָׁרִים

וּבַת הַנָּשִׁים LXX θυγατέρα ἀνθρώπου, *a daughter of the man,* Θ θυγατέρα τῶν γυναικῶν, *daughter of the women,* VUL filiam feminarum, *a daughter of the women.* An expression

unique to this verse of Daniel. It may be stresses the woman graces of this princess (Cf. Dan 7:13 *son of man*, i.e. a man) the Corrupted from בַּת הַנָּשִׂיא *daughter of the exalted leader* ? Nu 25:18; or from וּבֵית הַנָּשִׁים ? *house of the women, harem* Est 2:3.9.11.13.14, or וּבַת הַנֹּשִׁים וּבֵית ? *daughter / house of usurers (loaners, loan)"* i. e. a daughter, given as pledge of the peace. cf. Is 50:1, 2K 4:1 ? ; לְהַשְׁחִיתָהּ *to destroy it* [the kingdom, cf. NRS] Is 36:10; or וְלֹא תַעֲמֹד וְלֹא־לוֹ תִהְיֶה *to destroy him.* Is 7:7, Dt 22:19. לְהַשְׁחִיתֵהוּ / לְהַשְׁחִיתָה

Daniel 11:18

אִיִּים *coastlands* Gn 10:5, Jg 11:6.11, Ps 97:1, ZP 2:11. קָצִין *leader, commander, chief* Jos 10:24, Pr 6:7, 25:15, Is 1:10, 3:6.7, 22:3, 41:5, Mi 3:1.9. הִשְׁבִּית Jos 22:25, Pr 6:33. חֶרְפָּתוֹ Jr 36:29. חֶרְפָּתוֹ יָשִׁיב לוֹ Ho prob. corrupted from לְבִלְתִּי[301]*so as not, in order not.* לוֹ בִּלְתִּי 12:15.

Daniel 11:19

וְיָשֵׁב פָּנָיו *he will turn his face* (in Dan 11:18.19 only). וְנִכְשַׁל וְנָפַל Ps 27:2, Pr 24:16.17, Is 3:8, 8:15, 31:3, Jr 6:15, 46:6.12, Jr 50:32. וְלֹא יִמָּצֵא Is 30:14, Jb 20:8, 1S 10:21, Ne 7:67, Ps 37:36.

Daniel 11:20

מַעֲבִיר נוֹגֵשׂ Zc 9:8, Dt 18:10, Lv 25:9, Nu 8:7, Jos 7:7, Ps 78:13. נוֹגֵשׂ Ex 5:6, 2K 23:35, Jb 3:18, 39:7, Is 9:3, 14:2, הֶדֶר מַלְכוּת NRS *[for the]glory of the kingdom / [having the]royal majesty* (opp. to the detestable king of the next verse) Lv 23:40, Dt 33:17, Ps 145:5, Is 53:2. וּבְיָמִים אֲחָדִים *within a few days, a while,* Gn 27:44, 29:20. וְלֹא בְאַפַּיִם Pr 14:17, 30:33.

Daniel 11:21

הֶדֶר מַלְכוּת = הוֹד מַלְכוּת *detested, detestable* Ps 15:4, 119:141, Is 53:3, Ml 1:7.12. נִבְזֶה = ־מַלְכוּת כְּבוֹד v. 20. Ps 145:11.12, Zc 6:13; Ps 21:6, 104:1. וּבָא בְשַׁלְוָה Dan 8:25, 11:21.24, Ps 122:7, Pr 17:1. וְהֶחֱזִיק מַלְכוּת Dan 11:7. בַּחֲלַקְלַקּוֹת *by flattery, insincerely,* Dan 11:32.34, Ps. 12:3.4, 35:6, Is 30:10, Jr 23:12, Pr 6:24.

Daniel 11:22

וּזְרֹעוֹת.... וְיִשָּׁבְרוּ cf. v. 10.26. הַשֶּׁטֶף יִשָּׁטְפוּ / וּזְרֹעוֹת הַשֶּׁטֶף[302] Ez 30:21.22.24, Jb 38:15, Ps 10:15, 37:17, Jr 48:25. וְגַם נְגִיד בְּרִית cf. Dan 9:26-27, 2Ch 31:13.

Daniel 11:23

בִּמְעַט־גּוֹי See on v. 6. Q 9:4. יַעֲשֶׂה מִרְמָה Is 53:9. See on Dan 8:25. וּמִן־הִתְחַבְּרוּת אֵלָיו וְעָצַם Dan 8:24, Dt 26:5, Is 10:7.

Daniel 11:24

בְּשַׁלְוָה Origen's Hexapla: *in securitate (inopinato).*[303] וּבְמִשְׁמַנֵּי מְדִינָה Gn 27:28.39, Ps 78:31, Is 10:16. מְדִינָה *province, district* is found only in the post-exilic writings.[304] בִּזָּה וְשָׁלָל Dt 2:35, Is 8:1, 10:6, Ez 29:19, 39:10. יְבַזּוֹר Ps 68:31, (= פזר Jr 3:13 et al.). 2S יַחֲשֵׁב מַחְשְׁבֹתָיו 14:14, Jr 11:19, 18:18, 29:11. וְעַד־עֵת 2S 24:15, Ez 4:10.11.

---

[301] See C. G. Ozanne, 446-447.
[302] Proposal in BHS, critical apparatus, 1408.
[303] Field, 931.
[304] Ezra 2:1, Ne 1:3, 7:6, 11:3, Est 1:1.22, 3:12.14, 4:3, 8:9.11.13, Est. 8:17, 9:28.30, Q 5:7, Dan 8:2, 11:24.

Daniel 11:25

בְּחַיִל־גָּדוֹל see v.10. יִתְגָּרֶה לַמִּלְחָמָה Ps 78:38, Is 41:22, 42:13, 50:4, Jb 8:6, 41:2. וְיָעֵר
וְלֹא יַעֲמֹד Dan 8:8, Gn 27:33, 50:10. עַד־מְאֹד Gn 18:18, Nu 14:12. גָּדוֹל וְעָצוּם Ez 17:17. 2K 7:6,
Jos 10:8, Jb 8:15, 14:2, Am 2:15, Dan 11:6. מַחֲשָׁבוֹת ...כִּי־יַחְשְׁבוּ see v. 24.

Daniel 11:26

וְחֵילוֹ יִשְׁטוֹף וְאֹכְלֵי פַת־בָּגוֹ see on Dan 1:5, יִשְׁבְּרוּהוּ 1K 13:26, Dan 8:7.8.22.25, Am 6:6.
וְנָפְלוּ חֲלָלִים רַבִּים 1Ch 5:22, Jr 51:4.49, Ez 6:7, 28:23, 32:24, 2S 1:19.25. v. 10.22.

Daniel 11:27

לְמֵרָע * 2S 13:22, Pr 17:4. See also Dan 11:1. וְעַל־שֻׁלְחָן אֶחָד Ps 41:10, 1K 13:20, 2S
9:13. כָּזָב יְדַבֵּרוּ Jg 16:10.13, Ps 5:7, 58:4, Pr 10:8, Ho 7:13, ZP 3:13. וְלֹא תִצְלָח Nu 14:41, Ez
17:9.10, Jr 12:1. כִּי־עוֹד קֵץ לַמּוֹעֵד See on Dan 8:19, 10:14, 11:29.35.

Daniel 11:28

וְלִבָבוֹ עַל־ Hg 1:5.7, Dan 11:25. בְּרִית קֹדֶשׁ Dan 11:30.[305] A syntagm peculiar to *Dan-iel*. In the earlier writings, both terms are used extensively,[306] but no need was felt to stress the nature of the covenant with Yahweh,[307] by the term קֹדֶשׁ, which is so commonly used as a qualifying noun in many construct phrases. In Daniel, the *covenant* of Yahweh with His elect stands against all other covenants and it equals, practically, the Ten Commandments, which are seen in Torah as clauses the divine covenant.[308] וְעָשָׂה וְשָׁב לְאַרְצוֹ Dan 11:30, 2K 19:7.

Daniel 11:29

לַמּוֹעֵד יָשׁוּב *at the appointed time he will turn back,* Gn 18:14, 17:21, 21:2, Jos 8:14, 1S 9:24, 13:8, 2K 4:16.17, Dan 11:27.35, Hab 2:3. וְלֹא־תִהְיֶה כָרִאשֹׁנָה וְכָאַחֲרֹנָה Dt 13:10, 1K 17:13, Hg 2:9.

Daniel 11:30

וּבָאוּ בוֹ cf. v.10, 1S 9:6. צִיִּים כִּתִּים *ships of Kittim,* cf. Nu 24:24 (כִּתִּים or וּבָאוּ בוֹא or (וְצִים מִיַּד) the ultimate enemy of the covenant people, according to the prophecy of Balaam, which had to come from afar, on the Mediteranean Sea, and humiliate forever the Near East and Middle East peoples. צִי (the sg. of צִיִּים) *ship* (Is 33:21).[309] כִּתִּים *Kittim,* Hebrew name of an indo-european "people of the sea". Known by the Bible authors as related to the tribes of Ionia, Cyprus, Rhodos (Dorians?) and Tarshish (Tartessos in South Spain or the Cylician Tarsos ?),[310] located between Tarshish and Tyre (Is 23:1), a place were Sydonian (Phoenician, Punic) people had to seek for shelter after the fall of their metropolis, but without finding a definitive location (Is 23:12); western coastlands, islands (Jr 2:10), whence the traders of Tyre brought a certain wood (pine?) to build their ship cabins (Ez 27:6). In later writings, the name is applied to Macedonia (1Mac 1:1, 8:5). LXX reads Ῥωμαῖοι *Romans,* while VUL reads

---

[305] See also on Dan 9:27.

[306] The term בְּרִית is used in OT 274 times, and קֹדֶשׁ 296 times.

[307] It is usually called בְּרִיתִי (Gn 6:18 through Ml 2:5), בְּרִית יהוה (Nu 10:33,...Jr 22:9) et al.

[308] The "words of the covenant, the ten clauses " (Ex 34:28, Dt 4:13), the "ark of the covenant" (Dt 10:8, Jr 3:16), or the "ark of the testimony" (Ex 26:34, Jos 4:16), the "tables of the testimony" (Ex 31:18, 32:15-16, 34:29), The "two tables of the covenant" (Dt 9:9.11.15). Comp. Dan 9:4 and Ex 20:6, Dt 5:10, 7:9.

[309] The same term means also *desert-dweller, demon* (Is 13:21, 23:13, 34:14, Jr 50:39). The selection of this term to speak about those who, eventually had to destroy Israel, may be intended even for its double meaning.

[310] Gn 10:4, 1Ch 1:7.

Romani.[311] From the most liberal scholars, to the most rigid fundamentalists, practically all agree on the Roman identity of these Kittim in Daniel. The amazing fact is that the name of Romans, so common in the 2nd century BC has no place in the book. This may be hardly explained within the Maccabean theory of the date of *Daniel*'s redaction. If the Romans were still seen as liberation forces, if Jews had not yet suffered the Roman yoke, why not "predict" their true name? The phrase צִיִּים כִּתִּים has neither preposition as expected,[312] nor it is a usual construct, which should have been צִיֵּי כִּתִּים. This apparent iregularity may be explained by the presence of the old *enclitic Mem* (read: צִיֵּי־ם־כִּתִּים)[313], which is again, hard to be explained by a late date for Daniel.

וְנִכְאָה *be disheartened,* Ps 109:116, Ez 13:22, Ps 10:10. וְפָזְעַם עַל־ Is 10:25. See on Dan 8:19. וְעָשָׂה וְשָׁב cf. v. 28. * וְיָבֵן עַל Dan 11:37, a phrase peculiar to Daniel. בְּרִית קֹדֶשׁ עֹזְבֵי Dt 29:24, 31:36, 1K 19:10.14, Jr 22:9.

Daniel 11:31

זְרֹעִים a masc. pl. form of זְרוֹעַ *arm, [military] force,* Gn 49:24, Is 51:5, 2K 9:24, instead of the form זְרֹעוֹת, which is common in Daniel and elsewhere. But, whatever the form of the plural ending, the associated verb, in Daniel, is always in the masculine (e. g. v. 31 יַעֲמֹדוּ, v. 15 יַעֲמֹדוּ, v.22 יִשָּׁבְרוּ...וְיִשְׁטְפוּ), while the feminine agreement is present also in other writings: Ps 37:17, Ez 30:25. וְחִלְּלוּ הַמִּקְדָּשׁ Lv 20:3, 21:12.23, Ps74:7, Is 43:28, Ez 24:21, 28:18, Ez 44:7, Ez 23:38.39, Ml 2:11. הַמִּקְדָּשׁ הַמָּעוֹז *the sanctuary, the place of refuge (the fortress).* מָעוֹז is used for *stronghold* (Jg 6:26, Ez 30:15), *protection* (Is 30:2.3, Ez 24:25? Na 3:11), and, metaphorically, for *God-Yahweh* as a fortress, defense and refuge (Ps 27:1, 31:2.5, 37:39, Jl 4:16, Na 1:7). The two nouns are in apposition here. No wonder that it is some connection between the cities of refuge established in Canaan and the Levitic or priestly cities (Jos 21:13.21.27.32.38). The Sanctuary or the Temple was, by its sacred nature, the refuge ("sanctuary") par excellence (Ex 21:13-14). It was actually a strongold in times of war. But its highest function, its raison d'être, was spiritual: a defense against the sin and against its results – temporal and eternal damnation – by that blood sacrificial and mediatorial system so rich in meaning.[314]

וְהֵסִירוּ הַתָּמִיד See on Dan 8:11 הַשִּׁקּוּץ מְשֹׁמֵם This construct, as it is commonly understood by translators, is not usual as to the regular use in the classic Hebrew. All construct connections should have no article for the first item, only for the second – when the whole phrase is to be defined. However, this does not seem to be an error, because the same phenomenon may be seen in Dan 8:13 and in some Phoenician inscriptions.[315] This aspect hardly agrees with a late date for the composition of Daniel.

Daniel 11:32

וּמַרְשִׁיעֵי בְרִית – the Hiphᶜil stem הִרְשִׁיעַ means *to declare wrong or guilty, (to condemn)* in the books claiming pre-exilic origin: Ex 22:8, Dt 25:1, Jb 9:20, 10:2, 15:6, 32:3, 34:12.17.29, 40:8, Ps 37:33, 94:21, Pr 12:2, Is 50:9, 54:17; and *to do wickedly,* in the writings

---

[311] Cf. Ez 27:6 *de insulis Italiae.* "The Dead Sea Scrolls contain several references to Kittim, the most notable being the defeat of her people (Romans) at the hands of God's people." (Homan Bible Dictionary, entry KITTIM).

[312] Except that we emmend the spelling into צִיִּים מִכַּתִּים.

[313] Cf. Waltke and O'Connor, p. 158-160. See also on Dan 9:27, about שִׁקּוּצֵי־ם־מְשֹׁמֵם.

[314] This theme is related to that of Yahweh being Himself a Sanctuary (Temple) for His people (Is 8:14, Ez 11:16).

[315] See the explanation for Dan 8:12.13.

who claim (or imply) post-exilic origin: Ps 106:6[316], Dan 9:5, 12:10, 2Ch 20:35, Ne 9:33. In this verse, the logical context requires the second meaning, so that the phrase should be translated, *those who violate the covenant* (NRS)*, or *those who do wickedly against the covenant* (NKJ).

יַחֲנִיף *he will make ungodly, paganise, prophane, pollute*: Nu 35:33, Jr 3:2.[317] LXX μιανοῦσιν ἐν σκληρῷ λαῷ, *they will pollute with harsh people,* Θ ἐπάξουσιν ἐν ὀλισθήμασιν, *they will bring to slippery ...,* VUL simulabunt fraudulenter, *they will simulate deceitfully.* בַּחֲלַקּוֹת See on v. 21. עַם יֹדְעֵי אֱלֹהָיו lit. *the people of those who know his God,*[318] Ex 6:2, Is 8:19. וְעָשׂוּ יַחֲזִקוּ See v. 7.

Daniel 11:33

וּמַשְׂכִּילֵי עָם Dan 1:4, 11:35, 12:3.10. יָבִינוּ לָרַבִּים[319] Jb 6:24, Dan 8:16, 2Ch 35:3. וְנִכְשְׁלוּ *and they will be weakened, will be made to fall.* Not a spiritual fall is seen here, but a "stumbling": the bereavement, and enfeeblement of their forces caused by *sword, fire, captivity and plunder.* See on v. 14. יָמִים *for a while.* Dan 8:27, (cf. שָׁנִים 11:8).

Daniel 11:34

יֵעָזְרוּ עֵזֶר מְעָט *will be helped with a little help.* The phrase is peculiar to Daniel, though each term is common to the oldest phase of Hebrew. וְנִלְווּ עַל... Nu 18:2.4, Est 9:27, Is 14:1, 56:6; Is 56:3, Jr 50:5, Zc 2:15; Ps 83:9. בַּחֲלַקְלַקּוֹת See on v. 21.32.

Daniel 11:35

וּמִן־הַמַּשְׂכִּילִים יִכָּשְׁלוּ[320] Comp. with Dan 8:10. לִצְרוֹף בָּהֶם Jg 7:4, Ps 17:3, 26:2, 66:10, 105:19, Is 1:25, 48:10, Jr 6:29, Zc 13:9. No occurence with the prep. בּ like in this verse. וּלְבָרֵר Dan 12:10, 2S 22:27, Jb 33:3, Q 3:18, Is 49:2, 52:11, ZP 3:9, Jr 4:11, Ez 20:38, 1Ch 7:40, 9:22, 16:41, Ne 5:18; וְלַלְבֵּן Ps 51:9, Is 1:18, Jl 1:7, Ex 5:7, Q 9:8. עַד־עֵת קֵץ See on chap. 8:17. כִּי־עוֹד לַמּוֹעֵד See on chap. 8:19.

Daniel 11:36

וְעָשָׂה כִרְצוֹנוֹ Dan 8:4, 11:3.16, Est 1:8, 9:5, Ne 9:24; in pre-exilic writings, without כ Ps 40:9, 143:10 et al. וְיִתְרוֹמֵם Is 33:10, Aram. Dan 5:23. וְיִתְגַּדֵּל Is 10:15, Dan 11:37, Ez 38:23; Dan 8:9.10, Ob 1:12, Zc 12:7. נִפְלָאוֹת יְדַבֵּר Dan 7:8.11.20 (Aram. מְמַלֵּל רַבְרְבָן). וְהִצְלִיחַ se on chap. 8:25. עַד־כָּלָה נֶעֱשָׂתָה כִּי נֶחֱרָצָה נֶעֱשָׂתָה 2K 13:19, Ezra 9:14, Dan 8:19, 11:30. Is 10:13, 28:22; Dan 9:26.27.

---

[316] A post-exilic psalm, see v. 37-47.

[317] In Qal, to be godless, polluted, prophane (Ps 136:38, Is 24:5, Mi 4:11, Jr 3:1.9, 23:11). Adjective and nouns derived: in Jb 8:13, 13:16, 15:34, 17:8, 20:5, 27:8, 34:30, 36:13, Ps 35:16, Pr 11:9, Is 9:16, 10:6, 32:6, 33:14. Jr 23:15.

[318] The pronominal suffix is not in grammatical agreement with ידעי but with עם, in order to stress the unity of God and of the people, and in the same time, the spiritual quality of each individual belonging to this people.

[319] This wise people are not an esoteric group, but those who *understand* God's revealed mysteries, living according to the divine counsel, and instructing others. The Hiphᶜil pattern of the participle מַשְׂכִּלִים and the mission of these sages show their teaching function (see also Dan 12:3). While הָרַבִּים is thought to refer to the community, מַשְׂכִּלִים denotes the teaching, apocalzptic group. S.Thompson applied this Danielic concept to the apostles in the covenant community of the early Christianity. Steven Thompson, "Those Who Are Wise: The *Maskilim* in Daniel and the New Testament", in *To Understand the Scriptures–Essays in Honor of William H. Shea.* Ed. David Merling, Institute of Archaeology, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI. 1997, p. 215-220.

[320] J. Goldingay (279, n. 33c) suggested an wordplay on שׂכל and כשׁל.

Daniel 11:37

v. 30. לֹא יָבִין Dt 29:24, 2Ch 24:18, 28:9, Dan 11:38. וְעַל־אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֹתָיו

חֶמְדַּת נָשִׁים *the desire of* (or, longing for) *women* = אַהֲבַת נָשִׁים ? (2S 1:26)[321]; or *the feminine grace?* (cf. אֵשֶׁת...), comp. (מַחְמַד [עֵינַי]... אִשְׁתִּי Ez 23:12.23, 24:16.18 בַּחוּרֵי חֶמֶד לֹא־תַחְמֹד (Ex 20:17, 5:21). This is the reverse of another phrase peculiar to Daniel: אִישׁ־חֲמֻדוֹת *precious man, man greatly beloved* (Dan 9:23, 10:11.19). Another possible meaning would is suggested by a different reading of חמדת, according to the pattern חֲמֻדוֹת מִצְרַיִם from v. 43. Accordingly, חֲמֻדוֹת נָשִׁים would mean *the precious things of women (feminine)*. But this suggestion does not fit the literary context.

Daniel 11:38

אֱלֹהַּ *god, God*, a term used only in poetic books or passages of the OT.[322] אֱלֹהַּ מָעֻזִּים See on v. 31 (*god of strongholds-sanctuaries ?*), Hab 1:11 (*the power as god?*). The name of this god seems to be derived from its function, which is disclosed in v. 39: the detestable king will operate with him against (or in favour of ?) the fortresses. But the author does not think about a certain pagan divinity that we may identify, because in v. 36 he indicated the actual "divinity" of this king: his self. יְכַבֵּד לְ... – the prep. used here before אֱלֹהַּ (instead of אֵת cf. Pr 3:9) suggests an Aramaic influence (see on v.1).

Daniel 11:39

וְעָשָׂה לְ.... *do [favorably or not favorably] to ...* (Gn 20:9, Lv 4:20, Dt 31:4, Ez 31:11), *act, make something for* (Gn 37:3, Ex 20:4, 1S 2:19). Probably the verb has the political and military colour from Dan 8:4.24, 11:3.7 (בְּ+).17.24.28.30.36. מִבְצְרֵי מָעֻזִּים cf. Nu 13:28. נֵכָר עִם־אֱלוֹהַּ *together (in alliance) with a foreign god.* Dt 31:16, 32:12, Jos 24:20, Ml 2:11. The preferred god of this king is here indefinite, after it was definite as *the god of strongholds.* This may be understood as a poetic or rethoric aspect (comp. Ho 1:2-3.7, 3:1-3). אֲשֶׁר הִכִּיר Gn 27:23, Jg 18:3, 2S 3:36, Is 63:16. יַרְבֶּה כָבוֹד *he will make him rich and honoured* Ps 49:17, 2Ch 32:27. וְהִמְשִׁילָם – the pronominal suffix is in grammatical disagreement with its referent, but it has a logic agreement (with *anyone – all – who recognise...*). וַאֲדָמָה יְחַלֵּק Am 7:17, Zc 2:16. בִּמְחִיר *for / at a price* 2S 24:24, 1K 10:28, Is 45:13, Mi 3:11, Jr 15:13, La 5:4, 2Ch 1:16; Pr 27:26. Or, *as a price? in exchange (of their hommage)?* Comp. Mat 4:8-9.

Daniel 11:40

יִתְנַגַּח עִמּוֹ – elsewhere in Pi‘el only: Dt 33:17, Ps 44:6, 1K 22:11, 2Ch 18:10, Ez 34:21, Dan 8:4. וְיִשְׂתָּעֵר עָלָיו *rush upon him as a tornado.* The Hithpa‘el form is peculiar to Daniel. See the basic meaning in other forms: Jb 27:21, 2K 2:1, Ps 58:10, Ho 13:3, Jr 25:32, 30:23. בְּרֶכֶב וּבְפָרָשִׁים *with chariots and horsemen (riders, cavaliers, mounted soldiers).*[323]

Daniel 11:41

וְרַבּוֹת *many (fem.),* read וְרִבּוֹת / וְרִבָּאוֹת *tens of thousands, myriads,* cf. v. 12b and Symmachus.[324] יִכָּשְׁלוּ v. 33.35. LXX lacks the rest of this verse. Θ ἀσθενήσουσιν *will be (show themselves) weak,* VUL has *corruent* "fall down", Origen and Aquilas: σκανδαλισθήσονται *will*

---

[321] See also SS 2:3, Hg 2:7, 1S 9:20, 2Ch 21:20, 32:27, Jr 3:19, Ne 2:10, Zc 7:14.

[322] Dt 32:15.17, 44 times in *Jb*, 4 times in Psalms, Pr 30:5, Is 44:8, Hab 1:11, 3:3, 2Ch 32:15, Ne 9:17.

[323] Cf. Gn 50:9, Ex 14:28, Jos 24:6, 1S 8:11, 1K 1:5, 2K 18:24, Is 21:7, Ez 26:7, 2Ch 16:8. If this oracle had been written in the Hellenisitic times, it were a good opportunity to mention the impressive elephants, so characteristic to those unending wars !

[324] See Origen's Hexapla in Field, 932, and BHS, critical apparatus.

stumble down, and Symmachus: πταίσουσιν *they will fall.*[325] יִמָּלְטוּ *will escape, be saved* – see Jg 3:29. אֱדוֹם וּמוֹאָב ... בְּנֵי עַמּוֹן.... *Edom, Moab and Ammon* – kindred nations, but in long tradition of hostility toward Israel – mentioned together in 1S 14:47, Is 11:14, Jr 9:25, 25:21, 27:3, 40:11, 1Ch 18:11. וְרֵאשִׁית Syr. ושרכא = וּשְׁאֵרִית?[326] See ZP 2:9. But all older versions attest the more difficult reading, which is in MT. The meaning of *the first, best, the choice part* maight be intended: Gn 49:3, Dt 18:4, Ez 44:30, Am 6:6. The idea of seeing Israel utterly broken and the worse of its enemies saved, was hardly imagined by any pious Jew in the times of Antiochus Epiphanes (or in any other times). Are they saved because of an alliance with the great invader, or because they repented meantime ? Moreover, these three nations were nearly disappeared in the 2ⁿᵈ century BC, after "living" under the Babylonian and Persian yoke, and because of the Arabian (Nabatean) advances.

Daniel 11:42

וְשִׁלַח יָדוֹ בְּ... Ex 22:7.10, Est 9:2. תִּהְיֶה לִפְלֵיטָה *escape,* Gn 32:9, 45:7, 2S 15:14, 2K 19:31, 1K 4:43, Jl 2:3, 2Ch 12:7.

Daniel 11:43

וּמָשַׁל בְּ.... *have dominion, manage,* Ps 105:21, 24:2, 45:8. ...מִכְמַנֵּי – exclusive in Daniel, probable from an Aramaic root כמן *be hidden.*[327] Θ ἐν τοῖς ἀποκρύφοις *on the secret stores, hidden treasures.* לֻבִים *Lybians,* Na 3:9, 2Ch 12:3, **16:8**. כֻּשִׁים[328] *"Ethiopians", Cushites, Nubians,* ZP 2:12, Jr 13:23, 38:7, 2Ch 12:3, 14:11.12, 16:8, 21:16, Gn 10:7, Jb 28:19, 2K 19:9, Is 18:1, 20:3.4, 37:9, 43:3, 45:14, Na 3:9, ZP 3:10, Jr 46:9, Ez 29.10, 30:5.9, 38:5, Est 1:1. Lybians and Nubians were the closest African neighbors to the West and South of Egypt. בְּמִצְעָדָיו lit. *on (at / in) his steps* (cf. NRS *in his train,* as captives; others: *at his feet*). The expression is peculiar to Daniel, and the old translation are quite uncertain about it.[329] Ps 37:23, Pr 20:24; Jg 5:4, Jb 18:7.

Daniel 11:44

וּשְׁמֻעוֹת *certain news (reports, tidings, rumors),* 1K 19:7, Is 37:7, Ps 112:7, Pr 15:30, 25:25, Jr 10:22, 49:14, 51:46, Ez 24:26, Ob 1:1. יְבַהֲלֻהוּ Ps 2:5, 83:16, Q 7:9, 2Ch 32:18, Ezra 4:4. בְּחֵמָא an Aramaic spelling[330] instead of בְּחֵמָה Gn 27:44, Jb 19:29, Zc 8:2 וְיָצָא...לְהַשְׁמִיד Dt 2:23, 2Ch 20:23, (Aram. Dan 7:26: לְהַשְׁמָדָה וּלְהוֹבָדָה) Jos 9:24, 1K 13:34, Est 3:6.13, 4:8, 7:4, 8:11. וּלְהַחֲרִים Jos 11:20, 2Ch 20:23, 2K 19:11.

Daniel 11:45

וְיִטַּע אָהֳלֵי (cf. Is 51:16, comp. Is 40:22?). The usual expression is similar: וַיֵּט אָהֳלֹה Gn 12:8 et al., וְנָטָה אָהֳלֹה Gn 33:19; Gn 2:8, ZP 1:13. אָהֳלֵי אַפַּדְנוֹ Ps 132:3, 1Ch 9:23, אַפֶּדֶן* from Pers. *apadâna* = palace.[331] Since the term is found also in Syriac, it is possible that it was in circulation in the Imperial Aramaic before it was borrowed by bilingual Jews. לְ[הַר־] הַר־צְבִי־קֹדֶשׁ בֵּין [יַמִּים] *between the [sea(s)] and the...[mountain].* Lv 20:25, Ez 44:23, Jl 2:20

---

[325] Field, ibid.

[326] Cf. BHS, critical apparatus, 1409. See also Ez 36:3, Mi 5:6.

[327] See BDBG, 484.

[328] The archaic spelling of both words (lacking the usual *mater lectionis* ו) may contribute to indicate an early date of this composition.

[329] LXX has ἔσονται ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ αὐτοῦ *will be in his multitude,* and Θ ἐν τοῖς ὀχυρώμασιν αὐτῶν *in their fortresses.* VUL reads: per Lybias quoque et Aethyopias transibit = *he will pass through Lybia and Ethyopia.*

[330] See Dan 3:19: הִתְמְלִי חֱמָא *he was filled with rage.*

[331] See BDBG, p. 66.

phrase compound from הַר־קֹדֶשׁ (Dan 9:16.20, Ps 3:5, Ez 28:14) + צְבִי (Dan 8:9, 11:16.41, 2S 1:19, Ez 20:15) = *the mountain of the holy splendour / the glorious and holy mountain.* קִצּוֹ־ וּבָא עַד Jos 3:8, 2K 7:5.8, Jr 25:31. וְאֵין עוֹזֵר לוֹ Ps 72:12, La 1:7, Ps 22:12, 107:12. Parallel to... וְאֵין לוֹ from Dan 9:26?

Daniel 12:1

מִיכָאֵל See on Dan 10:13. הַשַּׂר הַגָּדוֹל *the Greatest (Highest)*[332] *Commander.* This superlative points back to the preliminary vision of chap. 8, where this personage is called שָׂרִים־ שַׂר (Dan 8:25) or שַׂר־(ה)צבא [יהוה] (Dan 8:10-11, comp. Jos 5:14). הַשַּׂר....הָעֹמֵד This language may be metaphorical, borrowed from the Persian imperial use, as it is reported in Bible writings: Since there were 7 Medo-Persian שָׂרִים who were standing before the king, having the first place and free access to the king, and representing the supreme council (Est 1:14, Ezra 7:14) the apocalyptic language describes the celestial organization in a similar manner.[333] עַל־בְּנֵי עַמְּךָ Lv 19:18, Ez 37:18, Dan 11:14. וְהָיְתָה עֵת צָרָה Jr 30:7, Ps 37:9, Is 33:2, Jr 14:8, 15:11. עַד... אֲשֶׁר לֹא־נִהְיְתָה Jl 2:2, Ex 11:6, Jg 19:30. מִהְיוֹת גּוֹי Jr 31:36.[334] הָעֵת הַהִיא Ne 6:1, Jg 21:14, 2K 8:22 et al., about 50 occurrences. יִמָּלֵט עַמְּךָ Jl 3:5, cf. Dan 11:41, Ez 17:8, Jr 51:45, Ps 88:49, 107:20, Pr 19:5, Ml 3:15.

כָּל־הַנִּמְצָא כָּתוּב בַּסֵּפֶר *everyone who will be found written in the book.*[335] This is an old prophetic theme (Is 4:3, Ex 32:32, Ps 69:29, 139:16, Jr 17:13), further enriched in the Persian period (Ezra 2:62, Ne 7:64, Est 2:23, 6:2, Ml 3:16-18).[336] The reference to names that are *found written in "the" book,* implies judicial investigation, and sends us back to the judgment scene of the first vision, where *the court sat and certain books were opened* (Dan 7:10). As a result, God's enemies are destroyed and "the people of saints of the Most High", around their human Representative, receive the eternal kingdom (because the *judgemnet was given for them*: Dan 7:22.26-27).

Daniel 12:2

וְרַבִּים מִיְּשֵׁנֵי....יָקִיצוּ In direct contradiction with one of Jb's depressive and hopeless thoughts (Jb 14:12 לֹא יָקִיצוּ וְלֹא־יֵעֹרוּ מִשְּׁנָתָם). This is a metaphoric speaking about death and corporeal resurrection (Jr 51:39.57, 2K 4:31, Ps 17:15, Is 26:19). In the TNK, the concept of resurrection is not so developed as in the NT, but it is implied by the lacking of spiritualist references and by the omnipotence and eternity of "God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob" (Gn 31:53, 32:10, Ex 3:6.15, 4:5), "the Living, Eternal God" (Dan 12:7, Jr 10:10, Nu 14:21, Jb 19:25), who is "God of the living, and not of the dead".[337] אַדְמַת־עָפָר lit. *the ground (land)*

---

[332] LXX ὁ ἄγγελος ὁ μέγας *that great angel;* Θ ὁ ἄρχων ὁ μέγας *that great prince.* However, phrases involving definite nouns and adjectives express usually the *comparative superlative.* See Waltke and O'Connor, p. 269.

[333] See also Rev 8:2, Lk 1:19, Mt 18:10 and Dan 7:14, Jb 1:6.

[334] All other occurrences of the infinitive cstr. מִהְיוֹת in the TNK have the meaning *not to be, cease from being.* See Rt 1:12, 1S 2:31, 15:26, 1K 2:27, Is 49:6, Jr 31:36, 33:21.24.

[335] This phrase is in apposition with עַמְּךָ. Thus *your people* (i. e. Daniel's, that is Israel) is identified with those written in the heavenly book. This is quite a spiritual concept about the identity of the "chosen people". The true Israel is the Qahal of those written in the celestial record. This affords them the citizenship in the apocalyptic Jerusalem (cf. Is 4:2-3) and survival / deliverance in the final battle. The theme is developed in the NT apocalyptic (Phil 3:20-21, 4:3, Heb 11:10.13-16.39-40, 12:22-23.28, 13:14, Gal 4:26, Rev 3:12, 14:1, 21:1 – 22:5).

[336] The NT further builds on this theme: Phil 4:3, Rev 3:5, 5:1-5, 13:8, 17:8, 20:12.15, 21:27, 22:19.

[337] According to a *midrash* on Ex 3:6.15, in Mt 22:31-32, Mk 12:26-27, Lk 20:37-38, where Jesus of Nazareth is reported to answer the Sadduceans "Torahic" objections to resurrection.

of dust – the two nouns, connected in a construct chain, are practically synonyme (Jb 5:6) and reminiscent from Gn 2:7, 3:19, 18:27.[338]

אֵלֶּה לְ... וְאֵלֶּה לַ *some to [this]...and some to [that]*. The author implies that the divine judgment deals not only with the living, but with the dead also, because two different classes of mortals are envisioned to awake "in that time". חַיֵּי עוֹלָם – this is, certainly, one of the earliest spiritual concepts, which the religion is based on. The syntagm is also reminiscent of Genesis (3:22), and reflected in Ps 21:5, 133:3.[339] The idiom עוֹלָם חַיֵּי *life forever* is lexically connected to the חֵי הָעוֹלָם *the One who lives forever* from v. 7. The meaning of עוֹלָם, employed 19 times in Daniel and 430 times in the rest of TNK, is "indefinite time": *age, eon, era.* It is used both for longtime (ago or in the future) and for eternity, everlasting, forever. While in late Hebrew it got an extended meaning – "world"[340] – that new meaning is never known in the TNK. חֲרָפוֹת, plural of חֶרְפָּה *disgrace, reproach, shame,* Ps 69:10-11, Ps 78:66, Jr 23:40, Gn 34:14, ZP 3:18. לְדִרְאוֹן עוֹלָם *abhorrence, aversion,* Is 66:24.[341]

Daniel 12:3

וְהַמַּשְׂכִּלִים *the wise, discerning ones* – see on Dan 11:33. יַזְהִרוּ *warn, admonish, advise, teach* (Ex 18:20, Ps 19:12, Q 4:13, 12:12, 2K 6:10, Ez 3:17-21, 33:3-9, 2Ch 19:10, Aram. Ezra 4:22).[342] In this verse only appears the basic, etymological meaning of this root: *send out light, shine,*[343] as it is the English verb *to enlighten,* – which has lost its archaic meaning. The speaker obviously intended to emphasise the teaching role of the *maśkilîm*, by making a pun with this double meaning verb, and describing their eschatologic destiny in terms of *shining,* shedding heavenly light, like the celestial bodies.

כְּזֹהַר הָרָקִיעַ *like the brightness of the sky*, Ez 8:2 (כְּמַרְאֵה־זֹהַר).[344] רָקִיעַ *vault, expanse*[345] is also present in Ezekiel's vision (Ez 1:22.23.25.26, 10:1). Reminiscent of this apocalyptic comparison is Jesus' prophecy of Mt 13:43.[346] וּמַצְדִּיקֵי הָרַבִּים *those who cause*

---

[338] עפר is very common in the TNK, and often present in the metaphorical speaking about death: Jb 7:21, 10:9, 17:16, 19:25, 20:11, 21:26, 30:19, 34:15, Ps 22:16.30, 30:10, Q 3:20, 12:7, Is 29:4.

[339] The Hebrew has no word for *immortality* in the Greek and Christian traditional sense. Immortality is understood and rendered only by the terms of real life: blessed, happy, unending. A single time it occurs in TNK and it is termed אַל־מָוֶת *"non-death"* (Pr 12:28), explained in the parallel line as *life.*

[340] See Mt 12:32, Mk 10:30, Lk 20:34-35, Heb 1:2, 9:26 (עלם=עולם) in *The New Covenant Aramaic Peshitta Text, with Hebrew Translation,* ed. The Bible Society, Jerusalem, 1986. This natural shift of meaning from the time-eon to the space-eon may be seen in the Greek term αἰών, according to Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich Lexicon, p. 28. See also 1S 2:8 in the Targum. יהושע שופטים שמואל מן עשרים וארבע, Propheten, Tom 1. Druck und Verlag von Pessel Balaban, Lemberg, 1867, p. 159

[341] In both Isaia and Daniel, the damnation word דֵּרָאוֹן is used in a similar context. The scene is outside the walls of Jerusalem (Is 66:23-24, Dan 11:45, 12:1-2). Comp. Zc. 12:2.3.8.9, 14:2-16 and Rev 20:9, 21:26-27, 22:3.14.15.

[342] Hebrew has a related old root צהר cf. BDBG 843-844.

[343] Despite the uncertainty of BDBG (264, §2094) about the original meaning of the root. Even though the root is borrowed from Aramaic (and this must have happened quite early, because it was employed freely in Kings and Ezekiel), its concrete meaning must precede the extended, figurative one, as it happens in any language.

[344] This *appearance of brightness* in Ezekiel describes the figure of a heavenly Being compared with the *fire* and the *electrum* or *bronze*. The term is, obviously, from the same root with the preceding verb in Dan 12:3.

[345] The *celestial vault* or *dome; the heavenly screen* with stars and clouds and birds. From √ □□□□ *make firm, expand metals by beating out*: Is 42:5, 44:24, Ps 136:6, Ez 6:11, Jr 10:9, 2S 22:43 *to tread underfoot, to beat*. Thence רָקִיעַ *metallic expanse hammered out, (of plates) expansion,* Nu 17:3. Gr. στερέωμα - *something firm*; Lat. firmamentum *firm expanse*, Gn 1:6 separating celestial waters in two parts, Gn 1:14.15.17 the heavenly bodies placed in it, Gn 1:20 birds fly in it, Eze 1:22 a translucent expanse.

[346] "The righteous ones will shine as the sunshine in their Father's kingdom". Note the eschatologic and wisdom context of this prophecy (v. 40-43).

many to be righteous, teach many in righteousness.[347] This phrase is borrowed from Isaia's oracle about the Righteous Servant of Yahweh: בְּדַעְתּוֹ יַצְדִּיק ... לָרַבִּים *by the knowlege of Him* (or, *by His knowledge*),... *He shall make many righteous.* The wise of Daniel also will determine many to be righteous by their knowledge. יַזְהִרוּ....כַּכּוֹכָבִים The comparison between God's people (the elect, the holy ones, the wise) and the celestial bodies is implied in the transparent imagery of the previous vision, where the saints, the people of God, a "sacerdotal nation" around God's Sanctuary, is called "the heavenly host", i.e. "stars". See on Dan 8:10.

לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד Both terms express, in apposition, the same idea of everlasting, unending continnuity, to emphasise it. While they are used separately, scores and hundreds of times, for this purpose, in many places they appear together like in this verse,[348] and even more often without preposition: עוֹלָם וָעֶד.[349]

Daniel 12:4

סְתֹם הַדְּבָרִים וַחֲתֹם הַסֵּפֶר See on Dan 8:26. עַד־עֵת קֵץ The logical context of this expression defines without any doubt the kind of *end,* which the speaker meant. This is the period ushering in the last, eschatological battle – described in chap. 11:40-45 and terminated in chap. 12:1 by Michael's raise to defend His people. It is the time of the resurrection and the final reward. יְשֹׁטְטוּ a Poᶜlel form of √ שׁוּט [350]– *to search everywhere, inquiring* (for prophetic messages: Am 8:12), *investigate through* (the city, to find a single righteous man: Jr 5:1), *search thoroughly, examinate, seeking through* (all the earth – God's eyes: Zc 4:10, 2Ch 16:9). The speaker employs this verb to emphasise the idea of thorough research for understanding the sealed prophecy.[351] This view fits the context when it is related to "the wise ones", and to the result of the prophesied "running to and fro": וְתִרְבֶּה הַדָּעַת *and the knowledge shall increase (multiply).*[352]

The sudden passing from the injunction "seal the book", to the revelation "many will investigate and the knowledge shall increase", should be made in translation by a temporal conjunction ("when"). In fact, LXX and Θ connect the two clauses by ἕως [ἂν] = *until.* The same syntactical situation may be seen in the coordination of two clauses (very similar) in v. 9 and 10: עַד־עֵת קֵץ ... יִתְבָּרֲרוּ..רַבִּים *till the time of the end, [when] many will be cleansed...*etc. Or, in both cases, we may consider the temporal adverb אָז implied before the second clause.

Daniel 12:5

שְׁנַיִם אֲחֵרִים *other two* [*beings* – implied]. The adjectiv אַחֵר stands after the numeral+noun, as regular (Gn 8:10.12, 2Ch 30:23). These "other two" implies that the writer had mentioned already two beings in his vision. And actually he did in chap. 10, where he described the appearance of Michael and the approach of Gabriel, who had to reveal him afterward all the prophecy written in chap 11 and 12:1-4. Thus near the close of the vision there are, seemingly, four heavenly beings.

---

[347] Comp. Is 5:23.50:8, Pr 17:15, Ex 23:7, Jb 27:5, where the same Hiphᶜîl is means *who declare righteous,* or *justify, pronounce innocent,* a meaning that obviously cannot be applied in Daniel.

[348] Ps 9:6, 119:44, 145:1.2.21, Mi 4:5.

[349] Ps 10:16, 21:15, 45:7, 48:15, 52:10, 89:38, 104:5.

[350] The basic meaning is evident from Qal: *to go (rove, row) about* (in worldwide travels: Jb 1:7, 2:2), *go about, seeking for* (manna: Nu 11:8), *go through and search* (all the tribes, for the military census: 2S 24:2.8).

[351] See also on Dan 9:2. Cf. Is 34:16a.

[352] LXX has ἀπομανῶσιν οἱ πολλοὶ καὶ πλησθῇ ἡ γῆ ἀδικίας *most will fall away* (read ישׁוטו instead of ישׁטטו) *and the earth will be filled by iniquity* (read הרעה, הרעה instead of הדעת). Θ has διδαχθῶσιν πολλοὶ καὶ πληθυνθῇ ἡ γνῶσις *man y will be taught and the knowledge will increase.* VUL: pertransibunt plurimi et multiplex erit scientia = *most.will travel extensively and the science will be multiple..*

הֵנָּה ... וְ...הֵנָּה *here...and....there* 2K 4:35, 1K 20:40, 2K 2:8.14. Used more than 40 times, from Genesis to Chronicles.[353] לִשְׂפַת הַיְאֹר *on the bank of the river* Gn 41:3.17, Ex 2:3, 7:15, 2K 2:13, Gn 22:17, 2Ch 8:17. יְאוֹר / יְאֹר is the Hebrew name of the Nile and of its canals, then extended to any river or watercourse.[354] This *yᵉ'or* was idendtified in chap. 10:4 as the great river Tigris.

Daniel 12:6

אִישׁ לְבוּשׁ הַבַּדִּים See on Dan 10:5. ...לְ מִמַּעַל אֲשֶׁר. See on Dan 8:16. NRS, NAB, NJB and TEV translated *upstream*, but this is not drawn from the text itself. Since the image is visionary, apocalyptic, we don't need to expect natural positions only.[355] This Being, who seems to be Michael, if we consider all information about Him in chap. 8, 10 and 12, is described as giving commands and answering questions. מֵימֵי הַיְאֹר is another old phrase: Ex 4:9, 7:24. עַד־מָתַי קֵץ הַפְּלָאוֹת lit. *Until then,[356] the end of these wonders [is to be waited]?* The "wonders" (amazing, astonishing things) were mentioned in the long prophecy, which the angel came to reveal to Daniel. See the linguistic comments on Dan 8:13.

Daniel 12:7

וָאֶשְׁמַע ......וַיָּרֶם Daniel shows first his interest in the divine answer, and creates a sentence that is impossible in English and perhaps in most languages: *I heard that Man clothed in linen, who was above the waters of the river, and He raised His right hand...* This should be understood as the following: *I heard the Man ....., how, after raising His right hand......He sweared...* וַיָּרֶם ...אֶל־הַשָּׁמַיִם Gn 14:22, Ex 6:8, Dt 32:40, Ne 9:15 (Comp. Rev 10:5-6. The Angel is seen there raising His right hand only). חֵי הָעוֹלָם This expression is used in Daniel only, see Aram. Dan 4:31, 6:27, and it may be derived from the royal greeting mentioned in Ne 2:3, Dan 2:4, 3:9, 5:10, 6:7.22 – implying the name of God as Heavenly King – , and from the Hebrew oath formula, חַי יהוה (Jg 8:19, 1S 14:39, Ho 4:15).

עַד־עִדָּן וְעִדָּנִין וּפְלַג עִדָּן = לְמוֹעֵד מוֹעֲדִים וָחֵצִי (Aram. Dan 7:25). In both places we should read as dual the noun עִדָּנִין / מוֹעֲדִים.[357] This is obviously an encrypted formula. The speaker just sends us to the Aramaic vision of chap. 7, which has many encoded figures. His reference is a strong suggestion that helps us identify the last tyrant of chap. 7 with the last one of chap. 11. It follows that the vision in chap. 8 is another perspective on the same events foreseen in chap. 7 and quite minutely described in chap. 11-12. The term מוֹעֵד *appointed time, period, term, sacred season,* must have been used sometimes for *year* (because of the time lapse between seasons?).[358] BDBG (1105) § 5732.2 renders it as definite time,= *year* (as

---

[353] The sysnonyme adverbs of location: פֹּה *here* is used 57 times and שָׁם *there, here* – 616 times..

[354] Gn 41:1-3.17.18, Ex 2:3.5, 4:9, 7:15.17.18.20.21.24.25.28, 8:5.7, 17:5, Is 19:7.8, 23:3.10?, Jr 46:7.8, Ez 29:9, Am 8:8, 9:5, Zc 10:11. See also BDBG 384. It is an old loan-word from Egyptian (*'iotr / 'io'r*). In the plural it is used for the canals of the Nile (Ex 8:1, Na 3:8, Ez 30:12) and any other canals (streams, rivers): Jb 28:10, Is 33:21.

[355] See also Péter-Contesse, op cit., p. 330. For unusual walk or standing on /above waters see Rev 10:2, Mt 14:25.

[356] See on Dan 8:13, about the meaning of עַד מָתַי.

[357] For עדנין, according to the suggestion of BDBG, p. 1105, § 5732, wich follows Bevan and Gunkel. For מועדים, BDBG 417, § 4150, is cited Briggs implying the same reading in the equation of the whole formula to *three years and a half.* Origen's Hexapla gives the same suggestion: *tempora (duo annos).* See Field, 933. Note the next apocalyptic period from v. 11, the "1290 days" (= 3 years+7 months) which is roughly three years and a half.. The NT Apocalypse aggrees on this equation ("42 months": Rev 11:2, "1260 days": 11:3, "1260 days": 12:6, "one time, times and half of a time":12:14, "42 months": 13:5).

[358] This is not unusual, because terms like שבת *sabbath / week,* and חדש *month, new moon day,* had the same double function.

modern Greek χρόνος). The same use of the parallel, Aramaic term is employed in Dan 4:13.20.22.29, where LXX has ἑπτὰ ἕτη = *seven years,* for those "7 times" (שבעה עדנין). The historical-typological pattern of this bloody period of "3 ½ times/years" of Dan 7 and 12 is that famous persecution and drought in the times of the prophet Elijah.[359] The prep. ...לְ means in this case, *till, after,* or *up to the passing of,* to answer the question "until when?". The speaker says that it must pass first that already mentioned period of "3 ½ times", then.... will come the end.

וּכְכַלּוֹת נַפֵּץ יַד־עַם־קֹדֶשׁ *when the shattering of the power of the holy people comes to an end* (NRS).[360]   This is one of the longest construct chains. עַם־קֹדֶשׁ *the holy peaople,* a covenant title and an ideal for Israel (Dt 26:19, Is 62:12, Dt 7:6, 14:2.21, 28:9).

תִּכְלֶינָה כָּל־אֵלֶּה (Gn 41:53) *[when that will come to an end], then all these ["wonders"] will come to an end.* The speaker means that the end of the 3 ½ seasons is not the eschaton itself, but when a last, crushing blow on God's people comes (as described above, in Dan 11:41.45), then will come "the End", when all sufferings of God's people will come to an end (through the divine intervention of Michael, as shown in v.1).

Daniel 12:8

וְלֹא אָבִין This appears in harmony with Dan 8:27c, but in contrast with Dan 10:1c, where Daniel refers to his last vision. It is very important to note that this motif of understanding / non-understanding occurs usually in context with the time periods (Dan 8:14.26-27, 9:2.22-24). וָאֹמְרָה a pseudo-cohortative: see on Dan 8:13. מָה אַחֲרִית אֵלֶּה *what shall be the end (outcome) of these [events]?*

Daniel 12:9

לֵךְ *go your way!* This is not the repelling word to an intruder, as may appear from any translation, but a friendly injunction from a superior, or like an English *come on, Daniel!* (It's over, Daniel! This is not for you!). כִּי־סְתֻמִים וַחֲתֻמִים הַדְּבָרִים *these things [about the chronology of the eschaton] are covered (shut up) and sealed...* This is the 3rd time that the idea of "sealing" some prophecy appears in Daniel (See on Dan 8:26, 12:4, 12:9).

עַד־עֵת קֵץ i. e. the period before the eschaton (Dan 8:17.19, 11:35, 12:4).

Daniel 12:10

יִתְבָּרֲרוּ וְיִתְלַבְּנוּ וְיִצָּרְפוּ רַבִּים See on v. 4. Despite of all known translations, the obvious parallel with the syntax and wording of v. 4 indicates the need of a bold intervention, to render [9....*to the time of the end*] 10: *when* (or, *then*) *many will be ...purified...*etc. The same three verbs are used in Dan 11:35, though in a different order, and in a passive meaning expressed by the active Qal / Piᶜel inf. cstr.+ בָּהֶם. In this instance, the passive is expressed through Hithpaᶜel imperfective forms and a Niphᶜal. הִתְבָּרֵר is used in Ps 18:27 with the meaning *show oneself pure,* but here it has a passive meaning:[361] *be sifted, purged out, tested.*

---

[359] The NT only renders explicitly this time as 3 ½ years (Lk 4:25, Jm 5:17), which roughly agrees with the OT record ("in the 3rd year" – from Elijah's prediction – 1K 18:1), if we properly assume that Elijah made his prediction after the passing of the natural Palestinian six months of dry season.

[360] וּכְכַלּוֹת 2Ch 7:1, 2Ch 29:29, Ezra 9:1, Dt 31:24, Jos 8:24. נַפֵּץ Ps 2:9, 137:9, 1K 5:23, Jr 13:14, 48:12, Is 27:9, Jr 51:20-23, Jg 7:19. יַד – here, figuratively, *power* (cf. Holladay, 128. *strength,* Dt 32:26, Jos 8:20; *power,* Pr 18:21, 2K 13:5). The same meaning is intended in Dan 8:4.7, 11:41. The expression is synonyme to שָׁבֹר זְרוֹעַ־ *break the arm of...* (Ps 10:15, Jr 48:25, Dan 11:22 et al.). See also Jr 8:21, 14:17, La 3:48, where the metaphor of *crush / break* is applied to God's people, meaning either destruction, or affliction.

[361] While the Niphᶜal of this verb means *keep oneself pure.* According to Holladay, p. 50. BDBG 141 favorises the meaning *purify oneself* for Dan 12:10, without giving any reason, while the literary context justifies

הִתְלַבֵּן is not attested elsewhere, but to be consistent, according to both Holladay and BDBG, it should be rendered *be made white, whitened, made white as a brick.* The third synonym, הִצָּרֵף is a Niphᶜal passive: *be refined, smelt, separated as a metal from ore, in a furnace.* The author emphasises the need of divine testing and purging the people, in accord with the ideal of "holy people" (v. 7e) and the permanent temptation of forgetting the Holy Covenant in the compromises, the mistifications and persecutions inspired from outside (Dan 11:30d.31d.34-35).

וְהִרְשִׁיעוּ רְשָׁעִים See on Dan 11:31c. In Daniel, this Hiphᶜil has only the meaning *show oneself wicked, do wickedly,* though most of its occurences in TNK have the meaning *to make (declare) one guilty.* This concept of two separated classes in the time of the end is found in the closing verses of the NT (Rev 22:11).[362] The speaker discloses here the real nature of the wisdom he means. It is not so much a high IQ + large quantities of information, nor a "spiritual" – mystical or esoteric – knowledge and power, but a deep spiritual-moral, practical wisdom: doing the right, not the wrong. וְלֹא יָבִינוּ כָּל־רְשָׁעִים If Daniel "didn't understand", it was because the message was not for him (v. 4.8.9). But when the speaker tells about these impious ones, he refers to those living in the time of the end, when his encoded time revelations had to be unsealed. וְהַמַּשְׂכִּלִים יָבִינוּ The *maśkilîm*, the pious-wise light bearers of all people shall only understand.

Daniel 12:11

וּמֵעֵת הוּסַר הַתָּמִיד Dan 11:31, (8:11), 2Ch 25:27, Is 48:16, Ez 4:10-11, 1Ch 9:25, Ne 13:21. Re. the linguistic and ritual meaning of הַתָּמִיד, see on Dan 8:11. וְלָתֵת...... The prep. לְ indicates, in this case, the purpose of removing the *tamîd,* and not the time (*till*) as in v. 7. To be consistent, the speaker probable means, *from the time of removing the "tamîd" – that is, in order to istall the....* – [until the time of the end, will be...]. שִׁקּוּץ שֹׁמֵם Re. this encrypted expression, see on Dan 8:12-13, 9:27, 11:31. יָמִים אֶלֶף מָאתַיִם וְתִשְׁעִים See on v. 7. Concerning the syntactic pattern of putting first the time period, then the numerals, see Dan 8:14, 9:24, 12:12.

Daniel 12:12

אַשְׁרֵי הַמְחַכֶּה Is 64:3, Jb 3:21, Is 30:18. וְיַגִּיעַ לְ.... Jb 20:6, Ps 32:6, Ps 88:4, Q 12:1, Is 25:12, La 2:2, 2Ch 28:9. The formula of blessing / congratulation: אַשְׁרֵי lit. *O, the hapinness of...!* occurs first in Dt 33:29 and is found scores of times in TNK, down to 2Ch 9:7, most times in Psalms. In Daniel, this is the only occurence. יָמִים אֶלֶף שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת שְׁלֹשִׁים וַחֲמִשָּׁה On the syntax of this expression see v. 11. This numeral 1335 is not found elsewhere in the TNK, like the 1290 days of v. 11 and the 2300 days of chap. 8:14. Neither fit they satisfactorily any explicit or hard searched period related to the Maccabean application.

Holladay's proposal. See Waltke and O'Connor 431-432 for the passive use of Hithpaᶜel (הִתְקַדֵּשׁ Is 30:29, הִשְׁתַּכַּח Q 8:10 et al.)

[362] In a similar context: book non-sealed, the imminence of the end, and even wording from the old Greek translations:

Dan 12:9-10	Rev 22:10-11
LXX καὶ εἶπέν μοι... Θ ἐσφραγισμένοι οἱ λόγοι ἕως καιροῦ πέρας... LXX ...καὶ ἁγιασθῶσι πολλοί καὶ ἁμάρτωσιν οἱ ἁμαρτωλοί ...Θ καὶ ἀνομήσωσιν ἄνομοι	καὶ λέγει μοι, Μὴ σφραγίσῃς τοὺς λόγους ... ὁ καιρὸς γὰρ ἐγγύς ἐστιν. ὁ ἀδικῶν ἀδικησάτω ἔτι καὶ ὁ ῥυπαρὸς ῥυπανθήτω ... καὶ ὁ ἅγιος ἁγιασθήτω ἔτι.

Daniel 12:13

וְאַתָּה *as for thee* – to emphasise again the limited privilege of the prophet against those who reach the days of the end, to understand the sealed time prophecy and to experience alive the ultimate salvation described in v. 1-3. לֵךְ לַקֵּץ *go your way,*[363] *until the end!* See on v. 9a. Concerning the term קֵץ it is good to observe that Daniel uses it in its old EBH meaning, not as it was often used in the 2nd century BCE.[364] The "end" in this phrase should not be understood as Daniel's end, but it is explained in the last sentence as the end of time. וְתָנוּחַ *[for] you shall rest / repose...* See on the metaphor of sleeping and awaking in v. 2. וְתַעֲמֹד לְגֹרָלְךָ *and you shall stand up in view of your lot.* גּוֹרָל means *lot,*[365] hence *thing assigned by casting lots (recompense, retribution, portion, destiny).* Cf. Pr 16:33, Is 17:14, Jr 13:25. This is another metaphor of God's righteous judgment and retribution. לְקֵץ הַיָּמִין *at the end of the (those) days.*[366] The definite time *(days)* spoken of here, must be the days foreseen in this prophecy. First, the divine speaker reminded the prophet about the "3 ½ times" that are further equated, roughly, with "1290 days". But he showed that the end of the *1260-1290 days* is not the final End for God's people; the wise, who understand the times, have to wait till the fulfillment of 1335 days. This is a final date in the prophecy, and it must have the same *terminus ad quem* as the "2300 days" of Daniel 8:14.26, because that is also a final term (Dan 8:17.19). Whatever the theological or critical significance of this end of time, the Hebrew expression does not necesarrily mean the "end of the world" at the termination point of the (2300 / 1335) days. The *Daniel's* news is that the wise must wait patiently until the end of the long period. The end of Israel's troubles, the glorious messianic kingdom ushered by Michael's raise, may come after that only. God's judgement, the vindication of His Sanctuary, may come only after that.

הַיָּמִין This word reveals a plural ending that is specific to the Aramaic. But it is not a sole instance in the TNK. See Jb 24:22. (חַיִּין for חַיִּים). " Citing Kutscher and Qimron, Sáenz-Badillos says that in the LBH written and probably spoken at Qumran, "As in R[abinic]H[ebrew], final *mem* and *nun* are interchangeable."[367] This spelling, therefore, may reflect late scribal influence, but not late authorship. It is the only occurance of this kind in *Daniel.*

Conclusion of the Hebrew part

The modern studies on the Biblical Hebrew are under spectacular development. The diachronic study of BH reached to some good results, but there is the so-called minimalist school that makes scientific opposition. Not all representative scholars of the same school agree in important points. The Hebrew of Daniel was not thoroughly studied as Samuel-Kings and Chronicles or Ezekiel. Most of opinions concerning this book are based on philosophical or belief/unbelief patterns of thought, not on the internal evidence of the book itself.

We cannot negate, in principle, late redactions of the book, but there is sufficient evidence that old features (vocabulary, grammar and spelling) still remained in place. The Hebrew of Daniel contains **some Persian words** (apadana – *palace,* fratama – *noblemen,* pati-

---

[363] Holladay (80) gives a single reference with the meaning *to die* (Gn 15:2 אָנֹכִי הוֹלֵךְ), probably after LXX (ἀπολύομαι) but it is not convincing. NRS has *I continue,* which fits better the normal use of the verb and even the context. However, in Dan 12:13 the verb includes this meaning from the context (*you shall rest, till you stand up ... at the end....*).

[364] In his very interesting study, Shemariahu Talmon (*The World of Qumran from Within,* collected studies. Jerusalem-Leiden, E. J. Brill, Magnus Press, The Hebrew University, 1989) p. 46-48, 294, 296. shows that the term קֵץ was technically used with the meaning *period, time,* in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

[365] Actually, pebbles used for systematically making decisions. BDBG 174.

[366] Comp. with Gn 4:3, 1K 17:7, Jr 13:6; Gn 41:1, Jr 42:7 מִקֵּץ יָמִים *after a while, after a number of days;* Ne 13:6 וּלְקֵץ יָמִים *after some time.* The definite form is found exclusively in Daniel 12:13: *at the end of the (those) days = after the number of days [spoken of].*

[367] Sáenz-Badillos, op. cit. 140.

baga – *a king's portion,* dat – *law*), but **no Greek term**. [368] There are some Aramaic loan-words and syntactical influence, some features specific to LBH. But the basic texture of Daniel's language is nothing else than a Standard Hebrew modified, in the exilic context, in conditions of multilinguism (especially under Aramaic stress), with stylistic traits of a single author, having a literary structure that links together not only the Hebrew chapters, but the Aramaic chapters too.

These conclusions are only preliminary and this study is in itself an exercice for better attempts in the future.

---

[368] Gleason Archer, Jr., *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction,* The Moody Bible Institute of Chicago, 1985, pp. 396-397.

The ARAMAIC OF DANIEL WITH A STUDY ON CHAPTER 7

by Florin G. Lăiu, Student nr. 3153-918-1

Paper for MTHOT3-G

Presented to

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

(UNISA)

Department of Old Testament

Supervisor: PROF. I.J.J. SPANGENBERG

October 1999

Introduction to the Aramaic part

In writing this modest paper, I was interested to do a general research, in order to know a bit more about the Aramaic Language as its study involves a clearer appreciation of the Aramaic part of the book of Daniel. After some introductory comments on the linguistic implications, I studied some lexical and syntactic aspects while surveying the Aramaic text of Daniel 7. I compared some Aramaic terms, roots, and often idioms of Dan. 7 through all other OT books, using basicaly the PC program Bible Works 95/NT Release (1996) and the whole panoply of lexicons, dictionaries, grammars etc. at hand, as they are listed in the Bibliography.

Why Aramaic beside Hebrew?

The most striking linguistic peculiarity of the book is its bilingual composition. As it is known, the introductory chapter and the first verses of the second one are written in Hebrew. Then, after the mention that "the Chaldeans answered the king – in Aramaic –" (Dan 2:4a), not only is their reply rendered as natural in Aramaic, but the text keeps on the Aramaic track down to the end of chap. 7, resuming afterward to Hebrew for the chapters 8-12. Though some possible explanations were given to this strange phenomenon, it is still a defiant reality for all philological camps.[369] We have the book of Ezra in the canon, with precisely the same problem. We cannot explain this one without the other one. This apparent complication of the problem may contribute to its solution.

Whatever the justification found, we must have **the same** explanation for the same problem in Ezra. The bilingual composition of Ezra (Hebrew 1:1 – 4:6; Aramaic 4:7 – 6:18; Hebrew 6:19 – 7:11; Aramaic 7:12 – 26; Hebrew 7:27 – 10:44) cannot be explained only on the basis of the presence of some official Aramaic letters, because the Aramaic text often extends beyond those letters intended to be rendered in their original language, just as in the book of Daniel. And the first official letter (the famous decree of Cyrus) is rendered in Hebrew. Moreover, the first change from Hebrew to Aramaic occurs in precisely the same literary manner (Ezra 4:6-7 cf. Dan 2:4), which is a proof that the term אֲרָמִית in Dan 2:4 cannot be considered a later insert to indicate a late redaction, say, after the "lost" of the original language text. It is rather a mark of authenticity.

Both authors lived in a strong bilingual milieu. It was so natural for them to switch from their native tongue to that acquired in the Exile (that in short time became the second, or even the first mother tongue of the Jew) that it could have happened to change from one to another for the most banal motives. We see this natural phenomenon in our day, in similar circumstances; why not think so about the exilic and postexilic Jews? The Aramaic was the sacred language of their ancestors (Dt 26:5, Neh 9:7) and now it was spoken by all Jews. Only late mystical-nationalistic considerations could lead to the idea of Ivrith's unique sacredness. Therefore we may logically assume (if we only admit the actual Danielic authorship!) that Daniel, like Ezra, naturally switched to Aramaic when he had to quote an originally Aramaic speaking, then naturally alike, he kept on writing in Aramaic as long as he remained to write at that time – or in the same emotional state for a couple of days. The *terminus a quo* of his writings / final redaction seems to be c. 536 BC for the Aramaic part (as suggested in Dan

---

[369] J. A. Soggin, *Introduction to the Old Testament,* 2nd rev. ed. (Philadelphia, 1980), p. 410. A theological / literary content explanation (Aramaic for stories in pagan setting, Hebrew for revelations about Israel) is not convincing, because of some chapters' dissent. Zimmerman's opinion (now developed by many other theologians), about an original Aramaic book being later translated partially in Hebrew, seems not acceptable to me. We have no "complete" Aramaic text discovered, and the Danielic manuscript fragments of Qumrân (1QDan[a] and 1QDan[b]) indicate the shift from Aramaic to Hebrew and back at exactly the same places as in the Masoretic text. Cf. Gerhard Hasel, *op. cit.* pp. 141-143.

6:28) and c.534 BC for the Hebrew part (as suggested in Dan 10:1). We cannot negate, in principle, late redactions of the book, but there is sufficient evidence that old terms, no more understood in the 2nd century BC, remained in place.

While a strictly scientific conclusion concerning the presence of both Aramaic and Hebrew in the book of Daniel cannot yet be drawn, the old words of a great scholar, who was Pusey, are still valid:

> Over and above, the fact, that the book is written in both languages, suits the times of Daniel, and is inexplicable by those, who would have it written in the time of the Maccabees. No other book or portion of a book, of the Canon, approximates to that date.[370]

The Aramaic of Daniel

The Aramaic of Daniel proves to be Imperial Aramaic, a stage of linguistic evolution down to 300 BC. Indeed, 90 % of Daniel's Aramaic vocabulary is attested by Aramaic texts dating from the 5th century or even earlier.[371] Says Kitchen: "It is equally obscurantist to exclude dogmatically a sixth-fifth (or fourth) century date on the one hand, or to hold such a date as mechanically proven on the other, as far as the Aramaic is concerned."[372] Moreover, the comparison with the late Aramaic Genesis Apocryphon and Job Targum, leads us to more certain stands in favour of an earlier date for the Aramaic of Daniel.[373]

In a good Romanian academic book, written in the communist-atheistic regime, containing a lot of ancient Near East texts, the authors Constantin Daniel and Ion Acsan, state:

> In the 7th century BC, the Aramaic language considerably extended its geographical area and began to be spoken not only by the majority of the Mesopotamian peoples, but even in Canaan, in Palestine.[…] Aramaic texts from the 5th century came to us, from Elephantine in the Upper Egypt […] They contain letters, official documents, transactional documents and literary texts […] In the Bible we encounter also – **written in the same epoch, but some even earlier** – , excerpts edited in Aramaic (cf. Jer 10:11, Ezra 4:8 etc, 6:8 etc, 7:12 etc., as well as part of the book of Daniel: 2:4 – 7:28). **The Aramaic parts of the Book of Ezra contain official documents of the Persian administration, edited in Aramaic. In the Book of Daniel are rendered events from the imperial courts of Babylon and Persia, the 6th century BC**.[374]

The earliness of the Aramaic of Daniel was emphasised by many scholars. However, this does not mean that the implicite claims of the book to have been written during the reign of Cyrus are recognized. Focusing on some differences between the Aramaic of the Papyri and that of Daniel, Montgomery holds that the latter "is not earlier than within the 5th cent., is more likely younger, certainly is not of the 6th cent." He allows chapters 1-6 to be earlier than chap. 7.[375]

Indeed, as a scholar like Kutscher had said in 1965, Biblical Aramaic "has been one of the most debated Biblical problems for more than sixty years. There are two questions to be answered: 1) Time of origin; 2) Place of origin....It is my belief that B. A. shows indications of eastern origin."[376] After he establish a time for the Aramaic of the Scroll (Genesis Apocryphon), as a language in transition from 'Reichsaramäisch' to Middle Aramaic, Kutscher

---

[370] Rev. E. B. Pusey, *Daniel the Prophet.* 9 lectures. NY, Funk & Wagnals, 1885. p. 113.

[371] K A Kitchen, *op. cit.,* pp. 32.79.

[372] K A Kitchen, *op. cit.* p. 79.

[373] G. Hasel, *op. cit.* pp. 132-136. Hasel cites Kutscher, Coxon and others.

[374] *Tăbliţele de argilă – scrieri din Orientul antic,* Editura Minerva, Bucureşti, 1981, pp. 254-55. My translation, my underlining.

[375] James A. Montgomery, "Daniel", in *International Critical Commentary,* Ed. S.R. Driver, A. Plummer, C. A. Briggs. Edinburgh, T.&T. Clark 1927, p. 19-20.

[376] E. Y. Kutscher, "The Language of the 'Genesis Apocryphon'. A preliminary Study", in *Scripta Hierosolymitana,* Publications of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem. vol. IV. 1965, p.2.

treats the influence of Biblical Aramaic (and especially of the language of Daniel) on the language of the Scroll. At least two of the examples he proposes are linked to Dan chap.7 (v. 15. בחזוא (עם) ליליא / בחזוא די ליליא ; Dan 2:19, 7:2.7.13 ; לנוא נדנהא – GA II, 10 – בגוא נדנה GA XXI, 8 בחזוא די ליליא).[377] This indicates a much earlier date for the Aramaic of Daniel than for the Aramaic of the Scroll. And note that the language of the Scroll is earlier than Middle Aramaic.[378] Archer drew his conclusion very sharp, on the cumulative result of the linguistic evidence, "that the Aramaic of the [Genesis] Apocryphon is **centuries later** than that of Daniel and Ezra. Otherwise there is no such thing as linguistic evidence."[379] Gerhard Hasel also concluded that

> …on the basis of presently available evidence, the Aramaic of Daniel belongs to Official Aramaic and can have been written as early as the latter part of the sixth century B.C. Even if the exact date of Daniel cannot be decided on linguistic grounds alone, there is abundant and compelling linguistic evidence against a second-century Palestinian origin.[380]

At least "in the lexical field – Coxon says – Biblical Aramaic contains unmistakable traits of Official Aramaic. In his attempt to re-affirm the second century of *Daniel* Rowley fails to do them justice."[381]

The comparative linguistical study involving the Aramaic of Daniel consists not in similarities or dissimilarities with later stages of development of the Imperial Aramaic, but also in comparison with the Old Aramaic texts available. In this area, a major contribution achieved Zdravko Stefanovic, who showed that the assumed uniformity of the Old Aramaic cannot be maintained any longer. And he divided the OA into three or four dialects. His study

> contributes to the present discussion of D[aniel] A[ramaic] in that it presents answers to certain objections raised regarding the traditional dating of DA. Three factors must be accounted for in any conclusion on DA: geography, chronology, and the literary character of the text. The text of DA in its present form (including chap. 7) contains a significant amount of material similar to OA texts.[382]

Regarding the unending debate on the actual age of the book *Daniel*, there is also an important question to answer: Since we already know so many things about the role of scribes and Massoretes to update the spelling, why not give more weight to the suggestion that some aspects of the language may not reflect the real lexic or grammar of the original writer, but some later and very natural interventions? If we know something about the extreme conservative position of the Massoretes – fortunately for the text preservation –, we cannot assume the same attitude from the part of old scribes. As Josephus, who reflects older Jewish traditions, knew, – and the Biblical data agree – Ezra, the *sophér* par excellence, could so well do the last textual aggiornamento of all OT books written before him. And the OT claims from within does not allow much to have been written afterwards, that is after c. 400 BC.

---

[377] Kutscher, op. cit. p. 7.

[378] Kutscher, op. cit. p.15.

[379] Gleason L. Archer, "Aramaic Language,"Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible, ed. M. C. Tenney (Grand Rapids, Mich.,1975), 1:255. My emphasis.

[380] Gerhard F. Hasel. "Book of Daniel: Matters of Language," in *Andrews University Seminary Studies.* vol. 19, autumn 1981, N3, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich., p. 225.

[381] Peter W. Coxon, "The Distribution of Synonyms in Biblical Aramaic in the Light of Official Aramaic and the Aramaic of Qumran," in *Revue de Qumran,* 36, Décembre 1978, Tome 9, Gabalda, Paris, p. 512.

[382] Zdravko Stefanovic, *The Aramaic of Daniel in the Light of Old Aramaic,* Journal of the Studies of the Old Testament, Supplement Series 129, Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield, England, 1992, p. 108.

Concerning some special terms

"Chaldeans"

Some scholars considered the second use of the term "Chaldeans" as a professional Babylonian elite in Daniel, an anachronism for the 6ᵗʰ century BC. But there are later uses of the term with ethnic connotation, even to Strabo (d. AD 24) who uses both connotations, just like Daniel.[383] And the specialised, second use (which some scholars limit to later writings), is found in Herodotus (d. 425 BC)[384] where it designates the priests of Bel. The term was found even in Assyrian records with ethnic connotation, while the professional connotation was not found so far prior to the Persian era. While the Babylonian records are still silent, Daniel uses the term with both meanings. Thus the critics' argument is again found to be an inference ex silentio.[385]

Though the linguistic research on Daniel cannot suppress the objections of the unbelieving criticism, as a striking and indubitable evidence for an early date of composition, none of the signalled difficulties precludes the acceptance of an earlier date, or force us to accept the second century (BC) thesis. The philosophical-psychological bias is manifest in the linguistic research too.

The Greek loanwords

These terms, very suggestive for a late date of the book, as some hyper-critical scholars contend, are only three or four – just musical terms borrowed alongside the designated objects: musical instruments and specifications. One wonders why so few Greek words, comparatively, if the book was written in the 2ⁿᵈ century BC.[386]

The terms thought to be of Greek origin are: קִיתָרוֹס – κιθάρα or κιθάρις after an older Greek form (zither / kind of lyre); סַבְּכָא or שַׂבְּכָא – σαμβύκη (trigon, triangular lyre with 4 strings) a foreign word (possible Aramaic) in Greek; פְּסַנְתֵּרִין – ψαλτήριον (kind of triangular harp) and סוּמְפֹּנְיָה / סִיפֹנְיָה – συμφωνία (1. harmony / orchestra; 2. *in later Greek:* bagpipe) or it might be a Doric pronounciation for τύμπανον / τύπανον (tambourine), or a noun in apposition to the preceding one. Mitchell and Joyce have shown that the first two terms might be loan words in both languages, borrowed from a third unidentified language.[387]

These Greek loans are explainable since the famous orientalist W. F. Albright demonstrated that Greek culture penetrated the ancient Near East long before the Neo-Babylonian period.[388] Montgomery, however, opinates that "the Gr[eek]. words are, until more light comes, to be put in the scales with those from Persia, and both categories require a heavy counterweighting to resist their logical pressure."[389]

---

[383] Strabon, *Geografia,* vol. III, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, Bucharest, Cluj-Napoca, 1983, p. 716. For ethnic connotation see book XVI, 1:6.8, 3:1.3, 4:1. For the professional use see book XVI, 1:6, 2:39, and book XVII, 1:29.

[384] Herodotus, *Histories* 1:181-83.

[385] Hasel, *op. cit.* 124-126. It is interesting the observation of the French large dictionary of J. Planche & A. Pillon, *Dictionnaire Grec-Francais,* Librairie Hachette et Cᴵˣ , Paris, 1872, p. 1470: **"CHALDEEN, *nom de peuple; et par ext.* astrologue, tireur d'horoscope, *de même que chez nous* bohème, bohémien, -enne."** (my underline)

[386] T C Mitchell and R Joyce, *The musical Instruments in Nebuchadnezzar's Orchestra,* published in D J Wiseman etc. *op. cit.* pp. 20-27.

[387] T C Mitchell and R Joyce, *The Musical Instruments in Nebuchadnezzar's Orchestra,* in D J Wiseman, *op. cit.,* pp.19-27. Kitchen pointed to the penetration of Greek culture in the East even since the 7ᵗʰ and 8ᵗʰ centuries BC. (K A Kitchen *The Aramaic of Daniel,* published in D J Wiseman etc., *op. cit.* pp. 44-50).

[388] W F Albright, *From Stone Age to Christianity,* 2ⁿᵈ ed. (New York, 1957) p. 337.

[389] Montgomery, op. cit. p. 23.

The Persian loanwords

These terms amount to 18, designating specialised technical terms and titles for administration, law and military, and specific cultural elements (clothes, materials, etc.), [390] or even some ordinary words (such as זַן – category; פִּתְגָם – message; רָז – secret), all belonging to lexical categories that have in any time the fastest circulation. And not to forget that all these are Old Persian words, occurring in the history of the language not later than 300 BC.[391] The Aramaic, as the old *lingua franca* of the Middle East, long time before the Chaldean Empire, and in touch with different cultures and languages, could quickly assimilate neologisms, such as these Persian and Greek terms, and naturally preserved some of them for long or short time. Some of the Persian loanwords were so old and outdated at the time of the LXX translation, that they could not be properly understood. In Dan 3:2, אֲדַרְגָּזְרַיָּא (counselors) is rendered ὑπάτους (grandees), גְדָבְרַיָּא (treasurers) is rendered διοικητὰς (governors), and דְתָבְרַיָּא and תִּפְתָּיֵא (magistrates and judges) are rendered by a general phrase καὶ τοὺς ἐπ' ἐξουσιῶν (and those in authority).[392] I noted a single Persian loan-word in chap. 7: דָּת (law).

Proper names

To consider seriously the language of Daniel, we have to pay more attention to the proper names it uses. For example, P. R. Berger interprets Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego from Babylonian onomastics.

Shadrach is from Akkadian *shaduraku* ("ich bin sehr in Furcht versetzt"), a shortened form in which the name of the deity is omitted. Meshach is from the Akkadian *Meshaku* ("ich bin gering geachtet"), also omitting the theophoric component. It has a striking similarity with the known Akkadian term *mushkennu*, "ordinary people", and with the French *mesquin* – ital. *meschino* – rom. *meschin,* "base", "mean"

Abednego is from the Akkadian *Abad- Nagu* ("the servant of the shining one").[393] It was considered once to be a late corruption from Abed-Nebo, but meanwhile it was discovered in the Elephantine papyri dating from the 5th century BC.[394]

The name of Nebuchadnezzar, *Nabu-kudurri-utsur* ("May Nabu protect the crown"), which is spelled נְבוּכַדְרֶאצּוֹר / נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר by Ezekiel, retains both principal spellings (with נ / ר) in Jeremiah: נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר and נְבוּכַדְנֶאצַּר , while in 2 Kings, 2 Chronicles, and Esther is preferred the form נְבוּכַדְנֶאצַּר. Ezra spells it נְבוּכַדְנֶצּוֹר or נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר while Nehemiah and Daniel prefer the last spelling: נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר (except Dan 1:1 where it is spelled נְבוּכַדְנֶאצַּר). These orthographic variants reflect different pronunciations, and should not be emphasised as evidence for a late authorship of Daniel. At most they may reflect late updating by the copyists; but even this is difficult to infer, because the same copyists left the supposed older variants in Ezekiel – and partially in Jeremiah.

אַשְׁפְּנַז *Ashpᵉnaz*(Dan 1:3) and אַרְיוֹךְ *Aryokh* (Dan 2:14), are not historically identified, but these names are attested, so they prove to be genuine and could not be invented in the 2nd century BC, neither were then common. The first one appears in the Aramaic incantation texts

---

[390] K A Kitchen, *op. cit.,* pp. 35-44.

[391] G. Hasel, *op. cit.,* p.127.

[392] Gleason Archer, Jr., *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction,* The Moody Bible Institute of Chicago, 1985, pp. 396-397. The Hebrew of Daniel contains some Persian words too (apadana – *palace,* fratama – *noblemen,* patibaga – *a king's portion*), but no Greek term!

[393] P.-R. Berger, Der Kyros-Zylinder mit dem Zusatzfragment, BIN 2 Nr. 32 und die Akkadischen Personennamen im Danielbuch, ZA 64 (1975): 224-226, quoted by Hasel, op. cit. p. 126.

[394] E. Yamauchi, "Slaves of God" in *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society,* Winter 1966, p.33.

from Nippur as *Ashpenaz*, and is probably attested in cuneiform records as *Ashpazanda.*.[395] The name Arioch has been found in the cuneiform texts from Mari on the Euphrates in the form of *Arriwuk*, the fifth son of Zim-Lim, king of Mari in the 18th cent. B.C.[396]

בֵּלְטְשַׁאצַּר Cf. Dan 10:1. The most important thing, before discussing archeological data, is that there are some names in the book, which could not have been invented. The surname of Daniel– Belteshazzar – names of king Balthasar (Belshazzar) and of Nebuchadnezzar, are real Babylonian names and could not be found or invented centuries later. Belteshazzar (always spelled distinctly from Belshazzar in Hebrew: בֵּלְטְשַׁאצַּר distinct from בֵּלְשַׁאצַּר / בֵּלְאשַׁצַּר) is proprably from *Bel-balatshu—utsur* ("May Bel protect his life"), while Belshazzar, is from *Bel-shar-utsur* ("May Bel protect the king").

The text's insistence on the relationship *father-son* between Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar (Dan 5:11.13.18.22) is obviously the general semitic use of referring to *predecessor-successor* on the same throne, who may or may not be of the same dinasty. (cf. the references to Ahab *the son of* Omri). Thus nobody needs to insist on a direct necessary father-son relationship when they speak about Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar of Dan 5, especially now, that the historicity of Belshazzar was acurately proven by archaeology. Dougherty said:

Of all Neo-Babylonian records dealing with the situation at the close of the Neo-Babylonian empire, the fifth chapter of Daniel ranks next to cuneiform literature in accuracy, so far as outstanding events are concerned. The scriptural account may be interpreted as excelling because it employs the name Belshazzar, because it attributes royal power to Belshazzar, and because it recognizes that a dual rulership existed in the kingdom.[397]

The names Darius (*Darayavahush*) and Xerxes/Ahasuerus (*Khshyayarshah*), could well be royal titles like *Caesar* or *Augustus*. Or, according to König, the Danielic name *Daryawesh (Darayavaush)* can be explained as a regnal name, or an old Iranian title. In the Medieval Persian we found the term *dara* with the meaning "king".[398] It is known that the Persian kings often took new names at their accession. In *Daniel, even* the spelling of Darius's name דַּרְיָוֶשׁ, specific to the 6th-5th centuries BC, instead of דָּרְיָוֹהוּשׁ which is specific to the late centuries, indicates an early date for the book's composition.

Cyaxares (Khwakhshatra) II, as W. F. Albright has shown , A*hashwerosh (Khshayarsha* – "the mighty man" – cf. BDBG, entry 325.)*, might be a surname or a royal title for Cyaxares I, the famous victor of Assyria. D. J. Wiseman takes it as an ancient Achaemenid royal title. [399]

Study of some terms and phrases in Daniel 7

The following study consists in comparing some terms, idioms and syntactical patterns with parallels in other biblical texts, Aramaic or Hebrew. While some terms or expressions were given a special attention and all biblical occurences were searched to support their meaning or function, many others – considered irrelevant, for the time, in view of my immediate need – were left aside. Translation of the terms or phrases is seldom made, since it is implied in the comments and the study, in this form, is not addressed to beginners.

---

[395] SDA Bible Dictionary . **Ashpenaz.** Available on CD. *Logos Bible Software,* v2.0b, Logos Research Systems, 1996.

[396] 396. See also Gen 14:1.9. SDA Bible Dictionary, **Arioch**.

[397] Cf. Raymond Dougherty, *Nabonidus and Belshazzar* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1929), pp. 199-200:

[398] F. W. König, *Relief und Inschrift des Königs Dareios I,* Leiden 1938, p.1..

[399] K. A. Kitchen, *The Aramaic of Daniel,* in D. J. Wiseman etc., *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel,* The Tyndale Press: London, 1965, pp. 15.59-60; W. F. Albright, "The Date and Personality of the Chronicler", *JBL*, 40, 1921, p. 112n; J. C. Whitcomb, *Darius the Mede,* p. 27; R. N. Frye, *The Heritage of Persia,* 1962, p. 95.97.

Dan 7 :1

בִּשְׁנַת חֲדָה לְבֵלְאשַׁצַּר מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל Comp. Hebr. Dan. 1:1, 8:1, 9:1, 10:1. The same syntactic pattern.

רֵאשׁ מִלִּין אֲמַר Comp. רֹאשׁ־דְּבָרְךָ אֱמֶת (Ps 119:160), contrasting with סוֹף דָּבָר (Ec 12:13). These idioms, rendered differently by lexicographers and translators, should be further studied. They seemingly mean more than "beginning" and, respectively, "end". Origen's Hexapla has *summam rerum*[400] ("the most important / highest / principal of the things") and, according to LXX, κεφάλαια λόγων ("the capital / fundamental / principal / summary of the words").[401] However, we should note that Theodotion neglected completely this phrase, followed by modern translations like NRS. Thus, it is possible to understand the expression as the parallel structure of the verse seems to indicate, like the table below attempts to evidentiate.

	ראשׁ		חלם	
B	וְחֶזְוֵי רֵאשֵׁהּ עַל־מִשְׁכְּבֵהּ		דָּנִיֵּאל חֵלֶם חֲזָה	A
B¹	רֵאשׁ מִלִּין אֲמַר		בֵּאדַיִן חֶלְמָא כְתַב	A¹

If this structure, so specific to the Biblical literature, intends to give the same meaning for רֵאשׁ in the parallel lines, then we should understand רֵאשׁ מִלִּין as identical in meaning with חֶלְמָא A¹ though taking the form of B-B¹: *he told things that passed through his head.* This is only a supposition, since it is not yet convincing, considering the usual syntax.

Dan 7:2

עֲנֵה [דָנִיֵּאל] וְאָמַר A common formula used aproximately 100 times in Biblical Hebrew (Gen 18:27, Zec 6:5)

חָזֵה הֲוֵית....וַאֲרוּ Comp. with Hebr. Dan 8:3, Ez 2:9, Zec 5:1 et al.: וָאֶרְאֶה וְהִנֵּה The phrase חָזֵה הֲוֵית is used ten times in Daniel in the first person (4:7.10, 7:2.4.6.7.9.11. 13.21). and twice in the second person (2:31.34). In v. 8 וַאֲלוּ instead of וַאֲרוּ.

בְּחֶזְוֵי עִם־לֵילְיָא. Dan 7:7.13, 2:19, comp. Hebr. Job 4:13, 20:8, 33:15, Is 29:7, Mi 3:6.

אַרְבַּע רוּחֵי שְׁמַיָּא See on. Dan 8:8, 11:4. The metaphor of the wind was already used for the destructive force of the war.[402] This motif is further developed in the NT Revelation (7:1-3). מְגִיחָן The same root as in Hebr. Dan 8:4, 11:40. It is also an old military image (Dt 33:17, 1Ki 22:11, Ps 44 6). לְיַמָּא רַבָּא Comp. Hebr. Num 34:6, Ez 48:28, *the Great Sea=Mediterranean*. The Targum gives the same phrase as the Aramaic of Daniel.[403]

Dan 7:3

וְאַרְבַּע חֵיוָן רַבְרְבָן Comp. Ez. 1:5. Though the four living creatures of Ezekiel are connected with the throne of Yahweh, they share with the beasts of Daniel the numeral four, which was so consecrated as a symbol of the universal. It is a possible correspondence, a mirror image of Ezekiel's imagistic, as in the NT Revelation are found four living creatures (cherubs), corresponding in some way with the four horses (Rev 4:6-7, 6:1-8). סָלְקָן מִן־יַמָּא The verb is used in the Aramaic of Daniel (2:29, 7:3.6.20) and of Ezra (4:12).

---

[400] VUL has also, *summatimque*. ("and in summary").

[401] See F. Field, *Origenis Hexapla*, II, Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, Hildesheim 1964, p. 921.

[402] See Jer 4:11-12, 49:36, 51:1-2.

[403] יהושוע – מקראי קודש etc., Propheten, Tom 1. Druck und Verlag von Pessel Balaban, Lemberg, 1867; and יחיקאל, Propheten, Tom 9. Druck und Verlag von Pessel Balaban, Lemberg, 1878.

Dan 7:4

קַדְמָיְתָא כְאַרְיֵה וְגַפִּין דִּי־נְשַׁר לַהּ The combination lion + eagle, is seen in Ez 1:10, 10:14, and in the prophetic imagery describing the Babylonian invasion: Jer 4:7.13, 48:40, Lam 4:19, Hab 1:8, Ez 17:3.12. It is to stress both swiftness and strength, like in 2S 1:23. עַד דִּי־מְרִיטוּ נַפִּיהּ See also how the passive (Niphᶜal) stem of this root in Hebrew is means *to loose (hair)*: Lev 13:40-41. וּנְטִילַת מִן־אַרְעָא The same verb in Dan 4:31. See also in Is 63:9, used beside נשׂא *lift*. וְעַל־רַגְלַיִן כֶּאֱנָשׁ הֳקִימַת Cf. Hebr. 2Ki 13:21, 1Ch 28:2, 2Ch 3:13, Ez 2:1, 37:10, Zec 14:12. וּלְבַב אֱנָשׁ יְהִיב לַהּ That is, human mind, or heart (Ps 104:15, Is 13:7, 2S 15:6, Gen 8:21), human state of spirit (1S 17:32). In a context of changing from human mind to animal mind or viceversa, and of changing from insensitive to sensitive heart (mind), see Dan 4:16.34, Ez 11:19.

Dan 7:5

תִּנְיָנָה (with ה spelled instead of א, the mark of the definite article) corresponding to the Hebrew הַשֵּׁנִית (the Aramaic ת often corresponds in verbal roots to the Hebrew שׁ).

דָּמְיָה לְ *like* (cf. Sol 2:9, Gen 1:26 in Hebrew). דֹּב *bear*. Pr 17:12, Lam 3:10.

וְלִשְׂטַר־חַד הֳקִמַת *raised up on one side,* that is, half raised, not fully raised.

עִלְעִין Comp. Hebrew צלע (Gen 2:22 et al.). The Aramaic ע correspondes often to the Hebrew צ. While the *Qᵉrî* שְׁנַה is indicated, the *Kᵉthîb* form שְׁנַיַה, with the *yod* inserted, should be further studied, like many other *Kᵉthîb* forms in the Aramaic of Daniel, at least in chap. 7.[404] וְכֵן אָמְרִין לַהּ See Dan 3:4, 4:28, 11:21, for the use of the plural impersonal or in the third person, to express a passive.

Dan 7:6

כִּנְמַר *leopard, panther* (Jer 13:23, Hab 1:8), symbol of agility / swiftness.

וְלַהּ גַּפִּין אַרְבַּע דִּי־עוֹף עַל־גַּבַּיהּ A double number of wings, in comparison with the first beast, to further emphasise swiftness. וְאַרְבְּעָה רֵאשִׁין is found in Hebrew only (Gen 2:10, Jdg 9:34 אַרְבָּעָה רָאשִׁים) with the meaning, *four divisions* (1.branches of a single river, 2. military companies / divisions, parted from a principal army). The natural meaning of a polycephal monster is an entity characterised by disunity, having four command centers, instead of one (Pr 28:2). The bear with three coasts in its mouth, and the four-headed leopard – first, a heavier animal, then a swift one – correpond to the Persian ram (pushing in three directions) and, respectively, to the Macedonian four-hourned goat, in the next vision (Dan 8:4.20-21). This fourfold-division is also emphasised in the last oracle (Dan 11:3-4).

Dan 7:7

יַתִּירָא (יתר) Dan 2:31, 8:9, Ec 2:15. וְתַקִּיפָא (תקף) Ezr 4:20, Ec 6:10, Dan 2:40:42, 3:33, 4:8.17.27, 11:17, Est 9:29. וְאֵימְתָנִי (אים) Hab 1:7, Sol 6:4. דְּחִילָה Dan 2:31, 4:2, 5:19, 6:27, 7:19, (זחל) Job 32:6. וְשִׁנַּיִן דִּי־פַרְזֶל לַהּ רַבְרְבָן אָכְלָה וּמַדֱּקָה (cf. v. 19.23). A similar wording in the first apocalyptic dream (פַרְזְלָא מְהַדֵּק... כֹּלָא ......תַּדִּק...) refers to the fourth world kingdom (Dan 2:40), the iron-kingdom. וּשְׁאָרָא בְּרַגְלַיַּהּ רָפְסָה (cf. v. 19.23). The expression is present in Hebrew too: רפס = רמס Ez 32:2, 34:18.19, and the root is used in the Hebrew of Daniel 8:7.10.13. מְשַׁנְּיָה *different*, from a root (שׁנא/שׁנה *change, alter*) used extensive-

---

[404] S. Fassberg published an interesting study on theese *kethîb / qere* problem of Biblical Aramaic. In conclusion he states that "it would appear that the Biblical Aramaic *qere* of the pronominal suffixes on dual and masculine plural nouns, as well as the *qere* of participles II-*w/y*, are Palestinian phenomena of the Middle Aramaic period and not , as has recently been argued, linguistic features taht entered the biblical tradition during the Late Aramaic period." Steven E. Fassberg, "The Origin of the *Ketib/Qere* in the Aramaic Portions of Etra and Daniel," in *Vetus Testamentum,* XXIX, 1: 1989, Leiden, E. J. Brill, Netherlands, p. 12.

ly in Daniel: (2:9.21, 3:19.28, 4:13, 5:6.9.10, 6:9.16.18, 7:19.23.24.25.28). וְקַרְנַיִן עֲשַׂר This (v. 20.24) is the only occurence in TNK of a ten-horned animal. The meaning of the multiple horns coming up from one head is suggested by the next vision in chap. 8. The two horns of the ram-kingdom stand for the two allied forces and dynasties of Media and Persia (8:20), while the four horns of the goat-kingdom symbolise four kingdoms inheriting the empire of Alexander (8:22). In all cases, the ten horns, are not described as raising one after another, but they are always described as a group, and therefore, meant to be understood as contemporary.

Dan 7:8

קֶרֶן אָחֳרִי זְעֵירָה *another horn, a little one.* This is the single horn described as raising סִלְקָת בֵּינֵיהוֹן בֵּינֵיהֵן (cf. v. 20.24) among the other ten horns, thus while they continue their existence. אֶתְעֲקַרוּ *were plucked up,* a root shared with Hebrew (Zep 2:4, Gen 11:30). אֲנָשָׁא כְּעַיְנֵי – possibly suggesting partial judgment (Job 10:5), or, simply, in comparison to the other horns, this is the only one seeing and speaking. The other ones must listen blindly to him. In spite of its physical smallness, it has some controlling power over them.

וּפֻם מְמַלִּל רַבְרְבָן Dan 7:11.20. These *great words (speeches)* are equated with *words against (comparable with) the Most High* in v. 25.

Dan 7:9

כָּרְסָוָן רְמִיו 9 LXX and Θ : ἐτέθησαν *were set, arranged,* though the usual meaning of the verb רמא / רמה is *throw, cast.* וְעַתִּיק יוֹמִין יְתִב Beside Daniel 7:9.13.22, the aramaic adj. עַתִּיק is found only in the post-exilic Hebrew: 1Ch 4:22. The plural *thrones* implies the expectance of a court, a jury (see v. 11d, cf. Job 1:1, Ps 82:1, Is 24:23, Dan 4:17, Rev 4:4).

כָּרְסְיֵהּ שְׁבִיבִין דִּי־נוּר גַּלְגִּלוֹהִי נוּר דָּלִק The description of the majestic chariot-throne has some similarities with that from Ez 1:16-28, 10:1.9-22.

Dan 7:10

נְהַר דִּי־נוּר נָגֵד וְנָפֵק מִן־קֳדָמוֹהִי The noun נוּר, is used extensively in 3:6:11.15.17.20-27.

וְרִבּוֹ רַבְבָן קָדָמוֹהִי יְקוּמוּן *and a myriad of myriads stood before Him* – attending Him (as NRS renders), or waiting for their particular sentence ? The first variant is supported by the parallelism of the lines, the second is supported by a late use. See Rev 20:11-20 that seems to be built on Daniel's vision. These later buildings, however, do not necessarily interpret the basic vision; they might often use an old phrasing or imagery to build their own scenes.

דִּינָא יְתִב *the "judgment" sat down,* must mean only *the court sat in judgment* (NRS, IEP *il tribunale sedette,* EIN *Das Gericht nahm Platz).* This translation explains also the presence of more than one throne. LXX and Θ confirm this understanding: κριτήριον ἐκάθισε(ν) = *[the] court sat.* The root דין / דון is present in Hebrew too[405] and even the name of Daniel is based on it.

וְסִפְרִין פְּתִיחוּ Books opened to investigation in judgment is quite usual in the Biblical apocalyptic (Rev 20:12). Comp. Dan 12:1, כָּל־הַנִּמְצָא כָּתוּב בַּסֵּפֶר *everyone who will be found written in the book.* This is an old prophetic theme (Is 4:3, Ex 32:32, Ps 69:29, 139:16, Jer 17:13), further enriched in the Persian period, on the basis of the cultural experience (Ezr 2:62, Neh 7:64, Est 2:23, 6:2, Mal 3:16-18). The NT further builds on this theme: Phil 4:3, Rev 3:5, 5:1-5, 13:8, 17:8, 20:12.15, 21:27, 22:19. The reference to names that are *found writ-*

---

[405] The root דין as noun or verb appears in such places: Gen 6:3, 34:1, 49:16, Dt 17:8, 32:36, 1S 2:10, 24:16, 2S 19:10, Job 35:14, 36:31, Ps 7:9, 9:9, 72:2, 96:10, 110:6, 135:14, Pr 22:10, 29:7, 31:8, 50:4, Ec 6:10, Is 3:13, Jer 5:28, 21:12, 30:13, Zec 3:7. According to BDBG 192, it is found in Assyrian too, thus it is an old Semitic root, not an Aramaism.

ten in "the" book (Dan 12:1)*,* implies investigation of cases. As a result of this judgment, God's enemies are destroyed and "the people of saints of the Most High", through their Representative, receive the eternal kingdom (because the *judgemnet was given for* them: Dan 7:22.26-27).

Dan 7:11

מִן־קָל מִלַּיָּא רַבְרְבָתָא דִּי קַרְנָא מְמַלֱּלָה The prophet's attention is drawn especially to this arrogant horn, which is the main actor on the one side of the scene. The writer emphasises here that the wicked horn didn't yield up with the beginning of the Judgment, but he kept on calling out its high claims and "divine"orders.

וְהוּבַד גִּשְׁמַהּ וִיהִיבַת לִיקֵדַת אֶשָּׁא This could happen only after the Judge's sentence. The interesting fact is that the little horn is not judged alone. The beast is punished for all its horns and sins. Daniel uses here as a hapax, a different word for *fire*, אֶשָּׁא, which is an Hebraism.

Dan 7:12

וּשְׁאָר חֵיוָתָא הֶעְדִּיו שָׁלְטָנְהוֹן The destiny of the first three beast is different. They are only stripped out of their power, וְאַרְכָה בְחַיִּין יְהִיבַת לְהוֹן but their life continues under God's providence, עַד־זְמַן וְעִדָּן for a specific time respectively. In contrast, the fourth beast, being the last one, is deposed and executed at once. The apparent simultaneous life of the four beasts should be compared to the metal-kigdoms of chap. 2, where the future "history" is envisioned not only as successive powers, but as ages of the same entity. Finally, they are all broken together (2:35.45).

Dan 7: 13

וַאֲרוּ עִם־עֲנָנֵי שְׁמַיָּא The cloud is associated in the Jewish thought with the divine covered presence: Ex 14:19 (the Angel of Yahweh), the mediatorial function of Moses (Ex 24:18), the divine invisible "glory of Yawheh" in the Sanctuary (Lev 16.2), the chariot of Yahweh (Ps 104:3, Is !9:1) The NT Apocalypse associate it with Christ's divinity (Mt 17:5 cloud + Son; Lk 21:27 cloud + Son af man, AA 1:9.11 cloud + Jesus, Rev 10:1 cloud + the Divine Messenger, Rev 14:14.16 cloud + Son of man). כְּבַר אֱנָשׁ אָתֵה הֲוָה The phrase בַּר אֱנָשׁ – later, בַּרְנָשָׁא / בַּרְנָשׁ / NT Peshitta ברה דאנשא corresponds to Hebr. בֶּן אָדָם = son of Adam / human being, synonyme to אִישׁ and אֱנוֹשׁ (Dan 8:17, Num 23:19, Dt 32:8, especially in the poetic books and in Ezekiel). If He is described "like" a human being, this suggests tha He is not simply a human being. He is comparable to Michael, who is also "in the likeness of man" and has priestly, that is human garments (See on Dan 10:5-6.21 comp. Rev 1:12-18). He is apparently both human and divine.

וְעַד־עַתִּיק יוֹמַיָּא מְטָה וּקְדָמוֹהִי הַקְרְבוּהִי *and He was brought* (lit. *they brought Him near*) *before Him (the Ancient of Days).* This passive emphasises again His human nature. See also Jer 30:21:

> Their prince shall be one of their own, their ruler shall come from their midst; I will bring him near, and he shall approach me, for who would otherwise dare to approach me? says Yahweh..

The expression ...קְדָם [ה]קרב is used also for a royal audience in a 5th century BC Aramaic papyrus: קרבתיך קדם סנחאריב *I presented you before Sennacherib.*[406]

Dan 7:14

וְלֵהּ יְהִיב שָׁלְטָן וִיקָר וּמַלְכוּ This like a "son of man" must certainly be the expected Messiah, because He receives kingdom from God. וְכֹל עַמְמַיָּא אֻמַּיָּא וְלִשָּׁנַיָּא is a specific phrase in the Aramaic of Daniel: 3:4.7.31, 5:19, 6:26. Applied to the cosmic scene of this vi-

---

[406] Eduard Sachau. *Aramäische Papyrus und Ostraka.* Leipzig. J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1911.p. 50.

sion, it certainly means the universal kingdom of Messiah. לֵהּ יִפְלְחוּן applies exclusively to Messiah as Divine Being, because this is exactly the term used for *cultus, worship,*[407] *divine service* in Biblical Aramaic (Ezr 7:19.24, Dan 3:12.14.17.18.28, 6:17.21, 7:14.27).[408] יֶעְדֵּה שָׁלְטָנֵהּ שָׁלְטָן עָלַם דִּי־לָא This doxology ephasises again the Messianic and Divine nature of this "like a son of man" as it is used reffering to God Himself (Dan 3:33, 4:3 et al.).. תִתְחַבַּל וּמַלְכוּתֵהּ דִּי־לָא Dan 2:24. Thus the kingdom established through this Representative Man, is clearly identified with the kingdom of God.

It is a high contrast in this vision, between the four earthly beast-kingdoms and this fifth heavenly, human (that is, best) kingdom. The motif of this contrast develops with the four kingdoms too. The first kingdom later receives a human heart, and a human standing, while it remains, yet, a beast. The fourth kingdom has, among others, a little horn, arrogant and blasphemous, with human eyes and mouth, but revealing the most ferocious heart of the beast. The fierceness of these beast kingdoms gradually increases. After a tamed lion, comes a voraceous, carnivorous bear, then comes the number one in cruelty, a leopard. Finally, the fourth kingdom cannot be likened to any beast, so different it is, and so cruel. It tears up all to pieces, but not only for its food, but for play or to satisfy its evil temper: it tramples underfoot the remnants of its victims and makes war with God's people, under the leadership of its least horn. After this beastly row, a king "like a son of man" comes, first receiving the universal kingdom, as a result of God's judgment.

Dan 7:15

אֶתְכְּרִיַּת רוּחִי See Dan 2:1.3 (וַתִּפָּעֶם רוּחִי), comp. 8:27. אֲנָה דָנִיֵּאל Dan 7:28, but also in Hebr. Dan 8:1.15, 9:2, 10:2.7, 12:5. בְּגוֹא נִדְנֶה Considered by some as a Persian loan-word (meaning *sheath*), it is, according to BDBG (1102, § 5086) an "expression at best strange". To see it as a corruption from בְּגִין דְּנָה / בְּגוֹן *on account of this*[409] seems safe and sound. LXX renders it by ἐν τούτοις *in (during) these [things],*[410] which VUL (in his = *in these*) was glad to follow.[411] וְחֶזְוֵי רֵאשִׁי יְבַהֲלֻנַּנִי Dan 4:2.

Dan 7:16

קִרְבֵת עַל־חַד מִן־קָאֲמַיָּא The only beings described as standing before God are those "a myriad of myriads" from v.10, probable understood as angels (cf. Rev 5:11, 7:1).

---

[407] Meadowcraft says:that "as we saw in the context of Darius' confession (6.27-28), λατρεύω is a word that has connotations of service in worship and as such reflects a portion of the semantic range of the Aramaic פלח In fact,, by the time of Official Aramaic and on into Middle and Late Aramaic, although there is still considerable crossover between the meanings of the two words, פלח is more likely than עבד to be used in a worship context. " T. J. Meadowcraft, *Aramaic Greek and Greek Daniel – a Literary Comparison.* Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series 198. Sheffield Academic Press, England, 1995, p.153.

[408] See also Arthur J. Ferch. *The Son of Man in Daniel 7* (doctoral dissertation, vol. 6). Andrews University Press, Berrien Springs, MI 1983, p. 167. Ferch's thesis is an exhaustive and very balanced analysis on this subject.

[409] See BDBG, 1102. Cf. the Targum of Jonathan and the G. Dalman's *Grammatik des Jüdisch-Aramäischen* (2nd ed., 1905); see also BDBG 1086, § 5085, which cites Dalman for the occurance of the prep. בְּגִין in the Galilean Aramaic. So Holladay 413, who adds the variant reading בְּגוֹן דְּנָה.

[410] Θ reads ἐν τῇ ἕξει μου *in my body,* which shows dependence on the corrupted spelling.

[411] However, the same expression is found in the Genesis Apocryphon (II, 10), in the form לגו נדנהא . See E. Y. Kutscher, "The Language of the 'Genesis Apocryphon'. A preliminary Study", in *Scripta Hierosolymitana,* Publications of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem. vol. IV. 1965, p. 7. Kutscher lists it among other expressions that seem to imitate the language of Daniel.

וְיַצִּיבָא אֶבְעֵא־מִנֵּהּ עַל־כָּל־דְּנָה See also v.19. The prophet is also eager to have more insight, and grasp more truth concerning the things shown to him. יַצִּיבָא *truth* (Dan. 2:8.45, 3:24, 6:13), corresponds to אֱמֶת (Dan 8:12.26, 9:13, 10:1.21, 11:2).

וּפְשַׁר מִלַּיָּא יְהוֹדְעִנַּנִי Dan 2:4-7.9.16.24-26.30.36, 4:3.4.6.15.16.21, 5:7.8.12.15-17.26. See Hebr. Ec 8:1 יוֹדֵעַ פֵּשֶׁר דָּבָר, where פְּשַׁר is, probably, an aramaism. Instead, we find in Biblical Hebrew a term from the same Semitic root, having ת for שׁ, which is specific to the Aramaic: פתר *to interpret (dreams)* Gen 40:8.16.22, 41:8.12.13.15, and פִּתְרוֹן *interpretation* (Gen 40:12.18). The aramaic term became a technical one in the later apocalyptic. Among the most known writings found at Qumrân, there is a *Pesher Habaqqŭq.*

Dan 7:17

אַרְבְּעָה מַלְכִין יְקוּמוּן מִן־אַרְעָא four "kings", it is a half disclosed *pesher,* since the *angelus interpres* further indicates, for example, that the fourth beast-king is a "kingdom" (v. 23). The same device is used in the first dream, where the golden head of the image is interpreted as a *king* (Nebuchadnezzar), then all the successive powers are called *kingdoms* (Dan 2:37.39-41.44).

Dan 7:18

וִיקַבְּלוּן מַלְכוּתָא קַדִּישֵׁי עֶלְיוֹנִין This is also a half explanation. At first view, it seems to identify the celestial human-like Being with "the saints of the Most High". In reality, this is only a summary explanation, and it reveals that the "Son of Man" is to be understood as a Representative. He is one of the saints, but not just a certain one. He is One who stands for all of them, representing, including, "recapitulating" them. He receives the kingdom not for Himself only, but for all those He represents (v. 27).[412]

עַד־עָלְמָא וְעַד עָלַם עָלְמַיָּא וְיַחְסְנוּן מַלְכוּתָא cf. v. 27a., 12:3.13. The expression implies eternal life, anticipating chap. 12:2-3.

Dan 7:19

וְטִפְרַיהּ דִּי־נְחָשׁ *and claws of bronze* is a feature not mentioned in the principal description (v. 7) אָכְלָה מַדֲּקָה וּשְׁאָרָא בְּרַגְלַיהּ רָפְסָה.

Dan 7:20

וְחֶזְוַהּ רַב מִן־חַבְרָתַהּ *and its sight look greater than the other ones.* This is an addition to the first description, where the smallness of this horn was mentioned only. No contradiction. This horn is seen in its dynamic development. Before being great, it was, seemingly, a little one, certain time, in comparison with its fellows (as it is said about the little horn of chap. 8:9). Or, it is possible to understand this horn-"king" as being small in size (temporal power) and great in its different authority, influence and claims, if we consider that it only has eyes and mouth to maintain "universal" control. .

Dan 7:21

עָבְדָה קְרָב עִם־קַדִּישִׁין וְיָכְלָה לְהוֹן cf. the Hebrew phrase עשׂה מלחמה עם (Gen 14:2, 20:12.20, 1Ki 12:21, 1Ch 5:10.19, 2Ch 11:1). The Aramaic term קְרָב is also found in Hebrew writings, considered a loan-word: Job 38:23, Ps 55:19.22, 68:31, 78:9, 144:1, Ec 9:18, Zec 14:3. This theme of a succeeding war against the saints appears also in Dan 8:24-25, 12:7e, and is present in Rev 11:7, 13:7.

---

[412] It is not only a literary-contextual interpretation within Dan chap. 7, but the NT understanding of this messianic-apocalyptic feature: 2Tim 2:12, Rev 2:26-27, 3:21, 20:6, 22:5d.

Dan 7:22

וְדִינָא יְהַב לְקַדִּישֵׁי עֶלְיוֹנִין and the verdict was given **in favour of the saints** of the Most High LXX καὶ τὴν κρίσιν ἔδωκε τοις = and He gave the judgment (justice) to (for) the..., Θ καὶ τὸ κρίμα ἔδωκεν ἁγίοις = and He gave the judgment (verdict, power to judge)[413], to the saints... [414] BDBG (1088) agrees with the translation: judgment was given in favour of... The plural עֶלְיוֹנִין is quite unusual in Aramaic. Arthur Ferch says:

Grammatically, this unusual Aramaic name for God has been explained as a double plural or as an imitation of the Hebrew אלהים. Examples for a singular associated with the Hebrew plural אלהים ("God") are common and frequently interpreted as <u>pluralis excellentiae</u> or <u>majestatis</u>. According to <u>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</u> the Aramaic עליוין belongs to this same class and can therefore be construed with a singular suffix.[415]

Concerning its theological meaning, the Hebrew עֶלְיוֹן (*upper, superior; highness, excellence;* hence, *The Supreme God),* must be studied in the literary contexts. It appears in poetic Hebrew texts only (especially in Psalms), and its first occurences are related to non-Hebrew, *goy* people.[416] The Supreme God, the Most High is another name for Yahweh, in contexts of polyteism, universal (supreme) kingdom, and nations. Therefore it is also the best choice in Dan 7.

וְזִמְנָא מְטָה In all these visions, there are references to appointed times, measured mathematically (though still encoded), or as the Greek καιρός *proper time,* a conditional term. BDBG (p.1091) indicates the meaning *appointed time* for this place.

וּמַלְכוּתָא הֶחֱסִנוּ קַדִּישִׁין comp. Hebr. Dan 11:21 וְהֶחֱזִיק מַלְכוּת. Since the saints *take possession of the (universal) kingdom,* this must be related to their receiving the judgment (or having right judgment made for them).

Dan 7:23

מַלְכוּ רְבִיעָיָא See on. v. 17. Repetitions from v. 7.19. וּתְדוּשִׁנַּה This is a new element in description. The fourth beast-kingdom *will thresh* all the earth like its threshing-floor.

Dan 7:24

וְקַרְנַיָּא עֲשַׂר מִנַּה מַלְכוּתָה It is interesting to observe that after this clause, the speaker feels no need of an expression like *that means,* or פִּשְׁרֵהּ *its interpretation [is...].* The verb is implied. עַשְׂרָה מַלְכִין יְקֻמוּן *[means that] ten kings will arise.* These words of themselves permit a successive arising of the ten kings, as does the text in 11:2-3. But the rising of the eleventh horn, and uprooting of three from the previous ten horns, suggests a simultaneous tenfold, divided kingdom. In all this chapter, the *ten horns / ten kings* are mentioned as a compact group, and there is no indication of their being successive. Moreover, if we continue to parallel this vision with the royal dream of chap. 2, like most commentators do, we may observe that the iron and iron-clay kingdom (corresponding to the fourth beast of chap. 7), has

---

[413] Cf. Rev 20:4.

[414] The Aramaic uses the expression דִּינָא מִתְעֲבֵד מִנֵּהּ *judgment be executed upon him* (Ezr 7:26) when it deals with condemnation. Though it is a different verb used, it is interesting to observe that it is followed by the prep. מִן wich is usually in contrast with לְ .

[415] Arthur Ferch, op. cit. p. 170.

[416] Gen 14:18-20 (the Canaanite king Malki-tzedeq), Num 24:16 (the Aramean prophet Balaam), Dt 32:8 (Moses, speaking about the world's nations), 2S 22:14, Ps 7:18, 9:3, 18:14, 21:8, 46:5, 47:3, 50:14, 57:3, 73:11, 77:11, 78:17.35.56, 82:6, 83:19, 87:5, 89:28, 91:1.9, 92:2, 97:9, 107:11 (poetic synonym for Yahweh, the Suprem King, God of David, doing justice against his ennemies), Is 14:14 (the king of Babylon speaks), Lam 3:35.38.

iron-clay *[ten] toes* (2:41.42), which stand also for *kings* (2:44a).[417] And all these in a context of division (internal and external), which is emphasised.

וְהוּא יִשְׁנֵא מִן־קַדְמָיֵא Since Daniel, in order to describe the distinction of the little horn, uses the same words used to indicate the distinction of the fourth beast in comparison to the previous ones, it seems that the little king / kingdom is different in power, fierceness, et al., not necessarily in nature.

וּתְלָתָה מַלְכִין יְהַשְׁפִּל The uprooting from v. 8 and 20 is here interpreted as *bringing low, putting down, humble*. The same verb used in 4:34, 5:19.22.

Dan 7:25

וּמִלִּין לְצַד עִלָּיָא יְמַלִּל These words should not be understood as overtly against God, brcause they are called *great (imposing) words* (v. 8.11.20). The expression לְצַד seems to be softer than the words used about Belshazzar's blasphemy: וְעַל מָרֵא־שְׁמַיָּא הִתְרוֹמַמְתָּ *and against (above) the Lord of Heaven exalted yourself.* Origen's Hexapla quotes Symmachus' translation: "et sermones quasi Deus loquitur" *and words like God will he speak.*[418]

וּלְקַדִּישֵׁי עֶלְיוֹנִין יְבַלֵּא Which was described as *making war* in v. 21, is called here בַּלֵּא *harass constantly, wear away, wear out.*[419] Something like a long guerilla warfare, or a hunting, a chase until the victim loses all power.

וְיִסְבַּר *and he will (hope?).* This is a hapax in Biblical Aramaic. It is used in Hebrew with a different spelling (שׂבר) to mean *wait, hope,*[420] or *inspect, examine.*[421] LXX has προσδέξεται *he will expect to,* while Θ has ὑπονοήσει *he will suspect to.* VUL renders it by *putabit quod possit* ("he shall consider / calculate that he is able to.."). Origen's Hexapla gives *confidet* ("he will boldly trust, presume").[422] In the modern Hebrew, the term is used to mean *to think, have insight, express opinions, aspire, hope, tend.*[423] It is easy to observe that the old translations do not so precisely agree on this point. The pragmatic meaning of the term **in this place** seems to escape. Anyway, it must have a dynamic within such meanings: *expect – suspect – inspect – prospect,* or *tend – intend – attend – pretend.* The different king shall *aspire and conspire,* he will devise patiently an ambitious project. The *angelus interpres* does not stress the king's activity or success in this area, but only his insolent aspiration, his bold project. This does style not exclude his success, but it appears that he is never satisfied with what he won, and he aspire to an absolute result.

לְהַשְׁנָיָה זִמְנִין וְדָת *to change times and law.* This phrase should be understood through its use in the same book. In chap. 2:21, the same words are employed מְהַשְׁנֵא עִדָּנַיָּא וְזִמְנַיָּא וְהוּא *He changes the seasons and the times,* referring to God who revealed to Daniel the dream of the king (containing exactly this message: God is sovereign over all changes in the political and religious world, and finally He shall triumph). To better understand it, we should read the next line: מְהַעְדֵּה מַלְכִין וּמְהָקֵים מַלְכִין *He deposes kings and set up kings.* The expression עִדָּנַיָּא וְזִמְנַיָּא in the first line may be understood also in comparison with that in Dan

---

[417] The Revelation, in the first century of this era, portrays the ten horns of the beast as *kings who didn't yet receive the kingdom* (Rev 17:12).

[418] See Field, op. cit. 922.

[419] See BDBG 1084 for the Aramaic term and p. 115 for the same root in Hebrew. The basic meaning is *wear out, use up to destruction* (Job 13:28, Ps 32:3).

[420] See Rt 1:13, Est 9:1, Ps 104:27, 119:116.166, 145:15, 146:5, Is 38:18.

[421] See Neh 2:13.15.

[422] Field, op. cit. 923.

[423] Cf. Menahem P. Mandel , *Millon Ivri-Romani* (Hebrew-Romanian Dictionary). Histaderuth Hannashim Haᶜivriyoth be-Romania. (No year of publication). p. 254. The root סבר is marked with asterisk (*) to indicate its Aramaic origin.

7:12b: (עַד־זְמַן וְעִדָּן *for a season and a time*), that points out to God's supervision over the life and historical place of all nations. The same thought may be implied in 2:9 (עַד דִּי עִדָּנָא יִשְׁתַּנֵּא *till the time will change*). The implication on Dan 7:25 might be that the different king aspires to have the supreme control in politics, deposing and setting up kings. However, if this expression has not this meaning in itself, but it is derived from its context, then it might have in 2:9 and 7:25 respectively different applications.

* דָּת *law, order, command, rule, custom, regulation* is employed only in Aramaic and as a loan-word in the Hebrew of the book of Esther.[424] According to all sources (see BDBG), the term is of Persian origin. Its official nature let it enter easily and early in the Imperial Aramaic. What kind of law did the bold king hope to change? If we preserve a political meaning for the expression *change times,* then the simple addition *and law* would be naturally related to the political understanding of the first term. But if we consider the anarthrous presence of both זִמְנִין וְדָת *times and law,* and the critical seriousness the author puts on this bold aspiration of the king, it is possible to understand this idiom as a hendiadys referring to the Divine Law with its appointed times.

זִמְנִין *times,* is also of Persian origin (zarvân – *time, age*) according to BDBG[425] but Montgomery and others list it as Akkadian.[426] BDBG indicates the meaning "(festival) *seasons*" in this context, and Holladay (404) has *holy time[s], feast[s].* This plan of the different king must be understood in the context of his warfare against God's saints, because the phrase *and he will hope to change (holy)times and law* is a paranthesis. After this assertion, the speaker resumes to his prediction about the conflict between the arrogant king and the saints.

וְיִתְיַהֲבוּן בִּידֵהּ *and they shall be given into his hand,* underlines God's sovereignty on the destinity of His people. He permits persecutions to purify individuals and groups (see chap. 11:34.35, 12:10), but any time of trouble is measured and limited. God only is in controll over times.

Comp. Hebr. Dan 12:7: לְמוֹעֵד מוֹעֲדִים וָחֵצִי. עַד־עִדָּן וְעִדָּנִין וּפְלַג עִדָּן In both places we should read as dual the noun מוֹעֲדִים / עִדָּנִין.[427] This is obviously an encrypted formula. The term מוֹעֵד *appointed time, period, term, sacred season,* must have been used sometimes for *year* (because of the time lapse between seasons?).[428] The same use of the Aramaic term is employed in Dan 4:13.20.22.29, where LXX has ἑπτὰ ἔτη = *seven years,* for those "7 times" (שבעה עדנין). The historical-typological pattern of this bloody period of "3 ½ times/years" of Dan 7 and 12 is that famous persecution and drought in the times of the prophet Elijah.[429]

---

[424] Dan 2:9.13.15, Ezr 7:26, 8:36, Est 2:8, 3:8.14.15, 4:3.8, 8:13.14.17, 9:1.13.14 (royal verdict, edict, order), Ezr 7:12.14. 21.25.26 (of your God), Dan 6:6 (of his God), Dan 6:9.13.16, Est 1:.13.15.19, 4:11.16 (of Medes and Persians), Est 1:8, 2:12, (the custom, the regulation).

[425] BDBG 1091, § 2166.

[426] Montgomery, op. cit. 20.

[427] For עדנין, according to the suggestion of BDBG, p. 1105, § 5732, wich follows Bevan and Gunkel. For מועדים, BDBG 417, § 4150, is cited Briggs implying the same reading in the equation of the whole formula to *three years and a half.* Origen's Hexapla gives the same suggestion: *tempora (duo annos).* See Field, op. cit. 933. Note the next apocalyptic period from v. 11, the "1290 days" (= 3 years+7 months) which is roughly three years and a half.. The NT Apocalypse aggrees on this equation ("42 months": Rev 11:2, "1260 days": 11:3, "1260 days": 12:6, "one time, times and half of a time":12:14, "42 months": 13:5).

[428] This is not unusual, because terms like שבת *sabbath / week,* and חדש *month, new moon day,* had the same double function. BDBG (1105) § 5732.2 renders it as definite time,= *year* (as modern Greek χρόνος).

[429] The NT only renders explicitly this time as 3 ½ years (Lk 4:25, Jm 5:17), which roughly agrees with the OT record ("in the 3rd year" – from Elijah's prediction – 1Ki 18:1), if we properly assume that Elijah made his prediction after the passing of the natural Palestinian six months of dry season.

Dan 7:26

וְדִינָא יִתֵּב וְשָׁלְטָנֵהּ יְהַעְדּוֹן See on v. 10d. 12. Unlike the preceding powers, this king looses, as a result of God's Judgment, both power and existence, facing an utterly and complete destruction: לְהַשְׁמָדָה וּלְהוֹבָדָה עַד־סוֹפָא *to be destroyed [his dominion] and finally perish.*

Dan 7:27

וּמַלְכוּתָה וְשָׁלְטָנָא וּרְבוּתָא דִּי מַלְכְוָת תְּחוֹת כָּל־שְׁמַיָּא The text is clear in recurring to the theme of the universal kingdom. This is the fundamental Messianic theme.

לְעַם The All that is given to the representative Man in v.14, is actually given to the "saints of the Most High". The Judgment settles forever the matter of the universal empire and of what laws should be considered first and foremost.

מַלְכוּתֵהּ מַלְכוּת עָלַם Opinions vary concerning the referent of the pronominal suffix of the word מַלְכוּתֵהּ *his kingdom.* Whose kingdom? Of the holy people? Or of the Most High? NRS prefers the people, and this may not be refuted on simple grammatical criteria, because the closest referent appears to be (at least for our European grammar and logic!), *the people of the Most High.* However, in view of the religious use of the term יִפְלְחוּן *they shall worship* (see on v.14) – and a parallel doxology in Dan 6:26 *Whose kingdom shall never be destroyed, and dominion has no end,* – we might remain to the old translations of Θ and VUL.[430] The next phrase confirms that this was the intention of the speaker: שָׁלְטָנַיָּא לֵהּ יִפְלְחוּן וְיִשְׁתַּמְּעוּן וְכֹל *and all dominions (powers) will worship (serve) and obey Him.*

Dan 7:28

עַד־כָּה סוֹפָא דִי־מִלְּתָא [431]lit. *hitherto,* [where comes] *the end of the word (account).* Or, *It's over – The end of the account.* The setting of this phrase helps us understand its meaning better. The writer passes from the account of his dream, to the effects the experience brought on him. Thus the phrase must mean something like: *This is all that I've seen and heard, so that I stop here my account.*[432] It is possible to better understand רֵאשׁ מִלִּין אֲמַר from v. 1e., as announcing the beginning of the account.

זִיו * See Dan 5:6.9.10. וְזִיוַי יִשְׁתַּנּוֹן עֲלַי comp. Dan 4:16, 5:6.10. שַׂגִּיא רַעְיוֹנַי יְבַהֲלֻנַּי *complexion, brightness,* is "perhaps loan-word from Assyrian *zîmu.* chiefly of *countenance.*"[433]

וּמִלְּתָא בְּלִבִּי נִטְרֵת This mention helps us understand the deep theological and psychological connections between the apocalyptic experiences and their accounts in the book. The Greek Θ rendition of this phrase is used by Luke in NT about Mary, the Mother of Jesus:

Θ Dan 7:28   καὶ τὸ ῥῆμα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου συνετήρησα
Lk 2.19   ... συνετήρει τὰ ῥήματα...ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς
Lk 2.51   ...διετήρει ...τὰ ῥήματα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς

This may be an influence of the book of Daniel, in a literary context where Luke mentions Gabriel, Messiah the Lord, etc., or it may be a usual Hebrew expression.

---

[430] Θ has: ....were given to the saints of the Most High; and his kingdom is an everlasting kingdom.... VUL: ...detur populo sanctorum Altissimi cuius regnum regnum sempiternum est .. were given to the people of the saints of the Most High whose kingdom is an evrlasting kingdom...

[431] Because סוף means also *end, consummation,* LXX "translated": ἕως καταστροφῆς τοῦ λόγου... *until the catastrophe of the word...* (sic). Can you believe it?

[432] ⟦ עד כא סוף חלמא . ⟧ . F61 f2ii+6_12(?):12

[433] BDBG, p. 1091.

Conclusion to the Aramaic part

With a single Persian loan-word (דָּת), of wich we don't know for sure the time of its slipping into the Imperial Aramaic, with no Greek term and with a relatively old type of Aramaic, the chapter 7 of Daniel, containing his first animal apocalypse, should be considered also, at least as an exercise in logic, from a supernaturalist point of view. The important similarities between the third beast-kingdom (the four-headed leopard) of Daniel 7, and the four-horned goat-kingdom of Daniel 8 (identified with the Greek-Macedonian control), should inspire again the exegetes, as many other apocalyptic symbols of chap. 7 that refuse to be forced into the straitjacket of the destructive criticism. However, this study is not more than a modest attempt to prepare myself for better an more critical approaches to this fascinating book.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aharoni, Y. "Hebrew Ostraca from Tel Arad", in *Israel Exploration Journal,* vol 16, nr. 1, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1966.

Albright, W. F. *From Stone Age to Christianity,* 2nd ed. New York, 1957.

Albright, W. F. "The Date and Personality of the Chronicler", *JBL*, 40, 1921.

Andreasen, Niels-Erik. "Translation of Nişdaq / Katharisthesetai in Daniel 8 14"*,* in *Symposium on Daniel,* vol 2, Frank Holbrook, editor, Biblical Research Institute, GC of SDA, Washington DC, 1986..

Archer, Gleason L. "Aramaic Language,"Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible, ed. M. C. Tenney. Grand Rapids, Mich., 1975.

Archer, Gleason. "The Hebrew of Daniel Compared with the Qumran Sectarian Documents"*, The Law and the Prophets,* ed. J. Skilton (Nutley, NJ, 1974).

Archer, Jr., Gleason. *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction,* The Moody Bible Institute of Chicago, 1985.

Baldwin, Joyce G. *Daniel,* Intervarsity Press, 1978.

Berger, P.-R. *Der Kyros-Zylinder mit dem Zusatzfragment, BIN 2 Nr. 32 und die Akkadischen Personnennamen im Danielbuch,* ZA 64,1975.

Bevan, A. *A Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1892.

Bickermann, E. J. *Chronology of the Ancient World,* London, 1968.

Charles, R. H. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament.* 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.

Collins, John. *Daniel,* Fortress Press, Minneapolis, 1993.

Coxon, Peter W. "The Distribution of Synonyms in Biblical Aramaic in the Light of Official Aramaic and the Aramaic of Qumran," in *Revue de Qumran,* 36, Décembre 1978, Tome 9, Gabalda, Paris.

Cryer, Frederick H. "The Problem of Dating Biblical Hebrew and the Hebrew of Daniel," in K. Jeppesen *et al.* (eds.), *In the Last Days* − On Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic and its Period. Aarhus, 1994. p. 185-198.

Dalman, G. *Grammatik des Jüdisch-Aramäischen* (2nd ed., 1905).

Davidson, Richard M. "Satan's celestial slander", *Perspective Digest,* ATS, Hagerstown, MD, 1/1996.

Dougherty, Raymond. *Nabonidus and Belshazzar.* New Haven, Conn.:Yale University Press, 1929.

Driver, S. R. *The Book of Daniel,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922.

Ehrenswärd, Martin. "Once Again: The Problem of Dating Biblical Hebrew". In *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament,* vol. II, no. I (1997).

Farris, Michael Herbert. "The Formative Interpretations of the Seventy Weeks of Daniel." Ph. D. dissertation, University of Toronto, Canada, 1990.

Fassberg, Steven E. "The Origin of the *Ketib/Qere* in the Aramaic Portions of Etra and Daniel," in *Vetus Testamentum,* XXIX, 1: 1989, Leiden, E. J. Brill, Netherlands, p. 12.

Ferch, Arthur J. *The Son of Man in Daniel 7* (doctoral dissertation, vol. 6). Andrews University Press, Berrien Springs, MI 1983.

Field, F. editor. *Origenis Hexapla*, II, Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, Hildesheim 1964.

Ford, Desmond. *The Day of Atonement, and the Investigative Judgment.* Euangelion Press, Casselberry, FL. (no date)

Frye, R. N. *The Heritage of Persia,* 1962.

Goldingay, John E. "Daniel". *Word Biblical Commentary*. Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1989.

Hartman, L. F., and A. A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel*. Anchor Bible. Vol 23. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1978.

Hasel, Gerhard F. "Interpretations of the Chronology of the Seventy Weeks."In *The Seventy Weeks, Leviticus*, Nature of Prophecy, ed. Frank B. Hollbrook, 25,

Hasel, Gerhard F. "The Hebrew Masculine Plural for Weeks in the Expression 'Seventy Weeks' in Daniel 9:24." in *Andrews University Seminary Studies*, 31 (1993).

Hasel, Gerhard F. "Book of Daniel: Matters of Language," in *Andrews University Seminary Studies.* vol. 19, autumn 1981, N3, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Mich.

Hasel, Gerhard F. *"nagîd."* *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament.* Edited by G G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1986.

Holladay, William L. *The Root ⋆űbh in the Old Testament,* Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958.

Ishida, Tomoo. "נגיד : A Term for the Legitimization of the Kingship", *Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute,* vol. III, Tokyo, editors: Masao Sekine & Akira Satake. Yamamoto Shoten, 1977.

Jonge, Marinus de. "Messiah." *Anchor Bible Dictionary.* Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York:Doubleday, 1992.

Josephus, Flavius. *The Complete works of Josephus*. Enlarged-type Edition / Illustrated. Translated by Wm. Whiston. Kregel Publications, Grand Rapids, Mich. 1981.

Joüon, Paul and T. Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew,* Subsidia Biblica. Vol. 14. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1991.

Keil, C. F. "Biblical Commentry on the Book of Daniel." in *Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1950.

Kernbach, Victor. *Dicţionar de mitologie generală,* Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, Bucureşti 1989.

Kitchen, K. A. *The Aramaic of Daniel,* in D J Wiseman, *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel,* The Tyndale Press, London, 1965.

Kline, Meridith G. "The Covenant of the Seventieth Week." In The Law and the Prophets: Old Testament Studies Prepared in Honor of Oswald Thompson Allis, ed. John H. Skillton. Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian Reformed Publishing Co., 1974.

Koch, Klaus; with Till Niewisch and Jürgen Tubach, *Das Buch Daniel,* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980.

Köhler, Ludwig and Walter Baumgartner, *Hebraisches und Aramaisches Lexikon zum Alten Testamenten*, Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1967.

König, F. W. *Relief und Inschrift des Königs Dareios I,* Leiden, 1938.

Kutscher, E. Y. "The Language of the 'Genesis Apocryphon'. A preliminary Study", in *Scripta Hierosolymitana,* Publications of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem. vol. IV. 1965.

Mandel, Menahem P. *Millon Ivri-Romani* (Hebrew-Romanian Dictionary). Histaderuth Hannashim Haᶜivriyoth be-Romania. (Old edition. No date and place of publication).

McNamara, Martin. "Daniel", in *The New Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture.* Ed. Reginald C. Fuller; London: Nelson, 1969.

Meissner, Bruno and Wolfram von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch,* Band I, A-L, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, Germany, 1965.

Michel, Diethelm. *Grundlegung einer hebraischen Syntax* 34-39,49, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1977.

Mitchell, T. C. and Joyce, R. *The musical Instruments in Nebuchadnezzar's Orchestra,* published in D J Wiseman etc., D. J. *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel,* The Tyndale Press: London, 1965.

Montgomery, James A. "Daniel", in *International Critical Commentary,* Ed. S.R. Driver, A. Plummer, C. A. Briggs. Edinburgh, T.&T. Clark, 1927.

Naudé, J. A. "The Language of the Book of Ezekiel. Biblical Hebrew in Transition?" (UFS).

Orel, Vladimir and Olga Stolbova. *Hamito/Semitic Etymological Dictionary–Materials for a Reconstruction,* E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands. New York, Köln. 1995.(p. 1293, 1391-1392).

Owusu-Antwi, Brempong. *The Chronology of Daniel 9:24-27*, ATS Publications, Berrien Springs, MI, 1995.

Ozanne, C. G. in "Three textual problems in Daniel", *Journal of Theological Studies,* Ed. Chadwick, Sparks; Oxford, Clarendon Press. 16, 1965: 445-446.

Pedersen, Johs. "The Phoenician Inscription of Karatepe", in *Acta Orientalia,* vol. XXI, pars. 2., apud Ejnar Munksgaard, Havnlae, 1951.

Péter-Contesse, René & John Ellington, *A Handbook on The Book of Daniel*, UBS, New York, 1993.

Pfandl, Gerhard. *The Time of the End in the Book of Daniel,* ATS Publications, Berrien Springs, MI. 1992.

Planche, J. & Pillon, A. *Dictionnaire Grec-Francais,* Librairie Hachette et C^IX , Paris, 1872.

Plöger, Otto "'Siebzig Jahre.'" *In Festschrift Friedrich Baumgärtel*, ed. J. Herrmann. Erlangen: Universitätsbund, 1959.

Pusey, (Rev.) E. B. *Daniel the Prophet.* 9 lectures. NY, Funk & Wagnals, 1885.

Rooker, Mark F. "Diachronic Analysis and the Features of Late Biblical Hebrew", in *Bulletin for Biblical Research,* 4 (1994).

Rooker, Mark F. "The Diacronic Study of Biblical Hebrew", in *Journal of Nortwest Semitic Languages,* XIV (1988).

Sachau., Eduard. *Aramäische Papyrus und Ostraka.* Leipzig. J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1911.

Sáenz-Badillos, Angel. *A History of the Hebrew Language,* Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Schwantes, Siegfried J. *ᶜEreb Boqer of Daniel 8:14 Reexamined,* in *Symposium on Daniel,* Frank Holbrook, editor, Biblical Research Institute, GC of SDA, Washington DC, 1986.

Shea, William H. "The Prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27", in *70 weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy,* F. B. Hollbrook editor, Biblical Research Institute, Washington DC, 1986.

Shea, William H. *Unity of Daniel,* in Frank B. Holbrook, Editor, *Symposium on Daniel*, Daniel & Revelation Committee Series. Vol 2. Biblical Research Institute, Washington DC, 1986.

Shea, William H. *Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation.* Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, vol I, Edited by The General Conference of SDA, College View Printers, Lincoln, Nebraska, 1982.

Soggin, J. A. *Introduction to the Old Testament,* 2nd rev. ed. Philadelphia, 1980.

Sokoloff, Michael. *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic*, Bar-Ilan University Press, 1990.

Stefanovic, Zdravko. *The Aramaic of Daniel in the Light of Old Aramaic,* Journal of the Studies of the Old Testament, Supplement Series 129, Sheffield Academic Press, Sheffield, England, 1992.

Strabon, *Geografia,* vol. III, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, Bucureşti, Cluj-Napoca, [Romania] 1983.

Stuart, Moses. *Hints on the Interpretation of Prophecy.* Andover, MA: Allen, Morrill and Wardwell, 1842.

T. J. Meadowcraft, *Aramaic Greek and Greek Daniel – a Literary Comparison.* Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series 198. Sheffield Academic Press, England, 1995.

Talmon, Shemariahu, *The World of Qumran from Within,* collected studies. Jerusalem-Leiden, E. J. Brill, Magnus Press, The Hebrew University, 1989.

Thompson, Steven. "Those Who Are Wise: The *Maskilim* in Daniel and the New Testament", in *To Understand the Scriptures–Essays in Honor ofWilliam H. Shea.* Ed. David Merling, Institute of Archaeology, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI. 1997.

Wallis Budge, E. A. *An Egyptian Hierogyiphic Dictionary,* vol. 1, Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., New York.

Waltke, Bruce K. & M. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax,* Eisenbrauns, Winona Lake, Indiana, 1990.

Wiseman etc., D. J. *Notes on Some Problems in the Book of Daniel,* The Tyndale Press: London, 1965.

Yamauchi, E. "Slaves of God" in *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society,* Winter 1966.

Tăbliţele de argilă – scrieri din Orientul antic, Editura Minerva, Bucureşti, [Romania] 1981.

Bibles

*** Biblia, The Romanian Translation of D. Cornilescu, UBS (1990).
*** Bibel, Dr. H. Menge's Translation, Stuttgart 1927.
*** The Holy Scripture, A Modern Greek Translation, Athens 1919

(with Targum) vdwq yarqm – laqyxy, Propheten, Tom 9. Druck und Verlag von Pessel Balaban, Lemberg, 1878.

(with Targum) vdwq yarqm – [wvwhy etc., Propheten, Tom 1. Druck und Verlag von Pessel Balaban, Lemberg, 1867.

Bible Works for Windows, 95/NT Release, HERMENEUTIKA™ Computer Bible Research Software, Michael S. Bushell, Lotus Development Corporation, 1996. Big Fork, USA.

Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia BHS edited by K. Elliger and W. Rudoph, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart, Fourth Corrected Edition, 1990.

Dictionaries and Encyclpedias

Brown, F. etc. The New Brown-Driver-Briggs-Gesenius HEBREW AND ENGLISH LEXICON with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic. Hendrickson Publishers, Peabody, Mass. 1979.

Davidson, Benjamin. Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon of the Old Testament. Mac Donald Publishing Company, Mac Dill AFB, Florida.

Holladay, William L. Editor. A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament, *Eerdmans Pub. Company, Grand Rapids, MI; E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1989.*

Holman Bible Dictionary for Windows (1.0c), *Parsons Technology, 1994.*Mandel, Menahem P. מלון עברי-רומני (Hebrew-Romanian Dictionary). Histaderuth Hannashim Haᶜivriyoth be-Romania. (Old edition. No date and place of publication).

Planche, J. & Pillon, A. *Dictionnaire Grec-Francais,* Librairie Hachette et C[IX] , Paris, 1872.

SDA Bible Dictionary. Available on CD. *Logos Bible Software,* v2.0b, Logos Research Systems, 1996.

Septuaginta LXX (Old Greek Jewish Scriptures) edited by Alfred Rahlfs, Württembergische Bibelanstalt / Deutsche Bibelge-sellschaft (German Bible Society), Stuttgart, 1979.

The New Covenant Aramaic Peshitta Text, with Hebrew Translation, The Aramaic Scriptures Reserach Society, The Bible Society, Jerusalem, 1986.

The Jewish Encyclopedia, vol. 8, KTAV Publishing House, Inc., New York, 1901.

Abbreviations

A, Σ, Θ, Aquillas, Symmachus, Theodotion – Old Greek Translations

ASV	American Standard Version	1901
BDBG	Brown-Dtiver-Briggs-Gesenius Hebrew&Chaldee English Lexicon	
BHS	Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia	1990
DRB	French Version Darby	1885.
ELB	Revidierte Elberfelder	1993
JB	Jerusalem Bible	
KJV	King Jame=s Verison	1769
LSG	French Louis Segond	1910
LUT	Lutherbibel	1994
LXX	The Rahlf's Septuagint	
NAB	New American Standard Bible	1995
NAS	New American Standard Bible	1977
NÉG	French Nouvell Edition Geneve	1979
NIV	New International Version	1984
NJB	New Jerusalem Bible	
NJV	New Jewish Version (Tanakh)	
NKJ	New King Kame's Version	1982
NRS.	New Revised Standard Version	1989
REB	Revised English Bible	
ROV	Romanian Orthodox Version 1994	
RSV	Revised Standard Version	1952
SVV	Dutch Version	
TEV	Today's English Version	
TNK	*Torah, Nebiim uKetubim* (The Hebrew Bible)	
VUL	Latin Vulgate	
WEB	The Webster Bible	1833
YLT	Young's Literal Translation	1898