

## Daniel viii. 9-14.

PROF. G. F. MOORE.

ANDOVER, MASS.

IN vs. 10 we read : "And it (the horn) waxed great, even to the host of heaven ; and it cast to the earth some of the host and of the stars, and trampled on them." The interpretation which has obtained, almost without dissent, from the earliest commentators to our own time is, that the *host of heaven* here symbolizes the Jews, as the people of God ; and that, by the casting down of some of the host and trampling on them, the religious persecution of the Jews by Antiochus Epiphanes is meant.<sup>1</sup> No distinction is intended between *the host* and *the stars* ; most modern scholars take the conjunction explicatively, *even* the stars.<sup>2</sup>

That the *host of heaven* should stand in this way for the Jewish people is strange, even in the symbolism of these visions, and without any parallel in the Old Testament.<sup>3</sup> But the decisive argument against this interpretation seems to me to be found in the following verses. In vs. 11 f. the horn in its pitch of pride attacks even the ruler of the host. Here *שׂר הַצְּבָא*, as most interpreters have rightly felt, cannot be the head of the Jewish people ;<sup>4</sup> it is God himself. The analogy of *יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת*, and the author's predilection for such titles as God of Heaven, Lord of Heaven, King of Heaven, show

<sup>1</sup> So, with differences in details which need not be discussed here, Ephrem (specifically, *the priesthood*), Polychronius, Jerome, Theodoret. This is also the Jewish exegesis, the earliest witness to which is perhaps the Targ. Isa. xiv. 13; see Rashi, Aben Ezra, *al*.

<sup>2</sup> Chr. B. Michaelis.

<sup>3</sup> It is quite a different thing when it is promised that the descendants of Abraham shall be as (numerous as) the stars (Gen. xxii. 17, adduced by Jewish commentators); or when it is said that wise and good men shall shine as the stars forever (Dan. xii. 3; cf. Enoch civ. 2; Matt. xiii. 43).

<sup>4</sup> Ephrem, consistently with his interpretation of vs. 10, the High Priest, Onias III. So also Grotius, Houbigant; cf. Gall. According to Polychronius, the angel set over the Jewish people; so also Aben Ezra (Michael).

that the name is not equivalent to 'the Divine Ruler of the Jewish people';<sup>5</sup> but signifies 'the God who does according to his will in the host of heaven,' as among the inhabitants of the earth (iv. 32); the Supreme Ruler (שׂר שׂרים, vs. 25). The *host of heaven* in vs. 10 are, therefore, as elsewhere, the heavenly bodies, especially as the objects of heathen worship, and as the celestial rulers of the heathen world.<sup>6</sup>

The full significance and climactic force of the passage comes to light when we understand it thus. Antiochus extends his empire by conquest toward the South (Egypt) and the East (Media and Persia); he makes war, not only on kingdoms and nations, but on their religions, and actually overthrows some of their gods; he even dares to attack the Supreme God, to profane his altar and inhibit his worship. This interpretation is sustained by the parallel passage, xi. 36 ff., where we read that Antiochus, in his arrogance, exalted himself against every god, and uttered monstrous things against the God of gods; that he had no regard for the god of his fathers, or for the great goddess, or for any other deity, but exalted himself against all; and that he was devoted to the worship of some new and foreign divinity. In 1 Mac. i. 41 f. the suppression of the religion of the Jews is represented as part of the general imperial policy. The king issued a decree to all his empire, that all should be one people, and each nation should give up its distinctive religious institutions (νόμματα).<sup>7</sup> According to some reports the death of Antiochus was the direct or indirect consequence of a sacrilegious attack upon the temple of the goddess Nanaea in Elymais.<sup>8</sup>

This explanation is not at variance with vs. 23 ff. Unlike the preceding verses, 20–22, which are explicit enough, this part of the interpretation of the vision is somewhat enigmatical, and the obscurity is enhanced by the palpable corruption of the text. But the most natural exegesis is that which refers שׂר שׂרים, vs. 24, to the powerful Gentile nations or rulers which Antiochus conquered, in distinction from "the holy people"; here also the climax is the attack on the Supreme Ruler (שׂר שׂרים). The crimes of Antiochus against religion are

<sup>5</sup> Theodoret.

<sup>6</sup> See Isa. xxiv. 21 ff.; Enoch lxxx. ff.; cf. also Deut. iv. 19, xxxii. 8. This was the oldest interpretation of the verse, if we may judge from the translation of the LXX. and the allusion in 2 Mac. ix. 10. In modern times it has been maintained by Smend, *Z.A.T.W.* iv. 201, *Alltestamentliche Religionsgeschichte*, p. 395.

<sup>7</sup> See also i. 51, ii. 19.

<sup>8</sup> 1 Mac. vi. 1 ff.; Polybius, xxxi. 11 (cf. Fl. Jos. *Antt.* xii. 9, 1); 2 Mac. i. 13.

not emphasized in vs. 23-25 as they are in the vision; but the accord is otherwise complete.

At the beginning of vs. 12 the word **צבא** creates insuperable difficulties. Its gender forbids us to take it as the subject of the verb; yet no other construction is possible. Nor should we gain much if we were bold enough to ignore the grammatical discord, or to bring the verb into agreement. For after the repeated use of the word in vs. 10 f. (**שר הצבא, צבא השמים, הצבא**), it is only a desperate exegesis which can ascribe to **צבא** in vs. 12 a wholly different signification, whether 'military force' or 'priestly service.'<sup>9</sup> Even thus, commentators have been unable to make sense of the passage, as a glance at the various renderings proposed suffices to show. The most recent interpreters therefore give up the verse as incurably corrupt.<sup>10</sup> Neither LXX. nor Theod. renders the word; and Bertholdt (1808) cancelled it as an accidental intruder. At the end of vs. 13 **צבא** is grammatically unobjectionable, but the exegetical difficulty is the same as in vs. 12; here also it is not found in LXX.<sup>11</sup> The conjecture may perhaps be hazarded that in both places the word was originally written **וצבני**, and intended as a gloss to the preceding, **קדש, מקדש, מקדש**. Thus in vs. 11: *and overthrew the seat of his sanctuary* [and the delectable *sc.* land];<sup>12</sup> in vs. 13: *How long shall . . . the holy place* [and delectable land] *be trodden under foot?*<sup>13</sup> After the repetition of **צבא** in vs. 10, a scribe might very easily write **וצבא** instead of **וצבני** at the end of vs. 12; vs. 13 would then be conformed.<sup>14</sup>

In vs. 11 the masc. gender of the verbs would not in itself give us any difficulty; we might say that the author was thinking, not of the symbol (**קדש** fem.), but of the thing symbolized, Antiochus himself; but we should not expect him to fall back into the feminine again, as our text does in vs. 12. The tense of **והשליך** is more serious; for the proper sequence is otherwise preserved.<sup>15</sup> If the verse be

<sup>9</sup> This difficulty may not be removed by attributing a 'double sense' to **צבא** in vs. 10 f., as even Bevan, following older commentators, feels constrained to do.

<sup>10</sup> Bevan; Marti, in Kautzsch, *A. T.*

<sup>11</sup> What Hebrew word, if any, is represented in both these places by LXX. *ἐρημώθησεται* does not appear.

<sup>12</sup> See vs. 9 end; xi. 41, 45; Jer. iii. 19; Ezek. xx. 6, etc.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. 1 Mac. ii. 12, τὰ ἅγια ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ κάλλιστή ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ δόξα ἡμῶν ἡρημώθη. Smend thinks that **וצבני** is genuine in vs. 13.

<sup>14</sup> The Heb. manuscript from which Theod. translated had the same error at the end of vs. 9: *πρὸς τὴν δύναμιν* is **אל הצבא**. See also Vg. *contra fortitudinem*.

<sup>15</sup> See Driver, *Tenser*, p. 162.

genuine, as both the sequel and the interpretation in vs. 24-26 seem to imply, we must make bold to read **וַתִּשְׁלַךְ הַרְיָמָה הַגְּדִילָה**.<sup>16</sup>

In vs. 12, since we cannot, with LXX. and Theod., make **פָּשַׁע** (masc.) subject of **תִּנְתֵּן**, and this verb would naturally have the same subject as those before it in vs. 11 and **וַתִּשְׁלַךְ** in vs. 12<sup>b</sup>, we are led to emend, **וַתִּתֵּן עַל הַתְּמִיד הַפָּשַׁע**,<sup>17</sup> and it (*the horn*) put on the daily sacrifice the Iniquity. The reference is to the altar of Jupiter which Antiochus erected on the great altar of burnt-offering in the temple in Jerusalem, on which, instead of the daily sacrifice to Yahwè (*הַתְּמִיד*), he offered sacrifice to the heathen deity. Vs. 13 (**הַפָּשַׁע שָׁמַם**) shows that *the Iniquity* is the same which elsewhere is called *the Abomination* (**שָׁקוץ שָׁמַם**, etc.), that is, the altar or cult of Jupiter.<sup>18</sup> The perfects at the end of the verse, **וְהִצְלִיחָה וְהִצְלִיחָה**, cannot well be either future<sup>19</sup> or frequentative. It may perhaps be suspected that the words have been repeated here from vs. 24 f.

In vs. 13 it is necessary to supply after **וְהִצְלִיחָה**,<sup>20</sup> or better **וְהִסָּר**, as in xii. 11; cf. LXX. Theod., *ἡ ἀφθεῖσα*.<sup>21</sup> The clauses are in apposition to **הַחֲזוֹן**: *For how long is the vision — the taking away of the daily sacrifice, and the setting up of the Desolating Iniquity, and the trampling under foot of the Holy Place?* The position of the infinitives is unusual, but not impossible; compare Jer. x. 13, **לִקְרַל תִּתֵּן**.<sup>22</sup> It is possible that all after **וְהִצְלִיחָה** may be a gloss from xii. 11; in which case there would be even less reason to stumble at the construction.<sup>23</sup> The use of infinitives in such a parenthetical recapitulation is less difficult to explain than the participles which many critics (following LXX. Theod.) would substitute for them.

<sup>16</sup> See Vg., Syr. The passive pronunciation of the verbs in M. T. may have been occasioned by the discord in gender.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. **וַתִּתֵּן עַל הַתְּמִיד הַפָּשַׁע**. Kampschusen tries to save **צָבֵא** at the beginning of the verse by reading, **עַל הַתְּמִיד בַּפָּשַׁע**.

<sup>18</sup> See ix. 27, xi. 31, xii. 11.

<sup>19</sup> These perf. led to the punctuation **וַתִּשְׁלַךְ** in a future sense (cf. Vg.); see Driver, *Tenses*, p. 216.

<sup>20</sup> Graetz; cf. **וְהִסָּר** vs. 11.

<sup>21</sup> Bevan emends, **מִיָּדָה**; see also Kautzsch, *A.T.*: but this involves further changes in the text which seem to me unnecessary.

<sup>22</sup> Cited by Hitzig; see also Ewald, *L.B.* § 307 *b*.

<sup>23</sup> The parallel to xii. 11 — whether viii. 13 is a gloss or not — prevents our adopting the conjecture of Bevan: **וְהִצְלִיחָה וְהִצְלִיחָה עַל הַתְּמִיד מִיָּדָה וְהִצְלִיחָה עַל הַתְּמִיד מִיָּדָה**. Gall emends, **וְהִצְלִיחָה עַל הַתְּמִיד מִיָּדָה**.

A tentative reconstruction of the whole passage is as follows :

9 וּמִן הָאֵחָת מִזֶּהן <sup>24</sup> יִצְאָה <sup>25</sup> קִרְן אַחֲרַת צְעִירָה <sup>26</sup> וְתִגְדֵּל יִתֵּר <sup>27</sup> אֶל הַגִּבּוֹ וְאֶל  
הַמִּזְרָח <sup>28</sup> 10 וְתִגְדֵּל עַד צִבְאֵי הַשָּׁמַיִם וְתִפֹּל אֶרְצָהּ מִן הַצִּבְאוֹ וּמִן הַכּוֹכָבִים <sup>29</sup> וְתִרְמַסֵּם  
11 וְעַד שֶׁר הַצִּבְאוֹ הַגְּדִילָה <sup>30</sup> וּמִמֶּנּוּ הִרְיָמָה <sup>31</sup> הַתְּמִיד וְתִשְׁלַךְ <sup>32</sup> מִכֶּהן מִקְדָּשׁוֹ <sup>33</sup>  
12 וְתִתֵּן <sup>34</sup> עַל הַתְּמִיד הַפֶּשַׁע <sup>35</sup> וְתִשְׁלַךְ <sup>36</sup> אֶמֶת אֶרְצָהּ וְעִשְׂתָּהּ הַצְּלִיחָה <sup>37</sup> 13 וְאִשְׁמַעְתָּ  
אֶחָד קְדוֹשׁ מִדְּבַר וְיֹאמֶר לְפִלְמוֹנִי <sup>38</sup> עַד מָתִי הַחֹזֵן הַתְּמִיד הַיּוֹסֵר <sup>39</sup> הַפֶּשַׁע שִׁמְמֵם <sup>40</sup>  
תַּת וְקִדְשׁ <sup>41</sup> מִרְמָם 14 וְיֹאמֶר אֱלֹהִי <sup>42</sup> תֵּר

קִרְן אַחֲת <sup>24</sup> H. מִרְמָם. <sup>25</sup> H. יִצְאָה. <sup>26</sup> קִרְן אַחֲרַת צְעִירָה. Bevan, cf. vii. 8: H. אַחֲת אֵחָת. <sup>27</sup> מִצְעִירָה. Graetz conj. קִרְן אַחֲת צְעִירָה. cf. Vg. Syr. LXX. Theod. *λεχυρῶν* = טַעֲמוֹהָ. <sup>28</sup> LXX. *καὶ ἐπὶ ἀράξην* = וְתִתֵּן. <sup>29</sup> So Syr. Theod. cu. Ald.: H. וְאֶל הַצִּבְאוֹ + וְאֶל, perh. gloss from xi. 41. LXX. *καὶ ἐπὶ βροχῶν* = וְאֶל הַצִּבְאוֹן, adopted by Graetz. Theod. *καὶ πρὸς ἡὺδ δύναμιν*, Vg. *contra fortitudinem* = וְאֶל הַצִּבְאוֹ. Q cu. Compl. Chrysost. Arab. *πρὸς ἡὺδ δύναμιν*. <sup>30</sup> H. הַגְּדִילָה. <sup>31</sup> Vg. Syr.: H. הִרְיָמָה, M. הִרְיָם. <sup>32</sup> Vg. Syr.: וְתִשְׁלַךְ. <sup>33</sup> H. הַתְּמִיד. <sup>34</sup> H. + תִּתֵּן, erroneously joined in M to the following verse: < LXX. Theod., prob. originally as gloss to preceding; cf. vs. 9, 13. <sup>35</sup> H. הַפֶּשַׁע. <sup>36</sup> LXX. *αὶ ἀμαρτίας* Theod. *ἀμαρτία*: H. בַּפֶּשַׁע. <sup>37</sup> תִּתֵּן. <sup>38</sup> Vg. Syr.: וְיֹאמֶר. <sup>39</sup> H. אֶחָד קְדוֹשׁ מִדְּבַר וְיֹאמֶר. <sup>40</sup> H. שִׁמְמֵם. <sup>41</sup> H. מִרְמָם. <sup>42</sup> H. אֱלֹהִי. LXX. Theod. *ἡ ἀρθείρα*, cf. xii. 11: > H. Graetz conj. הַיּוֹסֵר, Bevan הַיּוֹסֵר. Cf. xii. 11. <sup>41</sup> H. + וְיֹאמֶר. > LXX. <sup>42</sup> LXX. Theod. Vg. Syr.: H. אֱלֹהִי.