

Narrative Structure of Daniel 8: A Text Linguistic Approach

Samuel Nuñez
Forest Ranch, California

1. Introduction

In general terms, believers in the inspiration and revelation of the Hebrew Bible have used the grammatical-historical method to decipher the meaning of the Biblical Hebrew text since the Reformation.¹ In spite of this method's lengthy existence, it has not yet reached its full potential of usefulness because the Biblical Hebrew verbal system has not been thoroughly understood.

It is well known that Hebraists believed and taught since the Middle Ages that Biblical Hebrew is a tense-based system. This theory lost its credibility at the end of the nineteenth century because it did not fully convince the majority of Hebrew Scholars that it matched the reality of the biblical text.² It was replaced by Ewald-Driver's view that Biblical Hebrew is an aspect-based system.³ This theory began to crumble in less than a century because it did not accurately represent the actual usage of Biblical

¹ Alfred Jepsen, "The Scientific Study of the Old Testament," in Claus Westermann (ed.), trans. by J. L. Mays, *Essays On Old Testament Hermeneutics* (Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1963), 254, 255. Jepsen quotes from Luther's Isaiah lecture of 1527 as follows: "In order to expound the prophet a two-fold knowledge is necessary. First grammar, and this can be esteemed a most potent thing. The other thing is even more necessary, to wit, a knowledge of history. . . ."

² B. K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 458-460.

³ *Ibid.*, 463: "Aspectual Theories Proper Begins in the 1820s"; Roy Heller, *Narrative Structure and Discourse Constellations: An Analysis of Clause Functions in Biblical Hebrew Prose* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004), 8.

NUÑEZ: NARRATIVE STRUCTURE OF DANIEL 8

Hebrew verbal forms.⁴ A common complaint against these grammatical theories has been their focus on the sentence rather than on the level of the text.⁵

1.1 Beyond a Sentence-based Grammar

Biblical Hebraists, who continued working persistently at the level of the sentence, indirectly propelled the investigation of the Biblical Hebrew verbal system at the level of discourse.⁶ This approach is known in Europe as Text Linguistics and in America as Discourse Analysis.⁷ Since the 1970's advocates of this approach have applied it to the study of the narrative structure of Biblical Hebrew with good results.⁸ However, to the best of my knowledge, this approach has not yet been applied to the analysis of the vision report of Biblical Hebrew. This situation has impelled this author to test the methodology of text linguistics in the study of the narrative structure of Daniel 8.

1.2 Terminology Distinctions

The terms "text" and "discourse" have been used in a variety of ways.⁹ In popular use, the term "text" usually conveys the meaning of written language, whereas in academic circles "text" is a "sequence of well formed sentences," or "a logical sequence of linguistic signs between two significant breaks of communication,"¹⁰ or "a written language that has

⁴ Roy Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 10; see also Waltke and O'Connor, *An Introduction*, 464, 470; F. J. del Barco, *Sintaxis Verbal en los Profetas Menores Preexilicos* (Madrid: Departamento de Estudios Hebreos y Arameos, 2001), 17.

⁵ Waltke and O'Connor, *An Introduction*, 53, 470; David A. Dawson, *Text Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press LTD, 1994), 25; Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 19.

⁶ C. H. J. Van der Merwe, "Discourse Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew Grammar," in R. D. Bergen, (ed.) *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics* (Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1994), 13-22; del Barco, *Sintaxis Verbal en los Profetas Menores Preexilicos*, 15-32.

⁷ Heller, 19-20.

⁸ Heller, 19-20; Van der Merwe, 15; del Barco, 15.

⁹ Dawson, *Text Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*, 21.

¹⁰ Alviero Niccacci, trans. by W. G. E. Watson, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*. JSOT Supp 86 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1990), 56.

cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativity, situationality, and intertextuality.¹¹

The term “discourse,” in popular usage, has usually been restricted to the spoken language, whereas in text linguistics “discourse” may refer to a text between two significant breaks, or a complete literary work, or a character’s speech within the narrative (direct speech or direct discourse).¹² In this paper, the term discourse will be used to indicate a complete literary work and direct speech.

1.3 Aim and Basis of this Study

This study will use the theoretical model of Text Linguistics to delimit the text of Daniel 8 into two types of communication (narrative and discourse), two levels of communication (foreground and background), and two types of narrative organization (inner-paragraph and extra-paragraph comments) in order to discover the final structure of this vision report. This approach has been used in the study of the narrative structure of the Hebrew Bible for more than four decades. It has its basis on the conviction that tense, aspect, or any grammatical category of the Hebrew verbal system can be properly analyzed and observed “on the linguistic level beyond that of the sentence.”¹³ Moreover, it also has its basis on the conviction that “the use of differing verbal forms in narrative does not [. . .] mark changes in tense (which is consistently past), but rather changes in aspect and changes in narrative organization (initiation or conclusion of narrative blocks or the providing of offline commentary).”¹⁴

This investigation will attempt to verify the viability of Heller’s proposal concerning the usage and function of clause types according to three discourse categories of Biblical Hebrew¹⁵ and Heller’s classification

¹¹ Robert-Alain de Beaugrande and Wolfgang U. Dressler, *Introduction to Text Linguistics* (London; New York: Logman, 1981); Laura Alba-Juez, *Perspectives on Discourse Analysis* (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009), 6-7.

¹² Dawson, *Text Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*, 21; Alba-Juez, *Perspectives on Discourse*, 6.

¹³ Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 428-482.

¹⁴ *Idem*, 430.

¹⁵ Type of communication: narrative and direct speech (Heller, 25). Level of communication: foreground and background (Heller, 430-432). And type of organization: inner-paragraph comments and extra-paragraph comments (Heller, 432-441, 451).

NUÑEZ: NARRATIVE STRUCTURE OF DANIEL 8

of discourse text types into: Narrative Discourse, Predictive Discourse, Expository Discourse, Hortative Discourse and Interrogative Discourse.¹⁶

2. Procedure of this Study

The first step of this investigation is to determine the boundaries of the text of Daniel 8. Then the “narrative text proper” (narrator’s text) will be split up into WAYYIQTOL clauses (foreground) and non-WAYYIQTOL clauses (background). The “direct discourse text” (character’s speech text) will be separated into a third group and will be classified according to text types. In other words, this investigation will set two columns for two distinct narrative clause types (WAYYIQTOL and non-WAYYIQTOL) and one column for all discourse text types (e.g. Narrative Discourse, Predictive Discourse, Expository Discourse, etc.) of the Hebrew text of Daniel 8. The first group, comprised of WAYYIQTOL clauses (foreground), will be placed at the right margin of page.¹⁷ The second group, comprised of non-WAYYIQTOL clauses (background), will be fixed to the left of the first right margin. Finally, the third group, comprised of direct speech, will be placed to the left of the second right margin. After these three groups are set up into their respective columns, the narrative text will be delimited into paragraph blocks and will be classified into two types of paragraphs: inner-paragraphs comments and extra-paragraph comments. Then, the results of the structural analysis will be presented in this paper in a descriptive manner.

2.1 Text Type and Boundaries of Daniel 8

Several scholars have classified Daniel 8 as a vision report.¹⁸ This text type is similar to the narrative prose of Biblical Hebrew. They are similar in the fact that both were built with the same building blocks (clause types) and according to the same grammatical conventions of Biblical Hebrew. That is, both convey a story of the past and both are composed of two writing materials: narrative proper (the narrator’s text) and direct discourse

¹⁶ Idem, 457-480.

¹⁷ Hebrew sentences are written from the right margin to the left.

¹⁸ Martin Pröbstle, *Truth and Terror: A Text-Oriented Analysis of Daniel 8:9-14* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Doctoral Dissertation, 2006), 523.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

(the characters' speech text).¹⁹ However, narratives and vision reports are not identical. They differ in the fact that a narrative was usually written in the third person, whereas the vision report of Daniel 8 is written in both the first and the third person. A narrative by nature is past oriented, whereas the vision report of Daniel 8 deals with future realities. A narrative presents a story that happened in the past, whereas Daniel 8 reports a vision that was seen in the past but expected to happen in the future.

The text of Daniel 8 starts at verse 1 and ends at verse 27. These boundaries have been established on the basis of two factors: Discourse features and clause type functions. Daniel 8:1 starts with a dating formula that provides the date in which Daniel saw a vision. Dating formulas, in Biblical times, served to introduce a historical narrative or a vision report²⁰ (cf. 1Kings 15:33; 16:8, 23; 2Kings 8:25; 13:1, 10; 14:1, 23; 15:1, 8, 17, 23, 27, 32; 16:1; 17:1, 6; 2Chr 13:1; 6:3; Je 52:30; Dan 1:1; 7:1; 9:1; 10:1; Hag 1:1; 2:10). This literary convention served as a signal to the reader that a story or vision report was about to be recounted. Since Daniel 8:1 starts in this fashion, it is an indication that a new story or vision report will begin. Additionally, the text of Daniel 8 starts with an independent X-QATAL clause, whose function is to mark the beginning of the text that presents the seer's name, the vision event and the place of the event. These factors support the conclusion that Daniel 8:1 is the beginning of the vision report. Likewise, the end of the vision report was established on the basis of discourse features and clause type functions. One notes that the initiation of the segment in Daniel 8:27 is marked by an X-QATAL clause. It is followed by three WAYYIQTOL clauses that provide sequential information until the end of the paragraph. Then, after verse 27, Daniel 9:1 starts with a dating formula that signals the reader that a new story or vision report will be recounted. The evidence is clear that Daniel 8:27 is the epilogue of the vision report, set between two strong breaks.

¹⁹ Niccacci, "Analysis of Biblical Narrative," in Robert D. Bergen, (ed.) *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1994), 176.

²⁰ David J. Clark, "Vision and Oracle in Zechariah 1-6," in Robert D. Bergen, (ed.) *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1994), 530, 531.

NUÑEZ: NARRATIVE STRUCTURE OF DANIEL 8

2.2 Prologue (Dan 8:1-2)

The boundaries of the prologue are marked initially by an X-QATAL clause and terminally by another X-QATAL clause. This segment is composed of two WAYIQTOL clauses and several non-WAYYIQTOL clauses that provide background information²¹ on the time, the event, the seer's name (Dan 8:1) and the place of the vision (Dan 8:2).²² These clauses do not propel the story forward, but provide setting information.

Between the prologue (Dan 8:1-2) and the epilogue (Dan 8:27), Daniel's account of his vision (Dan 8:3-14) and Gabriel's explanation of the vision (Dan 8:15-26) appear. Thus, the prologue and the epilogue serve as a frame to both Daniel's account of his vision and Gabriel's explanation of the vision.

2.3 First Section: Daniel's Account of the Vision (Dan 8:3-14)

The first section of Daniel 8 (Dan 8:3-14) consists of five paragraph blocks (Dan 8:3-4; 5-8; 9-10; 11-12; 13-14). The first paragraph is an

²¹ The clause types that constitute the prologue of Daniel 8:1-2 are: two X-QATAL clauses in the first verse and in the second verse two unchained WAYYIQTOL clauses, a WAYHY temporal clause, a nominal or verbless clause and an X-QATAL clause. These clause types provide information about the time, the vision event, the name of the seer (Dan 8:1) and the place of the vision (Dan 8:2). The unchained WAYYIQTOL provides punctual information and the Verbless clauses provide static information in contrast to dynamic information.

²² The setting or prologue of the text of Daniel 8 is composed of the following clause types: The prologue initiates with a complement verbless clause, followed by two QATAL clauses (8:1b). The verbless clause provides the date in which Daniel saw the vision. The following Qatal clause presents the subject of a passive clause in first position or focus (the vision) and the name of the person who saw the vision (Daniel). For more information on the function of clause types see, R. E. Longacre, "Discourse Perspective on the Hebrew Verse," 178-180; Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 53, 54, 59. The first WAYYIQTOL clause in Daniel 8:2a has the function of making a punctual reference to the "vision" event. Then a temporal clause (Dan 8:2b) informs the reader that while Daniel saw the "vision" he was in the citadel of Susa in the province of Elam (8:2b). Then a WAYYIQTOL clause (Dan 8:2c) reiterates that Daniel saw [the "vision"], whereas the following X-QATAL clause affirms that it happened while he was on the bank of the River Ulai (Dan 8:2d). All these clause types have their proper function. The verbless clause provides static or general information; the unchained WAYYIQTOL provides punctual information; whereas the HAYA verbal form provides existential information and marks the original boundary of the prologue. None of these clauses provide foreground information, including the unchained WAYYIQTOL.

“extra-paragraph comment,” that serves as an introduction (8:3-4), three are “inner-paragraph comments”²³ (8:5-8, 8:9-10; 8:13-14) and one is an “extra-paragraph comment”²⁴ (8:11-12).

2.3.1 First Paragraph (8:3-4)

After the prologue (Dan 8:1-2), a WAYYIQTOL clause (Dan 8:3:a) signals the beginning of the paragraph and vision account (Dan 8:3-14).²⁵ This clause in conjunction with the following clause, form an introduction-formula that initiates the vision account: “I lifted up my eyes and I saw” (Dan 8:3a, b). This introductory formula was a literary resource or language convention that a prophet could use to initiate his account (cf. Gen 31:10; Ezek 8:5; Daniel 10:5; Zech 2:1, [Eng 1:18]; 2:5 [Eng 2:1]; 5:1, 9; 6:1). Then the narrator introduced the first symbolic participant (a ram) by means of the Hebrew particle *wehinneh* (וְהִנֵּה) + a participial clause²⁶ (Dan 8:3c). This syntactical pattern was another language convention or literary resource that an author utilized to introduce an actor in a dream or vision report (cf. Gen 37:7a; Dan 8:5b, 15c; 10:5; 12:5a). After this introduction, a series of five non-WAYYIQTOL clause types describe the ram’s two horns (Dan 8:3d-g), the ram’s butting (*nagah*) toward the west, the north and the south (Dan 8:4h) and the fact that no beast could stand before the ram and deliver from its power (Dan 8:4i-j). Finally, the narrator used two WeQATAL clauses to indicate that the ram did its will and grew arrogant (Dan 8:4k-l). The last of them marks the end of the paragraph.

The boundaries of this paragraph are determined on the basis of the initial WAYYIQTOL and the final WeQATAL clauses. This delimitation is confirmed by the thematic scope of the ram that covers the two verses of

²³ Idem, 57.

²⁴ Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 57, 58, 431-441. The first paragraph of Daniel 8 has two WAYYIQTOL, one QATAL, one YIQTOL and two WeQATAL clauses. In addition, the paragraph has three participial and three verbless clauses. The fourth paragraph, on the other hand, has three QATAL, one YIQTOL, one WeYIQTOL and two WeQATAL clauses.

²⁵ Solitary or unchained WAYYIQTOL clauses may signal in Daniel 8 the beginning or the ending of a paragraph, or may provide punctual background information. Only WAYYIQTOL chains of at least three clauses are the backbone of the story.

²⁶ Participial clauses present ongoing situations, actions or states. In this case, it describes the standing of the ram on the banks of the River Ulai.

NUÑEZ: NARRATIVE STRUCTURE OF DANIEL 8

the first paragraph (Dan 8:3-4). Thus, both methods of delimitation corroborate the established boundaries of the first paragraph are correct.

The paragraph thematic outline consists of: (1) the presentation of the ram or first actor, (2) its identity (3), its activity, (4) its supremacy, and (5) its arrogance.

2.3.2 Second Paragraph (8:5-8)

The beginning of the second paragraph is marked by an X-QATAL clause (Dan 8:5a) and its end is signaled by a WAYYIQTOL clause (Daniel 8:8c).

This paragraph introduces the second symbolic participant of the vision account (a male goat) by means of the Hebrew particle *wehinneh* (וְהִנֵּה) + a participial verbal form (Dan 8:5b). It depicts the male goat coming from the west (Dan 8:5b), without touching the earth. It came toward the ram, which was at the river Ulai, and it ran against it with a furious rage (Dan 8:6).²⁷ Then, through five foreground clauses and two negated QATAL clauses,²⁸ the paragraph advances the story indicating that the male goat (1) charged against the ram, (2) struck it, (3) broke its two horns, (4) left it without strength, (5) cast it toward the ground, (6) trampled upon it, and (7) none could deliver it from the goat's power (Dan 8:7). After these foreground clauses, the narrator comments that the male goat magnified itself very much (Dan 8:8a), but when it was strong, its great horn was broken (Dan 8:8b) and four prominent [horns] came up in its place toward the four winds of heaven (8:8c).

Since this paragraph has a WAYYIQTOL chain of at least three clauses, the function of the non-WAYYIQTOL clause types of this unit is to provide "inner-paragraph comments"²⁹ on actions presented by the WAYYIQTOL clauses, "but do so apart from the sequentiality of the foundational narrative and do not brake that sequentiality."³⁰

²⁷ According to Heller, individual QATAL clauses may function as comment clauses when they appear in a clause that is semantically parallel with a nearby QATTAL or WAYYIQTOL clause within an "inner paragraph comments." See Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 441.

²⁸ On the negated QATAL propelling the story forward, see Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 279 (note 64), 387 (note 67) and 437 (note 14).

²⁹ *Idem*, 58-59, 441-451.

³⁰ *Idem*, 441.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

The initial X-QATAL clause and the final WAYYIQTOL clause mark the boundaries of this paragraph. This delimitation is confirmed by the thematic scope of the male goat that defeated the ram, which covers four verses of this segment (Dan 8:5-8). Both methods of delimitation attest the boundaries of the second paragraph are correct.

The thematic outline of this block is similar to the thematic outline of the first paragraph: (1) the presentation of the male goat or second participant, (2) its identity, (3) its foreground activity, (4) its supremacy, (5) its arrogance, (6) its big horn state of brokenness, and (7) the replacement of it by four visible [horns].

2.3.3 Third Paragraph (8:9-10)

The beginning of this paragraph is explicitly marked by an independent QATAL clause.³¹ This has the function of discontinuing the previous story and of introducing the new participant of the third scene. In contrast to the preceding presentations, this introduction has no indication of surprise (no *hinneh* particle) possibly because the narrator already knew the actor from his previous vision (cf. Dan 7:8).

The narrator propels the story forward by means of four WAYYIQTOL clauses. They depict the little horn performing four consecutive activities without any interruption or comment. It is said that (1) it grew geographically toward the south, toward the east and toward the beautiful land (Dan 8:9); (2) it grew cosmically up to the host of heaven, (3) it threw down some of the host or stars, and (4) trampled upon them (Dan 8:10). The last WAYYIQTOL clause of this verse marks the end of the paragraph.

The thematic outline of this block consists of: (1) the presentation of the little horn or third participant, (2) its foreground activity without comment and (3) its supremacy.

2.3.4 Fourth Paragraph (Dan 8:11-12)

The beginning of the fourth paragraph is marked by means of an initial X-QATAL clause. It has the function of breaking the sequence of the

³¹ Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 432.

NUÑEZ: NARRATIVE STRUCTURE OF DANIEL 8

previous story line. Following, six clause types provide “extra-paragraph comments” to the vision account.³² They do not move the story forward, but provide a set of comments apart from the sequence of the preceding WAYYIQTOL chain of the narrative. These clause types occur between two “inner-paragraph comments”³³ of the vision account or between the third and fifth paragraphs of the first section of Daniel 8.

In this segment the narrator informs the reader that the little horn magnified itself up to the Prince of the host. Then he, by means of two passive QATAL and one passive YIQTOL clauses,³⁴ adds that three possessions of the Prince of the host were damaged. They are: (1) “the regular [cultic service],”³⁵ (2) “the sanctuary” and (3) “the host [of heaven].”³⁶ Finally, the narrator states that as a consequence of the preceding actions (4) the little horn cast the truth to the ground, it did [its will] and prospered (8:11-12).

According to Heller, the extra-paragraph comment provides background information about 1) “multiple actions that occurred before the larger narrative framework of the preceding and following paragraphs,”³⁷ or 2) “actions that either form the basis of a following story, or occur throughout a story but are not tied to the sequentiality of the narrative, or are the eventual outcome of a preceding story.”³⁸ In view of these alternatives, one may ask: Can we determine specifically to what period of history the actions of the fourth paragraph refer? Do they refer to actions that occurred before or throughout the narrative of Daniel 8:10? Or are they the outcome of the preceding story of Daniel 8:10? To answer these questions, it is necessary to know if there are thematic or linguistic connections between the fourth and the third paragraphs or between the fourth and the fifth paragraphs. Then we may determine the chronological relation that exists between them.

³² QATAL, YIQTOL, WeYIQTOL and WeQATAL clauses. See Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 451, 455.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Passive clauses usually demote the agent and promote the grammatical subject (patient).

³⁵ The Hebrew word is an ellipsis of “the regular cultic service.”

³⁶ The Hebrew word is an ellipsis of “the host of heaven.”

³⁷ Heller, 451.

³⁸ Heller, 455.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

Since the little horn is the subject of a masculine verbal predicate in the first independent clause of the third and fourth paragraphs (Dan 8:9b; 8:11a), there is no doubt they have the same subject and therefore are closely connected. Moreover, both paragraphs finish their account of the little horn with feminine verbal forms that predicate its actions (Dan 8:9b, 10:abc; 8:12bcd). In addition, there are some linguistic links between the third and the fourth paragraphs that show their connection. One of them is between the word “host” of the phrase “host of heaven” in Daniel 8:10a and the word “host” in the phrase “prince of the host” in Daniel 8:11a. In this context, the “host of heaven” and the “Prince of the host” relate to each other. That is, the leader of the “host of heaven” is the “prince of the host.” Another linguistic link exists between the “anarthrous host” in the fourth paragraph (Dan 8:12a) and the arthrous “host of heaven” in the third paragraph (Dan 8:10a). They are related because the “anarthrous host” in Daniel 8:13e suffered the same fate that the “host of heaven” of Daniel 8:10a experienced. That is, the little horn trampled upon them (Dan 8:10d; 8:13e) because they belonged to the prince of the host. These linguistic links open the possibility that the events of both paragraphs are simultaneous or overlapping. However, we must wait for more information before we come to a final conclusion.

The thematic outline of this paragraph has the following order: (1) the little horn’s arrogance, (2) its damages against the properties of the prince of the host, and (3) its success. The end of the fourth paragraph is marked by a WeQATAL clause.

2.3.5 Fifth Paragraph (8:13-14)

The initial marker of the fifth paragraph is a default WAYYIQTOL clause. This segment continues the sequence of the story. Here the narrator introduces two new actors that engage in a dialogue. One of them approached the other requesting some specific information. He asked:

(ID)

“How long will it take for the vision to be fulfilled—the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, the rebellion that causes desolation, and the surrender of the sanctuary and of the host that will be trampled underfoot?” (Dan 8:14 NIV).

NUÑEZ: NARRATIVE STRUCTURE OF DANIEL 8

This question reveals the angel's concern regarding the actions of the little horn against the (a) "regular [cultic service]," (b) "the sanctuary," (c) the "host"³⁹ and the truth (Dan 8:11-12). It also reveals the angel's desire to know about the end of the vision or the ceasing of the "criminal action" against the Prince, his properties, and his covenant people.⁴⁰

The response to the former question was: (PD) "until 2300 evening-morning(s), then the sanctuary will be cleansed" (Dan 8:14). That is, the answer assured to the former holy being that the criminal actions against the Prince and his properties would come to their end as soon as the sanctuary became cleansed. The Hebrew verb *nisdaq* (to be righteous), in this answer, is pregnant with meaning. It is a multivalent lexeme that belongs to the semantic domain of ethics,⁴¹ namely, jurisprudence and social behavior. The temporal expression "2300 evening-morning(s)" is more ambiguous, but it can be understood in light of two known Israelite calendars: (1) the calendar system of literal days (cf. Lev 23:15-16) and (2) the calendar system of Jubilee in which a day represents a year (cf. Lev 25:8, 9). In light of these two calendar systems and in light of the context of the vision report, the temporal locution makes more sense if we take it as symbolic time rather than literal days. Therefore, the temporal period of "2300 evening-morning(s)" refers to 2300 years. According to Daniel 9:25, the beginning point of this period would be the decree to rebuild Jerusalem in 457 BC.⁴²

This paragraph has linguistic connections with the preceding fourth block. Both are linked by the following lexical terms: host/host (Dan 8:12a;

³⁹ The Hebrew word "host" is indefinite in Dan 8:12a and 13d.

⁴⁰ See R. Knierim, "*pesha*" in E. Jenni and C. Westerman, Trans. by M. Biddle, *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. According to the covenant law, rebellion or sin against God must be punished (cf. Lev 19:30; 24:10-23; Deut 32:40-41).

⁴¹ Bruce K. Waltke, "Righteousness in Proverbs," *Westminster Theological Journal* (2008): 233-235.

⁴² Peter Gentry, "Daniel's Seventy Weeks and the New Exodus," *SBJT* (2010): 33-36; Gerhard F. Hasel, "Interpretations of the Chronology of the Seventy Weeks," in Frank B. Holbrook (ed.), *70 Weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy* (Washington: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), 49-63; William Shea, "The Prophecy of Daniel 9:24-27," in Frank B. Holbrook (ed.), *70 Weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy* (Washington: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), 84-88; Arthur J. Ferch, "Commencement Date for the Seventy Week Prophecy," in Frank B. Holbrook (ed.), *70 Weeks, Leviticus, Nature of Prophecy* (Washington, DC: Biblical Research Institute, 1986), 65-74.

8:13d), regular [cultic worship]/regular [cultic worship] (Dan 8:11b, 12a, 13a), sanctuary/sanctuary (Dan 8:11c, 13d, 14c) and rebellion/rebellion (Dan 8:12a, 13c). Similar linguistic links are present between the third and the fourth segments. Therefore, we can assert that these three paragraphs of Daniel 8 constitute a literary unit because they deal with the same subject, the same actions, and the same objects.

The end of the fifth paragraph is marked by a WeQATAL clause. According to Longacre, the WeQATAL verbal form may mark a pivotal or climactic event.⁴³ In this case, it marks the climactic dialogue that finally provides the resolution to the aggressive perpetration of the little horn toward the Prince, his host and his cultic properties.

3. The Second Section: The Explanation of the Vision (Dan 8:15-26)

The second section of Daniel 8 is comprised of two paragraphs. The first introduces a new actor that came to help Daniel understand his vision, and the second presents Gabriel's explanation of the vision account.

3.1 The First Paragraph of the Second Section (Dan 8:15-18).

The beginning of the new paragraph is marked by the Hebrew WAYHI temporal clause in Dan 8:15a. This paragraph introduces a new participant, with the particle *wehinneh* (וְהִנֵּה) + a participial clause (Dan 8:15b). He received the following audible order:

(HD)

“Gabriel, make this man understand the vision (הַמְּרָאָה)” (Dan 8:16d).

When Gabriel approached Daniel, the latter was so terrified that he fell to the ground (Dan 8:17abc). Then Gabriel said to him (Dan 8:17d):

(HD)

“Understand, O man, that the vision (הַזֵּן) [shall end at or refers to] the time of the end” (Dan 8:17e).

⁴³ Longacre, “Weqatal Forms in Biblical Hebrew Prose,” 71.

NUÑEZ: NARRATIVE STRUCTURE OF DANIEL 8

One notes above that Gabriel used the Hebrew word *chazon* (חֲזוֹן) (Dan 8:17e) instead of the Hebrew word *mar'eh* (הַמְרֵאָה). Before him, Daniel had also used it to express his desire to understand the vision (Dan 8:15a). Besides Daniel, a holy being had also used it (Dan 8:13) in his inquiry about the end of the vision. In these previous cases the Hebrew word *chazon* referred generally to the vision account of Daniel 8:3-14 (cf. 8:1, 2) but more specifically to some actions in Daniel 8:9-12. On the other hand, the Hebrew word *hammare'h* (הַמְרֵאָה) in Daniel 8:16d denotes the vehicle of divine revelation⁴⁴ and the content in Daniel 8:13, 14 (cf. Dan 8:27; 9:23; Dan 10:1, 7, 8, 16). Therefore, we can safely say that Gabriel's use of the Hebrew word *chazon* (חֲזוֹן) in his latter speech to Daniel refers generally to the whole vision account (Dan 8:3-14), but specially to some specific actions in Daniel 8:9-14. This interpretation is supported by Gabriel's general explanation of the vision account (cf. Dan 8:20-26) and his reference to some events of Daniel 8:9-14 in Daniel 8:23-26, 9:24-27 and 11:21-12:4.

The final marker of this paragraph is a WAYYIQTOL clause in which Daniel indicates that Gabriel helped him to come out of his shock (Dan 8:18d).

3.2 The Second and Last Paragraph of the Second Section (Dan 8:19-26)

The second paragraph of this section begins with a quotation formula that introduces Gabriel's speech as is illustrated below:

And he said:

(PD)

“I am going to inform you what shall be in the latter time of the indignation (Dan 8:19b), for [the vision shall end at or refers to] the appointed time of the end” (Dan 8:19c).

Gabriel's mission is clearly stated. He came to inform Daniel about the event or events that would occur “in the latter time of the indignation.” The

⁴⁴ R. L. Harris, Gleason L. Archer and Bruce K. Waltke, *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, Volume 2 (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1980), 824.

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

term “indignation,” in this predictive discourse, suggests that the vision of Daniel 8 would end with the execution of God’s judgment against the little horn (cf. Dan 8:25c; 11:45) and with God’s wonderful salvation in favor of his people (cf. Dan 12:1-3).

Gabriel’s explanation uses a series of verbless clauses, with some embedded clauses (Dan 8:20-22), that are predominant clausal forms for Expository Discourse (ED).⁴⁵ According to Gabriel:

ED⁴⁶

“The two-horned ram *signifies* the kings of Media and Persia” (Dan 8:20).

“The he goat *signifies* the kingdom of Greece” (Dan 8:21a).

“The large horn *signifies* the first king” (Dan 8:21b).

The four *horns signify* four kingdoms that will arise out of a nation, but not with his power.” (Dan 8:22b).

Note that Gabriel gave only the meaning of the animal symbols, but without any information about their activities. Note also the last clause of Daniel 8:22 which emphasizes the diminished power of the four sub-kingdoms of Greece in comparison with their former united empire. This avoids any misconception regarding the referent of the little horn that would be greater than any of the previous kingdoms.

(PD)

The first two lines of Gabriel’s predictive discourse (Daniel 8:23a) establish the time frame for the appearing of the little horn in the historical arena; it would appear in the latter time of the four sub-kingdoms of Greece (Dan 8:23). This poetic verse, contrary to the explanation of the ram and male goat (Dan 8:20-22), lacks any mention of the little horn (Dan 8:23). In spite of this fact the preceding verse relates to it.

⁴⁵ See Heller, *Narrative Discourse*, 464-467.

⁴⁶ The embedded clauses add some clarification on the symbols of Daniel 8.

NUÑEZ: NARRATIVE STRUCTURE OF DANIEL 8

The second poetic verse indicates that the impudent king would be mighty, but not by his own strength (Dan 8:24a), thus contrasting the superiority of this king with the weakness of the four horns of the male goat. It also asserts that the impudent king would destroy extraordinarily (Dan 8:24b). This prediction of destruction, in light of other visions (Dan 9 and 10-12), may include the destruction of the Jewish temple, the Jewish people and the city of Jerusalem. One support of this interpretation is the manner in which this verse ends that is identical to the ending of the fourth paragraph of the vision account (Dan 8:12cd). That is, the pair of verbal forms in Daniel 8:24b mark the end of the first stage of the impudent king's reign as the verbal forms in Daniel 8:12cd mark the end of the first stage of the little horn in the fourth paragraph of the vision account (Dan 8:11-12).

The first line of the third poetic verse indicates that the impudent king would destroy the mighty men and the holy people (Dan 8:24c). This poetic line is at the center of six poetic lines that Gabriel used to explain the symbol of the little horn, from its beginning to its end. From this poetic line (Dan 8:24c) backwards, there are three poetic lines to the beginning of the little horn (Dan 8:23b) and from this poetic line forward, there are three poetic lines to the demise of the little horn (Dan 8:25b). The phrase "holy people" of this poetic line (Dan 8:24c) is parallel to the phrase "holy people" in Daniel 7:25, which relates to God's people of the Middle Ages. This fact entails the content of the third poetic verse to refer also to the Middle Ages, a period in which the impudent king, by his cunning, would make deceit prosper in his hand (Dan 8:25a).

The fourth poetic verse indicates that the impudent king would magnify himself in his heart (Dan 8:25b), would destroy without warning (Dan 8:25b), would stand up against the Prince of princes (Dan 8:25c), but would finally be broken without hand (Dan 8:25c). If the phrase "holy people" in Daniel 8:24c refers to God's people of the Middle Ages, then the two poetic lines of Daniel 8:25bc relate to the actions of the little horn during the "time of the end."

After his predictive discourse on the little horn, Gabriel used a verbless clause (ED), with an embedded clause, to affirm that the vision (הַמַּרְאֵה) of the evening-morning(s) is true (Daniel 8:26a). Then, he commanded Daniel to keep the vision (הַחֲזוֹן) secret for it was for many days (HD; Daniel 8:26b).

Gabriel's explanation of the symbols in Dan 8:20-26 followed the same outline of the vision account in the first section (Daniel 8:3-14): the ram,

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

the male goat, the male goat's big horn, the male goat's four horns, the little horn, and the time prophecy of two thousand and three hundred evening-morning(s).

Up to this point Gabriel had told Daniel that either the events of the vision were to conclude at "the time of the end" or some events of Daniel 8:9-14 relate to "the time of the end" (cf. Dan 8:17d). He also added that the impudent king (1) would destroy astonishingly, (2) would destroy the holy people and (3) would destroy many without warning (Dan 8:23-25). According to the verbal forms and the poetic units of the discourse, the latter actions would not happen in a single event but would occur sequentially in three different stages.⁴⁷

Gabriel's explanation to Daniel provides support for the view that the vision would conclude at the time of the end, but it creates a problem for the view that the actions of the extra-paragraph comments in Daniel 8:11-12 are simultaneous with the event of the preceding story (Dan 8:10). This problem requires an investigation of Gabriel's second explanation in Daniel 9:24-27 to determine if it offers a solution.

One notes that Daniel 9:24-27 provides information regarding the construction of Jerusalem, the appearing of a Messiah, the purpose of his coming, the time of his coming, the destruction of the temple and the destruction of the people of Judah during the first stage of the little horn. The time-prophecy of Daniel 9 covers part of the period of Medo-Persia, the period of Greece and part of the period of Rome. It helps us understand

⁴⁷ The linguistic links that exist between Daniel 8:9-14 and Daniel 8:23-26 are the following: **First stage:** (1) a little horn went/a king shall stand up (Dan 8:9b; 8:23b); (2) it trampled upon some of the host/he shall destroy awfully (Dan 8:10a and 8:24b); (3) the sanctuary was cast down/he shall destroy awfully (Dan 8:11c and 8:24b); (4) it did its will and succeeded (Dan 8:12cd and 8:24b). **Second stage:** (1) a host was given/he shall destroy the holy people (Dan 8:12a? and 8:24c). **Third stage:** (1) a host was given/he shall destroy many (Dan 8:12a? and 8:25b); (2) it magnified itself/he magnified in his heart (Dan 8:11a and 8:25b); (3) it magnified up to the prince/he will stand up against the prince of princes (Dan 8:11a and 8:25c). The information of Daniel 8:23-26 belong to four poetic units of two lines each verse: (1) 8:23ab, (2) 8:24ab, (3) 8:24c-25a, (4) 8:25bc. The first poetic verse presents the time in which the impudent king would stand up (Dan 8:23ab); the second poetic verse indicates his power, his destructive actions and his success during the first part of his reign (Dan 8:24ab); the third poetic verse presents his destructive actions against the mighty and holy people in the second stage of his reign (Dan 8:24c-25a); and the fourth poetic verse refers to his destructive actions against many people and his arrogance against the Prince of princes in the third period of his reign or the time of the end (Dan 8:25bc).

NUÑEZ: NARRATIVE STRUCTURE OF DANIEL 8

the two thousand three hundred evening-morning(s) symbolically as day-year and the happening of the cleansing of the sanctuary at the time of the end. However, this explanation has left a gap between the event of 70AD and the cleansing of the sanctuary at the time of the end.⁴⁸ Therefore, we must investigate Gabriel's third explanation in Daniel 11:21-45 to see if the problem of the gap is solved.

It is observed that Daniel 11:21-45 introduces a despicable man in verses 21-24. He is described as a destructive, deceptive, crafty and corruptive king. During the first stage of his reign he fights against the king of the south (Dan 11:25-28), engages against the people of the covenant, desecrates the temple, takes away the *tamid* (הַתְּמִיד) and sets up the abomination of desolation (Dan 11:30-31). Then, during the second stage of his reign, he persecutes "the people who know his God" or "the wise people" until the time of the end (Dan 11:32-35). Then the character of the king of the north is revealed in verses 36-39. It is said that he will exalt and magnify himself above every god and speak horrendous things against the God of gods (Dan 11:36). He will have preference for the god of fortress instead of the God of his fathers and the fathers of his fathers (Dan 11:37, 38). He will devise plans against fortified cities and will give benefits to those who recognize him (Dan 11:39). Finally, in the time of the end or his third stage, the king will come to the beautiful land (Dan 11:41), will

⁴⁸ The linguistic links that exist between Daniel 8:9-14 and Gabriel's second explanation in Daniel 9:23-27 are the following: **First stage:** (1) the host of heaven/the people of Daniel (Dan 8:10a; 9:24a); (2) the rebellion/the rebellion (Dan 8:12a; Dan 9:24b); (3); prince of the host/Messiah the prince (Dan 8:11a; 9:25b); (4) the sanctuary shall be cast down/a people shall destroy the sanctuary (Dan 8:11c, 13:c; 26b); (5) desolation/desolation (Dan 8:13b; 9:26c, 27d). **First stage and third stage:** (6) the sanctuary/the most holy place (Dan 8:14c; 9:24c); (7) time period of 2300 evening-morning(s)/time period of 70 weeks (Dan 8:14c; 9:24a); (8) be brought to its rightful state/righteousness (Dan 8:14c; 9:24c); (9) the vision/the vision (Dan 8:13a; 9:24c). The lexical terms host, rebellion, prince of the host, desolation and the destruction of the sanctuary belong to the first stage. However, the lexical terms or phases bring to its rightful state, 2300 evening-morning(s) and the sanctuary belong to the third stage. The majority of the actions of the poetic discourse of Daniel 9:24-26 refer basically to the events of the first stage of 70 AD and some to both the first stage of 70 AD and the third stage of the time of the end. This situation indicates that Daniel 8:9-14 and Daniel 9:24-27 focus mainly on the events of the first stage of 70 A.D (Dan 8:10-12), but the ultimate goal of the sanctuary function and the Messiah ministry is the time of the end (Dan 8:14).

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

control the treasures of gold and silver (Dan 11:43), will go with great fury to kill and annihilate many (Dan 11:44), and will plant the tents of his palace between the seas and the beautiful-holy-mountain. However, he will come to his end there (Dan 11:45).⁴⁹

Based on Gabriel's explanations above, we can assert that the comments of Daniel 8:11-12 refer to the destruction of the temple of Jerusalem, the elimination of its rituals, the destruction of the people of Judah and the casting of truth to the ground in the year 70 AD, during the first stage of the little horn.

This view raises two questions: if the vision account of Daniel 8:9-14 predicted events that would occur in 70 AD, why did Gabriel declare that the vision should finish at the time of the end or be fulfilled at the time of the end? Why did Gabriel in his first and last explanation of the vision of Daniel 8 speak of the king's actions being fulfilled during three stages of his reign until the end of earth's history?

These questions deserve an honest and appropriate answer. My response to them presupposes that Daniel reported his vision faithfully, accurately and according to the grammatical conventions of the Hebrew language of his time. It presupposes the text of Daniel has come to us in its original form. It also presupposes some of the Biblical Hebrew grammatical conventions were lost in the past. However, much of the lost knowledge has

⁴⁹ The linguistic connections that exist between Daniel 8:9-14 and the third explanation of Gabriel in Daniel 11:21-12:4 are as follow: (1) **First stage**: "a little horn went"/"a despicable man shall stand up" (Dan 8:9a; 11:21a); (2) "prince of the host"/"prince of the covenant" (Dan 8:11; 11:22); (3) "sanctuary"/"holy covenant" (Dan 8:11c; 8:13d, 14c; 11:28b, 30bc); (4) "sanctuary"/"sanctuary" (Dan 8:11c; 11:31b); (5) "regular cultic worship"/"regular cultic worship" (Dan 8:11b; 11:31c); (6) "desolation"/"desolation" (Dan 8:13c; 11:31d). (7) **Second stage**: "host"/"people that know their God" and "wise people" (Dan 8:12a?; 11:32c; 33a); (8) "some of the host shall fall"/"they shall fall" and some shall fall (Dan 8:10b; 11:33c, 35a); (9) "time of the end"/"until the time of the end" (Dan 8:17f; 11:35d). (11) **Third stage**: "it shall do"/"he shall do his will" (Dan 8:12c; 11:36a); (12) "he shall magnify up to the prince of the host"/"he shall magnify above every god" (Dan 8:11a; 11:36b, 37d); (13) "beautiful land"/"beautiful land" (Dan 8:9c; 11:41a, 45b); (14) "the host was given"/"he shall kill and annihilate many" (Dan 8:12a?; 11:44c); (15) "it went out"/"he shall come to his end" (Dan 8:9b; 11:45c). The majority of these connections relate to Dan 8:10-12, two of them to Dan 8:9 and three to Dan 8:13, 14. In addition, the connections of this prophetic discourse relate to three periods or stages of the despicable man or king of the north.

NUÑEZ: NARRATIVE STRUCTURE OF DANIEL 8

been recovered throughout several centuries of investigation regarding the Biblical Hebrew verbal system, among them the suffix verbal form (QATAL) and the prefix verbal form (YIQTOL). According to some Hebraists the QATAL verbal form expresses a situation as a whole or in its totality⁵⁰ (with beginning, middle and end as one event) and serves to make comments in narratives.⁵¹ According to them, the YIQTOL verb form views a situation in its internal temporal constituency⁵² (either the beginning, middle or end of the event) or denotes iterative or repetitive actions in the past.⁵³ In 2004 Roy Heller proposed, on the basis of his analysis of several Biblical narratives, the YIQTOL verb form has a repetitive function within extra-paragraph comments.⁵⁴ If this proposal is correct, as he has proven, it is probable that Daniel used this linguistic convention in his extra-paragraph comment of Daniel 8:12a to indicate: “In rebellion a host was given [repetitively unto trampling] in addition to the regular [cultic worship].” It is possible that Daniel did not understand at first all the dimensions of the actions he saw in his vision, as we are informed in Daniel 8:15, 27. However, Gabriel was sent to explain to him, among other things, the repetitive actions inflicted against “the host” that would be fulfilled during the three stages of the king’s reign.⁵⁵ Thus, Daniel perceived the

⁵⁰ Waltke and O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 475, 480. David O. Moomo, *The Meaning of the Biblical Hebrew Conjugation from a Crosslinguistic Perspective* (Doctoral Dissertation at the University of Stellenbosch, 2004), 177-178, 271.

⁵¹ Alexander Andrason, QATAL, YIQTOL, WEQATAL Y WAYYIQTOL: Modelo Pancrónico del Sistema Verbal de la Lengua Hebrea Bíblica (Madrid: Tesis Doctoral en el Departamento de Estudios Hebreos y Arameos de la Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 2010), 277, 283.

⁵² Waltke and O’Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, 475, 480. Moomo, *The Meaning of the Biblical Hebrew Conjugation*, 271.

⁵³ Alexander Andrason, “The Panchronic Yiqtol: Functionally Consistent and Cognitively Plausible” in *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 10 (2010), 13, 15, 31, 32, 53; Andrason, QATAL, YIQTOL, WEQATAL Y WAYYIQTOL, 370, 375, 376; Jan Joosten, “The Distinction Between Classical Hebrew and Late Biblical Hebrew as Reflected in Syntax” *Hebrew Studies* 46 (2005), 334. Moomo, *The Meaning of the Biblical Hebrew Conjugation*, 194, 271.

⁵⁴ See Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 403, 405, 453-454.

⁵⁵ The repetitive function of the YIQTOL verbal form in Daniel 8:12a, which is attested in other extra-paragraph comments of the Hebrew Bible narratives (cf. 2 Sam 12:31; 17:17; 1Ki 1:1), fits very well with Gabriel’s explanation of Daniel 8:9-14 in Dan 8:17, 19, 23-26; 9:24-27; 11:21-12:4.

prophecy would reach until the time of the end, when God would judge the little horn for its actions and it would be broken without human hand (cf. Dan 8:25c; 11:45). If this interpretation is correct, then Antiochus Epiphanes cannot be the referent of the little horn, but rather it should be a greater kingdom than Greece and Medo-Persia. That is, the Roman Empire.

4. The Epilogue

The epilogue of Daniel 8:27 is marked by an initial X-QATAL clause (Dan 8:27). Then a QATAL clause indicates Daniel was sick. Finally, three WAYYIQTOL clauses indicate he arose, did the king's work and was shocked or dismayed on account of the vision (הַמְרָאָה).⁵⁶

5. Conclusion

The narrative structure of Daniel 8⁵⁷ starts with a prologue and finishes with an epilogue. Between them are two sections: (1) Daniel's vision account (Dan 8:3-14) and (2) Gabriel's explanation of the vision account (Dan 8:15-26). The first section is divided into five paragraphs and the second section, in two. The center of these seven paragraphs is the third scene of the little horn that covers the third, the fourth, and the fifth paragraphs. It depicts a conflict between the little horn and the Prince of the host. The former trampled the host of the latter (Dan 8:9-10). It took away his regular [cultic worship] and cast down his sanctuary (Dan 8:11; cf. Dan 9:24-27). A comment adds that a host was given repetitively [unto trampling] in addition to the regular [cultic worship] in rebellion (Dan 8:12a). These repetitive actions against the host do not represent a one-time event, but they would actually occur in three different stages of the little horn's reign (cf. Dan 8:23-26 and 11:21-45). Since some of the actions in Daniel 8:9-14 involve the destruction of the Jewish temple, the taking away

⁵⁶ The epilogue of verse 27 has a chain of three WAYYIQTOL clauses that moves the story of Daniel forward. At the end of the epilogue, Daniel indicates that he was appalled or shocked on account of the vision (*hammare'h*). This information serves to motivate the reader for continuing reading on the time prophecy of Daniel 8 in the prophecy of the 70 weeks in Daniel 9.

⁵⁷ For a comparative study of works on the literary structure of Daniel 8, see Pröbstle, *Truth and Terror*, 526-562.

NUÑEZ: NARRATIVE STRUCTURE OF DANIEL 8

of the temple's rituals, the destruction of Jerusalem and the trampling of God's people during three stages of the little horn's reign, the referent of the latter symbol cannot be Antiochus Epiphanes, but a greater kingdom than the two kingdoms symbolized by the male goat and the ram. Should someone argue that Gabriel presented the little horn as a king and not as a kingdom, there is no inconsistency because Gabriel used the term king as a figure of synecdoche. That is, he made a part to represent the whole as in Dan 7:17, 23. The climax of the vision account appears in the fifth paragraph. The explicit resolution is: "The sanctuary shall be cleansed" (Dan 8:14; cf. 12:1). Daniel did not understand the cryptic answer at once (Dan 8:15, 27). Three more explanations were necessary so that he could understand it (Dan 9:24-27, 11:2-12:4 and 12:5-13). This is a pragmatic reminder of the need to take into account the whole picture of the vision and its explanation in order to grasp the structure and meaning of the vision of Daniel 8.

Heller's proposal regarding the usage and function of clause types according to three discourse categories of Biblical Hebrew and his proposal regarding the repetitive function of the YIQTOL verb form within extra-paragraph comments are verifiable in the vision report of Daniel 8. Text Linguistics, the study of the function of clause types according to three categories of discourse, is an asset to the historical-grammatical method of interpretation for it offers objective criteria for analyzing narratives and vision reports that comprise over forty percent of the Hebrew Bible.

An Outline of the Narrative Structure of Daniel 8

1. Prologue

It presents the setting of the vision on the banks of the River Ulai, in the citadel of Susa, in the province of Elam and in the third year of Belshazzar.

2. First section

2.1. *Extra-paragraph comments*

It describes a ram standing on the banks of the river Ulai, its identity, its supremacy, and its arrogance.

2.2 *Inner-paragraph comments*

JOURNAL OF THE ADVENTIST THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

It depicts a male goat coming from the west to fight against the ram, its victory, its supremacy, its arrogance, and the fracturing of its power.

2.3 Inner-paragraph comments

It portrays a little horn extending its power to the beautiful land, to the host of heaven, casting down part of the host, and trampling upon them.

2.4 Extra-paragraph comments

It depicts the little horn's arrogance, its damages to the properties of the Prince of the host, and its success.

2.5 Inner-paragraph comments

It presents a dialogue between two holy beings regarding the damages caused to the properties of the Prince of the host and the resolution to the problem.

3. Second section

3.1 Inner-paragraph comments

It shows the coming of an interpreter to help Daniel understand his vision and Daniel's experience with him.

3.2 Explanation paragraph

It presents Gabriel's explanation of the vision account.

4. Epilogue

It indicates Daniel was exhausted, sick, and astonished on account of the vision, without being able to understand it.

Samuel Nuñez earned a Th.D. from Andrews University in 1987. He worked as professor of Old Testament at Montemorelos University, México for 8 years. He also worked as a Pastor of the Seventh-day Adventist church in Mexico for five years and in the United States for 26 years. He and his wife of 44 years, Raquel, retired from the ministry in 2011. He is now doing research on the books of Daniel and Revelation and enjoys exploring the woods of Northern California with his grandchildren. samuel.nunez@hughes.net