

# Who Did What to Whom? Anaphoric Subjects and Objects in Daniel 11:2b-12:3<sup>1</sup>

Tarsee Li  
Oakwood University

## Abstract

There is a consensus among critical scholars that the bulk of Daniel chapters 10-12 consists of an *ex eventu* prophecy that describes the conflicts between the Seleucids and the Ptolemies followed by a failed attempt at an eschatological prediction. However, most Evangelical scholars including Seventh-day Adventists reject that interpretation because they cannot reconcile an interpretation that requires an *ex eventu* prophecy that fails in its final prediction with a high view of Scripture. Instead, they have proposed a variety of other interpretations. Nevertheless, one of the difficulties in the interpretation of Daniel 11, and one of the reasons for the variety of interpretations, is the presence of clauses whose subjects and/or objects are expressed with pronominal markers rather than explicit subjects or objects. Therefore, the pronominal ambiguities in Daniel 11 offer us a good test case for the rules proposed by Lénart J. de Regt for dealing with ambiguity in anaphoric references in Hebrew clauses. It is hoped that this paper will contribute to the discussion of this chapter by clarifying the identity of some of the pronominal participants in the chapter.

## Dedication

This paper is dedicated to the memory of Dr. Johann E. Erbes, a great scholar who loved the Bible and the ancient languages. He taught me a lot about Hebrew, Aramaic, and Septuagint Greek in his classes. As a student worker I also had the privilege of gaining insights into the complex and sometimes tedious work of textual criticism. I appreciated him especially because he encouraged and nurtured my love for the ancient languages. He will be missed.

## Introduction

The great majority of scholars, both critical and conservative, understand the bulk of Daniel chapters 10-12 as a description of the conflicts between the Seleucids and the Ptolemies as well as the plight of pious Judeans and the Maccabean revolt. Critical scholars also view the end of the discourse as a prediction that the Maccabean victory would result in the coming of the eschatological time of the end.<sup>2</sup> The critical view can be illustrated by John J. Collins' comment

---

<sup>1</sup> Paper presented at the Daniel 11 Conference, in Berrien Springs, MI, October 22, 2021.

<sup>2</sup> For a brief summary of early interpretations, see James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1927), p. 468-470.

regarding 11:40, "Modern scholarship marks the transition from *ex eventu* prophecy to real (and erroneous) prediction at this point."<sup>3</sup> Similarly, C. L. Seow states:

Verse 40 returns to the theme of an "end time" that has been anticipated earlier . . . Unlike the preceding overview of history, which is corroborated by historical happenings often to a remarkable degree, the events in this climactic section cannot be so coordinated. The accounting of truth (see v. 2) has, in fact, moved from a review of the past, to a view of the present condition of the narrator and the audience, and now to a daring preview of the future.<sup>4</sup>

Since one cannot reconcile an *ex eventu* prophecy that fails in its final prediction with a high view of Scripture, it is understandable why many Evangelical scholars have proposed alternative interpretations. For example, some limit the Seleucid-Maccabean interpretation to 11:1-35, and apply the rest eschatologically.<sup>5</sup> Others see in vv. 36-39 a transitional section where Antiochus IV prefigures the Antichrist.<sup>6</sup> For others the transition begins in v. 40.<sup>7</sup> Still others see vv. 40-45 as a continuation of events to the end of Antiochus' life, in which case the "time of the end" (v. 40) is a reference not to the end of the world but the end of Antiochus' life.<sup>8</sup> Similarly, there is a variety of interpretations in Adventist scholarship, which I will not list here because I am sure to miss some.

---

<sup>3</sup> John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Hermeneia (Fortress Press, 1994), 388.

<sup>4</sup> Choon-Leong Seow, *Daniel*, Westminster Bible Companion (Louisville, KY; London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003), 184.

<sup>5</sup> Stephen R. Miller, *Daniel*, The New American Commentary 18 (Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1994), 305.

<sup>6</sup> Gleason Archer (1985): 143-146; Joyce G. Baldwin, *Daniel: An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries 23 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1978), 220-221.

<sup>7</sup> John E. Goldingay, *Daniel*, Word Biblical Commentary 30 (Dallas: Word, Incorporated, 1989), 305.

<sup>8</sup> Paul R. House, *Daniel: An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries 23 (London: Inter-Varsity Press, 2018), 178. Likewise, the events of 12:1-4 do not primarily depict the end of the world, but do have eschatological significance (p. 180).

One of the difficulties that complicates attempts at the interpretation of Daniel 11 is the occurrence of many clauses whose subjects and/or objects are not explicitly named, but are expressed with pronominal suffixes or morphological markers of person, gender, and number. Therefore, these ambiguities in Daniel 11 offer us a good test case for the rules proposed by Lénart J. de Regt for dealing with ambiguity in anaphoric references in Hebrew clauses.<sup>9</sup> It is hoped that this paper will contribute to the understanding of this section of the book of Daniel by clarifying the identity of at least some of the ambiguous clause participants. However, although I hope to contribute to the discussion of this passage, this study will not attempt to give an interpretation of the chapter.

### Preliminary Remarks

Before delving into this study, a few preliminary remarks are in order. To begin with, although this study is based primarily on the Hebrew Masoretic Text (hereafter, MT), it is also recognized that we do not have the original text of Daniel but only the scribal copies, and that, therefore, some of the textual variants may be relevant to this study.

At the risk of being pedantic, two concepts must be defined for the benefit of biblical scholars who are not acquainted with linguistic terminology. First, by definition each "clause" has one and only one predicate,<sup>10</sup> which in Hebrew can be either verbal (a verb or verb phrase) or nominal (a nominal word or phrase). Hence, if a group of words does not have a predicate it is

---

<sup>9</sup> Lénart J. de Regt, "Anaphoric Accessibility in Biblical Hebrew Narrative: Global and Local Participant Tracking across Clause Boundaries," pages 63-78 in *Ancient Texts and Modern Readers: Studies in Ancient Hebrew Linguistics and Bible Translation*. edited by Gideon R. Kotzé, Christian S. Locatell, and John A. Messarra, *Studia Semitica Neerlandica* 71 (Leiden: Brill, 2019).

<sup>10</sup> It should be noted here that a clause may also have a compound predicate (as well as a compound subject or compound object), where two or more verbs or verb phrases share the same subject and object in one clause. For example, "The student looked up and saw the teacher." This should be distinguished from a compound sentence with two or more separate clauses, such as, "The student looked at the teacher, and he saw other students behind him."

not a clause, and if it has more than one predicate it consists of more than one clause. Second, "anaphora" means the use of one word or phrase to refer to or replace another previously used word or phrase. For the purpose of this study, the anaphoric elements in a Hebrew clause are markers of person, gender, and number that refer back to someone or something previously named. These include not only pronouns and pronominal suffixes but also the morphological markers of person, gender, and number in verbs.<sup>11</sup> These anaphoric elements are easy for English speakers to see because they are all translated as pronouns in English.

Turning to de Regt's rules, there are four of them, which can be divided into two groups. Rules one and two are most applicable to narratives of actions and events, whereas rules three and four are most applicable to narratives of dialogues. Due to the content of Daniel 11, the first two rules are the most relevant for our study. These may be cited as follows:

As a first rule, if there is an object (direct or indirect) or object complement (a prepositional direct or indirect object) in the preceding clause, the anaphoric subject in the current clause (or, if the subject is already specified, the current anaphoric object) is coreferential with that previous object, provided it is of the same gender and number.<sup>12</sup>

As a second rule—if there is no animate object (direct or indirect) or object complement (a prepositional direct or indirect object) in the preceding clause, the anaphoric subject (or, if the subject is already specified, an anaphoric object) in the current clause is coreferential with a previous subject (of the same

---

<sup>11</sup> As in the case of the majority of languages, Hebrew is a null-subject language, which means that sentences can lack an explicit subject. The subject is still anaphorically expressed, however, by the verbal markers of person, gender, and number.

<sup>12</sup> De Regt, "Anaphoric Accessibility," p. 64.

gender and number) that is still active across clauses in the discourse (i.e., globally).<sup>13</sup>

The most important distinction between rules one and two is whether or not there is an animate object in the preceding clause. If yes, rule one is applicable, but if not, rule two is applicable. Next, the important distinction within each rule is whether there is a specified subject in the current clause. Hence, if there is an animate object in the preceding clause and an anaphoric subject in the current clause, according to rule one they are coreferential if they agree in gender and number. If the subject of the current clause is already specified, then the anaphoric object of the current clause is coreferential with the object of the previous clause of the same gender and number. If, however, there is no animate object in the preceding clause, then rule two applies, and the subject of the preceding clause and an anaphoric subject of the current clause are coreferential if they agree in gender and number. If the subject of the current clause is already specified, then the anaphoric object of the current clause is coreferential with the subject of the previous clause of the same gender and number.

De Regt's rules three and four deal with participants in a dialogue. "As a third rule, the preceding addressee (object complement) becomes the subject of the verb of utterance or cognition/perception in the current clause."<sup>14</sup> "As a fourth rule, the current subject is the participant to whom the imperatives or requests in a previous utterance were addressed."<sup>15</sup> Rules three and four seem almost intuitive, since one expects a person to respond after he or she is addressed. Nevertheless, since the passage that is the focus of this study consists of a monologue, rules three and four are less relevant to our study.

---

<sup>13</sup> De Regt, "Anaphoric Accessibility," p. 67.

<sup>14</sup> De Regt, "Anaphoric Accessibility," p. 72.

<sup>15</sup> De Regt, "Anaphoric Accessibility," p. 73.

In addition to the aforementioned rules, de Regt also mentions some cross-clausal regularities that take precedence over the first two rules.<sup>16</sup> One cross-clausal regularity is: "When verbs refer to consecutive, successive movements with similar meaning (for example, to the first and last stage of the same movement, or to two lexically different verbs of utterance for the same speech act), these will have the same subject and object."<sup>17</sup> In other words, when a series of verbs denote the same or related actions, the subject and object remain the same throughout these clauses. Another cross-clausal regularity occurs in most circumstantial nominal clauses introduced by אָנְחֵי "and he." In such clauses this pronoun is "coreferential with the last mentioned participant in the preceding clause, irrespective of whether this was a subject or object."<sup>18</sup> Circumstantial אָנְחֵי nominal clauses do not occur in the passage under study, and thus require no further comment.<sup>19</sup>

On the one hand, the present study may clarify some of the anaphoric references in the Hebrew text of Daniel 11, which is useful for its interpretation. On the other hand, it can also serve as a test of de Regt's proposed rules.

### Clause Participants

The passage that is the focus of this study is part of the conversation between Daniel and the angel in Daniel 10-12. At the heart of this conversation is the narration of future events given

---

<sup>16</sup> De Regt, "Anaphoric Accessibility," p. 66-67, 75-78.

<sup>17</sup> De Regt, "Anaphoric Accessibility," p. 78.

<sup>18</sup> De Regt, "Anaphoric Accessibility," p. 67, 78.

<sup>19</sup> In addition, the clause combination, "X [e.g., YHWH] was/will be with Y, and he ...," can be considered a third cross-clausal regularity. In this case "he" in the second clause "refers to participant X, while another participant in the second clause is coreferential with Y" (p. 78). However, since participant "Y" is not an actual object and this type of clause often employs a pronominal reference for participant "Y" as in the phrase אִתּוֹ "with him," these instances can be seen as a variant of de Regt's rule two (p. 69).

by the angel in Daniel 11:2b-12:3. This is introduced by the first clause in 11:2, וְעַתָּה אֵמֶת וְאֵינִי אֲנִי לְךָ "And now, as for the truth, I will tell you." It concludes with the angel's direction to Daniel in 12:4 to seal the book until the time of the end. Hence, this section of the dialogue can be considered "the book" that contains the truth. There are 180 clauses in this passage, but since 20 of these are subordinate clauses, there are 160 complete sentences.<sup>20</sup> For the purpose of this study, the distinction between subordinate and independent clauses is based on the presence or absence of overt markers of subordination.<sup>21</sup> Subordinate clauses are provisionally grouped together with the main clause to which they are subordinate as one sentence unit, and anaphoric constituents in subordinate clauses are not analyzed in this study. Henceforth, the words "clause" and "sentence" are used interchangeably to refer to the 160 complete sentences, except where otherwise noted. Among these sentences, there are at least 110 of them that have anaphoric subjects and/or objects. The remaining 50 sentences do not have anaphoric subjects or objects. It should be mentioned that in some instances an unspecified subject does not constitute an anaphoric reference, but rather the sentence can be considered a subject-less sentence. These

<sup>20</sup> Unfortunately, de Regt does not discuss any distinction between independent and subordinate clauses. Thus, in cases where the immediately preceding clause is subordinate to an earlier main clause, it is not clear whether the anaphoric constituent refers back to a subject/object in the subordinate clause or in a previous main clause. The following is an example from 11:24:

וְעָשָׂה	He will do
אֲשֶׁר לֹא-עָשׂוּ אֲבוֹתָיו וְאֲבוֹת אֲבוֹתָיו	that which neither his fathers nor his forefathers have done.
בְּזָה וּשְׁלַל וּרְכוּשׁ לָהֶם יִבְזֹר	He will distribute to them plunder and spoil and wealth.

In the above example, the first two clauses form a complex sentence. However, the first clause has a singular subject, and the second clause, the subordinate clause, has a plural subject. If these two clauses are analyzed separately, the difference between the plural subject of the second clause and the singular subject of the third clause results in de Regt's rules being not applicable. However, if the first two clauses are treated as a unit, then de Regt's rule two would identify the anaphoric subject of the third clause as coreferential with the subject of the first clause.

<sup>21</sup> For example, infinitival clauses and relative clauses introduced by אֲשֶׁר are treated as subordinate clauses that are part of complex sentences. Clauses without an explicit subordinating conjunction are treated as independent clauses even if they serve a subordinate function, e.g., circumstantial clauses, etc. Clauses introduced by כִּי are treated as independent clauses because this conjunction does not always have a subordinating function.

include 2 sentences where a third person feminine singular verb refers to a situation rather than an actor (11:27, 29) and 2 sentences where a third person plural verb occurs in an impersonal expression (11:21, 25).<sup>22</sup> Also, de Regt's rules apply to anaphora of the same gender and number as the corresponding constituent of the previous clause. Therefore, these rules are inapplicable in at least 15 sentences because of differences in gender and/or number, and the reader must rely on the context for the identification of the anaphoric references.<sup>23</sup> Further, it should also be mentioned that de Regt's rules only apply to subjects and objects. Hence, anaphoric references that function as neither subject nor object, such as some of the possessive pronominal suffixes, are beyond the scope of this study. The focus of this study, therefore, will be on the remaining 95 sentences that have anaphoric subjects or objects that could potentially be identified by means of de Regt's rules.

A problem that occasionally arises is that some clause boundaries can be ambiguous. For example, the Hebrew **וּבְתִמְרוֹת** "and with desirable things" at the end of 11:38 is translated by the Septuagint Old Greek (hereafter, OG) as the beginning of the first clause in v. 39, *καὶ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳσι* <sup>39</sup> *ποιήσει [πόλεων]* "And with desirable things [of the cities] he will act."<sup>24</sup> Fortunately, in this instance, as in most textual variants, the variants do not affect the identification of the anaphoric references. Nevertheless, there are occasional instances where textual variants do affect the anaphoric references (for example, 11:5, 17), and a discussion of the relevant textual variants can be found in appendix 2. Similarly, there may be occasional ambiguities where a group of words could be analyzed either as a nominal constituent at the end

---

<sup>22</sup> Although these sentences are impersonal/subject-less, two of them still contain anaphoric objects (11:21, 25).

<sup>23</sup> An example of a contextual clue is the series of expressions **וַיִּשְׁמוּ פָּנָיו** (11:17), **וַיִּשְׁבוּ פָּנָיו** (11:18, see Qere), and **וַיִּשָּׁב פָּנָיו** (11:19, see textual variants), which clearly have the same subject, even though de Regt's rules are not applicable to the instance in v. 18.

<sup>24</sup> For further discussion on the textual variants in vv. 38-39, see appendix 2.

of a clause or a separate Hebrew nominal clause. It is also possible that there are other factors that could make some clause boundaries ambiguous. Since the instances of ambiguous clause boundaries are few, the decisions on how to resolve them are best done on a case-by-case basis.

*De Regt's Rule One*

Of the 95 sentences with anaphoric subjects and/or objects that can be identified by means of de Regt's rules, there are at least 12 instances where rule one is applicable because the preceding clause has an animate direct or indirect object or object complement. In 11 of the instances the rule helps to identify the anaphoric subject (11:9, 11, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 30, 33, 42, 44). The following is an example from 11:9:

וְהוּא שָׁנִים יַעֲמֹד מִמֶּלֶךְ הַצָּפוֹן :	As for him, for some years he will stand beyond the king of the north.
9 וַיָּבֹא בְּמַלְכוֹת מֶלֶךְ הַדְּבָרִים	Then he will come into the kingdom of the king of the south.

In the above example, the clause in question is at the beginning of v. 9, and it has an anaphoric subject, "he," expressed by the 3ms morphology of the verb וַיָּבֹא. Since the preceding clause at the end of v. 8 has an animate object, "the king of the north," de Regt's rule one applies. The subject of the current clause is coreferential with the object of the previous clause. That is, the king of the north is the object of the previous clause as well as the subject of the current clause.

In at least 1 instance de Regt's rule one identifies the anaphoric object (11:26).

כִּי־יִחְשְׁבוּ עָלָיו מַחְשְׁבוֹת :	For plans will be devised against him.
26 וְאֹכְלֵי פֶת־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְהוּא	And those who eat his provisions will break him.

In the above example the clause at the beginning of v. 26 has a specified subject, וְאֹכְלֵי פֶת־בְּנֵי and an anaphoric object, the 3ms pronominal suffix of the verb "those who eat his provisions" and an anaphoric object, the 3ms pronominal suffix of the verb

יִשְׁבְּרוּהוּ. The previous clause at the end of v. 25 has an impersonal subject and an animate (albeit anaphoric) object consisting of a 3ms pronominal suffix attached to a preposition, עָלָיו "against him." Therefore, rule one is applicable, and the object of the current clause is coreferential with the object of the previous clause, which is specified earlier in v. 25 as the king of the south.

### *De Regt's Rule Two*

There are at least 42 instances of clauses where de Regt's rule two is applicable because the preceding clause lacks an animate object. In 34 of the instances this rule identifies the anaphoric subject (11:2, 3, 3, 7, 8, 8, 10, 11, 14, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 24, 24, 25, 25, 27, 28, 28, 29, 30, 30, 31, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 39, 39, 41, 45). Below is an example (11:25).

<p>וַיִּמְלֹךְ הַמֶּלֶךְ הַדָּבָר לְמַלְחָמָה בְּחֵיל- גָּדוֹל וְעֲצוּמִים עַד-מְאֹד וְלֹא יַעֲמֹד</p>	<p>The king of the south will be stirred up for the battle with a great and very strong army. But he will not stand.</p>
--	--

In the above example the first clause has a specified subject and no animate object, whereas the second clause has an anaphoric subject expressed by the 3ms morphological form of the verb. According to rule two, the subjects of both clauses are coreferential. That is, the "king of the south" in the first clause is also the anaphoric subject of the second clause.

In 8 instances de Regt's rule two identifies the anaphoric object (11:5, 16, 21, 22, 25, 34, 40, 45). The following is an example from 11:34.

<p>34 וּבְהִפְשָׁלָם יַעֲזְרוּ עִזְרַת מְעַט וְנִלְוִי עֲלֵיהֶם רַבִּים בְּחִלְקֵלְקוֹת:</p>	<p>When they stumble, they will be helped with a little help. And many will join them with flatteries.</p>
--	--

In the above example, the current sentence has a specified subject, רַבִּים "many," and an anaphoric object in the form of a 3mp pronominal suffix on a preposition, עֲלֵיהֶם "them." Since the previous sentence has no animate object, rule two is applicable, and, since the current sentence already has a specified subject, the anaphoric object is coreferential with the subject of the previous sentence, which in turn is also anaphoric, "they," expressed by the third person plural form of the verb וְנִלְוִי. That is, those who receive a little help are the ones who are joined by many who are insincere. Perhaps, this also explains why they only receive a "little" help.

#### *Clauses with Cross-Clausal Regularity*

There are possibly 42 instances of what de Regt calls cross-clausal regularity (11:4, 5, 7, 7, 7, 9, 10, 10, 10, 10, 11, 12, 12, 13, 13, 15, 15, 17, 17, 18, 18, 19, 19, 21, 22, 23, 29, 30, 30, 30, 31, 31, 32, 36, 36, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 40, 40). That is, the subject is active globally because two or more verbs refer to the same action or to parts of the same action or a series of related actions. This is especially true in cases where the first of two verbs is adverbial in function. An example comes from 11:13.

13 וְשָׁב מִלְּךְ הַצָּפוֹן      Then the king of the north will again  
וְהָעַמִּיר הַמִּזֶּן רַב מִן־הָרֵאשֹׁן      raise up a multitude greater than the first.

Although from a formal perspective each Hebrew verb in the above example occurs in a separate clause, the adverbial nature of the verb in the first clause means that both clauses refer to the same action. Other instances include וַיִּתְנַחֵם וַיִּשָׁב "again he will fight" (11:10), וַיָּשׁוּב וַיָּבֵא "he will again come" (v.29), and possibly also וַיִּשָׁב וַיִּבֶן "he will again pay attention" (v. 30).

In addition, there are also instances where two or more verbs refer to parts of the same action or a series of related actions. For example, 11:15:

15 וַיָּבֵא מֶלֶךְ הַצָּפוֹן	The king of the north will come
וַיִּשְׁפֹּךְ סוּלְלָה	and lay siege mounds
וַיִּלְכֹּד עִיר מְבֻצָּרֹת	and capture a fortified city.

In the above example, the actions of coming, laying siege mounds, and capturing a city form a series of related actions. Hence, the subject of the first clause continues being the subject in the second and third clauses.

It must be acknowledged that in a few instances the determination of a cross-clausal regularity may be ambiguous or subjective. Fortunately, the anaphoric referent often remains the same either way it is analyzed. The following is an example from 11:17.

וְלֹא תִעַמְדַּי	But she will not stand
וְלֹא-לֹו תִהְיֶה:	nor be for him.

In the above example the two clauses are best understood as referring to the same event, that is, the daughter of the king of the north did not support him. Hence, the two clauses can be considered an example of cross-clausal regularity. However, if they were to be considered two separate unrelated events, the anaphoric referent would remain the same, since according to de Regt's rule two the subject of the first clause would be coreferential with the subject of the second clause.

### *The Value and Limitations of the Rules*

Having given examples of the application of de Regt's rules, we now turn to an example of where these rules help in clarifying an anaphoric ambiguity. In most cases the application of

the rules matches what would be expected in light of the context. However, in a few cases, the results do help to clarify the referent of the anaphora. An example comes from 11:33.

<p>33 וּמְשֹׁכְלֵי עָם יִבְיִנוּ לְרַבִּים וְנִכְשְׁלוּ בַחֶרֶב וּבִלְהָבָה בְּשָׂבִי וּבְבָזָה יָמִים:</p>	<p>The wise among the people will give understanding to the many. They will stumble by sword, flame, captivity, and plunder for some days.</p>
---	--

In the above example, the second clause has an anaphoric subject, "they," expressed in the third person plural form of the verb, whereas the subject and object of the previous clause are specified, i.e., "the wise among the people" and "the many." The context allows for either of these to be the referent of the anaphoric subject of the second clause. That is, the ones who fall by the sword, flame, captivity, and plunder could be either the wise teachers or the many who were given understanding by them.<sup>25</sup> In fact, some interpreters include both as the subject.<sup>26</sup> However, since rule one suggests that the anaphoric subject of the current clause is coreferential with the object of the previous clause, one must conclude that it is "the many" whose suffering is described here, and that the suffering of their wise teachers is not described until v. 35.

On the other hand, de Regt's rules cannot resolve all ambiguities. For example, for obvious reasons the rules can only identify one anaphoric constituent per clause. There are at least 4 instances where a clause has both an anaphoric subject and an anaphoric object (11:17, 17, 24, 39). The following is an example from 11:24.

---

<sup>25</sup> For the view that the sentence describes the suffering of the wise teachers, see for example, Baldwin, *Daniel*, 217; Newsom and Breed, *Daniel*, 352–353. For the view that the sentence describes the suffering of the many faithful, see for example, Collins, *Daniel*, 385; Goldingay, *Daniel*, 303; House, *Daniel*, 177.

<sup>26</sup> For example, Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, 458; Miller, *Daniel*, 302.

בָּזָה וְשָׁלַל וּרְכָשׁ לָהֶם יִבְזֹר      He will distribute to them plunder and  
 spoil and wealth.

In the above example there are two anaphoric constituents, the subject "he" expressed by the 3ms form of the verb and the indirect object "them" expressed by the pronominal suffix on the preposition לָהֶם. In such instances, the rules apply to the subject but not the object.

Moreover, as already mentioned, de Regt's rules cannot be applied in instances where the gender and/or number of the relevant constituents do not match. There are 15 such instances (11:6, 6, 6, 10, 17, 23, 24, 28, 30, 32, 37, 42, 43, 44, 45). Here is an example (11:43):

וְאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם לֹא תִהְיֶה לְפָלִיטָה:	The land of Egypt will not escape.
43 וּמִשָּׁל בְּמִכְמֵי הַזָּהָב וְהַכֶּסֶף וּבְכָל חֲמֻדֹת מִצְרָיִם	He will rule over the hidden treasures of gold and silver and over the precious things of Egypt,

In the above example the sentence at the beginning of v. 43 has an anaphoric subject, "he," expressed by the 3ms form of the verb. Since the previous sentence in v. 42 has no animate object, rule two would suggest that the subject of the first sentence is coreferential with the anaphoric subject of the second sentence of the same gender and number. However, the subject of the first sentence is feminine, אֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם "the land of Egypt." Fortunately, it is clear from the context that the masculine singular subject of this and several previous sentences is the king of the north, which is specified in v. 40. Nevertheless, one cannot identify the anaphoric reference of the above example on the basis of the rules.

In addition, except where a priority of rules takes precedence, de Regt's rules are restricted to the relationship between anaphoric constituents in a clause and the constituents of the immediately preceding clause. However, some anaphoric references have antecedents in an

earlier clause that is not the immediately preceding clause, as in the example discussed in the last paragraph. Here is another example (11:32):

וַיִּבֶן עַל-עֲזְבֵי בְרִית קֹדֶשׁ:	He will pay attention to those who forsake the holy covenant.
31 וְזִרְעִים מִמֶּנּוּ יֵצְמְדוּ	Arms will arise from him
וְחָלְלוּ הַמִּקְדָּשׁ הַמְּעוֹז	and will profane the sanctuary fortress.
וְהִסִּירוּ הַתָּמִיד	They will remove the <i>tamid</i>
וְנָתְנוּ הַשְּׂקוּץ מְשׁוּמָם:	and set up the desolating abomination.
32 וַיַּרְשִׁיעַ בְּרִית יִחְנִיף בְּחִלְקוֹת	He will corrupt those who act wickedly towards the covenant with smooth words.

In the above example, v. 32 begins with a clause that has an anaphoric subject, "he," expressed by the 3ms morphology of the verb **יַחְנִיף**.<sup>27</sup> Since the previous clause (v. 31) has a plural subject, the rules do not apply. In fact, the previous four clauses contain plural subjects that are coreferential. This plural subject is specified in the clause at the beginning of v. 31, **זִרְעִים** "arms." Nevertheless, the anaphoric subject in v. 32 seems to be coreferential with the last previous masculine singular subject, which in turn occurred in the last clause of v. 30. That is, the one who pays attention to "those who forsake the covenant" is the same as the one who corrupts with smooth words "those who act wickedly towards the covenant." Hence, although no instances were found that challenged de Regt's rules, it is hoped that further patterns can be found to deal with the identification of anaphoric references that span a longer stretch of narrative text.<sup>28</sup> Such patterns or rules might be useful in identifying the anaphoric references where these rules do not apply because of differences in gender and/or number between constituents in adjacent clauses.

<sup>27</sup> This example is based on the MT. However, there is a textual variant that is discussed in Appendix 2.

<sup>28</sup> In fairness, it should be said that de Regt does acknowledge interruptions due to the priority of rules (pp. 74-75). Thus, rule two may be interrupted by a stretch of text involving rule four. However, he does not discuss other types of interruptions that do not involve a hierarchy of rules.

## Conclusion

In summary, the foregoing study consisted of an application of de Regt's rules for clarifying anaphoric references to the narrative passage in Daniel 11:2b-12:3. It served both as an attempt to identify anaphoric references in the passage and as a test of the validity and usefulness of de Regt's rules. The rules were found to be consistent and useful in clarifying at least some of the anaphoric ambiguities in the text. It is also hoped that de Regt or other scholars will find more patterns in addition to his very insightful rules that would allow for the identification of anaphoric references that span longer stretches of text.

As I mentioned earlier, this study did not attempt to give an interpretation of this section of Daniel. It was only an attempt to clarify some of the anaphoric references in the text. Nevertheless, it is hoped that this study will be helpful for those among us who are interested in its interpretation.

## References

- Archer, Gleason L., Jr. "Daniel." Pages 1-157 in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: with The New International Version of the Holy Bible: In Twelve Volumes*, volume 7 (Daniel--Minor Prophets). Ed. Frank E. Gaebelin. Grand Rapids: MI, 1985.
- Baldwin, Joyce G. *Daniel: An Introduction and Commentary*. Vol. 23. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1978.
- Collins, John J. *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Hermeneia. Fortress Press, 1994.
- De Regt, Lénart J. "Anaphoric Accessibility in Biblical Hebrew Narrative: Global and Local Participant Tracking across Clause Boundaries." Pages 63-78 in *Ancient Texts and Modern Readers: Studies in Ancient Hebrew Linguistics and Bible Translation*. Ed. Gideon R. Kotzé, Christian S. Locatell, and John A. Messarra. *Studia Semitica Neerlandica* 71. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
- Goldingay, John E. *Daniel*. Word Biblical Commentary, 30. Word Biblical Commentary. Dallas: Word, Incorporated, 1989.
- House, Paul R. *Daniel: An Introduction and Commentary*. Edited by David G. Firth. Vol. 23. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries. London: Inter-Varsity Press, 2018.

- Miller, Stephen R. *Daniel*. The New American Commentary 18. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1994.
- Montgomery, James A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1927.
- Newsom, Carol A., with Brennan W. Breed. *Daniel: A Commentary*. The Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2014.
- Porteous, Norman W. *Daniel: A Commentary*. The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965.
- Seow, Choon-Leong. *Daniel*. Westminster Bible Companion. Louisville, KY; London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003.

## Appendix 1: The Text of Daniel 11:2b-12:3

Below is the text of Daniel 11:2b-12:3 with a provisional translation and some notes on the anaphoric references. The Hebrew text presented here is that of the MT without textual corrections or emendations.<sup>29</sup> However, in a few instances, the sentence divisions depart from those of the MT. These are explained in Appendix 2, along with a discussion of the corrections/emendations that have been adopted in this study.

<b>Daniel 11:2b-12:3</b>		<b>#</b>	<b>de Regt rule</b>
הִנֵּה-עוֹד־שְׁלֹשָׁה מְלָכִים עֹמְדִים לְפָרֶס	Look, three more kings will arise for Persia.	1	
וְהָרְבִיעִי יַעֲשֶׂי עֲשָׂר-נְדוּל מִכֹּל	A fourth one will gain greater riches than all.	2	
וּכְחֻזְקָתוֹ בְּעֲשָׂרוֹ יַעֲרֵר הַכֹּל אֶת מְלָכוֹת יוּן:	When he becomes strong with his riches, he will arouse everyone against the king of Greece.	3	^ Rule 2: subj fourth king
3 וְעֹמֵד מִלְּךָ גִּבּוֹר	A mighty king will arise.	4	
וּמִשָּׁל מִמְּשָׁל רֹב	He will rule over a great dominion.	5	^ Rule 2: subj mighty king
וְעָשָׂה כְּרִצּוֹנוֹ:	He will do according to his will.	6	^ Rule 2: subj mighty king
4 וְכַעֲמֵדוֹ תִשָּׁבֵר מְלְכוּתוֹ	When he has risen, his kingdom will be broken	7	
וְתִחָץ לְאַרְבַּע רוּחֹת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְלֹא לְאַחֲרֵיתוֹ וְלֹא כְּמִשָּׁלוֹ אֲשֶׁר מָשָׁל	and will be divided to the four winds of heaven, but not to his posterity and not as his dominion which he ruled.	8	^ C-C Reg. (his kingdom)
כִּי תִנְתַּשׁ מְלְכוּתוֹ וְלֹא-אֲחֵרִים מְלַבְדֵי-אֲלֵהָ:	For his kingdom will be uprooted and belong to others besides these.	9	
5 וַיִּחְזַק מִלְּךָ-הַנִּגְב	The king of the south will grow strong.	10	
וּמִן-שָׂרָיו וַיִּחְזַק עָלָיו	And one of his princes will be stronger than him	11	^ Rule 2: obj king of south
וּמִשָּׁל מִמְּשָׁל רֹב מִמְּשָׁלָתוֹ:	and will rule a greater dominion than his dominion.	12	^ C-C Reg. (subj: prince)
6 וּלְקֵץ שָׁנִים יִתְחַבְּרוּ	At the end of some years they will form an alliance.	13	^ n/a
וּבַת מִלְּךָ-הַנִּגְב תָּבוֹא אֶל-מִלְּךָ הַצָּפוֹן לַעֲשׂוֹת מִישָׁרִים	The daughter of the king of the south will come to the king of the north to make an agreement.	14	
וְלֹא-תִעָצֵר כֹּחַ הַזְרֹעַ	But she will not retain the strength of arm.	15	^ n/a

<sup>29</sup> Instances of Ketiv/Qere follow the traditional convention of the MT, that is, the text consists of the consonants of the Ketiv with the vowels of the Qere.

וְלֹא יַעֲמֹד וְזָרְעוֹ	And his arm [seed?] will not stand.	16	
וְתִתְּנֶנָּהּ הִיא וּמִבִּיאֶיהָ וְהַנִּלְוָה וּמִחֲזָקָהּ בְּעֵתֵיהֶם:	And she will be given up, along with the one who brought her and the one who fathered her and her supporter in those times.	17	^ n/a
7 וְעֵמֶד מִנְצֵר שָׁרְשֶׁיהָ כִּנּוֹ	A sprout of her roots will arise in his place.	18	
וַיָּבֹא אֶל־הַחַיִל	He will come against the army,	19	^ Rule 2: subj sprout
וַיָּבֹא בְּמַעוֹז מֶלֶךְ הַצָּפוֹן	come into the fortress of the king of the north,	20	^ C-C Reg.
וַעֲשֶׂה בָהֶם	take action against them,	21	^ C-C Reg.
וְהִחְזִיק:	and conquer.	22	^ C-C Reg.
8 וְגַם אֱלֹהֵיהֶם עִם־נִסְכֵיהֶם עִם־כְּלֵי חַמְדָּתָם כֶּסֶף וְזָהָב בְּשָׁבִי יָבֹא מִצְרַיִם	Also, their gods with their cast images with their precious utensils, silver and gold he will bring into captivity to Egypt.	23	^ Rule 2: subj sprout
וְהוּא שָׁנִים יַעֲמֹד מִמֶּלֶךְ הַצָּפוֹן:	As for him, for some years he will stand beyond the king of the north.	24	^ Rule 2: subj sprout
9 וַיָּבֹא בְּמַלְכוּת מֶלֶךְ הַנֶּגֶב	Then he will come into the kingdom of the king of the south.	25	^ Rule 1: subj king of north
וְשָׁב אֶל־אֲדָמָתוֹ:	But he will return to his own land.	26	^ C-C Reg.
10 וּבְנֵי יִתְגַּדּוּ	His sons will be stirred up	27	
וְאִסְפוּ הַמִּזֶּן חֲיָלִים רַבִּים	and gather a multitude of great forces.	28	^ C-C Reg. (subj: sons of king of north)
וַיָּבֹא בֹא	He will certainly come	29	^ n/a
וְשָׁטַף	and overflow	30	^ C-C Reg. (subj: "he")
וְעָבַר	and cross over.	31	^ C-C Reg.
וַיָּשָׁב	And again	32	^ Rule 2: subj "he"
וְיִתְגַּדּוּ עַד־מַעֲזָה:	he will fight as far as his fortress.	33	^ C-C Reg.
11 וַיִּתְמַרְמַר מֶלֶךְ הַנֶּגֶב	The king of the south will be furious.	34	
וַיֵּצֵא	He will go out	35	^ Rule 2: subj king of south
וְנָלְחָם עִמּוֹ עִם־מֶלֶךְ הַצָּפוֹן	and wage war with him, with the king of the north.	36	^ C-C Reg.

וְהֵעִמִּיר הַמִּזְוֹן לְרַב	He will raise up a great multitude.	37	^	Rule 1: subj	king of north
וְנָתַן הַהִמְוֹן בְּיָדוֹ:	But the multitude will be given into his hand,	38			
12 וְנִשָּׂא הַהִמְוֹן	and the multitude will be carried away.	39			
יָרוּם לִבָּבוֹ	His heart will be lifted up,	40			
וְהִפִּיל רַבָּאוֹת	and he will bring down myriads.	41	^	C-C Reg.	
וְלֹא יֵעָוֵז:	But he will not prevail.	42	^	C-C Reg.	
13 וְשָׁב מֶלֶךְ הַצָּפוֹן	Then the king of the north will again	43			
וְהֵעִמִּיר הַמִּזְוֹן רַב מִן־הָרִאשׁוֹן	raise up a multitude greater than the first,	44	^	C-C Reg.	(king of north)
וְלִקֵּץ הָעֵתִים שָׁנִים יָבֹוא בֹּוא בְּחֵיל גָּדוֹל וּבְרִכּוּשׁ רַב:	and he will certainly come at the end of some years with a great army and much equipment.	45	^	C-C Reg.	
14 וּבְעֵתֵים הָהֵם רַבִּים יַעֲמְדוּ עַל־מֶלֶךְ הַנֶּגֶב	In those times many will stand against the king of the south.	46			
וּבְנֵי פְרִיצֵי עֲמֻדָּה יִנְשָׂאוּ לְהַעֲמִיד חֲזוֹן	The violent ones of your people will be raised up, confirming the vision.	47			
וְנִכְשְׁלוּ:	But they will stumble.	48	^	Rule 2: subj	violent ones
15 וַיָּבֹא מֶלֶךְ הַצָּפוֹן	The king of the north will come	49			
וַיִּשְׁפֹּד סוּלְלָה	and lay siege mounds	50	^	C-C Reg.	(king of north)
וְלָכַד עִיר מְבֻצָּרֹת	and capture a fortified city.	51	^	C-C Reg.	
וְזִרְעוֹת הַנֶּגֶב לֹא יַעֲמְדוּ וְעַם מִבְּחַרְיֹו	The arms of the south will not stand, nor his choice troops.	52			
וְאֵין כֹּחַ לַעֲמֹד:	There will be no strength to stand.	53			
16 וַיַּעַשׂ תַּבָּא אֵלָיו כְּרִצּוֹנוֹ	The one who comes against him will do according to his will.	54			
וְאֵין עוֹמֵד לְפָנָיו	And there will be no one standing before him.	55	^	Rule 2: obj	the one who comes (king of north)
וַיַּעֲמֵד בְּאַרְצ־הַצְּבִי	He will stand in the beautiful land,	56	^	Rule 1: subj	"him" (king of north)
וְקָלָה בְּיָדוֹ:	with complete destruction in his hand.	57			
17 וַיִּשְׂם פָּנָיו לְבֹוא בְּתַקְוָה כָּל־מַלְכוּתוֹ	He will set his face to come with the strength of his entire kingdom.	58	^	n/a	

וַיִּשְׂרֵם עִמּוֹ וַעֲשֵׂה	He will form alliances with him [textual variant],	59	^	Rule 2: subj	the one who sets his face (king of north)
וּבַת הַנְּשִׂים יִתֶּן-לּוֹ לְהַשְׁחִיתָהּ	and give him a daughter (in marriage) to destroy it.	60	^	C-C Reg.	
וְלֹא תֵעָמַד	But she will not stand	61	^	Rule 1: subj	"daughter"
וְלֹא-לּוֹ תִהְיֶה:	nor be for him.	62	^	C-C Reg.	
18 וַיִּשָּׁב פָּנָיו לְאֵיִם	He will set his face to the coastlands	63	^	Rule 1: subj	"him" (king of north)
וְלָקַד רַבִּים	and capture many.	64	^	C-C Reg.	
וְהַשְׁבִּית קֶצֶין חֲרָפְתּוֹ לֹ	But a commander will put a stop to his taunt.	65			
בְּלִתֵּי חֲרָפְתּוֹ יָשִׁיב לּוֹ:	Indeed, he will turn back his taunt on him.	66	^	C-C Reg.	
19 וַיִּשָּׁב פָּנָיו לְמַעוֹזֵי אֶרְצוֹ	He will then turn his face to the fortresses of his own land.	67	^	Rule 1: subj	"him" (king of north)
וַנִּכְשַׁל	But he will stumble	68	^	Rule 2: subj	the one who turns his face (king of north)
וַנִּפֹּל	and fall	69	^	C-C Reg.	
וְלֹא יִמָּצֵא:	and not be found.	70	^	C-C Reg.	
20 וְעַמָּד עַל-כִּנּוֹ מַעֲבִיר נוֹגֵשׁ הַדָּר מַלְכוּת	In his place there will arise one who sends out an exactor for the splendor of the kingdom.	71			
וּבְיָמִים אַחֲרָיִם יִשָּׁבֵר וְלֹא בְּאַפִּים וְלֹא בְּמַלְחָמָה:	But in a few days he will be broken, but not in anger or in battle.	72	^	Rule 2: subj	the one who sends out an exactor
21 וְעַמָּד עַל-כִּנּוֹ נִבְזֶה	Then a contemptible person will arise in his place.	73			
וְלֹא-נָתַנּוּ עָלָיו תְּהוֹד מַלְכוּת	They did not confer royal dignity on him.	74	^	Rule 2: obj	contemptible person
וַיָּבֵא בְשִׁלְוָה	He will come in quietly,	75	^	Rule 1: subj	contemptible person
וְהִחְזִיק מַלְכוּת בְּחִלְקָלְקוֹת:	and will seize the kingdom by smoothness.	76	^	C-C Reg.	
22 וַיִּזְרְעוּת הַשֶּׁטֶף יִשְׁטְפוּ מִלְפָּנָיו	The sweeping arms will be swept away before him,	77	^	Rule 2: obj	contemptible person
וַיִּשָּׁבְרוּ וְגַם נָגִיד בְּרִית:	and will be broken, also the prince of the covenant.	78	^	C-C Reg.	
23 וּמִן-הַתְּחַבְּרוֹת אֵלָיו יַעֲשֵׂה מְרָמָה	After the making of a covenant with him he will practice deception.	79	^	n/a	
וַעֲלֶה	He will go up	80	^	Rule 2: subj	the one who will practice deception

	וְעַצְמָם בְּמַעֲט־גֹי׃	and become mighty with a small people.	81	^	C-C Reg.	
	24 בְּשֵׁלִיָּהּ וּבְמִשְׁמַנֵּי מְדִינָהּ יָבוֹא׃	Quietly he will come into the rich areas of the province.	82	^	Rule 2: subj	(same)
	וְעָשָׂה אֲשֶׁר לֹא־עָשׂוּ אֲבֹתָיו וְאֲבוֹת אֲבֹתָיו׃	He will do that which neither his fathers nor his forefathers have done.	83	^	Rule 2: subj	(same)
	בְּזָה וּשְׁלָל וּרְכוּשׁ לָתֵם יִבְזֹר׃	He will distribute to them plunder and spoil and wealth.	84	^	Rule 2: subj	(same)
	וְעַל מְבָצְרִים יַחֲשֹׁב מִחֲשֻׁבְתָּיו וְעַד־עֵת׃	Against the fortifications he will devise plans, but only for a time.	85	^	n/a	
	25 וַיַּעַר כָּחוֹ וַיִּלְבְּבוּ עַל־מֶלֶךְ הַנֶּגֶב בְּתוֹל גְּדוֹל׃	He will arouse his strength and his heart against the king of the south with a large army.	86	^	Rule 2: subj	"he"
	וּמֶלֶךְ הַנֶּגֶב יִתְנַרֵּה לְמַלְחָמָה בְּתוֹל־גְּדוֹל וְעֲצוֹם עַד־מְאֹד׃	The king of the south will be stirred up for the battle with a great and very strong army.	87			
	וְלֹא יַעֲמֹד׃	But he will not stand.	88	^	Rule 2: subj.	king of south
	כִּי־יַחֲשֹׁבוּ עָלָיו מִחֲשָׁבוֹת׃	For plans will be devised against him.	89	^	Rule 2: obj	(same)
	26 וְאֹכְלֵי פֶת־בָּנָו יִשְׁבְּרוּהוּ׃	And those who eat his provisions will break him.	90	^	Rule 1: obj	(same)
	וַחֲיָלוֹ יִשְׁטוּף׃	His army will be swept away.	91			
	וַנְּפְלוּ חֲלָלִים רַבִּים׃	Many will fall slain.	92			
	27 אֲשֶׁר־לָהֶם הַמְּלָכִים לְבָבָם לְמַרְעַע׃	As for the two kings, their hearts will be set on evil.	93			
	וְעַל־שֻׁלְחָן אֶחָד כָּזֵב יִדְבְּרוּ׃	At the same table they will speak lies.	94	^	Rule 2: subj	the two kings
	וְלֹא תִצְלַח׃	But it will not succeed.	95			
	כִּי־עוֹד קֵץ לְמוֹעֵד׃	For the end is still for an appointed time.	96			
	28 וַיָּשָׁב אֶרְצוֹ בְּרְכוּשׁ גְּדוֹל׃	He will return to his land with great riches,	97	^	n/a	
	וַיִּלְבְּבוּ עַל־בְּרִית קֹדֶשׁ׃	with his heart set against the holy covenant.	98			
	וְעָשָׂה׃	He will take action.	99	^	Rule 2: subj	the one who returns
	וְשָׁב לְאַרְצוֹ׃	Then he will return to his own land.	100	^	Rule 2: subj	(same)
	29 לְמוֹעֵד יָשׁוּב׃	At the appointed time he will again	101	^	Rule 2: subj	(same)
	וַיָּבֹא בְּנֶגֶב׃	come into the south.	102	^	C-C Reg.	

ולא־תהיָה כְּרֵאשֹׁנָה וְכֵאַחֲרֹנָה:	But it will not be as at first or the last.	103	
30 וּבָאוּ בּוֹ צִיִּים כְּתִים	Ships of Kittim will come against him.	104	^ n/a
וְנִכְאָה	He will be disheartened	105	^ Rule 1: subj "him" (king of north)
וְשָׁב	and turn back.	106	^ C-C Reg.
וְזַעַם עַל־בְּרִית־קֹדֶשׁ	He will be indignant against the holy covenant	107	^ Rule 2: subj (same)
וְעָשָׂה	and take action.	108	^ C-C Reg.
וְשָׁב	He will return	109	^ Rule 2: subj (same)
וְיִבֶן עַל־עֲזָבֵי בְרִית קֹדֶשׁ:	and pay attention to those who forsake the holy covenant.	110	^ C-C Reg.
31 וְזִרְעִים מִמֶּנּוּ יִעֲמְדוּ	Arms will arise from him	111	
וְחָלְלוּ הַמִּקְדָּשׁ הַמְּעוֹז	and will profane the sanctuary fortress.	112	^ C-C Reg. (arms)
וְהִסִּירוּ הַתָּמִיד	They will remove the <i>tamid</i>	113	^ Rule 2: subj arms
וְנִתְּנוּ הַשְּׂקוּץ מְשׁוּמָם:	and set up the desolating abomination.	114	^ C-C Reg.
32 וּמְרִשְׁעֵי בְרִית יַחֲנִיף בַּחֲלָקוֹת	He will corrupt those who act wickedly towards the covenant with smooth words.	115	^ n/a
וְעַם יִדְעֵי אֱלֹהֵיוּ יַחֲזִקוּ	But the people who know their God will be strong	116	
וְעָשׂוּ:	and take action.	117	^ C-C Reg.
33 וּמִשְׁכִּילֵי עַם יְבִינּוּ לְרַבִּים	The wise among the people will give understanding to the many.	118	
וְנִכְשְׁלוּ בְּחֶרֶב וּבִלְהֶבֶה בְּשָׂבִי וּבְבִזָּה יָמִים:	They will stumble by sword, flame, captivity, and plunder for some days.	119	^ Rule 1: subj the many
34 וּבְהַכְּשָׁלָם יֵעָזְרוּ עִזָּר מְעַט	When they stumble, they will be helped with a little help.	120	^ Rule 2: subj (same)
וְנִלְוּ עֲלֵיהֶם רַבִּים בַּחֲלָלָקוֹת:	And many will join them with flatteries.	121	^ Rule 2: obj (same)
35 וּמִן־הַמִּשְׁכִּילִים יִכְשְׁלוּ לְצַרוּף בָּהֶם וּלְבַרֵּר וּלְלַבֵּן עַד־עֵת גָּץ	Some of the wise will stumble to refine, purge, and make them white until the time of the end.	122	
כִּי־עוֹד לְמוֹעֵד:	For it is still for an appointed time.	123	
36 וְעָשָׂה כְּרֵצוֹנוֹ הַמֶּלֶךְ	The king will do according to his will.	124	

וַיִּתְרוֹמֵם	He will exalt himself,	125	^	Rule 2: subj	"the king"
וַיִּתְנַדֵּל עַל-כָּל-אֱלֹהִים	and will magnify himself against every god,	126	^	C-C Reg.	
וְעַל אֱלֹהֵי אֱלֹהִים יִדְבַר נִפְלְאוֹת	and will speak amazing things against the God of gods.	127	^	C-C Reg.	
וְהִצְלִיחַ עַד-כְּלֵה אָעִים	He will succeed until the indignation is finished.	128	^	C-C Reg.	
כִּי נִחְרְצָה נְעֻשְׂתָהּ:	For what is determined will be done.	129			
37 וְעַל-אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתָיו לֹא יִבִּין	He will not acknowledge the gods of his ancestors.	130	^	n/a	
וְעַל-חֲמֻדַּת נָשִׁים וְעַל-כָּל-אֱלֹהִים לֹא יִבִּין	He will not acknowledge the one desired by women, or any god.	131	^	C-C Reg.	("he"--the king)
כִּי עַל-כָּל יִתְנַדֵּל:	For he will magnify himself above all.	132	^	Rule 2: subj	(same)
38 וְלִאֱלֹהֵי מְעֹזִים עַל-כַּנּוֹן יִכְבֹּד	In its place he will honor the god of fortresses.	133	^	Rule 2: subj	(same)
וְלִאֱלֹהֵי אֲשֶׁר לֹא-יָדָעוּהוּ אֲבוֹתָיו יִכְבֹּד בְּזָהָב וּבַכֶּסֶף וּבְאַבְנֵי יָקָרָה וּבַחֲמֻדוֹת:	A god whom his ancestors did not know he will honor with gold and silver and precious stones and desirable things.	134	^	C-C Reg.	
39 וְעָשָׂה לְמִבְצָרֵי מְעֹזִים עִם-אֱלֹהֵי נֹכַר אֲשֶׁר הִכִּיר	He will take action against the stronghold of fortresses with a foreign god, whom he recognizes.	135	^	Rule 2: subj	(same)
יִרְבֶּה כְבוֹד	He will increase honor.	136	^	Rule 2: subj	(same)
וְהִמְשִׁילֵם בְּרַבִּים	He will make them rule over the many,	137	^	Rule 2: subj	(same)
וְאָדָמָה יִחַלֵּק בַּמַּחֲרִיר:	and divide the land for a price.	138	^	C-C Reg.	
40 וּבַעֲת קֵץ יִתְנַחַח עִמּוֹ מֶלֶךְ הַנֹּגֵב	At the time of the end the king of the south will join in combat with him.	139			
וַיִּשְׁתַּעַר עָלָיו מֶלֶךְ הַצָּפוֹן בְּרֶכֶב וּבַפָּרָשִׁים וּבְאֲנִיּוֹת רַבּוֹת	But the king of the north will storm against him with chariots, horsemen, and many ships.	140	^	Rule 2: obj	king o south
וּבָא בְּאֶרְצוֹת	He will enter countries,	141	^	C-C Reg.	(king of north)
וְשָׁמַר	and overflow,	142	^	C-C Reg.	
וְעָבַר:	and cross over.	143	^	C-C Reg.	
41 וּבָא בְּאֶרֶץ הַצְּבִי	He will enter the beautiful land.	144	^	Rule 2: subj	(same)
וְרַבּוֹת יִפְשְׁלוּ	Many (lands) will fall,	145			

וְאֵלֶּה יִמָּלְטוּ מִיָּדוֹ אֲדוֹם וּמוֹאָב וְרֵאשִׁית בְּנֵי עַמּוֹן:	but these will escape his hand, Edom, Moab, and the leaders of the Ammonites.	146		
42 וַיִּשְׁלַח יָדוֹ בְּאַרְצוֹת	He will stretch his hand into (other) lands,	147	^	n/a
וְאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם לֹא תִהְיֶה לְפָלִיטָה:	and the land of Egypt will not escape.	148		
43 וּמִשָּׁל בְּמִכְמֹנֵי הַזָּהָב וּתְכֵשֶׁת וּבְכָל חֲמֻדוֹת מִצְרָיִם	He will rule over the hidden treasures of gold and silver and over the precious things of Egypt,	149	^	n/a
וּלְבָיִם וְכֹשִׁים בְּמִצְעָדָיו:	with the Libyans and Ethiopians in his footsteps.	150		
44 וּשְׁמֻעוֹת יִבְהַלְּהוּ מִמְּזִרְחָ וּמִמְּצִיֹּן	But reports from the east and the north will frighten him.	151	^	n/a
וַיֵּצֵא בְּחֵמָא גְדֹלָה לְהַשְׁמִיד וּלְהַחֲרִים רַבִּים:	He will go out with great fury to destroy and to exterminate many.	152	^	Rule 1: subj "him" (king of north)
45 וַיִּטַּע אֹהֶלָי אֶפְרָתָיו בֵּין יָמַי לְהַר־צְבִי־קָדֵשׁ	He will plant his royal tents between the seas and the beautiful holy mountain.	153	^	n/a
וּבֹא עַד־קִצּוֹ	But he will come to his end,	154	^	Rule 2: subj "he" (king of north)
וְאֵין עֹזֵר לוֹ:	with no one to help him.	155	^	Rule 2: obj (same)
1 12 וּבַעֲתָהּ הָיָא יַעֲמֹד מִיכָאֵל הַשָּׁר הַגָּדוֹל הָעֹמֵד עַל־בְּנֵי עַמְךָ	At that time Michael the great prince who stands over the sons of your people will arise.	156		
וְהָיְתָה עֵת צָרָה אֲשֶׁר לֹא־נִהְיְתָה מִהַיּוֹת גְּזוּי עַד הָעֵת הַהִיא	There will be a time of trouble which has not been from since a nation came to be until that time.	157		
וּבַעֲתָהּ הָיָא יִמָּלְט עַמְךָ כָּל־הַנִּמְצָא כְּתוּב בְּסֵפֶר:	At that time your people, all who are found written in the book, will be delivered.	158		
2 וְרַבִּים מִיֹּשְׁבֵי אֲדָמַת־עָפָר יִקְיִצּוּ אֵלֶּה לְחַיֵּי עוֹלָם וְאֵלֶּה לְחַרְפּוֹת לְדָרְאוֹן עוֹלָם: ס	Many of those who sleep in the dust of the ground will wake up, some to eternal life and some to shame and eternal contempt.	159		
3 וְהַמְּשַׁכְּלִים יִזְהָרוּ כְּזֹהַר הַרְקִיעַ וּמִצְדִּיקֵי הַרְבִּים כַּכּוֹכָבִים לְעוֹלָם וָעֶד: פ	The wise will shine like the glow of the firmament, and those who turn the many to righteousness like the stars forever and ever.	160		

## Appendix 2: Notes on Selected Textual Variants

It is beyond the scope of this study to attempt a reconstruction of the best text of the Daniel 11:2b-12:3. However, a discussion of textual variants is unavoidable, since some of them affect the analysis of the anaphoric references. The following consists of some notes on textual variants that are relevant to the application of de Regt's rules on anaphoric references.

11:5

There is a textual variant in 11:5 that affects the location of a clause boundary, and the presence or absence of an anaphoric reference.

MT	OG	Theod
5 וַיַּחֲזֹק מִלְּדֹ-הַנְּגִב וּמִן-שָׂרָיו	καὶ ἐνισχύσει βασιλεὺς Αἰγύπτου	καὶ ἐνισχύσει ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ νότου
וַיַּחֲזֹק עָלָיו	καὶ εἷς ἐκ τῶν δυναστῶν κατισχύσει αὐτὸν	καὶ εἷς τῶν ἀρχόντων αὐτῶν ἐνισχύσει ἐπ' αὐτὸν

In the above example, the Masoretic cantillation suggests that the expression "וּמִן-שָׂרָיו" "and one of his princes" belongs to the first clause, but the Greek translations (both the OG and Theod) take it as part of the second clause. If the MT is followed, both the subject and the object of the second clause are anaphoric, but if the Greek is followed, the clause has an explicit subject. Following the Greek versions results in a more natural sentence break, though it requires emending the verb in the second clause from  $\text{וַיַּחֲזֹק}$  to  $\text{יַחֲזֹק}$ . This in turn could easily be explained as a copying error due to the fact that the verse begins with  $\text{וַיַּחֲזֹק}$ . Hence, in this passage the sentence division of the Greek translations has been adopted.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>30</sup> Either way, most interpreters understand the phrase as referring to Seleucus I Nicator, one of Alexander's generals who for a time served under Ptolemy I Soter in Egypt.

11:6

The OG departs considerably from the MT in 11:6, including, most curiously, the absence of any mention or reference to the daughter of the king of the south. However, most of the differences in OG are not supported by other witnesses. The most interesting variant in this verse comes from Theod.

MT	OG	Theod
וְלֹא יַעֲמֹד וְזָרְעוֹ	καὶ ὁ βραχίον αὐτοῦ ναρχήσει καὶ τῶν συμπορευομένων μετ' αὐτοῦ,	καὶ οὐ στήσεται τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ,
וְתַנְתֵּן הִיא וּמְבִיאֶיהָ וְתִלְדָּה וּמְחַזְקָהּ בְּעַתָּים:		καὶ παραδοθήσεται αὐτὴ καὶ οἱ φέροντες αὐτήν καὶ ἡ νεάνις καὶ ὁ κατισχύων αὐτήν ἐν τοῖς καιροῖς.
	καὶ μενεῖ εἰς ὥρας.	

In the first clause above according to the MT has an anaphoric subject along with an additional specified subject וְזָרְעוֹ "and his arm." There is, however, a variant in a couple Hebrew manuscripts where the word occurs without the conjunction, זָרְעוֹ "his arm," in which case the clause has a simple specified subject. This appears to be followed by both OG and Theod. The latter translates the word as τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ "his seed," which suggests a different vowing of the Hebrew as זָרְעוֹ. The vowing of the MT is followed by the OG καὶ ὁ βραχίον αὐτοῦ ναρχήσει "and his arm will grow numb," but the sentence division is slightly different. In conclusion, there is evidence that the MT of this verse contains several possible scribal errors, most of which cannot be easily resolved, and which are beyond the scope of this discussion. However, the absence of the conjunction "and" in front of the consonants זָרְעוֹ has support in both Hebrew and Greek manuscripts and has been adopted in this study. Also, the variant in

Theod may support the reading "his seed" rather than "his arm," though not conclusively. The remaining variants in the OG have no support and have not been adopted.

11:10

There is a textual variant in 11:10 related to the switch from plural to singular in the MT.

MT	OG	Theod
10 וּבְנֵי יִתְנַרְוּ	<sup>10</sup> καὶ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐρεθισθήσεται	<sup>10</sup> καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ
וְאַסְפֹּף תְּמוֹן תְּהִלִּים רַבִּים	καὶ συνάξει συναγωγὴν ὄχλου πολλοῦ	συνάξουσιν ὄχλον δυνάμεων πολλῶν,
וְבֹא בֹא	καὶ εἰσελεύσεται κατ' αὐτήν	καὶ ἐλεύσεται ἐρχόμενος

As can be seen above, the MT switches from the plural in the first two clauses in v. 10 to the singular in the following clauses. There is a Ketiv/Qere variant in the first word of the verse. The Ketiv singular **וּבְנֵי** "and his son" is supported by the OG καὶ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ, followed by singular verbs. On the other hand, the Qere plural **וּבְנֵי** "and his sons" is supported by Theod καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ, which, however, omits the translation of the Hebrew verb **יִתְנַרְוּ**. The Syriac also has a plural, but, unlike the MT or Theod, it continues with the plural throughout the verse. Most commentaries follow the Qere and understand the sons to be the two sons of Seleucus II, i.e., Seleucus III and Antiochus III, in which case the puzzling switch from a plural subject to a singular subject is explained by the fact that Seleucus III died soon after coming to the throne and was followed by Antiochus III. However, it is unusual to have an anaphoric reference without an antecedent that it refers to. Hence, it would be more natural for the verse to begin with the singular, in which case and the entire verse refers to the same ruler (that is, the short reign of Seleucus III is passed over in the account, which moves straight to Antiochus III). Further, the fact that the MT text is problematic is also reflected in another Ketiv/Qere later in

the verse, where the Ketiv is plural וַיִּתְּנֵהוּ and the Qere is singular וַיִּתְּנֵהוּ. Nevertheless, this study provisionally follows the MT due to the lack of other witnesses supporting the OG.

11:11-12

There is a cluster of textual variants in 11:11-12.

MT	OG	Theod
וַיִּצָא		καὶ ἐξελεύσεται
וַיִּלָּחֶם עִמּוֹ עִם־מֶלֶךְ הַצָּפוֹן	καὶ πολεμήσει μετὰ βασιλέως βορρᾶ,	καὶ πολεμήσει μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως τοῦ βορρᾶ.
וַהֲעִמִּיד הַקָּמוֹן לְב		καὶ στήσει ὄχλον πολύν,
וַנִּתֵּן הַקָּמוֹן בְּיָדוֹ:	καὶ παραδοθήσεται ἢ συναγωγή εἰς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ.	καὶ παραδοθήσεται ὁ ὄχλος ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ.
12 וַנִּשָּׂא הַקָּמוֹן	<sup>12</sup> καὶ λήμψεται τὴν συναγωγὴν	<sup>12</sup> καὶ λήμψεται τὸν ὄχλον

In v. 11 two of the clauses that are present in the MT and Theod are absent in the OG.

Additionally, the MT has a prepositional phrase עִמּוֹ "with him" that is absent in both Greek translations. In v. 12 the MT וַנִּשָּׂא has a passive meaning "and it will be carried away," whereas both the OG and Theod translate the clause actively, λήμψεται "he will take away." The Syriac Peshitta supports the Greek versions both in the absence of the prepositional phrase "with him" and in the active verb in אַסְלַס, אַסְלַס "and he will destroy the army." The difference between the MT and the ancient translations that have an active verb corresponds to two different ways to vowel the Hebrew consonants, וַנִּשָּׂא (Niphal, "and it/he will be carried away") or וַנִּשָּׂא (Qal, "and he will carry away"). The combined witness of the ancient versions may tip the scale in favor of the active meaning of the clause in v. 12. However, the fact that this variant is part of a cluster of textual variants makes it difficult to determine the best reading.

The textual variants in 11:11-12 have a complicated effect on the application of de Regt's rules concerning anaphoric references. For example, the MT of the first clause in v. 12 has a specified subject and no object, whereas the Greek and Syriac versions have an anaphoric subject and a specified object. In the OG, the series of related actions carried out by the king of the south may fit de Regt's category of cross-clausal regularity, whereas in the MT and Theod the king of the north is the anaphoric subject of one clause in the middle of the passage. Thus, it is best to provisionally leave the passage as is in the MT but to acknowledge that text may be corrupt.

### 11:17

There is a textual variant in 11:17 that affects the sentence divisions.

MT	OG	Theod
וַיִּשְׁרִים עִמּוֹ וְעָשָׂה	καὶ συνθήκας μετ' αὐτοῦ ποιήσεται·	καὶ εὐθεῖα πάντα μετ' αὐτοῦ ποιήσει

The MT literally reads "... and equitable things with him. And he will do." That is, the first two words belong to the previous sentence and the verb begins a new sentence. However, both the OG and Theod translate these words as a single sentence, as also the Syriac Peshitta.<sup>31</sup> The Hebrew וַיִּשְׁרִים is translated as καὶ συνθήκας "and agreements/treaties" (OG) and καὶ εὐθεῖα πάντα "and all right things" (Theod). Some have suggested that the Hebrew word can be emended to מִיִּשְׁרִים "agreement" (as in v. 6),<sup>32</sup> though the word can also be understood as the plural of יִשְׁרָה, which can also mean "agreement." The Greek translations also require correcting the verb וְעָשָׂה "and he will do" to יַעֲשֶׂה "he will do," which is plausible, since confusing the

<sup>31</sup> Though the wording סַבְלָא כְּסָבְלָא כְּסָבְלָא "and all his people will pass over" shows that the Syriac translator was having trouble understanding the MT.

<sup>32</sup> Collins, *Daniel*, 365.

letters ך and ך was not a rare scribal mistake. Thus, the sentence division of the Greek translations is followed in this study.

### 11:18

In 11:18 the words לֹא בְלִתִּי are somewhat enigmatic, but, if they reflect any type of textual corruption, the Greek translations, in spite of their differences, do not help to resolve the puzzle.

MT	OG	Theod
וְהַשְׁבִּית קִצְיִן חֲרָפְתּוֹ לֹא		καὶ καταπαύσει ἄρχοντας ὀνειδισμοῦ αὐτῶν,
בְּלִתִּי חֲרָפְתּוֹ יָשִׁיב לֹא:	καὶ ἐπιστρέψει ὀργήν ὀνειδισμοῦ αὐτῶν ἐν ὄρκῳ κατὰ τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν αὐτοῦ.	πλὴν ὀνειδισμὸς αὐτοῦ ἐπιστρέψει αὐτῷ.

Both the MT and Theod have two sentences, whereas the OG combines them into one sentence with different wording. Theodotion's translation of the first sentence, "he will make rulers cease their insult" reads קִצְיִן "commander" as a plural object of the verb, perhaps viewing the ending ך as an Aramaic masculine plural ending. Thus, the variant in Theod appears to be primarily a different understanding of the Hebrew syntax rather than a reflection of a different Hebrew original.

### 11:32

There is a textual variant in 11:32 that affects the identity of the subject of the clause.

MT	OG	Theod
32 וּמְרִשְׁעֵי בְרִית יַחְנִיף בְּחֻלְקוֹת	<sup>32</sup> καὶ ἐν ἀμαρτίαις διαθήκης μιανούσιν ἐν κληροδοσίᾳ,	<sup>32</sup> καὶ οἱ ἀνομοῦντες διαθήκην ἐπάξουσιν ἐν ὀλισθήμασι,

In the above example, the MT clause contains an anaphoric subject, "he," expressed by the 3ms morphological form of the verb **יְהַנִּיף**. The Greek translations diverge from the MT and from each other. The OG has "And with sins against the covenant they will defile by means of a distribution," whereas Theod has "And the lawless ones will institute a covenant by means of slipperiness." The OG has an anaphoric subject, whereas Theod has a specified subject of **ἀνομοῦντες** "the lawlessness ones." Nevertheless, in spite of their differences, both Greek translations (OG and Theod) have plural verb forms, **μυνοῦσιν** "they will defile" (OG) and **ἐπάξουσιν** "they will make happen" (Theod). The Vulgate also has a plural verb, *et impii in testamentum simulabunt fraudulententer* "and the impious against the covenant will behave deceitfully." On the other hand, the Syriac Peshitta follows the MT closely, **ܘܟܠܗ ܘܗܘܘܢ ܗܘܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ ܕܘܢܘܢ** "as for those who trespass against the covenant, he will make them guilty." The verb, **ܘܗܘܘܢ** "he will make guilty" is singular. If the MT verb is emended to a plural, the subject would naturally be **וּמְרִשְׁעֵי בְרִית** "those who act wickedly towards the covenant" instead of an anaphoric 3ms subject. Either way, de Regt's rules would not be applicable in this sentence. Alternatively, since the previous sentence has a plural subject, it is also possible to apply rule two and conclude that the subject of the sentence is coreferential with the subject of the previous sentence. The evidence for a plural verb is strong. However, since the various witnesses disagree on the rest of the sentence, the present study provisionally follows the MT.

11:36

Another relevant instance of a textual variant occurs in 11:36.

MT	Theod
<b>וַעֲשֶׂה כְּרִצּוֹנוֹ הַפֶּלֶךְ</b>	καὶ ποιήσει κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ
<b>וַיִּתְרוֹמֵם</b>	καὶ ὑψωθήσεται ὁ βασιλεὺς

In the above example, the word **הַמֶּלֶךְ** "the king" occurs at the end of the first clause in the MT, but the translator of Theod places the word in the next clause. Whereas in the MT the first clause has a specified subject and the second clause has an anaphoric subject, in Theod the first clause has an anaphoric subject and the second clause has a specified subject. Since the subject of these and the following clauses remains the same, there is no advantage in deciding which of the variants is the better reading, and so, provisionally the MT is followed in this instance for the purpose of this study.

11:38-39

A cluster of variants involving clause boundaries occurs in the OG translation of 11:38-39.

MT	OG	Theod
וְלֹאֵלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יָדְעוּהוּ אֲבֹתָיו יִכְבֵּד בְּזֹהָב וּבְכֶסֶף וּבְאַבְנֵי יָקָרָה וּבְחַמְדוֹת:	καὶ θεόν, ὃν οὐκ ἔγνωσαν οἱ πατέρες αὐτοῦ, τιμήσει ἐν χρυσίῳ καὶ λίθῳ πολυτελεῖ.	καὶ θεόν, ὃν οὐκ ἔγνωσαν οἱ πατέρες αὐτοῦ, δοξάσει ἐν χρυσῷ καὶ ἀργύρῳ καὶ λίθῳ τιμίῳ καὶ ἐν ἐπιθυμήμασι.
39 וְעָשָׂה לְמִבְצָרֵי מְעֻזִּים עִם־ אֱלֹהִים נֹכַר אֲשֶׁר הִבִּיר	καὶ ἐν ἐπιθυμήμασι <sup>39</sup> ποιήσει [πόλεων]	<sup>39</sup> καὶ ποιήσει τοῖς ὀχυρώμασι τῶν καταφυγῶν μετὰ θεοῦ ἄλλοτρίου
	καὶ εἰς ὀχύρωμα ἰσχυρὸν ἤξει·	
יִרְבֶּה כְבוֹד	μετὰ θεοῦ ἄλλοτρίου, οὗ ἔὰν ἐπιγνῶ, πληθυνεῖ δόξαν	καὶ πληθυνεῖ δόξαν

In the above example, the Hebrew **וּבְחַמְדוֹת** "and with desirable things" at the end of 11:38 is translated by the OG as the beginning of the first clause in v. 39, *καὶ ἐν ἐπιθυμήμασι <sup>39</sup>ποιήσει [πόλεων]* "And with desirable things [of the cities] he will act." The translator of the OG also ends the sentence with the verb at the beginning of v. 39. This is followed by the translation of

the next two Hebrew words לְמִבְצָרֵי מְעִזִּים "to the stronghold of the fortresses" as a separate clause καὶ εἰς ὄχυρῶμα ἰσχυρὸν ἥξει, where the OG inserts the verb ἥξει "he will come." Then the Hebrew words up to the atnach, the verse's major disjunctive cantillation mark, are translated as the next sentence. Fortunately, aside from the additional clause in the OG, the variants do not affect the identification of the anaphoric references. As for the additional clause in the OG due to the addition of the verb ἥξει, this addition is not reflected in Theod or the Syriac, which follow the clause divisions of the MT. Thus, this study provisionally follows the MT.