AUSTRALIAN BIBLICAL REVIEW

December 1959

PRICE: TEN SHILLINGS

Egypt—Isa. xix. 2 is an apt summary of the Egyptian situation.
. . . "Egyptians against Egyptians . . . every one against
his brother and everyone against his neighbour; city against city
and kingdom against kingdom"—the course of fraternization with
Egypt was a popular one with the rulers of Palestine.

That Egypt's legendary greatness was unable to protect Pales-
tine, Assyria was willing to demonstrate any number of times, as
the cities of Syria-Palestine-Gaza, Ekron, Tyre[4] were to discover
to their cost. Hoshea of Israel allowed hopes of Egyptian assist-
ance to induce him to shake off Assyrian suzerainty and so caused
the downfall of his kingdom, while Judah, unwilling to learn from
this object lesson, allowed the phenomenal rise of the Ethiopian
XXVth dynasty to entice her into joining some of the maritime
Palestinian states in a revolt against Assyria. Such hopes of
Egyptian assistance were false. Egypt refused to move to save
Israel from Shalmaneser and Sargon, while in 701 B.C. when
Sennacherib first attacked Jerusalem (II Kings xviii. 13-xix. 8)[5]
the Egyptian army coming to the assistance of Palestine was
thoroughly beaten at the battle of Eltekeh.[6]

Further Egypto-Judaean plotting led to more reprisals in the
form of another attack on Judah under Sennacherib[5] (II kings
xix. 9-36), while Assyrian armies marched through Palestine and
Egyptian territory under Esarhaddon and Asshurbanipal.[7] Thebes,
the Egyptian capital, was sacked so effectively in 663 B.C. that
the destruction was remembered and used by the prophet Nahum
when, almost forty years later, he was prophesying the overthrow
of Nineveh (Nahum iii. 8, 10).

That it takes more than the mere sack of a city to scotch a
legend is amply illustrated by the fact that during the last days
of the kingdom of Judah the 'Lachish letters'[8] reveal negotiations
with Egypt on the eve of the Babylonian conquest!

MARY NEELY.

4. Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia,* I, pp. 292-3
(Gaza), II, pp. 142-3 (Ekron), and p. 61 (Tyre).
5. See Albright *B.A.S.O.R.* No. 130, pp. 8-11, and No. 141, pp. 25-6
(footnote) for discussion.
6. *ARA & B,* II, pp. 119-120.
7. *ARA & B,* II, pp. 227, 293, 295.
8. Pritchard, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts,* p. 322 (especially ostracon III).

A NOTE ON DANIEL i. 3

In his Commentary on Daniel, Charles has the following to say :[1]
"The Children (of the exile of) Israel, both of the seed royal
and of the nobles.

"The phrase *children of Israel* has a wider significance than the
phrase *children of Judah* in v. 7[2] . . . our author seems to
have believed that the king limited his choice of pages to captives
of the tribe of Judah".

Thus Charles has introduced the word *gōlat* after *benē* of the
M.T. This reading has the support of Theodotion who reads
τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας. LXX reads τῶν μεγιστάνων, which might con-
ceivably be taken to support the emendation[3]. Both Peshitta and
Vulgate read as M.T. It would seem that an emendation without
the direct support of any of the other versions must be questioned.

The significant point of the comment, however, is that Charles
says that the verse means that some of the seed royal and some of
the nobles of the Israelites were taken. This means that the king
took only Israelites as servants, and these Israelites were men-
tioned under an inclusive category and then under two separate
heads, of which the second is the word *partᵉmim*. This is con-
nected with the Old Persian *fratma* meaning *first* and is found
twice elsewhere, Esther i. 3 and vi. 9, where it is used of Persian
nobles. Thus there is an initial improbability of its being used in
an isolated instance of Jewish nobles. However, it is possible to
maintain that the book is of late date, and the word had passed
into the normal prose usage of the time,[4] although it is more likely
that the author or editor used it to add local colour, unconscious
of the anachronism.

In some MSS. of M.T. we find the copula before *seed royal*
omitted.[5] This invalidates Charles' translation and makes his general
theory less probable.

1. R. H. Charles: *Commentary on Daniel* (Oxford 1929), p. 12.
2. The verse number "7" appears to be a misprint in Charles.
3. i.e. One might surmise that the most important people were those most
likely to be carried into exile.
4. It is to be noted that this is made unlikely by the fact that the word
does not appear anywhere else in late Biblical prose other than in the
passages in Esther quoted above.
5. C. Ginsburg: *The Writings* (Lond. 1926), quotes Add. 15451, Add.
15252 as well as a number of early printed editions.

Nevertheless it is of some profit to examine the use of
...ו ...ו meaning *both . . . and . . . .* Charles says, "Both
. . . and . . . So ...ו ...ו are to be translated in 8. *13,*
Gen. 34. 28, Josh. 9. 23, Jer. 32. 20".[6]

In Dan. viii. 13 Charles himself excises one of the three terms
from the text,[7] and so it would not seem to be a good criterion
of normal Biblical usage, even in his own eyes. Let us look
then at Josh. ix. 23. ...לא יכרת מהם עבד וחטבי עצים ושאבי מים
Here indeed the general term עבד is followed by two particular
terms חטבי עצים and שאבי מים and these two terms are joined
by a copula. Thus we can translate "both hewers of wood and
drawers of water . . ."

The next verse quoted is Gen. xxxiv. 28. Here we have a list
of three items את צאנם ואת בקרם ואת חמריהם. צאנם can scarcely
include either בקרם or חמריהם. Rather is this a list of three
items, each joined to the one that precedes it by the copula, "their
sheep *and* their cattle *and* their asses". A similar situation obtains
in the verse of Jeremiah[8] where the sense will not permit any
other interpretation. Thus of the cases quoted by Charles only
one will stand as an example of this usage. The Genesis and
Jeremiah examples are unambiguous, not only because of their
sense, but because the parallel grammatical position of each of the
elements is indicated. Thus *eth* is before each item in the former,
and *b-* before each item in the latter, list. If we had a similar indi-
cation in the Joshua list this might well be the situation there.
In our text, too, מן is found before each of the items, and they
are joined to one another by the copula. Thus the position is iden-
tical with that of the Genesis list. On this basis Charles' proposition
seems less convincing.

The ambiguity of the Hebrew is maintained in the ancient ver-
sions, while both the A.V. and the J.P.S. English versions regard
them as three classes. Thus it would seem that on the linguistic
evidence, and with regard to the ancient versions, while no definite
conclusion can be reached, the weight of evidence is for the inter-
pretation of the list as being composed of three separate items.

This is supported by examination of the phrase *children of
Judah* in *v.* 6 which Charles sees as a specific reference to the
Judahites. The commentaries of Sa'adia Gaon and Mesudath David,

6. *Commentary on Daniel,* p. 12. He has to translate thus to make his
point.
7. *Ibid.,* p. 211.
8. Jer. xxxii. 20.

both say that this means the royal house of Judah, which has no
support from other places. Ibn Ezra says that they were Judahites
as opposed to Benjaminites. This is a possible meaning of the
phrase as in Neh. xi. 3-4 and I Chron. ix. 3, of later Biblical books,
but in these places the phrase *children of Benjamin* is always found
as well.

The use of *children of Judah* meaning *the Jews* is found in
II Chron. xxv. 12 and in the prophets. The use in Dan. ii. 25 would
also tend to support this view although it is not conclusive. If we
accept the polemical theory of the writing of the book suggested by
Professor Segal[9] then why should the Jews (presumably of Ben-
jamin) who did not concern themselves with the dietary laws, not
be mentioned?

Thus if, against Charles, we say that *v.* 3 indicates that Daniel
and his group were the only Jews at the court of Nebuchadnezzar,
then the author's point, which is their uncompromising loyalty to
the Torah even in times of stress, is made more forcefully. If we
take the position of either Ibn Ezra or Charles then why do we
hear no word of the observance or the non-observance of these
other Jews? The author wants to point out that the observance of
the Torah had its reward and non-observance its punishment. Yet
there is no punishment revealed as befalling the non-observant.

So we can see that the interpretation of *children of Judah* as
synonymous with the Jews clarifies the author's main point, and
it is significant that nowhere else does he mention any other Jews
at the court. It follows from this, then, that as other factors are
equal, the *children of Judah* from whom Daniel and his com-
panions were picked, and the *children of Israel* in *v.* 3, were the
same people, that is, all the Jews. Thus Daniel and his companions
were the only Jews at court and the *seed royal* and *nobles* were
non-Israelites. Charles' interpretation of *v.* 3 is permissible, although
doubtful, on textual grounds; on the basis of the internal consist-
ency of the chapter, and indeed of the book as a whole, it must be
rejected.[10]

MICHAEL STONE

9. מבוא המקרא Vol. 3, p. 178.
10. If we accept this interpretation then the emendation suggested by
Charles (p. 8) to v. 2 will not stand. He suggests the insertion of זרע
המלוכה והפרתמים after ומקצת . It is outside the scope of this note to
discuss this in detail, but either the text of the emendation will have to be
changed or, as it is based on a haplography, if the sense of v. 3 is not what
Charles thought it to be, then the basis for the emendation is lost.