

[This paper has been reformulated from old, unformatted electronic files and may not be identical to the edited version that appeared in print. The original pagination has been maintained, despite the resulting odd page breaks, for ease of scholarly citation. However, scholars quoting this article should use the print version or give the URL.]
Journal of the Adventist Theological Society, 7/1 (Spring 1996): 1-20.
Article copyright © 1996 by William H. Shea.

Nabonidus Chronicle: New Readings and the Identity of Darius the Mede

William H. Shea
Biblical Research Institute
General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists

Introduction

The Contract Tablets. In pursuit of the elusive Darius the Mede of the book of Daniel (Dan 5:31) I once spent a considerable amount of time examining the dates and royal titles on the published contract tablets from the early Persian period.¹ In the end it did not turn out to be a very informative procedure. The study did confirm that the one year of Cambyses' coregency with Cyrus in Babylon occurred in Cyrus' first year, from 538 to 537 B.C.² The title search also confirmed that Cyrus did not take up the title, "King of Babylon," until the end of that year of coregency.³ Other than that little progress on the identity of Darius the Mede was gained through that avenue.

The Nabonidus Chronicle. Informative historical sources from this narrowly defined period are few. The verse account of Nabonidus and the Harran inscriptions do not extend to the transition to Persian control.⁴ The Cyrus Cylinder does treat this transition but in a rather propagandistic way which is of only modest historical value.⁵ Excluding the later Greek writers leaves the Nabonidus Chronicle as the main cuneiform document describing the events surrounding the fall of Babylon.

I have given some attention to that document in previous studies also, mainly in an effort to straighten out its chronology.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

There is one place where its dates are clearly out of order. After describing the return of the gods to their cities from the ninth month to the twelfth month of the year in which Babylon was captured, the text goes on to tell of the deaths of Ugbaru, the general who conquered Babylon for Cyrus, and an unnamed queen. These occurred in the eighth month.

Following this order, I attempted to date the death of Ugbaru one year and three weeks after the fall of Babylon, rather than just three weeks after that event.⁶ The purpose of that revision in chronology was to give Ugbaru, my candidate for Darius the Mede, a full year of governmental activity in Babylon before his death. That chronological conclusion was also misguided, and correlations with the contract tablets make it necessary to return to the non-sequential order here. The arrangement of this text by the scribes probably stems from thematic or topical concerns, or from a matter of emphasis. This conclusion indicates that Ugbaru died on VIII/11 in the fall of 539 B.C. according to the dates in the chronicle. This was 25 days after he conquered Babylon and only 8 days after Cyrus arrived there.

Chronological Data from Daniel. The question these dates from the chronicle raise is: Does this short period of time allow Ugbaru to carry out the activities attributed to Darius the Mede in Daniel? This requires an examination of the book of Daniel to determine just how much time his Darius requires.

Darius the Mede is mentioned in four passages in Daniel: 5:31; 6:1-28; 9:1; 11:1. Daniel 5:31 simply records that Darius received the kingdom when Belshazzar's Babylon fell to the Medes and Persians. In the chronicle's dates this occurred on VII/16 when Ugbaru and his division of the army took Babylon without a battle.

Daniel 9:1 gives mainly genealogical data about Darius, indicating that he was of the seed of the Medes and his father's name was Ahasuerus. Since no genealogical data is available for Ugbaru this point cannot presently be checked.

One chronological point does appear in Daniel 9:1. Both Daniel's prayer and the prophecy which followed came in Darius' first year. How much time would be necessary for that? Since neither day nor month are mentioned, it could theoretically have occurred in as brief a period as one day into that year. The eight

SHEA: NABONIDUS CHRONICLE

days that Ugbaru lived after the arrival of Cyrus in Babylon would have allowed sufficient time for the prayer and prophecy. It need not have been a full year or even a sizeable portion thereof.

Daniel 11:1 gives little more chronological information about Darius. From the vantage point of the third year of Cyrus (Dan 10:1), Gabriel refers back to the first year of Darius as a time when he, Gabriel, stood up to confirm and strengthen him. The nature of this action indicates that it should have occurred at the very beginning of Darius' first year, at the time of his accession to the throne. Relatively little time need be allowed for the event.

Chapter 6 is the one full narrative in Daniel which deals with the activities of Darius the Mede. He set about establishing the new bureaucracy of Babylon under the Persians. This was the sort of political structure that was needed very soon after the conquest in order to insure a smooth transition to Medo-Persian control. Relatively little time need be allowed for this type of activity, either before or after the arrival of Cyrus. There may well be a reference to this type of activity in the chronicle (III, 19) even before the death of Ugbaru.

There is only one specific chronological datum in this narrative. This involves the length of time decreed by Darius for no (prayer) requests to any other god or man. It was specified that this period was to last 30 days (Dan 6:7). We need not expect, however, that the whole 30 days had to elapse before the spies accused Daniel of violating this statute.

Daniel continued praying the same way that he did before the law went into effect. His actions would have been readily apparent to the spies after only a day or two of the 30 days. Thus most of the action described in Daniel 6 probably took place relatively early in that period, before Ugbaru died.

What would have happened to the rest of the 30 day period if Darius died sometime during its course? As the officials pointed out to Darius, the laws of the Medes and Persians did not change (Dan 6:12); therefore, the 30 days would have run their course whether the king who pronounced the law was still alive or not.

From this brief chronological review it can be seen that the events described in these four passages dealing with Darius the Mede occurred at the beginning of

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

his reign, at the beginning of Medo-Persian control over Babylon. None of them specifically require more time to extend beyond the death date of Ugbaru according to the chronicle.

The Nabonidus Chronicle Reexamined

The chronological factors for Darius the Mede discussed above require only a relatively short time for his rule at the beginning of Medo-Persian control over Babylon. The chronicle is the best historical document available since it describes the events of this transition period. The chronicle should be examined again, therefore, to see if any of the details from Daniel can be correlated with those found in the chronicle. For that purpose a new translation of the most important lines is presented here. The especially relevant portion comes from the end of col. III (ll. 15-22) where these events are described, beginning with line 15 of column III.⁷ The translation and the interpretation of line 15 are clear and present no problems.

Line 15: “On the 16th day (of Tishri) Ugbaru, the governor of Gutium, and the army of Cyrus entered Babylon without a battle.”

This passage indicates that the city of Babylon was taken by stratagem rather than frontal assault. This is in harmony with Herodotus’ story of the diversion of the Euphrates as a means by which the Persians gained access to Babylon. It is also implied in the narrative of Daniel 5. The record here dates the conquest (the 16th of Tishri is supplied from the preceding lines). In addition the statement names the general of the Persian army who led out in directing this conquest. That already makes him a prime candidate for the identification of Darius the Mede, and the proposal deserves further examination.

Line 16a: “Afterwards, after Nabonidus retreated, he was seized in Babylon.”

There are no translational or interpretational problems with this portion of this line either. Lines 12-14 describe how Nabonidus led one division of the Babylonian army and did battle with Cyrus first at Opis on the Tigris River and then at Sippar, nearer to Babylon. He was defeated on both occasions, so he fled back to the capital, undoubtedly hoping to find it still in Babylonian hands. Unfortunately for him, the Persian forces had already taken over

SHEA: NABONIDUS CHRONICLE

there, and he was captured and made prisoner. His fate was decided later.

Line 16b-17: “Until the end of the month (Tishri) the shields of Gutium (i.e., troops) surrounded the gates of the Esagil.”

This is the first of three main statements about activities at the main temple of Babylon. The chronicle takes great interest in the religious affairs in the temple. Earlier, for example, the scribe noted each of the years during which the New Year’s ritual was suspended while Nabonidus was away in Tema of Arabia.⁸ So it is natural for him to take an interest in what was going on in the temple at this important juncture. The translation of this passage presents no problems, but its interpretation does.

The standard interpretation of Assyriologists who have dealt with this text has been that these troops were stationed at the gates of the temple to insure that all of the rituals proceeded in the usual manner and without any interruption.⁹ The other alternative is that these troops were stationed at the temple to prevent any of those rituals from taking place. This is the interpretation we have adopted here. The matter can only be settled by the next two lines, and this is one place where the readings and interpretation of previous treatments of the chronicle need to be revised.

Line17 b: *baṭ-la ša mim-ma ina E-sag-gil u ekurrati. Meš.DIS*

“There was a cessation of everything in the Esagil and the (other) temples.”

The first sign of this phrase (see Labat No. 69) has been read by Smith as *be*, as *til* by Oppenheim, and as *baṭ* by Grayson.¹⁰ These are all permissible values for this sign, but Grayson’s reading appears to be preferable. That makes the word present here a verb coming from *baṭalu*, “to stop, cease.” The verb is not negated, however, which means that there was a stopping or a cessation. This is followed by the relative *ša*, “of,” and the indefinite pronoun *mimma*, “all, whatever.” Thus these three crucial words say that there was a stopping or a cessation of whatever had previously been going on in the main temple and the other temples in the city. The correct translation of this portion of the line complements the preceding phrase by indicating that the Gutian (= Median) troops had been posted at the temple gates to prevent the people from going into the temples and performing their rituals there.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

The next line of the text extends this idea further. Grayson has suggested that the single vertical wedge at the end of this line is simply a scribal error.¹¹ On the other hand it fits well as the number “one,” as a subject of the verb that follows at the beginning of the line. If so, the syntax of the two phrases in the next line follow the same pattern: subject—negation—verb.

Line 18:

išten ul iš-ša-kin “nothing was established while (and)
u simanu ul innitiq (DIB)*iq* the appointed time had not passed.”

The single vertical stroke at the end of the preceding line is not taken here by us as a scribal error, but rather as it commonly is used, to represent the number “one.” This is followed by the negative particle and then by the verb “to establish.” Literally this translates as, “one was not established.” To put this in better English word order it should be translated, “not one was established,” or, “no thing was established.”

The question then is, What was it that was not established? In context it clearly has to do with the temple(s). Nothing was established in connection with the temples. What types of things or functions went on in the temples? There are a number of possibilities: sacrifices, prayers, services, priestly activities. Any or all of these could be included in this reference. The point is that the temples were not functioning as normal. Their procedures, by and large, had been suspended.

How long was this state of affairs to go on? The next phrase in Line 18 refers to the fact that this situation was to obtain for a particular “appointed time.” This does not refer to the services of the temple, but to the suspension thereof. Those services, according to whatever aspect is referred to here, were suspended, and they were to remain suspended until the appointed time had passed when they could be resumed. How long a period of time did this last? The chronicle does not tell us, but we have another extra-chronicle source which gives us some information on this subject. That extra-chronicle source is the book of Daniel. The events of Daniel 6 need to be considered in this context.

According to Daniel 6, Daniel himself came into prominence as the new bureaucracy was being installed in Babylon after the Persian takeover. As a result, professional jealousy caused his fellow

SHEA: NABONIDUS CHRONICLE

civil servants to rise up against him with a plot. They knew that they could not obtain his conviction on the basis of unfaithfulness in the affairs of his office or functions for the king. They knew that the only way they could remove him was to gain his conviction on matters of his own personal religion. This they knew received his total allegiance and dedication. His prayers to his God were evident and well known down to his specific prayer practices. The plot involved attempting to gain a conviction of him on the basis of these practices. This they arranged with the unwitting complicity of the king, Darius the Mede, who agreed to their idea that no prayers would be said to any god for 30 days. This occurred at a time when Babylon was in a disturbed state of transition. It would not have been feasible at another time when the situation was more normal.

How could one prevent prayers being said? The simplest expedient would be to cut off access to the gods who were in the temples in Babylon. Preventing access to the gods would be simpler than attempting to monitor thousands of people. Closing of the temples by Median troops, as described in the chronicle, would accomplish the new governmental policy. Thus the services and other aspects of temple activities, such as prayer, were cut off. The fact that the gods from the other cities had been brought into Babylon by Nabonidus before the Persian attack, facilitated the program involved here, because they were temporarily inaccessible to the worshipers of their own cities and temples. It is of interest, therefore, to see that the chronicle mentions later that these gods did not *begin* to return to their cities and temples until the ninth month.

The chronology of these events should be compared. Babylon was captured about the middle of the seventh month, Tishri. Sometime after that Darius the Mede made a decree suspending prayers, in the temples and elsewhere, for 30 days. We do not know the exact date upon which that decree went into effect, but it probably was sometime during the last half of the seventh month. Thirty days from that point in time would have extended to a point sometime in the last half of the eighth month. With the new moon of the next month, the ninth, the gods begin to return home, and once having reached their home cities and temples they were available to their worshipers to receive their prayers there.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Thus the 30 days during which these operations were suspended according to Daniel 6, fit perfectly into the time period during which the chronicle says that these operations were suspended. We may see this type of activity reflected in the chronicle as coming from Darius the Mede according to Daniel. That brings one particular candidate for Darius the Mede to the fore, and that is Ugbaru, the general who conquered Babylon with his division of the army of Cyrus. Cyrus himself did not arrive on the scene of action until well after this time and thus we may see this biblical and chronicle activity as stemming from Ugbaru/Darius the Mede.

Line 18b: “Arahsamnu, day 3, Cyrus entered Babylon.”

Line 19a: “The way before him they filled.”

The statement about the entry of Cyrus is straightforward and requires no detailed explanation. The point to notice here is that this was 17 days after the city was conquered by the division of the army under Ugbaru, and he had been the military ruler of the city during that period of time. The first word at the beginning of the next phrase has posed a problem and there has not been any unanimity of opinion as to what it means. The original word is *ha-ri-ni-e*. As a rare word there is not much comparative material with which to judge its significance. It seems to me that there is a more common word with which to connect this one here, and that is the word *harranu*, “way, road,” written here with only one *r*. This probably refers to the great processional way which led up to the Ishtar gate, the main gate of entrance into the city from the north.

As Cyrus entered the city through this great portal, the people thronged the way in front of him, welcoming him as a deliverer from the unpopular Nabonidus. The object of the verb here is not quite clear. The question is whether the people themselves filled the street, as would be the case from Grayson’s translation of this verb, or whether they filled the street before him with some objects like branches, as Oppenheim has suggested.¹² The effect was the same, the great conqueror was welcomed by an enthusiastic throng. What is more important is to note his activities and those of Ugbaru after he arrived. These are described especially in the next three statements of the chronicle.

Line 19b: *šu-lum ana ali ša-kin^m Ku-raš*

“peace to the city established Cyrus”

SHEA: NABONIDUS CHRONICLE

Line 20a: *šu-lum ana Babil^{ki} gab-bi-šu qi-bi^m Gu-ba-ru*
“peace to Babylonia, all of it, spoke Gubaru.”

Line 20b: *^{lu} pa htū(NAM)šu^{lu} pahatuti(NAM.MES) ip-te-qid*
“his governor governors appointed”

There are several different ways in which these three statements can be translated. The common way is to make Cyrus the subject of the first two statements and to make Ugbaru/Gubaru the subject of the last statement. In that case the phrase, “his governor” stands in apposition to Gubaru, and he is the one who carried out the appointing of the governors. In either event, Cyrus did not do the appointing of the governors, except through the agency of his co-workers. This bears upon the identification of Darius the Mede in Daniel 6, because he did that kind of appointing. That would appear to weigh against Cyrus for this identification and weigh in favor of Gubaru. The conclusion seems sound, but it is emphasized all the more when the syntax of these statements is considered in parallel.

The question of translation involves the matter of syntax, because it is syntax which determines where these sentences should be divided. If one follows the parallelism of expression that is present here, then it is Cyrus who carries out the first action, establishing peace in the city of Babylon. Then it is Gubaru who speaks peace to all of Babylonia. Finally, it is Gubaru’s governor who appoints the needed governors in the third statement.

The syntactical basis for following this translation comes from noting the parallel syntax. For that reason I have supplied the transliterated Akkadian and a very literal translation following the Akkadian word order. When that is done it is noted that the first two statements follow exactly the same word order: Direct object, indirect object, verb, subject. The direct object in both cases is the same, *šulum* or “peace.” The indirect object, found in a prepositional phrase is very similar. In the first case it is the city of Babylon; in the second case it is the country of Babylon. The larger realm comes with the second statement. The verbs are related too in a general sense, but they are not exactly the same. In the first instance peace was “established.” In the second instance that peace is “spoken” to Babylonia, probably by royal decree. The word which follows this second verb is the name Gubaru. The personal name

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

stands in exactly the same location in its sentence as Cyrus does in the preceding instance. In both cases, therefore, the subject comes last. That should make Cyrus the subject of the first statement and Gubaru the subject of the second statement.

This parallel arrangement also separates the title of “governor” in the third statement from Gubaru. In actuality he stands above the governor. The governor carries out his work in the third statement, whereas Gubaru carries out his activity in the second statement, namely, to state or decree the state of peace that has now overtaken Babylonia in its totality.

This order of the text points out that Gubaru stands in a position midway between Cyrus, the emperor of the Persian empire, and the governor in Babylonia, who acts in the third statement. What office would Gubaru occupy on this basis? The office that would have put him into a real midpoint in officialdom would have been that of a vassal king. This he was *de facto* from the time he conquered Babylon and began its government operations there, and this would have been confirmed by Cyrus when he arrived at the city on the third day of the eighth month.

That also brings up the question of the identification of the governor who did the appointing. The pronominal suffix on the end of the singular word governor refers most directly back to Gubaru, not Cyrus. Who was Gubaru’s governor? If Gubaru and Darius the Mede of Daniel 6 are the same person, as seems reasonable since they carry out the same kind of activities, then this governor of Gubaru would have been the governor which he, alias Darius the Mede, appointed. We have no information elsewhere on the identity of the governor whom Gubaru appointed, but we have a good idea about the governor that Darius the Mede appointed.

Daniel 6 opens with Daniel being numbered among the three “presidents” and Darius considering his appointment as chief governor (vs. 3). The end of the story does not specifically state that Daniel was then made full governor, but that is the most logical way in which to understand the outcome of the narrative. It says that Daniel prospered under Darius, and if he was already under consideration for full governor, then his appointment to that office would be consistent with the account. We may take it as implied, therefore, that Daniel would have been the one who made the

SHEA: NABONIDUS CHRONICLE

appointments mentioned in the chronicle, even if his name is not specifically spelled out.

What appointments would these have been? According to Daniel 6, Darius the Mede had made his own appointments. But some of those officials fell by the wayside when they were killed in the lion's den after Daniel's deliverance. Thus, there was need for a second series of appointments to replace those who died in the lion's den. Those appointments could have been left to the chief governor, Daniel, in this case.

Lines (21-22a) "From the month of Kislev to the month of Adar, the gods of Akkad which Nabonidus had brought down to Babylon returned to their places."

There are no translational or interpretational problems with this line. Nabonidus brought these gods to Babylon to defend the city, theologically speaking, and they were still there after the city had fallen to the Persians. Thus it was necessary to send them back to their cities and their temples. The important thing to notice here is, as has been mentioned above, the date upon which this activity began, Kislev, the ninth month. The task was not completed until Adar, the twelfth month and the end of the year.

Why were the idols not sent back in the eighth month, right after Cyrus arrived, or in the seventh month, soon after the city was conquered? The 30-day decree of Darius had to run from a point in the second half of the seventh month until the second half of the eighth month. The decree would have interrupted the religious services of the land, delaying the return of the gods. If they had been sent back to their temples then, the people in those cities would have had them available for prayers and other services. When the 30 days were over, late in the eighth month, the process of returning the idols could begin in the next or ninth month. That process lasted until the end of the Babylonian year four months later.

Line (22) "In the month of Arahsmnu, on the night of day 11, Ugbaru died in Baby[lon KI]"

Line (23) (and) the wife of the king died."

There are three signs that present problems in these two lines: the first sign in the personal name, the sign at the end of line 22, and the sign at the beginning of line 23. The reading for the sign at the beginning of line 23 has been largely settled by reexamining the

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

tablet. The consensus is that the sign represents the word for “wife” (*aššat*). It is evident that this was some female figure, because the verb which follows has the female phonetic complement (*-at*) following the logogram (BAD). Thus, even if it were not the queen who died, it was indeed some important female personage. The verb clearly indicates this was a female, and that she died.

The question is, When did she die? Previous interpreters have assumed that the broken sign present following the verb for Ugbaru’s death was the determinative for month. This is not the case. In the heart of the rectangle of the sign for month (*arah*), a horizontal row of wedges are incised. These are not present in the rectangle of this broken sign, according to S. Smith’s copy.¹³ What is present here is one wedge pointed vertically across the bottom line of the sign. This is the sign for Babylon, and it can be compared favorably with half a dozen other occurrences of the same sign in the preceding lines.

Thus, what this statement says, is that Ugbaru died in the city of Babylon; it does not go on to give a separate date for the death of the queen. There is no more room for another date here. Following the sign for Babylon, the determinative KI for a place name would have been incised. However, this has been broken away from the present line. There is only enough space for one or two signs, which is not enough for another date. So, in all likelihood, this line ended with the word for Babylon and the determinative KI following it. The meaning of the statement is that when Ugbaru died, on the 11th of Arahsamnu, he died in Babylon.

The close relationship between Ugbaru who died and the wife of the king who died at the same time suggests that the “king” was Ugbaru. Other possibilities have been considered: Nabonidus and Belshazzar among the Babylonian kings, but both of them had been deposed or slain earlier; Cyrus among the Persian kings, but there is no mention of him here in connection with this queen’s death or with the period of mourning for her which came later. Ugbaru then makes the most logical connection here in this passage of the text. The fact that they both died at the same time and in the same place suggests their matrimonial connection. Furthermore, the fact that no king was in attendance at her period of mourning also points

SHEA: NABONIDUS CHRONICLE

most directly to Ugbaru as her husband. He was unable to attend, because he too was dead.

The close connection between these two individuals in the text also suggests a reason for their death. Until this time Darius appears to have been in good health, carrying out his duties without difficulty. He led the Persian troops that conquered Babylon; then he went about organizing the administration of the conquered city. No sign of difficulty with his health surfaces during these activities. The fact that he and his wife died at the same time, suddenly and unexpectedly, suggests an irregular cause for their death. The fact that they both died at night, a most unusual item for the chronicle to mention, adds to the mystery here.

In the absence of a body upon which to perform an autopsy, the cause for Ugbaru's death may be hypothesized: he was poisoned. This would explain why his wife died at the same time. Eating and drinking from the same banquet table, she consumed the same poison intended for him with the same effect. It is most unusual for the chronicle to mention the time of day when it gives death dates. Commonly the day number is sufficient for that purpose. The fact that their deaths occurred at night suggests they ate the poisoned meal in the evening.

If the couple were poisoned, the question naturally arises, Who poisoned them? Ugbaru/Darius had quite a few enemies in Babylon. In the first place, the priests in the temple would have been at odds with him because he had suspended their activities. In addition, the officials of the city and country had reason to dislike him and to be afraid of him. He had thrown some of their colleagues into the lions' den, with fatal results. Probably there were other plotters who had escaped this first execution, and they feared for their lives if they were found out. They could have seen this as a case of kill or be killed. Thus there were several classes of people in Babylon who would have had good motives for wanting to see king Darius dead. The poison given to him could have come from any one of these groups, or they may have acted in concert.

This is the point at which the line by line evaluation of the Nabonidus Chronicle may be concluded. There are only two further items that need be noted. A ceremony of mourning was held for the queen at the end of the year, from the 27th of Adar to the 3rd of

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Nisan. The next day after the mourning period, Cambyses, the son of Cyrus, marched into the temple to take part in some sort of ceremony. This ceremony fits well with his taking up the reins of government in Babylonia at the time of the New Year's festival.

This was, in essence, his installment as coregent with his father Cyrus. Cyrus served as king of the empire, "King of Lands" as the title was known, and Cambyses served as "King of Babylon." This arrangement of the coregency lasted for only one year. Then, for reasons unknown to us, Cyrus appears to have removed Cambyses from that post. He did not serve in it again until eight years later, when Cyrus died. Then the tablets take up anew the title of "King of Babylon" for Cambyses, but this time (530 B.C.) he also reigned as ruler of the empire.

Summary

The details of these new readings from the Nabonidus Chronicle can now be integrated with what was already known about Ugbaru from this text, and these can be compared with what is known about Darius the Mede from the book of Daniel. The thesis of this study is that when these details are compared they make a good case for identifying Darius the Mede as Ugbaru the Persian general.

The general's name appears three times in the Chronicle, and it is spelled in different ways, with a different sign in the first position in each case. These variations are minor, and all three references should be taken as referring to the same individual. His original personal name probably was Gubaru, but since the text refers to him twice as Ugbaru and only once as Gubaru, the name of Ugbaru has been used for him throughout this study.

The name Darius should be taken as a throne name in Babylon where Ugbaru served briefly as a vassal king under the authority of Cyrus as suzerain and emperor of the Persian empire. His reign as a vassal king was short-lived. The reason suggested above for the brevity of his reign being that he probably was poisoned. We now summarize the various points that suggest the identity of Ugbaru as Darius the Mede.

1. Ugbaru was the conqueror of Babylon. He took his division of the Medo-Persian army to besiege the capital, while Cyrus met

SHEA: NABONIDUS CHRONICLE

Nabonidus in the field. Nabonidus was defeated and fled, while Ugbaru and his division seized the city by stratagem in which the use of arms was minimal. Belshazzar, left behind by Nabonidus to guard the city with the other division of the Babylonian army, died that night when the city was taken. Cyrus did not arrive in Babylon for another two and one-half weeks, leaving Ugbaru as regent of the city in charge of its affairs, thus giving him the powers with which he is described in Daniel 6. Thus, when Darius “received” the kingdom (Dan 5:31), he received it from the hand of God as stated in the prophecy in Daniel 5:24-28.

2. According to these new readings and interpretation of the Nabonidus Chronicle, Ugbaru (= Darius) did indeed interrupt the services of the main temple of Babylon and the subsidiary temples of the land. This was the purpose for stationing Median (i.e., Gutian) troops around the temple gates. They were not there to continue the normal functions of the temple; they were there to prevent the services of the temple. Daniel 6 shows why this was so. A prohibition had been placed upon the citizenry. They could not pray to any god or person other than Darius for 30 days. This was enforced by preventing them from going into the temple areas where they would have normally offered those prayers. The chronicle indicates that this interruption began in the last half of the seventh month, when Ugbaru was in control of Babylon, and it lasted until sometime late in the eighth month. We know that by the ninth month the gods of Babylonia were being returned to their cities and temples. By this time the prohibition would have been lifted.

A question may be asked here about what would have happened to this decree when Ugbaru died on the 11th of the month of Arahsamnu, the eighth month. The fate of this decree is clear from other passages in Daniel 6 which indicate that the laws of the Medes and the Persians could not be changed (vss. 8, 12, 15). Thus even though the ruler who proclaimed this law had died, the time element in the decree should have run its full course to some point in the last half of the eighth month. This was the appointed time about which the chronicle spoke. It was the time “appointed” by Ugbaru/Darius.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

3. There are several elements which suggest the status of kingship for Ugbaru after his conquest of Babylon:

a. The fact that his personal name is used in the chronicle puts him in a category with royalty. The vast majority of personal names used in the Babylonian chronicle series of texts belong to kings.¹⁴

b. The fact that his death date is given also puts him in the category of royalty, since almost all of the individuals whose deaths are dated in the chronicles are kings.¹⁵

c. The association of his name with the immediately following phrase about the death of the wife of the king suggests that the antecedent to the word king is Ugbaru. It was most likely his wife who died. This becomes all the more likely once it is realized, according to these new readings, that they both died on the same night, probably as a result of having been poisoned at the same meal.

d. According to the syntax of the statements which follow the recorded entry of Cyrus into Babylon, Ugbaru stands in mid-position between that of Cyrus the king of the empire and his (Ugbaru's) governor. The most likely position for such an individual to occupy in that case would have been the office of vassal king of Babylon. Ugbaru occupied that position on an informal basis for two and one-half weeks before Cyrus arrived at Babylon, and for another week (8 days) after his arrival. It probably was upon his arrival that Cyrus appointed Ugbaru the official vassal king of the country.

For these four reasons there is justification to suspect that the scribe of the Nabonidus Chronicle followed a series of conventions in the chronicle to point to the fact that Ugbaru was serving as a king, albeit on a level lower than that of Cyrus himself.

4. The book of Daniel supplies us with a series of biographical and personal details about Darius the Mede. Unfortunately most of the corresponding details from Persian sources for Ugbaru are not currently available in the texts that have survived from ancient times. These include:

a. His age. Daniel 5:31 gives the age of Darius the Mede at the time of the conquest of Babylon as 62 years. No sources give us the age of Ugbaru at the time of Babylon's capture. We can estimate, however, that he was sufficiently senior to have commanded a

SHEA: NABONIDUS CHRONICLE

division of the Persian army in its attack upon the capital city of the country. Thus an estimate of 62 years of age could not be far from the mark for a man of such seniority.

b. His father's name was Ahasuerus. Unfortunately, we have no ancient sources from which we can obtain the name of Ugbaru's father, so this detail must remain unattested.

c. He is identified as a Mede. The ethnic origin of Ugbaru is not clearly identified in the ancient texts. We do know, however, that a battalion of his crack troops were Medes, given the label of Gutians in the chronicle. These were the troops who surrounded and guarded the temple in Babylon when it was closed off to the public.

The Gutians were hill-country people. They are identified as an old group of barbarians who were responsible for disrupting the established order down on the plain of Mesopotamia, especially in the time of the Ur III Dynasty, ca. 2000 B.C. At the collapse of Babylon the Medes played that same role again, and thus were given the older identification to show how much distaste the civilized Babylonians had for them. One can also read the name, Gutium, as standing for Media. Ugbaru was governor of Gutium before he came to Babylonia. Thus Ugbaru was governor of Media, and the special troops under his control were Medians. These two points add up to a strong argument that Ugbaru was himself a Median.

5. The thesis of this study is that Ugbaru, the general of the Persian army who conquered Babylon and ruled it for approximately a month afterwards, makes the best candidate for Darius the Mede in the book of Daniel. The principal objection to this identification is that he did not live long enough after the conquest to satisfy the chronological requirements for Darius the Mede in the book of Daniel. This raises the question, Just how much time is required for Darius the Mede in the book of Daniel?

These factors have been reviewed above, and the answer is, not much. Daniel 5:31 only requires that he be around at the time Babylon was conquered. As general of the victorious army, Ugbaru surely was. Daniel 6 requires that he be in office for enough time to appoint new officials to their tasks. Then the problem over Daniel arose. The main chronological requirement here is the 30 days set apart by the decree Darius gave.

Since Ugbaru did not live a full 30 days after the surrender of

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Babylon, it might be thought he could not satisfy the requirement. But this is not a valid objection, however. Daniel was undoubtedly arrested on one of the first few days after the decree went into effect. After Ugbaru died, the decree would have continued to run its course. He himself did not have to live out the full 30 days to satisfy that qualification; he only had to live long enough to start the process.

Daniel 9:1 requires only an unspecified date in Darius' first year. Theoretically, one day could satisfy this requirement, a week into that reign would certainly be adequate. Presumably this would be after Cyrus had formalized Ugbaru's vassal reign, not before. As a byproduct this historical datum could be used to narrow down the date of Daniel 9. It would fall between the 3rd and the 11th of Arahshamnu in the fall of 539 B.C. He need not have ruled any longer than that to have received a date in his first year. The same could be said for the reference to Darius the Mede in Daniel 11:1.

6. For the data about Darius the Mede in the book of Daniel, therefore, some are fulfilled in a very specific way by Ugbaru, some are fulfilled in a general way by him, and some we still do not know whether they are fulfilled by him or not, because the information is lacking in order to confirm or deny these points about him.

Given the present status of our knowledge about Ugbaru in the Nabonidus Chronicle and Darius the Mede in the book of Daniel, the two fit together as the same individual reasonably well. They operate in the same limited amount of time, and they carry out the same or similar actions.

It has been said that there is no room in history for Darius the Mede. Actually, there is room for him. It is only a limited amount of time, three and one half weeks to be exact. Even though it is less time than previously thought, it is enough time for him to carry out his designated actions according to the book of Daniel. Thus, there is room in history for Darius the Mede. Ugbaru the Medo-Persian general fits very neatly and specifically into that limited amount of time.

7. A side effect of this study suggests there is also room for Daniel at a point in history identified by the Nabonidus Chronicle. This comes at the point in column III where the text states, as translated above, "his (Ugbaru's, not Cyrus') governor appointed

SHEA: NABONIDUS CHRONICLE

(sub-) governors.” The logical conclusion of Daniel 6 is that Daniel was indeed finally elevated to the post of the highest governor for which he was considered at the beginning of the narrative. When he came out of the lion’s den and prospered (in appointment) under Darius the Mede, that should have been the post to which he was appointed.

If Darius the Mede was Ugbaru the general, as suggested in this study, then Ugbaru’s chief governor would have been the chief governor of Darius the Mede. Since Darius the Mede’s governor should have been Daniel according to the outcome of Daniel 6, it means that Ugbaru’s governor mentioned in the chronicle, but not named there, would have been Daniel too. Thus, we have a place in the chronicle’s recitation of events surrounding the fall of Babylon into which Daniel should fit. The governors that Daniel appointed were not the first wave of appointments done by Darius/Ugbaru: they would have been the second wave of appointments following the loss of some of these officials in the lions’ den. There is room in 6th century B.C. history, therefore, for both Darius the Mede and Daniel the prophet.

Endnotes

1 W. H. Shea, “An Unrecognized Vassal King of Babylon in the Early Achaemenid Period,” *AUSS* 9 (1971): 51-67; Id., *Ibid.*, pt. II, *AUSS* 9 (1971): 99-128.

2 Id., “Darius the Mede in His Persian-Babylonian Setting,” *AUSS* 29 (1991): 236-237.

3 *Ibid.*, p. 238.

4 For the Verse Account of Nabonidus see J. B. Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University, 1955), pp. 312-315. For the Harran inscriptions of Nabonidus see C. J. Gadd, “The Harran Inscriptions of Nabonidus,” *Anatolian Studies* 8 (1958): 35-92. For a recent treatment of the Harran inscriptions with special attention to how long Nabonidus spent in Tema of Arabia see P.-A. Beaulieu, *The Reign of Nabonidus King of Babylon 556-539 B.C.*, Yale Near Eastern Researches, 10 (New Haven: Yale University, 1989), pp. 149-202.

5 *ANET*, pp. 315-316.

6 W. H. Shea, “An Unrecognized King of Babylon in the Early Achaemenid Period, III,” *AUSS* 10 (1972): 88-117; Id., *Ibid.*, pt. IV, *AUSS* 10 (1972): 147-178.

7 For A. L. Oppenheim’s translation of the Nabonidus Chronicle see *ANET*, pp. 305-307. For A. K. Grayson’s transliteration and translation of the relevant portions of this text see his *Assyrian and Babylonian Chronicles*, TCS 5 (Locust Valley, NY: J. J. Augustin, 1975), pp. 104-112. For S. Smith’s earlier publication of this text see his *Babylonian Historical Texts Relating to the Capture and*

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Downfall of Babylon (London: Methuen, 1924), pp. 28-123. The hand copy of this text that I have used is that of Smith, Pl. XIII. Another recent translation of this text occurs in the work published by Beaulieu mentioned in n. 4, pp. 224-225.

8 *ANET*, p. 306. For a discussion of this period see especially Beaulieu's study mentioned in the preceding note, pp. 149-202.

9 See the translations of Oppenheim, Smith, Grayson, and Beaulieu mentioned in n. 7.

10 R. Labat, *Manuel d'epigraphie Akkadienne* (P. Geuthner: Paris, 1976), p. 67. Smith, p. 113; Oppenheim, p. 306, n. 12; Grayson, p. 110.

11 *Ibid.* Grayson's commentary on column III, line 17.

12 *Ibid.* Oppenheim, p. 306, n. 13.

13 Smith, Plate XIII.

14 W. H. Shea, "An Unrecognized Vassal King of Babylon in the Early Achaemenid Period: IV," *AUSS* 10 (1972): pp. 147-151.

15 *Ibid.*, pp. 152-154.

[This paper has been reformulated from old, unformatted electronic files and may not be identical to the edited version that appeared in print. The original pagination has been maintained, despite the resulting odd page breaks, for ease of scholarly citation. However, scholars quoting this article should use the print version or give the URL.]
Journal of the Adventist Theological Society, 7/1 (Spring 1996): 21-50.
Article copyright © 1996 by Winfried Vogel.

Cultic Motifs and Themes in the Book of Daniel

Winfried Vogel, Th.D. Candidate
Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary
Andrews University

Introduction

Biblical scholars have observed that “it remains a perplexing phenomenon that the theological insights into the book of Daniel have not increased proportionately” to our historical insight into the book.¹ The most pressing issue in the debate over Daniel has long been the question of when the book might have been composed,² combined with the search for the most likely sources as well as the historicity of Daniel. The bilingual state of Daniel's text and the different focus and style of the two halves of the book have prompted an avalanche of linguistic probes and literary studies on structure and unity.³ But, surprisingly, little study has been given to the theology of the book or its theological themes.

It is also observed that there are “many intertwining theological, prophetic, and eschatological-apocalyptic themes”⁴ in the book of Daniel. But, so far, little has been done to obtain a clear and comprehensive picture of the author's theological purpose. Since there are so many instances of cultic terminology and activity⁵ throughout the book, we believe an examination of this phenomenon could help to bring us closer to a richer understanding of the book's overall theology.

Purpose. We intend to pay close attention to the text as it stands—its linguistic and literary features—without being limited by the usual critical analyses, which generally do not see the book of Daniel as one whole.⁶ Numerous references and allusions to cultic

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

objects, rituals, and personages in the book of Daniel suggest the crucial importance of cultic motifs and themes to this writing. Our objective is to sample some of these and to assess their meaning and implications for the exegesis and theology as well as the structure of Daniel.

Definition of terms. The term “motif” suggests linguistic, literary or conceptual elements within a literary unit,⁷ which by their recurrence or by allusion contribute to the thematic development within that unit and also to its unity.⁸ “By virtue of their frequency and particular use, [they] tell us something about the author’s intentions. . .”⁹ In our study the motifs will be drawn from Daniel’s references/allusions to the cultic life of ancient Israel.

The reader should note that the term “theme” is not used interchangeably with “motif.” “Theme” is employed to identify the message or idea which is conveyed by the motifs,¹⁰ making motifs the smaller element which contributes to a theme. For example, the temple vessels mentioned in Daniel 1 and 5 form a cultic *motif* which in turn contributes to the cultic *theme* of defilement in both chapters.

The terms “cult” or “cultic” refer to “all those fixed conventions of worship, observed by both the individual and the group, by which the benefits of divine favor in everyday life could be realized.”¹¹ This includes all elements and terms that pertain to religious rituals¹² in OT sacrificial and sanctuary worship and also to conditions and actions related to them. Since worship in ancient Israel was always connected with cult,¹³ it will inevitably play a role in our motif study here, although we have to be aware that the term as such has a wider meaning.¹⁴ For example, the fact that in exilic times more general notions of worship (like prayer, Dan 6) came to prominence,¹⁵ justifies our including it here,—all the more so, since it was performed with the Israelite cult in mind.

Procedure. We will focus first on the description and literary, exegetical and theological significance of some of the cultic motifs as they appear within the book. We shall not concern ourselves with examining motifs from the perspective of tradition history, seeking to establish their extra-biblical origin.¹⁶ The task will be to pay attention to the biblical text in what has been called “close read-

VOGEL: CULTIC MOTIFS AND THEMES IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL

ing,”¹⁷ or, in an even better designation, a “holistic study of the text.”¹⁸

Our study will also endeavor to take into account the comprehensive nature of the cult in all its dimensions, such as space, time, objects, personage and performance,¹⁹ whereby the last one encompasses all the others. Although there certainly is a dynamic relation between the cultic elements which cannot be fully captured by a strict organization in rubrics we shall hope to retain the theological dynamic of the cult in Daniel by paying attention to the different and interrelating aspects of those elements.

We shall include references and allusions to objects, rituals, persons related to cult in our investigation as well as references and allusions in the book of Daniel to cultic texts outside the book.

We also want to examine the extent to which the cultic motifs serve to highlight cultic themes. We then wish to focus on the interrelationship of the cultic themes, hoping to demonstrate the value of thematic structure as a literary device, employed not only for the coherence and unity of the book of Daniel but also for revealing its theological meaning.

Finally, we will observe some implications of the cultic motifs and themes and their contribution to the theology of the book of Daniel.

Overview of Cultic Motifs. We have organized the instances of cultic motifs in Daniel by the different rubrics commonly used to classify cultic material. In order to gain an idea of the amount and nature of cultic motifs, it will be helpful to take note of the following outline:

Cultic Space

Mountain

Sanctuary

Throne

City

Cultic Time

Ten Days of Non-Defilement

Three Weeks of Mourning

Three Times of Prayer

Time of the Evening Offering

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

- Periods of Seven
- Cultic Objects
 - Temple Vessels
 - Images
 - Offering and Incense
 - Sacrificial Animals
- Cultic Personage
 - The Man Clothed in Linen
 - The Messiah
 - Daniel
 - The Three Hebrews
 - The Saints
- Cultic Performance
 - Tamid*
 - The Cleansing of the Sanctuary
 - Atonement and Anointing
 - Liturgical Prayers
 - End of Sacrifice and Offering

Limitations. Because of space limitations, we have limited our study to brief discussions of a few selected samples of cultic motifs. We have selected one motif from each category which seems typical for that grouping: for cultic space, the mountain motif; for cultic time, the prayer offered three times a day; for cultic objects, the temple vessels; for cultic personage, Daniel himself acting as a cultic person; and for cultic performance, Daniel's liturgical prayer (Dan 9).

Cultic Space: The Holy Mountain

The term “mountain” appears five times in Daniel (2:35, 45, *tûr*, Aramaic; 9:16, 20; 11:45, *har*, Hebrew). In Daniel's earnest intercession with God he refers to “your holy mountain” (*har-qodšekā*). The expression stands in direct apposition to “Your city Jerusalem” (Dan 9:16). Daniel uses the expression “holy mountain of my God” (*har-qōdeš^e lohê*), which is “an epithet of Zion (Pss 2:6; 48:2 [1]; 99:9).”²⁰ The context reveals that Daniel is thinking of the sanctuary, which is mentioned in vs. 17.

VOGEL: CULTIC MOTIFS AND THEMES IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL

There is a close connection to be observed between vs. 16, “Let Your anger and Your fury turn away from Your city Jerusalem, Your holy mountain,” and vs. 17, “Cause Your face to shine on Your sanctuary.” These statements express the same idea by using contrasting expressions. More importantly, they substantiate the connection between²¹ the city, the holy mountain and the sanctuary.²² This is further confirmed by vs. 26, where the “city and the sanctuary” are mentioned together.²³

In vs. 20 Daniel is presenting his supplication before the Lord his God “concerning the holy mountain of God.”²⁴ The holiness of this mountain directly derives from the location of the sanctuary/ temple there and from the fact that it is the place of God's residence.²⁵ This is evidenced by many texts in the OT.²⁶

The term *qodeš* which is used to qualify the mountain is a cultic term²⁷ that is also employed to designate the sanctuary (Dan 8:13-14).²⁸ Although the one is adjectival and the other is nominal, this is an indication that the two are linked. This could mean, then, that the expression “holy mountain,” which is used three times (9:16, 20; 11:45), is employed by Daniel as a device to point to the sanctuary.

Daniel 9:16 clearly refers to the earthly sanctuary, which Daniel had in mind in his prayer,²⁹ although vs. 20 seems to indicate that he directed his prayer towards heaven, where he knew God was residing (“before the Lord my God”), since the earthly sanctuary was desolate. Three times in Daniel 9—one time in Daniel's prayer and two times in the angel's prophecy—we have direct references to the sanctuary: vs. 17 (*miqdāš*—sanctuary),³⁰ vs. 24 (*qodeš qodašim*—Most Holy); vs. 26 (*qodeš*—sanctuary).³¹

The mountain in Daniel 2 occurs in a different context from that in chapter 9, although both chapters are of prophetic content. The “great mountain” in 2:35 develops from the stone that smites the image in an event of judgment and destruction. In 2:45 the same stone “was cut out of the mountain without hands.” The interpretations of these passages are fairly unanimous. Many commentators agree that the mountain refers to Mt. Zion, where Yahweh's house stands,³² or at least to God's universal rule,³³ which, as we have seen, is strongly linked to the sanctuary.³⁴

However, the idea to be conveyed here, as in chapter 9, is not

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

one of identification but one of association.³⁵ The kingdom of God is not to be identified with the sanctuary, but rather to be linked with the sanctuary concept. God's kingdom will be established because of what takes place in His sanctuary.

P. R. Davies hints to a possible eternal existence of the mountain. He points to the apparent change from vs. 35 (stone becomes a mountain) to vs. 45 (stone cut out of an existing mountain) and states, "The mountain therefore was already, as it were, in existence."³⁶ Although Davies by no means refers to any heavenly sanctuary here, his remark is worth considering.

The text does indeed imply that the mountain has already been in existence before the events described. Inasmuch as the stone has to be seen as Christ and the coming of God's eternal kingdom,³⁷ and inasmuch as the divine steering of earth's history comes from the sanctuary above (cf. Rev 4:1; 8:1-6; 9:13, 14; 11:19; 14:1; 15:5.6; 16:1), the mountain in chapter 2 could be an allusion to the heavenly sanctuary, from which judgment will go forth at the end of time when Christ, as the High Priest, will come forth from the heavenly temple to establish His kingdom and save His people.

Cultic Time: Three Times for Prayer

In Daniel 6:10 (11) it is stated that Daniel customarily prayed three times a day towards Jerusalem. This is not merely an instance of "non-cultic, private religious activity,"³⁸ or "a custom,"³⁹ but a rather clear reference to the sanctuary service. Daniel did so because he directed his supplication to the site of the (then destroyed) sanctuary at the time of the daily sacrifices. Lacocque observes: "The morning and evening times coincide with the two sacrifices in the Temple: Exodus 29:39; 1 Chronicles 23:30. It should be noted that at Qumran we find a ternary prayer punctuating the day."⁴⁰

Rabbinical teaching saw the ordinance promulgated by Moses, but also conformed to by the Patriarchs.⁴¹ Charles⁴² argues for three times for prayer,—starting at the time of the morning sacrifice, followed in the afternoon, at the ninth hour, the time of the evening meal offering, and in the evening at sunset, against Keil⁴³ who sets the times at the third, sixth, and ninth hour of the day.⁴⁴ The only other text in the OT suggesting three times of daily prayer is Psalm

VOGEL: CULTIC MOTIFS AND THEMES IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL

55:17 (18), which by contextual association with the “house of God” hints at the same cultic practice.⁴⁵

It is also significant, as Wood has pointed out, that “the word order in the Aramaic places this element before those of bowing, praying, and praising; thus giving it a place of emphasis.”⁴⁶

Daniel's position in prayer towards Jerusalem in this instance corresponds to Daniel 9:3, 20, where he is also concerned with the sanctuary and Jerusalem, and where the “holy mountain” plays a major role in his supplication.⁴⁷ We have seen that this expression can be understood as referring to the temple. Daniel is directing his prayer to God in heaven, but his position is towards the site of the earthly sanctuary in remembrance and acknowledgment of the cultic services and their significance for the covenant, which Daniel hopes will be restored.

Cultic Objects: The Temple Vessels

Daniel 1:2 states that as a result of the conquest of Jerusalem “some of the articles of the house of God” were carried “into the land of Shinar to the house of his [Nebuchadnezzar's] god,” “into the treasure house of his god.” The fact that (1) these vessels, as well as the house of the pagan god, are mentioned twice, and (2) this detail is given at the very outset of the narrative indicates the significance of this action.⁴⁸ Although it was common practice⁴⁹ and “may be seen as a perfectly normal procedure,”⁵⁰ we do not have an “incidental or irrelevant beginning. On the contrary, it is the theme of the book and the key to everything that follows.”⁵¹

This assessment is not difficult to follow. The book of Daniel deals indeed with the issues of superiority and defeat, of usurpation and worship. Therefore, it is not accidental that the removal of the temple vessels sets the stage, as it were, for the theme that is treated in the rest of the book. Some commentators do not attach much significance to this aspect of the conquest, because they either see it as a mere preparation for the events in chapter 5,⁵² or as the usual taking of “worthwhile plunder,”⁵³ a matter of secondary concern.⁵⁴ However, there is more.

Dominion and Defeat. It becomes clear from the context in Daniel 1 and from the ancient Near-Eastern understanding of temple worship that the act of removing the articles from the

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Jerusalem temple and of placing them in a pagan shrine was viewed as a great victory for the conquering party.⁵⁵ The destruction of the Jewish temple along with the deportation of young Jews was seen as “a sign and pledge of the subjugation of Judah and its God under the dominion of the kings and the gods of Babylon.”⁵⁶ A closer look at the significance of the sanctuary, described as “the house of God” (*bêt—hā ’lohîm*,⁵⁷ Dan 1:2), and its articles, will reveal the theological importance of this verse.

The Temple as the Center of God's Reign. The most obvious aspect of the theology of the temple in the OT is the fact that it was God's dwelling place among His people (Exod 15:17; 25:8; 29:45, 46).⁵⁸ This included, as Craig Koester has aptly summarized, revelation and appearance of God, offering of sacrifices securing atonement, and God's presence indicating His faithfulness to the covenant promises.⁵⁹ Judging from the biblical data, we also find the temple understood as the place or center of God's reign. This is clearly expressed in the following statements:

Honor and majesty are before Him; strength and beauty are
in His *sanctuary*.

Tremble before Him, all the earth.

Say among the nations, “The Lord *reigns*; . . .

He shall *judge* the people righteously.” (Ps 96:6, 9, 10)

In the OT Mount Zion was the location of the sanctuary and came to be closely associated with it.⁶⁰ Numerous texts confirm the truth that the reign and also the judgment of God issue from the sanctuary.⁶¹ The temple was even seen as “the cosmic center of the universe. . . , the place where heaven and earth converge and thus from where God's control over the universe is effected.”⁶² Not only the texts already quoted but also the sanctuary service—the Day of Atonement (Yom Kippur) in particular—describe God's judgment taking place in or from the sanctuary.⁶³ This is the way the Day of Atonement was understood in biblical times and which is reflected in Jewish interpretation.⁶⁴

Thus, we may conclude that one of the major theological meanings of the sanctuary was the reign of God. This again is demonstrated by the obvious significance which is attached to the removal of the vessels in Daniel 1. The action clearly indicates

VOGEL: CULTIC MOTIFS AND THEMES IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL

Yahweh's defeat.⁶⁵ To see this even more conclusively, we turn to the meaning of the temple vessels in the OT tradition.

Theological Significance of the Temple Vessels. Considering the extensive treatment of sanctuary vessels in various places in the OT, we have to conclude that they were viewed as more than mere treasures or booty when taken by a conquering enemy.⁶⁶ The sacred vessels are mentioned as being made for the tent sanctuary (Exod 25:1-31:11) as well as for the temple of Solomon (1 Kgs 7) and feature prominently in the conquest of Jerusalem (2 Kgs 24, 25). Consequently they are mentioned in connection with the return of the exiles (Ezra 1, 6) and in a manner to suggest their significance.

The Hebrew term for "vessels" (used in all instances, including Dan 1) is *keli*, occurring about 320 times in the OT. The term is used to depict vessels, household articles, tools, weapons, and artifacts or the articles used in the cultic service of the sanctuary.⁶⁷ The word in its cultic context is translated⁶⁸ utensil,⁶⁹ article,⁷⁰ furnishing,⁷¹ implement,⁷² with the general term "article" being the most frequently used. Biblical evidence indicates that this term describes all those items that had been especially crafted for use in the sanctuary,⁷³ except the ark of the covenant.⁷⁴ It is explicitly stated that these articles were "articles of service for the house of the Lord,"⁷⁵ and that they were esteemed so holy that to touch them would result in death.⁷⁶

We must conclude, then, that the temple articles were identified with the temple itself, as Peter Ackroyd observes:

The temple vessels as essential component parts of the temple itself would then have the same function, that of depicting the order to which practice must conform, the order which is itself linked to what the deity himself ordains. . . what is being provided is not simply the necessary objects for religious use, but what corresponds to the divine command.⁷⁷

The theological meaning of the temple articles, apart from their significance for the sanctuary service, lies in their identification with the temple as the center of God's dominion.⁷⁸ "Yahweh is associated with the articles, which belong to the temple service and the sacrificial cult, in a special way."⁷⁹

The fact that they can be removed by the enemy further

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

intensifies the notion of subjugation. This is strongly supported by prophecies and incidences in the book of Jeremiah, where the “vessels of the Lord's house,”⁸⁰ the same expression as in Daniel 1,⁸¹ are made a sign both for defeat and also for restoration.⁸² Jeremiah 27:16-22 illustrates this very well, when the prophet says that God will allow even those vessels left behind by Nebuchadnezzar to be taken to Babylon. In the context of chapters 27 and 28 the vessels become a distinct sign for God's judgment. On the other hand, according to 27:22, they are also a sign for the hope of restoration,⁸³ which will then mean a restoration of the sanctuary, its services, and by the same token, the reign of God.⁸⁴

Usurpation of Divine Prerogatives. The removal of the temple vessels, in its theological significance, is intensified by their being brought into the house of Nebuchadnezzar's pagan god. A number of scholars have come to the conclusion that the first mention of “the house of God” should be discarded due to some minor textual evidence or syntactical problems.⁸⁵ But I agree with Goldingay in his assessment that Daniel is “characteristically careful” in his choice of words and phrases, which often involves “fulsomeness and repetition rather than syntactical elegance.”⁸⁶

The double mention of the articles and the house of his god adds emphasis to the usurpation of power and cultic preeminence performed by the Babylonian king. Seen in the context of vs. 1, which introduces the kingdom theme in the book of Daniel, this is a clear reference to the fact that this is not only a military conquest and the seizure of kingly powers but is also a seizure of religious prerogatives that belong to the one true God.⁸⁷

This theme of usurpation can be traced through the whole book, but it is especially seen in the presumptuous activities of the little horn power in chaps. 7 and 8.⁸⁸ It is also alluded to in the geographical location, “the land of Shinar,” (Dan 1:2), generally understood as a reference to Genesis 11:2ff, which recounts the first instance of hubris, false religion and self-aggrandizement. It also reminds us of Zechariah 5:11 where Babel's sin and wickedness is referred to.⁸⁹

Babylon's pride is evident as well in Daniel 5, when Belshazzar desecrates the sacred temple vessels from Jerusalem even more by using them in his idolatrous feast. Daniel, as the spokesperson for

VOGEL: CULTIC MOTIFS AND THEMES IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL

God, denounces this act as a rebellion against the true God (vs. 23)⁹⁰ and reminds Belshazzar of Nebuchadnezzar's arrogance and downfall, which, together with the mention of the vessels, could also be an allusion to their removal from Jerusalem in chap. 1.

This removal of the vessels, their placement in a pagan temple, and their subsequent additional desecration (Dan 5), however, suggest more than the usurpation of royal dominion. Seeing these temple articles as essential symbols of the sanctuary service, we have to conclude that this event also marks the usurpation of God's prerogatives to grant salvation and atonement to man.⁹¹ The sanctuary, as an integral part of Yahweh's worship, is not only attacked and mocked, but is also substituted with another "house of God" (Dan 1) and another "worship" (Dan 5).⁹²

Since there is a connection between sanctuary and judgment,⁹³ this also has to be recognized as an attempt of the enemy to usurp God's judgment. Consequently, the desecration of the temple vessels by Belshazzar brings about immediate judgment from God, the Lord of the temple, on the Babylonian monarch and his kingdom.

Cultic Personage: Daniel's Self-Affliction

It is of special interest to observe Daniel's attitude of mourning and fasting recorded in chap. 10, especially because the concept is expressed by the term *ʿānāh* in vs. 12, its only occurrence in the book. It seems significant because *ʿānāh* belongs to the language of Yom Kippur, the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:29, 31; 23:27, 29, 32), and depicts the "self-affliction" or "humbling attitude" of the individual on that day.⁹⁴ The use of this word suggests Daniel's involvement in cultic activity himself.

Leviticus 23 uses *ʿānāh* in an idiom that was obviously rooted in the cultic life of Israel, "you shall humble yourselves," which reveals a reflexive meaning. The phrase is most often translated "to afflict one's soul" or "to humble oneself." Gesenius adds: "i.e. to fast," citing Leviticus 16:31; 23:27, 32; Num 29:7.⁹⁵ That *ʿānāh* can carry the nuance of fasting is supported by many commentators who see the parallelism of *ʿānāh* and *šûm* (to fast) in Isaiah 58:3, 5 and the explanatory connection of the two words in Psalm 35:13 as an indication for this meaning.⁹⁶ Some suggest that more than

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

just abstaining from food and drink is involved here,⁹⁷ while others say “it probably included fasting and perhaps other penitential exercises as well.”⁹⁸

The Qumran documents indicate that *‘ānāh* describes an inner attitude of humility, a knowledge of one's (spiritual) poverty, and a submission to God.⁹⁹ It also reminds us of texts like Psalms 109:16, 22; 147:3, where the root *‘ānāh* is used alongside the expression “the brokenhearted.” The combination provides a clear spiritual overtone which fits perfectly the context of Leviticus 23 as well as that of Daniel 10.

The word *‘ānāh* describes the required attitude of penitence and humility on the part of the people before God on Yom Kippur. This was a serious matter. God warned that those Israelites not taking an active part in this kind of preparation would be “cut off” (*kārat*) from the people.

That Daniel is indeed showing an attitude of humility and contrition in chap. 10 is also affirmed by the time and date mentioned in the first verses of the chapter. Verse 4 states that he was fasting and mourning for three weeks in the first month, which, if taken to be Tishri,¹⁰⁰ would mean that Daniel fasted during the month of the fall festivals, which included Yom Kippur.

Cultic Performance: Atonement and Anointing

In Daniel 9:24-27 we find a strong “cultic perspective in terms of atonement (Hebrew root, *kpr*), anointing (Hebrew root, *mšḥ*), ‘holy of holies,’ cutting off of the Messiah and cessation of sacrifice and offering.”¹⁰¹ We wish to focus briefly on the first two points.

At the beginning of the seventy week prophecy (vs. 24) the angel Gabriel gives some important information concerning the purpose and goal of the seventy weeks as a sort of prelude to the main body of the vision. Although Charles is of the opinion that “this is a most difficult verse,”¹⁰² it is still worth the attempt to understand its significance for the study of cultic motifs in Daniel.

It has been noted that vs. 24 has a clear literary structure, which elaborates and enhances the initial statement that “seventy weeks are determined for your people and for your holy city.”¹⁰³ Not only is “the thought here . . . concerned with the theme of the holy city and hence with the sanctuary” and “is cultic,”¹⁰⁴ but the

VOGEL: CULTIC MOTIFS AND THEMES IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL

six lines themselves, of which three are negative and three positive,¹⁰⁵ are inter-related by synthetic parallelism,¹⁰⁶ which is significant for the interpretation. In this case the line, “and to atone [*kpr*] for iniquity,” is parallel to the line, “and to anoint [*mšḥ*] holy of holies.” There can be no doubt that the word *kpr* is a “key cultic verb,”¹⁰⁷ since most of its references in the OT are to be found in connection with the sanctuary cultus.¹⁰⁸

The expression “holy of holies” clearly reminds us of cultic language,¹⁰⁹ and even of the sanctuary itself, although it seems not to be free from obscurity.¹¹⁰ When used with the article, in the overwhelming majority of texts it depicts the “inner sanctum” or second chamber of the sanctuary.¹¹¹ When used without the article, as here in Daniel 9, the expression can designate altar,¹¹² priests,¹¹³ incense,¹¹⁴ bread,¹¹⁵ offering,¹¹⁶ things,¹¹⁷ and the sanctuary or its location.¹¹⁸ This shows that the term is always connected to the sanctuary,¹¹⁹ although it does not always refer to the whole tabernacle or temple.¹²⁰ We may be safe in asserting that the expression does not refer to a person,¹²¹ which is confirmed by the fact that the line, “to anoint the holy of holies” is “on the side of Jerusalem/sanctuary”¹²² in the verse.

Most helpful in the interpretation of this expression is the text in Exodus 29:36-37, where the only other time in the OT we have the same association of atonement (*kpr*), anointing (*mšḥ*) and holy of holies (*qodeš qodašim*) as it appears here in Daniel 9:24.¹²³

This passage deals with the consecration of Aaron and his sons to their high priesthood (the earliest consecration of an Israelite priesthood). It is significant that this ceremony consisted of an anointing of a “holy of holies” which was marked by the number 7: The ceremony was to last 7 days.¹²⁴

This raises the question whether in the terms “anoint” (*mašah*) and “anointed one” (*māšīah*) in chap. 9 we may have another element of cultic language, a notion that needs further discussion.

If we take the whole prophecy and its time element into account, we cannot come to the conclusion that Daniel 9:24-27 is a parallel prophecy to the vindication of the sanctuary prophecy in Daniel 8:13, 14.¹²⁵ Seeing the fulfilment of the seventy week

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

prophecy in the events of the life of Christ, we see more reason to apply the former to the first coming of Christ.¹²⁶

Since Daniel 9:24 can be viewed as a kind of prelude to the remainder of the prophecy (vss. 25-27) and functions as a preliminary summary, the actions that are depicted in it find their fulfillment in the life and death of Christ. By His death Christ “anointed the holy of holies,” that is, He inaugurated (retrospectively and for the future) the sanctuary services of the heavenly temple (vs. 24, last part).¹²⁷ This view is substantiated by Exodus 29:35-37, which not only mentions the seven days of consecration for the priesthood but also the anointing of the altar through a sin offering during the same time.¹²⁸

We may conclude, then, that Daniel 9:24 is a clear reference to the sanctuary motif, focusing on the cultus through the term (*kpr*) and the expression “holy of holies” (*qodeš qodašim*), and by referring to the “holy city” and to the “vision” (*hāzôn*).¹²⁹

Cultic Themes: A Model for Thematic Structure

Numerous studies have been made on the structure of Daniel. A. Lenglet¹³⁰ pioneered the research with his investigation of the literary structure of the first half of the book. His proposal of a concentric chiasmus, in which he demonstrates the links of chapters in parallel pairs (2 and 7, 3 and 6, 4 and 5), has received general acceptance.¹³¹

David Gooding¹³² builds on Lenglet's study and extends his structural analysis to the whole book, but his attempt in balancing chaps. 1-5 and 6-12 is less convincing.¹³³ William Shea¹³⁴ and Jacques Doukhan¹³⁵ have also analyzed the structure of chaps. 7-12 and have come up with a much better case, demonstrating thematic links and concentric parallels.

Likewise, in his recent dissertation Pablo David¹³⁶ further corroborates Lenglet's structure of Daniel 2-7 by analysis of thematic and linguistic links between the chapters. He has also applied the same structural analysis to the second half of the book and supports insights gained by Shea and Doukhan, apparently without being aware of their earlier work, and that also by Albertz.¹³⁷ He also assigns a specific role to chap. 7 in this structure,

VOGEL: CULTIC MOTIFS AND THEMES IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL

calling it the “literary hinge” between the two halves of the book,¹³⁸ as Raabe and others¹³⁹ have done before him.

Building on Lenglet's and David's studies, I would like to propose the following structural model: Each of the chapters has a particular cultic theme which is informed by the cultic motifs present in the chapter. By way of the same, or by a contrasting but complementary theme, another chapter forms a structural parallel with the former chapter, thus giving evidence of a concentric parallel structure to the whole book. As mentioned before, David has found evidence for such a concentric structure by way of analyzing linguistic and thematic parallels. My contribution, however, is to demonstrate that the same structure is evident from the perspective of cultic themes. We will explain by way of a general summarization.

Daniel 1 introduces cultic motifs from all the categories of cultic life,¹⁴⁰ thereby setting the cultic stage for the book. The other chapters are linked in parallel fashion. Chapters 2, 7, and 12, with chap. 7 having the function of a hinge or center, have the theme of “judgment from the sanctuary” in common. It is generally acknowledged—and not difficult to see—that the three chapters talk about judgment, although chap. 7 is the only one to use the term. We shall hope to demonstrate in a more extensive study that in all three chapters the cultic motif is linked with the judgment theme.

Chapters 3 and 6 have several linguistic and literary connections, but are also linked by the common cultic theme of “usurpation of the true cult.” In both narratives the central issue is worship and the usurpation by pagan rulers of the reverence that belongs only to Yahweh. The response by the three Hebrews and Daniel is in both instances a decision to be faithful to the imperatives of the true cult, namely, not to worship any image or human being.

Chapters 4 and 5, whose close and parallel connection has already been demonstrated elsewhere,¹⁴¹ share the cultic theme of “desecration and judgment.” In both chapters a king sets himself above God and his holiness¹⁴² either by boastful word (chap. 4) or sacrilegious deed (chap. 5). Both times this “cultic arrogance” and desecration is met with instant judgment from Yahweh.

Chapters 8 and 11¹⁴³ have a theme similar to chaps. 3 and 6, suggesting a structural link that extends beyond critical

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

scholarship's usual confinement of Daniel A (chaps. 1-6) and Daniel B (chaps. 7-12) as separate, or at least separately created, documents. Again there is "usurpation of cult and cleansing" which is similar in 3 and 6. The judgment motif is present in all four chapters.

Beyond the link between chaps. 9 and 10 in the person of Daniel who mourns and fasts and understands the vision as stated in both chapters, there is also the thematic parallel of "atonement and victory" which is strongly related to cult. In both chapters Daniel functions as the representative for his people, receiving the assurance of salvation after he has humbled himself, which humbling, as I have shown above, is a term related to Yom Kippur. If chap. 9 is to be interpreted as pointing to the Christ event at His first coming, then chap. 10 reveals the Warrior-High Priest who makes atonement on the Day of Atonement for those who show humility and believe in His strength.

This theme stands in related contrast to the one in chaps. 4 and 5 in which pagan kings exalt themselves above the Holy God. Although one of them eventually repents and humbles himself, judgment from the same God meets both of them. On the other hand in chaps. 9 and 10 we have the reverse situation. Daniel humbles himself and pleads on behalf of his people, and God reveals to him His plan of salvation and atonement.

I have attempted to show that the whole book of Daniel has a thematic structure in concentric, chiasmic parallels which are determined by cultic themes. It would require further studies to draw conclusions for the composition of the book. However, it can be said with some certainty that the book of Daniel has more coherence and unity than is generally accepted.

Conclusions: Cult in Theological Perspective

The foregoing investigation of cultic motifs and themes has demonstrated that the book of Daniel is indeed imbued with the imagery and language of cultus. This fact leads to several conclusions in regard to the theology and the interpretation of the book.

1. The sanctuary is of central importance for the theology and the concern of the book. This is underlined by the fact that the cultic

VOGEL: CULTIC MOTIFS AND THEMES IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL

motif is not only present in chaps. 8 and 9, as most commentators recognize, but is prominently mentioned at the very beginning of the book (Dan 1:2). The context, especially the information about the temple vessels being placed in the house of the Babylonian god, makes it abundantly clear that Daniel has more in mind than mere historical facts.

The cultic theme is connected to other themes in the book, such as the reign of God, the sovereignty of God, and the kingdom of God. Since cult played such a prominent role in the faith and life of Israel, it may be expected to provide deeper insights into the concept of the covenant which is present in the book.

As a matter of fact, all theological concepts in the book of Daniel are to be investigated in the light of the cultic theme, because they are informed and enriched by its concept of redemption and atonement.

2. The presence of cultic motifs throughout the document speaks for the unity of the book, an issue which is still hotly debated among critical scholars. A number of thematic links can be pointed out:

a. The usurpation of divine prerogatives (Dan 1, 5) by removing and desecrating the temple vessels is clearly echoed by the activities of the little horn power (Dan 7, 8) which are also directed against the sanctuary and are meant to challenge God's reign. In both cases the result is divine judgment on Babylon (Dan 5:25-30) and on the little horn (Dan 7:22, 26; 8:25).

b. The cultic allusions in Daniel 1, which could also be referring to the Day of Atonement, would find their counterpart treatment in Daniel 7-12, where Yom Kippur plays a major role.

c. In Daniel 2 the sanctuary mountain is related to the kingdom theme, which again has a major function in Daniel 7.

3. The cultic motif appears both in historical and prophetic reality. This means that the sanctuary has a very prominent place in God's history with mankind, which is also underlined by the mountain motif in Daniel 2.

4. The very fact that there is no difference in terminology between the earthly and the heavenly sanctuary suggests that both are real in Daniel's mind.¹⁴⁴

5. If indeed the Day of Atonement is referred to in Daniel 1, 10,

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

which has not been studied in detail before, these two chapters would suggest how to live during this day in spiritual and practical preparation for judgment. Together with Daniel 3, 6, this ethical aspect would have an impact on developing a corresponding lifestyle during the eschatological “day” of atonement.

6. The references to the sanctuary services in Daniel are not mere expressions of veneration for the holy place, as might be expected by a people in exile. Rather, these serve a definite purpose. They are key elements in the prophecies of Daniel 8, 9, and also highlight the distinct connection they have with the ethical implications in Daniel 6, 10.

7. Understanding the sanctuary in the OT as a whole is indispensable to an interpretation of the book of Daniel. Four dimensions can be distinguished:

a. The holy war theme is one of the major themes in the book, which is connected, of course, to the kingdom theme. The sanctuary plays a significant role in the unfolding of this theme and has to be considered for a proper understanding of the book of Daniel.

b. The prophetic-historical dimension, which is particularly prominent in the second half of the book, is very much dependant upon an understanding of the sanctuary and the elements of its services. Without a correct and informed understanding of the issues involved, there can be no interpretation that does justice to the text.

c. The dimension of redemption, both in its present and eschatological aspects, is featured in the presence of the cultic motif in the book. It was natural for a reader in the ancient Hebrew world to note this carefully, but it seems to be even more important for readers at the end of time for whom the book has a message (Dan 12:4, 9). In “the time of the end” the most important theme, individually and corporately, will be that of atonement and redemption.

d. The dimension of ethical consequences for the faith and practice of the individual (in the light of the sanctuary) plays a significant role in the book, most prominently in the first six chapters, but also in the remainder of the book. If this phenomenon is severed from the sanctuary theme, the interpretation loses the actual thrust of the author's intention.

VOGEL: CULTIC MOTIFS AND THEMES IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL

8. The cultic motif underlines the importance of the theme of worship, which has to do with the revelation of the character of God and the human response. It helps to focus our attention on the real issue of the book and also deepens our understanding of it.

9. The cultic motif also enhances our understanding of the judgment of God, which is particularly dealt with in Daniel 7. Judgment from the sanctuary not only involves the theme of the sovereignty and reign of God on the divine level but also the dimension of atonement and vindication on the divine *and* human level.

Endnotes

1 Brevard S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), p. 613; John E. Goldingay, *Daniel*, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 30 (Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1989), xxxix, quoting Childs; see also Jacques B. Doukhan, "Allusions à la création dans le livre de Daniel," *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings*, ed. A. S. Van der Woude (Leuven: University Press, 1993), p. 285, who observes that no theology of the book of Daniel has been written as yet.

2 J. Benton White, *Taking the Bible Seriously* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), 116.

3 See some of the references below in the section on thematic structure.

4 G. F. Hasel, "The 'Little Horn', the Saints and the Sanctuary in Daniel 8," *The Sanctuary and the Atonement*, ed. A. V. Wallenkampf and W. R. Leshar (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1981), p. 177.

5 For an overview of the cultic motifs see pp. 8-9.

6 A good case in point is P. R. Davies, *Daniel* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), pp. 81ff., who cautions the interpreter to heed the "two voices" of the book in any dealing with theological questions because of the dichotomy between chaps. 2-6 and 7-12 that seems to be the only legitimate conclusion of the foregoing literary analysis.

7 J. A. Cuddon, *A Dictionary of Literary Terms*, rev. ed. (London: Penguin Books, 1987), p. 405, defines the term as "One of the dominant ideas in a work of literature; a part of the main theme. It may consist of a character, a recurrent image or a verbal pattern." Similarly also Karl Beckson and Arthur Ganz, *A Reader's Guide to Literary Terms* (New York: The Noonday Press, 1960), p. 129; William Freedman, "The Literary Motif: A Definition and Evaluation," *Novel* 4/2 (1971): 123-131, also provides helpful insights into the nature and function of a motif, although he sees motif as a recurring theme which in my opinion is confusing. I would prefer to see motifs making up a theme, not vice versa. See also Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, 1981), p. 95, who defines: "2. *Motif*. A concrete image, sensory quality, action, or object recurs through a particular narrative."

8 Cf. Sandra Beth Berg, *The Book of Esther: Motifs, Themes and Structure* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979), p. 16. Berg aptly defines: "The term 'motif' thus points to situations, elements or ideas which pervade the story, potently

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

recalling or anticipating their earlier and later occurrences.” Susan Niditch and Robert Doran, “The Success Story of the Wise Courtier: A Formal Approach,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 96/2 (1977), p. 179, use the terms “motif” and “content elements” interchangeably; cf. also Pamela Milne, *Vladimir Propp and the Study of Structure in Hebrew Biblical Narrative* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988), p. 192.

9 Freedman, p. 123.

10 Alter, p. 95: “3. *Theme*. An idea which is part of the value-system of the narrative. . . is made evident in some recurring pattern. . . may also be associated with a motif”

11 Brevard S. Childs, *Old Testament Theology in a Canonical Context* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), p. 155; for further definitions of the terminology see Victor Hamp, “Kult,” *Bibelllexikon*, ed. Herbert Haag (Einsiedeln: Benziger Verlag, 1968), 1000f; Walter Harrelson, *From Fertility Cult to Worship* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1969), p. 45; Odilo Kaiser, “Cult,” *Encyclopedia of Biblical Theology*, ed. Johannes B. Bauer, trans. from the German (London: Sheed and Ward, 1970), p. 157; Knud Jeppesen, “Myth in the Prophetic Literature,” in *Myths in the Old Testament*, ed. Benedikt Otzen, Hans Gottlieb, and Knud Jeppesen, trans. Frederick Cryer (London: SCM Press, 1980), p. 96; Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, The Anchor Bible, vol. 3 (New York: Doubleday, 1991), p. 491, only hints at his definition of cult by using the headline “The Inauguration of the Cult” to introduce the section on chaps. 8-10 in Leviticus where the priesthood is consecrated; Angel M. Rodríguez, “Significance of the Cultic Language,” in *Symposium on Daniel*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), p. 530, who simply uses “cult” and “sanctuary worship system” synonymously; neither John E. Hartley, *Leviticus*, WBC 4 (Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1992), lvi-lxxiii, nor Gordon Wenham, *The Book of Leviticus*, NICOT 3 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1977), pp. 15-32, explicitly define the term but refer to the “fundamental issue of how the people of God may maintain their relationship with the holy God” (Hartley, lvi). Donald L. Williams, “The Israelite Cult and Christian Worship,” in *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays*, ed. James M. Efird (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1972), p. 111: “cult means simply ‘organized worship.’” Cf. J. H. Kurtz, *Sacrificial Worship of the Old Testament*, trans. James Martin (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1863), p. 17. Sigmund Mowinckel, *Religion und Kultus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953), pp. 10-13, basically agrees with Evelyn Underhill, *Worship* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1937), p. 3, that cultus has to be seen as worship which is a “response of the creature to the eternal.” Darrell J. Pursiful, *The Cultic Motif in the Spirituality of the Book of Hebrews* (Lewiston, NY: Mellen Biblical Press, 1993), p. 12, suggests “that cultus be defined as a system of visible and culturally established religious acts or symbols conceived as a coherent whole.” Walther Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, trans. J. A. Baker (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961), 1:98: “. . . the term ‘cultus’ should be taken to mean the expression of religious experience in concrete external actions performed within the congregation or community, preferably by officially appointed exponents and in set forms.”

12 Ritual as a crucial part of cultic activity can be defined with Roy Gane as “a formulaic activity system carrying out an individual, complete cognitive task transformation process in which an ‘inaccessible entity’ unit is involved,” “Ritual Dynamic Structure: Systems Theory and Ritual Syntax Applied to Selected

VOGEL: CULTIC MOTIFS AND THEMES IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL

Ancient Israelite, Babylonian and Hittite Festival Days” (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1992), p. 71; for a more anthropologically informed definition see Evan M. Zuesse, “Ritual,” *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, ed. Mircea Eliade (New York: Macmillan, 1987), 12:405, who sees in ritual “those conscious and voluntary, repetitious and stylized symbolic bodily actions that are centered on cosmic structures and/or sacred presences.” Underhill, p. 20, defines rituals as elements of cultus, whose object is “real communion between Man and God.” “Its formal constituents must be of a kind which further, support, and express this communion.” More concretely she describes religious ritual as “an agreed pattern of ceremonial movements, sounds, and verbal formulas, creating a framework within which corporate religious action can take place,” *ibid.*, p. 32. For an elucidating summary on studies in ritual see E. Thomas Lawson and Robert N. McCauley, *Rethinking Religion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 45-59.

13 Mowinckel, p. 10, finds this confirmed in the cultic function and use of the term “*boda*.”

14 Pursiful, p. 13; H. H. Rowley, *Worship in Ancient Israel* (London: S.P.C.K., 1967), p. 68: “Worship is always encounter, whether accompanied by a ritual act or not, and is never to be estimated merely in terms of ritual.”

15 Roger T. Beckwith, “The Jewish Background to Christian Worship,” in *The Study of Liturgy*, ed. Cheslyn Jones, Geoffrey Wainwright, and Edward Yarnold (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), pp. 41, 43.

16 John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), xiv and xv, emphasizes the fact that little consensus has been reached in the search for the origin of motifs in Daniel and arrives at the important conclusion that “the meaning of a book is ultimately decided not by the sources of the traditions it uses, but by the manner in which these traditions are structured and combined within the book.”

17 Leo G. Perdue, *The Collapse of History: Reconstructing Old Testament Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), pp. 240-243. See also John Barton, *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1984), pp. 140-198, who gives a helpful analysis of the approach that has been called “new criticism” or “narrative criticism.” The caveat that has to be sounded, however, has to take clear note of the fact that scholars who use this approach mostly see the biblical text in its intended “function as literary narrative, not as historiography” (Barton, p. 165). It has to be kept in mind that the expression “close reading” may have ideological underpinnings which in reality would contradict its expressed purpose.

18 Goldingay, “Story, Vision, Interpretation. . . <170> p. 301.

19 Cf. Edmond Jacob, *Theology of the Old Testament*, trans. Arthur W. Heathcote and Philip J. Allcock (New York: Harper and Row, 1958), pp. 262-270; Hamp, p. 1001; Kaiser, p. 157; Eichrodt, pp. 98-177, who is criticized for using “the rubrics of comparative religion” by Childs, *Canonical Context*, pp. 161-162, although he uses them himself “in order to provide a useful perspective on the material.” I shall do likewise for the same reason, being aware of Childs’ caveat not to miss the “peculiar theological dynamic of the Old Testament.”

20 Goldingay, p. 248; see also Jon D. Levenson, *Sinai and Zion* (Minneapolis, MN: Winston Press, 1985), pp. 111-145, for an elucidating discussion of Zion as the mountain of the temple and as the cosmic mountain.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

21 See Wilfred G. E. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984), pp. 114, 131.

22 This means that whenever the holy mountain is in view, the sanctuary is seen at the same time, also. In this conceptual sense the two designations can be used as synonyms, although this does not mean that there is physical identification involved. The holy mountain *is not* the sanctuary, but it strongly reminds us of the sanctuary, which was located there.

23 Deryck C. T. Sheriffs, "'A Tale of Two Cities'—Nationalism in Zion and Babylon," *TynB* 39 (1988): 41.

24 Most commentators translate the preposition *‘al* which is used here with “concerning” or “for.” See, for example, John H. Collins, *Daniel*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), p. 345; Goldingay, p. 227; Stephen R. Miller, *Daniel*, NAC 18 (N.p.: Broadman & Holman, 1994), p. 249; Leon Wood, *A Commentary On Daniel* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1973), pp. 244-245; Jacques Doukhan, *Le soupir de la terre* (Dammarie le Lys Cedex: Vie & Santé, 1993), p. 198 (“en faveur de”); Harry Bultema, *Commentary on Daniel* (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, 1988), p. 275. Hersh Goldwurm, *Daniel: A New Translation with a Commentary Anthologized from Talmudic, Midrashic and Rabbinic Sources*, 2nd and rev. ed. (New York: Mesorah Publications, 1980), p. 256, refers to Rashi, but also cites Ralbag who favored the meaning of “upon” and opted for a literalistic sense of Daniel being in Jerusalem at the time of the prayer. André Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel*, trans. David Pellauer (Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1976), p. 1898, and idem, “The Liturgical Prayer in Daniel 9,” *HUCA* 47 (1976): 139, n 84, appears to be the only recent scholar who, although diagnosing a “certain ambiguity in the preposition ‘*al*,” argues for the locational sense because of the statement on the time of the evening offering in 9:21. However, his suggestion (“Liturgical Prayer,” p. 142) of Daniel being “spiritually” in the temple (which, incidentally, does not exist any more) and “liturgically” offering a daily *minhah* is less than convincing. (On the ambiguity or ambivalence of prepositions with regard to Ugaritic and Aramaic usages see Dennis Graham Pardee, “The Preposition in Ugaritic,” in *Ugarit-Forschungen*, ed. Kurt Bergerhof et al. [Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1975], 7:333.) Although the first and most well-known meaning of *‘al* is “on, upon” there are also other uses attested; see Bruce K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), pp. 216-218, esp. part g. L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, trans. and ed. M. E. J. Richardson (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995), 2:826, has “on account of” and “with regard to, concerning” as the second and third major meanings of the term. It should be of interest to note that in the Aramaic section of the book the same preposition is frequently used in this latter sense, namely in Dan 2:18; 3:16; 5:14, 29; 6:13, 15; 7:16, 20. Moreover, there is at least one other instance in the OT where *‘al* is being used in conjunction with the term “supplication” in the same sense as here in Daniel: Est 4:8 reads “to make supplication to him and plead before him for (*‘al*) her people,” although, admittedly, the object of the supplication in this case is not a location as in Dan 9:20, which has led to the impression of ambiguity in the first place. However, the masoretic use of the small *Zakef*, a disjunctive accent, on the word immediately preceding *‘al*, would also argue against the meaning of “upon” in the sense of God residing on the mountain, or of Daniel being on the mountain at the time of the prayer, which is even more unlikely. Moreover, the usage of *‘al* in the immediate context in Daniel 9 suggests that here it almost never has a locational

VOGEL: CULTIC MOTIFS AND THEMES IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL

meaning (with the possible exception of *‘al-miqdaška* in v. 17, although a figurative sense [“cause your face to shine on behalf of Your sanctuary”] could perhaps be argued for). See also L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995), 5:1758.

25 Thomas B. Dozeman, *God on the Mountain* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1989), pp. 29, 30: “The close association between temples and cosmic mountain imagery in Israel, as well as in the ancient Near East in general, suggests that the description of God on the mountain represents a cultic theology of divine presence.”

26 Cf. Ps 74:2; Isa 24:23; 27:13; 56:7; 66:20. S. Talmon, “*har*,” *TWAT* II:480, speaks of an “identification in terms” [begrifflich identisch] of ‘sanctuary’ and ‘mountain’ in the OT and uses Dan 9:16, 20 among the texts to prove his point. On the basis of what I pointed out earlier, however, the term “identification” should be used with great caution. The term “association” is to be preferred, or, with Ben C. Ollenburger, *Zion the City of the Great King: A Theological Symbol of the Jerusalem Cult* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987), p. 20, “evocational field.” By this he refers to the fact that whenever the holy mountain is mentioned, the sanctuary is being perceived at the same time, and vice versa.

27 W. Kornfeld, “*qdš*,” *TWAT* VI:1179-1188; H.-P. Müller, “*qdš*,” *THAT*, II:589-609; Hasel, “The ‘Little Horn,’ the Saints. . . ,” p. 205, demonstrates the terminological link between Dan 8:14 and Lev 16 through *qodeš*.

28 H. P. Müller, col. 592; Gerhard F. Hasel, “The ‘Little Horn,’ the Heavenly Sanctuary and the Time of the End: A Study of Daniel 8:9-14,” in *Symposium on Daniel*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), pp. 444-447.

29 James Valentine, “Theological Aspects of the Temple Motif in the Old Testament and Revelation,” (Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University, 1985), p. 146, thinks that “it is likely that here there is a telescoping of two realities: the heavenly and earthly temples are seen as one.” This might be possible, but there is no control in the text affirming this assumption. Moreover, Valentine bases his idea on an equation of “sanctuary” and “saints of the Most High” by Lacocque, which cannot be substantiated, either.

30 Hasel, “The ‘Little Horn,’ the Heavenly Sanctuary. . . ,” p. 414: “This is the major meaning of this term in the OT with its 74 usages” (n. 83), in Dan 8:11, “as in the remainder of the book of Daniel”; n. 84: “In 9:17 the earthly sanctuary/temple is in view.”

31 See *ibid.*, pp. 444-446, for an elucidating discussion of the term *qodeš* for the meaning of sanctuary. Here in this context it seems certain that this term in vs. 26 recapitulates the term *miqdāš* in vs. 17, just as it does in chap. 8:11, 13, 14. The context also makes clear that only vss. 17 and 26 refer to an earthly sanctuary/temple, the term *qodeš qodašim* (“Most Holy”) refers to the sanctuary in heaven, which is supposed to be annointed at the end of the seventy weeks. Prophetically, historically and contextually this cannot refer to the earthly temple in Jerusalem.

32 L. F. Hartman and A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1978), pp. 149, 150, who, like Goldingay, p. 49, refer to Isa 2:2 (= Mic 4:1): “In days to come the mountain of Yahweh’s house shall be established as the highest mountain”; C. F. Keil, *Biblical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, trans. E. M. Easton (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1959), p. 110; Bultema, p. 97; D. S.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Russell, *Daniel: An Active Volcano* (Edinburgh: Saint Andrews, 1989), p. 37, 38. Against James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (New York: Scribner's, 1927), pp. 190, 191, who holds, that there is no "mythical" background but rather the "universal" interpretation to be accepted, which sees the stone imagery as pointing to the "Messianic, in the broad sense of the term." Against Karl Marti, *Das Buch Daniel* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1901), p. 17, who remarks that the imagery used "only belongs to the picture" and is not referring to Zion. H. C. Leupold, *Exposition of Daniel* (N.p.: Wartburg Press, 1949; reprint, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1969), p. 126, agrees with Marti, but tends to be at least open to the "Zion" interpretation.

33 John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Book of the Prophet Daniel*, trans. Thomas Myers (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1948), p. 190; Goldingay, *Daniel*, pp. 49, 51, 52, who refers to Mt. Zion and the sanctuary only implicitly by the OT references he gives. Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel*, p. 49, points to the fact that the term for mountain here, the Aramaic *tûr* (in Hebrew: *sûr*), often translated "boulder," is in Scripture "always associated with the divine presence" and also with the Exodus from Egypt. The mountain, according to Lacocque, is the "Boulder of theophany," that is, "the Kingdom of God."

34 Hubert Lignée, *The Temple of Yahweh* (Baltimore, MD: Helicon, 1966), p. 113, comments this way: "The symbol of the mountain is not explained. But when one considers that in the Bible 'mountain' often designates the sanctuary one may be tempted to interpret the mountain from which the stone has become detached as the heavenly sanctuary of Yahweh, 'the heavenly temple of his glory' . . . , and to assume that the mountain formed from the stone is the new sanctuary, the kingdom of God, which fills the whole earth." It is questionable, however, to identify the mountain, which, according to Dan 2:44 is the prophetic symbol for the powerful ushering in of God's eternal kingdom, with the sanctuary, or, to identify the sanctuary with the kingdom of God.

35 Dozeman, pp. 30, 31, in his discussion of the Mountain of God tradition, suggests that "the imagery of God as dwelling on the mountain encourages an *identification* between God and the mountain, or perhaps better a relationship of *resemblance*." In view of the fact that we have to deal with historical realities here and not with mere metaphorical images even the expression "relationship of resemblance" has to be called into question. The idea is rather one of association or evocation in the Hebrew mind.

36 Philip R. Davies, "Daniel Chapter Two," *JTS* 27/2 ns (Oct. 1976): 399.

37 See Douglas Bennet, "The Stone Kingdom of Daniel 2," *Symposium on Daniel*, ed. by Frank B. Holbrook (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), pp. 331-377, esp. pp. 351-367.

38 Rex A. Mason, "The Treatment of Earlier Biblical Themes in the Book of Daniel," *PRST* 15 (1988): 85, who in my view misses the point here.

39 Hartman and Di Lella, p. 199.

40 Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel*, p. 114, n. 14.

41 So also Goldwurm, pp. 181, 182; Eric W. Heaton, *The Book of Daniel* (London: SCM Press, 1956), p. 166; Marti, p. 45.

42 Robert H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929), p. 157.

43 Keil, p. 213.

44 Otto Plöger, *Das Buch Daniel* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1965), p. 98, thinks that "prayer for two times could be connected with the

VOGEL: CULTIC MOTIFS AND THEMES IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL

daily sacrifices” (also Goldingay, *Daniel*, p. 128) but also concedes the connection of the gesture with “the cultic life of a past time.”

45 Against Goldingay, *Daniel*, p. 128.

46 Wood, p. 163.

47 In both instances we have a preposition, which allows for a similar directional connotation. In 6:10 (11) it is *neged*, in 9:3 which has links to 9:20 it is *'el*, which seems to have stronger directional force. Furthermore, since in both instances Jerusalem is mentioned as the matter of concern, considerable significance seems to be attached to the direction of the respective prayers.

48 Klaus Koch, *Daniel*, BKAT XXII/1 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1986), p. 34, who states that “seemingly they [the vessels] receive their own significance in the great turning point from the time of the Judaic kings to the evil time of the exile.”

49 James M. Efrid, *Daniel and Revelation* (Valley Forge, PA: Judson Press, 1978), p. 24; Heaton, p. 116.

50 Peter R. Ackroyd, *Studies in the Religious Tradition of the Old Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1987), p. 57: “. . . for where else would such objects be placed but in the shrine of the deity who has shown himself superior in power?”

51 James M. Boice, *Daniel—an Expository Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1989), p. 15; cf. Sheriffs, p. 42, who says: “when the opening verses of Daniel speak of the Babylonian king, god, land and temple (1:2), it marks the theology of the book of Daniel as a counterpart theology,” and he explicitly points to the contrast between ‘the temple of God’ and ‘the temple of his god’ in 1:2.

52 John J. Collins, *Daniel with an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature*, FOTL XX (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1984), p. 44; Hartman and Di Lella, p. 132; Aage Bentzen, *Daniel* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1952), p. 17; M. Delcor, *Le Livre de Daniel* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1971), p. 61; Koch, p. 34, who adds, however, that “this is not the only purpose of their being mentioned in this location.”

53 Goldingay, *Daniel*, p. 16; Josef Schreiner, “Tempeltheologie im Streite der Propheten,” *BZ*, Neue Folge 1 (1987): 6-7.

54 Russell, p. 20; Leupold, p. 57.

55 Robert A. Anderson, *Signs and Wonders—A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, ITC (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1984), p. 3.

56 Keil, p. 73.

57 The same expression is also found in Jer 27:16; 28:3, 6, also in connection with the vessels. It is used about 50 times in Chronicles, where it also designates the sanctuary in Jerusalem; cf. Koch, p. 34.

58 Frank B. Holbrook, “The Israelite Sanctuary,” *The Sanctuary and Atonement*, ed. A. V. Wallenkampf and W. R. Leshner (Washington, D.C.: General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, 1981), p. 9; George A. Barrois, *Jesus Christ and the Temple* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1980), p. 61; Carol Meyers, “Temple, Jerusalem,” *ABD* (1992) 6:359.

59 Craig Koester, *The Dwelling of God* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1989), p. 20; R. E. Clements, *God and Temple* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965), p. 63.

60 Pss 74:2; 132:13,14; 135:21; Isa 8:18; 18:7.

61 Ps 2:6: “Yet I have set *My King* on My holy hill of Zion”; 99:1, 2: “The Lord *reigns*, let the people tremble! He *dwells between the cherubim*; let the earth be moved! The Lord is great in Zion, And He is high above all the peoples”; 110:2: “The Lord shall send *the rod of Your strength* out of Zion. *Rule* in the midst of

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Your enemies;” Isa 2:3, 4/Mic 4:2, 3: “. . . out of Zion shall go forth the law. He shall judge between the nations”; 24:23: “The Lord of hosts will reign in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem”; Joel 3:16-21: “The Lord also will roar from Zion. . .”; Mic 4:7: “The Lord will reign over them in Mount Zion”; Zech 6:13: “He shall build the temple of the Lord, He shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule on His throne,” emphases supplied.

62 Carol Meyers, “Temple, Jerusalem,” *ABD*, 6:359; Clements, pp. 65, 67: “The underlying idea was that the temple was a microcosm of the macrocosm, so that the building gave visual expression to the belief in Yahweh’s dominion over the world and all natural forces.” See also Koester, pp. 59-63, who traces a cosmological view of the temple in Philo and Josephus, and also mentions that these interpretations “first given to the temple’s furnishings were gradually applied to those of the tabernacle”(59).

63 Valentine, p. 107: “The divine judgment in the Old Testament always takes place in the temple. . .”

64 Jacques B. Doukhan, *Daniel—the Vision of the End* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 1987), pp. 26, 62-64.

65 Goldingay, *Daniel*, p. 16, “Removing them is thus a sign of victory of Nebukadnezzar and his god over the Israelite king and his god.”

66 Heaton, p. 116.

67 K.-M. Beyse, “*k’li*,” *TWAT*, ed. by G. J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren, H.-J. Fabry (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1984), IV:179-185.

68 English translation of NKJV.

69 Num 3:31; 4:12, etc.

70 Num 18:3; 31:3, which is an ambiguous text, because the Hebrew expression is *k’li haqodeš* without a clear indication as to which articles are actually meant here. Considering 1 Chr 22:19, however, this expression seems to depict articles of the sanctuary; 1 Kgs 7:45, 47; Ezra 1:7, 11.

71 Exod 25:9; Num 4:15, 16; 1 Kgs 7:48.

72 Num 14:4.

73 Ezra 1:11 mentions 5,400 articles at the return of the exiles; 1 Kgs 7:45, 48-50 lists different kinds of articles like the golden altar, the table of gold, the lampstands of gold, including smaller items, that were made for the Solomonic temple and which are summarized as *k’lim*, whereas Exod 37:16 uses the same term for the vessels that were put on the table of showbread. We must conclude, therefore, that the term was used exclusively as well as inclusively.

74 1 Kgs 8:4 and 1 Chr 22:19 mention the holy furnishings as an all inclusive term except the ark which is singled out and mentioned separately. Menahem Haran, *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), p. 156, also affirms this observation. Moreover, he gives a very detailed analysis of *k’lim* in the tent tabernacle, calling them, in a narrower definition, “minor utensils attached to the major pieces of furniture.” After speaking about three categories of appurtenances (furniture, fabrics, beams), he comes to the conclusion: “The furniture is indeed the essential constituent in the cult and cultic sanctity, whereas all the other objects merely serve as protective and separating accessories,” p. 158. Haran also points to the distinction between the “vessels of the inner sanctum” and the “temple treasures,” the latter being less sacred. In Haran’s view Nebukadnezzar was the first of all invaders to not only plunder the treasures but also “to penetrate the temple, that is, to enter the outer sanctum,” where he only stripped the articles of their precious metals (pp. 286, 287). Haran

VOGEL: CULTIC MOTIFS AND THEMES IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL

seems to downgrade the importance of this event and does not want to attach the significance to it that Dan 1 indicates. It becomes apparent, however, that he argues in that direction, because (1) he wants to refute the idea, that a pagan king ever entered the inner sanctum and stole the sacred articles, let alone the ark in the Most Holy Place (p. 285), and (2) he works with the hypothesis of an unreliable tradition in the book of Daniel (p. 286, n. 21).

75 1 Chr 28:13.

76 Num 18:3.

77 Ackroyd, p. 50.

78 See Clements, pp. 65-67, also 67, n. 1, who upholds the highly symbolic significance of the temple furnishings: "The furnishings of the temple were full of cosmic symbolism, as was in effect true for the temple as a whole. The very conception of such a building was founded on the belief that a correspondence existed between the earthly and the heavenly worlds. Yahweh's house in Jerusalem was intended to be a copy, or symbol, of the cosmic 'house' where he had his abode. In this way the particular form of the Jerusalem cult emphasized the power of Yahweh over the natural world" (65).

79 Schreiner, p. 12.

80 Ch. 27:16.

81 Although here Yahweh is used instead of Elohim. It has to be kept in mind, that the book of Daniel does not use Yahweh except in chap. 9, an issue which cannot be followed up here.

82 In Jer. 27 God denounces the false prophets for giving the assuring prediction: "Behold, the vessels of the Lord's house will now be shortly brought back from Babylon" (vs. 16), and in chap. 28 one of the false prophets gives such a prediction.

83 Ackroyd, pp. 54, 55, who convincingly makes a point in seeing the theme of continuity and restoration intrinsically bound up with the temple vessels.

84 *Ibid.*, p. 57; Joyce G. Baldwin, *Daniel*, TOTC (Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity, 1978), pp. 78, 79: "... vindicating His authority"; Schreiner, p. 14: "In giving them back God demonstrates His will to save [Heilswille], in punishing for their misuse of His power. The cultic articles of the house of Yahweh, which seem to be of marginal importance, become in the theology of the temple a sign for the activity of a punishing, free disposing, merciful and powerful God."

85 Plöger, p. 36; Marti, p. 2; cf. Jürgen-Christian Lebram, *Das Buch Daniel*, Zürcher Bibelkommentare (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1984), p. 43.

86 Goldingay, *Daniel*, p. 10. Baldwin, p. 78, suggests that we have a dittography here, but at the same time affirms that the repetition lays "stress on the incongruity of the situation."

87 Koch, *Daniel*, p. 36, who recognizes this connection and expounds the kingdom theme.

88 Hasel, "The 'Little Horn,' the Heavenly Sanctuary. . .," p. 400; Doukhan, pp. 65-69.

89 Plöger, p. 36; Goldingay, *Daniel*, p. 15; Lebram, p. 43; Norman W. Porteous, *Daniel—A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965), p. 27; Leupold, p. 57; Baldwin, p. 78. It is interesting to note in this context that there is a linguistic connection between the exaltation of the little horn in Dan 8:11 and the tower of Babel in Gen 11:4 (see Doukhan, p. 65).

90 Mason, p. 89 "... the emphasis here is not so much on 'hubris' as on

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

sacrilege and idolatry, on the unspeakable abomination of desecrating the sacred vessels of the Jerusalem temple.”

91 Ackroyd, p. 60, acknowledges that “the vessels are seen to be intimately related with the worship and hence with the life of the people,” but falls short of deeper implications for the sanctuary theme.

92 The praise of “the gods of silver and gold, bronze and iron, wood and stone, which do not see or hear or know” is explicitly mentioned in 5:23.

93 Hasel, “The ‘Little Horn’, the Heavenly Sanctuary . . .,” p. 413, mentions 1 Kgs 8:49 and Pss 89:14; 97:2, where *mišpār* is seen as being at the foundation of God's throne.

94 Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel*, p. 205, sees the whole “rite” of mourning in this chapter as “particularly fitted for the Day of Atonement.”

95 W. Gesenius, *Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the OT Scriptures*, trans. S. P. Tregelles, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1905), DCXLII.

96 Cf. Wenham, p. 236; A. Noordtziij, *Leviticus* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1982), p. 171

97 *The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, ed. Francis D. Nichol (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1953-1978) 1:778, 779.

98 Rita J. Burns, *Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers*, (Wilmington, DE: M. Glazier, 1983), p. 199.

99 E. Gerstenberger, “‘anah II,” *TWAT* 6:253.

100 There is some discussion about the identity of this month. If it should have been Nisan, the first month according to the Jewish calendar, then Daniel would have fasted straight through Passover, which would be hard to believe in the light of Exod 12:8-11, where eating and drinking is commanded for the passover feast. Ibn Ezra maintained that this month was the first month of the Babylonian year, which was reckoned from the accession year of Cyrus, starting in the fall, in the month of Tishri. See Goldwurm, pp. 270, 271; Anderson, p. 121; Jacques Doukhan, *Le soupir de la terre* (Dammarie les Lys Cedex, France: Edition Vie et Santé, 1993), p. 225, against Goldingay, p. 290, and William H. Shea, “Wrestling with the Prince of Persia,” *AUSS* 21 (1983): 225-228.

101 Hasel, “The Little Horn,’ the Heavenly Sanctuary. . .,” p. 437.

102 Charles, p. 237.

103 J. B. Doukhan, “The Seventy Weeks of Dan 9: An Exegetical Study,” *AUSS* 17 (1979): 10, 11.

104 Ibid.

105 Ibid.; Goldingay, *Daniel*, pp. 258, 259; Heaton, p. 212.

106 Doukhan, “Seventy Weeks,” p. 11.

107 Goldingay, p. 258; Baldwin, p. 169: “The verb is regularly used in the Old Testament for making atonement, especially by the blood sacrifices.”

108 Solomon Mandelkern, *Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae Atque Chaldaicae* (Berlin: F. Margolin, 1925), pp. 596, 597, lists 52 occurrences of verb and noun forms in Leviticus alone (*kapporet* not counted), which are without exception to be found in the context of the sanctuary services; see also Pierre Winandy, “The Meaning of *Kipper* in Daniel 9:24,” *70 Weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy*, ed. by Frank B. Holbrook (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), p. 127. For further insights see B. Lang, “*kipper*,” *TWAT* IV:303-318; Herbert C. Brichto, “On Slaughter and Sacrifice, Blood and Atonement,” *HUCA* 47 (1976): 19-36.

109 Charles, p. 242: “. . . is a priestly term.”

VOGEL: CULTIC MOTIFS AND THEMES IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL

110 Doukhan, "Seventy Weeks," p. 11.

111 Of the 13 occurrences listed by Mandelkern, 9 depict the inner sanctum, while 2 refer to the whole sanctuary and 2 depict "most holy things."

112 Exod 29:37; 30:10; 40:10.

113 Exod 30:29.

114 Exod 30:36.

115 Lev 24:9.

116 Lev 2:3, 30; 6:17 (10), 25 (18), 29 (22); 7:1, 6; 10:12, 17; 14:13; 27:28; Num 18:9.

117 1 Chr 23:13; Num 18:9.

118 Ezek 43:12; 45:3; 48:12.

119 Wood, p. 250. He says that there are 39 occurrences (also Doukhan), whereas Mandelkern lists only 36. Thirteen with the article, 23 without. Abraham Even-Shoshan, ed., *A New Concordance of the Bible* (Jerusalem: "Kiryat Sefer" Publishing House, 1990), 1005, however, lists 41. Seventeen with the article, 24 without.

120 Cf. Doukhan, "Seventy Weeks," p. 11 n. 26.

121 Heaton, p. 212; Marti, p. 68; Plöger, p. 134; Charles, p. 237; Hartman and Di Lella, p. 244.

122 Doukhan, "Seventy Weeks," p. 11.

123 Ibid., followed by Goldingay, *Daniel*, p. 259.

124 Doukhan, <169>Seventy Weeks,<170> p. 11.

125 Cf. Goldingay, p. 259.

126 Cf. Goldingay, p. 260.

127 Hasel, "'The Little Horn,' the Heavenly Sanctuary. . .," p. 446: "The anointing of the sanctuary in heaven is the prelude to the postlude of the 'cleansing' of the sanctuary to which 8:13-14 points." William H. Shea, "The Prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27," in *70 Weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy*, ed. by Frank B. Holbrook (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), pp. 82, 83. Delcor, p. 203, also sees an inauguration here, but one of "new times coming from a new institution, the kingdom of God being figured by a sanctuary."

128 I favor this view also because the use of the expression "holy of holies" as such is connected to the priesthood only once in the OT (see above). Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel*, pp. 193, 194, bases his preference for the Aaron interpretation on an ambiguous text in 1 Chr 23:13 and its interpretation by J. de Menasce and Annie Jaubert.

129 This term is here placed "in the same cultic perspective as in Dan 8:13-14," Doukhan, "Seventy Weeks," p. 10 n. 22.

130 A. Lenglet, "La Structure littéraire de Daniel 2-7," *Biblica* 53 (1972): 169-190.

131 See e.g. Baldwin, pp. 59-63; Maurice Casey, *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7* (London: SPCK, 1979), p. 7; James H. Sims, "Daniel," in *A Complete Literary Guide to the Bible*, ed. Leland Ryken and Tremper Longman III (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1993), pp. 330-331, who is also suggesting an interesting, yet not quite convincing thematic structure of the whole book (pp. 333-334); J. J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision*, pp. 11-14 (with modifications); idem, *Daniel with an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1984), p. 30; William H. Shea, "Further Literary Structures in Daniel 2-7: An Analysis of Daniel 4," *AUSS* 23 (1985): 193. Shea, in this and a follow-up article ["Further Literary Structures in Daniel 2-7: An

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Analysis of Daniel 5, and the Broader Relationships Within Chapters 2-7," *AUSS* 23 (1985): 277-295] attempts to demonstrate similarities in structure and thematic links between chaps. 4 and 5, further supporting Lenglet's thesis; Philip R. Davies, *Daniel* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), pp. 43-44, half-heartedly and with reservation agrees with Lenglet's suggestion but plays down its significance.

132 David W. Gooding, "The Literary Structure of the Book of Daniel and Its Implications," *Tyndale Bulletin* 32 (1981): 43-79.

133 With Goldingay, *Daniel*, p. 325, whose own attempt at structure is just as unconvincing as Gooding's; for a critique of Gooding, see also Paul R. Raabe, "Daniel 7: Its Structure and Role in the Book," *Hebrew Annual Review* 9 (1985): 272, n.14.

William H. Shea, "Unity of Daniel," in *Symposium on Daniel*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), pp. 249-252.

135 Doukhan, *Daniel*, pp. 3-6.

136 Pablo S. David, "The Composition and Structure of the Book of Daniel: A Synchronic and Diachronic Reading," (Th.D. dissertation, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 1991).

137 Rainer Albertz, *Der Gott des Daniel* (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988).

138 *Ibid.*, pp. 178-179: "Daniel 7 is both thematically and structurally united with Daniel A in its basic layer. . . In its final form, i.e., with its secondary layers. . . Daniel 7 is simultaneously united both structurally and thematically with Daniel B."

139 Raabe, p. 272. He calls chap. 7 the "middle pivot or hinge," whereas Collins, *Daniel with an Introduction*, p. 30, calls it "an interlocking device." Similarly, R. G. Kratz, *Translatio imperii: Untersuchungen zu den aramäischen Danielerzählungen und ihrem theologie-geschichtlichen Umfeld* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991), p. 21, who calls it a *Nahtstelle* (= seam), which has a *verklammernde Funktion* (function of a clamp); see also Doukhan, *Daniel*, p. 6.

140 Cultic space: the house of God (vs. 2), cultic time: ten days (vss. 12, 14, 15), cultic objects: temple vessels (vs. 2), cultic personage: Daniel and three friends without blemish and defilement (vss. 4, 8), cultic performance: non-defilement (vs. 8).

141 See Lenglet, pp. 185-187; cf. David, pp. 65-67.

142 The term *gode* appears several times in chap. 4 and once in chap. 5, in all instances designating God and his realm.

143 The astonishing parallelism in vocabulary, esp. also in cultic terms, has been pointed out by David, pp. 195-198.

144 Cf. Levenson, pp. 122, 123.

[This paper has been reformulated from old, unformatted electronic files and may not be identical to the edited version that appeared in print. The original pagination has been maintained, despite the resulting odd page breaks, for ease of scholarly citation. However, scholars quoting this article should use the print version or give the URL.]
Journal of the Adventist Theological Society, 7/1 (Spring 1996): 51-63.
Article copyright © 1996 by Paul Birch Petersen.

The Prayers of Daniel

Paul Birch Petersen, Ph.D. Candidate
Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary
Andrews University

Introduction

Prayer is a matter of life and death in the book of Daniel. The first reference to prayer is found in Daniel 2:18. Daniel and his companions plead with God to reveal the king's dream because the death decree of Nebuchadnezzar threatens their lives. In chapter 3 Daniel's companions are sentenced to death, because they refuse to bow down, worship and pray (implied) to an idol. In chapter 6 Daniel himself is likewise sentenced to death, because he continually and regularly prays to his God.

From a *theological* point of view the prayers of the prophet Daniel are important, because they form part of a divine-human dialogue in this inspired writing which contains dreams and visions as vehicles for divine revelation. Throughout the book the prophet is depicted as a man of prayer. His prayers are effective; they create a divine response. For example: the revelation by a heavenly messenger in 10:12 comes about as a result of Daniel's fasting and prayer.

But the prophet's prayers are also in themselves a response to God. This becomes evident when we look at the *literary* aspect of the book. The document is obviously divided into two parts. The narrative section (chaps. 1-6) is fairly easy to understand, even for small children. "Dare to be a Daniel," we sing. On the contrary the prophetic section (chaps 7-12) seems difficult to comprehend. The revelations are given in visions to a highly educated Jew, a scholar, a wise man, not to Gentile kings with little understanding of the true God.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

I believe this movement in understanding is intentional. Literary patterns and important theological themes and messages from the stories enlighten the visions. (Maybe we have done wrong at times in letting only the children listen to the stories!).

Now, with regard to the literary structure of the book, only two verbally expressed prayers (labelled ‘stated prayers’ by some scholars) are recorded—one in each section. Both are concerned with the issue of understanding. They are responses to God’s revelation.

In chapter 2:19-23 Daniel bursts out in thanksgiving, because God has revealed the content of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream and given him the understanding of its interpretation. In chapter 9:1-19 Daniel notes his study of Jeremiah’s prophecy regarding Judah’s seventy year captivity. He understands it, but still ponders its relationship to the time-element (the 2300 days) of the previous vision (chap. 8). In his quest for understanding he pours out his heart to God in a confession of Israel’s sins and his own. We may chart the two prayers and the two sections of the book. (See Table 1).

We will first examine Daniel’s prayer in chapter 2, in the first section of the book. Next, we will consider his longer prayer in chapter 9. Finally, we will compare the two prayers and evaluate their significance for the book as a whole.

Table 1

The ‘Stated Prayers’ In the Structure of the Book

Dan 2: prayer of thanksgiving	Dan 9: prayer of confession
Chaps. 1-6	Chaps. 7-12
<u>narratives</u>	<u>prophecies</u>
Easy to understand (told to the world - Nebuchadnezzar, etc.)	Difficult to understand (told to the people of God - Daniel)

The Prayer of Thanksgiving (Dan 2:20-23)

The story of Nebuchadnezzar’s attempt to discover the meaning of his dream is well-known and need not be repeated.

The structure of the chapter (see Table 2) places the divine-

PETERSEN: THE PRAYERS OF DANIEL

human dialogue in the center of the narrative. Enclosed by a prayer of petition on the one side (no wording recorded, vss. 17-18) and a prayer of thanksgiving on the other (vss. 20-23) lies the basic theological statement of the chapter (vs. 19): “The secret was revealed to Daniel in the nightly vision.” Revelation is the issue. The question is, “who is giving the revelation?” The answer is “the Lord of Heaven.” God alone is able to reveal the secrets of human hearts and of history. See in Table 3 how the literary structure emphasizes the revelation from God as the central truth in this historical experience.

Table 2
Structure of Chapter 2

- A The dream: Nebuchadnezzar’s emotional reaction, calls his wise men (vss. 1-2)
- B Content and interpretation of dream unknown (vss. 3-6)
- C No human is able to reveal dream/interpretation (vss. 7-12)
- D Death threat: postponed by Daniel’s intervention (vss. 13-16)
- E Prayer to God: petition (vss. 17-18)
- F **Revelation of the secret** (vs. 19)
- E’ Prayer to God: thanksgiving (vss. 20-23)
- D’ Death threat: removed by Daniel’s intervention (vss. 24-25)
- C’ God is able to reveal dream/interpretation (vss. 26-30)
- B’ Content and interpretation of dream made known (vss. 31-45)
- A’ The dream/interpretation: Nebuchadnezzar’s emotional reaction, honors Daniel and companions (vss. 46-49)

The hymn of thanksgiving can be studied in several ways. In Table 3 we point out some of the formal elements of communication, some basic themes of the prayer, and some larger theological issues of importance in describing the God to whom the prayer is directed. The text follows the NIV.

Table 3
The Prayer of Thanksgiving

Text (NIV)	Forms	Themes	Theology
20 "Praise be to the name of God forever and ever; wisdom and power are his.	Address Description (general)	Wisdom and power (God's possessions) Power and wisdom and knowledge <i>given</i> by God (in general)	Creation History
21 He changes times and seasons; He sets up kings and deposes them. He gives wisdom to the wise and knowledge to the discerning.			Creation
22 He reveals deep and hidden things; he knows what lies in darkness, and light dwells with him.			Creation
23 I thank and praise you, O God of my fathers: You have given me wisdom and power, you have made known to me what we asked of you, you have made known to us the dream of the king."	Motivation for thanksgiving (specific)	Wisdom and power <i>given</i> by God (the specific situation)	History

A close relationship exists between Daniel's prayer of thanksgiving and the narrative. The themes of wisdom and power are central to both the prayer and the narrative. In the account these are characteristic possessions of God, who is the Lord of Creation and the Sovereign of History. The dialectic between creation and history is important, because the constant change of human power in history points to the future eschatological time when God, in establishing his eternal kingdom, will turn the clock back to original creation-time. The fact that God is mentioned in the prayer as the great *Giver* is a challenge to king Nebuchadnezzar in the narrative who wants to emphasize his power by giving life or death to the wise men (vss. 5-9).

Furthermore, notice how prayer and story give the same role and abilities to wise men and kings in general (wisdom and power) as well as to the three friends of Daniel in specific (wisdom and power). And see, how the humility of Daniel, as we know it from the story (vs. 30), is beautifully expressed by the attitude revealed

PETERSEN: THE PRAYERS OF DANIEL

in the prayer (vs. 23). So the prayer and the narrative are closely linked together.

Looking at the literary structure of the chapter, as we have done, is to view the story after it occurred, as a final product. But we can also “live” the narrative as it flows in the course of events, as though we did not know the final outcome. Making this kind of approach, we discover that the prayer of thanksgiving slows down the pace of the story and delays the revelation of the secret.

But more than anything, this delay—this taking time to thank and praise God—reveals Daniel’s character and intimate connection with God. Common sense would have prompted him to appear before the king immediately to save his life. He could not know beforehand how Nebuchadnezzar would react when he learned his kingdom would *not* last forever. Yet, Daniel paused to pray and praise. Is this a lesson for us? Not always knowing the outcome, not always sensing the assured presence of God, should we not pause and praise Him for His promised assurances as well as for His future victory?

Other comparisons. We will compare Daniel’s expression in verse 21 with two other references in the book. In this verse, Daniel acknowledges that God “changes [šena’] times and seasons [zeman]. He removes [‘adah] kings and installs [qûm] kings.”

The theme is an important one in the book. It finds a climax in the description of “the little horn” about which it is said: “He intends to change [šena’] times [zeman] and law [dat] (7:25).” So what “the little horn” attempts is to put itself in the place of God in changing the times.

But I suggest that the story about Daniel in the lion’s den (chap. 6) gives yet another link to the interpretation about the horn (7:25). This is but one example of how the stories enlighten the visions. The struggle in the narrative of chapter 6 concerns laws for worship. The enemies of Daniel express their belief that they will not be able to find any reason for attacking Daniel, unless they can do so regarding “the law [dat] of his God (6:6).” In contrast to this genuine religion, the Medes and Persians establish laws that cannot be “altered [šena’]”. . . “laws [dat] which cannot be repealed (‘adah)” (6:9). As said a little later, “No decree that the king issues [qûm] can be changed [šena’] (6:16).”

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

The verbal and thematic links between the prayer in chapter 2, the story in chapter 6, and the climactic vision in chapter 7, help us to understand how the attack by “the little horn” on the Lord and Creator centers upon time and the divine law for worship.

The Prayer of Confession (Dan 9:4-19)

Since the content and context of this prayer is generally known, I will note just three features:

1. The Historical Setting. The background of the prayer is related to the vision and its explanation in chapter 8. The three first elements of that vision—ram, goat, and the little horn—had already been explained by Gabriel (8:20-25). The auditive element, that is, the conversation between the heavenly beings regarding time (8:13-14) had not been explained, however. On the contrary, the remarks by Gabriel about this point seemed cryptic (8:26). Daniel’s deep worry that prompted his study of prophetic time in the Book of Jeremiah should be seen against this background. This is generally recognized by Adventists.

2. Daniel’s Concern. Formal investigation of the prayer shows that Daniel’s underlying concern within his prayer was related to *time*. His specific petition is expressed in the phrase: “Do not delay,” (vs. 19).

3. Intercessory Prayer. Looking at the way the prayer depicts Daniel as an intercessor, we see that though he personally is innocent of the sins of his people, yet he identifies himself as guilty with them. This feature forms a link to the prophecy given by Gabriel a few verses later (vss. 24-27) in which the Messiah, likewise innocent in the ultimate sense of the word, identifies with the people through His sacrificial death “to make reconciliation for iniquity” (KJV).

The Two Prayers Compared

The two prayers have several things in common in both themes and setting. Their similarities may be seen by examining the following Tables 4-6.

PETERSEN: THE PRAYERS OF DANIEL

Table 4
Corresponding Themes

1. The human inadequacy before God
2. The stress on the honor of God (His name, 2:20; 9:19)
3. The importance of “time”
4. The concern with a view of history

Table 5
Corresponding Patterns in Structure

<i>Daniel 2</i>	<i>Daniel 9</i>
1. Thanksgiving	1. Confession
2. View of history: general specific examples	2. View of history:
3. Specific prayer: thanksgiving	3. Specific prayer: petition

Table 6
Corresponding Pattern of History In the Narrative Context

<i>Daniel 1-2</i>	<i>Daniel 8-9</i>
1. Sin of the people	1. Sin of the people
Leading to	
2. Punishment/exile	2. Punishment/exile
3. Apparent victory of the enemy	3. Apparent victory of the enemy
Suffering	
4. Faithfulness by Daniel	4. Covenant-loyalty by Daniel
Divine answer gives promise of	
5. Establishment of the kingdom of God	5. Redemption

Identifying some of the similar themes and corresponding patterns of these two prayers should not make us overlook their

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

differences. These differences need not to be understood as contrasts. Rather, they point to the fact that the prayers complement each other. We chart their complimentary aspects in Table 7 as follows.

Table 7
Complementary Aspects of the Prayers

1. The prayers are found in the two main sections of the book: the narrative and the prophetic.

Chapter 2. Within the historical narratives we find the prayer connected with a prophecy that deals with the future. Chapter 9. Within the midst of prophetic visions about the future a prayer reviews past history.

2. The prayers are examples of the two basic types of prayer in the OT: *praise* and *lament*.

Exilic and postexilic confession of sin (like Dan 9; Neh 9; Ezra 9) is here understood as a development of the lament. Thus, the prayers illustrate the basic complementary aspects in man's relationship with God: presence and absence.

The prayers also illustrate basic themes of the book. The prayer of thanksgiving answers the question "Who?"—Who is in charge, Who is able to reveal etc.—relevant to the first part of the book. The prayer of confession or lament fits into the question "How long?" of the second part (8:13; 12:6).

3. Each of the prayers is unique in making reference to either wise men (chap. 2) or prophets (chap. 9), thereby encompassing two types of divinely appointed messengers in the OT.

4. In their view of history, the prayer in chapter 2 is concerned with the kingdoms of the world in general, while in chapter 9 it deals with the people of God (see Table 8).

No philosophy of history as portrayed in the OT would be satisfactory without both of these aspects. The prayers complement each other perfectly at this point.

5. "The Reversal of Roles." See Tables 8 and 9.

Theological Contribution

These prayers add to the theology of the Book of Daniel as a whole. We will illustrate this by a comparison of king

Table 9
The ‘Reversal of Roles’

<i>Narratives</i>	<i>Visions</i>
1. God through Daniel to the world	1. God through an angel to Daniel
2. Daniel, a wise man (1:4), understands the dreams of kings	2. People of God, wise men (12:4, 10), understand the visions of Daniel
3. The narratives are “hero stories,” and readers identify with Daniel and his friends as representatives of God’s people.	3. The visions: designate “the saints of the Most High as the people of God, and readers identify with them as they study to understand Daniel’s visions.

The importance of this reversal of roles for the significance of the theology of the Book of Daniel can hardly be overlooked. In the stories Daniel and his friends are portrayed as examples to imitate. That is how such stories function. But the appeal in the latter part of the book is made particularly to the people of the end-time. The setting in Babylon therefore provides a microcosmos pointing forward to the situation at the end of the world as the macrocosmos of the controversy between good and evil. The narrative and the prophetic parts thus combine to present a picture of the people of God at the time of the end.

Some of the implications of these observations may be seen in Table 10.

Table 10

The People of God In the Time of the End - A Characterization

God's End-time Faithful

1. Loyal in crises
2. Honor God's law
3. "Wise men" in prophetic understanding (12:3-4, 10)
4. Messengers to the world revealing the secrets of the Danielic visions to the world.
5. Humble before God
6. Patiently waiting the divine judgment (Dan 12:12 [Heb. Chakah]; cf. Rev 14:12 "patient endurance")
7. In contact with God through prayer—we have often emphasized the aspect of obedience of the people of God in the last days or put the stress on our understanding of the 'truth' in the sense of the right doctrines. Only rarely have I heard any sermon describing the people of God in the end-time as a people characterized by prayer.
8. "One with Christ"

Illustrated in the Book of Daniel

1. As Daniel and three friends facing death (chap. 3, 6)
2. As the four young men (chap 1) and Daniel (chap. 6)
3. As Daniel received insight in the dreams of kings (2:23)
4. As Daniel revealed God's Word to the kings of Babylon.
5. As Daniel was not just pointing to the sins of all others, but identified with the people of God by acknowledging, "we have sinned" (9:5)
6. Illustrated in Daniel by the long time period (Dan 8); long prayer (Dan 9); long oral prophecy (Dan 11), "Waiting" is an important OT theme, not least for Yom Kippur
7. As Daniel (6:11-12)
8. Clinging to His sacrifice in our behalf, prophesied in 9:24-27, and trusting Him as our heavenly representatives, the 'Son of Man' in chapter 7.

Conclusions

We conclude our survey on the prayers recorded in the book of Daniel with some remarks about prayer in general, relating it to basic themes within OT theology.

Presence and Absence. First of all, prayer is an expression of a longing. We long to be with loved ones we have lost. When traveling, we long for the renewed company of our family. We enjoy the brief time we are able once again to converse with friends we have not seen for years. And yet, in our intense longing, or in our joy at their presence, we realize their absence and feel the sorrow. Prayer is an expression of a longing for the everlasting presence of God in the midst of His absence, a desire for His kingdom in the midst of a world of sin, a looking forward to the time when departure is no more.

Freedom. Second, prayer is a sign of trust that my personal life, as well as the state of the world, may be changed through divine-human dialogue. There is a God outside yourself. He is there. Lives may be saved by praying to Him. God may reveal His will as a response to prayers. Genuine prayer speaks against the determinism of the astral religion of Babylon just as it speaks against the impersonal, modern, New Age religion. Prayer is a sign of the belief in the freedom of man and of God. Confession, for instance, is an expression of faith in His personal forgiveness, of trust that He will remove my guilt stricken condition. Prayer is evidence of our realization that it does not help to find yourself, when you actually need Another. Prayer is our confidence that He is there and will make the final change. Prayer is trust in the reality of the kingdom to come.

PETERSEN: THE PRAYERS OF DANIEL

Power. Third, prayer to the God of Creation, the Sovereign Lord of History presupposes the powerlessness of the petitioner. We pray to God because we have no power in ourselves, no hope and no future without Him. We pray, because without Him we can do nothing. Nebuchadnezzar did not succeed in reaching God in prayer, not because God was unwilling to show His power, but because the king was unwilling to let go of his. Powerless and humble we bow before God in prayer, and, like Daniel we receive power to speak His Word in front of all earthly authorities.

Praise and Lament. Finally, prayer leads to worship and praise. I recently read an article by some young people who rejoiced in attending a church where there was only praise, no lament. What a tragedy! To renounce reality, close your eyes to the facts of the present world, deny suffering a place in worship, and attempt to escape being sorry for sin, and the need for confession is to miss the full meaning of prayer! But then I read another article in a youth magazine claiming we had nothing to celebrate! We were only to feel sorrow for our sin! What a pity! What a distrust in the kingdom! What a lack of prayerful relationship with God!

We are, as Daniel, to give thanks, though we do not see the final outcome; we are created to praise. In feeling His presence, genuine praise leads to the realization of God's absence in the world and to the acknowledgment of personal sin, and therefore to lament and confession. Genuine confession leads the believer to praise the God who by the cross has taken away the guilt, and has promised a new life.

To Daniel, prayer was praise *and* lament, thanksgiving *and* confession. It was a matter of life and death. So it is for the church today. So it is for you and me.

[This paper has been reformulated from old, unformatted electronic files and may not be identical to the edited version that appeared in print. The original pagination has been maintained, despite the resulting odd page breaks, for ease of scholarly citation. However, scholars quoting this article should use the print version or give the URL.]
Journal of the Adventist Theological Society, 7/1 (Spring 1996): 64-80.
Article copyright © 1996 by Alberto R. Treiyer.

The Priest-King Role of the Messiah

Alberto R. Treiyer
Ph.D. (Theology)
New York

The book of Daniel is generally regarded as a prophetic book. Many focus on the symbolic beasts and on the role of the antichrist. Liberal authors, who deny the Danielic authorship, devote their time to establishing the presumed second century B.C. background of the material, neglecting to understand the fundamental purpose of the document. It seems that in one way or another the central Person and His ministry, as portrayed in the prophecy, have been passed over in this scientific era or have been relegated to a second or third place of importance.

However, nothing is more important in this prophetic book than the role filled by the Messiah, the principal Person in its visions. He gives sense to Daniel's stories and prophecies. It is in the light of the great controversy between Christ and Satan that all the prophecies and stories of the Bible have to be seen, and especially those of Daniel in the OT and Revelation—its counterpart—in the NT.

The Royal Priest Foretold

Several prophecies, outside the book of Daniel, foretell the priestly roles of the Son of God. Three biblical examples form the background to what is portrayed in a special way in Daniel's prophecies. One antedates Daniel by half a millennium; another precedes the prophet by two centuries; and a third is enacted and spoken a few years after the fall of Babylon.

1. Psalm 110:1, 4. Here David respectfully calls his messianic descendant, "My Lord,"* and observes that He would one day sit at the right hand of God

TREIYER: THE PRIEST-KING ROLE OF THE MESSIAH

upon His throne (vs. 1). His mission would also include a royal priesthood similar to that which the prince-priest Melchisedek

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

filled in ancient times (vs. 4). Jesus and the apostles cite this Psalm to demonstrate the superiority of the promised Messiah over against any royal and priestly prefigurative institutions of the old dispensation.¹

This forecast of a messianic, royal-priest is also prominent in the prophecy of Daniel 7. The Son of Man appears in the heavenly court at the “time of the end,” just as the high priest appeared in the Most Holy Place at the end of the religious year to obtain the decision “in favor of the saints of the Most High” (Dan 7:22) and to receive all “authority, glory and sovereign power” over “all peoples, nations and men of every language” of this world (vs. 14; cf. Rev 5:12-13; 11:15-19).

2. Isaiah 53. This passage depicts the sufferings of the Lord's Servant more than 700 years before its fulfillment. The Servant of the Lord suffers for His people, bears their sins (vss. 2-9), dies as a guilt offering (vs. 10), thereby enabling Him to undertake a ministry of justification (vs. 11) similar to that which the priests performed for repentant sinners who sought atonement for sin when they brought their sin and guilt offerings to the sanctuary (Lev 4:31, 35, etc.).² All this will reappear in the prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27—in relation to the death of the Messiah Prince and the termination of sin.

This prophecy (Isa 53) also describes the power of the Servant as a warrior prince. “I will give him a portion among the great and he will divide the spoils with the *strong* [*ašûmîm*]” (vs. 12). As a warrior prince the Messiah shares the spoils of battle with “the strong,” a term that is used at times to describe princes/kings who prevail in battle.³ However, in this instance, these “strong” or powerful princes may refer to heavenly beings (compare Joel 2:11 where the same term is employed to describe the angels who engage in the last battle at the end of the world).⁴ This also appears in a definite form in the last prophecies of Daniel,—more specifically with those passages which describe angelic battle against the evil

TREIYER: THE PRIEST-KING ROLE OF THE MESSIAH

powers represented by worldly empires and the last intervention of Michael at the end of the world (Dan 10:13, 21: 12:1).

3. Zechariah 6:9-13. The prophet Zechariah enacts a prophecy in which certain messianic features of a future king descending from David are symbolically applied to his contemporary, the high priest Joshua.⁵ Not only is the messianic title, the “Branch,” applied to the typical priesthood of Joshua (Zech 3:8; 6:12), but the priest himself is crowned as a king (vs. 11).⁶ The functions of a king (represented by Zerubbabel, the current ruler) and of a high priest (represented by Joshua) are applied in this passage to the promised Messiah.⁷ A modern author writes: “The symbolic coronation and the enigmatic term ‘Branch’ referred to a future leader, who would fulfill to perfection the offices of priest and king, and build the future Temple with all appropriate splendor (Hag 2:6-9). In this way the priestly and royal offices will be unified.”⁸

The Messiah's double role is also depicted in Hebrews 7 and in the book of Revelation. In the latter book, a kingly and priestly role is attributed to “the Lion of the tribe of Judah, the Root of David.” The name that Jesus receives par excellence in this last book of the Bible is that of “Lamb.” As a confirmation of His kingdom, the Lamb receives the *book of the covenant* granted to a king during the ceremonies of investiture (Rev 5).⁹ We must not forget that He is the “prince of the covenant” in Daniel's visions (Dan 11:22).

The Priestly-Royal Character of God's Covenant People

Characteristic of the prophecies of Daniel is a similar priestly-royal character of the people of the “covenant” (see Dan 9:27; 11:22, 32). Although they suffer tribulation in this world by the kingdom of the “little horn,” they are promised a share in God's eternal kingdom at the end together with their heavenly prince (Dan 7:14, 18, 22, 27)). This fact brings us back to the origins of Israel, when God established an official covenant with His people. In words that reveal the conditionality of the covenant the Lord said to them through Moses: “If they obey me fully and keep my covenant, then out of all nations you will be my treasured possession. . . . [Y]ou will be for me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation” (Exod 19:5-6).

Just as Aaron, his sons and descendants, were priests for God's

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

people (Exod 28:1, Num 8:6, 14, 19; 18:1-7; 1 Chr 23:13), so the people of Israel—as a whole—were to be a royal priesthood for God to the world,—to mediate between God and humanity (Exod 19:4-6; Deut 14:1-2; 26:16-19; Isa 61:6). This is the same purpose God has today for the people of the new covenant, over whom the Son of God exerts an equivalent priesthood to that which Aaron and his sons performed. The Lord grants to the church—first in a spiritual dimension, and then literally at the end—the double priestly and royal function that He accorded to the people of Israel (1 Pet 2:9-10, Dan 7:14, 18, 22, 27; Rev 1:6; 2:26-27; 5:9-10; 7:14-15; 20:6; 22:5).

All this biblical background has to be taken into account when we read the prophecies of Daniel, if we want to find the plot or plan of the great controversy between the holy seed of the woman and the perverse seed of the serpent (Gen 3:15). These two seeds—engaged in battle—are represented by the people of the covenant on the one hand and by the empires that try to destroy them on the other. The chosen nation, paradoxically, should keep itself as a nation separate from the world and at the same time should be a “light for the nations.” In the midst of the crisis that appears in the Daniel context, a heavenly Prince comes to help His people, mediates in their behalf before God, and grants them the everlasting kingdom. This prince is the central Person of the book. To discover His double priestly and kingly roles in relation to His people and the world, is to find the divine plan for human redemption.

The Heavenly Prince: Titles and Functions

In the literary heart of Daniel (chap. 8) two titles are applied to the heavenly Prince: “Prince of the Army” (*šar-haššābaʿ*) and “Prince of princes” (*šar-šārîm*). The first title is the equivalent to the well-known name of God appearing in the OT as: “*YHWH šebāʾôt*,” commonly translated “Lord of hosts” (KJV) or “the Lord Almighty” (NIV). The literal meaning of the phrase is “the Eternal [One] of the armies” (cf. Jer 29:4, 8, 17, 25).

Prince of the Army (Dan 8:11). The expression, “prince of the army” (Dan 8:11) appears early on in Scripture to designate a heavenly Being who appeared before Joshua as he prayed and contemplated Israel's conquest of Canaan and the approaching

TREIYER: THE PRIEST-KING ROLE OF THE MESSIAH

battle for the walled-city of Jericho. Looking up, Joshua “saw a man standing in front of him with a drawn sword in his hand” (Josh 5:13). Approaching the warrior, Joshua asked, “Are you one of ours?” or “One who is for us?” As the Hebrew text stands, the stranger's reply begins with a “No” (*lō*), but other readings (such as the Greek Septuagint) read, “And he said *to him* (*lō*), giving the sense, “He told him.”

The Warrior now discloses His true identity, describing Himself as the “Prince of the army of the Eternal [One]” (*śar-šebā’ YHWH*, vs. 14). Only here and in Daniel is this title applied to persons like Abner and Joab who were titled “prince of the army” of their respective kings, Saul and David. Obviously, in Joshua and Daniel this “Prince of the Army” is the One who is in charge of the army of the Eternal God. Just as the “Angel of the Lord” in other biblical accounts and prophecies is presented as being equivalent to Yahweh,¹⁰ just so this heavenly Prince is a divine Being—not simply a “man” or an “angel.” His deity is confirmed by the reaction of Joshua who “fell facedown to the ground” and removed his sandals in obedience to the Prince's command (vs. 15; cf. Exod 3:5; Acts 7:33).

Prince of Princes (Dan 8:25). An additional confirmation of the heavenly origin of the “Prince of the Army” may be seen in the title by which the angel interpreter describes Him in the explicative section of the prophecy: *śar-śārîm*, the “Prince of Princes.” This title is not attributed to any other prince in the Bible. The Hebrew Bible employs the expression only here in Daniel 8:25.

Similar titles in the Priesthood. At this point it will be profitable to note similar titles that were used in the Israelite priesthood and kingdom. In regard to the priests we observe they are called “princes of the sanctuary,” “princes of God” (1 Chr 24:5; Isa 43:28). Leaders among the priests were termed, “princes of the priests” (2 Chr 36:14; Ezra 22:28[27], *nāsî*). The high priest was, of course, considered greater still. He was literally designated “the great priest that is anointed” (Num 35:25; cf. Lev 21:10; 8:12).

Although the priests in the typical system are never designated by some of the combinations that Daniel and other prophets make with the term “prince,” that term can and was related to a priestly function.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

At this juncture, it is important to consider the fact that Daniel qualifies this heavenly prince in his last chapter as “the great prince” (*haššar haggāgôl*, Dan 12:1).

If the priests who operated under the typical high priest were called “princes,” it is obvious that the high priest was considered a “prince of the priests,” something comparable to “prince of princes.” Should we be surprised, then, to find (in the vision of Daniel) this heavenly prince discharging a *tāmîd*, that is, a “continuous” ministry which was generally performed by the common priests? (Dan 8:11). Since we are dealing with a heavenly prince, His sanctuary would be also the heavenly one. Likewise, the cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary that is performed at the end of His “continuous” (*tāmîd*) intercessory ministry must be of equal value to that which was carried out in the earthly sanctuary on the Day of Atonement as the conclusion of the regular services of the year (Lev 16). In actuality, of course, the heavenly priest's antitypical ministry is the true reality of which the earthly rites are only a role-playing “shadow.”

Similar titles in the Kingdom. Another term equivalent to “Prince of princes” is found in the civil and military organization of the Israelite kingdom. David named certain persons to be “head” (*rôš*) of all princes of the armies (*šārê haššabā’ôt*, 1 Chr 27:3). This expression is similar to “Lord of kings” (Dan 2:47), a title applied to God Himself. The fact that in Daniel's book the “Prince of princes” is also the “Prince of the army” of the Lord indicates His role is not restricted to that of a High Priest. It has also to do with functions related with royal rule.¹¹ Actually, the vision given to Daniel is of a heavenly prince Who surpasses all earthly representations. According to what we find in the rest of the book the qualities of both king and priest center in His Person.

Now, we ask a question. May we find these two characteristics in Onias, the priest killed by Antiochus Epiphanes in Maccabean times? Was Onias remembered in the history of Israel and in the NT as a heavenly prince, as a person as extraordinary and elevated as the heavenly prince Daniel depicts? The answer is an obvious “no.”

The only inspired application of these titles is found in the NT. These expressions are equivalent to that which Peter employed to

TREIYER: THE PRIEST-KING ROLE OF THE MESSIAH

describe Jesus, such as “the chief Shepherd” (*archipoimenos*, 1 Pet 5:4). Paul depicts the enthronement of Jesus as God’s right hand in the heavenly sanctuary, the substance of which is drawn from the title, “Prince of princes,” found in the book of Daniel. God “exerted in Christ” His divine power, the apostle says:

when he raised him from the dead and seated him at his right hand in the heavenly realms, *far above all rule and authority, power and dominion, and every title that can be given, not only in the present age but also in the one to come.* And God placed all things under his feet and appointed him to be head over everything for the church (Eph 1:20-22, emphasis added).

By virtue of His victory at the cross of Calvary, God exalted His Son “to the highest place and gave him the name that is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father” (Phil 2:9-11).

Prince Messiah (*māšīaḥ nāgīd*, Dan 9:25, 26). The angel Gabriel is sent to Daniel to help him understand the time for the final cleansing of the heavenly sanctuary within which the heavenly priest, the Messiah, will exercise His *tāmīd* or “continuous” priestly ministry. Gabriel does so by implying the inauguration of the new covenant under the coming of the Messiah—His atoning death and priesthood (cf. Dan 9:24-27; Jer 31:31-34; Heb 9:20-27; Luke 22:20).

Since the troubled prophet could not take his eyes off his hope of a restored Temple (sanctuary) in Jerusalem after the seventy-year Babylonian captivity (cf. Dan 9:1-19; Jer 25:12; 29:10), Gabriel gave him a glimpse of its destiny. Unfortunately, the rebuilt temple and city would be eventually destroyed as a consequence of a later national rebellion against their messianic Prince (*nāgīd*, vs. 26).

The “Prince Messiah” would be put to death, but this would not be the end. His would be no ordinary death. On the contrary, His death would atone for sin and would bring in everlasting righteousness (Dan 9:24, 26; cf. Heb 9:26). Furthermore, in connection with His atoning death, Gabriel foretold the anointing of the heavenly sanctuary, implying the beginning of the Messiah’s priestly ministry.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Now, if we examine the fulfillment of the time element in the prophecy of Daniel (Dan 9:24; 25 cf. Gal 4:4; Mark 1:15), we are led to the appearing of the promised Messiah in the first century A.D. On that occasion, the typical sanctuary—terminated by God (Matt 27:50-51; Luke 23:45) and finally destroyed (Matt 24:1-2)—was the temple in Jerusalem. The sanctuary that was inaugurated (Dan 9:24), in exchange as it were, was the heavenly temple (cf. Rev 15:5). The only atonement which could give the death blow to sin and rebellion was that which the promised Prince accomplished when He died on the cross bearing the sins of the world (John 1:29; 1 John 2:2). In this manner Prince Messiah prepared Himself to begin His heavenly, priestly ministry.

What does the term “Messiah” mean? In the OT the Hebrew word is transliterated into English as “Messiah.” Since the term means “anointed” person, the NT Bible writers use the equivalent Greek word for this meaning which translates into English as “Christ.” Thus, we may address this heavenly Being as “Prince Messiah” or “Prince Christ.” The anointing of the Messiah at His baptism by the Holy Spirit and His enthronement at the right hand of God in the heavenly sanctuary are themes the apostles repeatedly touch on (Matt 3:16; Acts 2:33; 10:38, etc.).

“Prince,” the other term in this title (Prince Messiah) is *nāgîd*, not *śar* as in Daniel 8. This difference, it has recently been suggested,¹² was deliberate on the part of the Bible writer. A careful study of the two prophecies (Dan 8, 9) suggests that *śar* (chap. 8) pertains to the *heavenly* mission of the Prince of the people of God, whereas in His *earthly* mission (Dan 9:25-26; 11:22) He is identified by the term *nāgîd*. An additional confirmation of this contrast is the fact that *nāgîd* is never used in the Hebrew Bible to refer to a heavenly “prince.”

What are the contexts in which *nāgîd* is used in the Hebrew Bible? Like *śar*, *nāgîd* is also employed to designate kings¹³ and priests¹⁴ who are anointed to carry out their respective tasks. Since kings as well as priests were anointed, there is nothing unusual in describing them as princes. Thus, it would not be strange in this context to find not only similar titles and similar priestly and kingly functions ascribed to the heavenly Prince.

At this juncture it may be helpful to consider the prophetic

TREIYER: THE PRIEST-KING ROLE OF THE MESSIAH

passage of Isaiah 55:4. In this prediction the Lord announces the coming of the Messiah, the Son of David, whom God will set up as a “Prince” (*nāgîd*) and “Legislator” (*mešawweh*)¹⁵ of the peoples. In other words, the foretold “Prince” will have a rank equivalent to one who legislates, or who teaches the law. This is exactly the role fulfilled by the Prince Messiah of Daniel 9. In the last prophetic week of the 70-week prophecy the Messiah has a mission to “confirm the covenant to many.”

Prince of the Covenant (Dan 11:22). In Daniel's last line of prophecy the promised Messiah is designated the “Prince of the covenant” (*nāgîd berît*, Dan 11:22). This descriptive expression is in total agreement with the aforementioned messianic prophecy of Isaiah. The Messiah is obviously connected in Daniel 11:30-33 with the people of *the new covenant*. In this sense, the promised Davidic-prince will not only function in priestly service (as in Dan 8-9), but will also function like a second Moses who mediated in the establishment of the earlier covenant (Exod 19-20; Deut 9:9-11; 10:1-5; cf. Deut 18:15; Matt 5-7; Heb 3:1-6; 8:6).

Michael, One of the principal Princes (Dan 10:13). In Daniel 10 we come back to the use of the term *šar* (prince) in a context of a battle between good and evil angels.¹⁶ “The prince of this world” (John 12:31)—called in other places *Satan*, the “adversary” (Zech 3:1)—is represented by the “prince of Persia,” just as in Isaiah 14 he is represented by the king of Babylon. This evil angel actually tries to keep the people of God in permanent exile so they cannot return to rebuild the temple in Jerusalem. But *Michael*, whose name means: “Who is like God?” comes to help the angel Gabriel struggle against the opposing Satanic influence of the prince of Persia (Dan 10:13). This struggle against the prince of Persia was apparently repeated more than once (cf. Dan 10:20).

Who is this personage who assisted Gabriel in this supernatural battle? The Hebrew reads: “Michael, one of the head princes.”¹⁷ Doubtlessly, Michael is represented here as struggling in behalf of His people in His role as the “Prince of the Army” of the Lord. The fact that He prevails against the “prince of Persia” implies He is also the “Prince of princes.” The other princes were princes of or over the nations who, as in other visions, symbolize

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

the forces of opposing, evil angels (Dan 10:13 = “the kings of Persia and vs. 20 = of Greece).

“Michael, Your Prince” (Dan 10:21). Joshua came to realize that the heavenly “prince of the army” who faced him with a drawn sword was “One of ours, or “One Who is for us.” Now the angel interpreter tells Daniel that “Michael,” a Being “Who is like God” and Who fights for His people is indeed “your Prince.”

Daniel and his people in Babylonian exile had to look beyond the princes of this world and the evil spiritual forces which attempted to control them (cf. Eph 6:10-12). The focus of God's people had to be on *their* Prince who was superior to all other princes, supernatural or earthly. Although we do not understand fully the nature of the supernatural battle between the angelic forces of good and evil, it is encouraging to know that the Prince of Israel is also the “Prince of Princes,” and He will prevail.

The *archangel*, that is to say, *Prince* Michael, is identified in the NT with Jesus Christ (cf. 1 Thess 4:16). Jude saw Michael contending with the devil (vs. 9; cf. Heb 2:14). A little later on, the apostle John was shown in vision a wider panorama of this war between the angels (Rev 12:7-9). John's vision shows that the struggle begun in heaven continues on in our earth. But we may be assured that no other supernatural prince or angel can overcome our heavenly Prince, because no created intelligence in God's universe can equal Him in power and might.

Michael: the Great Prince Who Stands for Your People (Dan 12:1).

Noting Gabriel's direct reference to “the time of the end; (*‘ēt qeš*, Dan 11:40) when in heaven the Court is set up (cf. Dan 8:14, 17, 19; 7:9-14), Daniel sees Michael, the heavenly Prince, *standing* in the tribunal to redeem His people (Dan 12:1; cf. 7:18, 22, 27). He is qualified inasmuch as He is “the great prince” (*haššar haggādōl*), an expression equivalent to that of the “high priest” who was designated “the great priest who [is] anointed” (*hakkōhēn haggādōl ašer māšah*, Num 35:25; cf. Lev 21:10; 8:12).

The act of “standing up” (*‘amad*) is typical of persons appearing before a court (Num 27:2; Josh 20:4; Rev 20:12). This is not only the usual position of a petitioner or of an accused person, but also that of the accuser (Deut 19:17), and even that of a mediator or defender of the accused (Rev 5:6). Moses, for example, “stood in the

TREIYER: THE PRIEST-KING ROLE OF THE MESSIAH

breach before him [God], to keep his wrath from destroying” the people (Ps 106:23). Joshua, the high priest in the time of the prophet Zechariah, is seen in vision interceding for his people in the heavenly court while “*standing* before the angel of the Lord.” At the same time the prophet also sees “Satan *standing* at his right side to accuse” the priest (Zech 3:1, emphasis added).¹⁸

Although the verb *amad* literally means “to stand up,” it is often used metaphorically with a wide range of nuances. For example, the verb in certain contexts may mean “to resist” (2 Kngs 10:4), “to remain” (Eccl 2:9), “to defend” or “to protect” (Esth 8:22), “to stop” (Josh 10:13), etc. This is the reason why a number of writers prefer to translate this verb in Daniel 12:1 with the expression “to protect” or “to defend.” They construe that Michael stands up to protect His people from the onslaughts of the king of the North.

However, in Daniel's larger setting Michael's standing up is related to the session of the heavenly tribunal, the eschatological judgment as presented in Daniel 7-8 when the names of those who are written in the book of life are considered (Dan 12:1). In other words, Michael's standing up in behalf of His people in Daniel 12:1 could be considered not only as the conclusion of this session, but also as a kind of recapitulation or summary of what he has been doing during the whole “time of the end” (Dan 11:40-12:1). One of the NT equivalents to Michael's stand in behalf of His people may be summarized in the words of Jesus to the church in “Sardis.” “He who overcomes will. . . be dressed in white. I will never erase his name from the book of life, but will acknowledge his name before my Father and his angels” (Rev 3:5).¹⁹

Son of God (Dan 3:25, NKJV). What Michael will do at the end of the world by interposing Himself between the world powers and His people, He did at the time of Daniel to support the three Hebrew worthies in the blazing furnace. The prince of this world, Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon, had to acknowledge that the fourth Person who appeared among them was “the Son of God” (*bar elāhîn*, Aramaic).

It is beyond the scope of our study to examine the expression, “Son of God,” in depth. We can agree, however, on one point: the equivalent Hebrew Plural form for “God,” *elōhîm*, when it desig-

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

nates the God of Israel, is to be translated in the singular (God, not Gods). The Hebrew Bible employs the singular as well as the plural forms of this word, but always in a monotheistic sense. As an example of the plural form with a singular sense, note Genesis 6:2, 4, *benē hā'elōhîm* ("sons of God"), a reference to the holy seed of the woman referred to in Genesis 3:15. Consequently, the translation of Daniel 3:25 depends on how the translator understands the expression—whether the phrase should express the uninstructed, pagan mind of the king (polytheistic plural) or the sanctified Israelite mind (monotheistic singular).²⁰

The readers of the book of Daniel, being mostly Israelites, would easily understand the expression, "Son of God," in the singular. The fourth Personage could be no other than the heavenly Prince Who commanded the hosts of Israel. He was, in the expressions of Joshua and Daniel, "One of ours," or "One for us." As the Ambassador of the heavenly kingdom, He reveals Himself now as God's Son, the Deity Himself with divine power and authority (cf. Col 2:9), demonstrating that He fulfills what He promises. He intervenes to save His people when His people stand for Him no matter how terrible the trouble may be (cf. Matt 10:32-33; Rev 3:5).

Son of Man (Dan 7:13, NKJV). We come now to the last, but no less important title: "Son of Man," or literally, "like a son of man" (Dan 7:13). This is a complementary expression to that of "Michael," a term which means (as we have already noted): "Who is *like God*?" In other words, the heavenly Being in the Book of Daniel is comparable to God and man because He has both natures. In the vision of Daniel 7 He appears at the time of the end in the preadvent judgment before His Father and before the angelic hosts to intercede in behalf of His oppressed people on earth. Standing before the heavenly Court, He stands in behalf of all His genuine believers who are written in the book of life (Dan 7:22; 12:1). According to the stories and visions of Daniel our heavenly Prince is a perfect Mediator between God and man. He presents Himself before the kingdoms of this world as the Son of God, the highest representative of the Deity, before a human court. On the other hand before the Ancient of Days or Most High and His angels seated in session, our Prince is not ashamed to identify Himself with our humanity. The Son of Man is our highest representative before the

TREIYER: THE PRIEST-KING ROLE OF THE MESSIAH

heavenly Court. And Daniel sees towards the end of his vision that our Intercessor is able to obtain for His genuine followers a sentence “in favor of the saints of the Most High,” so they—like Him (Dan 7:13-14)—may “possess the kingdom” (Dan 7:22, 26-27).

To that time and final judgment Jesus referred when He told His disciples He would appear for them in the Court of heaven. He would testify in behalf of His faithful ones, and against them who deny Him (Matt 10:32-33; Rev: 5).

Significance of “The Man Clothed in Linen” (Dan 10:5-7)

Over working-garments of linen (*bad*, the attire of the high priest on the Day of Atonement, Lev 16:4, 23, 32), our heavenly Prince is seen by Daniel in his last vision as having “a belt of the finest gold around his waist” (Dan 10:5-6; cf. Rev 1:13). This is apparently a reference to the belt or girdle that linked the ephod of the high priest to his body (Exod 28:8; Lev 8:7).²¹ The golden belt could also signify His kingship as well as His priesthood. It cannot be inferred from His clothing in this snapshot that the Prince is in the process of His Day of Atonement ministry, because He is depicted near the Tigris River and not in the heavenly sanctuary (Dan 10:4).²² Anyway, His attire points to the time of the end (Dan 12:5-9), when the sanctuary had to be cleansed (Dan 8:14).

Just when Cyrus, the Persian King who had granted the freedom predicted by Isaiah for the people of God (Isa 44:28; 45:13; Ezra 1:1-4), was being urged to change his mind towards the returned exiles (cf. Dan 10:1, 13), this heavenly Prince is once more presented as the true Royalty—as the One “Who stands up” for God's people (Dan 12:1). The *attire* of “the man dressed in linen,” whom we identify with the heavenly Prince (Dan 10:5-6), is presented in the context of the “time of the end” when the sanctuary is to be cleansed after the “continuous-*tāmîd*” ministry He has performed in the Holy Place (Dan 8:11, 13-14, 17, 19; 12:5-9). Since He presents Himself in the working garments of the high priest on the Day of Atonement, it is obvious that He is the heavenly High Priest in charge of cleansing the heavenly sanctuary at that time.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Heavenly Royal-Priestly Ministry: Three Steps

Just as the earthly sanctuary (building/priesthood) was anointed at the time of its inauguration, so—according to Daniel's prophecy—the Prince Messiah and His sanctuary were to be anointed and inaugurated by His death (Dan 9). Just as the priests performed a daily *tamid* during the year, so the Prince of the Army was to perform a “continuous” ministry in behalf of His oppressed people on earth (Dan 8). Finally, just as the high priest in the OT appeared in the Most Holy Place at the end of the year to cleanse the sanctuary and vindicated in this manner the name of Him Who dwelt there, so the heavenly Prince is shown to Daniel clothed in the working garments of the high priest at the “time of the end,” standing for His people (Dan 12:1) and prepared to do a similar work (Dan 10:5-6; 12:5-9).

In other words we have in the visions of Daniel a complete picture of the heavenly ministry of our royal Priest. The fulfillment of these visions is, therefore, to be expected in connection with the sanctuary of the New Covenant, the heavenly one (Heb 8:1-6, 13; 9:15, etc.) Daniel understood this heavenly dimension of the sanctuary, for he saw that the minister of that sanctuary was the heavenly Prince, the Angel of the covenant. Consequently, His sanctuary had to be the heavenly one. There, because of the permanent value of the blood that He shed at the outer altar, as it were, the “Prince of the shepherds” continuously intercedes within the heavenly sanctuary (1 Pet 5:4; Heb 13:20; 9:12, 13, 23-26, etc.).

Conclusion

The message from the visions of Daniel is that we have a heavenly Prince Who is *for us*. He was “for us” 2,000 years ago during His earthly ministry and during His priestly *tamid ministry* in the Holy Place after His ascension. Today, He is pleading our case before the heavenly Court in the Most Holy Place, and He will continue to be “for us” as His people pass through their final tribulations. The Lord will show to a world in rebellion and to His church that He is Michael, the great Prince who stands for His people.

How can we doubt the true intentions of Jesus, our heavenly Prince, for us? What more could He do to strengthen our trust in

TREIYER: THE PRIEST-KING ROLE OF THE MESSIAH

Him? His love is steady. No one may move Him from His determination to redeem us. “He who watches over Israel will neither slumber nor sleep,” says the psalmist (Ps 121:4). “He who began a good work in you will carry it on to completion,” affirms the apostle Paul (Phil 1:6). He “is the same yesterday and today and forever” (Heb 13:8). Will we trust Him?

Endnotes

* Biblical citations are from the NIV, unless otherwise noted.

1 Matt 22:41-46; Luke 20:41-44; Acts 2:23-35; Heb 1:13; 5:6; 6:20; 7; 10:12-13; 1 Pet 3:22, etc.

2 The priests, however, did not forgive sin. Rather, they performed the rite of atonement. Forgiveness was something carried out between God and the sinner. See A. Treiyer, *The Day of Atonement and the Heavenly Judgment. From the Pentateuch to Revelation* (Creation Enterprises International, Siloam Springs, 1992), p. 160.

3 The plural *‘ašûmîm*, “strong,” “powerful,” is applied to the princes or kings of powerful nations (Deut 4:38; 7:1; 9:1; 11:23). The strength of such nations is measured by their powerful armies (Joel 1:6; 2:2, 5; Dan 11:25). God would make His people more powerful than the other nations, granting them the support of the heavenly army (Gen 18:18; Num 14:12; Deut 9:14, etc.).

4 In relation to the “Day of the Eternal” at the end of the world the armies of angels will reveal themselves as “very powerful,” to the point no other army will resist them (Joel 2:11). On that day the Lord will make His remnant a powerful nation, and He will reign forever over His people (Mic 4:7; see vs. 3; Rev 21:24, 26).

5 Jer 23:5; 33:15 (*šemaḥ*); Isa 11:1 (*nāser*, “shoot”), see Isa 53:2. J. G. Baldwin, *Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi: An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries (Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1972), p. 135: “Already in Jeremiah’s usage the term combines priestly and kingly functions.” See Jer 23:5-6; 33:15-18.

6 The fact that the Messianic title, “Branch,” was applied to Joshua, a symbolic high priest—the same title given to the future Davidic king, and crowned with a crown never worn by a high priest—has led many critics to emend the text and to apply the crowning to the symbolic king of that time, Zerubbabel. See J. G. Baldwin, pp. 133-137; also “*šemaḥ* as a Technical Term in the Prophets,” in VT 14 (1964): 93-97. But “it is best to allow the text to stand, and to regard Joshua as the one who was crowned,” Baldwin, p. 134.

7 Baldwin, p. 135: “His hearers had been prepared for the Branch to fulfill priestly and kingly functions and therefore would realize that both Joshua and Zerubbabel contributed to the work of the coming Branch, while neither alone adequately represented him.”

8 *Ibid.*, pp. 136-137. According to Baldwin, “nowhere else in the Old Testament is it made so plain that the coming Davidic king will also be a priest. It is for this reason that the passage has occasioned so much questioning,” *ibid.*, p. 137. The fact that Zechariah sees the crowning of the high priest Joshua, and his identification as the promised “Branch,” led the interpreters of Qumran to

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

develop the hope of a Messiah who would come from Aaron and who would have the preeminence over the Messiah of Israel. See references in S. Amsler, *Zacharie 1-8* (Delachaus & Niestlé, 1981), p. 110. Amsler seems to find in these passages of Zechariah the notion also of a king-priest that is taken up again in the Epistle to the Hebrews and applied to Jesus, *ibid.* See also D. Nam, *The "Throne of God" Motif in the Hebrew Bible* (Doctoral dissertation, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, 1989), pp. 306-309. Another significant prophecy is that of Isa 53, where the Lord's Servant fulfills both the priestly and kingly role.

9 It is significant that both the Levitical priests and the future kings were to function as guardians of the law, and to be themselves in submission to its requirements (Priests: Deut 31:9-13, 24-26; Neh 8:2-3, 7-8; Kings: Deut 17:18-20; 2 Kgs 11:12; 2 Chr 23:11; 2 Kgs 23:1-3; cf. 1 Chr 29:19). In this sense, both institutions had to some degree a shared role.

10 Zech 3:2; Mal 3:1; Gen 16:7-13; 18:17, 20, 22, 26, 33; Judg 6:11, 23; 13:13, 22, etc.

11 The term *šābā'*, "army," was also used to designate the priestly order of the Levites (Num 4:3, 23, 30; 8:24-25). See A. M. Rodriguez, "Significance of the Cultic Language in Daniel 8:9-14," in *Symposium on Daniel* (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), p. 531.

12 William Shea, *Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation* (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1982), pp. 44-53.

13 1 Sam 25:30; 2 Sam 6:21; 1 Kgs 1:35; 14:7; 16:2; 1 Chr 5:2; 11:2; 17:7; 29:22, etc.

14 1 Chr 9:11, 20; 12:27; 2 Chr 31:13; 35:8b; Neh 11:11; Jer 20:1, etc.

15 *Mešawweh* "legislator," comes from the root *sawah*, which conveys the idea of "setting over," "appointing," "determining," "decreeing." The term *mišwah*, "commandment, precept," also comes from that root.

16 Against F. Michaéli, *Le livre de Daniel* (Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, 1959), p. 666 n. vs. 13, who interprets the "prince of the kingdom" as being "the angel in charge of the kingdom of Persia," we may say that this angel is an usurper, that is, not designated by God but as being the spiritual counterpart of the king of this world. We may say the same thing of P. de Menasce, *Daniel* (Bible de Jérusalem, Cerf. Paris, 1978), 1315, n. vs. 13, who thinks that "the Prince of Persia appears [in Dan 10:13] as being one of the protector Angels of the Israel enemy nations," and thinks that this is a "mysterious conflict between the angels."

17 The Greek text renders Dan 10:13: "I left him there, with the prince of the kings of Persia." In this case, Michael would be one of the princes who was in command of the princes engaged in battle.

18 Amsler, pp. 80-81: The role of Satan "does not consist here in pushing men to do evil (cf. 1 Kgs 22:21; 1 Chr 21:1), but in denouncing the sin which could escape God's watching (cf. Job 1:6ff; 2:1ff). His presence in the heavenly court should not cause us any surprise: he looks for banishing far from the Eternal those who are unworthy. Like in a process in the tribunal, the adversary tries to make the judge to acknowledge the well founded of his complaint; on the opposite case, the adversary is the one who is confused. . . , and the accused is rehabilitated."

19 See E. G. White, *Early Writings*, p. 254.

20 The king already knew something about the God of Israel. In Nebuchadnezzar's presence Daniel and his three friends had referred to the God of heaven as being One (Dan 2:28, 45; 3:17), and the king himself referred to the God of the Hebrews also in singular (Dan 2:47).

TREIYER: THE PRIEST-KING ROLE OF THE MESSIAH

21 This point may serve as additional evidence to prove that some of the outer garments of the High Priest (or all), were used over the lesser ones of simple linen. See A. R. Treiyer, *The Day of Atonement and the Heavenly Judgment. From the Pentateuch to Revelation* (Siloam Springs: Creation Enterprises International, 1992), pp. 77-103, 324-327. Because the divine prince appears in his permanent service of intercession in Dan 8, He is not represented there with the typical garments of the Day of Atonement as in the final vision which concludes not only the book, but also the whole role of the heavenly prince (cf. Dan 10:5-6; 12:6-10 = simple linen [*bad*]).

22 The Tigris lay east of Babylon, and the place where Daniel saw the vision was near its entrance into the Persian Gulf, near Susa, the Persian capital.

[This paper has been reformulated from old, unformatted electronic files and may not be identical to the edited version that appeared in print. The original pagination has been maintained, despite the resulting odd page breaks, for ease of scholarly citation. However, scholars quoting this article should use the print version or give the URL.]
Journal of the Adventist Theological Society, 7/1 (Spring 1996): 81-106.
Article copyright © 1996 by Martin T. Pröbstle.

A Linguistic Analysis of Daniel 8:11, 12

Martin T. Pröbstle
Ph.D. Candidate
Andrews University

Introduction

Daniel 8:11-12 is considered one of the most difficult texts in the book of Daniel.¹ It has puzzled scholars because of its intricate syntactic and semantic problems, which in turn have provoked a number of proposals for solving this Gordian knot. Some scholars have tried to make sense out of the traditional divisions of the Masoretic Text (MT) according to its accent system.² Others demarcate sentences differently than the Massoretes, leaving the consonantal text with its word divisions untouched.³ Many scholars, however, suggest textual emendations,⁴ which in one case are seven for vss. 11 and 12.⁵ A fundamental question, then, is whether and to what extent the MT of Daniel 8:11-12 is capable of explanation in linguistic and structural terms.⁶

The purpose of this study is (a) to take a fresh look at the syntactic problems of the MT of Daniel 8:11-12, (b) to propose some solutions, if possible, and (c) finally to outline a syntactic working structure of vss. 9-12 on which basis further investigations can be undertaken.⁷ The MT provides the basis for this study. Our analysis follows a bottom-up process, that is, the study of syntax will precede the study of syntactic structure and the study of semantics, because both structure and semantics are higher in the linguistic hierarchy than syntax.⁸ This study does not attempt to investigate the semantic level, which is reserved for future study.

It may be helpful to present at the outset a preliminary sen-

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

tence division of Daniel 8:9-12. Verse references in this study refer back to this outline:

- 9a *ûmin-hā' aḥat mēhem yāšā' qeren-ḥ aḥat mišš^eṭrāh*
9b *wattigdal-yeter ḥel-hannegeb w^e ḥel-hammizrāh w^e ḥel-haššebî*
10a *wattigdal ḥad-š^ebā' haššamāyim*
10b *wattapēl ḥaršāh min-haššābā' ûmin-hakkôkâbîm*
10c *wattirm^e sēm*
11a *w^eḥad šar-haššābā' higdîl*
11b *ûmimmennû huraym hattāmîd*
11c *w^ehušlak m^ekôn miqdašô*
12a *w^esābā' tinnātēn ḥal-hattāmîd b^epāšaḥ*
12b *w^etašlek ḥmet ḥaršāh*
12c *w^eḥāš^etāh*
12d *w^ehišlîḥāh*

Sentence Demarcations and Problem Areas

The first syntactic question to be asked is, Where do sentences start and end in vss. 11, 12? Sentence demarcations may be easily recognized by *wayyiqtol* and *w^eqatal* verbal forms. These forms usually begin a new sentence.⁹ Our verses show four of these verbal forms, each beginning a new sentence: *w^ehušlak* (11c), *w^etašlek* (12b), *w^eḥāš^etāh* (12c), and *w^ehišlîḥāh* (12d).

According to the Masoretic division of sentences, three of the sentences of this passage do not start with a verbal form (11a, 11b, 12a). It is necessary to investigate whether the words in question may rather belong to the previous sentence.

Verse 11b: ûmimmennû

In the case of *ûmimmennû* (11b), the decision is straightforward. It makes no sense to separate it from 11b, as 11b is syntactically without a problem and *ûmimmennû* with its conjunction does not fit syntactically to the verb *higdîl* of the previous sentence (11a). The other two cases, however, deserve a closer look.

Verse 11a: w^eḥad šar-haššābā' higdîl

Usually *w^eḥad šar-haššābā'* is taken as prepositional object of 11a: "He/It made himself great *up to the prince of the host*." However, the consideration of another syntactic problem, that is, the

PRÖBSTLE: A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF DANIEL 8:11, 12

gender change of verbal forms from feminine in vs. 10 to masculine in vs. 11, opens the issue of sentence demarcation again.

The question is, who is the subject of *higdîl* (11a)? Only two options are available. First, the subject may still be *qeren-ʾ aḥat*, “one horn” (9a). The “horn” is clearly the subject of all the feminine *wayyiqtol* forms in vss. 9b and 10a-c and may be carried on as subject into vs. 11a. Verse 11a would then read: “And even to the prince of the host it [the horn] made itself great.” This option harmonizes with the accentuation of the MT, but one would have to explain why suddenly a masculine verb is used whereas *qeren* (horn) is feminine.

Second, the subject may be *śar-ḥaṣṣābāʾ*, “the prince of the host.” This is the only masculine form in the context which one could consider as a subject for *higdîl* so that gender congruence can be preserved. The second option requires to place a sentence demarcation after *wʿad śar-ḥaṣṣābāʾ* and to regard *higdîl* as a sentence of its own. Only then could “the prince of the host” function as subject of *higdîl*. Verse 11a would then read: “He [the prince of the host] made himself great.” The attractiveness of this suggestion lies in the fact that no gender incongruence occurs. However, the question is whether this suggestion is syntactically valid.

Analysis of *GDL-H*¹⁰ Sentences. An analysis of the sentences in which the verb form *gādal* (grow up, become great) occurs in the hiphil stem (*GDL-H*) helps to decide which option is to be preferred here since this is the verb and stem found in the passage. In the OT 33 *GDL-H* sentences are found, apart from Daniel 8:11.¹¹ These *GDL-H* samples show the following semantically relevant, syntactic features:¹²

1. With a direct object; transitive-causative meaning of *GDL-H*: “To make something great”
 - a. Human subject (negative): Amos 8:5; Ps 41:9[10]; Eccl 2:4.
 - b. Divine subject (always positive): Gen 19:19; 1 Sam 12:24; 2 Sam 22:51=Ps 18:50[51] (*ketib*); Isa 9:3[2]; 28:29; 42:21; Ezek 24:9; Ps 138:2.
2. With infinitive sentence as semantic predicate:¹³ “(To do) great things”
 - a. Human subject (negative): Joel 2:20.
 - b. Divine subject (positive): Joel 2:21; Ps 126:2, 3.
 - c. Inanimate subject (positive): 1 Chr 22:5.¹⁴

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

3. Without direct object; reflexive meaning:¹⁵ “To make oneself great,” often by exalting oneself or boasting

a. Human subject: 1 Sam 20:41; Jer 48:26, 42; Ezek 35:13; Obad 12; Zeph 2:8, 10; Pss 35:26; 38:16[17]; 55:12[13]; Job 19:5; Eccl 1:16,¹⁶ Lam 1:9; Dan 8:4, 8, 25.

b. Divine subject: no occurrence.

The above organization of occurrences indicates that in determining the semantic meaning of a *GDL-H* expression, (a) the absence or presence of the direct object plays a major role, and (b) the subject plays a minor role.¹⁷ With a direct object *the expression* has a transitive meaning; without a direct object it has reflexive meaning. It is interesting to note that the activity expressed by a *GDL-H* phrase with a human subject is always negative in character (with the possible exception of 1 Sam 20:41), whereas with a divine subject it always designates a positive activity.

The syntactic-semantic features of *GDL-H* sentences without direct objects are of special interest to us since Daniel 8:11a belongs to that category. In all cases where a *GDL-H* expression takes no direct object, the subject is human. The action itself is of a negative character. Fifteen out of 16 times it designates the making great of oneself—probably implying boasting, exalting or magnifying oneself—which may be a general activity with no obvious relation to someone else, or a specific activity directed against someone.¹⁸ The one who is negatively affected by this activity is marked by the preposition *‘al*.¹⁹ The preposition *‘ad* with a *GDL-H* expression is only used in Daniel 8:8, 11 where it denotes the extent to which one makes oneself great.²⁰

Syntactic Place of *higdil* in Daniel 8:11a. The above syntactic-semantic analysis of *GDL-H* sentences lays the ground for determining the sentence demarcation at the beginning of Daniel 8:11. For several reasons, the separating of the expression “unto the prince of the host” from *higdil* and the taking of “the prince of the host” as the subject of *higdil* is problematic:

1. To take “the prince of the host,” which probably refers to a heavenly or divine being,²¹ as the subject of *GDL-H* here is contrary to all the other 16 examples where a human being is the subject of a *GDL-H* sentence without an object.

2. If the *GDL-H* expression takes no object, the activity it refers

PRÖBSTLE: A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF DANIEL 8:11, 12

to is 15 out of 16 times a negative one (“making oneself great,” “exalting oneself,” “boasting”). Such an activity cannot be harmonized with the noble figure of “the prince of the host” as agent.

3. In Daniel 8, the *GDL*-H expression occurs three more times beside vs. 11 (vss. 4, 8, 25), and two times with the Qal stem (vss. 9, 10). All designate a negative activity. In view of the usage of *GDL* in the immediate context of Daniel 8:11, it seems stretched to suggest that *GDL*-H in 8:11 involves a positive connotation.

4. Three of six occurrences of *GDL* in Daniel 8 appear clearly in connection with “the little horn” symbol (vss. 9, 10, 25). The subject of *higdîl* in vs. 11a may then very well be “the little horn.”

5. The occurrences of the verbal root *GDL* in the vision of Daniel 8 line up to form an intentional literary *crescendo* of boastful activity by adding stronger dimensions to *GDL* (marked by italics).²²

8:4 “He made himself great (hiphil *gdl*)”

8:8 “The male goat made himself great (hiphil *gdl*) *exceedingly* (literally, up to very).”

8:9 “It grew (qal *gdl*) *great toward the south, toward the east, and toward the beauty.*”

8:10 “It grew (qal *gdl*) *up to the host of heaven.*”

8:11 “*Even unto the prince of the host* he made himself great (hiphil *gdl*).”

If the phrase “even unto the prince of the host” does not belong to 11a, this literary *crescendo* would come to an abrupt end in vs. 11, with no further qualifications of *higdîl*. Furthermore, if the prince of the host is the subject of *higdîl* (11a), the *crescendo* of presumption would be disturbed by an occurrence of the *GDL* expression which would denote a *positive* activity.²³

6. Since the prepositional phrase with conjunction (*w^ead šar-haššābā*) cannot syntactically belong to the end of vs. 10, one must postulate that this phrase takes up the verbal idea of 10a (without mentioning the verb again) by paralleling the prepositional phrase *ad-š^ebā haššamayim*. The sequence of three *wayyiqtol* forms in vs. 10, however, implies—by nature of the narrative *wayyiqtol* form—that each sentence is functioning on the same structural level.²⁴ Therefore, a resumption of the verbal idea in vs.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

11a by *w^e‘ad śar-haššābā’* does not appear possible without mentioning a *GDL*-H expression again.

7. The only other occurrences of the verbal root *GDL* in the book of Daniel outside chapter 8 appear in Daniel 11:36, 37. Daniel 11:36 seems intertextually important for Daniel 8:11, 12, because the lexical links between the two texts are rather strong. Apart from the *GDL* verbal form, the verbal roots *‘SH*, *RWM* and *‘LH* occur in both passages.²⁵ Therefore, it may be a hint for the meaning of *higdīl* in Daniel 8:11 that the two Hithpael forms of *GDL* in Daniel 11:36, 37 designate an activity which is extremely negative in character.

In conclusion, it seems syntactically and semantically highly problematic to demarcate another sentence after *w^e‘ad śar-haššābā’*. Thus, vs. 11a should read *w^e‘ad śar-haššābā’ higdīl*, “even unto the prince of the host he/it made himself great.” The subject of *higdīl* is ellipsed, but is *qeren* in vs. 9, which is the subject of all *wayyiqtol* forms in vss. 9 and 10 and, thus, carried over as subject (understood) to vs. 11a.²⁶

Verse 12a: *w^esābā’ tinnātēn ‘al-hattāmīd b^epāša’*

The second problem of sentence demarcation arises from the placement of *w^esābā’* (“and a host”). J. J. Collins points to the fact that “both the meaning and the placement of the word for host, *wšb’*, have baffled commentators and given rise to a multitude of proposed solutions, none of which has commanded a consensus.”²⁷ Of this multitude of proposed solutions,²⁸ three different kinds try to do justice to the syntax of the MT: (1) “A host” is the subject of *tinnātēn*,²⁹ (2) “A host” is the direct object of *tinnātēn*,³⁰ and (3) “A host” belongs to vs. 11c and *tinnātēn* starts vs. 12a.³¹ The first two ways of understanding retain the traditional Masoretic verse and sentence demarcation, whereas the latter ignores this division.

The suggestion that “a host” is the direct object of *tinnātēn* has to be linguistically abandoned. The Niphal stem of the verbal root *NTN* (*nātan*, give, put, set) has *passive meaning* (*NTN*-N, “was given”). Thus, 12a is a passive sentence. The passive sentence is a transformation or transposition of the corresponding active sentence. In general, in transformations from active to passive voice the direct object of the active sentence becomes the subject in the

PRÖBSTLE: A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF DANIEL 8:11, 12

passive sentence, the prepositional phrases are retained, and the subject of the active sentence is dropped in the passive sentence or becomes the so-called logical subject of a passive verb by means of a prepositional word group with the preposition *b^e*, *l^e*, or *min*.

It is recognizable that, due to the active-passive transformation of the direct object into the subject, a passive sentence has no direct object.³² Thus, the idea that “a host” may be the direct object of the passive verbal form *tinnātēn* fails. A brief look at the *NTN-N* sentences in the OT confirms this general linguistic observation: no direct object appears in any of the 82 *NTN-N* sentences.

The decision of whether *šābā'* (host) is subject of vs. 12a or belongs to vs. 11c is far more difficult. After laying out the arguments, it seems advisable to draw only a tentative conclusion.

Syntactic Place and Grammatical Form of *šābā'* First, it is necessary to examine whether the syntactic place of *šābā'* and its grammatical form allow it to function as the subject of *tinnātēn*. Whenever in a *NTN-N* sentence a word occurs without a preceding preposition, this word functions as the subject.³³ Even an indeterminate subject (a subject without article or pronominal suffix and no proper name) in the initial position in a sentence is found eight times in *NTN-N* sentences.³⁴ It then becomes apparent that the indeterminate *šābā'* in the initial position in Daniel 8:12a is not an impossible phenomenon in the syntax of *NTN-N* sentences.

The problem usually pointed out with this interpretation is the gender incongruence between subject and verb.³⁵ The noun *šābā'* is usually regarded as masculine, but the verb *tinnātēn* is feminine in gender. Thus, vs. 12a displays an apparent gender incongruence. Two considerations, however, may explain the gender incongruence.

First, the gender of the verb form *NTN-N* and its subject do not always agree. An examination of the 82 *NTN-N* sentences finds three possible cases of gender incongruence: Leviticus 19:20,³⁶ Numbers 26:62,³⁷ and Joshua 24:33.³⁸ Therefore, gender incongruence between *šābā'* and *tinnātēn* in Daniel 8:12 would not be singular in a *NTN-N* sentence.

Second, while the feminine form of the verb is indeed unusual with *saba*, there is a precedent at Isaiah 40:2.³⁹ Daniel 8:12 may therefore well be a second example for the feminine gender of *šābā'*.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Further, the plural formation of *šābā'* is almost always the feminine *s^eba ôṭ*, which may also indicate a feminine gender of *šābā'*.⁴⁰ The argument of gender incongruence, therefore, loses its force.⁴¹

The Subject of Daniel 8:12b-d. A more serious difficulty with the view that “a host” is the subject of the singular feminine *tinnātēn* is the fact that vs. 12 consists of a sequence of four verbal forms. The four verbs of vs. 12 all have the same gender and number: feminine, singular. Further, no subject is introduced in clauses b-d. One would, therefore, expect that the subject of the feminine singular verb in vs. 12a is also the subject of the singular feminine verbs in vs. 12b-d. Thus “a host” may not only be regarded as the subject of vs. 12a but also as subject of the following three clauses.⁴² The initial position of “a host” in the sentence would strengthen this view, indicating focus of topicalization. That is, since the horn was the subject of the verbs in vss. 9-11b, a new subject or topic may be introduced by placing *šābā'* in the first position of the sentence in vs. 12a. The word *qeren* seems too far away (vs. 9a) to be understood as the ellipsed subject of vs. 12b-d. *Šābā'*, as subject of vs. 12a-d, would then differ in meaning from *šābā'* in vss. 10a, 10b, and 11a, designating a counter-host which is hostile against the truth.⁴³

This interpretation would present no problem if it were not for the lexical relation between Daniel 8:12 and 8:24. The verbal forms *ʿSH* and *šLḤ-H* in vs. 12c-d occur once again, in different sequence, in the interpretation of the vision in Daniel 8:24d-e.⁴⁴ This establishes a textual and thematic relation between Daniel 8:12c-d and 24d-e.⁴⁵ In Daniel 8:24, the subject of *ʿSH* and *šLḤ-H* is the “king” (vs. 23), which is the interpretive correspondent to the horn in the vision. This may indeed be the interpretive key for identifying the subject in Daniel 8:12. The subject of *ʿSH* and *šLḤ-H* in Daniel 8:12 is the horn, just as the subject of *ʿSH* and *šLḤ-H* in Daniel 8:24 is the king. Therefore, the subject of the *yiqtol* form *w^etašlek* (vs. 12b) must be the horn too. And, because the *yiqtol* form *w^etašlek* is linked by the conjunction *waw* with the *yiqtol* form *tinnātēn* (vs. 12), the subject of *tinnātēn* should also be understood as the horn.⁴⁶ In other words, the sequence of the verbal forms in vs. 12 together with the interpretive key of vs. 24 suggest that the subject of *tinnātēn* is the horn.

PRÖBSTLE: A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF DANIEL 8:11, 12

If the horn is the subject of *tinnātēn* in vs. 12a, then what is the function of *šābā'*? Two different answers present themselves: (1) *šābā'* belongs to vs. 11c and is part of the object; or (2) *šābā'* is the grammatical subject in vs. 12a, whereas the horn is the logical subject of this passive clause.⁴⁷ The latter explanation has some credit. The activities described in vss. 9-12 can all be attributed to the horn which is introduced in vs. 9a. In the passive sentences of this section (11c, 12a, and perhaps 11b) the grammatical subject is not the horn. But the logical subject in those passive sentences—the entity who is the understood agent, but who is not explicitly mentioned—is nevertheless the horn. Thus, it may be that in vs. 12a *šābā'* is the grammatical subject of the passive *tinnātēn*, and the horn is the implied logical subject. In other words, it is the horn, as logical subject, who gives a host and then functions naturally as the subject of the next three clauses.

An Intratextual-Stylistic Argument. Another argument brought forth in this discussion on the grammatical function of *w^ešābā'* is of an intratextual-stylistic nature. The question of one of the holy ones in vs. 13 puts *w^eqodeš* and *w^ešābā'* together. If *w^ešābā'* belongs to vs. 11c, a very similar construction occurs there: *miqdāšô w^ešābā'*. That both times *šābā'* is indeterminate stresses the link between *w^eqodeš w^ešābā'* (vs. 13) and *miqdāšô w^ešābā'* (vs. 11).⁴⁸

However, this stylistic argument seems not to give credit to the semantic function of the question in vs. 13. The different content parts of this question take up language from vss. 9-12: *hattāmîd* from vss. 11b and 12a, *happēša'* from vs. 12a, *qodeš* from vs. 11c,⁴⁹ *šābā'* from vss. 10a, 10b, 11a, and 12a, and *mir-mās* from vs. 10c. The combination of the root *RMS* (trample) with *šābā'* as found in vs. 13 is thus only found in vs. 10c, where the pronominal suffix (them) attached to *RMS* refers to *šābā'* and *kôkâbîm*. The lexical links of *w^ešābā'* *mir-mās* in vs. 13 to vs. 10b-c seem thus to be stronger than the proposed link between *w^eqodeš w^ešābā'* (vs. 13) and a supposed *miqdāšô w^ešābā'* (vs. 11c).

Semantic Meaning of *šābā'* in Daniel 8:12a. The syntactic-stylistic analysis so far has not been able to decide conclusively on the question of the syntactic function of *w^ešābā'*, though tentatively it may be regarded as the grammatical subject of vs. 12a. It is

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

important, therefore, to pursue a brief semantic investigation to identify the relationship between *ṣābā'* in vs. 12 and the other occurrences of this word in the immediate context. Such an analysis shows the interrelation of semantics and questions of syntax.

Ṣābā' occurs five times in vss. 10-13. In vss. 10, 11, and 13 it refers to an entity which is negatively affected by the activity of the horn. In fact, *saba* falls a victim of the horn's aggression. In vs. 10 *ṣābā'* is connected with heaven. It is called "the host of the heaven," and some of the host are thrown down to earth, implying a heavenly setting of the host. In vs. 11 the host in the construct chain, "the prince of the host," refers again to a heavenly setting of the host. The lexical link between vs. 10b-c, namely, some of the host are caused to fall to earth and the horn trampled (*RMS*) them, and "a host of trampling (*RMS*)" in vs. 13 suggests that the same host is in view in vs. 13. The absence of the article before host in vs. 13 seems to suggest that only that part of the host of heaven which was caused to fall to earth is meant.

What host, then, is referred to in vs. 12? The uniform usage of host in vss. 10-13 in reference to the host of heaven and the grammatical similarity between *w^eṣābā'* in vs. 12 and 13 lead to the conclusion that *w^eṣābā'* in vs. 12 refers to the same entity as the other occurrences of *ṣābā'* in vss. 10-13.⁵⁰ The indetermination of *ṣābā'* in vs. 12 has then the same function as the indetermination of *ṣābā'* in vs. 13. That is to say, that *ṣābā'* without the article refers back to that part of the host which the horn caused to fall down (vs. 10b-c).⁵¹

Taking *ṣābā'* in vs. 12 with vs. 11 would therefore fit the semantic meaning of the other usages of *ṣābā'* ("the foundation of his sanctuary and a host were thrown down by the horn"). However, the question has to be asked how the throwing down of a host (vs. 11c with *w^eṣābā'*) is different from the falling down of some of the host (vs. 10b) and their being trampled (vs. 10b), or why the writer would restate at vs. 11c the same idea as in vs. 10b. A satisfying answer is not yet in sight.

How would vs. 12a read if *ṣābā'*—some of the host of heaven—is regarded as grammatical subject of *tinnātēn*? This question is interrelated with another one which has to be pursued first: What function do the prepositions in vs. 12a have?

PRÖBSTLE: A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF DANIEL 8:11, 12

The Prepositions in Daniel 8:12a. Another step in understanding the syntax and the meaning of vs. 12a is the identification of the function of the prepositions *ʿal* and *be*, for which several different translations have been given. A closer look at the usage of *ʿal* and *be* in sentences with the root *NTN* helps in determining their function in Daniel 8:12a.

The Preposition ʿal. In *NTN-N* sentences the preposition *ʿal* occurs apart from Daniel 8:12 two times (2 Kgs 22:7; Isa 29:12). In both texts *ʿal* is followed by a concrete noun referring to a human being,⁵² and the preposition is used in a locational sense. These references do not help in clarifying the meaning of *ʿal* in Daniel 8:12.

The sentences with the root *NTN* in the Qal stem (*NTN-Q*) may shed some light on the prepositional phrases in vs. 12a since prepositional phrases are not affected by an active-passive transformation and thus retain the same function. An analysis of the *NTN-Q* sentences shows the following usage of the preposition *ʿal*: (1) simple locational sense (“on, over”),⁵³ (2) metaphorical locational sense (“control over,” *ʿal-yad* “under the control of”),⁵⁴ (3) indicating disadvantage or advantage for someone affected by the activity of giving (“against,” “for,” “on behalf of”),⁵⁵ or, (4) the fixed construction *ʿal-pî* (“at the command of”).⁵⁶

The preposition *ʿal* in vs. 12a may function in a metaphorical-locational sense, meaning “control over” (“the horn/a host is given control over the *tāmîd*”) or it may indicate disadvantage, meaning “against” (“the horn/a host is given against the *tāmîd*”).⁵⁷ In either case *šābāʾ* as subject would be opposed to the *tāmîd*.

The suggestion that the preposition *ʿal* means “together with”⁵⁸ or “in addition to”⁵⁹ resulting in the translation, “a host was given over in addition to the *tamid*,” does not take into account the usage of *ʿal* in *NTN*-sentences. An analysis of usages of *ʿal* in the book of Daniel—not only of the combination *NTN* + *ʿal*—reveals another possible function of *ʿal* in Daniel 8:12a. The preposition *ʿal* occurs 133 times in the book of Daniel (64 times in the Hebrew sections and 69 times in the Aramaic section).⁶⁰ In 15 instances *ʿal* has the function of reference (“with regard to,” “in reference to,” “concerning”).⁶¹ Daniel was aware that *ʿal* could be used in a referential function. This means for Daniel 8:12a that the

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

preposition *ʿal* may have referential function, but only if the prepositional phrase with *ʿal* is identified as optional syntagm (as is the prepositional phrase with *beth*), and not as a syntactic combination of *NTN+ʿal*.

To sum up: The preposition *ʿal* in Daniel 8:12a may either be used in a metaphorical-locational sense (“control over”), or with the semantic function of disadvantage (“against”), or in a referential sense (“with regard to”).

The Preposition beth. The function of the preposition *beth* in Daniel 8:12 (*b^epāša^ʿ*) is difficult to interpret. Jenni lists Daniel 8:12 among 70 occurrences of the preposition *beth* (out of 15,570) of which a lexicographic investigation is not possible because of textual corruption or other exegetical difficulties.⁶²

The profile of the *beth* function in *NTN-N* sentences presents itself as following: (1) locational sense (“in,” “on”),⁶³ (2) locational sense of *beth* followed by *yad* “hand,” in figurative sense meaning “control/power/authority,”⁶⁴ and (3) circumstantial sense (as *beth instrumenti*,⁶⁵ *beth pretii*,⁶⁶ and *beth causae*).⁶⁷ The preposition in vs. 12 finds no functional correspondence in any of the other occurrences in *NTN-N* sentences.

The profile of the function of *beth* in *NTN-Q* sentences provides more insight. The preposition *beth* functions (1) in a circumstantial sense (as *beth essentiae*,⁶⁸ *beth instrumenti*,⁶⁹ *beth gesticulationis*,⁷⁰ *beth pretii*⁷¹), (2) in a local sense,⁷² (3) in a temporal sense,⁷³ and (4) in a modal sense.⁷⁴

Statistically, the noun following the preposition *beth* in a sentence with *NTN* root in the Qal or Niphal stem is, in 98.8% of its occurrences, either concrete (person or thing) or a local or temporal term.⁷⁵ Only in the modal sense is the noun following *beth* an abstract or a nominalized sentence predicate. In *NTN-Q* sentences, this modal usage of *beth* is found three times (Gen 45:2; Isa 61:8; Hos 13:11), that is, 1.2% of all *beth* occurrences in *NTN*-sentences.⁷⁶

The preposition *beth* in Daniel 8:12 must be modal, because an abstract noun follows it (“transgression”). It is best interpreted, therefore, with the modal function followed by an abstract of a negative ethical quality. This function may then be translated as “a host/the horn will be given *ʿal-hattāmîd* in transgression,” meaning

PRÖBSTLE: A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF DANIEL 8:11, 12

that either the subject (a host or the horn) is in the condition of transgression or—adverbially understood—the activity is carried out “transgressionally,” that is rebelliously or sinfully by intention.

Summary. It is best to argue that *šābā*’ refers in all four instances in Daniel 8:9-14 to an entity under oppression by the horn. Regarding the function of the prepositions in vs. 12a it can be stated that (1) *‘al* is used in referential (“with regard to”) or metaphorical-locational sense (“control over”), or with the semantic function of disadvantage (“against”); and (2) *beth* is used in a modal sense (subject in condition of transgression, or “rebelliously”).

There remains the ambiguity of the syntactic place of *w^ešābā*’, whether it should be placed at the end of vs. 11 or whether it should be regarded as the grammatical subject of vs. 12. Further semantic analysis on *šābā*’, *tāmîd* and *pāšā^c* is needed to clarify this ambiguity. However, what has become clear at this stage is that no textual emendations are necessary. The MT is indeed somewhat difficult, but it seems not beyond explanation. After the sentence demarcations in Daniel 8:11-12 have been discussed, the syntactic structure of vss. 9-12 can be outlined and explained.⁷⁷

Syntactic Structure of Daniel 8:9-12.

Two problem areas—the shift of verbal conjugations and the shift of gender—seem to be at the same time the two main structural features on the syntactic level.

The twelve verbal forms in Daniel 8:9-12 display two conjugation changes from perfect to imperfect (9a-b; 11c-12a) and two changes from imperfect to perfect (10c-11a; 12b-c). The flow of verbal conjugations runs as follows: Vs. 9 starts off with a non-verbal phrase in the initial position in the sentence, which means that the verbal form of *YŠ*’ is conjugated in the perfect form to continue the vision narrative of vs. 8. After the perfect *yāsā*’ four *wayyiqtol* forms follow in usual narrative sequence (vss. 9b-10c).⁷⁸

The shift to a *qatal* form in vs. 11a is caused by another nonverbal phrase in the initial position in a new sentence. To continue the past aspect of the vision narrative after *w^e‘ad šar-haššābā*’, the writer had to use a *qatal* form. In vs. 11b there is again a

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

qatal form (*huraym*) caused by the sentence-initial position of *mimmennû* in a new clause.

Vs. 11c starts with a *w^eqatal* form (*w^ehušlak*). From the viewpoint of narrative sequence one expects a *wayyiqtol* form. Why does a *w^eqatal* form appear instead? A *w^eqatal* after a *wayyiqtol* does not express succession.⁷⁹ Rather, it designates a repeated or durative action in the past.⁸⁰ Thus, the throwing down of the foundation of the sanctuary—and of a host if one takes *šābā'* (vs. 12 a) to belong to vs. 11c—are not singular events. The horn continuously attacks the sanctuary and the host.

Beyond this distinctive aspect, we note that the use of a *w^eqatal* form instead of a *wayyiqtol* form serves as a clue that the author might have intentionally chosen perfect or imperfect forms for the sake of structural balance. In vs. 9 one perfect form is balanced by one imperfect form. The three imperfect forms of vs. 10 are balanced by three perfect forms in vs. 11. It is not surprising, then, that two perfect forms at the end of vs. 12 balance the two imperfect forms of the first two sentences in vs. 12.

Much more interesting is the use of a *yiqtol* form in vs. 12a. A *wayyiqtol* form (*wattinnātēn*) would have served the perfect/imperfect pattern and continued the vision narrative from vs. 11. However, a *yiqtol* form with future time reference interrupts the narrative flow of vss. 9-11. The following *w^eyiqtol* form (12b) is sequential.⁸¹ The two *w^eqatal* forms in vs. 12c-d are also sequential and express a future action subsequent and consequent to the former two actions in vs. 12.⁸² One may ask why the author did not use two *w^eyiqtol* instead of *w^eqatal* forms. The answer is again twofold: obviously the author wanted to balance the imperfects with perfects, and by the *w^eqatal* forms he indicates the continuous succeeding and prospering of the horn.

Thus, the balance of perfect and imperfect forms betrays the author's intentional arrangement. Only between vs. 11 and vs. 12 is there a discontinuity in tense.

An almost similar arrangement is found with the gender forms of the verbs (see above). Vs. 9 introduces the basic principle of gender balance with one masculine and one feminine verb, both having the horn as subject. There is a perfect balance of gender until the end of vs. 11, and, like the pattern of perfect/imperfect forms,

PRÖBSTLE: A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF DANIEL 8:11, 12

vs. 12 is separated from vss. 9-11 in that all verbal forms are feminine. A reason for this gender change is not readily apparent. An indication is obtained by the fact that the verbal roots *ʕSH* and *ʕLH* occur in the vision feminine in gender (8:12), whereas in the interpretation they are masculine in gender (8:24), though in both texts they refer to the same subject. Thus, the masculine verb form may refer to the reality behind the symbol “horn,”⁸³ or the gender change has merely structural function.

Summary and Outlook

The results of our linguistic, syntactic study of Daniel 8:9-12 may be summarized by means of the following chart which displays the pattern of (a) the perfect and imperfect verb forms, (b) the gender of the verbs, and (c) the line of demarcation in the aspect of tense:

9a *qatal* m.

9b *wayyiqtol* fem.

10a *wayyiqtol* fem.

10b *wayyiqtol* fem.

10c *wayyiqtol* fem.

11a *qatal* m.

11b *qatal* m.

11c *w^eqatal* m.

12a *yiqtol* fem.

12b *w^eyiqtol* fem.

12c *w^eqatal* fem.

12d *w^eqatal* fem.

It seems that at least as many questions have been left unaddressed as have been solved by this study. In conclusion, some implications of the syntactic structure are pointed out as pointers for further investigation:

First, the non-verbal elements in the initial position of clauses are structurally significant. For example, in verse 11a and b, the phrases “prince of the host” and “from him,” are located in the initial position and thereby highlight the activities of the horn as

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

being directed *even* against the “prince of the host,” in comparison to vs. 10 where “the host of heaven” in general was affected by the horn.

Secondly, the interruption of the narrative flow between vss. 11 and 12 is significant. More attention needs to be given to the time aspect of vs. 12. The tense in vs. 12 is indeed “puzzling,”⁸⁴ but only a few scholars have tried to wrestle with this issue.⁸⁵

At this stage a hypothesis based on text-grammatical considerations may be outlined.⁸⁶ Daniel 8:9-11 shows typical features of narrative speech (as does 8:1-8). The central verb form in narrative texts is the consecutive imperfect *wayyiqtol* (vss. 9b-10c). Secondary is the perfect *qatal* (vss. 9a, 11a-c).

Whereas vss. 9-11 is thus a narrative text, vs. 12 belongs to the category of discursive text. Verse 12 shows typical features of discursive speech. The main verb form in discursive texts is the imperfect *yiqtol* (vs. 12a-b), and the secondary verb form is the consecutive perfect *w^eqatal* (vs. 12c-d).

There may be a possible explanation in the text why vs. 12 shows the features of a discursive text. Verse 13a reports that Daniel heard a holy one speaking, but what was said is apparently not recorded. Rather, in vs. 13b a second holy one asks the first one a question which is reported in the rest of vs. 13. My hypothesis is that vs. 12 constitutes the discursive speech of the first holy one, which Daniel heard speaking. Besides the discursive nature of vs. 12—by itself a strong argument—other reasons may support this proposal:

(1) The *wayyiqtol* form in vs. 13a does not necessarily imply that vs. 13a follows vs. 12 in a logical or temporal sense, as there is no text-grammatical connection between the past consecutive *wayyiqtol* of vs. 13a and the future consecutive *w^eqatal* of vs. 12d. *Wāʾ ešm^eāh* may even be translated as a pluperfect: “*And I had heard* a holy one speaking.”⁸⁷

(2) The only discursive texts found in Daniel 8 are angelic speeches (vss. 13, 14, 19-26).⁸⁸

(3) The same angel uttering vs. 12 would give the answer in vs. 14. The verb of vs. 14b is *w^enišdaq*, a *w^eqatal* form, which resumes the *w^eqatal* forms in vs. 12c-d. This would make sense if the same holy one would speak.

PRÖBSTLE: A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF DANIEL 8:11, 12

(4) Verse 12 may not be visualized as easily as vss. 9-11 are. This concurs with the impression that vss. 9-11 are part of Daniel's description of the vision, whereas vs. 12 may belong to an audition.⁸⁹

As a result, the thematic structure of Daniel 8:9-12 is marked with a specific high point: the true peak of the activities of the horn is the attack against the prince of the host (vs. 11) and not the activities mentioned in vs. 12. The *crescendo* of boastful activities—also marked by the recurring verbal root *GDL* (vss. 4, 8, 9, 10, and 11)—runs over the earthly dimension (vs. 9), and the attack against the host of heaven (vs. 10), and culminates in the ultimate attack against the prince of the host (vs. 11).

Thirdly, vss. 9-11 and 12 are packed with activity. In comparison with the many finite verbs in these verses, it is striking that only one finite verb appears in the following two verses: *w^enišdaq*. *W^enišdaq* seems to describe the (heavenly) reaction to the activities of the horn. Is it possible that *nišdaq* in vs. 14 takes care of every negative activity described in vss. 9-12? The question in vs. 13, which takes up terminology of vss. 9-12 without using a finite verb, strengthens this impression.

Furthermore, *w^enišdaq* is a *w^eqatal* form, which resumes the *w^eqatal* forms in vs. 12c-d. This may thereby express the consequence of the activities described in vs. 12. This may also mean that the activity referred to by *w^enišdaq* is a continuous activity which begins at a specific point in time in the future.⁹⁰

Endnotes

1 See, e.g., the assessments of Robert H. Charles *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1929), p. 204: "These verses [Dan 8:11-13] form one of the most difficult passages in Daniel owing to the corruptions of the text"; John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1993), p. 326: "the text [vs. 12a] is very difficult here"; and James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1927), p. 335: "11.12 constitute *crescendo* the most difficult short passage of the bk." whereas "11 presents less difficulty of the two." See also André Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel* (Atlanta, GA: Knox, 1979), p. 163; and Rainer Stahl, *Von Weltengagement zu Weltüberwindung: Theologische Positionen im Danielbuch*, Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology (Kampen: Pharos, 1994), pp. 173-174.

2 See, e.g., Gerhard F. Hasel, "The 'Little Horn,' the Heavenly Sanctuary

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

and the Time of the End: A Study of Daniel 8:9-14," in *Symposium on Daniel: Introductory and Exegetical Studies*, ed. Frank B. Holbrook, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, vol. 2 (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), pp. 400-420; Bernhard Hasslberger, *Hoffnung in der Bedrängnis: Eine formkritische Untersuchung zu Dan 8 und 10-12*, Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament, no. 4 (St. Ottilien: EOS, 1977), pp. 8-9; Carl Friedrich Keil, *Biblical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, transl. M. G. Easton (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1872; reprint, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1968), pp. 297-301 (page references are to reprint edition); H. C. Leupold, *Exposition of Daniel* (N.p.: Wartburg Press, 1949; reprint, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1969), pp. 347-350 (page references are to reprint edition); Gerhard Maier, *Der Prophet Daniel*, Wuppertaler Studienbibel (Wuppertal: Brockhaus, 1982), p. 305; Stephen R. Miller, *Daniel*, New American Commentary, vol. 18 (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1994), pp. 226-228.

3 John E. Goldingay, *Daniel*, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 30 (Dallas, TX: Word, 1989), pp. 195, 197-198 following LXX.

4 See, e.g., Aage Bentzen, *Daniel*, 2d ed., Handbuch zum Alten Testament (Tübingen: Mohr, 1952), p. 56; Charles, pp. 207-209; Harold Louis Ginsberg, *Studies in the Book of Daniel*, Texts and Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, no. 14 (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1948), p. 54; Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel*, Anchor Bible, vol. 23 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1978), p. 226; Kurt Marti, *Das Buch Daniel*, Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament (Tübingen: Mohr, 1901), p. 59; Montgomery, p. 337; Norman W. Porteous, *Das Danielbuch*, Das Alte Testament Deutsch, vol. 23 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), p. 97. Another emendation of the MT is to regard vss. 11-12a as later interpolation. See Jürgen-Christian Lebram, *Das Buch Daniel*, Zürcher Bibelkommentare: Altes Testament, vol. 23 (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1984), p. 95.

5 G. F. Moore, "Daniel viii. 9-14," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 15 (1896): 195-197.

6 It has to be expected that a linguistic and structural analysis of Daniel 8:11-12 may also affect the understanding of these difficult verses. In so far the remark by D. L. Smith-Christopher needs to be challenged that "the difficulties of a precise translation (and whether changes must be made in Hebrew). . . do not make substantial changes in how this verse is understood." Daniel L. Smith-Christopher, "The Book of Daniel," *The New Interpreter's Bible* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1996), 7:114.

7 This article is preliminary in so far as it is based on some initial investigations which lay the foundation for a more comprehensive research process. Further study—in line of the issues and questions raised in the article, and beyond—will be pursued and may lead me to abandon, to correct, or to confirm the results presented here. Any suggestions, corrections and helpful remarks concerning this topic are therefore more than welcome.

8 For the levels of linguistic analysis used in general linguistics, see John Lyons, *Semantics*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 2:373-378. Lyons distinguishes at least three levels: the phonological, the syntactic, and the semantic, with the possible extension by the morphological level as bridge between syntax and phonology in particular languages. *Ibid.*, p. 373. See also Geoffrey Leech, *Semantics* (Harmondsworth, England: Penguin, 1974), pp. 178-181. Leech suggests, to "stop trying to fit semantic analysis into the mould [sic]

PRÖBSTLE: A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF DANIEL 8:11, 12

of syntactic units like nouns, verbs, etc., and instead look for units [[127]] and structures which operate on the semantic level. This is not to ignore that such semantic categories will have correlations with syntactic units and constructions: in fact, the simplicity of the storable relations between syntax and semantics is an important consideration in evaluating a semantic description as part of the total description of a language." Ibid., pp. 126-127. For different levels of linguistic description of Biblical Hebrew, see Wolfgang Richter, *Grundlagen einer hebräischen Grammatik*, 3 vols. (St. Ottilien: EOS, 1978-1980), 1:14-21. For a brief description of the linguistic relation between syntax and lexical semantics in Biblical Hebrew, see Martin T. Pröbstle, "The Advantages of W. Richter's Approach for a Lexical Description of Biblical Hebrew," *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 21 (1995): 98-105. These studies show that syntactic analysis comes before semantic analysis—though there is no question that syntax and semantics are to some extent interrelated. Structure may be found on different levels and depends on the elements which constitute the structure. Elements of structure may be anything which shows an organized pattern, e.g. words, word groups, phrases, sentences, text units, etc. Thus, a syntactic structure builds upon and flows out of the analysis of the syntactic level.

9 The starting-point for the demarcation of sentences is the syntactic unit of the sentence, which is constituted by its words or word groups. To isolate sentences those conjunctions, modal words, and negations are used which function on the sentence level. For the demarcation of sentences see Richter, 1:7, 15, 19-20, 24-25, 186 and 3:7-9. See also Wolfgang Richter, *Untersuchungen zur Valenz althebräischer Verben, vol. 1, RK, Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache des Alten Testament*, no. 23 (St. Ottilien: EOS, 1985), pp. 8-9, 32-33.

10 The following short form is used throughout this article: A triconsonantal root is written in block letters and the stem in which it appears is abbreviated by one block letter which is connected to the verbal root by a hyphen.

11 For this study, in order to obtain all occurrences of the different words, the following works were consulted: Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament*, 3d ed. by Walter Baumgartner and Johann Jakob Stamm (Leiden: Brill, 1967-1995); Abraham Even-Shoshan, *A New Concordance of the Bible: Thesaurus of the Language of the Bible, Hebrew and Aramaic, Roots, Words, Proper Names, Phrases and Synonyms* (Jerusalem: "Kiryat Sefer," 1990); and Gerhard Lisowski, *Konkordanz zum hebräischen Alten Testament*, 2d ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1981).

12 See also Mosis for a similar observation which confirms my analysis. J. Bergmann, Helmer Ringgren and R. Mosis, "gadal," *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament*, eds. G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1970-), 1:942-943. Cf. Ernst Jenni, "gdöl," *Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament*, eds. Ernst Jenni and Claus Westermann (München: Kaiser, 1971-1976), 1:405.

13 In these sentences a desemantized main verb *GDL-H* is followed by an infinitive which designates the actual activity. In other words, *GDL-H* is syntactically the main verb, but semantically it only accompanies the infinitive.

14 E. Jenni regards the meaning of *GDL-H* in this sentence as reflexive. Ernst Jenni, *Der hebräische Pi'el: Syntaktisch-semasiologische Untersuchung einer Verbalform im Alten Testament* (Zürich: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1968), p. 49.

15 Jenni, *Pi'el*, p. 46 designates this reflexive meaning as inwardly transitive

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

(*innerlich-transitiv*). Waltke and O'Connor call this reflexive meaning of the Hiphil stem "one-place or inwardly transitive or internal *Hiphils*" [their italics]. Bruce K. Waltke and Michael O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), p. 439.

16 One could also argue that the object in this sentence is ellipsed and may be filled by the object of the next sentence ("wisdom"), which would then move this sentence to the first category, viz. *GDL-H* with a direct object.

17 The semantic function of the direct object and its influence on the semantic meaning of the verb does not surprise. A cursory glance at various Hebrew dictionaries or theological wordbooks confirms this observation.

18 See also Jenni, *Pi'el*, p. 49; idem, *THAT*, 1:405; Bergmann, Ringgren, and Mosis, *TWAT*, 1:942-943; and Waltke and O'Connor, pp. 439-440 and 440 footnote 17. Only in Lam 1:9 and Dan 8:4 a *GDL-H* sentence appears without any further syntagm beyond the subject.

19 Jer 48:26, 42; Ezek 35:13; Zeph 2:8, 10; Ps 35:26; 38:16[17]; 55:12[13]; Job 19:5.

20 The meaning of the preposition *'ad* in combination with *GDL* in the Qal stem is similar. This combination occurs five times. In all five instances *'ad* designates the extent to which one grows, either in temporal (Gen 26:13b; 2 Chr 17:12) or geographical dimension (Mic 5:4[3]; Dan 8:10; Ezra 9:6). The latter references are syntactically similar to Dan 8:8, 11 where *GDL-H* is also used with *'ad*: "He will be great unto (*'ad*) the ends of the earth" (Mic 5:4[3]); "It grew up to (*'ad*) the host of heaven" (Dan 8:10); and "Our guilt has grown even up to (*'ad*) the heavens" (Ezra 9:6).

21 In the interpretation of the vision, the "prince of the host" is called the "prince of princes," the activity *higdil 'ad* is interpreted as *ya' mod 'ad* (8:25). The "prince of the host" is thus identified with God himself (Charles, p. 207; Collins, p. 333; Goldingay, *Daniel*, pp. 210-211; Hasslberger, p. 99; Keil, p. 297; Miller, p. 226; Montgomery, p. 335; Porteous, p. 103) or with Michael (Hasel, p. 403). Other interpretations of the prince of the host are the high priest at the times of Antiochus IV. Epiphanes (M. A. Beek, *Das Danielbuch: Sein historischer Hintergrund und seine literarische Entwicklung*, [Leiden: Ginsberg, 1935], p. 80; as possibility in Charles, p. 204), a double reference to the high priest and God himself (Maier, p. 305), or a double reference to the high priest and the archangel Michael (Lacocque, *Daniel*, p. 162).

22 Though the verbal root *GDL* is constructed in different stems, viz. Qal and Hiphil, the *crescendo* still functions, because *GDL* in the Qal with human subject often comes near to the inwardly transitive or reflexive meaning of *GDL* in the Hiphil. See Bergmann, Ringgren, and Mosis, "*gdl*," *TWAT*, 1:940. See also Goldingay, p. 197.

23 Based on the separation of "up to the prince of the host" from *higdil*, it may be tempting to propose a literary chiasmic structure in the usage of *GDL* with prepositions:

- A *GDL* (vs. 4) Hiphil
- B *GDL* + *'ad* (vs. 8) Hiphil
- C *GDL* + *'al* (vs. 9) Qal
- B' *GDL* + *'ad* (vs. 10) Qal
- A' *GDL* (vs. 11) Hiphil

However, this chiasmic structure is not valid because of the different semantic meanings of A and A', the non-chiasmic arrangement of verbal stems for *GDL*,

PRÖBSTLE: A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF DANIEL 8:11, 12

and the problematic separation of “unto the prince of the host” from *higdil*. The literary *crescendo* of *GDL*-sentences remains the better explanation.

24 On *wayyiqtol* forms expressing temporal or logical succession in the narrative flow see Waltke and O'Connor, pp. 547-551.

25 A thematic relation between Dan 8:11 and 11:36 is recognized by Collins (Collins, *Daniel*, p. 333) and Mosis (Bergmann, Ringgren, and Mosis, *TWAT*, 1:944).

26 The apparent gender incongruence between *qeren* and *higdil* is addressed from a structural viewpoint under the discussion on the syntactic structure of Dan 8:9-12.

27 Collins, *Daniel*, p. 334. G. Hasel regards the first clause of vs. 12 as “probably the most difficult in verses 9-14 for understanding its intended meaning.” Hasel, p. 418.

28 Collins distinguishes four kinds of proposed solutions: (1) Excision of “host” as a gloss which was imported from vs. 13; (2) textual emendation of *w^ešābāh*; (3) reinterpretation of “host” in a different sense from vs. 10 and 11; and (4) the interpretation “a host was given over.” Collins himself chooses the fourth interpretation. Collins, *Daniel*, pp. 334-335.

29 The majority of scholars suggest that *šābā'* is the grammatical subject of 12a. See, e.g., Collins, p. 335; Hasel, pp. 416-417; Lacocque, p. 163; Montgomery, p. 336.

30 Hasel, pp. 417-418.

31 Goldingay, *Daniel*, pp. 195, 197.

32 Leech identifies correctly that these transformational rules operate on the syntactic level. By the active-passive transformation sentences are equated which have the same semantic representation. Leech, pp. 199-200.

33 The word may be a nominal form with or without the article, some kind of a pronoun, or a text deicticon (*kn*): Gen 38:14; Exod 5:16, 18; Lev 10:14; 19:20; 24:20; Num 26:62; 1 Sam 18:19; 2 Kgs 19:10; 22:7; 25:30; Isa 9:6[5]; 29:12; 33:16; 35:2; 36:15; 37:10; 51:12; Jer 13:20; 32:24, 25; 38:3, 18; 51:55; 52:34; Ezek 11:15; 16:34; 31:14; 32:20, 23, 25; 33:24; Job 9:24; 15:19; Eccl 10:6; Est 2:13; 3:14, 15; 5:6; 6:8; 7:2, 3; 8:13, 14; 9:12, 14; Dan 11:6, 11; Neh 13:10; 1 Chr 5:1, 20. *NTN*-*N* sentences with ellipsed subject or relative pronoun as subject are not considered in this reference list.

34 Exod 5:16, 18; Lev 19:20; Isa 9:6[5]; 51:12; Ezek 16:34; 32:20; Job 9:24.

35 Thus Montgomery, p. 336: “gender agreement between subj. and vb. is most improbable.”

36 The *hapax legomenon* *ḥupšāh*, “freedom,” seems to be a feminine subject, as the ending *-ah* usually indicates, but the verb *nittan* is a masculine form.

37 The subject *naḥ^alāh*, “inheritance,” is feminine, but the verb *nittan* is masculine in gender.

38 The relative pronoun *šer*, which is the subject of the masculine verb form *nittan*, refers to *gib^aat*, a feminine construct form of *gib^aah*, “Gibeah.” In Biblical Hebrew, cities are usually feminine in gender, probably because the headword *‘ir* is feminine. See J. C. L. Gibson, *Davidson's Introductory Hebrew Grammar: Syntax* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994), pp. 16 (17a); and Waltke and O'Connor, p. 104 (6.4.1d).

39 Collins, *Daniel*, p. 335; Hasslberger, p. 9 footnote 28. In Isa 40:2, *š^ebā^aah* has to be understood as subject of the feminine *māl^aah*. The parallelism in Isa 40:2c-d forbids to regard *š^ebā^aah* as masculine object (against Karl Albrecht, “Das

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Geschlecht der hebräischen Hauptwörter,” *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 15 [1895]: 319).

40 The feminine plural form *šēbā’ōt* occurs 311 times in the Old Testament of which it is used 285 times as divine epithet, whereas the masculine plural form is only used twice (Ps 103:21; 148:2 *qere*). Thus, in the singular, *sābā’* is predominantly used with masculine verbs, but its plural form is predominantly feminine.

41 Two other arguments that the construction of the MT in Daniel 8:12a is impossible can be dismissed easily. First, the argument that the author could have used the masculine verbal form *yinnātēn* to make clear that *sābā’* is its subject, does not take the fact into account that the author could well have thought of *sābā’* as feminine in gender. Besides, one should be careful in posing arguments which are psychological in nature. It seems better to stay with what is really expressed by the language. Second, the argument that the masculine plural pronominal suffix *-m* in *wattirmēsem* (Dan 8:10c) indicates that the author would regard the referent *min-haššābā’* as masculine, overlooks that the suffix refers back to both *min-haššābā’* and *min-hakkōkābīm, kōkābīm* (masculine, plural) determining the gender of the suffix.

42 Hasslberger, p. 102.

43 Ibid.

44 In the book of Daniel, *‘SH* and *SLH-H* occur together only in Dan 8:12, 25 and 11:36, which again shows the intertextual importance of Dan 11:36 for Dan 8:12, 25. Outside the book of Daniel, *‘SH* and *SLH-H* occur beside each other in Ps 1:3 and 2 Chr 31:21, in a parallelism in Ps 37:7, in close proximity in Jos 1:8 and 1 Chr 22:13, and *‘SH* occurs in an object clause to the verb *SLH* in Gen 39:3, 23 and 2 Chr 7:11. Due to the limited scope of this study, the evaluation of possible intertextual relations has to be reserved for a future investigation.

45 Hasslberger does not feel the strength of this argument, because he views Daniel 8:11-14 as a later interpolation. However, his argument that the different sequence of *‘SH* and *SLH-H* indicates that different authors had been at work does not convince. Hasslberger, pp. 17-20.

46 It seems that one can only hold two different grammatical subjects in vs. 12 if it is supposed that there is a textual discontinuity between vs. 12a and 12b. Thus, vss. 11-12a are regarded as a later interpolation, so that 12b continues vs. 10 and returns again to the anti-divine horn as subject. See Lebram, p. 95; Stahl, p. 174. As the following discussion shows, an interpolation does not need to be proposed.

47 The concept of grammatical and logical subject is based on the active-passive transformation of sentences. The grammatical subject (the *patient*) is the subject of the passive sentence on a syntactic level. The logical subject (the *agent*) is the subject of a passive sentence on a semantic level. If a passive sentence is retransformed into an active sentence the logical subject of the passive sentence becomes the subject of the active sentence. For example, in the sentence “He is redeemed by Yahweh” *He* is the grammatical subject and *Yahweh* is the logical subject. A transformation into an active sentence results in “Yahweh redeems him” where Yahweh is the subject. In Biblical Hebrew, the logical subject of a passive sentence often is not expressed explicitly, nevertheless it may be taken as implied.

48 Dequeker suggests a link between the two phrases. L. Dequeker, “The ‘Saints of the Most High’ in Qumran and Daniel,” in *Syntax and Meaning: Studies*

PRÖBSTLE: A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF DANIEL 8:11, 12

in *Hebrew Syntax and Biblical Exegesis*, ed. A. S. van der Woude, Oudtestamentische studiën, no. 18 (Leiden: Brill, 1973), p. 176. See also Goldingay, *Daniel*, p. 197, though he is not as explicit as Dequeker.

49 Though in vs. 11c *miqdāš* is used, and not *qōdeš*, both stem from the same root *qdš*. In further study, the question of their difference needs to be investigated.

50 See also Lacocque, p. 163.

51 Thus also Keil, p. 300 and Leupold, p. 348.

52 “On their hands” in 2 Kgs 22:7 is *pars pro toto*, meaning “to them.”

53 Gen 40:11; 41:42; Exod 12:7; 25:12, 21, 26, 30; 26:32, 34, 35; 28:14, 23, 24, 25 (three times), 27; 29:3, 6, 12, 20; 30:33; 34:33; 37:13; 39:17, 18, 25, 31; 39:16, 18, 20; 40:22; Lev 1:7; 2:1, 15; 4:7, 18, 25, 30, 34; 5:11; 8:7 (twice), 15, 23, 24, 27; 9:9; 14:14, 17, 18, 29; 16:8, 13, 18, 21; 17:11; 24:7; 26:30; Num 4:6, 7, 10, 12, 14; 5:15, 18; 6:18, 19; 15:38; 16:18; 17:11[16:46]; 19:17; 27:20; Deut 11:29; 28:48; 1 Sam 17:38; 1 Kgs 1:48; 7:16, 39; 10:9; 12:4, 9; 18:23; 2 Kgs 11:12; 12:15[16]; 16:14, 17; 18:23; 22:5, 9; Isa 22:22; 36:8; Jer 20:2; 27:2; 28:14; Ezek 3:25; 16:11; 21:15[20]; 23:42; 24:8; 28:18; 37:6; Mic 3:5; Ps 8:1[2]; Job 5:10; 2 Chr 3:16; 6:27; 9:8; 10:4, 9; 23:11; 34:10, 17. The noun following *‘al* is always concrete. The activity itself may also be metaphorical in as much as the agent puts/gives an abstract upon/on a concrete: Exod 32:29; Num 11:25, 29; Deut 11:25; 26:6; 30:7; 1 Kgs 8:32; 23:33; 2 Kgs 18:14; Isa 42:1; Jer 23:40; 26:15; Ezek 7:4, 9; 23:7, 49; 36:29; Jonah 1:14; Ps 69:28; Dan 11:21; Neh 10:33; 1 Chr 14:17; 22:19; 29:25; 2 Chr 35:25.

54 Gen 41:41, 43; Exod 18:25; Deut 1:15; 17:15; 26:19; 28:1; 1 Sam 12:13; 2 Sam 18:11; 1 Kgs 2:35; 5:7[21]; 14:7; 16:2; Est 6:9; Neh 9:37; 13:26; 2 Chr 2:10; 9:8; 13:5; 32:6. The noun is always personal or a land.

55 *‘al* designates advantage in Exod 30:16; Mic 1:14; and Neh 2:7. It designates disadvantage in Jer 4:16; 12:8; Ezek 4:2 (twice); 19:8; 26:8; Neh 5:7; 2 Chr 20:22.

56 Gen 45:21; Josh 19:50; 2 Kgs 23:35.

57 The simple locational sense for *‘al* in Dan 8:12 is less probable, as *tāmīd* does not have the semantic feature “locative.”

58 Keil, p. 300; Lacocque, p. 163; Leupold, p. 348; Von Lengerke in Charles, p. 207.

59 Collins, *Daniel*, p. 335.

60 In the Hebrew sections of Daniel *‘al* occurs in 1:1, 8, 11, 20; 2:1; 8:2, 5, 12, 17, 18 (twice), 25 (twice), 27; 9:1, 11, 12 (three times), 13, 14 (three times), 17, 18 (three times), 19 (twice), 20, 24 (twice), 27 (twice); 10:4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 16 (twice), 21; 11:5, 14, 20, 21 (twice), 25 (twice), 27, 28, 30 (twice), 34, 36 (twice), 37 (four times), 38, 40; 12:1. In the Aramaic section of Daniel *‘al* occurs in 2:10, 15, 18, 24, 28, 29, 30, 34, 46, 48 (twice), 49; 3:12 (twice), 16, 19 (twice), 28, 29; 4:2, 7, 10, 13, 14, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 33 (three times); 5:5, 7, 9, 14, 16 (twice), 21, 23, 29 (twice); 6:2, 4 (twice), 5, 6, 7, 11, 13, 14 (twice), 15 (twice), 16, 18, 19, 24; 7:1, 4, 6, 16, 19, 20, 28.

61 The preposition *‘al* is used with referential function in the Hebrew sections of Daniel in 8:25, 27; 9:14, 20, 24 (twice) and in the Aramaic section in 2:15 (compounded with the interrogative pronoun *māh*), 18; 3:16; 5:14, 29; 6:13, 15; 7:16, 20. For the Aramaic see Koehler and Baumgartner, p. 1758.

62 See Jenni’s statistics and reference list of the preposition *beth*. Jenni, *Die hebräischen Präpositionen*, pp. 46, 361-396. *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, vol. 2, *beth-waw*, ed. David J. A. Clines (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), pp. 37, 82 counts 15,722 occurrences of *beth*.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

63 Lev 24:20 (“on him,” the person is affected negatively); Est 3:14, 15; 4:8; 6:8; 8:13, 14; 9:14; Eccl 10:6; Ezek 32:23, 25 (twice).

64 This function of *b^c+yad* occurs 276 times in the OT. Thus, the locative usage of *beth* has become generalized. See Jenni, *Die Präposition Beth*, pp. 198-200. This usage in *NTN-N* sentences occurs in Gen 9:2; Lev 26:25; 2 Kgs 18:30; 19:10; 1 Chr 5:20; 2 Chr 18:14; 28:5; 34:16; Ezra 9:7; Job 9:24; Is 36:15; 37:10; Jer 21:10; 32:4 (twice), 24, 25, 36, 43; 34:3; 37:17; 38:3 (twice), 18; 39:17; 46:24; Dan 11:11. Interestingly, the subject in 2 Kgs 18:30 is preceded by the particle *et*. This is unusual as a subject may not be preceded by this particle which normally introduces a direct object. But the parallel sentences in 2 Kgs 19:10; Isa 36:15; 37:10 and Jer 38:3 (twice) show clearly that the *et* word group in 2 Kgs 18:30 has to be understood as the subject of the verb *NTN-N*.

65 By definition, the instrumental use of *beth* is marked by a transitive verb. Jenni, *Die Präposition Beth*, pp. 72-74, 118-119. With *NTN-N* sentences this use of *beth* occurs only as secondary preposition *b^cyad*, “by means of,” in Neh 10:30. *Ibid.*, p. 123.

66 Est 7:3; Ezra 9:7.

67 Only Jer 32:36. The *beth causae* is marked by an intransitive verb. *Ibid.*, p. 100.

68 Subject and word following *beth* are reference identical: Num 18:26; 36:2; Josh 21:26; 1 Chr 6:50.

69 Num 36:2; 2 Chr 31:15.

70 This seems to be a *beth instrumenti* but there is no object in the sentence: Jer 12:8; Ps 46:7; 68:34[33].

71 Deut 23:9; 47:16, 17; Exod 21:22; Lev 25:37 (twice); Deut 2:28; 14:25, 26; 1 Kgs 21:15; Ezek 18:13; 27:16, 19; Joel 4:3; Ps 15:5; Cant 8:7; Lam 1:11; 1 Chr 21:22, 25; and the secondary preposition *biglal*, “on account of,” in 1 Kgs 14:16.

72 The preposition *beth* is followed by a designation of place or space, which is not necessarily geographical: Gen 1:17; 16:5; 39:21; 40:3; 41:10, 48 (twice); 47:11; 48:9; Exod 11:3; 30:36; 35:34; 36:2; 39:25; 40:22; Lev 10:1; 18:23; 19:28 (twice); 20:15; 24:19, 20; 26:1, 6, 46; Num 5:20; 16:7; 35:14; Deut 3:20; 7:15; 11:15; 15:17; 18:18; 21:8, 17; Josh 1:14, 15; 13:8; 14:3, 4; 15:13; 19:49; 20:8; 22:4, 7, 11, 21; Judg 6:13; 1 Sam 9:22; 27:5; 2 Sam 24:15; 1 Kgs 2:5; 6:27; 7:51; 8:32; 10:24, 27; 12:29; 22:23; 2 Kgs 12:9[10]; 19:7, 18; Isa 37:7, 19; 41:19; 43:16, 20; 46:13; 56:5; Jer 1:9; 5:14; 6:27; 9:1; 22:20; 23:14; 27:8; 31:33(32); 32:40; 49:15; 52:11; Ezek 4:9; 7:27; 9:10; 11:19, 21; 16:27, 43; 17:5, 19; 19:9; 22:31; 25:4; 26:20; 29:21; 30:8; 32:23, 24, 25, 26, 32; 36:26, 27; 37:6, 14; 39:21; 44:28; Joel 3:3[2:30]; Obad 2; Hag 2:9; Pss 4:8; 27:12; 33:7; 40:4; 41:3; 69:22; Job 14:13; 19:23; 35:10; 42:15; Prov 1:20; 23:31; Eccl 3:11; Lam 2:7; 3:29; Ezra 1:7; 9:9; Neh 3:36; 13:4; 1 Chr 6:40; 12:19; 21:14; 2 Chr 1:15; 3:16; 4:4; 5:1; 6:13; 9:16, 23, 27; 11:11; 17:2 (twice), 19; 18:22; 22:11; 24:8, 9; 31:19; 35:3; 36:7. It also occurs in the metaphorical expression *b^cênê*, “in the eyes of”: Exod 3:21; 12:36; Jer 27:5. *Beth* can also express contact, whereby the activity is always for the disadvantage of the referent of the prepositional phrase: Exod 7:4; Lev 20:3; 26:17; Num 31:3; Ezek 15:7; 23:25; 25:14; Ps 50:20; Neh 9:10.

73 *Beth* is followed by a designation of time: Exod 16:8; 22:29; Lev 26:4; Deut 11:14; 24:15; 28:12; Josh 10:12; 1 Sam 12:18; 18:19; 27:6; 1 Kgs 13:3; Pss 1:3; 104:27; Est 8:1; Ezra 9:8; 1 Chr 16:7; 22:9; 2 Chr 27:5.

74 The prepositional phrase with *beth* expresses an abstract of quality (Isa 61:8, “in truth”) or an abstract of activity (Gen 45:2, “in weeping”; Hos 13:11, “in his anger”).

PRÖBSTLE: A LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS OF DANIEL 8:11, 12

75 For all *beth* occurrences in the OT, Jenni calculates the percentage at 93%. Ibid., p. 329.

76 This may well be one reason why Jenni has some difficulty in deciding the function of *beth* in Dan 8:12.

77 There are no problematic sentence demarcations in vss. 9-10.

78 For succession of *wayyiqtol* forms see Waltke and O'Connor, pp. 547-551 (33.2.1). For *wayyiqtol* after *qatal* see *ibid.*, pp. 554-555 (33.3.1.a). Cp. also Alviero Niccacci, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, JSOT Supplement Series, no. 86 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1990), p. 30; and Eep Talstra, "Text Grammar and Hebrew Bible. I: Elements of a Theory," *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 35 (1978): 170-171.

79 Paul Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, Subsidia biblica, vol. 14/I-II (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991; reprint with corrections, Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1993), pp. 390-391 (118d): "biblical writers deliberately avoid **Wayyiqtol** and replace it with *w- . . . qatal* when they do not want to express succession" [their emphasis].

80 Ibid., p. 402 (119u).

81 If vss. 11-12a are regarded as interpolation, *w^etašlek* is usually interpreted with a different vocalization as a *wayyiqtol* form. See Stahl, p. 174.

82 For this use of the *w^eqatal* with *waw* consecutive see Joüon and Muraoka, 396 (119c) and Waltke and O'Connor, pp. 526-529 (32.2.1).

83 See, e.g. Hasel, p. 401: Gerhard Langer, "Die Isotopie der Macht," in "Und die Wahrheit wurde hinweggefegt," ed. W. Bader (Tübingen, Francke, 1994), p. 90; Montgomery, p. 335. It is obvious that the feminine verbal forms of vss. 9b-10c and 12 belong to the symbolic language of the vision referring to *qeren*, "horn," which is feminine in gender.

84 Goldingay, *Daniel*, pp. 197-198.

85 Goldingay takes vs. 12 to have future reference. Ibid., p. 198. As explanation for the tense change, Goldingay states that "the seer entirely abandons the visionary way of speaking proper to one who has been watching an event, which he thus describes in the past, and adopts the future tense proper to an interpretative vision." Ibid., p. 211. Martin Schindele suggests to translate the verbs in 12a and 12b in a modal sense: "A host *should be mobilized*" and "truth *should be swept away*." The two *w^eqatal* verbs in 12c and 12d he regards as referring to activities in the past. For him, 12a and 12b describe projected or planned activities, and 12c and 12d indicate that the planned activities have been carried out. Martin Schindele, "Textkonstituierung zu Daniel 8," in "Und die Wahrheit wurde hinweggefegt," ed. W. Bader (Tübingen, Francke, 1994), pp. 9, 13. See also Martin Buschhaus, "Traumpsycho-logische-parapsychologische Bemerkungen zu drei Übersetzungsschwierigkeiten im Buch Daniel," *Biblische Notizen* 38-39 (1987): 28-29.

86 As background for the following observations see the discussion of verbal forms in discourse analysis or text linguistics by Randall Buth, "The Hebrew Verb in Current Discussion," *Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics* 5 (1992): 91-105; R. E. Longacre, "Discourse Perspective on the Hebrew Verb: Affirmation and Restatement," in *Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*, ed. W. R. Bodine (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1992), pp. 177-189; Alviero Niccacci, "On the Hebrew Verbal System," in *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics*, ed. R. D. Bergen (Dallas, TX: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1994), pp. 119-121; *idem*, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*; E. Talstra, pp. 170-171, which is based on Wolfgang Schneider, *Grammatik des biblischen Hebräisch* (München: Claudius,

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

1974); and Christo H. J. van der Merwe, "Discourse Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew Grammar," in *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics*, ed. R. D. Bergen (Dallas, TX: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1994), pp. 23-29. See also the essays in Walter R. Bodine, ed., *Discourse Analysis of Biblical Literature: What It Is and What It Offers*, Semeia Studies (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars, 1995); and the introduction and evaluation of different text-linguistic theories in David Allan Dawson, *Text-Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, no. 177 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1994).

87 R. Buth argues for the possibility of a nonsequential function of *wayyiqtol* forms. See Randall Buth, "Methodological Collision Between Source Criticism and Discourse Analysis: The Problem of 'Unmarked Temporal Overlay' and the Pluperfect/Nonsequential *wayyiqtol*," in *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics*, ed. R. D. Bergen (Dallas, TX: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1994), pp. 138-154.

88 The verbal forms *yiqtol* and consecutive *w^eqatal* appear in Daniel 9-12 also in 9:25-27 (direct speech of the angel Gabriel); 10:14 (direct speech of a heavenly being); 10:17 (direct speech of Daniel); 10:20-12:4 (direct speech of a heavenly being); 12:7e (oath of a heavenly being); and 12:10-13 (direct speech of a heavenly being). In all instances these verbal forms mark discursive texts. There are two other *yiqtol* forms in the corpus of Daniel 8-12, but they occur in a narrative text following the negation *lo²*, forming a negation word group (8:4; 12:8b). Therefore, they do not belong to the category of verbal forms marking discursive texts rather they indicate a durative activity ("I was not understanding") in a narrative context.

89 If vs. 12 still belongs to the vision one has to ask the question how an observer could see "the truth cast down"? This question is resolved if vs. 12 is not part of the vision, but part of a saying (this term is intentionally kept vague) of a heavenly being.

90 After an adverbial expression of time, the *w^eqatal* form has a (con)sequential notion. Waltke and O'Connor, p. 538 (32.2.6b). Thus, *w^enišdaq* refers to a time after the period of "2300 evening-morning" has been concluded.

[This paper has been reformulated from old, unformatted electronic files and may not be identical to the edited version that appeared in print. The original pagination has been maintained, despite the resulting odd page breaks, for ease of scholarly citation. However, scholars quoting this article should use the print version or give the URL.]
Journal of the Adventist Theological Society, 7/1 (Spring 1996): 107-119.
Article copyright © 1996 by Richard M. Davidson.

The Meaning of *Nišdaq* in Daniel 8:14

Richard M. Davidson
Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary
Andrews University

The Meaning of *Nišdaq*

Translations of Daniel 8:14. Daniel 8:14 reads, “Unto 2300 evening-mornings, then shall the sanctuary be *nišdaq*.” A glance at major modern English versions, lexicons, and commentaries indicates a wide range of different translations for the Hebrew *nišdaq*. The various renderings cluster around three basic ideas:

First, there is the idea of the sanctuary being “restored to its rightful state.”¹ Variations of the same idea include “have its rights restored,”² “rights of the sanctuary be restored,”³ “declared right,”⁴ “put right,”⁵ “come into its right,”⁶ “reestablished within its rights,”⁷ “properly restored,”⁸ or simply “restored.”⁹

A second idea conveyed by the translations of *nišdaq* is the traditional one, “cleansed,” indicated already by the Greek Septuagint and Theodotian *katharisthēsetai* and the Latin *mundabitur*, and the Syriac and Coptic. This translation of “shall be purified/cleansed” is followed in English by major modern versions in Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish traditions.¹⁰

The third idea represented by the English translations of *nišdaq* is that of vindication. Several translations read “shall be vindicated,”¹¹ others, “shall be justified”¹² or “its cause vindicated,”¹³ or the related “emerge victorious.”¹⁴

From this brief survey, it is clear that there is no consensus on the best English translation for *nišdaq* in Daniel 8:14.

Methodology. This study will seek to determine the meaning of *nišdaq* within the immediate context of Daniel 8:14. We will first

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

explore the semantic range of the word-group *šdq* throughout the Hebrew Bible, especially in settings related to the cultic motifs, as in Daniel 8. Then we will focus upon the Hebrew Bible's single occurrence of the *Niphal* form of this verb, namely *nišdaq* in Daniel 8:14, with particular attention to its immediate context in vs. 13 where the three problem situations are summarized which call forth the activity announced in vs. 14. The thesis which this study tests is that the word *nišdaq* in Daniel 8:14 was deliberately selected because it has a broad enough semantic range to encompass the specific solutions to each of the three problems expressed in vs. 13.

Limitations. Within space constraints it will not be possible to present an exhaustive word study of the *šdq* word-group, nor provide a detailed exegesis of Daniel 8:9-14. I suggest that the exegetical problems do not all need to be solved in order to come to a tentative conclusion regarding the intended meaning of *nišdaq*.

In this study we will not engage in the historical interpretation of the vision of Daniel 8, nor argue the case for one system of prophetic interpretation over another, whether it be historicist, preterist, futurist, idealist, or some other system. Hopefully the tentative semantic and exegetical conclusions will be of some assistance in the subsequent process of prophetic-historical interpretation.

The Semantic Range of the *Nišdaq* Root

Several excellent studies in recent years have summarized the basic data regarding the semantic range of the root *šdq*¹⁵ from which *nišdaq* is derived.

The root occurs in several West Semitic cognate languages (Arabic, Ugaritic, Phoenician, old Aramaic, Punic, Syriac and Ethiopic), all with the same general meaning as in Hebrew, namely, "just, right."

In the Hebrew Bible the root *šdq* occurs over 500 times, taking several forms: the masculine noun *šedeq* (119x), the feminine noun *šedāqāh* (157x) or Aramaic *šidqah* (1x), the adjective *šādîq* (206x), and the verb *šādaq* (41x). Of particular interest to us are the 41 appearances of the Hebrew verb *sadaq*, including 22x in the *Qal*, 5x in the *Piel*, 12x in the *Hiphil*, once in the *Hithpael*, and once in

DAVIDSON: THE MEANING OF NIŞDAQ IN DANIEL 8:14

the *Niphal*—this last occurrence, *nişdaq*, is, as we have seen, a *hapax legomenon*, occurring only once in this form (Dan 8:14).

Basic Meanings. The basic meaning of the verb *sadaq* in the simple *Qal* is “to be in the right, be justified, be just or righteous.” Following this basic meaning, the lexicons give straightforward translations of the intensive (*Piel*) as “to justify”; the causative (*Hiphil*) as “cause to be right or just [to do justly or declare righteous or make righteous],” and the reflexive (*Hithpael*) as “to make oneself right, justify oneself.”

In like manner, a simple straightforward English translation of *nişdaq*, the one occurrence of *şādaq* in the *Niphal* or passive voice, would be “to be made right or just, to be justified.” But as various studies have pointed out,¹⁶ this translation does not seem to fit very well the context of a sanctuary. Further, it does not help us to know in what sense the sanctuary is to be made right or just. It does not take into account various *extended* meanings of *şādaq*, one or more of which may well be implied in the use of *nişdaq* in Daniel 8:14.

Extended meanings. My study has revealed three major extended meanings of *şādaq*.

1. The first is not far from its basic meaning of “be right” or in the *Niphal* “be made right.” It is the idea of being “put right” in the sense of “restored” or “restored to its rightful place.” This is the translation of *nişdaq* reflected in the RSV and many other modern translations.

This extended meaning takes into account various studies of the root meaning and theological overtones of the root *şdq*. Earlier studies pointed out how *şdq* has a root meaning of “conformity to a norm.”¹⁷ For example, it was noted that in Arabic a “righteous” *şedeq* fig was one in a condition which conformed to the norm of what a fig should be like. In the Bible a “*şedeq* weight” (Lev 19:36, etc.) is a weight that conforms to the right standard for that weight. Later studies have shown how in its theological usages describing man and God *şdq* also implies fulfilling the demands of a relationship.¹⁸ Thus in the case of God, *şdq* describes Yahweh's consistency with His own character of love and His mighty acts in fulfilling the promises and threats of the covenant relationship with His people. For man, righteousness (*şedeq* /*şedāqāh*) is entire conformity of

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

attitude and action to the will of God within the covenant relationship.

When the *šedeq* condition or relationship is removed or broken, the process of “being made right” (*šdq* in the *Niphal*) would obviously involve the aspect of “restoration” to right condition or relationship. This “restoration” is not far from the basic meaning of *šdq* in the passive voice. One of the major extended meanings, therefore, that one would expect for *šdq* in the *Niphal* is “to be put right” in the sense of “restored to rightful place or relationship,” or simply “restored.”

A number of biblical passages imply this restoration to a *šedeq* state or relationship without actually using the *Niphal* of *šdq* (my translations):

Isaiah 46:13:

I will bring my righteousness [*šedeq*] near;
it shall not be far off.

Isaiah 51:4, 5:

And I will make My justice [*mišpaṭ*] rest
As a light of the peoples.
My righteousness [*šedeq*] is near,
My salvation has gone forth,
And my arms will judge [*šāpat*] the peoples.

Isaiah 10:22 (in the context of Israel's loss of righteousness
and its subsequent restoration):

Yet a remnant of them will return [*šûb*];
The destruction decreed shall overflow with righteousness [*šedāqāh*].

Daniel 9:24:

Seventy weeks are determined . . . to bring in everlasting
righteousness [*šedeq*] . . .

See also Isaiah 45:8; 62:1, 2; Amos 5:24.

Note especially the use of the verbal form of *šdq* (*Hiphil* participle) in

Daniel 12:3:

And those who turn/restore many to righteousness [*ûmašdîqē*]
[Shall shine] like the stars forever and ever.

DAVIDSON: THE MEANING OF NIṢDAQ IN DANIEL 8:14

Along with the meaning of “restoration to a rightful state,” there are two additional dominant extended nuances which emerge from a word study of *ṣdq*. These also must be considered as we survey the semantic range of *niṣdaq*.

One of the procedures for discovering extended meanings of a given Hebrew word is to examine terms appearing in poetic parallelism with the word under investigation. While words in synonymous parallelism are not to be considered identical in meaning, they are certainly related even as the parallel poetic lines are related, and may be said to “embrace each other in meaning.”¹⁹

2. A foundational study undertaken by J. P. Justesen has shown how various derivative forms of *ṣdq* are used in poetic synonymous parallelism with several different Hebrew words meaning “to be clean/pure, and to cleanse/purify.”²⁰ First, we note how *ṣdq* occurs in parallelism with *zākāh* “to be pure”:

Job 15:14:

What is man, that he could be pure [*zākāh*]?
And he who is born of a woman, that he could be righteous [*ṣdq*]?
Job 25:4:

Job 25:4:

How then can man be righteous [*ṣdq*] before God?
Or how can he be pure [*zākāh*] who is born of a woman?
Psalm 51:4 (6):

Psalm 51:4 (6):

That you may be found just [*ṣdq*] when You speak,
and blameless [*zākāh*] when You judge.
Next, we point to the poetic occurrence of *ṣdq* in synonymous parallelism with the term *bôr* “cleanness”:

Next, we point to the poetic occurrence of *ṣdq* in synonymous parallelism with the term *bôr* “cleanness”:

Psalm 18:20 (21):

The Lord rewarded me according to my righteousness [*ṣdeq*];
According to the cleanness [*bôr*] of my hands He has rewarded me.
It is also to be noted that *ṣdq* appears in striking parallelism with the term *tahēr* “to be clean, pure”:

It is also to be noted that *ṣdq* appears in striking parallelism with the term *tahēr* “to be clean, pure”:

Job 4:17:

Can a mortal be more righteous [*ṣdq*] than God?
Can a man be more pure [*tahēr*] than his Maker?

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

It is instructive to note that the LXX (Greek Septuagint) translated *šdq* in this passage by *katharos*, “pure, or clean,” the same Greek word-group used to translate *nišdaq* in Daniel 8:14.

In Job 17:9 we find the same parallelism, this time with the adjectival forms of *šdq* and *ṭhr*:

Yet the righteous [*sadîq*] will hold to his way,
And he who has clean [*tahar*] hands will be stronger and stronger.

It is important to recognize that although *ṭahēr* can sometimes be used in a broader sense for physical or moral cleanness, this word is the typical, technical OT term for cultic-ritual cleanness; it is the term employed in Leviticus 16:19, 30 for the cleansing of the sanctuary on the Day of Atonement.

The close synonymous association of *šdq* with *zākāh*, *bôr*, and especially with *ṭahēr*, strongly suggests that a second extended meaning of *šdq* moves into the cultic realm with the semantic nuance of “cleansing” or “purification.” Thus the LXX (Greek Septuagint) translation of *nišdaq* with the verb *katharizo* need not be based upon the misreading of a hypothetical Aramaic manuscript source of Daniel 8 (as has been suggested)²¹ but rather the LXX translators may have recognized this pronounced nuance embedded within the semantic range of *šdq*, particularly in a cultic setting, as in Dan 8:14 and Job 4:17. In fact, as the late Gerhard Hasel has concluded, “the unanimity of the ancient versions in translating *nišdaq* in 8:14 with ‘shall be cleansed/purified’ may reflect these semantic nuances of clean/pure and cleanness/purity manifested in these synonymous terms of Hebrew poetic parallelism.”²²

3. The third extended meaning of *šdq* emerges from its close connection with another Hebrew root, *špṭ*, in its verbal form *šāpaṭ* “to judge,” and in its nominal form *mišpāṭ* “judgment.” At least 18 times in the Hebrew Bible we find the nouns *šedeq/šedāqāh* and *mišpāṭ* in poetic parallelism. For examples:

Psalm 106:3:

Blessed are those who keep justice [*mišpāṭ*],
And he who does righteousness [*šedāqāh*] at all times!

Isaiah 32:1:

Behold, a king will reign in righteousness [*šedeq*],

DAVIDSON: THE MEANING OF NITŠDAQ IN DANIEL 8:14

And princes will rule with justice [*mišpāṭ*].

Isaiah 59:14:

Justice [*mišpāṭ*] is turned back,
And righteousness [*šedāqāh*] stands afar off . . .

Jeremiah 22:13:

Woe to him who builds his house without righteousness [*šedeq*],
And his chambers without justice [*mišpāṭ*].

Amos 5:24:

But let justice [*mišpāṭ*] run down like water,
And righteousness [*šedāqāh*] like a mighty stream.

Amos 6:12:

You have turned justice [*mišpāṭ*] into gall,
and the fruit of righteousness [*šedāqāh*] into wormwood.²³

Not only do these terms appear in poetic parallelism, but often they are inextricably linked in a single phrase: “righteousness and justice” or “justice and righteousness” (*šedeq/šedāqāh* and *mišpāṭ*):

Ps 97:2:

Righteousness and judgment [*šedeq ūmi _pat*] are the foundation of
his throne.

Prov 21:3:

To do righteousness and justice [*šedāqāh ūmišpāṭ*]
Is more acceptable to the Lord than sacrifice.

Jer 22:15:

Did not your father eat and drink,
And do justice and righteousness [*mišpāṭ ūšedāqāh*]?

Jer 23:5:

The righteous Branch will execute judgment and righteousness
[*mišpāṭ ūšedāqāh*] in the earth.

Ezek 45:9:

Execute justice and righteousness [*mišpāṭ ūšedāqāh*].²⁴

Note how many of these usages occur in Exilic literature (the time of Daniel).

In many of these uses (and other times when the nouns *šedeq/šedāqāh* appear without the legal term *mišpāṭ*) there is clearly a legal context, and *šedeq/šedāqāh* clearly take on legal connota-

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

tions (see e.g., Isa 59:14; 63:1). According to one count, of the 117 occurrences of *šedeq* in the OT, 67 (or 57%) are found in a legal context. Similarly, of the 155 occurrences of *šedāqāh* 45x have a legal setting.²⁵

Especially instructive for our purposes is the use of the verbal forms of this word group. As a verb in these legal contexts, *šadaq*, like its counterpart *šāpaṭ*,²⁶ can often be best translated as “vindicate.”

Ps 82:3:

Defend/judge [*špṭ*] the poor and fatherless;
Do justice to/vindicate [*šdq*] the afflicted and needy.

Isa 50:8:

He is near who vindicates Me [*šdq*];
Who will contend [*rib*] with Me?
Let us stand together?
Who is My adversary [*baʿal mišpaṭi*]?

Isa 43:9:

Let them bring out their witnesses,
that they may be vindicated [*šdq*].

Isa 45:25:

In the Lord all the descendants of Israel
Shall be vindicated [*šdq*].

Certainly in these legal settings it is clear that *šadaq* takes on an extended meaning with the connotation of “vindication.”

So far, we have surveyed the semantic range of *šdq*. Along with the basic meaning of “right, just,” which in the *Niphal* would translate “to be made right/just,” we have seen three major extended meanings: (1) in a relational context, to be “put right” or “restored to its rightful place/relationship”; (2) especially in a cultic context, “to be cleansed/purified”; and (3) and in a legal context, “to be vindicated.” With these various possible extended meanings of *nišdaq* in mind, let us now turn to the use of *nišdaq* in the immediate context of Daniel 8.

***Nišdaq* in Immediate Context**

Previous studies of *nišdaq* have not given sufficient attention

DAVIDSON: THE MEANING OF NIṢDAQ IN DANIEL 8:14

to the three-part question in vs. 13 which *niṣdaq* addresses in vs. 14.²⁷

We can literally translate Daniel 8:13a as follows: “Until when (is) the vision: the “continuance” [*hatāmîd*]; and the transgression that causes horror [*hapéša‘ šomēm*]; (and) the giving over of the sanctuary and host to be trampled under foot [*mirmas*]?”

According to this verse three problems exist, arising from the little horn's activities in vss. 9-12. First, there is the *tāmîd* or “continual,” which according to vs. 11 was taken away from the Prince by the little horn. In the cultic, sanctuary context of Daniel 8, this word should be understood as broader than just the “daily sacrifice” as translated in many modern versions.

A recent study by Angel Rodriguez cogently argues that *hatāmîd* here refers to more than the *‘ōlāt tāmîd* or “continual burnt offering,” since the limiting term *‘ōlāt* is not in Daniel and *tāmîd* does not by itself in Scripture refer to the burnt offering.²⁸ The *tāmîd* in the OT cultus is not only used with regard to sacrifices, but also is applied to the “bread of the Presence” which is to be kept before the Lord *tāmîd* (Exod 25:30; Num 4:7), the lamps which are to be kept burning *tāmîd* (Exod 27:20; Lev 24:2), the *tāmîd* incense (Exod 30:8), and the fire kept burning *tāmîd* on the altar of burnt offering (Lev 6:13). In summary, *tāmîd* in the OT cultus referred to the many ongoing cultic activities performed and perpetuated by the priest in his intercessory ministry in the court and holy place of the sanctuary throughout the year. The articular *hatāmîd* in Daniel 8:11, 13 seems to summarize the various aspects of the “continuance” or intercessory ministry of the priest in the daily services of the sanctuary. It is important to note that *tāmîd* did not refer to the priestly activities performed in the sanctuary Most Holy Place (in connection with the annual Day of Atonement).

The mention of the *tāmîd* in Daniel 8:13 harks back to the situation described in vs. 11a and b. I tentatively translate vs. 11a and b as follows: “He [i.e., the little horn] exalted [himself] even as high as the Prince of the host; and from him [i.e., the Prince of the host] the *tāmîd* or ‘continuance’ was taken away [lit. lifted up (*hūram*, following the *Qere*)].” This verse has translational difficulties, but the general meaning is clear. The little horn exalted himself up to the Prince of the host, and the *tāmîd* was taken away. This

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

first major problem summarized in Daniel 8:13, the taking away of the *tāmîd*, is explicitly referred to also in Daniel 11:31 and 12:11.

The second major problem summarized in vs. 13 concerns *hapéšaʿ šomēm* “the transgression of desolation” or “the transgression causing horror.” The word *šomēm*, in light of other usages in Daniel and the immediate context, should probably here be translated “causing horror” rather than “desolation.”²⁹ What is this horrifying transgression? The repetition of the crucial word *pešaʿ* from vs. 12 clearly reveals that this phrase summarizes the activity described in vs. 12.

I tentatively translate vs. 12 as follows: “The host [i.e., the same host mentioned in vs. 11, belonging to the Prince] shall be given over, with regard to [or in addition to] the *tāmîd* ‘continuance,’ because of transgression [i.e., the transgression of the host, or, less likely, the transgression of the little horn.]; and he [the little horn] cast truth down to the ground. He acted [i.e., did all this] and he prospered.”

Again there are major semantic/linguistic/syntactical problems in this verse, but again the major thrust is clear: *pešaʿ*—transgression or rebellion—is committed, and truth is cast down by the prospering little horn. Verse 13 summarizes this second problem mentioned in these verses by calling this transgression *hapéšaʿ šomēm* —“the transgression causing horror.”

The third major problem summarized in vs. 13 is the trampling underfoot of the sanctuary and host. By use of the two terms *šabaʿ* “host” and *mirmas* “trampling,” this reference clearly harks back to vs. 10, where we have the same two Hebrew root words. We read, “And it [the little horn] grew great up to the host [*šabaʿ*] of heaven, and it cast down [lit. “caused to fall”] some of the host and some of the stars to the ground, and it trampled [*rms*, verbal form from the same Hebrew root as the noun *mirmas*] upon them.” Furthermore, by use of the term “sanctuary” *qōdeš*, vs. 13 also harks back to vs. 11c: “and the place of his sanctuary [*miqdaš*] was cast down.”

Not only does vs. 13 summarize the trampling of the host and the sanctuary from previous verses, but very probably also has in its thought pattern the underlying theological situation implied by this trampling. In ancient Near Eastern thought an host or army and its sanctuary overrun and trampled down signified that the god

DAVIDSON: THE MEANING OF NIŠDAQ IN DANIEL 8:14

of that host and sanctuary was weak and undependable (see, e.g., Isa 36:16-20; Ps 79:1-10). Thus when the sanctuary and the host are being trampled in Daniel 8, the clear theological message is that the God of this host and sanctuary and his system of worship are being defamed.

Now, in light of the three-fold sanctuary-related problem brought about by the little horn, as summarized by Daniel 8:13, let us turn to vs. 14 and the usage of *nišdaq*. I suggest that the word *nišdaq* is uniquely suited in its breadth of semantic range to encapsulate the solution to all three of the sanctuary-related situations summarized in vs. 13. Not only does its basic meaning of “be made right” fit in a general way as a solution to vs. 13, but its three major extended meanings—restore, cleanse, and vindicate—specifically match the three problems of vs. 13, and their respective relational, cultic, and legal contexts.

First, *hatāmîd*, “the continual” ministry of the priest in the sanctuary, which was taken away by the little horn, needs to be made right in the sense of being restored to its rightful place—our first extended meaning of *nišdaq*.

Second, *hapêša’ šomēm*, “the transgression causing horror” in the sanctuary, needs to be made right in the sense of purified or cleansed—our second extended meaning of *nišdaq*.

Third, the God who has been defamed by the trampling down of his sanctuary and the host, as well as the sanctuary and host themselves, must be made right in the sense of vindication—our third extended meaning of *nišdaq*.

It may be noted that there are separate Hebrew terms for each of these ideas: *šûb* for “restore,” *tahēr* for “cleanse” and *šāpat* for “vindicate”; but the holy one in vs. 14 utilizes a single polyvalent Hebrew word which simultaneously encompasses all these aspects of the solution within its semantic range—the word *nišdaq*.³⁰

Conclusion

Returning now to our original question regarding the most appropriate translation of *nišdaq* in Daniel 8:14, it may be concluded that each of the three major ideas represented in the modern English translations is included within the semantic range of *nišdaq* and is an appropriate translation in the context, but is not

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

complete by itself. We have another of the many cases where a single English word is not sufficient to capture the breadth of meaning implied by the original Hebrew term.

If we were forced to choose a single English translation of *nišdaq*, probably the general basic meaning of “made right” or “put right” would be the most inclusive. But here is a case when a collage of the various modern translations is a blessing, encompassing all three extended meanings of restore, cleanse, and vindicate, which appear to be implied in the text. Perhaps—and I suggest this somewhat tongue in cheek—this should be an instance where the word becomes an untranslated technical Hebrew term like “Amen” or “Hallelujah.” We would then have the reading: “Unto 2300 evenings-mornings, then shall the sanctuary be *nišdaqed!*”

Endnotes

- 1 As in RSV and NRSV.
- 2 NJB, JB.
- 3 Berkeley.
- 4 Young's Literal translation.
- 5 Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902; repr. 1962, 1966), p. 842 (hereafter cited as BDB).
- 6 H. C. Leupold, *Exposition of Daniel* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1969), p. 354.
- 7 Andre Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979), p. 158.
- 8 NASB.
- 9 TEV; Leon Wood, *A Commentary on Daniel* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1973), p. 217.
- 10 Including the KJV, NKJV, Douay, NAB, and NJV (*JPS Tanakh*).
- 11 See NASB, margin; E. J. Young, *The Prophecy of Daniel* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1949), p. 173; James Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, *The International Critical Commentary* (New York: Scribner's, 1927), p. 342.
- 12 RV, margin; BDB, p. 842.
- 13 Ibid.
- 14 NEB.
- 15 Jerome P. Justesen, “On the Meaning of *šādaq*,” *AUSS* 2 (1964): 53-61; W. E. Read, “Further Observations on *šadaq*,” *AUSS* 4 (1966): 29-36; Gerhard Hasel, “The ‘Little Horn,’ The Heavenly Sanctuary and the Time of the End: A Study of Daniel 8:9-14,” *Symposium on Daniel* (hereafter cited as *Symposium*), ed. Frank Holbrook, DARCOM series, vol. 2 (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), pp. 448-454; Niels-Erik Andreasen, “Translation of *Nišdaq/Katharisthesetai* in Daniel 8:14,” *Symposium*, 475-496. The conclusions in this study regarding the extended meanings of *šdq* are very close to those of

DAVIDSON: THE MEANING OF NIṢDAQ IN DANIEL 8:14

Andreasen, although they were arrived at independently. See also the lexical studies by E. R. Achtemeier, "Righteousness in the Old Testament," *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (1962), 4:80-85; K. Koch, "šdq," *Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament* (1971-1976), 2:508-530; E. Kautzsch, *Über die Derivate des Stammes šdq in alttestamentlichen Sprachgebrauch* (Tübingen, 1881).

16 E.g., Andreasen, p. 486. Note that 39 of the 40 other occurrences of the verb *šdq* in the Hebrew Bible have reference to *persons* not objects. The one other occurrence (Ps 19:10) likewise does not refer to a concrete object but to the <169>judgments of the Lord.<170>

17 Kautzsch; see also Edmond Jacob, *Theology of the Old Testament* (New York: Harper & Row, 1958), pp. 94-102; Alan Richardson, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament* (New York: Harper & Row, 1958), pp. 79-83; Gottlob Schrenk, "dik-," *TDNT*, 2:178-225; and N. H. Snaith, *The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1946), p. 97.

18 E. R. Achtemeier, "Righteousness in the O.T.," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (1962), 4:80-85, who (I believe wrongly) denies the continuity between "conformity to a norm" and "fulfilling the demands of a relationship." See also J. A. Ziesler, *The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul* (Cambridge, 1972); for a recent survey of current research, see J. J. Scullion, "Righteousness (Old Testament)," *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (1992), 5:724-736.

19 Andreasen, p. 483.

20 Justesen, pp. 58-61.

21 F. Zimmerman, "The Aramaic Origin of Daniel 8:12," *JBL* 57 (1938): 258-272; H. L. Ginzberg, *Studies in Daniel* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1948), p. 42; L. F. Hartman and A. A. DiLella, *The Book of Daniel*, *The Anchor Bible* (New York: Doubleday, 1987), p. 227; Lacocque, p. 159.

22 Hasel, p. 451.

23 For other examples of *sedeq* paralleling *mišpāt* (judgment, justice) see also Job 8:3; 29:14; Ps 37:6; 72:2; Eccl 3:16. For a similar paralleling of *sedaqah* see Ps 72:1; Pr 8:20; Isa 1:27; 5:16; 28:17; 32:16; Amos 5:7.

24 Justesen, p. 56.

25 See also Jer 4:2; 9:24; 22:3; and 33:15.

26 For instances of the verb *šāpaʿ* meaning "vindicate," see e.g., Ps 7:8; 26:1; 35:24; 43:1, where David cries out to God, "vindicate me!"

27 Andreasen, pp. 493-496, moves farthest in the right direction, although he does not show how vs. 13 summarizes the activities described in vss. 9-12. The independent conclusions of the present study in linking vs. 13 with the polyvalence of *nišdaq* in vs. 14 are corroborated by the interpretive suggestions of Andreasen (see esp. p. 495).

28 Angel M. Rodriguez, "Significance of the Cultic Language in Daniel 8:9-14," *Symposium on Daniel*, ed. Frank Holbrook, *Daniel and Revelation Committee Series*, vol. 2 (Washington D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), pp. 532-533.

29 See discussion in Hasel, pp. 440-443.

30 I am not suggesting that the Hebrew reader was necessarily consciously aware of three distinct extended meanings of *nišdaq* that fit the three problems of Daniel 8:13. Rather, in harmony with biblical Hebrew thought, the word *nišdaq* was probably perceived wholistically in its broad semantic contours that encompassed the meanings represented by our three separate English translations. The polyvalence was thus more implicit than explicit for the Hebrew mind.

[This paper has been reformulated from old, unformatted electronic files and may not be identical to the edited version that appeared in print. The original pagination has been maintained, despite the resulting odd page breaks, for ease of scholarly citation. However, scholars quoting this article should use the print version or give the URL.]
Journal of the Adventist Theological Society, 7/1 (Spring 1996): 120-140.
Article copyright © 1996 by Donn W. Leatherman.

Adventist Interpretation of Daniel 10-12: A Diagnosis and Prescription

Donn W. Leatherman
Religion Department
Southern Adventist University

Statement of the Problem

It is clearly evident that the final three chapters of the book of Daniel contain unique problems. For a long time we have had interpretive difficulties with this part of the book.

Shortly after my graduation from the Adventist Theological Seminary in 1980, I was asked by my conference president in Quebec to arrange a workers' meeting on a theological topic. This was just about the time that the large Sanctuary Review Committee met at Glacier View, Colorado and the topic of the Sanctuary was being widely discussed. I considered inviting one of the Seminary professors to come to Montreal and make some presentations relevant to the issues which had been studied at Glacier View.

In the end, Dr. William Shea agreed to come. He preached three times on Sabbath morning and conducted a question and answer session for the laity in the afternoon. On Monday, he met with the pastoral staff of the Quebec conference, and made three more presentations. These were on the book of Daniel and selected eschatological topics. After his studies, he held another question and answer session for the pastors.

I had been present at all the meetings and led off the question session by remarking about my understanding of the book of Daniel. I told him, "I realized long ago that I have no hope in this

LEATHERMAN: ADVENTIST INTERPRETATION OF DANIEL 10-12

world of gaining a perfect, 100% understanding of the book of Daniel. I have told myself that I will have to be satisfied with a *majority* understanding, understanding 51% or more. I am confident that I have such an understanding of Daniel 1 to 9. I don't understand everything, but I think I understand more than I don't. But I haven't yet reached even a 51% understanding of Daniel 10 to 12. I'm hoping you can help a little."

Dr. Shea paused, and smiled a little, and said, "If you find some one who does understand it that well, send him to me."

Attempted Interpretations

This lack of certainty is reflected in the diversity of Adventist views on this segment of the book. We can compare the relative uniformity of our interpretations of the visions in Daniel 2, 7, 8, and 9. But there is considerable diversity in the interpretation of the last three chapters, and especially chapter 11. By way of example, I will present the passage in which our interpretations are the most varied: Daniel 11:29-45. What have Adventist interpreters made of this passage?

Quite a few of the writers of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries offered a rather strict historicist explanation. The passage is held to describe the medieval Roman church in its interaction with those who held a purer doctrine, whether the scattered faithful of the early middle ages or the Protestant reformers. Verses 36-39 are applied to the revolutionary government in France which attempted to displace Christianity with the worship of the goddess of reason.

In the final six verses these interpreters treated the geographical designations of Daniel 11 quite literally. The "king of the south" is understood to refer to the nation of Egypt. The "king of the north" was whatever power controlled the area north of Palestine, which, by the end of Daniel 11, was understood to be the Ottoman Empire. These interpreters expected the culmination of human history and the return of Christ to occur when Turkey, having failed in its attempts to reestablish control over Egypt, and beset by enemies from the North and East (possibly Russia and Persia), removed its capital from Istanbul to Jerusalem.

Foremost among the exponents of this interpretation was

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Uriah Smith, whose *Thoughts Critical and Practical on the Book of Daniel*,¹ published in 1881, had extensive influence on subsequent generations of Adventists. Later editions of his works, which combined his book on Daniel with a similar volume on the Revelation, are less specific regarding the interpretation of the latter part of Daniel 11. This is particularly true of the editions printed after Smith's death. These later editions state that "the prophecy of verse 45 centers in that power known as the king of the north. It is the power that shall hold the territory possessed originally by the king of the north."² Clearly, after the demise of the Ottoman Empire, Smith's original interpretation seemed dubious.

Another Adventist, who had adopted views similar to those of Smith, was Stephen N. Haskell,³ the popularity of whose volume on Daniel rivaled that of Smith's work for some time after its publication in 1901. Other Adventist books expressing similar views include those of J. Grant Lamson (1909),⁴ Max Hill (1915),⁵ and O. A. Johnson (1919).⁶ One might have expected this interpretive tradition, especially the parts involving Turkey, to have died with the Ottoman Empire, but it persisted in the anonymous *Two Great Prophecies* (1925),⁷ and the works of M. H. Brown (1926)⁸ and W. H. Wakeham (1930),⁹ and even after the Second World War in the works of E. A. Nixon (1945)¹⁰ and Walter E. Straw (1947).¹¹ Without attempting to exegete the book of Daniel, other Adventist writers from this era reflected similar views in their works. These include Alonzo T. Jones (1900)¹² and Arthur G. Daniels (1917).¹³

Some later writers adopted the same interpretive schema, but reinterpreted the final elements. Among these are R. A. Anderson (1975), who identifies the "king of the north" in the latter part of Daniel 11 with "worldwide atheistic socialism."¹⁴ As early as 1950 Taylor G. Bunch had adopted a similar view. He holds that the latter two-thirds of the chapter (beginning in verse 14) describe the career of Rome in its pagan and papal phases,¹⁵ but that the "king of the south" represents "the Mohammedan peoples,"¹⁶ and the "king of the north" is atheism and communism, centered particularly in Russia.¹⁷ He admits that "no explanation of verses 40-45 is satisfactorily clear in every detail,"¹⁸ but he sees in Daniel 11 a three-sided eschatological conflict between the "king of the north," the "king of the south" and the papacy.

LEATHERMAN: ADVENTIST INTERPRETATION OF DANIEL 10-12

After World War II many interpreters adopted a more radical revision of the earlier position represented by Uriah Smith, Stephen Haskell, and the great majority of Adventist writers of the early twentieth century. Beginning with Edwin R. Thiele,¹⁹ some Adventists identified Rome not only in verses 14 through 35, but in the last 10 verses of the chapter as well. Thiele's explanations of the last 6 verses of the chapter are somewhat vague historically, but nevertheless apply this passage to the papacy without hesitation.²⁰ Thiele also differs from earlier interpreters in applying vss. 29-30 to the Crusades and the medieval church, rather than to the sack of Rome by the barbarian kingdoms.²¹ Thus Thiele's interpretation of Daniel 11:29-45 has a somewhat later historical framework and omits reference to the French revolution and to the Ottoman Empire.

A similar position was adopted by Louis Were in 1949.²² Were makes no attempt to exegete the entire chapter; his focus is more narrow, but he does assert that the references to literal (i.e., pagan) Rome end in Daniel 11:30, and that vss. 31-45 describe spiritual Rome.²³ References to the "king of the north" in this part of the prophecy point to the papacy:

The power brought to view in Dan. 11:40-45 must be one whose activities *concern the people of God*—such has been Daniel's previous presentations of the work of the papacy.²⁴

In a 1955 publication, George McCready Price returned to the essential position of Uriah Smith regarding the interpretation of Daniel 11:29-32, but accepted the views of later interpreters who applied vss. 36-39 to the papacy. Price denies emphatically that these verses can be made to refer to revolutionary France.²⁵ Furthermore, the last six verses of the chapter are also held to describe the demise of the papacy. Egypt, the king of the south, represents atheistic science.

Price acknowledges two possible scenarios: one in which there are two major actors (the "king of the north" and the "king of the south") and another in which there are three major actors, with the third person pronouns of verses 40 to 45 refer to some other entity. The differences between these interpretations Price holds to be slight, since "both views agree in saying that the main world power dealt with here is the Roman papacy, . . ."²⁶

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

The last three verses of the chapter receive only brief comments. Price denies that the geographic references should be literally understood, states that parts of the passage are yet unfulfilled, and encourages the reader to wait until these passages are clarified by unfolding events before insisting on a specific interpretation.²⁷

Robert Brinsmead (1960) concurs in the identification of the “king of the north” with the papal system and the “king of the south” with atheism.²⁸ He sees in the final verses of Daniel 11 a conflict between

two opposing ideologies—Babylonian and Egyptian. . . . Babylonian is to profess to be a Christian, to have a form of godliness, but to deny the power thereof. Egyptian is to repudiate the Christian religion and to deny the very existence of God.²⁹

Clearly, the major focus of the closing verses of Daniel 11 in this interpretation is still on the demise of the papacy.

The *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* declines to speak decisively on this passage. In verse after verse the reader is presented with tentative speculation (“Some see specific reference here . . .”) or alternative and mutually contradictory views (“Others suggest . . .”).³⁰ The editors suggest two possible interpretations of verse 40: that the “king of the north” is Turkey, and that the “king of the north” is the papacy.³¹ No comment is offered on vs. 41-44, and the comment on vs. 45 consists primarily of a warning from James White to be cautious in offering interpretations of unfulfilled prophecy.³²

The view that the “king of the north” represents the papacy and that the final portion of Daniel 11 describes the eschatological demise of papal power is also supported (though with important differences in interpretation) by both Desmond Ford (1978) and Mervyn Maxwell (1981). Ford applies Daniel 11:29,30 to the evacuation of Antiochus IV from Egypt at the command of the Roman Senate. In subsequent passages he sees intimations of both the Antiochene desecration of the Jerusalem temple and the anti-Jewish and anti-Christian activities of Rome. Thus Ford holds the possibility for multiple fulfillments of these passages. Regarding vs. 36-39, Ford states,

These verses transcend Antiochus and pagan Rome, though including

LEATHERMAN: ADVENTIST INTERPRETATION OF DANIEL 10-12

reminiscences of them. They are applied in the New Testament to the antichrist . . .³³

Ford applies vss. 36-39 to the papacy, but is reluctant to be very specific on vss. 40-45. He remarks that at this point “we . . . enter upon delicate ground, as this is obviously in the realm of unfulfilled prophecy.” He does insist (against Price and Bunch) that there are only two powers, not three, in the conflict described in these verses.³⁴ He associates the “king of the south” with atheism, or “some latter-day movement opposed to religion.”³⁵

Maxwell, whose interpretations are significantly closer to Adventist tradition, associates all of Daniel 11:29-45 with the papacy, specifically identifying the last six verses of the chapter with the “demise of Roman Christianity.”³⁶ Nevertheless, he is considerably less specific in his interpretation of this passage than in his treatment of earlier chapters, or even of earlier parts of this chapter. He gives a detailed verse-by-verse interpretation of Daniel 11: 1-16. His comments on subsequent verses are more general, and are not always in canonical order.³⁷

Arthur Keough's *Let Daniel Speak*,³⁸ published in 1986, also declines to deal systematically with chapter 11. Less than two pages are devoted to Daniel 11:29-45, and the comments are of a rather general nature, emphasizing the spiritual characteristics of the conflict, without attempting to apply the prophecy to specific historical events.³⁹ Keough does call the reader's attention to the fact that Adventist scholars have not found a common view on this chapter,⁴⁰ and that vss. 40-45 are widely admitted to be yet unfulfilled.⁴¹

Most recently, Jacques Doukhan's *Daniel: The Vision of the End*⁴² (1989) offers a fairly thorough-going spiritual interpretation of Daniel 11.

Daniel 11:5-45 does not lend to a strict literal interpretation; historical events may well be implied here yet the deciphering of those references must also take into account the “spiritual” dimension the author tries to introduce in his description.⁴³

Doukhan does remark that the “king of the north” has the same character as the “little horn” mentioned earlier in the book of Daniel, thus implicitly linking the “king of the north” with

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

the Roman papacy.⁴⁴ He identifies the “king of the north” with “false claims of divinity” and the “king of the south” with “humanity without God.”⁴⁵ The parallel is also drawn between “Babel” as a religious usurper and “Egypt” as a secular power.⁴⁶ This is in basic agreement with George McCready Price's identification of the kings of the north and south, as well as Robert Brinsmead's description of the two conflicting ideologies, the Babylonian and the Egyptian.

These examples which we have cited are taken only from Adventist writers. If we were to consider other conservative evangelicals, the diversity would be even greater. But why is there such great diversity among us? Historically, there are probably several causes.

Factors in the Problem

The Millerite Focus. Shortly after his return from service in the American army in the War of 1812, William Miller sensed a profound need of God. His new feelings were quite at odds with his intellectual convictions regarding religious matters, which had previously led him to Deism. In an attempt to reconcile intellect and experience, Miller undertook to study the entire Bible. Beginning with Genesis, he read as far as Daniel, apparently resolving any difficulties he encountered by comparison of one passage of Scripture with another, using a concordance as his only study aid.

By 1818 he had read as far as Daniel 8 and 9, where he discovered the 2300 day prophecy. This demanded considerable thought on his part. Eventually, he concluded from the prophecy that Christ was to return in about a quarter of a century. Several years later, at the invitation of others, he began to preach his beliefs.

It is certain that Miller continued his studies of the Bible far past the book of Daniel, and that he gave some attention to the later chapters of this book. But it was chapters 8 and 9, supported to some extent by reference to the first seven chapters, which became the focus of his preaching and of the message which the Millerites promoted in the years leading up to 1844. Although Miller studied and preached on Daniel 10, 11 and 12, he gave far less attention to these chapters than to the earlier parts of the book of Daniel.

Because of the limited attention paid by Miller and his

LEATHERMAN: ADVENTIST INTERPRETATION OF DANIEL 10-12

nineteenth century followers to the last three chapters of the book of Daniel, those of us whose denominational background lies with the Millerite movement are historically less committed to these chapters, even though we accept them as fully inspired Scripture.

Evangelistic Usefulness. Customarily, Adventist preachers, especially those who are involved in public evangelism, make considerable use of the earlier parts of the book of Daniel, but have largely neglected the last three chapters. Daniel 2 and 7 have been used to confirm the reliability of the Bible. Evangelists have pointed to the accuracy of these chapters in predicting the rise and fall of the empires of Babylon, Persia, Greece and Rome, as well as the activities of the papacy.

The dependability of the prophecies of Daniel having been established from chapters 2 and 7, use has been made of chapters 8 and 9 to establish the doctrine of the sanctuary, and in particular, to determine the dates for the “heavenly day of atonement” which we see foreshadowed in Daniel 8:13,14. Daniel 9, with its prediction of the coming of “Messiah the Prince,” has also been called into service to establish the accuracy of apocalyptic prediction. If Daniel could tell us the dates of Christ's sacrificial ministry, surely he could also tell us the times of his mediatorial ministry.

Other parts of the book of Daniel may have been used somewhat less in evangelism, but they are standard elements of Adventist exhortation. Sabbath morning sermons exploit Daniel 1, 3 and 6 for examples of moral faithfulness, and Daniel 4 and 5 have served as illustrations of divine judgement.

But we have not found it necessary to use the rest of the book for these purposes. To a considerable extent, the last three chapters of Daniel have been abandoned for homiletical and evangelistic use. Adventist congregations in the latter half of the twentieth century are as likely to hear a sermon on Nahum or Obadiah as one on Daniel 11. There is thus a pervasive bias against the usefulness of Daniel 11.

Examples of popular evangelistic presentations which reflect this bias are easy to find. An illustration may be taken from Mark Finley's *Discoveries in Daniel*,⁴⁷ the participant worktext for Daniel Seminars conducted in conjunction with Finley's evangelistic campaigns. This book contains eleven lessons, one for each of

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

the first ten chapters, and a final lesson covering chapters 11 and 12. Since these last two chapters have a combined length more than three times as great as chapter 1, or chapter 10, it is clear even on the briefest examination that chapter 11 is likely to receive very cursory explanation.

This impression is aggravated by the fact that Finley devotes 22 pages to his examination of chapter 1 and only 11 pages to chapters 11 and 12. Closer study of the book shows that the single page devoted to Daniel 11:29-45 does not attempt to identify any of the events or characters of vss. 36-45 except the “king of the north.” It should be added that Finley's presentation is not atypical of Adventist evangelistic treatment of Daniel 11. We simply have not found this passage useful for evangelistic purposes.

Apologetic Necessity. There are several doctrines which distinguish Seventh-day Adventists from other Christian denominations. Among these are the Sabbath, the nonimmortality of the soul, the Spirit of prophecy, and the sanctuary. Of these, the last depends largely on our interpretation of the books of Hebrews, Revelation, Leviticus, and Daniel. Because of the uniqueness of this doctrine (which is not shared with any other denomination), it has faced opposition and challenge.

Since our interpretation of Daniel 8 and 9 is crucial for the doctrine of the sanctuary, and since this interpretation is contested by opponents of normative Adventist Theology, we have focussed our research on these chapters, to the neglect of other parts of the book. Again, examples are easily found: Dr. William Shea's *Selected Studies in Prophetic Interpretation*, a book of 137 pages, contains only 9 pages discussing Daniel 11, with nearly all of the rest of the book devoted to issues arising from Daniel 7, 8 and 9. This disproportionate ratio is determined by apologetic necessity: defense is needed at points where we have *been attacked*, not at points where we have *nothing to be attacked*.

Ellen White and Daniel 11. Ellen White has made some rather significant remarks about the eleventh chapter of Daniel, including her statement that “The prophecy of the eleventh chapter of Daniel has nearly reached its complete fulfillment.”⁴⁸ Nevertheless, she has not written on the specifics of this chapter. The *Comprehensive Index to the Writings of Ellen G. White* contains only four non-

LEATHERMAN: ADVENTIST INTERPRETATION OF DANIEL 10-12

repetitive references to chapter 11,⁴⁹ three of which are general comments on the chapter as a whole, like the one cited above, and one of which refers exclusively to Daniel 11:1. By contrast, there are 102 non-repetitive references to chapter 1⁵⁰, even though the first chapter of Daniel is less than half as long as the eleventh chapter, and contains not a single word of apocalypse. Without disrespect to the Spirit of Prophecy, Seventh-day Adventists have taken pains to establish doctrine on the Scriptures, and not on the writings of Ellen White. Nevertheless, her silence on this chapter may be a factor in our neglect of it.

The Opacity of Unfulfilled Apocalyptic. There is among Seventh-day Adventists a general belief that some parts of the predictions in Daniel 11 and 12 are yet unfulfilled. Though many nineteenth century interpreters were quite brave in their identification of characters and events in Daniel 11, it is now generally agreed that apocalyptic predictions are quite opaque to the reader who lives before the fulfillment, and that they become clear only in retrospect. Regarding the final verses of Daniel 11, Mervyn Maxwell remarks,

... as to the precise events on earth that will accompany their fulfillment, wisdom suggests we may not know them until they actually take place.

The purpose of prophecy is not always to provide prior knowledge of specific future events. Many Bible prophecies were given with the intention that they would be understood—and build faith—only after they were fulfilled.⁵¹

Some of the nineteenth century writers shared this caution. The editors of the *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary* quote approvingly a statement made by James White in 1877:

Positions taken upon the Eastern question are based upon prophecies which have not yet met their fulfillment. Here we should tread lightly and take positions carefully, lest we be found removing the landmarks fully established in the advent movement.⁵²

Similar cautions regarding the opacity of unfulfilled apocalyptic have been voiced by Price,⁵³ Ford,⁵⁴ and Keough.⁵⁵ Thus, we have declined to expound these chapters because we hold an antecedent belief that they are not interpretable—at present.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Failure to Observe Transitions of Genre. It is a commonplace that the first six chapters of Daniel are primarily narrative, and the last six primarily apocalyptic. There are, to be sure, exceptions to this general description: there is an extensive apocalypse embedded in the narrative of chapter 2, and there are narratives in chapters 9 and 10 which serve as introductions or transitions for the apocalyptic material. But the over-all distinction is useful. Nevertheless, the broad description of chapters 7 through 12 as apocalyptic may conceal a shift of genre which is just as important as the shift between chapters 6 and 7. It should be noted that there are varieties within major genre categories: it is not the case that all narratives are the same. In fact, there are several different narrative forms: the narrative of Daniel 1 is a story; the narrative of chapter 4 is a decree; the narrative of chapter 9 is a prayer. So also there are varieties of apocalypse: the apocalypses of chapters 2, 4 and 5 consist of dreams (or portents) of the king, interpreted by a prophet; those of chapters 7, 8 and 9 are dreams or visions of the prophet, interpreted by an angel; those of chapters 10, 11 and 12 are auditions of the prophet, dictated by an angel.

Adventist commentators have acknowledged this distinction. Maxwell remarks,

The language of Daniel 11 is considered to be “literal” in that it isn't symbolic in the same way that the language of chapters 2, 7 and 8 is. There are no multi-element images, no beasts or horns. Just the same, its language is far from easy. It is cryptic, almost like a code.⁵⁶

Similarly, Keough refers to Daniel 11 as “prophecy without symbols.”⁵⁷ Nevertheless, despite this perception, Adventist interpreters of the book of Daniel have tended to treat chapter 11 as merely a longer, more detailed, and less symbolic version of chapter 7 or 8. Such a reading fails to recognize the transition in genre between chapters 7 to 9 and chapters 10 to 12.

Failure to Observe Dialogical Patterns. The apocalypses of Daniel are not monologues. There is, in each of them, a conversation between Daniel and his heavenly guides. As an active participant, Daniel has some influence on the content of these conversations. That is to say that subjects discussed by the interpreter include those suggested by Daniel. Even in the apocalypses of chapters 7 to 9, much of the visionary experience receives, initially, only a cursory

LEATHERMAN: ADVENTIST INTERPRETATION OF DANIEL 10-12

explanation. More complete explanations are given only in response to Daniel's explicit inquiries.

Furthermore, the longer explanations which follow Daniel's inquiries tend to focus on the issues of Daniel's concern, rather than treating the various elements of the vision equally. For example, Daniel's vision of the four beasts from the sea in chapter 7 receives a terse initial explanation only two verses long.⁵⁸ Fuller explanation is given only after Daniel inquires about the fourth beast and the little horn—and this supplementary explanation, five verses in length, deals almost exclusively with the issues raised by Daniel's question.

In the same way, the vision of chapter 8 is initially explained only partially. The angelic interpreter does not, at first, clarify the parts of the vision dealing with the sanctuary and its justification. Supplementary explanation of these parts of the vision is given only after Daniel's lengthy prayer about *the sins of the Jewish people* and *the restoration of the temple and of Jerusalem*—and then, in the supplementary explanation Gabriel tells Daniel that he will inform him about “your people and your holy city,”⁵⁹ that is, *the Jews* and *Jerusalem*. Thus, in both cases, the explanations offered by the angel are not comprehensive, but dwell on issues anticipated in Daniel's questions.

The final apocalypse of Daniel, contained in the last three chapters, consists of an angelic discourse which responds to inquiries made by Daniel himself during a three-week period of fasting and prayer. When the angel appears to Daniel, he tells him,

Since the first day that you set your mind to gain understanding and to humble yourself before your God, your words were heard, and I have come in response to them⁶⁰ (NIV).

Unfortunately, Daniel does not record the content of his prayers on this occasion, so we do not know, from his own lips, the issues to which the angel promises to respond. Nevertheless, at the beginning of this revelation the angel tells Daniel,

Now I have come to explain to you what will happen to your people in the future, for the vision concerns a time yet to come.⁶¹

Clearly, any interpretation of chapters 11 and 12 which does not understand this revelation as a response to some question(s) by

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Daniel regarding the future of his people faces the risk of serious error.

Steps Toward a Solution

Our approach to the last three chapters of Daniel, and to Daniel 11 in particular, should be based on what we already know about the book of Daniel. This would include its background, authorship, composition, genre, themes, content, historical scope, and the internal progressions in the book. That is to say, we should start with what we have already learned from the rest of the book, seeking explanations that are in harmony with this previously established body of knowledge. What do we know about Daniel?

Sixth Century Origin. It is generally agreed among Adventists that the book of Daniel was written in the sixth century, B.C. At least two conclusions follow from this. First, the concerns of the writer tend to be tied to his era. He did not think the thoughts we think today, or ask the questions we might ask. Second, the things he wrote about regarding the history of the sixth century tend to be quite precise and highly detailed. The more remote periods tend to be described with less specificity.

Written by Daniel. The author of the book was a specific sixth-century person, Daniel, a high-born Jew of Jerusalem who was deported to Mesopotamia in 605 B.C. Daniel's concerns are directed toward the Jewish people and Jerusalem, rather than toward certain eschatological questions which tend to preoccupy us. For example, Daniel's prayer in chapter 9, does not address any of the issues of interest to Adventists living in the "time of the end."

Rather, Daniel cares about the Jewish people, the city of Jerusalem and the temple of Solomon, not about the investigative judgment or the heavenly day of atonement. These latter issues arise in the book of Daniel under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, but God is obliged, as it were, to inform Daniel on these matters while the prophet is looking in another direction. The book of Daniel does indeed deal with eschatological issues, but we must realize that these are sometimes obscured by Daniel's own concerns.

One Author: Daniel. Not only do we assert that the book of Daniel was written in the sixth century by the historical Daniel,

LEATHERMAN: ADVENTIST INTERPRETATION OF DANIEL 10-12

but we also insist that *the whole book* was written by him. The document is not a composite. We, therefore, expect it to present the *same ideas in the same way and in the same sequence* throughout.

Thematic Unity. If we understand the book to be the product of the sixth century, the veritable composition of the historical Daniel himself, then we should anticipate a consistent style and, more importantly, a unified perspective.

We should be sensitive to the shifts in genre which take place in the book, including the shift between chapters 7 to 9 and chapters 10 to 12. Nevertheless, despite the change of genres, we should expect to find an over-all thematic unity in the book. It is demonstrable that the same themes which motivate the narratives of chapters 1 to 6 are also expressed in the apocalypses of chapters 7 to 9. Both the narratives and the earlier apocalypses emphasize the ideas of *divine judgment* and *sovereignty*, frequently proclaimed to humanity through *encoded revelations* which are subsequently deciphered by a *divinely guided interpreter*.

Even though there is another significant genre transition between chapters 9 and 10, we should anticipate a thematic unity between the last three chapters and earlier portions of the book. The same themes of judgment, sovereignty, revelation and interpretation may reasonably be expected in the last three chapters.

Shift in Genre. As noted above, there is a shift in genre between Daniel 7 to 9 and Daniel 10 to 12. Both of these sections are apocalyptic, but they are different kinds of apocalypse. This change of genre has been noted, as indicated above, by Maxwell,⁶² Keough⁶³ and others. It is also worth observing that both of these can be contrasted with a third type of apocalypse in Daniel, the type found in Daniel 2, 4 and 5. These three types may be compared in tabular format: (see the following page)

Table 1
Comparison of Apocalypses in Daniel

	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3
Examples	Cf 2:1ff; 4:4-7; 5:5ff	Cf 7:1-27; 8:1-26; 9:20-27	Cf 10:1-12:13
Form of Revelation	Dream/vision/(portent)	Dream/vision	Word/vision/(audition)
Recipient of Revelation	King	Prophet	Prophet
Opacity of Symbols	Highly opaque	Highly opaque	More transparent
Divinely Inspired Guide	Prophet	Angel	Angel

Apocalypses of the first type (found in chapters 2, 4 and 5) consist of dreams or portents given to a king and consisting of highly opaque symbols which are interpreted by a prophet, under the guidance of God. Apocalypses of the second type (found in chapters 7, 8 and 9) consist of dreams or visions given to a prophet and consisting of highly opaque symbols which are interpreted by an angel. Apocalypses of the third type (found only in chapters 10 through 12) consist of auditions delivered by an angel and heard by the prophet, in which symbolism is largely absent and is apparently somewhat less opaque than in apocalypses of the first two types.

The auditory genre of chapters 10 through 12 has been seen earlier in the book, in chapters 7, 8, and especially in chapter 9, in which the angel explains to Daniel the visions which he has seen. But audition becomes the primary, and for all practical purposes the sole, apocalyptic genre of chapters 11 and 12.

It is evident that we treat various genres differently. Narrative

LEATHERMAN: ADVENTIST INTERPRETATION OF DANIEL 10-12

is identified as something that happened “back then,” a record of a discrete event within historical time. Apocalypse, on the other hand, offers either a diachronic view of the continuum of historical time (as with most of the apocalypses of Daniel), or else a view outside of historical time into the heavenly realities (such as we find in many of the apocalypses of the book of Revelation).

Even within these broad categories there are significant differences. The narrative of chapter 1 is linear and unidirectional. Its movement is set off by the initial event, and others follow in sequence as the plot develops. The narrative of chapter 4, which takes the form of a royal proclamation, begins with its conclusion, and recapitulates the development of its theme several times.

Similarly, we should not expect all of the apocalypses of the book of Daniel to work in exactly the same way. We have already seen that the dreams and portents of chapters 4 and 5 are treated differently than those of chapters 7 and 8. It is not a foregone conclusion that the apocalypse of chapters 10 through 12 should be treated in the same way as either of the two earlier types. We may need to consider whether there are any clues in the text as to how this third type of apocalypse should be treated.

Concern with a Succession of Historical Entities. Few things are more evident than that most of the apocalypses of Daniel deal with a series of historical entities. Nowhere is this more obvious than in Daniel 2 and 7, where the successions of metallic elements and animals are specifically identified as kingdoms. In each case, the series is terminated with an act of eschatological judgment. This can also be seen in the ram and the goat of chapter 8. We do not find such a series of historical entities in the dreams and portents of chapters 4 and 5; these seem to be concerned with immediate judgment, rather than eschatological judgment.

The question, of course, is whether Daniel 11 conforms to the pattern of chapters 2, 7 and 8, or that of chapters 4 and 5. In response, we may say briefly that it has entities described as kings or kingdoms, some of which are identified or identifiable. It also terminates (in chapter 12, which is part of the same apocalypse) with an act of eschatological judgment. Despite the differences of the apocalyptic form in Daniel 11 and 12 from the form of the earlier apocalypses, these factors of content would seem to strengthen the

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

hand of those who see the various characters of this apocalypse (for example, the “king of the north” and the “king of the south”) as concrete historical realities.

Internal Progression of Apocalypses. The historical apocalypses of the book of Daniel are not uniform in regard to the issues treated. The first of them (Dan 2) is primarily concerned with politics. The second historical apocalypse (Dan 7) addresses both political and spiritual concerns. The third (Dan 8) shifts even further toward spiritual or religious concerns.

The first apocalypse (Dan 2) depicts the conflict of human kingdoms without reference to religious values, and resolves the issue by (apparent) brute force: the stone strikes the statue and grinds the metals to powder. There is no overt evaluation, there is no discussion of the reasons for the destruction of these kingdoms, and no particular fault found in any of them, except that none of them is the kingdom of God which will fill the earth.

The second apocalypse (Dan 7) depicts the conflict of human kingdoms, as well as the opposition of human powers to God and to God's people. It ends with a scene of judgment in which the actions of the “little horn” are evaluated and a formal judgment is announced and executed. This judgment is based on the religious character of the little horn, its antagonism to God and to the saints.

The third apocalypse (Dan 8) depicts the conflict of human kingdoms, as well as their opposition to God, and describes the resolution of the issue in liturgical or cultic terms, the “justification of the sanctuary.” The supplementary explanation to this apocalypse, delivered to Daniel by Gabriel in chapter 9 also centers on religious matters, notably “Messiah the Prince.”

Thus, there is a marked progression in these historical apocalypses. They become progressively more spiritually focused. A similar progression can also be seen in the narratives. The narratives of chapters 1 and 2 are primarily political (including the partially religious apocalypse of chapter 2). The narratives of chapters 3 and 4 mix religious themes with the political: Nebuchadnezzar enforces an act of worship by political force in chapter 3, and acknowledges the sovereignty of the true God over all political powers in chapter 4. The narratives in chapters 5 and 6 continue the mixture of religious and political themes. Chapter 6, for ex-

LEATHERMAN: ADVENTIST INTERPRETATION OF DANIEL 10-12

ample centers on Daniel's prayers and Darius' edict which would forbid them. The narratives of Daniel 9 and 11 are entirely religious or spiritual in nature, transcribing Daniel's prayers and God's (supernatural) response.

Given this progression in both the narratives and the historical apocalypses of the book of Daniel, we might expect an even more profound spiritual focus in the apocalypse of chapter 11.

An Unfinished Task

At this point, several observations may be made:

First, the items recorded above do not, by any means, constitute a complete listing of data, and will not, in themselves, sustain a comprehensive approach to the interpretation of the final apocalypse of the book of Daniel. The reader may think of other widely held insights that may also contribute to the interpretation of chapters 10-12. There are certainly other patterns and progressions within the book which will, if carefully observed, help us in our reading of the last part.⁶⁴

Second, it may have already been observed that some of these factors appear, at first glance, to work at cross-purposes. For example, the concern of the book of Daniel with a succession of historical entities seems to make a concrete historical interpretation of Daniel 11 more probable. On the other hand the internal progression of the apocalypses from the more political to the more spiritual would seem to imply that the identification of concrete historical entities within this chapter is less significant. Considerable study will be necessary to resolve the tension between these factors, and the tension which may arise in other similar cases.

Third, the title of this paper is "Adventist Interpretation of Daniel 10-12: A Diagnosis and Prescription." I would not be accused of false advertising. I offered an analysis of the malady, and a proposal for therapy. I did not promise to present the cured patient, well and healthy and in his right mind. I cannot pretend to have a comprehensive, cogent and consistent interpretation of the last apocalypse of the book of Daniel. I only urge that such an interpretation be sought. By collaboration, by diligent study and sincere prayer, we may hope eventually to find such an interpretation. And

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

it is to this task that I would exhort the ministry and the academicians of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

Endnotes

- 1 Uriah Smith, *Thoughts Critical and Practical on the Book of Daniel* (Battle Creek, MI: Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association, 1881).
- 2 Uriah Smith, *The Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation* (Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing Association, 1945), p. 299.
- 3 Stephen N. Haskell, *The Story of Daniel the Prophet* (Battle Creek, MI: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1901).
- 4 J. Grant Lamson, *The Eleventh of Daniel Narrated* (n.p., 1909). Lamson's work appears to have been privately published.
- 5 Max Hill, *Studies in Prophetic History* (Oakland, CA: R. L. Bond and Sons, 1915). The name of Hill's printer in Oakland appears on the title page, but the location St. Helena is also indicated, implying that R. L. Bond was a job printer, and the volume was published by Hill himself.
- 6 O. A. Johnson, *Lessons on Daniel* (College Place, WA: 1919). This work is a typescript, apparently prepared for classes at Walla Walla College where Johnson taught in the Bible Department.
- 7 *Two Great Prophecies With a Message to All Mankind* (Takoma Park, MD: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1925).
- 8 M. H. Brown, *The Sure Word of Prophecy* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1926).
- 9 W. H. Wakeham, *Outline Lessons on the Books of Daniel and the Revelation* (Berrien Springs, MI: The College Press, 1930).
- 10 E. A. Nixon, *The Last Day's Story of Daniel and the Revelation* (n.p., 1945).
- 11 Walter E. Straw, *Studies in Daniel* (Concord, TN: 1947). This typescript volume was apparently privately published.
- 12 Alonzo T. Jones, *The Marshalling of Nations* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1900), p. 31.
- 13 Arthur G. Daniels, *The World War* (Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing Association, 1917), pp. 51, 52.
- 14 Roy Allan Anderson, *Unfolding Daniel's Prophecies* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1975), p. 161 ff.
- 15 Taylor G. Bunch, *The Book of Daniel* (n.p., 1950), p. 190.
- 16 Bunch, *The Book of Daniel*, p. 190.
- 17 Bunch, *The Book of Daniel*, p. 192.
- 18 Bunch, *The Book of Daniel*, p. 193.
- 19 Edwin R. Thiele, *Outline Studies in Daniel* (Berrien Springs, MI: 1947). This typescript volume was apparently prepared for Thiele's classes at Emmanuel Missionary College and privately published.
- 20 Thiele, *Outline Studies*, pp. 139-143.
- 21 Thiele, *Outline Studies*, pp. 123-125.
- 22 Louis F. Were, *The King of the North at Jerusalem: God's People Delivered: The Relationship Between Daniel 11:45 and 12:1* (East Malvern, Australia: A. F. Blackman, 1949).
- 23 Were, *The King of the North*, p. 46.
- 24 Were, *The King of the North*, p. 48.

LEATHERMAN: ADVENTIST INTERPRETATION OF DANIEL 10-12

- 25 George McCready Price, *The Greatest of the Prophets: A New Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1955), p. 306.
- 26 Price, *The Greatest of the Prophets*, p. 312.
- 27 Price, *The Greatest of the Prophets*, pp. 315, 316.
- 28 Robert D. Brinsmead, *The King of the North and the King of the South* (Conway, MO: Gems of Truth, 1960), p. 6.
- 29 Brinsmead, *The King of the North*, p. 6.
- 30 See, e.g., the comments on Daniel 11:30 in Francis David Nichol, ed. *The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, rev. ed., (Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1977) Vol. 3, pp. 872, 873.
- 31 Nichol, *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, Vol. 4, p. 877.
- 32 Nichol, *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, Vol. 4, p. 877.
- 33 Desmond Ford, *Daniel* (Nashville, TN: Southern Publishing Association, 1978), 269.
- 34 Ford, *Daniel*, p. 275.
- 35 Ford, *Daniel*, p. 276.
- 36 C. Mervyn Maxwell, *God Cares*, Vol. 1 (Boise, ID: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1981), 296.
- 37 See Maxwell, *God Cares*, Vol. 1, pp. 292-298, especially the chart on p. 295, which indicates the parallels between Daniel 7, 8 and 11. The sequence of this chart is apparently established by Daniel 7, with close parallels to Daniel 8. But the sequence of Daniel 11 is largely disrupted by this presentation of the material.
- 38 G. Arthur Keough, *Let Daniel Speak* (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1986).
- 39 Keough, *Let Daniel Speak*, pp. 118, 119.
- 40 Keough, *Let Daniel Speak*, p. 117.
- 41 Keough, *Let Daniel Speak*, p. 119.
- 42 Jacques B. Doukhan, *Daniel: The Vision of the End* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1989).
- 43 Doukhan, *Daniel*, p. 84.
- 44 Doukhan, *Daniel*, p. 81.
- 45 Doukhan, *Daniel*, p. 86.
- 46 Doukhan, *Daniel*, p. 88.
- 47 Mark A. Finley, *Discoveries in Daniel* (Siloam Springs, AR: Concerned Communications, 1988).
- 48 Ellen G. White, *Testimonies for the Church* (Boise, ID: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1909), 14.
- 49 *Comprehensive Index to the Writings of Ellen G. White* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1962), Vol. 1, p. 83.
- 50 *Comprehensive Index to the Writings of Ellen G. White* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press Publishing Association, 1962), Vol. 1, p. 81.
- 51 Maxwell, *God Cares*, Vol. 1, p. 297.
- 52 James White, "Unfulfilled Prophecy," *Second Advent Review and Sabbath Herald*, November 29, 1877, 172.
- 53 Price, *The Greatest of the Prophets*, pp. 315, 316.
- 54 Ford, *Daniel*, p. 274.
- 55 Keough, *Let Daniel Speak*, p. 119.
- 56 Maxwell, *God Cares*, Vol. 1, p. 278.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

- 57 Keough, *Let Daniel Speak*, p. 114. This expression is Keough's chapter title for his analysis of Daniel 11.
- 58 Daniel 7:17, 18.
- 59 Daniel 9:24.
- 60 Daniel 10:12.
- 61 Daniel 10:14.
- 62 Maxwell, *God Cares*, Vol. 1, p. 278.
- 63 Keough, *Let Daniel Speak*, p. 114.
- 64 This might include chiasmic structures such as those identified by Jacques Doukhan in *Daniel*, pp. 81-84.

[This paper has been reformulated from old, unformatted electronic files and may not be identical to the edited version that appeared in print. The original pagination has been maintained, despite the resulting odd page breaks, for ease of scholarly citation. However, scholars quoting this article should use the print version or give the URL.]
Journal of the Adventist Theological Society, 7/1 (Spring 1996): 141-158.
Article copyright © 1996 by Gerhard Pfandl.

Daniel's "Time of the End"

Gerhard Pfandl
Field Secretary, South Pacific Division
Wahroonga, NSW, Australia

Introduction

After the portrayal of the ram, the goat, and the activities of the little horn power in the vision of Daniel 8, the angel Gabriel says to Daniel, "Understand, O Son of man, that the vision extends to the time of the end" (vs. 17).

This is the first of five occurrences of the phrase "time of the end" (*ʿēṭ qēṣ*), in the book of Daniel, the other four being 11:35, 40; 12:4, 9. Research has shown that there is no cognate equivalent to *ʿēṭ qēṣ* in any of the other Semitic languages. It is not found in any of the other OT books nor in any extrabiblical Hebrew source.¹ Thus, we have to conclude that the expression, "the time of the end," is a purely Danielic phrase and as such must be evaluated within the context of the prophetic chapters of Daniel.

Scholarly Opinions

Scholarly opinion in regard to the meaning of "the time of the end" in Daniel is divided. One view among scholars considers it to be an eschatological term to be applied to the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes (2nd century B.C.). According to this position, the author of Daniel 8 expected the Messianic age to appear immediately after the demise of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.² Thus, "the time of the end" (*ʿēṭ qēṣ*) is equated with "the latter days" (*b^eʿah^ariṭ hayyāmim*) "the latter indignation" (*ʿah^ariṭ hazzaʿam*), and "the appointed time of the end" (*mōʿed qes*).³

A variation of this interpretation is E. J. Young's view who equates "the time of the end" (*ʿēṭ qēṣ*) with "the latter indignation"

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

(*ʔah^a rîṭ hazza^cam*) and applies both to “the end of time when afflictions of indignation are to be permitted upon Israel. It is the end of the Old Testament period and the ushering in of the New.”⁴

A second view takes Daniel 8 as having a dual fulfillment, which means “that a prophecy fulfilled in part in the past is a foreshadowing of a future event which will completely fulfill the passage.”⁵ Some take the entire chapter 8 as having a dual fulfillment;⁶ John F. Walvoord, for example, sees the whole chapter historically fulfilled in Antiochus, but foreshadowing typically the future world ruler.⁷ Others take the vision proper (vss. 1-14) as historically fulfilled but see in the interpretation of the vision a dual fulfillment.⁸ Expositors of this view generally apply “the time of the end” (*ʕēṭ qēṣ*) to the time before Christ's second advent.⁹

A similar view is taken by Joyce Baldwin who, in accordance with the idealistic method of interpretation, sees Daniel 8 portraying “a recurring historical phenomenon: the clever but ruthless world dictator, who stops at nothing in order to achieve his ambitions.”¹⁰

A third view rejects the Antiochus IV Epiphanes interpretation and applies the Little Horn in Daniel 8 either to the Roman Empire,¹¹ its successor—papal Rome,¹² the Mohammedans,¹³ or a future Antichrist.¹⁴ All expositors of this view see “the time of the end” as the time preceding and culminating in the second advent of Christ, that is, the end of world history.¹⁵

Finding a Starting Point

Daniel 11:35. A specific historical event in any of the five passages where the expression, “the time of the end” occurs would provide a starting point in the search for its meaning. I believe such an historical event is found in the passage of Daniel 11:35-12:4 where the phrase is used three times (11:35,40; 12:4).

Daniel 11 is part of the second “commentary vision” which begins in Daniel 10:1 and ends in Daniel 12:4. As in Daniel 9, there are no striking symbols in this vision, only explanations. The symbolic visions of Daniel end in 8:14, what follows are explanations and enlargements of the symbolic visions.

The angelic commentary in Daniel 11 begins with the kings of Medo-Persia (vss. 1-2), followed by the Alexandrian empire and its

PFANDL: DANIEL'S "TIME OF THE END"

break up into four parts (vss. 3-4). The next 40 verses are taken up with the struggle between two opposing forces, designated as kings of the North and the South (5-45).

In Daniel 11:35 the phrase, "time of the end" (*'ēṭ qēṣ*) makes its second appearance in the book. Daniel 11:35 is part of a series of verses describing the activities of "those who are wise," the *maškilîm* (vss. 32-35), in the face of the invasion of the King of the North. These wise persons "shall fall to refine and to purge them, and to make them white, until the time of the end, for it is yet for the appointed time" (vs. 35). Who is to be purged through the fall of the "wise"? They themselves, the people of verse 33, or the "many" in verse 34? The text unfortunately is ambiguous. However, whichever group is referred to, the thought is clear that this falling will go on until the time of the end which will come at the appointed time.

The passage following Daniel 11:35 describes the activities of the willful king in verses 36-39, and in verse 40 "the time of the end" (*'ēṭ qēṣ*) is mentioned again. In verse 40 "the time of the end," which was seen as future in verse 35, has now arrived. In the concluding part of the vision a resurrection of the dead takes place (12:2). It is this event which, I believe, holds the key to the proper understanding of the expression, "the time of the end" (*'ēṭ qēṣ*).

Daniel 12:1, 2. And at that time Michael shall stand up, the great prince who has charge of your people. And there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation until that time. But at that time your people shall be delivered, everyone who is found written in the book.

And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.

"At that time" refers us back to "the time of the end" in 11:40.¹⁶ During this "time of the end" Michael will stand up, because there will be such a "time of trouble" within "the time of the end" the like of it the world has never experienced. Yet "at that time," still referring to the "time of the end," God's people will be delivered.

As we have seen above, the phrase "at that time" (*ûbâ'ēṭ hahî'*) which appears at the beginning and the end of Daniel 12:1 refers

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

back to Daniel 11:40-45. The subject in Daniel 12:1c is “your people” qualified by the appositional phrase “everyone who is found written in the book.” Thus the “people” not only belong to God, but they are also recorded in God’s book. Many books are mentioned in the OT,¹⁷ but this one seems to be the “book of life” (Ps 69:28), also called “God’s book” (Exod 32:33).¹⁸ Only those whose names are written in this book will be delivered.

In Daniel 12:1 there are three different themes (Michael stands up, a time of trouble, and the deliverance of God’s people). These themes are welded together by the temporal phrase, “that time.” The immediate context in Daniel 12:2 deals with the resurrection of the dead which I believe holds the key to the meaning of “the time of the end” (*‘ēṭ qēṣ*).

There is a sizeable body of literature on the topic of the resurrection in the OT.¹⁹ According to the scholarly consensus, the physical resurrection of the dead is part of the OT apocalyptic matrix.²⁰ The two passages which most clearly enunciate it are Isaiah 26:19 and Daniel 12:1-4. Although Hans Wildberger and other scholars see the resurrection in Isaiah 26 as only a metaphor for the restoration of Israel,²¹ the majority of scholars hold that Isaiah 26:19 expresses the notion of a physical resurrection.²²

In regard to Daniel 12:2, some see the resurrection mentioned there simply as a figure of the moral and national revival of Israel in “the time of the end,”²³ but again the majority of interpreters agree that a physical resurrection is in view here as well.²⁴

Many scholars see Daniel 12:1-4 as part of the prophecy in Daniel 11:40-45, which the writer envisaged but which never came to pass. According to their understanding, the resurrection was to come after Antiochus IV Epiphanes had died.²⁵

In Daniel 12:2a we read: “And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake.” The word “many” (*rabbîm*) indicates that this is not the general resurrection at the end of time, but a resurrection which is limited to “many of them that sleep.” The preposition *min* being used in the partitive sense. Gerhard Hasel points out²⁶ that in Esther 8:17, the only other OT passage where we find exactly the same sentence construction,²⁷ *min* has the partitive sense. “Furthermore, the partitive usage is the more common one for *rabbîm* followed by *min*. One would have to have

PFANDL: DANIEL'S "TIME OF THE END"

compelling reasons," says Hasel, "for departing from normal usage before one could be reasonably sure that a meaning other than the common one should be chosen."²⁸ There does not seem to be any compelling reason in this text.

"Sleeping" (*yāšēn*) is used here of death as in Job 3:13, Psalm 13:3 and Jeremiah 51:39 of death. This is parallel to John 11:11 where Jesus says "Lazarus is sleeping" and three verses further on he explains that Lazarus is in fact dead.

"Dusty earth" or "land of dust" (*ʿadmat ʿaphār*) occurring only here, refers back to Genesis 3:19 "In the sweat of your face you shall eat bread, till you return to the ground (*ʿdamah*), for out of it you were taken; For dust (*ʿaphār*) you are, and to dust you shall return." Dust is frequently used as a symbol for the grave (cf. Job 7:21; Ps 22:29). The reference here is to those who are dead and buried.

"Shall awake" (*yāqîyû*). This verb appears 22 times in the OT and can refer to waking up from sleep (1 Sam 26:12; Ps 3:5) or from inactivity (Ps 35:23; 59:5). It is used for the resurrection in 2 Kings 4:31; Job 14:12; Psalms 17:15; Isaiah 26:19; Jeremiah 51:39,57 and here in Daniel 12:2. Nowhere does it refer to a moral or national awakening.

Thus, using normal Hebrew grammar and syntax for a reading of Daniel 12:2, I find that what is spoken of here is a partial resurrection when some will receive eternal life and others everlasting contempt.

Since in the time of Jesus the great tribulation and the resurrection were still future (Matt 24:21; John 5:28, 29), Daniel 11:35-12:4 cannot refer to the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes in the second century B.C. Daniel's time of trouble and the partial resurrection must come in "the time of the end" as this aeon comes to a close prior to the establishment of the kingdom of God.

Parallels in Daniel

This view is supported by the comparison of Daniel 2, 7, and 8 on chart A and Daniel 8, 9, and 10-12 on chart B.²⁹

In both charts the pivot is chapter 8. In these charts chapter 8 alone follows the chronological order of the text. One must also bear in mind that chapters 2, 7, and 8 consist of vision and explanation; this means that details appear in the vision and again in the

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

explanation. Therefore, the corresponding texts, particularly in chapters 9 and 10-12, are not in the chronological order as they appear in their respective chapters. Furthermore, the descriptions in the chapters do not follow a common sequence.

From Chart A we may draw the following conclusions:

1. The first three empires are clearly defined as Babylon, Medo-Persia, and Greece by direct citations from the text.

2. The Little Horn of chap. 7 is basically the same as the Little Horn of chap. 8, even though the Aramaic expression, "another little horn" in Daniel 7:8 is not the exact equivalent of the Hebrew, "a little horn," Daniel 8:9.³⁰ The activities of the Little Horn in Daniel 7 overlap to a large extent the activities of the Little Horn of Daniel 8. The identification of the two horns, says H. H. Rowley, "does not rest on the similarity of the terms, but on the indications of the character and deeds of the person each stands for."³¹ W. H. Shea, after listing eleven similarities between the two "little horns" observes, "If the prophet had desired to represent different powers in this final position, he could easily have used different symbols to do so."³²

3. In both chapters the activities of the Little Horn extend through the time of the end (Dan 7:26; 8:17), and in both chapters it is supernaturally destroyed (Dan 7:26; 8:25).

4. The visions in Daniel 2 and 7 end with the kingdom of heaven. In Daniel 7 the destruction of the Little Horn is connected with the establishment of Christ's kingdom.³³ Thus, we conclude that the Little Horn in Daniel 8, since it is parallel to the Little Horn in Daniel 7, also perishes (Dan 8:25) at the coming of the everlasting kingdom. Although Daniel 8 does not expressly mention this kingdom, nevertheless, the parallelism between Daniel 7 and 8 clearly indicates this.

From Chart B we can draw the following conclusions:

1. The striking linguistic parallels show that the same subject matter is treated in all three passages.

2. The "prince" or "anointed one" is Christ³⁴ in all three passages. He is Lord of the covenant (Deut 4:23), and He is also the "Prince of the covenant" (Dan 11:22).

3. The abomination that makes desolate (Dan 9:27; 11:31)³⁵ was cited by Christ (Matt 24:15) as still lying in the future.³⁶ A

PFANDL: DANIEL'S "TIME OF THE END"

fulfillment in the second century B.C., therefore, does not seem possible.

4. The visions of Daniel 8 and 11 both reach to "the time of the end," at which, according to Daniel 12:2, a resurrection takes place.

5. The "indignation" (*za'am*) in Daniel 8:19 and 11:36 refers to the judgment of God (Isa 10:25; 26:20-21). The context of both texts is "the time of the end" (Dan 8:17; 11:35). Historical-critical scholars have correctly seen that Daniel 8 and 11 parallel each other, but for them the historical events center around Antiochus IV Epiphanes. They see the "time of indignation" as the time in which God used Antiochus as the "rod of wrath" (Isa 5:24-30) for the Jews.³⁷

Summarizing both charts, we may say that Daniel 2, 7, 8, and 10-12 are parallel prophecies which cover roughly the same period. They begin either in the time of the Babylonians or the Persians and reach to the time of the end when the everlasting kingdom breaks into history. The stone in Daniel 2, the judgment in Daniel 7, and the resurrection in Daniel 12, clearly point to the apocalyptic end of history. Hence, we can assume that Daniel 8 also reaches that far since there are in it many parallels to the other chapters. The inner unity of the book, which I have attempted to illustrate, makes it difficult to accept any interpretation which restricts all or some of Daniel's prophecies to the period of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.

The structure of Daniel 11, as well as the links and similarities with other chapters of the book of Daniel, gives us ample ground to conclude that it does indeed span the time from the Persian kings to the resurrection and the final judgment at the end of earth's history.

The Input of Daniel 12:4, 9

Daniel 12:4. But you Daniel shut up³⁸ these words and seal³⁹ the book until the time of the end. Many shall (then) go back and forth⁴⁰ and knowledge shall increase.

At the end of the section of Daniel 11:2-12:4 there is again the direct address of the angel as we found at the beginning (Dan 11:2), thus the angel's direct words serve as markers for the introduction and conclusion of this segment of the vision.

The expression "time of the end" (*'ēṭ qēṣ*) in Daniel 12:4 again

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

refers back to “the time of the end” in Daniel 11:35, 40. We have seen that in view of the larger context “the time of the end” in these texts refers to *the time preceding the resurrection of the dead* in Daniel 12:2 which will happen at the end of all things.⁴¹ This seems also to be the meaning here in Daniel 12:4. Just prior to the end of history, people will study and search out the Danielic visions just as Daniel himself searched out the seventy-year prophecy of Jeremiah (Dan 9:2).

Daniel 12:9. And he said: Go Daniel for the words are shut up and sealed until the time of the end.⁴²

In this epilogue (Dan 12:5-13) a new scene is introduced. Two other beings appear and converse with the man clothed in linen whom Daniel had seen at the beginning of the vision (Dan 10:4-5). He hears what they say but does not understand it and so he asks, in verse 8, “My Lord, what shall be the outcome⁴³ of these things?”

The response refers to “the time of the end” (vs. 9b), which is the time when these things will be understood (vs. 10). It is the same time referred to in vs. 4 when knowledge about the Danielic visions would increase. The unsealing of the vision and the increase of knowledge will come when the power of the willful king is broken (Dan 11:45). And this will happen just prior to the resurrection of the dead (Dan 12:1-2).

Conclusion

In conclusion we can say that interpreters by and large consider “the time of the end” (*ʿēṭ qēṣ*) to be an eschatological term, some applying it to the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, others to the time immediately prior to the second advent.

The linguistic and thematic parallels in chapters 2, 7, 8, and 10-12 support the second view. They indicate that all these visions reach to the time of the second advent. I agree therefore with J. R. Wilch who, in his study on “time” (*ʿēṭ*), pointed out that the five instances of “the time of the end” (*ʿēṭ qēṣ*) in Daniel 8-12 all refer to the “absolute eschatological end.”⁴⁴ Yet this end is not a point in time, but the final period of history. Wilch calls it the “final ‘act’: the ‘situation of the end’.”⁴⁵

The vision in Daniel 8, therefore, cannot terminate in the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. It too must reach to the absolute end

PFANDL: DANIEL'S "TIME OF THE END"

of the course of history. For contextual reasons the expression “the time of the end” (*‘ēṭ qēṣ*) in the book of Daniel seems to be a technical term standing for the final period of human history leading up to the eschaton, Christ's return, when the old aeon will give way to the new one and God's kingdom will be established “without human hands” (Dan 2:34).

EXCURSUS: “THE LATTER DAYS”

In Daniel 2:28 the prophet tells King Nebuchadnezzar that “there is a God in heaven who reveals secrets, and He has made known to King Nebuchadnezzar what will be in the latter days.” The phrase “latter days” appears again in Daniel 10:14 where an angel tells Daniel that he has come to make Daniel understand what will happen to his people in the latter days. What is meant by the phrase “latter days?” To what time period does it refer?

In chapter 8:17 Daniel is told that the vision of the ram and the goat extends to “the time of the end.” This is the first of five occurrences of this phrase in the book of Daniel, the other four being Daniel 11:35, 40; 12:4, 9. These passages we have discussed above. Our question here is, How does the expression, “the latter days” relate to the phrase, “the time of the end”? Do these expressions refer to the same time period or not?

Adventist interpreters have frequently equated these temporal expressions in the book of Daniel. Both have been seen as referring to the time just prior to the second advent of Christ. Uriah Smith in the last century saw “the time of the end” beginning in 1798 and “the latter days” as following the 2300 prophetic days in Daniel 8:14,⁴⁶ and Taylor Bunch in this century wrote, “All four of the great visions of Daniel's book focus upon the ‘time of the end’ or ‘latter days,’ when they would be studied and understood.”⁴⁷ But are they in fact referring to the same time period?

The Latter Days

The Hebrew phrase for the expression, “the latter days” (*b^e‘ah^ariṭ hayyāmîm*) appears 14 times in the OT including the two occurrences in the book of Daniel (Gen 49:1; Num 24:14; Deut 4:30; 31:29; Isa 2:2; Jer 23:20; 30:24; 48:47; 49:39; Ezek 38:16; Dan 2:28; 10:14; Hos 3:5; Mic 4:1).

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

A study of the twelve references outside of the book of Daniel shows that the “latter days” can refer to various time periods in history. In Genesis 49:1, where the phrase appears for the first time, Jacob says to his sons: “Gather together and I will tell you what will happen to you in the latter days.”

At the end of his life Jacob looks into the future, and under prophetic inspiration he predicts major developments in the history of his sons and their descendants. He sees them settled in Canaan, notices the two leading and prominent figures in their history—Judah, on the one hand (vs. 8) and Joseph or Ephraim on the other (vs. 22), and predicts that the Messiah will come from the tribe of Judah (vs. 10). Since Jacob is primarily describing the future history of his descendants, that is, Israel, “the latter days” (*b^eʿah^arîṭ hayyāmîm*) is best translated and construed to mean “in the future” or “in the days to come” as the RSV, NEB, and NIV have done. This future began to be realized with the conquest of Canaan and continued until the first advent of Christ. “The latter days” in this text, therefore, refer to the whole time span extending from the Israel's entrance into Canaan to the appearance of the Messiah.

In Deuteronomy 31:29 Moses predicts that after his death the children of Israel would become utterly corrupt, and that evil would befall them in “the latter days.” This prophecy was fulfilled in the time of the judges (Judges 2:11-16) and kings (Jer 7:28-34) when Israel repeatedly apostatized on a large scale. Hence “the latter days” in this text were the times of the judges and kings. In Jeremiah 23:20 and 30:24 the phrase refers to the time of the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C. Then, Jeremiah says, the Jews would clearly understand that the calamities which had come upon them were the divine judgment upon their sins.

In Jeremiah 48:47; and 49:39 the time of the Persian restoration is in view. In other texts notably Isaiah 2:2; Micah 4:1; and Hosea 3:5 the time of the Messianic kingdom is referred to as “the latter days.”

Thus, we see that the context must decide in each case what specific era is intended. Most modern versions, therefore, translate the Hebrew phrase *b^eʿah^arîṭ hayyāmîm* as “in the days to come” (NASB in Gen 49:1); “in time to come” (NRSV in Deut 31:29); or “in later days” (NIV in Deut 4:30).

PFANDL: DANIEL'S "TIME OF THE END"

In summary, then, we can say that “the latter days” in the OT outside of the book of Daniel may refer to: (a) a specific future period in the history of Israel (Deut 4:30; 31:29; Jer 23:20; 30:24; 48:47; 49:39); (b) the future history of Israel beginning with the conquest (Gen 49:1) or the monarchy (Num 24:14) and reaching down to the time of the Messiah; and (c) the Messianic age (Isa 2:2; Mic 4:1; Hos 3:5) or the time immediately preceding it (Ezek 38:16).

Daniel 2:28. The context of “the latter day” passage in Daniel 2 is the dream of King Nebuchadnezzar. Daniel comes before the king and says in vs. 28, “There is a God in heaven who reveals mysteries and he has made known to king Nebuchadnezzar what will be in the latter days.” The mystery, which the king wanted to know, related to the future of his kingdom. He had just begun a brilliant reign. How would it end, and what would follow? The king hoped for some information concerning the future of Babylon. But what God showed him took in not only the future of the Babylonian realm but also the future of world history down to the end of time.

Thus “the latter days” in Daniel 2 refer to the future which began in the time of Daniel and reaches down to the time of the second advent of Christ, symbolized by the stone kingdom. The “latter days” cannot be confined to the final part of the vision as some have done; they refer to the whole time span referred to in the vision.

This is confirmed by the parallelism between verses 28 and 29.

vs. 28 God reveals secrets and makes known to the king.

vs. 29 The revealer of secrets makes known to you

vs. 28 what shall be in the latter days (*b^eʿaḥ^arîṭ yômayyāʾ*)

vs. 29 what shall be after this (*ʔḥ^arê d^enāh*)

vs. 28 the visions of your head upon your bed

vs. 29 your thoughts on your bed

To insist that what God makes known to the king in vs. 28, that is, “what shall be in the latter days,” is something different from what God makes known to him in vs. 29, that is, “what shall be after this,” is against the parallelism and flow of thought in this whole passage. The subject matter of the story is the king's dream, the whole dream, not only the final part of it. Therefore, if “after

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

this” refers to the whole vision, as is generally acknowledged, then “the latter days” must also refer to the whole vision.

Daniel 10:14. The same is true for the meaning of “the latter days” in Daniel 10:14, where the angel informs the prophet that he has come to give him understanding of what will happen to his people in “the latter days.” The prophecy, in the form of an audition in Daniel 11 and 12, runs from the days of the prophet, that is, from the days of the Persian kings (Dan 11:2) down to the very climax of human history, the resurrection (Dan 12:2).

The phrase “your people” in Daniel 10:14 clearly refers to the Jews, the people of whom Daniel was one. Any other meaning would have had to be explained to Daniel in order to be comprehensible to him. Again in Daniel 11:14, God, referring to the Jews, calls them “your people,” that is, Daniel's people. And when we look at Daniel 11 as a whole, we find that more than half the verses in this chapter actually deal with historical events prior to A.D. 70 and the final destruction of the Jewish state. Thus, when the angel says, “What will happen to your people in ‘the latter days’ . . .” these “latter days” must include the events of the first half of Daniel 11. They refer to the whole sweep of history which is outlined in Daniel 11 and 12, that is, the future which began in the time of Daniel and ends with the second coming of Christ.

Concluding our study of the phrase “the latter days,” we can say that the context remains decisive in each case for the meaning of “the latter days.” It is an idiomatic expression for “future” or “in days to come.” It is therefore in itself not a technical eschatological term, because its contextual settings and varieties of usages allow it to be employed in different ways. Only the context of a given passage can determine if the expression is being used with an eschatological nuance.

The two expressions, “the latter days” and “the time of the end,” are not equivalent and they bear no direct relationship to each other. Both are eschatological expressions, but only “the time of the end” refers to the final eschatological or apocalyptic event.

Endnotes

1 Gerhard Pfandl, *The Time of the End in the Book of Daniel*, Adventist Theological Society Dissertation Series, vol. 1 (Berrien Springs, MI: Adventist Theological Society Publications, 1992), p. 256.

PFANDL: DANIEL'S "TIME OF THE END"

2 J. Dyneley Prince, *A Critical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung, 1899), pp. 149, 187; K. Marti, *Das Buch Daniel*, Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1901), pp. 61, 88; S. R. Driver, *The Book of Daniel*, Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges (Cambridge: University Press, 1901), p. 121; R. H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929), p. 215; Arthur Jeffery, "The Book of Daniel," *Interpreter's Bible* (New York: Abingdon, 1956), p. 478; John E. Goldingay, *Daniel*, Word Biblical Commentary (Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1989), p. 216. B. Jones, "Ideas of History in the Book of Daniel" (Ph.D. diss., Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, 1972), p. 274, says it was impossible for him to determine whether the time would continue after the *qes* of 8:17, 19; 11:27, 35, 40; 12:4, 9. He refers it to the end of the persecution under Antiochus IV Epiphanes, but admits that the end of the persecution could also be the end of history.

3 Marti, p. 76; Charles, p. 394; Jeffery, p. 479.

4 E. J. Young, *The Prophecy of Daniel* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1949), p. 176.

5 John F. Walvoord, *Daniel* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1979), p. 194.

6 J. Dwight Pentecost, *Prophecy for Today* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1961), pp. 82-83; Walvoord, p. 196; Gerhard Maier, *Der Prophet Daniel*, Wuppertaler Studienbibel (Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus, 1982), p. 307; Desmond Ford, *Daniel* (Nashville, TN: Southern Pub. Assn., 1978), p. 172, 191; H. C. Leupold, *Exposition of Daniel* (Wartburg Press, 1949; reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1969), p. 361.

7 Walvoord, p. 196.

8 H. A. Ironside, *Lectures on Daniel the Prophet* 2nd ed. (Neptune, NJ: Loizeaux Brothers, 1920), pp. 147-149; Louis T. Talbot, *The Prophecies of Daniel* (Wheaton, IL: Van Kampen Press, 1940), p. 143; New Scofield Reference Bible, p. 911.

9 Frederick A. Tatford, *Daniel and His Prophecy* (London: Oliphants, 1953; reprint, Minneapolis, MN: Klock and Klock, 1980), p. 133; Ironside, p. 149. Leupold (p. 361) says: "... aside from the obvious relation that the vision has to the events that lie in the near future, namely, in the time of the Persian and the Greek Empires, this whole vision also serves as a type of what shall transpire at the time of the end of the present world order. So the 'end' referred to the absolute end."

10 J. C. Baldwin, *Daniel*, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1978), p. 162.

11 For example, W. R. A. Boyle, *The Inspiration of the Book of Daniel* (London: Rivingtons, 1863), p. 300; A. Clarke, *The Holy Bible*, 6 vols. (New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, n.d.), 4:597.

12 For example, Robert Reid, *The Seven Last Plagues; or Vials of the Wrath of God* (Pittsburgh: D. and M. Mclean, 1828), p. 48; David N. Lord, *The Coming and Reign of Christ* (New York: Franklin Night, 1858), p. 390; Uriah Smith, *The Prophecies of Daniel and Revelation*, rev. ed. (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1944), p. 144; F. D. Nichol, ed. *The Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary*, 7 vols. (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald 1953-57), 4:841; George McCready Price, *The Greatest of the Prophets* (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1955), p. 169; C. Mervyn Maxwell, *God Cares*, vol. 1 (Boise, ID: Pacific Press, 1981), p. 160; Gerhard F. Hasel, "The 'Little Horn,' the Saints and the Sanctuary in Daniel 8," *The Sanctuary and the Atonement*, eds. A. V. Wallenkampf and W. R. Leshner

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

(Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald, 1981), p. 190; W. H. Shea, "Unity of Daniel," in *Symposium on Daniel*, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, vol. 2, ed. F. Holbrook (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), pp. 189-190.

13 For example, Robert Nevin, *Studies in Prophecy* (Londonderry: James Montgomery, 1890), p. 82; H. N. Sargent, *The Marvels of Bible Prophecy* (London: Covenant Publishing, 1938), p. 167; E. Filmer, *Daniel's Predictions* (London: Regency Press, 1979), p. 92.

14 G. H. Pember, *The Great Prophecies of the Centuries Concerning Israel and the Gentiles* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1895), pp. 289-290; C. Larkin, *The Book of Daniel* (Philadelphia: C. Larkin, 1929), p. 140; A. E. Bloomfield, *The End of the Days* (Minneapolis, MN: Bethany Fellowship, 1981), p. 164.

15 Nevin, p. 79; Joseph Tanner, *Daniel and the Revelation* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1898), p. 524; U. Smith, p. 171; Price, 206; Nichol, 4:845; Bloomfield, p. 171; William H. Shea, *Selected Studies on Prophetic Interpretation*, Daniel and Revelation Committee Series, vol. 1 (Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1982), p. 60; G. F. Hasel, "The 'Little Horn,' the Heavenly Sanctuary, and the Time of the End," A Study of Daniel 8:9-14," *Symposium on Daniel*, DARCOM, vol. 2, ed. F. Holbrook (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), p. 457.

16 The article and demonstrative pronoun indicate that there is a preceding point of reference. In this case the time of the events in 11:40-45, 45.

17 Apart from early books like the "book of Moses" (Mark 12:26), we find several heavenly books mentioned: (1) the book of life (Ps 69:28); (2) the book of remembrance (Mal 3:16); (3) the book of lamentation, mourning, and woe (Ezek 2:9, 10); (4) the flying scroll (Zech 5:1,2).

18 J. A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, International Critical Commentary of the Holy Scriptures (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1927), p. 472. There is a possible link to the books (*siprin*) in Dan 7:10. In Rev 20:12-19 the book of life is used in the last judgment. In the judgment in Dan 7 books (plural) are opened which most likely include "the book of life," "the book of remembrance," and any other records required for this judgment.

19 See Friedrich Nötscher, *Altorientalischer und alttestamentlicher Auferstehungsglauben* (Würzburg, 1926; reprint, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970); Charles V. Pilcher, *The Hereafter in Jewish and Christian Thought* (New York: Macmillan, 1940); Edmund F. Sutcliffe, *The Old Testament and the Future Life* (London: Burnes Oates and Washbourne, 1946); H. Birkeland, "The Belief in the Resurrection of the Dead in the OT," *Studia Theologica* 3 (1950): pp. 60-78; Charles R. Smith, *The Bible Doctrine of the Hereafter* (London: Epworth, 1958); Robert Martin-Achard, *From Life to Death: A Study of the Development of the Doctrine of the Resurrection in the Old Testament*, trans. J. P. Smith (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1960); K. Schubert, "Die Entwicklung der Auferstehungslehre von der nachexilischen bis zur frührabbinischen Zeit," *Biblisches Zeitschrift* 6 (1962): 177-214; Nicholas J. Tromp, *Primitive Conceptions of Death and the Nether World in the Old Testament* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969); George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*, Harvard Theological Studies 26 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972); Gerhard Hasel, "Resurrection in the Theology of OT Apocalyptic," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 92 (1980): 267-284; L. J. Greenspoon, "The Origin of the Idea of

PFANDL: DANIEL'S "TIME OF THE END"

Resurrection," *Traditions in Transformation*, ed. Baruch Halpern and Jon D. Levenson (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1981), pp. 247-321; M. S. Moore, "Resurrection and Immortality: Two Motifs Navigating Confluent Theological Streams in the Old Testament (Dan 12, 1-4)," *Theologische Zeitschrift* 39 (1983): 17-34. See further, Pfandl, 285, note 150.

20 Hasel, "Resurrection," p. 267; see also M. S. Moore, p. 18; James M. Lindenberger, "Dan 12:1-4" *Interpretation* 39 (1985): 186.

21 Hans Wildberger, *Jesaja*, 3 vols. Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972-1982), 2:995; Joseph Jensen, *Isaiah 1-39*, Old Testament Message (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1984), p. 207; Theodor H. Gaster, "Resurrection," *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, 4 vols. (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), 4:40.

22 A. S. Herbert, *Isaiah 1-39*, The Cambridge Bible Commentary (Cambridge: University Press, 1973), p. 156; J. Ridderbos, *Isaiah*, Bible Students Commentary, trans. J. Vriend (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985), p. 213.

23 Ironside, 231; M. R. De Haan, *Daniel the Prophet* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1947), p. 307; Keith L. Brooks, *The Certain End* (Los Angeles: American Prophetic League, 1942), p. 56; Talbot, p. 215.

24 Young, p. 256; Leupold, p. 529; Walvoord, p. 284; Gleason L. Archer, "Daniel," *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, vol. 7 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985), p. 152; Ford, *Daniel*, p. 281; Price, p. 328; Driver, p. 201; Charles, p. 327; Montgomery, p. 471; Norman Porteous, *Daniel*, 2nd ed., Old Testament Library (London: SCM Press, 1979), p. 170; Marti, p. 90; Aage Bentzen, *Daniel*, 2nd ed., Handbuch zum Alten Testament (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1952), p. 85; J. J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel*, Harvard Semitic Monographs 16 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), p. 172.

25 Thomas S. Kepler, *Dreams of the Future*, Bible Guides 22 (London: Lutterworth Press, 1963), p. 45. See also Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel*, Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1978), p. 306; Jeffery, p. 544; J. R. Dummelow, ed., *A Commentary on the Holy Bible* (New York: McMillan Co., 1940), p. 544.

26 Hasel, "Resurrection," p. 279.

27 *Min* joined to a *nomen regens* which designates a human entity and is in construct with a spatial term: *w'rabbim mē'ammē ha'āreṣ*.

28 Hasel, "Resurrection," p. 279. On pp. 277-278 Hasel has an extended discussion on the various uses of *min* which have been proposed for Dan 12:2.

29 See charts at the end of this paper.

30 The Aramaic means literally, "another small horn," whereas the Hebrew says, "one horn from smallness."

31 H. H. Rowley, *Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press Board, 1959), p. 127. He applies both horns to Antiochus IV Epiphanes. See also André Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979), pp. 141, 161; Porteous, pp. 106, 124; Marti, pp. 51, 57; Montgomery, pp. 292, 333.

32 Shea, "Unity of Daniel," p. 187.

33 This is the interpretation of most Historicists and Futurists. See Young, p. 162; Leupold, p. 327; Maier, p. 297; Walvoord, p. 166; Price, pp. 147-148; Archer, p. 94; Ford, *Daniel*, p. 140.

34 Even the "prince who comes" (Dan 9:26) may be taken to be Christ and not Titus, since it is the people of the prince (the Jews) who caused the downfall

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

of Jerusalem through their rebellion against Rome. (See W. H. Shea, "The Prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27," in *The Seventy Weeks, Leviticus, and the Nature of Prophecy*, DARCOM, vol. 3, ed. Frank B. Holbrook [Washington, D.C.: Biblical Research Institute, 1986], p. 93, and others before him.)

35 In Dan 9:27, 11:31, and 12:11, the Hebrew reads *šiqqûš m'šomēm*, in Dan 8:13 *happeša' šomēm* is used. On the grammatical anomalies, see the discussion in Desmond Ford, *The Abomination of Desolation in Biblical Eschatology* (Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1979), pp. 149-150.

36 Since, in my view, Dan 12:11 uses Dan 11:31, the two must mean the same. Therefore, when Christ quoted Daniel 11:31 and referred it to the future, he clearly looked upon it as not yet fulfilled. (See Hasel, "The 'Little Horn', the Heavenly Sanctuary and the 'Time of the End': A Study of Daniel 8:9-14," p. 442; F. W. Burnett, *The Testament of Jesus-Sophia* [Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1981], p. 303, n. 1; J. C. Fenton, *The Gospel of Matthew* [Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963], p. 387); Ford (*The Abomination of Desolation in Biblical Eschatology*, p. 164) believes that Christ viewed the times of Antiochus as prefigurative of what lay ahead.

37 Prince, pp. 149, 184; D. S. Russell, *Daniel*, Daily Study Bible Series (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1981), pp. 158, 209; Hartman, and Di Lella, pp. 237, 301.

38 Imp. of *sātam* "shut up" "hide" (Francis Brown, Samuel R. Driver; and Charles A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907], p. 711; Water holes are "blocked" (2 Kgs 3:19, 25) and gaps in walls are "filled" (Neh 4:1). Figuratively the words of prophecy are "shut up" (Dan 8:26; 12:4, 9).

39 Imp. of *hātam* "seal," "seal up" (Brown, Driver, Briggs, p. 367). The word is used for the sealing of letters (1 Kgs 21:8) and documents (Jer 32:10). Isaiah 8:16 uses it metaphorically, "seal the instruction in the heart of my disciples." In our text it is probably used in the literal sense.

40 The term *šūt*, literally "rove about" (Brown, Driver, Briggs, p. 1002; Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros* [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958], p. 955), is used thirteen times in the OT (Abraham Even-Shoshan, *A New Concordance of the Bible* [Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, 1983], p. 1124) and describes Satan "roaming" the earth (Job 1:7; 2:2), the children of Israel "going round" gathering manna (Num 11:8), and the Lord's eyes "going to and fro" through all the land (Zech 4:10). Theodotion reads *heōs didachthōsin polloi* (until many are taught).

41 John R. Wilch, *Time and Event* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969), p. 111.

42 This verse is largely parallel to Daniel 12:4. For individual word studies see above.

The word *ʾahʾrīt* here refers to the end or outcome of things as in Isaiah 46:10; 47:7; etc.

44 Wilch, p. 111.

45 Ibid.

46 Uriah Smith, *Daniel and Revelation*, rev. (Mountain View, CA: Pacific Press, 1944), pp. 208-209, 256.

47 Taylor G. Bunch, *The Book of Daniel* (reprint, Payson, AZ: Leaves-of-Autumn Books, 1991), p. 21.

PFANDL: DANIEL'S "TIME OF THE END"

Chart A
Daniel 2, 7 and 8

Dan 2	Dan 7	Dan 8	Explanation
32. head of gold	4. lion		2:38 Babylon
32. breast of silver	5. bear	3. ram-one horn	8:20 Medo-Persia
32. thighs of bronze	6. leopard	5. he-goat	8:21 Greece
	-dominion given	7. he smote	
	-four heads	8. four horns	
33. legs of iron	7. a terrible beast	9. (little horn)	
40. strong as iron	-iron teeth		
-breaks and crushes	-devoured and broke in pieces		
33. feet of iron and clay	7. ten horns		2:41 divided kingdom
	8. little horn	9. little horn	
	21. persecutes saints	10. stamps on the host of heaven	
	25. speaks against the most high	11. magnified itself even to the prince of the host	
	25. three and a half times	14. two thousand three hundred days	
34. stone cut without hands	26. he shall be consumed	25. he shall be broken without hands	
35. stone became a great mountain	27. kingdom given to the saints = an everlasting kingdom		2:44 kingdom of heaven

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Chart B

Daniel 8, 9 and 10-12

Dan 8

2. at the river Ulai
3. I raised my eyes and saw,
and behold
8. the great horn was broken –
four horns toward four winds
of heaven
9. the little horn which grew
exceedingly great – toward the
glorious land
11. the daily sacrifice was
taken away – place of his
sanctuary was overthrown –
prince of the host

13. the transgression that
makes desolate

16. Gabriel makes this man
understand the vision
17. the vision is for the time of
the end
19. the latter end of the indig-
nation
24. he shall even rise up
against the Prince of princes
25. by no human hand, he shall
be broken
26. the vision is true

Dan 9

27. sacrifice and offering to
cease
26. shall destroy . . . the sanc-
tuary
25. an anointed one, a prince
27. upon the wings of abomi-
nation shall come one who
makes desolate
21-23 Gabriel . . . I have come
to give you understanding
26. unto the end

26. an anointed one shall be
cut off

Dan 10-12

10:4 at the great river
10:5 I lifted up my eyes and
looked and behold
11:4 his kingdom shall be
broken – divided toward the
four winds of heaven
11:23 he shall become strong
with a small people
11:16 the glorious land
11:31 shall take away the daily
offering

11:22 the prince of the cove-
nant
11:31 the abomination that
makes desolate

11:35 till the time of the end

11:36 until the indignation is
accomplished
11:22 the prince of the cove-
nant shall be broken
11:45 he shall come to his end

10:1 the word is true