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-

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

9a *ŭmin-hāʾ aḥat mēhem yāṣāʾ qeren-ʾ aḥat miṣṣᵉ῾îrāh*
9b *wattigdal-yeter ʾel-hannegeb wᵉ ʾel-hammizrāḥ wᵉ ʾel-haṣṣebî*
10a *wattigdal ῾ad-ṣᵉbāʾ haṣṣamāyim*
10b *wattapēl ʾarṣāh min-haṣṣābāʾ ûmin-hakkôkābîm*
10c *wattirmᵉsēm*
11a *wᵉ῾ad śar-haṣṣābāʾ higdîl*
11b *ûmimmennû huraym hattāmîd*
11c *wᵉhušlak mᵉkôn miqdašô*
12a *wᵉsābāʾ tinnātēn ῾al-hattāmîd bᵉpāša῾*
12b *wᵉtašlek ⁱmet ʾarṣāh*
12c *wᵉ῾āśᵉtāh*
12d *wᵉhiṣlîḥāh*

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 *wᵉqatal* verbal forms. These forms usually begin a new sentence.[9] Our verses show four of these verbal forms, each beginning a new sentence: *wᵉhušlak* (11c), *wᵉtašlek* (12b), *wᵉ῾āśᵉtāh* (12c), and *wᵉhiṣlîḥāh* (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: **wᵉ῾ad śar-haṣṣābāʾ higdîl**

Usually *wᵉ῾ad śar-haṣṣābāʾ* 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

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-ʾaḥat*, "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-haṣṣābāʾ*, "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 *wᵉʿad śar-haṣṣābāʾ* 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]

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 *ᶜal*.[19] The preposition *ᶜad* 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 *higdîl* 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 *higdîl* and the taking of "the prince of the host" as the subject of *higdîl* 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

to is 15 out of 16 times a negative one ("making oneself great," "exalting one-self," "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^{e}ʿad śar-haṣṣābāʾ*) 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 *ʿad-ṣ^{e}bāʾ 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.

11a by *wᵉ῾ad śar-haṣṣābāʾ* 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 *ṢLḤ* occur in both passages.[25] Therefore, it may be a hint for the meaning of *higdîl* 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 *wᵉ῾ad śar-haṣṣābāʾ*. Thus, vs. 11a should read *wᵉ῾ad śar-haṣṣābāʾ higdîl*, "even unto the prince of the host he/it made himself great." The subject of *higdîl* 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: *wᵉsābāʾ tinnātēn ῾al-hattāmîd bᵉpāša῾*

The second problem of sentence demarcation arises from the placement of *wᵉsābāʾ* ("and a host"). J. J. Collins points to the fact that "both the meaning and the placement of the word for host, *wṣbʾ*, 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

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 *ṣābāʾ* (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 *ṣābāʾ***.** First, it is necessary to examine whether the syntactic place of *ṣābāʾ* 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 *ṣābāʾ* 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 *ṣābāʾ* 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 *ṣābāʾ* 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 *ṣābāʾ*.

Further, the plural formation of *ṣābāʾ* is almost always the feminine *sᵉbaʾ ôt*, which may also indicate a feminine gender of *ṣābāʾ*.[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 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 *ṣābāʾ* 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. *Ṣābāʾ*, as subject of vs. 12a-d, would then differ in meaning from *ṣābāʾ* 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 ʿ*SH* and *ṢLḤ*-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 ʿ*SH* and *ṢLḤ*-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 ʿ*SH* and *ṢLḤ*-H in Daniel 8:12 is the horn, just as the subject of ʿ*SH* and *ṢLḤ*-H in Daniel 8:24 is the king. Therefore, the subject of the *yiqtol* form *wᵉtašlek* (vs. 12b) must be the horn too. And, because the *yiqtol* form *wᵉtašlek* 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.

If the horn is the subject of *tinnātēn* in vs. 12a, then what is the function of *ṣābāʾ*? Two different answers present themselves: (1) *ṣābāʾ* belongs to vs. 11c and is part of the object; or (2) *ṣābāʾ* 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 *ṣābāʾ* 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 *wᵉṣābāʾ* is of an intratextual-stylistic nature. The question of one of the holy ones in vs. 13 puts *wᵉqodeš* and *wᵉṣābāʾ* together. If *wᵉṣābāʾ* belongs to vs. 11c, a very similar construction occurs there: *miqdāšô wᵉṣābāʾ*. That both times *ṣābāʾ* is indeterminate stresses the link between *wᵉqodeš wᵉṣābāʾ* (vs. 13) and *miqdāšô wᵉṣābāʾ* (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, *happešaʿ* from vs. 12a, *qodeš* from vs. 11c,[49] *ṣābāʾ* from vss. 10a, 10b, 11a, and 12a, and *mirmās* from vs. 10c. The combination of the root *RMS* (trample) with *ṣābāʾ* as found in vs. 13 is thus only found in vs. 10c, where the pronominal suffix (them) attached to *RMS* refers to *ṣābāʾ* and *kôkābîm*. The lexical links of *wᵉṣābāʾ mirmās* in vs. 13 to vs. 10b-c seem thus to be stronger than the proposed link between *wᵉqōdeš wᵉṣābāʾ* (vs. 13) and a supposed *miqdāšô wᵉṣābāʾ* (vs. 11c).

Semantic Meaning of *ṣābāʾ* 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 *wᵉṣābāʾ*, though tentatively it may be regarded as the grammatical subject of vs. 12a. It is

important, therefore, to pursue a brief semantic investigation to identify the relationship between *ṣābāʾ* 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.

Ṣābāʾ 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 *ṣābāʾ* 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 *wᵉṣābāʾ* in vs. 12 and 13 lead to the conclusion that *wᵉṣābāʾ* in vs. 12 refers to the same entity as the other occurrences of *ṣābāʾ* in vss. 10-13.[50] The indetermination of *ṣābāʾ* in vs. 12 has then the same function as the indetermination of *ṣābāʾ* in vs. 13. That is to say, that *ṣābāʾ* without the article refers back to that part of the host which the horn caused to fall down (vs. 10b-c).[51]

Taking *ṣābāʾ* in vs. 12 with vs. 11 would therefore fit the semantic meaning of the other usages of *ṣābāʾ* ("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 *wᵉṣābāʾ*) 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 *ṣābāʾ*—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?

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 *ṣābāʾ* 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

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^ePāšaʿ) 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* occurences 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

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 *ṣābāʾ* 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) *ʿal* 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 *wᵉṣābāʾ,* 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 *ṣābāʾ*, *tāmîd* and *pāšaʿ* 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 *YṢʾ* is conjugated in the perfect form to continue the vision narrative of vs. 8. After the perfect *yāsāʾ* 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 *wᵉʿad śar-haṣṣābāʾ*, the writer had to use a *qatal* form. In vs. 11b there is again a

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

Vs. 11c starts with a *wᵉqatal* form (*wᵉhušlak*). From the viewpoint of narrative sequence one expects a *wayyiqtol* form. Why does a *wᵉqatal* form appear instead? A *wᵉqatal* 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 *ṣābāʾ* (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 *wᵉqatal* 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 *wᵉyiqtol* form (12b) is sequential.[81] The two *wᵉqatal* 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 *wᵉyiqtol* instead of *wᵉqatal* forms. The answer is again twofold: obviously the author wanted to balance the imperfects with perfects, and by the *wᵉqatal* 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,

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 *ŚH* and *ṢLḤ* 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 *wᵉqatal* m.

12a *yiqtol* fem.
12b *wᵉyiqtol* fem.
12c *wᵉqatal* fem.
12d *wᵉqatal* 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

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 *wᵉqatal* (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 *wᵉqatal* of vs. 12d. *Wāʾ ešmᵉʿāh* 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 *wᵉniṣdaq*, a *wᵉqatal* form, which resumes the *wᵉqatal* forms in vs. 12c-d. This would make sense if the same holy one would speak.

(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^e*niṣdaq*. W^e*niṣdaq* seems to describe the (heavenly) reaction to the activities of the horn. Is it possible that *niṣdaq* 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^e*niṣdaq* is a w^e*qatal* form, which resumes the w^e*qatal* 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^e*niṣdaq* 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 Positionenen 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

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 Geoffey Leech, *Semantics* (Harmondsworth, England: Penguin, 1974), pp. 178-181. Leech suggests, to "stop trying to fit semantic analysis into the mould [sic]

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 statable 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, ʿRK*, 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, "*gdôl*," *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 Piʿel: Syntaktisch-semasiologische Untersuchung einer Verbalform im Alten Testament* (Zürich: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1968), p. 49.

15 Jenni, *Piʿel*, p. 46 designates this reflexive meaning as inwardly transitive

(*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, *Piᶜel*, 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 ᶜ*ad* in combination with *GDL* in the Qal stem is similar. This combination occurs five times. In all five instances ᶜ*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 ᶜ*ad*: "He will be great unto (ᶜ*ad*) the ends of the earth" (Mic 5:4[3]); "It grew up to (ᶜ*ad*) the host of heaven" (Dan 8:10); and "Our guilt has grown even up to (ᶜ*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 *higdîl* ᶜ*ad* is interpreted as *yaᶜᵃmod* ᶜ*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 literarisch 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 *higdîl*, it may be tempting to propose a literary chiastic structure in the usage of *GDL* with prepositions:

A *GDL* (vs. 4) Hiphil
   B *GDL* + ᶜ*ad* (vs. 8) Hiphil
      C *GDL* + ᵓ*al* (vs. 9) Qal
   B′ *GDL* + ᶜ*ad* (vs. 10) Qal
A′ *GDL* (vs. 11) Hiphil

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

and the problematic separation of "unto the prince of the host" from *higdîl*. 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 *higdîl* 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 *wᵉṣābāh*; (3) reinterpretation of "host" in a different sense from vss. 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 *ṣābāʾ* 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 *naḥᵃlāh*, "inheritance," is feminine, but the verb *nittan* is masculine in gender.

38 The relative pronoun *ᵃšer*, which is the subject of the masculine verb form *nittan*, refers to *gibʿat*, a feminine construct form of *gibʿāh*, "Gibeah." In Biblical Hebrew, cities are usually feminine in gender, probably because the headword *ʿîr* 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, *ṣᵉbāʾāh* has to be understood as subject of the feminine *mālᵉʾah*. The parallelism in Isa 40:2c-d forbids to regard *ṣᵉbāʾāh* as masculine object (against Karl Albrecht, "Das

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

40 The feminine plural form ṣᵉbāʾôt 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, *sābāʾ* is predominantly used with masculine verbs, but its plural form is predominantly feminine.

41 Two other arguments that the construcstion 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 *sābāʾ* is its subject, does not take the fact into account that the author could well have thought of *sābāʾ* 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 *wattirmᵉsēm* (Dan 8:10c) indicates that the author would regard the referent *min-haṣṣābāʾ* as masculine, overlooks that the suffix refers back to both *min-haṣṣābāʾ* and *min-hakkôkābîm*, *kôkābîm* (masculine, plural) determining the gender of the suffix.

42 Hasslberger, p. 102.

43 Ibid.

44 In the book of Daniel, ʿŚH and ṢLḤ-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, ʿSH 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 ʿSH 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 ʿSH 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 proposesd.

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*

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 *ʿal* 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 *ʿal* 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 *ʿal* in Dan 8:12 is less probable, as *tāmîd* 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 *ʿal* 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 *ʿal* 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 *ʿal* 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 occurrencews of *beth*.

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^e+*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^e*yad*, "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 istrumenti* but there is no object in the sentence: Jer 12:8; Ps 46:7; 68:34[33].

71 Gen 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 $b^e{}^c$*ênê*, "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").

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, *wᵉtašlek* is usually interpreted with a different vocalization as a *wayyiqtol* form. See Stahl, p. 174.

82 For this use of the *wᵉqatal* 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 wurder 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 *wᵉqatal* verbs in 12c and 12d he regards as referring to activities in the past. For him, 12a and 12b describe projected or planned acivities, 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, "Traumpsychologische-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,

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 *weqatal* 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 *lo'*, 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 *weqatal* form has a (con)sequential notion. Waltke and O'Connor, p. 538 (32.2.6b). Thus, *wenisdaq* refers to a time after the period of "2300 evening-morning" has been concluded.