

## A TEXTUAL AND INTRA-TEXTUAL ORIENTED ANALYSIS OF THE EXPRESSION “יְהוָה” IN THE BOOK OF DANIEL

INNOCENT GWIZO<sup>1</sup>

### ABSTRACT

The expression “יְהוָה” with its inflections, appears at least 13 times in the entire corpus of Daniel: 12 times in Aramaic and once in Hebrew.<sup>2</sup> Its recurrence seems significant in light of scholarly debates that controvert Danielic literal structural, linguistic, single authorship, and textual unit. The unit of Daniel, for example, has largely been drawn from diverse thematic foci. Nevertheless, “There are both linguistic and thematic relations between the various sections of Daniel.”<sup>3</sup> In addition, syntactical analysis, within the broad framework of text linguistics, is therefore necessary to establish this observation. While it is controverted, whether Yahweh is actively involved in the corpus of Daniel, it seems necessary to take a textual look at the expressions used by the author, and establish the meaning, unit,<sup>4</sup> and intention of the book. The selected expression “יְהוָה” considered from a textual and intra-textual perspective serves as an exemplar of this observation. Besides, it helps for a deeper understanding of the Danielic corpus.

**Keywords:** *syntactical, intra-textual, textual, text linguistics*

### INTRODUCTION

Controverted issues that include the identity of the author, date of authorship, the meaning of its visions, images and stories, have characterized studies in the book of Daniel. Robert L. Cate notes, “Probably no book of the Old Testament has been the subject of such wide disagreement and heated discussion as has the book of Daniel.”<sup>5</sup> Debates on the date of authorship or unit of the book of Daniel, among other issues have characterized studies on Daniel.<sup>6</sup> There has not been much study on selected recurring expressions done to establish textual linguistic basis for thematic unity, date and authorship of the book. It is generally assumed, by many scholars that an editor(s) wrote the book in the 2nd century BCE, though Gerhard Pfandl<sup>7</sup> and others dispute this logic. Others have mildly accepted the historicity of the

<sup>1</sup>INNOCENT GWIZO is a Zimbabwean and PhD Candidate in Old Testament languages and exegesis at the Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies, Silang, Cavite, Philippines.

<sup>2</sup>Abraham Even-Shoshan, *A New Concordance of the Old Testament* (Jerusalem, Israel: Kiryat-Sepher, 1983), s.v. “יְהוָה”

<sup>3</sup>William Shea, “Daniel: A Case in Intertextuality,” in *The End from the Beginning: Festschrift Honoring Merling Alomia*. Ed Benjamin Rojas, Teofilo Correa, Lael Caesar, and Joel Turpo (Lima, Peru: Universidad Peruana Union, 2015), 189.

<sup>4</sup>Victor H. Matthews has, represents many other scholars who argue that “there is no connection between the earlier chapters and the apocalyptic visions. Even the sense of chronology is different in the two sections. In addition, linguistic differences make it difficult to determine the authorship of the book.” Victor H. Matthews, *The Hebrew Prophets and their Social World* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2012), 208. Accordingly, they argue that the two sections were put together by editors. Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Robert L. Cate, *An Introduction to the Old Testament and its Study* (Nashville, TN: Broadman, 1987), 503.

<sup>6</sup>Victor H Matthews argues, for example, that there are differences between the two sections of Daniel making it difficult to attribute the book to a single author. See Matthews, *The Hebrew Prophets*, 208.

<sup>7</sup>Gerhard Pfandl, *The Seer of Babylon* (Hagerstown, MD: Review & Herald, 2004), 10.

Daniel stories to be very old but still insist that that these stories had their meaning and fulfillment in the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175-164 BCE),<sup>8</sup> Judas Maccabees for some prophecies. Daniel is a legendary figure, who plays a role in the narrative, and nothing more.<sup>9</sup>

However, a syntactical theological approach is one way to proffer an alternative to understand the Daniel corpus. The genre of chapters 1-6 differ from those of 7-12, yet the dynamism of the first section continues.<sup>10</sup> Studies on Daniel, have been done using the preterist,<sup>11</sup> futurist<sup>12</sup> and historicist<sup>13</sup> approaches. The current study is insightful as the text is studied for what it is.<sup>14</sup> God is depicted as active in the historical development of human history in Daniel.<sup>15</sup> Both the classical, and apocalyptic prophecies attest to this observation. This is shown in the outline prophecies (chaps. 2, 7, 8 and 11).<sup>16</sup> A textual study may shed more light to this note.

### A Brief Overview of Text Linguistics in the light of Danielic use of “לָקַח”

Various definitions of what entails linguistics<sup>17</sup> in connection with pragmatics, its limits<sup>18</sup> and strengths could be given, “But whether we speak of linguistics in general or pragmatics in particular we are dealing with subjects which are of enormous importance to the correct understanding of the Bible.”<sup>19</sup> It has been argued that linguistics concern itself with the “phenomenon of language.”<sup>20</sup> However, linguistics could be understood as part of the task to understand the text. Besides, establishing the meaning of a text is a complex task for which there are no short cuts.<sup>21</sup> And the “findings of historical grammatical exegesis,”<sup>22</sup> remain critical. The study of an expression can utilize a syntactical theological method.<sup>23</sup> Morpho-syntactical analysis and etymology of the expression “לָקַח” in the linguistic units it appears in Daniel.

<sup>8</sup>Robert Anderson, Daniel: Signs and Wonders, *International Theological Commentary*, eds. George A.F. Knight and Fredrick Carlson Holmgren (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1984), xiii.

<sup>9</sup>Anderson, *Daniel*, xv.

<sup>10</sup>John J. Collins and Peter W Flint, *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception, vol II* (Leiden, Netherlands: Brill Academic, 2001), 646.

<sup>11</sup>“Sees the fulfillment of portions of the prophecies as past.” William H Shea, *Daniel 1-7*, The Abundant Life Bible Amplifier (ALBA) (Ontario, Canada: Pacific Press, 1996), 21.

<sup>12</sup>Fulfillment of prophecies is placed into the future. Shea, *Daniel 1-7*, 21.

<sup>13</sup>Prophecies are seen as a continuity of the past, present and the unfulfilled future. Shea, *Daniel 1-7*, 21.

<sup>14</sup>Martin Probstle, *Truth and Terror: A Text Oriented Analysis of Daniel 8:9-14*, Unpublished Dissertation for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy, Andrews University (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 2006), 435.

<sup>15</sup>Shea, *Daniel 1-7*, 35.

<sup>16</sup>See Shea, *Daniel 1-7*, 25; Pfandl,

<sup>17</sup>See Daniel Kwame Bediako, “Genesis 1:1-2:3 in the Light of Text linguistics and Text Oriented-Literary Studies,” (PhD dissertation, Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies, Silang, Cavite, Philippines, 2009).

<sup>18</sup>“We must beware, however, of making claims for linguistics that go beyond its competence.” Peter Cotterell and Max Tuner, *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation* (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity, 1989), 32.

<sup>19</sup>Cotterell and Tuner, *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation*, 19.

<sup>20</sup>Cotterell and Tuner, *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation*, 26.

<sup>21</sup>Cotterell and Tuner, *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation*, 32.

<sup>22</sup>Cotterell and Tuner, *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation*, 32.

<sup>23</sup>Walter C. Kaiser and Moises Silva, *Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics: The Search for Meaning* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2007), 34-35.

A textual, intra-textuality<sup>24</sup> and textual witness analysis,<sup>25</sup> within the context of the book, is part of this procedure to help establish a thematic or theological motif(s) of the book through an analysis of the expression “לְקַלְקֵל.” It is noted that there “is not a universal definition of intertextuality theory,”<sup>26</sup> as noted by Teofilo Correa. It is for this reason, the paper avoids the contours of debate around *intertextuality*, argued to be focused at the *reader’s view* by both Correa<sup>27</sup> and Jay C Y. E. Rothstein.<sup>28</sup>

This paper utilizes intra-textuality, in the context of inner-biblical textual connection. It considers intra-textuality to be “an eclectic methodology that brings together a spectrum of approaches focused on the connections of the texts.”<sup>29</sup> Literary, textual analysis coupled with etymological considerations and textual is done in this study. Connections of texts within Daniel will be done through intra-textuality. Historical and theological implications will also be done.

The phenomenon of the expression “לְקַלְקֵל,” in Daniel needs to be understood for a deeper appreciation of the book. Though the current study is not an exclusively linguistic approach as may be defined by scholars, it seeks to make use of its elements in the process. Richard M. Davidson notes, “the original text of the Bible must be ascertained as far as possible,”<sup>30</sup> taking the “immediate context in which the word or phrase is found,”<sup>31</sup> and the genre,<sup>32</sup> into account in order to “to arrive at the plain, straightforward meaning of Scripture.”<sup>33</sup>

In their observation Robert-Alain Beaugrade and Wolfgang Dresser make a category of seven elements in text linguistics; “cohesion, coherence intentionality, acceptability, informativity, situationality and inter-textuality.”<sup>34</sup> It is noted that “gradually with time, words come to have new meanings,” by Peter Cotterell and Max Tuner, making it difficult to arrive at the exact meaning of the word.<sup>35</sup> Nevertheless etymological investigations seek to establish the meaning within a a given historical context, which accounts for the historical development of the word’s meaning.

<sup>24</sup>Shea observes that inter-textuality is the study of the relationship of “words, phrases or longer statements in one passage in the Bible that are used in other passages in the bible. These relationships may be between different narratives in one biblical book or between one or more biblical books or between passages from one testament into the other.” Shea, Shea, “Daniel: A Case in Intertextuality,” 179.

<sup>25</sup>It has been noted that awareness of the history of the text in its Hebrew, Greek, Aramaic, Syriac, Latin and other languages is a critical exercise. Robert Chisholm, Jr., *From Exegesis to Exposition: A Practical Guide to Using Biblical Hebrew* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1988), 19.

<sup>26</sup>Teofilo Correa, “Significant Assumptions: On the Methodology of Inter-textuality and Inner-Biblical Exegesis,” *The End from the Beginning: Festschrift Honoring Merling Alomia*. eds, Benjamin Rojas, Teofilo Correa, Lael Caesar, and Joel Turpo (Lima, Peru: Universidad Peruana Union, 2015), 302.

<sup>27</sup>Correa, “Significant Assumptions: On the Methodology, 302. Regarding intertextuality Correa further observes that, “If we use intertextuality as a methodology, we must state what we understand by intertextuality and what are the implications of our approach.” Teofilo Correa, “Significant Assumptions,” 309.

<sup>28</sup>Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein, “Figures in the Corpus: Theories of influence and Intertextuality,” in *Influence and Intertextuality History*, eds. Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein (Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1991): 291-317.

<sup>29</sup>Clayton and Rothstein, “Figures in the Corpus,” 304.

<sup>30</sup>Richard M. Davidson “Biblical Interpretation,” *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary (SDABC)*, rev. ed., ed. Francis D. Nichol (Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1976-1980), 12:68.

<sup>31</sup>Davidson “Biblical Interpretation,” 78.

<sup>32</sup>Davidson “Biblical Interpretation,” 75.

<sup>33</sup>Davidson “Biblical Interpretation,” 77.

<sup>34</sup>Michael B. Shepherd, “Daniel in the Context of the Hebrew Bible,” *Studies in Biblical Literature (SBL)* 123, ed. Hemchand Gossai (New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2009), 122. Also Robert-Alain Beaugrade and Wolfgang Dresser, *Introduction to the Text Linguistics* (New York, NY: Longman, 1982), 3-12.

<sup>35</sup>Cotterell and Tuner, *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation*, 132.

Furthermore, the study of expression “כִּלְכִּל” includes textual witness the LXX, the DSS<sup>36</sup> or Vulgate or the Targums, are critical<sup>37</sup> in many ways that help establish the meaning of the MT.<sup>38</sup> Others prefer the term textual criticism and define it as a “collection of variants, and secondly, the evaluation of the variants.”<sup>39</sup> More complicated considerations may be given attention for a focused in-depth evaluation of the LXX as a variant; such as are raised by Tim McLay, about the complexities of reconstructing the hypothetical Vorlage used to produce the LXX.<sup>40</sup> More so, textual witness is done as it applies to the BHS,<sup>41</sup> with careful consideration of scholars’ perspective taken into account.<sup>42</sup> Debates on which version of the textual witness to use as most credible,<sup>43</sup> are not avoidable.

Some scholars prefer one witness above others or even the MT, such as the case of the Theodotion Greek version for the book of Daniel as noted by T J Meadowcroft.<sup>44</sup> Discussions abound, that argue for the Theodotion text of the book of Daniel to be closer to the MT,<sup>45</sup> than other witnesses. Ernst Wurthwein makes a critical observation when he says “textual criticism generally follows the principle of examining individual cases.”<sup>46</sup> This is valuable “because errors can creep anywhere.”<sup>47</sup> The variant must be considered for what it is.

In addition to the above, consideration on the genre of the text, within whose context the text linguistic unit occurs is pivotal. John J. Collins points out that when it comes to the book of Daniel, the historical section “Klaus Koch (Daniel) listed no fewer than five categories which have been proposed as overall classifications of Daniel 1-6.”<sup>48</sup> For example, Klaus lists “marchen, legend, court tale, erotological narrative and midrash.”<sup>49</sup> What is critical to note, is the genre. It helps to analyze the text. Collins posits three aspects that go along with genre: (1) structure,<sup>50</sup> (2) setting,<sup>51</sup> and (3) intention<sup>52</sup> of the text. He explains each of these elements with a focused application on the book of Daniel, and in the process, he considers the DSS, 4Qps Daniel,<sup>53</sup> for textual witnessing.

<sup>36</sup>See Forentio, G. Martinez, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. Vol 1. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.

<sup>37</sup>Shepherd, “Daniel in the Context of the Hebrew Bible,” 123.

<sup>38</sup>Also to be noted is what Ernst Wurthwein has noted, that the MT is a “consonantal text because vowels are spoken but not written,” Ernst Wurthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament: An introduction to the Biblia Hebraica*, trans. Errol F Rhodes (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2014), 3. This means that each variant read and the translated the MT as they saw best.

<sup>39</sup>Tim McLay, *The OG and The Versions of Daniel* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1996), 5.

<sup>40</sup>Tim McLay, *The OG and The Versions*, 5. This also goes to show that textual witness analysis is a rigorous exercise or task that entails a lot of detail and procedure.

<sup>41</sup>*Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* based on the “Codex Leningradensis, written in 1008 CE.” Ernst Wurthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament: An introduction to the Biblia*

*Hebraica*, trans. Errol F. Rhodes (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2014), 184. Read also pages 46-52 of the same book by Ernst Wurthwein, which discusses the scholarly editions of the text.

<sup>42</sup>Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel* (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic, 1995), 24.

<sup>43</sup>Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel*, 29-30.

<sup>44</sup>Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel*, 15.

<sup>45</sup>Meadowcroft, *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel*, 15.

<sup>46</sup>Wurthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament*, 184.

<sup>47</sup>Wurthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament*, 184

<sup>48</sup>John J. Collins, *Daniel with an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature*, *The Forms of the Old Testament Literature (FOTL)* 20, ed. Rolf Knierim and Gene Tucker (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1984), 41.

<sup>49</sup>Collins, *Daniel with an Introduction*, 41.

<sup>50</sup>Collins, *Daniel with an Introduction*, 43.

<sup>51</sup>Collins, *Daniel with an Introduction*, 45.

<sup>52</sup>Collins, *Daniel with an Introduction*, 46.

<sup>53</sup>Collins, *Daniel with an Introduction*, 50.

Regarding textual analysis, as noted earlier in this discussion by Correa, there is no consensus definition on what inter-textuality is,<sup>54</sup> it follows too that there seems to be no consensus on nuances that characterize text linguistics or text-oriented analysis or best procedure or sequence to follow in establishing the meaning of the text. However, the scholar must seek to follow at least a methodology that will include the elements that are critical irrespective of genre.

The import of this discussion helps, in somewhat ways, to respond to the controverted issues concerning the book of Daniel. Linguistic thematic, unit of different sections have been used to arrive at diverse conclusions concerning the book of Daniel. This has ranged from authorship to intent of the book itself. A linguistic or text-oriented study of expressions such as the one being looked at in this paper, can provide a window to the plethora of arguments that have been postulated on various issues concerning the book of Daniel. These include, as noted earlier, the composition of the book, its intent, and the unique parts in it, and how they contribute to divergent arguments held by various scholars.<sup>55</sup> Words of foreign origin found in the historical section are argued to be indicative of an older section, compared to the last half.<sup>56</sup> It is such arguments and much more that make it critical to do a text linguistic oriented analysis.

Craig C. Broyles underscores that there are “features and categories,”<sup>57</sup> of a word that should be noted. These include syntagmatic, paradigmatic relationships and semantic relationships, occur in other sections of the OT or a single book, and variant ancient, and modern witnesses.<sup>58</sup> Exegesis is not merely atomistic but explores the entire pericope or unit of Scripture to establish the inherent cohesion of the text. The individual expression must be understood in the context of the integral whole of the text. Ross H. Cole makes a good conclusion in his remarks about diverse methodologies in general, when he observes there is “need to be broad enough to accept a variety of methods that respect the text but narrow enough to reject those that go against the grain of the text itself.”<sup>59</sup>

Could the use of the expression “יָקַל” in the book of Daniel be a deliberate linguistic syntactical style aimed at being insightful to understanding the linguistic unity, and a thematic issue of the book? Furthermore, the study of the expression “יָקַל” will limit itself to intra-textuality of the book of Daniel. It is noted that there is much more insightful textual and linguistic dimensions that could be done.

## TEXTUAL ANALYSIS of “יָקַל”

### Wider Context of the Expression “יָקַל”

The wider context of the expression “יָקַל” can easily be noted by the 13 occurrences it makes in the book of Daniel. Mainly it appears in the classical prophetic section of the book of Daniel or sometimes referred to as historical. Unlike the apocalyptic section, it is used in the court narratives that focus on specific characters who come to the historical scene as presented by the author. More so, what is said of them happens shortly after the pronouncements of the prophet.

<sup>54</sup>Correa, “Significant Assumptions: On the Methodology,” 302.

<sup>55</sup>Andre LaCocque discusses the view of scholars on various issues including authorship, editorial work done over the centuries on the book of Daniel by various scholars. He makes an evaluation of the arguments thus presented by them. See Andre LaCocque, *Daniel in His Time* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1988), 59-75.

<sup>56</sup>See LaCocque, *Daniel in His Time*, 59.

<sup>57</sup>Craig C. Broyles, “Interpreting the Old Testament: Principles and Steps,” in *Interpreting the Old Testament: A Guide to Exegesis*, ed. Craig C. Broyles (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001), 38.

<sup>58</sup>Broyles, “Interpreting the Old Testament,” 39.

<sup>59</sup>Ross H. Cole, “The Pros and Cons of Intertextuality,” *Hermeneutics, Intertextuality and The Contemporary Meaning of Scripture*, eds. Ross H Cole and Paul Peterson (Cooranbong, Australia: Avondale, 2014), 15.

The meaning of the expression therefore, is reflective of the historical development of the characters it is used in relation to. The stories<sup>60</sup> in-between that include, the forgotten dream (Dan 2), the attempt by Nebuchadnezzar to force people to worship the image of gold (Dan 3), judgment on proud Nebuchadnezzar and his acknowledgement that God rules (Dan 4), and judgment on Belshazzar (Dan 5). Also, the expression is used in prophetic sections: the suffering of the holy ones (Dan 7:21), and encounter of Daniel with God (Dan 10:17). The wider context will take account of the allusions or echoes<sup>61</sup> of the expression “יָכַל” in the different passages of the book of Daniel.

### Immediate Context of the Expression “יָכַל”

The immediate context of the expression “יָכַל” is determined by the narrative since the narratives of the classical prophecy entail different characters who lived in different time periods, in circumstances that are separated with time and host of other factors that may include but not limited to occasion, status etc. Each case of the occurrences is understood in what the narratives is all about. However, the intra-textual analysis gives insight to why the author uses the same expression though the characters involved are different and living at different time periods.

### The Expression יָכַל

The expression יָכַל appears 198<sup>62</sup> times in its lexical and inflected forms in the MT. Besides, in the book of Daniel it appears 12 times in Aramaic<sup>63</sup> and once in Hebrew, i.e., Dan 10:17 to be specific. It is also attested 8 times in the DSS.<sup>64</sup> Etymologically, it is found in Egyptian and Nabatean and the Aramaic of the Qumran and the Talmud, besides the MT. In the DSS it is found in the “anthropology of the Essenes at Qumran.”<sup>65</sup>

The expression יָכַל is translated “be able,” “succeed,” “be allowed,” “be superior,” “be victorious,” “over,” “grasp,” “bear,” or “endure.”<sup>66</sup> It also means, “conquer,” “win.”<sup>67</sup> Soggin also notes that it is related to the verb *khl* and its appearance in the OT “usually means, “be able.”<sup>68</sup> In addition, it has also been noted that the expression יָכַל is usually used with an infinitive construct,<sup>69</sup> and 89.4% of the total 85 infinitives, it appears prefixed with the preposition ל.<sup>70</sup> The expression יָכַל is attested in OT texts; Gen 15:5, 1 Sam 17:9

<sup>60</sup>Zdravko Stefanovic, *Daniel: Wisdom to the Wise* (Ontario, Canada: Pacific Press, 2007), 27.

<sup>61</sup>Craig C. Broyles, “Traditions, Inter-textuality and Canon,” *Interpreting the Old Testament: A Guide for Exegesis*, ed. Craig C Broyles (Grand Rapids: MI: Baker, 2001), 167.

<sup>62</sup>Even-Shoshan, *A New Concordance*, s.v. “יָכַל”

<sup>63</sup>Even-Shoshan, *A New Concordance*, s.v. “יָכַל”

<sup>64</sup>J. A. Soggin, “יָכַל,” *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament (TDOT)*, ed. G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren and Heinz-Josef Fabry (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1986), 6: 72.

<sup>65</sup>H. J. Fabry, “יָכַל,” *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament (TDOT)*, ed. G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren and Heinz-Josef Fabry (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1986), 6:75

<sup>66</sup>Fabry, “יָכַל,” *TDOT*, 6:75

<sup>67</sup>Victor P. Hamilton, “יָכַל,” *Dictionary Old Testament Theology and Exegesis (DOTTE)* ed. William A. VanGemeren. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 19997), 2:455

<sup>68</sup>Hamilton, “יָכַל,” *TDOT*, 2:455.

<sup>69</sup>“In BA only one form of infinitive is found in the peal conjugation, and thus BA does not have in this conjugation the distinction between the infinitive absolute and the infinitive construct found in BH.” Alger F. Johns, *A Short Grammar of Biblical Aramaic* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1972), 24.

<sup>70</sup>Miles V. Van Pelt, *Basics of Biblical Aramaic: Complete Grammar, Lexicon and Annotated Text* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2011), 106. See also Pratico, Gary D and Miles V. Van Pelt, *Basics of Biblical Hebrew Grammar* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2007).

Isa 47:12, 2 Chr 32:13, Numb 22:11, Jer 13:23, 2 Kgs 16:5, I Sam 6:20, etc. It is used perhaps mostly in the book of Proverbs and secondly most often in the books of Deuteronomy, Psalms, 2 Chronicles, and Jeremiah. With this analysis we can now make analysis of its use in the different texts it occurs in the book of Daniel. The focus will be limited to the immediate clause (s) or sometimes the sentence in which the expression occurs due to the limited length of this paper. Consideration of the context of the pericope or passage or event of the entire chapter will still be done for a complete syntactical analysis.

### Dan 2:10, 27, 47

עָנוּ כַשְׁדֵּיָא [כַשְׁדֵּיָא] [י] קְדָם־מַלְכָּא וְאַמְרִין לָא־אִיתִי אַנְשׁ עַל־יַבְשֻׁתָּא דִּי מַלְתַּ מַּלְכָּא יוֹכַל לְהַחְוִיָּה פַל־קֹבֵל דִּי פַל־מְלֵךְ רַב וְשְׁלִיטַּ מְלָה כְדָנָה לָא שְׂאֵל לְכַל־חֲרָטָם וְאַשְׁפָּה וְכַשְׁדָּי:

#### Morpho-syntactical and Etymological Analysis

The first appearance of the expression יֹכֵל which appears in Aramaic is in Dan. 2:10.

In this first appearance, it is worthy to note the clause that has the expression “יֹכֵל” The word יֹכֵל appears as a imperfect masculine singular piel verb. Its subject is the expression אַנְשׁ within the same clause that begins with a negative particle לָא. Its object in this clause seems to be the infinitive that is juxtaposed to it, לְהַחְוִיָּה.<sup>71</sup> The infinitive by its position is informative of what the expression יֹכֵל is all about. The *atnah* of the BHS then appears right under this expression, meaning this is a complete half of the sentence. The expression יֹכֵל has as its root, the tri-consonant יֹכַל and can be translated “able, permitted, attained, prevail, succeed, overcome, capable of, endure.”<sup>72</sup> And the inflected expression can best be translated as “he will be able.”

However, the entire sentence begins with another clause that carries a verb that informs about the one speaking. The Chaldeans who answered כַשְׁדֵּיָא, and said וְאַמְרִין the words that carry the expression יֹכֵל. One more observation, the Chaldeans’ response to king Nebuchadnezzar, mentioned by name in 2:1. The noun in apposition and title מְלֵךְ is used thereafter in the pericope. In this sentence, the Chaldeans express the inability of any man in the present or future, to inform the king what he is asking for.

Verse 27 in the same chapter has a clause that reads “רְזָה דִּי־מַלְכָּא שְׂאֵל לָא סַכְיָמִין אֲשַׁפִּין־חֲרָטָמִין גְּזָרִין” with three subjects that go along with the expression יֹכֵל that are all preceded by the negation לָא. It can be translated there is “no wise men, astrologer, magician, enchanter able to make known to the king.” The clause has an infinitive לְהַחְוִיָּה, *to make known* to the king as the action described by יֹכֵל in this text.

Verse 47 in the same chapter uses the expression in this clause “דִּי יֹכֵל לְמַגְלָא רְזָה דְנָה:” What should be noted is that here the expression, first: it does not use the negative particle לָא, unlike the previous cases in the same chapter. The expression which is perfect second masculine singular is descriptive of what the indirect object of the previous clause, only referred to by the second person pronoun *you*, who *was able to do*. Secondly: it is the same action which the previous three subjects “סַכְיָמִין אֲשַׁפִּין־חֲרָטָמִין” were not *able to do*, i.e., *to make known*. The author is using an interplay of these expressions to make a contrast of two sides. The entire clause of the verse can thus be translated “that you were able to make known this

<sup>71</sup>David J. A. Clines, *The Concise Dictionary of Classical Hebrew (CDCH)* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2009), s.v. “חווה” 169. Also note; Imperfect. יֹכַל; participle. מחווה; infinitive. חווה *Declare something* Ps 19:3, with double accus., *Declare something to someone* Job 32:6. *Inform someone* Job 15:17. חווה *declaration*. Ibid.

<sup>72</sup>Clines, *CDCH*, s.v. “יכיל” “be able to do something, in ref. to a. physical ability, לי *I am not able to stand up before you, because the way of women is upon me*, i.e. I am having my period Gen 31:35, לא נוכל לצשות, *vast floods cannot quench love*. b. what is permitted by custom or law, לא נוכל לצשות, *we are not able to do this..., because it is a disgrace among us* Gen 34:14. c. will, הביט אל, *you cannot countenance*, i.e. tolerate, *wrongdoing* Heb 1:13. 2. be capable of, attain, תוכל, *I know that you are capable of everything* Job 42:2. 3. *Endure* an object, person Ps 101:5, thing Isa 1:13. Est 8:6. 4a. *Prevail, succeed*, of Yahweh. Jer 20:7, Israel Jer 3:5. b. *Prevail against* someone Judg 16:5. c. *Overcome* enemy Ps 13:5. David J. A. Clines, *The Concise Dictionary*, s.v., “יכיל.”





where the expression was used in connection with *making known the mystery*, here it is used in connection with *deliverance*. One more important thing to note is that this clause begins with a conditional expression,  $\text{כִּי}$ , which is indicative of a constant factor that has preceded its utterance. Based on the story that the king is determined to make the speakers of this clause do as he wants (2:15). Thus, the first two expressions of this clause form a *protasis* “ $\text{כִּי אִתִּי}$ ” meaning “if that is so.” This is immediately followed by an *apodosis* that makes the rest of the clause “ $\text{לְשִׁיבֹתָנָא יִבְלֵ לְשִׁיבֹתָנָא פְּלִחִין יִבְלֵ לְשִׁיבֹתָנָא}$ .” It is interesting to note that within this apodosis is the expression  $\text{יִבְלֵ}$  which is descriptive of God’s ability “ $\text{לְשִׁיבֹתָנָא}$ .” In addition, the expression “ $\text{לְשִׁיבֹתָנָא פְּלִחִין}$ ” translated “whom we serve,” is still part of the apodosis. Therefore, the verb piel, participle, masculine plural “ $\text{פְּלִחִין}$ ”<sup>77</sup> translated “serve,” is a contrast to whatever the king is demanding. The subject are the Hebrew boys, and the one being addressed is the king in the context of the passage.

Verse 29 “ $\text{כִּי לֹא אִתִּי אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים וְיִבְלֵ לְהַצִּילָה בְּדָגָה}$ ” repeats the same idea of verse 17 with few unique aspects in it. Here, the expression  $\text{יִבְלֵ}$  is describing the same thing  $\text{לְהַצִּילָה}$ ,<sup>78</sup> “to deliver,” a kind of parallelism to the previous idea and thought of verse 17. However, the significant thing about this text is that the speaker has changed. While in verse 17, it was the Hebrew boys speaking to the king and using the same expressions, in verse 29 it is the king speaking to the Hebrew boys using the same expression. The author plays around with this expression. In both cases there is agreement about what God can do. In this text, the king adds another element, i.e., he declares that “ $\text{לֹא אִתִּי אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים}$ ”, meaning, “there is no other God.” He who was enforcing and demanding the worship of another god, here acknowledges that there is no other divinity *that can do* what the God of the Hebrew boys *is able to do*, i.e., “ $\text{יִבְלֵ לְשִׁיבֹתָנָא}$ ”

### Textual Witness Analysis

In verse 17, the LXX uses an expression that denotes not only *ability* but also *power* to deliver: “ $\delta\upsilon\nu\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma \ \epsilon\acute{\xi}\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha$ ”. This is an adjective that has taken the place of  $\text{יִבְלֵ}$  in Hebrew. The syntax shows that “ $\delta\upsilon\nu\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ” is qualifying “ $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha$ ” a verb, aorist middle infinitive, and can be translated “to remove, to take out, deliver,”<sup>79</sup> among other possible meanings. Here the LXX does not use a verb to translate the Hebrew expression  $\text{יִבְלֵ}$ .

Verse 29 in the LXX is completely different from the MT and it is as if it is not a translation of the same text. The LXX is talking about sin and lawlessness; it cannot even be compared with the MT. The DSS has only the last clause “ $\text{יִבְלֵ לְהַצִּילָה בְּדָגָה}$ ”<sup>80</sup> with the expression  $\text{יִבְלֵ}$  but not the preceding clause including the particle  $\text{וְ}$ . The MT is to be preferred, because it carries the complete thought, even though the part remaining in the DSS agrees with the MT.

#### Translation

The two clauses of 3:17 can be translated as “if it is so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us.” The two clauses within verse 29 are rendered “for there is no other god who is able to deliver like this.” The thought is carried to this point.

### Dan 4:15, 34

#### Morpho-syntactical and Etymological Analysis

Verse 15 has two clauses that use the expression  $\text{יִבְלֵ}$  out of the total appearance of 3 times in the same chapter. The expression in both cases is used by the king. The sentence reads: “ $\text{כִּי לֹא אִתִּי אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים וְיִבְלֵ לְהַצִּילָה בְּדָגָה}$ ”

<sup>77</sup>It means “to till, work, cleave, serve.” Francis Brown, with S. R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic* (BDB), based on the lexicon of William Gesenius (1952), s.v. “ $\text{פְּלִחִין}$ ”

<sup>78</sup>Etymologically it means to “snatch away from, take away from, rescue, deliver, escape from, from enemies and troubles”<sup>78</sup>Clines, *The Concise Dictionary*, s.v. “ $\text{לְהַצִּילָה}$ ”

<sup>79</sup>Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, ed. *A Greek English Lexicon* (GEL) (Oxford, UK: Clarendon, 1996), s.v. “ $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha$ ”

<sup>80</sup>4QDan, frg 1-2, 13-15.

“פִּשְׂרָא לְהוֹדְעָמְנִי וְאִנְתָּה כְּמֵל כִּי רִוּחַ־אֱלֹהִים קָדִישׁ בְּךָ:” The first clause uses the expression with the negative particle as לא just as happened in chapters 2 and 3. In this case it appears in the first part of the two clauses. The wise men are qualified as all of them who are in “his,” the king’s kingdom “מְלִכּוּתִי” In this case also it must be noted that the same expression that appeared early on with the verb יָכַל, e.g., *inability of the wise* men also appear in this clause, “לְהוֹדְעָמְנִי” a verb, hiphil infinitive construct, with a pronominal suffix first person common singular, is rendered “to make known to me.” Besides, what is supposed to be made known is tied to the interpretation, so he uses the expression “פִּשְׂרָא” the equivalent of the רִזָּה, the “mystery,” of the previous text.

The second part or the complement clause begins with a vav conjunction of contrast “but,” telling us that what is about to follow is going to be the opposite of what has been stated. Furthermore, the expression יָכַל is used first, without the negative particle לא and secondly, it does not have the infinitive that it is telling the action about, because it is clear that the thought or the infinitive is in the previous clause, “לְהוֹדְעָמְנִי” The king then proceeds to give reason why Daniel is *able to tell* by stating that “כִּי רִוּחַ־אֱלֹהִים בְּךָ קָדִישׁ” meaning, “because the Spirit of the holy God is in you.” In this expression it’s interesting to note that this statement affirms the earlier statement that said “לֹא־אֵיתִי אֲנִשׁ עַל־יַבְשָׁתָא” who is יָכַל to “לְהַחְיֶיהָ” to the king concerning the רִז (2:10). There is such connection of these expressions, in chapter 2 both the wise men and Daniel use this expression and their audience is the king. In this situation now, its Daniel who is being addressed and the king uses the same expression used by both Daniel and the wise men. What is significant, is the way in which the writer uses the expression יָכַל to depict an interplay of the developing enigmatic issue that forms the connection of the narratives in these chapters.

Verse 34a reads “כִּפְעֹן אֲנִי וְבוֹכְדִנְצָר מִשְׁבַּח וּמְרוֹמָם וּמְהַדָּר לְמִלְכָּךְ שְׁמַיָּא” This clause is critical in our discussion of the expression יָכַל in a significant way because; first it is connected to the statement of the Hebrew boys “אֲלֵהֲנָא דִּי־אֲנַחְנָא פְּלִחִין יָכַל לְשִׁיבוּתָנָא” And now the author of the book of Daniel presents the king as doing the same action as the Hebrew boys in relation to serving the God of the Hebrew boys. This is an intra textual connection, in addition to those we have already noted.

Secondly, notice what the king says, 3 things that he declares, again the Hebrew boys use one term to describe loyalty to God in the clause “אֲלֵהֲנָא דִּי־אֲנַחְנָא פְּלִחִין” (2:10), while the king uses 3 expressions to put his position about serving God in this situation. The expressions can thus be translated “מִשְׁבַּח וּמְרוֹמָם וּמְהַדָּר לְמִלְכָּךְ שְׁמַיָּא” praise, extol and honour,” the God of the heavens,

The import of all this discussion is worthy because what the king gives as reason for doing this is rooted and made clear by the use of this expression יָכַל, in the two subordinate clauses of 34b, “וְדִי מְהַלְכִין בְּגִוְהָ יָכַל לְהַשְׁפִּילָהּ:” Critical issues arise: The first of the two clauses has a verbal participle masculine plural “מְהַלְכִין” and a noun “בְּגִוְהָ” meaning “pride,”<sup>81</sup> precursors to the expression יָכַל in the terminative close of the entire sentence. As we look at this clause, “וְדִי מְהַלְכִין בְּגִוְהָ” it becomes apparent what the expression יָכַל is describing besides the infinitive it has, “לְהַשְׁפִּילָהּ,” “to humble.” God is able to humble those who walk in pride. The use of יָכַל in 4:34 is expressive of something that only the king, no other has experienced, “being humbled.” גוה attracts humiliation that is only enabled or executed (יָכַל) by God. Again, here the expression goes with an infinitive לְהַשְׁפִּילָהּ and no negative article לא, and as can be seen in the narrative and the context of the pericope, God is the active power behind, a similar structure in all the previous texts (chapters 2 and 3) in which יָכַל occurs.

### Textual Witness analysis

In verse 15, the LXX talks about a totally different subject, the translation done by the LXX is diametrically different from the MT, verse 15 of the MT is about the king’s wise man being unable to do what the king asked for, and Daniel’s ability to do what the king asked for. The LXX talks about animals and pastures. The DSS<sup>82</sup> has a complete text of this verse and it agrees with the MT.

<sup>81</sup>Holladay, *CHALOT*, s.v, “בְּגִוְהָ”

<sup>82</sup>4QDan, frg 3-7, 16-18.

In verse 34 the LXX has very interesting elements that are not in the MT, first while the MT uses three expressions of what the king did, “מְשִׁבַּח וּמְרַוֵּחַ וּמְהַדְרֵר” the LXX uses a the term “δούλευσον” second person singular aorist active imperative, and it means “to serve like a slave.”<sup>83</sup> This imperative is used with reference to “τῷ θεῷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ” The idea of “serving like a slave,” is not in the MT, but helps to add our understanding of the text even more. A Chaldean king, most likely would use such language, given the historical background of Neo-Babylonian Empire. The second expressions we find in the LXX are “δοξάτω τῷ ὑψίστῳ” in which “δοξάτω” is an imperative. And what is to be given “δοξάτω” is directed to “τῷ ὑψίστῳ” the Most High. It can therefore be observed that the LXX presents the king as using two imperatives instead of three participles of the MT. Besides, another interesting aspect in the LXX is that the king uses three titles to refer to God, “τῷ θεῷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ”, “τῷ ἁγίῳ”, “τῷ ὑψίστῳ”, while the MT uses only a different title and its only one, “לַמֶּלֶךְ שְׁמַיָּא” More so, it seems the Jewish scholarship is presenting the portrait of God that resonate with the Hebrew worldview. The DSS ends with verse 30.<sup>84</sup> However, the author of Dan 4:34 is making a statement about what has happened earlier in chapter 3 especially. The king of Babylon has realized and acknowledged God as the greater king before whom he must serve as *a slave does to their master*. Daniel the writer uses the expression to show that God is כָּל as king of the universe to humble earthly kings to acknowledge his kingship and authority over man’s kingdoms. He reigns supreme and above all. All expressed and compacted in an expression לֹכ syntactically used in connection with other expressions.

#### Translation

4:15, “All the wise men of my kingdom were not able to make known the interpretation, but you were able because the Spirit of God is in you.”

4:34, “I Nebuchadnezzar praise, and extol and honour the King of the heavens.”

### Dan 5:16

#### Morpho-syntactical and Etymological Analysis

The text reads “הֵן תִּוְכַל כְּתָבָא לְמַקְרָא וּפְשָׁרָהּ לְהוֹדֵעַתְנִי” and the quick thing that can be noticed in this clause in which the expression וְכָל appears as “תִּוְכַל” is a verb peal imperfect second masculine singular is preceded by a conditional expression הֵן. This is the first time the expression וְכָל is used without the negative article לֹא. Rather, it appears with a conditional expression. The syntactical element is that the entire clause is a protasis that must be complemented by an apodosis in the clause that follows. Unlike before, the expression here appears with two infinitives “לְמַקְרָא” and “לְהוֹדֵעַתְנִי” meaning “to read” and “to make me understand,” respectively. Previously, it appeared with one infinitive.

Furthermore, there is another expression “וּפְשָׁרָהּ” meaning “and interpret.” Therefore, there are three things the expression informs about the condition presented by the speaker, “to read, and “to interpret” and “to make known to me.” This is interesting because in this clause, that is a protasis, syntactically, the expression has the highest number of expressions that it is telling about. The speaker, from the context of the narrative, is king Belshazzar (5:1, 9). Notice that the expression informs that the words are coming from the mouth of a king “בְּלִישְׁאָצַּר מֶלֶכָּא” just like before. Daniel and the wise men are the only ones using this expression. There is a mystery that demands someone to *be able to make it known*. There is similar quest for someone to *be able*, to *interpret* and *make the king understand*. In both cases the king needs understanding in the face of a mystery. In the same observation of intra-textuality, the writing is placed on the same level with “the mystery,” of chapter 2 discussed early on. There is intra-textual connection with the expression וְכָל, deliberately used by the writer.

#### Textual Witness Analysis

<sup>83</sup>Liddell, *GEL*, s.v. “δούλευσον.”

<sup>84</sup>4QDan, frg 8.

The LXX syntax is interpretive of the MT rather than just a translation. “καὶ ἐγὼ ἤκουσα περὶ σοῦ ὅτι δύνασαι κρίματα συγκρίναι” The expression “δύνασαι” which means “you are able”<sup>85</sup> is followed by the term “κρίματα” meaning judgment.<sup>86</sup> This term has been used instead of “the writing” in the MT. The infinitive “συγκρίναι” meaning “to interpret”<sup>87</sup> is used. DSS does not have the entire clause to make a comparison.<sup>88</sup>

Translation

5:16: “If you are able to read the writing and interpret to make me understand.”

## Dan 6:5, 22

### Morpho-syntactical and Etymological Analysis

The clause first clause of verse 5 in which the expression יָכַל is used in this text reads; “וְכָל-עֲלֵהּ וְהוֹשִׁיעֵהוּ לֹא-יִכְלִין לְהִשְׁפֹּתָהּ כָּל-קָבֶל דִּי-מְהִימָן הוּא” The expression is in plural preceded by a negative article לֹא, and this means “they were not able.” It has an infinitive that follows if לְהִשְׁפֹּתָהּ “to find.”<sup>89</sup> And what is *not found* is stated as well in the expressions עֲלֵהּ and הוֹשִׁיעֵהוּ, “charge” and “fault” respectively. וְכָל-יִכְלִין is plural they were not able. It seems Daniel, according to the narrative in this chapter is being pursued by many people. Intra-textually, a similar situation arose in chapter 2, in which a group was not able. In this case the text repeats the idea of a group’s inability to do something else. The expression יָכַל is central in that syntactical matrix once again. The first group is confronted with a situation that needs only God to handle, and in this text, as shown in the last part of this clause, the group is not able to find charge or fault with someone faithful to God. Syntactically, it can also be noted that the reason for “their” inability to find fault is because of what the last part states, “כָּל-קָבֶל דִּי-מְהִימָן הוּא” because he (Daniel) was faithful. His faithfulness to God, makes “them” to not to be able to find fault.

In verse 22 “וְהִיכַלְהוּ דִּי אֲנִתָּה פְּלַח-לֵהּ בְּתַדְרִיא הַיְכָל לְשִׁיבֹתָהּ מִן-אַרְיֹתָא” the expression “הִיכַל” appears with an interrogative particle הַ besides being third person piel perfect singular, to give it the meaning “was he able.” The context of the pericope and the narrative informs us that the speaker or the one questioning is “מֶלֶכָּא דְרַבְרִישׁ” (6:10) and he is addressing Daniel. It should be noticed again that it’s a king who makes the interrogative statement that include the same expression יָכַל. The person addressed is Daniel. It may also be noted that an infinitive follows the expression יָכַל just like before, as evidenced in the past occurrences already looked at, “לְשִׁיבֹתָהּ” meaning “to deliver you.” And in this case, it’s a delivery “מִן-אַרְיֹתָא” syntactically and intra-textually, the first use of the expression translated “to deliver us” was “לְשִׁיבֹתָנָא” (3:17) in relation to fiery furnace. And in this case (6:22) it is used in relation to deliver “מִן-אַרְיֹתָא”.

The elements from which deliverance is able to be done are different. Fire is different from the ferocious beasts. The rest of the narrative informs the reason why Daniel was not harmed. Notice what the following text states; אַרְיֹת פִּמּוּ וּסְגַר מְלָאכָה שְׁלַח אֱלֹהֵי. What happened, the delivery, is an act of *God who is able*. Notice the king is asking if *God was able*, and so Daniel answers by explaining what God did as a result of his *ability*. Then the second reason which Daniel seems to subordinate to the first one, because it is in a complementary clause, it ates that “וְכִי הִשְׁתַּבַּחְתָּ לִּי וְאַף קָדְמִיָּהּ”, translated “because I was found blameless before Him and before you.” The writer amplifies the reason why “they” could not find fault. The reason is rooted in the idea of being *faithful*, which is paralleled to being *blameless*. So, God delivers those who are both faithful and blameless. Intra-textually, it seems to connect to chapter 3’s case where such reasons are not stated; action being the face that gives reason. Visibility of action of the boys rather than a fact stated in the text, in the narrative in which the Hebrew boys simply refuse to bow to the

<sup>85</sup>Liddell, *GEL*, s.v. “δύνασαι”

<sup>86</sup>Liddell, *GEL*, s.v. “κρίματα”

<sup>87</sup>Liddell, *GEL*, s.v. “συγκρίναι”

<sup>88</sup>4QDan, frg 1-4, 14.

<sup>89</sup>Holladay, *CHALOT*, s.v. “שָׁפֵת”

gold image. Here in chapter six, elements of why God delivers are stated; God sending His angels, faithfulness and blamelessness. God *was able* (יכל) to deliver those who are *faithful* and *blameless*.

#### Textual Witness Analysis

The LXX in describing why Daniel was found without charge or fault, it uses the expression “παράπτωμα” a noun neuter singular, and it means “trespass”<sup>90</sup> which denotes the idea of sin against God considering the background of the LXX scholars. The DSS does not have the entire text available to us, rather the chapter begins with verse 8.<sup>91</sup>

#### Translation

6:5; “But they were not able to find charge and fault because he was faithful.”

6:22; “Your God whom you serve continually, was He able to deliver you?”

### Dan 7:21

#### Morpho-syntactical and Etymological Analysis

The text “וַיִּכְלֶה לְהוֹן: עַם־קַדְיִשְׁיָן וְקַרְבַּת עִבְרָה דְכֹן עֲבָדָה קַרְבַּת עִבְרָה קַרְבַּת עִבְרָה” is found in the apocalyptic section, until now the expression יכל has been discussed only as it appears in the historical section of the book of Daniel. Right here the context of the narratives is in the apocalypse and largely there are symbols used in the sentences. As such it pays to give particular attention to the nature of this genre when analyzing the text. The first part of the sentence is itself a complement clause because the first expression begins with a conjunction. Besides, the subject is in these words “וְקַרְבַּת דְכֹן” meaning “and this horn.” The horn is doing the action that is described in the second part of the sentence, and second clause, “עֲבָדָה קַרְבַּת”<sup>92</sup> meaning “it made war,” and its action is directed to the object “עַם־קַדְיִשְׁיָן”<sup>93</sup> who are the *holy ones*.<sup>94</sup> And then the next clause is a subordinate clause that is telling more about the war done by the horn. This is where the expression יכל appears and it is descriptive of the outcome of that war. The syntax and the context make the expression “וְיִכְלֶה” be rendered “and was overcoming.” The *holy ones* here referred to by the expression “לְהוֹן” made up of a preposition and a third masculine pronoun, making the best translation just “them.” The horn has some ability to overcome. The best translation of the text should be overcome.

Intra-textually, the expression is still located in a position of two contending ends, and descriptive of what one element was able to do, just like the previous texts have shown. However, in this case, the picture of the historical section has changed, the holy ones are overcome by something that is not holy. This is a complete shift from what was happening. The narrative is telling a reverse order of what has been happening, and connected to the expression יכל, which is used with meaning that informs what the horn was able to do. There is no infinitive and no negative particle.

#### Textual Witness Analysis

The LXX uses the expression “ἴσχυσεν” a verb, third singular aorist active, indicative which carries the idea of “being able, to be strong”<sup>95</sup> in Greek. And the text would best be translated “and this horn made

<sup>90</sup>Liddell, *GEL*, s.v. “παράπτωμα”

<sup>91</sup>4QDan, fgr. 7, i.

<sup>92</sup>The expression “קרב” means “war.” Holladay, *CHALOT*, s.v. “קרב”. A special note is also made in the lexicon suggesting “war” as the best translation for Dan 7:21.

<sup>93</sup>“With or against,” Clines, *CDCH*, s.v. “עמ” 330. Also the expression “קדִישִׁין” means “Holy,” *CHALOT*, s.v. “קדש,” 418. “Pure, consecrated,” Ernst Jenni, “קדש,” *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament (TLOT)*, ed. Ernst Jenni and Claus Westerman (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994), 3: 1104.

<sup>94</sup>Holladay, *CHALOT*, s.v. “קדש” 419.

<sup>95</sup>Liddell, *GEL*, s.v. “ἴσχυσεν”

war with the holy ones and was strong over them.” The LXX seems to avoid the idea of total defeat of the holy ones by the horn yet captures the idea that somehow it was stronger over them. The DSS has the same text that agrees with the MT.<sup>96</sup> This is critical to note that the Qumran community used the same expression, assuming they were making copies of the Scriptures. The holy ones being overcome are passive rather than total extinction.

Translation

7:21, “And this horn made war against the holy ones, and was overcoming them.”

### Dan 10: 17

Morpho-syntactical and Etymological Analysis

The text reads “וְהִיָּד יוֹכֵל עֲבָד אֲדֹנָי זֶה לְדַבֵּר עִם־אֲדֹנָי זֶה” The expression יִכַּל is in the imperfect and once again the infinitive appears in the second of the two clauses. This is a feature unique to this clause, because the past occurrences have the infinitive in the same clause with the יִכַּל expression. It is an interrogative sentence which puts the expression יִכַּל at the center of what is being interrogated about: ability to do something, “לְדַבֵּר עִם־אֲדֹנָי זֶה”, to “speak this with my Lord.” Daniel is using the expression with the nuance it carries in the previous section and context of the historical narratives, besides painting a picture in the mind of the reader the fact that ability seems to be an action that is only done by God. Once again God is mentioned, and an infinitive is used. Most interesting is the intra-textual element of how this interrogative statement is placed as a parallel interrogative statement of king Nebuchadnezzar asked in 3:15 יֵדֵן מִן הוּא וּמִן יִשִּׁיבִנְכוּן דִּי אֱלֹהֵי הוּא וּמִן וְהִיָּד יוֹכֵל עֲבָד אֲדֹנָי זֶה לְדַבֵּר עִם־אֲדֹנָי זֶה translated “and which God will deliver you from my hand?” And here Daniel states “וְהִיָּד יוֹכֵל עֲבָד אֲדֹנָי זֶה לְדַבֵּר עִם־אֲדֹנָי זֶה” translated “And how will this servant of my Lord be able to speak this with my Lord?” It is here placed as an antithesis of the first interrogation to suggest what the king should have considered in his words against the servants of God. Notice that the idea of servant is found in both. The king in 3:15 does not fear to challenge the “servants” of God, while in 10:17 “the servant” of God *fears to speak to God*. It is a contrast of syntactical arrangement of expressions by the writer.

Textual Witness Analysis

The LXX expresses it as “καὶ πῶς δυνήσεται ὁ παῖς σου” The expression “δυνήσεται” is a verb, 3rd singular aorist act indicative, best translated as “will be able.”<sup>97</sup> This affirms the MT, besides the next expression “παῖς” carries the nuance of “slave,” or “child,”<sup>98</sup> in Greek. The syntax resonates well with the rest of the expressions that the LXX uses. The DSS has only the second half of the sentence:<sup>99</sup> the first is missing which contains the expression יִכַּל. Secondly, the syntax suggests that the clause is subordinate to something missing.

Translation

10:17 “And how will this servant of my Lord be able to speak this with my Lord.”

### Intra-textual Analysis and Theological Implications

It was critical to show the intra-textual connections as the discussion of the paper progressed than wait till the very end of the syntactical and textual witness analysis to be done first. This section necessarily gives the grand portrait of the connections of the expression in the book. James M. Hamilton, Jr., notes that

<sup>96</sup>4QDan, frg, 8-9.

<sup>97</sup>Liddell, *GEL*, s.v “δυνήσεται”

<sup>98</sup>Liddell, *GEL*, s.v, “παῖς”

<sup>99</sup>4QDan frg 15, 15-16.

words and phrases in the book of Daniel weave the book into a unit whole.<sup>100</sup> In this case, the expression demonstrates this fact and more, about the book of Daniel. First, the expression יָכַל is best translated *able to, to be able*, in most of the occurrences serve one in 7:21, where “overcoming” is the preferred translation. The context of 7:21 demands this translation. Secondly, יָכַל retains the meaning that features in the rest of the book.

### Uses of the infinitive with the Expression יָכַל

In all occurrences serve 7:21, the expression יָכַל is used with an infinitive that comes after it, serve 4:15 where the infinitive is placed before it. It is clear in the syntax of 4:15, that the expression is referring to the previous infinitive. In all cases it has the preposition ל.

### It is God as the Subject who does the action of יָכַל mostly

In 11 cases, out of the 13, i.e., 7:21 and 10:17 the subject who does the action יָכַל is God. He does it in directly 3:29 or through His servant Daniel (4:15). In 7:21, the holy ones are being overcome by the little horn, while in 10:17 Daniel is making an interrogative statement about his inability to speak to his Lord. In all cases, however the meaning of the text informs about a common feature concerning God, carried in the expression יָכַל.

### Syntactical connections of the expression יָכַל

The diagram below shows syntactical connections, which goes to show the intra-textuality of the expression יָכַל in Daniel. A brief observation of the visible evidences will thus be highlighted. The connections carry unique elements, yet one thought.

(1). Dan 2:10, 2:27, 4:15, 6:5 form a very clear parallelism.

The stated facts of the first line get more detail in the following lines. It is clear that the “no man upon the earth” of 2:10 are inclusive of those regarded as “wise men, astrologers, magicians and enchanters,” of 2:27. They are from Babylon (4:15), and the common emphasis in this parallelism is that they are identified with inability to do something. The expression has a negative article לֹא right through when used to refer to the wise men of Babylon. They fail *to make known* (2:10, 2:27, 4:15) and *not able to find fault with Daniel* (6:5). Besides, each of the failures is centered on something that has been *caused by God*; 2:45-the dream, 5:26 the writing on the wall, faith as a result of the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit.

- 2:10: “There is no man upon the earth  
who will be able to make known the king’s word.”
- 2:27: “No wise men, astrologer, magician, enchanters  
is able to make known to the king.”
- 2:47: “That you were able to make known this mystery.”
- 3:17: “if it is so our God whom we serve is able to deliver us.”
- 3:29: “for there is no other god who is able to deliver like this.”
- 4:15a, “All the wise men of my kingdom  
were not able to make known the interpretation,
- 4:15b but you were able  
because the Spirit of God is in you.”
- ....4:34: “I Nebuchadnezzar praise, and extol and honor the King of the  
heavens.”
- 5:16: “If you are able to read the writing and you be able to interpret to make me  
understand” (a mystery)

<sup>100</sup>James M. Hamilton, Jr., “With the Clouds of Heaven: The book of Daniel in Biblical Theology,” *New Studies in Biblical Theology* 32, ed. D. A. Carson (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2014), 66.

6:5 : "But they

were not able to find charge and fault because he was faithful.

6:22; Your God whom you serve continually, was He able to deliver you?

7:21: "And this horn made war against the holy ones, and was overcoming them."

10:17: "And how will this servant of my Lord be able to speak this with my Lord."

Notice that, "He was faithful" (6:5) is paralleled to "the Spirit of God who is in you" (4:15), meaning in trying to find fault with a Spirit filled man they were attempting to find fault with the Spirit who lives in Daniel. Thus another parallelism is closely connected to the first chain of parallelism. This is an occurrence of intra-textuality of the expression *לֹא יָכוֹל*. The table below is a brief overview of the specific syntactical intra-textual, and specific function of the expression *לֹא יָכוֹל* in each clause, phrase or sentence of the corpus of the entire book of Daniel.

	<b>Person and Status</b>	<b>Occasion</b>	<b>To whom</b>	<b>Condition</b>
1	Chaldeans, the wise men (2:10)	King's dream	King Neb <sup>101</sup>	Not able to tell
2	Daniel (2:27)	King's dream	To king Neb	Stating fact about wise men's inability to tell
3	King Neb (2:47)	King's Dream/a mystery	Daniel	Acknowledges Daniel ability to tell mystery
4	Three Hebrews Daniel's friends (3:17)	Golden image	King Neb	Tells Neb of God's ability to deliver
5	King Neb (3:29)	Golden image	Hebrew boys and all people	God's ability delivers the Hebrews from fire
6	King Neb (4:15a)	After 7 years forest exile	All people	Acknowledges God's ability for foreknowledge
7	King Neb (4:15b)	After 7 years forest exile	All people	Acknowledges Daniel's ability as a man of God
<i>King Nebuchadnezzar Worships the King of the Universe (4:34)</i>				
8	King Belshazzar (5:16a)	Writing on the wall/ a mystery	Daniel	Wants to know Daniel's ability to read the mystery
9	King Belshazzar (5:16b)	Writing on the wall/ a mystery	Daniel	Wants to know Daniel's ability to interpret the mystery
10	Daniel the prophet (6:5)	Worship of Darius	All who read the book	Asks God's ability to deliver Daniel
11	King Darius (6:22)	Daniel in lion's den	Daniel	God's ability delivers Daniel from lions

<sup>101</sup>Neb for Nebuchadnezzar.



12	Daniel the prophet (7:21)	Little horn power	All who read the book	The horn is overcoming holy ones
13	Daniel the prophet (10:17)	God reveals Himself to Daniel	God	Daniel’s lack of ability before God.

**(2) Significance of the Characters using the expression יָקַץ**

There is a significant observation about the persons, their status and number of times they use the expression יָקַץ, and to whom they are speaking. The table below shows in a graphical manner how significant this observation is. It was the Chaldeans who stood in for the wise men of king Nebuchadnezzar’s kingdom, three kings, (Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar and Darius), and the prophet Daniel.

It seems Daniel is telling the reader through the syntactical connectivity of the use of the expression יָקַץ that there are three contending powers in this world.

The wise, spiritists, false religions, etc.	Rulers and systems of power or governance	God and His Faithful ones
---	---	---------------------------

Daniel is telling of contending forces for control, even though the other two are against God and His people. He informs that God will emerge the victor at the end.

Three times King Nebuchadnezzar acknowledged the supremacy of God (2:47, 3:17, 4:15b).

Ability (יָקַץ) of God to deliver now and in the Future

There is a connection between the expressions used in 3:17 and 6:22, the ability of God to deliver those who serve Him, now and in the future. This is a great theological theme of the book expressed by the use of the expression יָקַץ in Daniel. The expressions are parallel, and they attest to one thing, God’s ability to deliver. In verse 3:17 those who serve Him are aware of *God’s ability to deliver* before it happens, and in 6:22, those who look at those who serve God become aware of the *ability of God* to deliver them. Tied to this point is the fact that the service of those who serve God is known by others. Notice right here that 7:21 comes immediately after the last deliverance, and the holy ones seemingly are being overcome. Daniel the writer has put it in such a way as to show from the rest of how the expression יָקַץ is active in the deliverance of those who serve Him. So, if God has delivered those who serve Him in 3:17 and 6:22, why should He not deliver those who are seemingly being overpowered by the little horn, Daniel’s narrative seems to present this in a graphic picture. Even kings have acknowledged His power, the wise and people of all religions have attested to this reality about God, Daniel seems to declare in his careful syntactical use of the expression יָקַץ. Both the three Hebrews and Daniel went into the zone and sphere of danger, so do those who are overcome by the little horn. This is an interesting connection of intra-textuality of the expression יָקַץ.

**(3) Earthly kings worship the King of the universe**

Right at the center of all the occurrences of the expression יָקַץ in the book of Daniel, are carefully placed the praises and worship and honor of an earthly king to the King of the heavens (4:34). God is able to make all realize, through His redemptive love to lead all to know Him, and worship Him. God is able: through the words of the Chaldeans (2:10), the prophet Daniel solving mysteries (2:27,47), deliverance of His children (3:29, 4:15), to lead king Nebuchadnezzar to acknowledge Him. In all cases the expression יָקַץ is used.

This is followed by the mystery solved in 5:16, by Daniel, failure to find fault in a Holy Spirit indwelt worshiper of God (6:5) and the deliverance of 6:22. The holy ones of 7:21 after deliverance, will all praise and worship and honor God, the king of the heavens. Worship of God is at the center of the ability of God in His actions in the historical development of His people.

**(4) A Contrasting Inclusio Formation of the Expression יָקַץ**

The final intra-textual analysis is how the two sentences that appear, one at the beginning and one at the end. In 2:10, the Chaldeans are talking to an earthly king of what no human on earth will be able to

do. In the end Daniel talks to the King of Heaven his inability to speak to Him because God is holy. The first is a portrait of failure by servants, to tell what the king is demanding, while the second is a failure by a servant to stand and talk to the king who is able to do all things. The first is a cry of despair while the last one is an act of reverential worship. And after this there is no more use of the expression *לְקַדֵּשׁ* in the book of Daniel. According to the Danielic use of the expression *לְקַדֵּשׁ*, God requires worship, and does not demand what He is not able to provide.

## CONCLUSION

The study has shown that the expression *לְקַדֵּשׁ* is used in the Danielic corpus to convey a textual and intra-textual linguistic feature. It helps to reveal the literary and linguistic unit of the book. Textual witnesses, though they differ in their linguistic elements, they have shown to shed light in understanding the MT. Besides, the study has shown that the syntactical theological method employed to study the expression *לְקַדֵּשׁ* is a viable biblical study methodology within the broad spectrum of text-linguistic approaches. The expression *לְקַדֵּשׁ* is a deliberate selection by the author of the book of Daniel to express one of its major thematic issues: God’s sovereignty demonstrated by His ability to act unique ways within the corpus. The syntactical connections are interwoven in a manner that has been carefully done to express the intended message. Consequently, the use of the expression *לְקַדֵּשׁ* in the book shows that the book of Daniel seems to suggest a linguistic connection, and the product of single authorship, contrary to Victor Matthews and like-minded scholars.<sup>102</sup>

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, Robert. Daniel: Signs and Wonders, *International Theological Commentary*, Edited by George A. F. Knight and Fredrick Carlson Holmgren. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1984.
- Beaugrade, Robert-Alain and Wolfgang Dresser, *Introduction to the Text Linguistics*. New York, NY: Longman, 1982.
- Bediako, Daniel. “Genesis 1:1-2:3 in the Light of Text linguistics and Text Oriented-Literary Studies,” PhD diss., Adventist International Institute of Advanced Studies, Silang, Cavite, Philippines, 2009.
- Broyles, Craig C. “Traditions, Intertextuality and Canon,” *Interpreting the Old Testament: A Guide for Exegesis*, edited by. Craig C. Broyles, 157-176. Grand Rapids: MI: Baker, 2001.
- Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic* based on the lexicon of William Gesenius, Oxford: Clarendon, 1952.
- Cate L, Robert. *An Introduction to the Old Testament and its Study*. Nashville, TN: Broadman, 1987.
- Chisholm, Robert, Jr. *From Exegesis to Exposition: A Practical Guide to Using Biblical Hebrew*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1988.
- Cole, Ross H. “The Pros and Cons of Intertextuality,” *Hermeneutics, Intertextuality and The Contemporary Meaning of Scripture*, Edited by Ross H Cole and Paul Peterson, 3-16. Cooranbong, Australia: Avondale, 2014.

<sup>102</sup>Matthews, *The Hebrew Prophets*, 208.

- Collins, John J. *Daniel with an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature*. The Forms of the Old Testament Literature 20. Edited by Rolf Knierim and Gene Tucker. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1984.
- Collins, John J and Peter W Flint. *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception, vol II*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill Academic, 2001.
- Correa, Teofilo. “Significant Assumptions: on the Methodology of Intertextuality and Inner-Biblical Exegesis,” *The End from the Beginning: Festschrift Honoring Merling Alomia*. Edited by Benjamin Rojas, Teofilo Correa, Lael Caesar, and Joel Turpo, 299-310. Lima, Peru: Universidad Peruana Union, 2015.
- Cotterell, Peter and Max Tuner, *Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation*. Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity, 1989.
- Clines, David, J A. *The Concise Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.
- Clayton, Jay and Eric Rothstein. “Figures in the Corpus: Theories of influence and Intertextuality,” in *Influence and Intertextuality History*, Edited by Jay Clayton and Eric Rothstein. Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1991: 291-317.
- Davidson, Richard M. “Biblical Interpretation.” *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary (SDABC)*. Rev. ed., Edited by Francis D. Nichol. Washington, DC: Review & Herald, 1976-1980). 12:58-104.
- Even-Shoshan, Abraham. *A New Concordance of the Old Testament*. Jerusalem, Israel: Kiryat-Sepher, 1983.
- Fabry H J, “יָדָל,” *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren and Heinz-Josef Fabry. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1986. 6:75.
- Hamilton, P. Victor “יָדָל,” *Dictionary Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* Edited by William A. VanGemeren. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997. 2:455.
- Hamilton, James M. Jr. *With the Clouds of Heaven: The book of Daniel in Biblical Theology*. New Studies in Biblical Theology 32. Edited by D A Carson. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2014.
- Holladay, William L. *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1988.
- Jenni, Ernst. *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Edited by Ernst Jenni and Claus Westerman. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Johns, F Alger. *A Short Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1972.
- Kaiser, C. Walter and Moises Silva, *Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics: The Search for Meaning*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2007.
- LaCocque, Andre, *Daniel in His Time*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1988.
- Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott, eds. *A Greek English Lexicon*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon, 1996.
- Matthews, Victor H. *The Hebrew Prophets and their Social World*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2012.
- Meadowcroft, T. J. *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic, 1995.

- McLay, Tim. *The OG and The Versions of Daniel*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1996.
- Martinez, Forentio Garcia, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. Vol 1. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Meadowcroft, T J. Aramaic Daniel and the Greek Daniel, *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series (JOST)* 198, Edited by David J A Collins and Philip R Davies. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic, 1995.
- Pratico, Gary D and Miles V. Van Pelt. *Basics of Biblical Hebrew Grammar*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2007.
- Probstle, Martin. *Truth and Terror: A Text Oriented Analysis of Daniel 8:9-14*, Unpublished Dissertation for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University, 2006
- Shea, William. “Daniel: A Case in Intertextuality,” *The End from the Beginning: Festschrift Honoring Merling Alomia*. Edited by Benjamin Rojas, Teofilo Correa, Lael Caesar, and Joel Turpo, 179-190. Lima, Peru: Universidad Peruana Union, 2015.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Daniel 1-7*. The Abundant Life Bible Amplifier. Ontario, Canada: Pacific, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Daniel 7-12*. The Abundant Life Bible Amplifier: Edited by George Knight. Ontario, Canada: Pacific, 1996.
- Phandl, Gerhard. *Daniel: The Seer of Babylon*. Hagerstown, MD: Review & Herald, 2004.
- Shepherd, B Michael. Daniel in the Context of the Hebrew Bible, *Studies in Biblical Literature (SBL)* 123, Edited by Hemchand Gossai. New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2009.
- Stefanovic, Zdravko. *Daniel: Wisdom to the Wise*. Ontario, Canada: Pacific Press, 2007.
- Soggin, J. A, “יכל.” *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren and Heinz-Josef Fabry. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1986, 6: 72.
- Van Pelt, Miles V. *Basics of Biblical Aramaic: Complete Grammar, Lexicon and Annotated Text*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2011.
- Waltke, Bruce K and M. O’Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Wurthwein, Ernst. *The Text of the Old Testament: An introduction to the Biblia Hebraica*. Translated by Errol F. Rhodes. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2014.