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The Meaning of Niṣdaq

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

First, there is the idea of the sanctuary being “restored to its rightful state.” Variations of the same idea include “have its rights restored,” “rights of the sanctuary be restored,” “declared right,” “put right,” “come into its right,” “reestablished within its rights,” “properly restored,” or simply “restored.”

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

The third idea represented by the English translations of niṣdaq is that of vindication. Several translations read “shall be vindicated,” “shall be justified” or “its cause vindicated,” or the related “emerge victorious.”

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

Methodology. This study will seek to determine the meaning of niṣdaq within the immediate context of Daniel 8:14. We will first
explore the semantic range of the word-group $sdq$ throughout the Hebrew Bible, especially in settings related to the cultic motifs, as in Daniel 8. Then we will focus upon the Hebrew Bible's single occurrence of the Niphal form of this verb, namely $nis\text{ } daq$ in Daniel 8:14, with particular attention to its immediate context in vs. 13 where the three problem situations are summarized which call forth the activity announced in vs. 14. The thesis which this study tests is that the word $nis\text{ } daq$ in Daniel 8:14 was deliberately selected because it has a broad enough semantic range to encompass the specific solutions to each of the three problems expressed in vs. 13.

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

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

**The Semantic Range of the Nisdaq Root**

Several excellent studies in recent years have summarized the basic data regarding the semantic range of the root $sdq$ from which $nis\text{ } daq$ is derived.

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

In the Hebrew Bible the root $sdq$ occurs over 500 times, taking several forms: the masculine noun $s\text{ } edeq$ (119x), the feminine noun $s\text{ } edaqh$ (157x) or Aramaic $si\text{ } dqah$ (1x), the adjective $s\text{ } ad\text{ } l\text{ } q$ (206x), and the verb $sadaq$ (41x). Of particular interest to us are the 41 appearances of the Hebrew verb $sadaq$, including 22x in the Qal, 5x in the Piel, 12x in the Hiphil, once in the Hithpael, and once in
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the *Niphal*—this last occurrence, *nisdaq*, is, as we have seen, a *hapax legomenon*, occurring only once in this form (Dan 8:14).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Isaiah 46:13:
I will bring my righteousness [*šedeq*] near;
it shall not be far off.

Isaiah 51:4, 5:
And I will make My justice [*mišpat*] rest
As a light of the peoples.
My righteousness [*šedeq*] is near,
My salvation has gone forth,
And my arms will judge [*sûapėt*] the peoples.

Isaiah 10:22 (in the context of Israel's loss of righteousness and its subsequent restoration):
Yet a remnant of them will return [*šûb*];
The destruction decreed shall overflow with righteousness [*šedāgāh*].

Daniel 9:24:
Seventy weeks are determined . . . to bring in everlasting righteousness [*šedeq*] . . .

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

Note especially the use of the verbal form of *šdq* (*Hiphil* participle) in Daniel 12:3:
And those who turn/restore many to righteousness [*ûmašdîqē*]
[Shall shine] like the stars forever and ever.
Along with the meaning of “restoration to a rightful state,” there are two additional dominant extended nuances which emerge from a word study of \( \text{sdq} \). These also must be considered as we survey the semantic range of \( \text{nissdq} \).

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

2. A foundational study undertaken by J. P. Justesen has shown how various derivative forms of \( \text{sdq} \) are used in poetic synonymous parallelism with several different Hebrew words meaning “to be clean/pure, and to cleanse/purify.”

First, we note how \( \text{sdq} \) occurs in parallelism with \( \text{zakkh} \) “to be pure”:

- **Job 15:14:**
  - What is man, that he could be pure \( \text{[zakkh]} \)?
  - And he who is born of a woman, that he could be righteous \( \text{[sdq]} \) ?

- **Job 25:4:**
  - How then can man be righteous \( \text{[sdq]} \) before God?
  - Or how can he be pure \( \text{[zakkh]} \) who is born of a woman?

- **Psalm 51:4 (6):**
  - That you may be found just \( \text{[sdq]} \) when You speak,
  - and blameless \( \text{[zakkh]} \) when You judge.

Next, we point to the poetic occurrence of \( \text{sdq} \) in synonymous parallelism with the term \( \text{bohr} \) “cleanness”:

- **Psalm 18:20 (21):**
  - The Lord rewarded me according to my righteousness \( \text{[sedeq]} \);
  - According to the cleanness \( \text{[bohr]} \) of my hands He has rewarded me.

It is also to be noted that \( \text{sdq} \) appears in striking parallelism with the term \( \text{tahor} \) “to be clean, pure”:

- **Job 4:17:**
  - Can a mortal be more righteous \( \text{[sdq]} \) than God?
  - Can a man be more pure \( \text{[tahor]} \) than his Maker?
It is instructive to note that the LXX (Greek Septuagint) translated \( \text{\textit{sdq}} \) in this passage by \textit{katharos}, “pure, or clean,” the same Greek word-group used to translate \( \text{\textit{nisdaq}} \) in Daniel 8:14.

In Job 17:9 we find the same parallelism, this time with the adjectival forms of \( \text{\textit{sdq}} \) and \( \text{\textit{thr}} \):

Yet the righteous [\textit{sadiq}] will hold to his way,
And he who has clean [\textit{tahar}] hands will be stronger and stronger.

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

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

3. The third extended meaning of \( \text{\textit{sdq}} \) emerges from its close connection with another Hebrew root, \textit{sûpt}, in its verbal form \( \text{\textit{sûaœpat}} \) “to judge,” and in its nominal form \( \text{\textit{misûpaœt}} \) “judgment.” At least 18 times in the Hebrew Bible we find the nouns \( \text{\textit{sedeq/ sedâqâh}} \) and \( \text{\textit{mišpât}} \) in poetic parallelism. For examples:

Psalm 106:3:

Blessed are those who keep justice [\textit{mišpât}],
And he who does righteousness [\textit{sedâqâh}] at all times!

Isaiah 32:1:

Behold, a king will reign in righteousness [\textit{sedeq}],

---
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And princes will rule with justice [mišpāt].

Isaiah 59:14:  
Justice [mišpāt] is turned back,  
And righteousness [sedāqāh] stands afar off . . .

Jeremiah 22:13:  
Woe to him who builds his house without righteousness [ṣedeq],  
And his chambers without justice [mišpāt].

Amos 5:24:  
But let justice [mišpāt] run down like water,  
And righteousness [sedāqāh] like a mighty stream.

Amos 6:12:  
You have turned justice [mišpāt] into gall,  
And the fruit of righteousness [ṣedāqāh] into wormwood.23

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

Ps 97:2:  
Righteousness and judgment [ṣedeq ūmi patrol] are the foundation of his throne.

Prov 21:3:  
To do righteousness and justice [ṣedāqāh ūmišpāt]  
Is more acceptable to the Lord than sacrifice.

Jer 22:15:  
Did not your father eat and drink,  
And do justice and righteousness [mišpāt ūṣedāqāh]?

Jer 23:5:  
The righteous Branch will execute judgment and righteousness [mišpāt ūṣedāqāh] in the earth.

Ezek 45:9:  
Execute justice and righteousness [mišpāt ūṣedāqāh].24

Note how many of these usages occur in Exilic literature (the time of Daniel). In many of these uses (and other times when the nouns ṣedeq/sedāqāh appear without the legal term mišpāt) there is clearly a legal context, and ṣedeq/sedāqāh clearly take on legal connota-
tions (see e.g., Isa 59:14; 63:1). According to one count, of the 117 occurrences of ṣedeq in the OT, 67 (or 57%) are found in a legal context. Similarly, of the 155 occurrences of ṣediqāh 45x have a legal setting.25

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

Ps 82:3:

Defend/judge [ṣpat] the poor and fatherless;
Do justice to/vindicate [ṣdq] the afflicted and needy.

Isa 50:8:

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

Isa 43:9:

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

Isa 45:25:

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

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

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

**Nisdaq in Immediate Context**

Previous studies of nisdaq have not given sufficient attention
to the three-part question in vs. 13 which niṣdaq addresses in vs. 14.27

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

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

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

The mention of the tāmīd in Daniel 8:13 harks back to the situation described in vs. 11a and b. I tentatively translate vs. 11a and b as follows: “He [i.e., the little horn] exalted [himself] even as high as the Prince of the host; and from him [i.e., the Prince of the host] the tāmīd or ‘continuance’ was taken away [lit. lifted up (hûram, following the Qere)].” This verse has translational difficulties, but the general meaning is clear. The little horn exalted himself up to the Prince of the host, and the tāmīd was taken away. This
first major problem summarized in Daniel 8:13, the taking away of the tāmid, is explicitly referred to also in Daniel 11:31 and 12:11.

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

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

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

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

Not only does vs. 13 summarize the trampling of the host and the sanctuary from previous verses, but very probably also has in its thought pattern the underlying theological situation implied by this trampling. In ancient Near Eastern thought an host or army and its sanctuary overrun and trampled down signified that the god
of that host and sanctuary was weak and undependable (see, e.g., Isa 36:16-20; Ps 79:1-10). Thus when the sanctuary and the host are being trampled in Daniel 8, the clear theological message is that the God of this host and sanctuary and his system of worship are being defamed.

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

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

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

Third, the God who has been defamed by the trampling down of his sanctuary and the host, as well as the sanctuary and host themselves, must be made right in the sense of vindication—our third extended meaning of nišdaq.

It may be noted that there are separate Hebrew terms for each of these ideas: šūb for “restore,” fahēr for “cleanse” and šāpat for “vindicate”; but the holy one in vs. 14 utilizes a single polyvalent Hebrew word which simultaneously encompasses all these aspects of the solution within its semantic range—the word nišdaq.\(^\text{30}\)

**Conclusion**

Returning now to our original question regarding the most appropriate translation of nišdaq in Daniel 8:14, it may be concluded that each of the three major ideas represented in the modern English translations is included within the semantic range of nišdaq and is an appropriate translation in the context, but is not
complete by itself. We have another of the many cases where a single English word is not sufficient to capture the breadth of meaning implied by the original Hebrew term.

If we were forced to choose a single English translation of nışdaq, probably the general basic meaning of “made right” or “put right” would be the most inclusive. But here is a case when a collage of the various modern translations is a blessing, encompassing all three extended meanings of restore, cleanse, and vindicate, which appear to be implied in the text. Perhaps—and I suggest this somewhat tongue in cheek—this should be an instance where the word becomes an untranslated technical Hebrew term like “Amen” or “Hallelujah.” We would then have the reading: “Unto 2300 evenings-mornings, then shall the sanctuary be nışdaqed!”
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