

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php

On Daniel viii. 11, 12.

PROF. J. DYNELEY PRINCE.

NEW YORK.

11 וְעַד שָׂר הַצִּבְאָה הַגְּדִיל וּמִמֶּנּוּ הָרִים הַתְּמִיד הַשְּׂלֶכֶד מִכֵּן מִקְדָּשׁוֹ: 12 וְצִבְאָה
הִנָּחֵן עַל הַתְּמִיד בְּקִשְׁטֹת וְהַשְּׂלֶכֶד אָמַת אֲרָבָה וְעִשְׂתָּהּ הַצְּלִיחָה:

Verses ^{9, 10} describe the rise and the extent of the sway of the Little Horn, the symbol of Antiochus Epiphanes. In v.¹⁰ it is said that the Horn exalted itself 'even unto the host of heaven (*i.e.* the kingdom of the Israelitish saints), and felled to the earth some of the host and some of the stars and trampled on them.' In these two verses the fem. subject of the verb is unquestionably 'the Horn,' קָרְן אַחֲרֵת צִבְיָה.¹ In the interpretation of vs.^{11, 12}, however, we meet with three difficulties; viz.: 1. the unexpected transition to the masc. in the form הַגְּדִיל, the subject of which must be either the Horn or Antiochus Epiphanes directly. If it be supposed that Antiochus is referred to here directly, the form of the verb is of course correct; but 2. the sudden recurrence of the fem. forms in v.¹² without any repetition of the Horn as a subject (*cf.* הַצְּלִיחָה, עִשְׂתָּהּ, תְּשִׁלֵּךְ) seems to make this view untenable; 3. the construction of צִבְאָה as a fem. subject of תִּנְתֵּן. Nearly all the modern expositors disregard these changes of gender and make their translations on the unwarranted assumption that the author refers to Antiochus directly in the first instance in the masc., and that then, suddenly thinking of the Horn, he changes the gender of the verbs in the same sentence without any change of subject.² Such a confusion of gender, however, taken in connection with the two unexplained suffixes in מִמֶּנּוּ and מִקְדָּשׁוֹ, could only produce the greatest ambiguity and would certainly not have been permitted to stand by any author who had made the most cursory revision of his work. It must be concluded, therefore, that the text is corrupt; and in fact, that if the Masoretic

¹ So Bevan and Kamphausen for M. קָרְן אַחֲרֵת מִצְעִידָה.

² V. Lengerke, Hitzig, Behrmann, Kamphausen, etc. Bevan remarks that no plausible emendation has been as yet suggested.

text of this passage be allowed to remain unaltered, a satisfactory translation is impossible.

Little or no help can be obtained from the Versions. The text of both the LXX and © is in even a worse condition than that of M., so that we are practically left to our own devices to explain the difficulty.

I suggest the following emendation of the text and translation :

וְעַד שָׂר הַצֶּבֶא הַגִּדְלִיָּהּ וּמִמֶּנּוּ הָרֵם הַתָּמִיד הַיְשָׁלֵךְ מִכֶּן מִקִּדְשׁוֹ : הַצֶּבֶאָה נָתַן
עַל הַתָּמִיד בְּקִשְׁעַת וְתִשְׁלַךְ אֶמֶת אֶרְצָה וְקִשְׁתָּהּ וְהִצְלִיחָה :

And even unto the Prince of the Host (Jhvh) it (fem., the Horn) exalted itself, and from Him (Jhvh) was taken away the daily offering, and the place of His (Jhvh's) Sanctuary was cast down. And its (the Horn's) host was appointed against the daily sacrifice by reason of iniquity, and it (the Horn) will cast down truth to earth and will undertake and carry out successfully.

We thus have צֶבֶא used in two senses in vs.^{11, 12}. In v.¹¹ it is the host of Israel, God's host, against which the Horn exalts itself. In v.¹² the author, wishing to emphasize the fact that the Antiochan persecution against Israel was permitted by Jhvh as a necessary chastisement, states that, owing to Israel's wickedness, the Horn's host was imposed upon her as a penalty, to be especially operative against the daily offering. The fem. suffix הַיְשָׁלֵךְ relieves the ambiguity of צֶבֶא and brings out the contrast between the צֶבֶא of Israel and the צֶבֶא of Antiochus.⁶

Hitzig and Ewald also regard צֶבֶא in v.¹² as an allusion to the Horn's host, but fail to make the reference intelligible by means of a suffix, as they retain the Niph. תִּנְתֵּן, unwarrantably construing צֶבֶא as a feminine.

⁶ הַגִּדְלִיָּהּ adding הַיְשָׁלֵךְ, accidentally omitted before הַיְשָׁלֵךְ. So also Gall.

⁴ הָרֵם following *Qrē*.

⁵ הַצֶּבֶאָה תִּנְתֵּן for הַצֶּבֶאָה תִּנְתֵּן, changing תִּנְתֵּן to תִּנְתֵּן and construing the latter as a suffix referring to קָרַן. For תִּנְתֵּן עַל in the sense 'impose as a penalty' (also Ewald), cf. 2 Ki. 18¹⁶ Jon. 1¹⁴ Ezek. 7³.

⁶ None of Professor Moore's emendations in JBI. xv. seem necessary. The text of these verses can be explained without such radical alterations.