

## On Daniel viii. 11, 12.

PROF. J. DYNELEY PRINCE.

NEW YORK.

11 וְעַד שָׂר הַצִּבְאָה הַגְּדִיל וּמִמֶּנּוּ הָרִים הַתְּמִיד הַשְּׂלֶכֶד מִסֶּחַן מִקְדָּשׁוֹ: 12 וְצִבְאָה  
הִנָּחֵן עַל הַתְּמִיד בְּקִשְׁטֵה וְהַשְּׂלֶכֶד אִמְתָּ אֲרָגָה וְעִשְׂתָּהּ הַצְּלִיחָה:

Verses <sup>9, 10</sup> describe the rise and the extent of the sway of the Little Horn, the symbol of Antiochus Epiphanes. In v.<sup>10</sup> 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,' קֶרֶן אַחֲרַת צִיבְרָה.<sup>1</sup> In the interpretation of vs.<sup>11, 12</sup>, 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.<sup>12</sup> without any repetition of the Horn as a subject (*cf.* הַצְּלִיחָה, עִשְׂתָּהּ, תְּשַׁלֵּךְ) 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.<sup>2</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup> So Bevan and Kamphausen for M. קֶרֶן אַחֲרַת צִיבְרָה.

<sup>2</sup> 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 הַצִּבְּאָה הַגְּדִילָה וּמִמֶּנּוּ הָרָם הַתָּמִיד הַיְשָׁלֵךְ מִכֶּן מִקִּדְשׁוֹ : וַיִּצְבְּאָה נָתַן  
עַל הַתָּמִיד בְּקִשְׁעוֹ וַתִּשְׁלַךְ אֶמֶת אֶרְצָה וְקִשְׁתָּהּ וַיַּצְלִיחָה :

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 צבאה used in two senses in vs.<sup>11, 12</sup>. In v.<sup>11</sup> it is the host of Israel, God's host, against which the Horn exalts itself. In v.<sup>12</sup> 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 צבאה and brings out the contrast between the צבאה of Israel and the צבאה of Antiochus.<sup>6</sup>

Hitzig and Ewald also regard צבאה in v.<sup>12</sup> 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. תנתן, unwarrantably construing צבאה as a feminine.

<sup>6</sup> הגדילה adding ה, accidentally omitted before ו. So also Gall.

<sup>4</sup> הרם following Q<sup>rs</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> יצבאה תנתן for יצבאה נתן, changing ת to ה and construing the latter as a suffix referring to קרן. For נתן על in the sense 'impose as a penalty' (also Ewald), cf. 2 Ki. 18<sup>16</sup> Jon. 1<sup>14</sup> Ezek. 7<sup>3</sup>.

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