8) Note that in Gen. xxxi 47 ṭāhḏāḏāh is parallel to ṣṭd.
9) Isa. lxv 4 is ambiguous. ṭsʿāmmîm may be an adverbal accusative. Or the preposition ḫ may have been lost by haplography. Or, in the light of the use of ṭsʿāmmîm in the parallel colon, the MT may be an error for ṭsʿāmmîm (so BHT).
11) The reason for taking the garment is not clear. The petitioner may have been a corvée laborer who claims against his officer that he has adequately performed his duties (so Talmon) or a peasant farmer in a military colony (Cross), or a sharecropper who had failed to complete a certain amount of work (another possibility suggested by Cross).
12) The meaning of ṣmm is a matter of dispute and so omitted from the translation. See the discussions of Cross and Talmon.
13) "A comparison with Ruth 4: 10-11 makes it probable that initially, the full formula may have been yʾnw ṭʿdm, i.e. 'we are prepared to be witnesses' ” (Talmon, p. 34).
14) Talmon (pp. 34-5) suggests with reference to the word ṣmn: "It introduces the the accused's declaration: 'not guilty,' and should be compared with the biblical introductory formula ṭsomnh or ṭsomnm, rather than with the affirmative response ṭsmin (Num. 5: 21-22; Neh. 5: 12-13, etc.) The perfect parallel to X's declaration of innocence, ṭmn ṭnht, is Achan's confession of guilt: ṭsomnh ṭbīʾīt (Josh. 7:20). One may further compare Gen. 20:12 and Ruth 3:12 where ṭsomnh and ṭsomnm introduce assertions of a legal nature and could be translated: 'I testify …' (cf. also 2 Ki. 19:17 = Is. 37:18; Job 19:4-5; 34:12; 36:4; Ps. 58:2).” Cf. Talmon, “Amen as an Introductory Oath Formula”, Textus 7 (1969), pp. 130-31.
15) The text is broken at this point.
16) If the interpretation of yāḇlāḥ as witness is correct for Ps. xii 6 and Hab. ii 3, then the Hebrew lexical stock for "witness (verb or noun) for X" and "witness (verb or noun) against X" is expanded and consistent. The Mesad Hasavyahu petition provides the idiom ʿnb ṭe ṭe to match ʿnb ṭe ṭe …, well-attested in Biblical Hebrew. Thus:

"witness for"
ʿnb ʿe (Mesad Hashavyahu — 2x) ʿnb ʿe (Deut. v 20, xix 18, etc.) ṭwʾdʾd ʿe (Gen. xxi 30; Isa. xix 20) ṭwʾdʾd ʿe (Num. v 13; Deut. xxxi 28) ṭpʾb ʿe (Hab. ii 3; Ps. xii 6) ṭpʾb ʿe (Ps.xxiv 12)

(Sometimes "witness against" is expressed by ṭw + suffix, e.g. 1 Kings xxi 10, 13.)

ISAIAH'S VISION AND THE VISIONS OF DANIEL

The visions of Daniel (Dan. vii-xii) have generally been studied within the context of the development of apocalyptic, and the tradi-
tio-critical investigation of these chapters has consequently been con-
cerned, for the most part, with the use which has been made by their
author of such themes and motifs as may be held to demonstrate a
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continuity with late Israelite prophetic traditions. However, the call vision as a form of prophetic discourse was by no means confined to a late post-exilic milieu, and it is the purpose of this note to set out a number of examples where the author of the visions of Daniel appears to have made use of an earlier vision tradition which goes back, at least, to the account of Isaiah's call vision (Is. vi) 1).

It may be observed that the account of Daniel's visions, like that of the visions of Isaiah, begins with a date formula. In both cases the date is stated in terms of a significant regnal year of a particular monarch, for Isaiah it is the year of the death of king Uzziah (Is. vi 1), whereas for Daniel it is the first year of the reign of Belshazzar, king of Babylon (Dn. vii 1). It would, no doubt, be going too far if one were to attempt to discover some deep significance in the transformation of the relevant regnal year from the last to the first year of the sovereign's reign, but, in view of the parallels which will be adduced below, it may be considered not unlikely that a similar tradition lies behind the use of a regnal year of this order by the two authors. Their motivation appears to have been the desire to emphasize the importance of the visions which they report by placing them in particularly significant years. The use of this kind of date formula by the later author is particularly interesting since, in direct contrast to the relatively simple and straightforward account of the vision which one finds in Is. vi, he follows it with the baroque and rather grotesque description of his several visions, each introduced in similar manner by its own date formula (Dn. vii 1, viii 1, ix 1, x 1).

The use of such date formulae by the two authors might be considered of little consequence if there did not also exist a number of points of contact between the two traditions. The following connections seem to be particularly clear and significant:

(1) In Is. vi 5, the prophet confesses his own sin and the sin of his people with the words, "I am a man of unclean lips and I dwell among a people of unclean lips" 2). This statement is quite specific in its reference to "unclean lips", but the intention behind the words appears to be the confession of sin or guilt. Although there is no verbal correspondence, Daniel's activity in his long prayer (Dn. ix 4-19) is described by the visionary as "confessing my own sin and my people Israel's sin" (Dn. ix 20).

(2) In Dn. ix 23, Daniel is invited to "consider well the word, consider (wbbn, or, understand) the vision". At Is. vi 9, however, the prophet is instructed by the deity to proclaim, "You may listen and