Four Inner-Biblical Interpretations of Genesis 49:10: On the Lexical and Syntactic Ambiguities of עַד as Reflected in the Prophecies of Nathan, Ahijah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah

RICHARD C. STEINER
rsteiner@yu.edu
Bernard Revel Graduate School, Yeshiva University, New York, NY 10033

The lexical and syntactic ambiguities of the word עַד in Gen 49:10, the third verse of Jacob's blessing to Judah, have helped to make that verse one of the most difficult cruxes in the Hebrew Bible. Ancient and medieval interpreters of the verse took עַד as equivalent to English (1) "ever" (in the phrase "not ever"), (2) "forever" (in the phrase "not forever"), (3) "until" (indicating a point of cessation), and/or (4) "until (not to mention after)" (indicating a point of culmination). These four interpretations of עַד correspond to three different ways of bracketing the word with the neighboring words in the verse. Two of the interpretations are joined together in an ancient double interpretation of עַד that is reflected in *Targum Onqelos* and possibly also in 4Q252 (4QCommGen A) and the *Testament of Judah*.

These ambiguities did not go unnoticed in the biblical period. During the course of that period, they gave rise to a number of distinct interpretations of the oracle, interpretations that are reflected in the prophecies of Nathan, Ahijah the Shilonite, Ezekiel, and Zechariah. Each interpretation corresponded to a different historical development: the rise of the Davidic dynasty in the time of Nathan; the decline of the Davidic dynasty in the time of Ahijah; the fall of the Davidic dynasty in the time of Ezekiel; and the limited renewal of Davidic leadership in the time of Zechariah. Thus, they allowed the oracle to adapt to the changing fortunes of the House of David, making it possible for each generation to adopt an interpretation that was suited to its own time.

לֹא־יָסוּר שֵׁבֶט מִיהוּדָה וּמְחֹקֵק מִבֵּין רַגְלָיו עַד כִּי־יָבֹא שִׁילֹה וְלוֹ יִקְהַת עַמִּים
(Gen 49:10)

Menasseh Ben Israel, often said to be the teacher of Benedict Spinoza, begins his discussion of Gen 49:10 with the following reflection:

> Ambiguities [*los equivocos*] have really caused great mischief and controversy in the world, and as there are in the Law many ambiguous [*ambiguas*] and equivocal [*equivocas*] words that admit in themselves of different interpretations, so as to involve various mysteries, they often cause doubt and lead into error. This is clearly seen in the first verse [Gen 49:10].[1]

He then proceeds to show that almost every word in Gen 49:10 is ambiguous.

Some scholars believe that the ambiguity of Gen 49:10 was discussed already by Josephus:

> Josephus applied this verse to Vespasian when he predicted that the Roman general would be proclaimed emperor in Judea, although, as he himself pointed out, the Jews interpreted "an ambiguous oracle . . . found in their sacred scriptures to the effect that . . . one from their country would become ruler of the world" [*Bell.* VI, 5, 4 (312f); *ibid.* III, 8, 9 (400ff.)]. This is confirmed by Tacitus (*Hist.* I, 10; V, 13), Suetonius (*Vesp.* 4–5) and Dio Cassius (*Epitome* LXVI: 1)—proof that the Shilo prophecy as interpreted by Josephus was included among the *omina imperii* of the Flavian dynasty.[2]

It should be noted, however, that this identification of Josephus's "ambiguous oracle" (χρησμὸς ἀμφίβολος) is only one of many that have been proposed. And even if Josephus was alluding to our verse, the "ambiguity" that he had in mind was probably the one he manufactured to persuade Vespasian that the oracle applied to him.

In this article, I shall focus mainly on one of the ambiguous words discussed by Menasseh Ben Israel: עַד. The contribution of this word to the ambiguity of the verse goes well beyond the lexical ambiguity noted by Menasseh Ben Israel (*hasta,* "until," and *siempre,* "forever"),[3] for it is also at the heart of a three-way syntactic ambiguity. I shall attempt to show that recognition of this syntactic ambiguity is crucial for an understanding of the inner-biblical interpretations of Gen 49:10,

---

[1] Menasseh Ben Israel, *Conciliador o De la conveniencia de los Lugares de la S. Escriptura, que repugnantes entre si parecen* (4 vols. in 2; Francofurti: Auctoris impensis, 1632–51), 1:119. I have revised the translation from *The Conciliator of R. Manasseh Ben Israel: A Reconcilement of the Apparent Contradictions in Holy Scripture* (2 vols.; London: Duncan & Malcom, 1842), 1:93.

[2] *The Aramaic Bible: The Targums* (ed. Martin McNamara et al.; Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1987–), 6:163 n. 25; also in Moses Aberbach and Bernard Grossfeld, *Targum Onqelos on Genesis 49: Translation and Analytical Commentary* (Aramaic Studies 1; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976), 14 n. 24; and in eidem, *Targum Onkelos to Genesis: A Critical Analysis together with an English Translation of the Text* (Denver: Center for Judaic Studies, University of Denver, 1982), 286 n. 22.

[3] Menasseh Ben Israel, *Conciliador,* 1:120; *Conciliator,* 1:94.

interpretations reflected in the prophecies of Nathan, Ahijah the Shilonite, Ezekiel, and Zechariah:

Nathan:　　A. The scepter shall not depart from Judah . . . ever [עַד]; rather [כִּי] tribute shall come to him [שִׁי לֹה = שִׁי לֹה = שִׁילֹה שִׁי לֹה = יָבֹא שִׁילֹה]⁴ and the homage of peoples shall be his.

　　　　　　B. The rod [> the sword] shall not depart from Judah . . . ever [עַד] . . . .

Ahijah:　　The scepter shall not depart from Judah . . . forever [עַד]; rather [כִּי] tribute shall come to him and the homage of peoples shall be his.

Ezekiel:　　The scepter shall not depart from Judah . . . until [עַד; point of cessation] the coming of him [= Nebuchadnezzar] to whom tribute [> judgment] belongs and to whom the homage of peoples belongs.

Zechariah:　The scepter shall not depart from Judah . . . until (not to mention after) [עַד; point of culmination] the coming of him [= the Messiah] to whom tribute belongs and to whom the homage of peoples belongs.

In short, I shall argue that, far from causing mischief, the lexical and syntactic ambiguities of the oracle enabled it to adapt to the changing fortunes of the House of David. They allowed each generation to adopt an interpretation that was appropriate to its time.

　　Menasseh Ben Israel's discussion of the ambiguity of עַד is not original. As he himself makes clear, it rests on important insights of Jewish exegetes of the Middle Ages. Some of these insights were later to become part of the conventional wisdom of modern biblical scholarship,⁵ but others are virtually unknown today. It will, therefore, be useful to begin by citing some of the medieval discussions. Those discussions will make it possible for us to understand the less explicit ancient exegesis, both inner-biblical and postbiblical.

I. Three Bracketings of Genesis 49:10

　　In medieval exegesis of our verse, three syntactic analyses can be discerned. First of all, although most exegetes read עַד together with the following words, in

---

⁴For the history of this interpretation, which takes שִׁילֹה as a combination of two words (like וְאִילוֹ, "and woe unto him," in Qoh 4:10), and for שִׁי as a poetic form of שַׁי, "tribute," see Richard C. Steiner, "Poetic Forms in the Masoretic Vocalization and Three Difficult Phrases in Jacob's Blessing: יֶתֶר שְׂאֵת (Gen 49:3), יְצוּעִי עָלָה (Gen 49:4) and יָבֹא שִׁילֹה (Gen 49:10)," *JBL* 129 (2010): 219–26.

⁵See at nn. 12–13 below.

accordance with the masoretic accents, a few read it with what precedes, ignoring the accents. The two interpretations correspond to the following bracketings:

1. ‏[לֹא־יָסוּר שֵׁבֶט מִיהוּדָה וּמְחֹקֵק מִבֵּין רַגְלָיו], [עַד כִּי־יָבֹא שִׁילֹה וְלֹו יִקְהַת עַמִּים]‏

2. ‏[לֹא־יָסוּר שֵׁבֶט מִיהוּדָה וּמְחֹקֵק מִבֵּין רַגְלָיו עַד], [כִּי־יָבֹא שִׁילֹה וְלֹו יִקְהַת עַמִּים]‏

Bracketing 1 takes עַד to mean "until":

1. The scepter shall not depart from Judah . . . , until . . . .

Bracketing 2 takes עַד as equivalent to לְעַד, "to eternity, forever," and allows for two distinct interpretations:

2a. The scepter shall not depart from Judah . . . ever . . . .

2b. The scepter shall not depart from Judah . . . forever . . . . = If the scepter departs from Judah, it shall not do so forever . . . .

Some readers may prefer to think of this second ambiguity as an extension of the aforementioned lexical ambiguity, with עַד now having three relevant meanings: "until," "forever," and "ever." Such a formulation can make it easier to follow the discussion below, and I shall indeed use it for that purpose. Technically, however, it is more accurate to say that the difference between interpretations 2a and 2b is syntactic rather than lexical. It is a difference that will be familiar to those readers who have studied elementary logic. The collocation of a word meaning "not" with a word meaning "to eternity, forever" (i.e., "for all time," with an implicit universal quantifier) creates ambiguity, as seen in the following bracketings of the main clause:

2a. ‏[לֹא־יָסוּר שֵׁבֶט מִיהוּדָה וּמְחֹקֵק מִבֵּין רַגְלָיו] [עַד]‏

2b. ‏[לֹא]־[יָסוּר שֵׁבֶט מִיהוּדָה וּמְחֹקֵק מִבֵּין רַגְלָיו עַד]‏

2a. [The scepter shall not depart (= shall avoid departing) from Judah . . .] [forever] = The scepter shall not depart from Judah . . . ever.

2b. [It is not the case that] [the scepter shall depart from Judah . . . forever] = If the scepter departs from Judah . . . , it shall not do so forever.

It will be noted that עַד is rendered as "forever" in *both* of these translations; the difference between them is purely syntactic. In bracketing 2a, "not" has narrow scope (modifying "shall depart"), while "forever" has wide scope (modifying "shall not depart"); in bracketing 2b, "forever" has narrow scope (modifying "shall depart"), while "not" has wide scope (modifying "shall depart forever").[6] Put dif-

---

[6] Cf. the scope ambiguity of Shakespeare's "All that glisters is not gold," discussed by Willard Van Orman Quine, *Word and Object* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1960), 139. According to Quine, Shakespeare intended "not" to be "an outside operator governing the whole"; we may paraphrase this interpretation as "it is not the case that each thing that glisters [= glitters] is gold."

ferently, in bracketing 2a the meaning is "forever not," while in bracketing 2b the meaning is "not forever." The illusion of lexical ambiguity is created by the fact that, in English, "forever not" is semantically equivalent to "not ever" and "never."[7]

Bracketing 1

Bracketing 1 ("shall not depart until") is the one aligned with the masoretic accents (since the *etnaḥ* is under the word that *precedes* עַד) and the one assumed by most medieval and modern exegetes. Thanks to the importance of our verse in Jewish–Christian polemics,[8] the precise nuance of עַד in this interpretation has been the subject of discussion since the Middle Ages. In the twelfth century, Abraham Ibn Ezra argued that it does not imply the cessation of Judah's dominion at the time specified.[9] In the thirteenth century, Solomon b. Abraham Ibn Adret (henceforth: Rashba) asserted that "the word עַד does not (always) indicate cessation of a thing from some point on; rather, at times it promises that a thing will occur (until the specified point) and, *a fortiori*, continue thereafter."[10] This certainly applies to one of the examples he cites: לֹא־יִתְיַצֵּב אִישׁ בְּפָנֶיךָ עַד הִשְׁמִדְךָ אֹתָם, "no man shall stand up to you (at any point), until (not to mention after) you destroy them" (Deut 7:24). The same goes for לֹא יִירָא עַד אֲשֶׁר־יִרְאֶה בְצָרָיו, "(he trusts in the Lord . . .) he will not be afraid (at any point), until (not to mention after) he sees the downfall of his enemies" (Ps 112:8). In both of these cases, God's (negative) promise expires only in the sense that it becomes superfluous at the time specified by the עַד-phrase. Put differently, עַד is sometimes used to indicate a point of culmination rather than a point of cessation.[11]

Contrast the Wikipedia article entitled "All that glitters is not gold": "[F]ool's gold . . . reflects substantially more light than authentic gold does. Gold in its raw form appears dull and does not glitter." This explanation assumes that Shakespeare meant: "Anything that glitters (in its raw form) is perforce not gold."

[7] For a similar illusion of lexical ambiguity, involving allegedly disjunctive -וֹ, see Richard C. Steiner, "Does the Biblical Hebrew Conjunction -ו Have Many Meanings, One Meaning, or No Meaning At All?" *JBL* 119 (2000): 261–63.

[8] See, e.g., David Berger, *The Jewish–Christian Debate in the High Middle Ages: A Critical Edition of the Niẓẓaḥon Vetus with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (Judaica, Texts and Translations 4; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1979), 315; and Robert Chazan, *Barcelona and Beyond: The Disputation of 1263 and Its Aftermath* (Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992), 61, 105–8, 113, 151.

[9] See his two commentaries on this verse in מקראות גדולות הכתר (ed. Menachem Cohen; Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 1992–).

[10] שאלות ותשובות הרשב״א (Piotrków, 1883), 4:53 col. 1 last 2 lines (#187). For discussion, see Robert Chazan, *Daggers of Faith: Thirteenth-Century Christian Missionizing and Jewish Response* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 143. Chazan asserts that Rashba "breaks with the general pattern of explication of this key verse that we have encountered thus far," an assertion that seems to overlook Ibn Ezra's exegesis.

[11] This is particularly clear in וַיְהִי חָלְיוֹ חָזָק מְאֹד עַד אֲשֶׁר לֹא־נוֹתְרָה־בּוֹ נְשָׁמָה, "his illness became very bad until (not to mention after) [or: to the point that] he had no breath left in him"

In the nineteenth century, this idea was adopted by a number of scholars, including Wilhelm Gesenius, E. W. Hengstenberg (who provided an extensive Latin translation of one of Ibn Ezra's discussions), Franz Delitzsch, and Samuel Davidson.[12] It was subsequently accepted by BDB (725, s.v. עַד, meaning II1b), GKC (503, §164f), and many commentators down to the present day.[13]

Despite the widespread acceptance of bracketing 1, it is not without problems. As noted by Nahum M. Sarna, the problems reside in the combination עַד כִּי:

> Hebrew ʿad ki is rare and is otherwise used only in narrative prose to express the leading up to a climactic passage. The present usage is exceptional in that it takes a verb in the imperfect and refers to the future, making its signification uncertain.[14]

In short, the use of עַד כִּי is unparalleled in this context, that is, in poetry[15] and

---

(1 Kgs 17:17). More generally, we may say that there are factors other than cessation that may lead a speaker to specify a terminus. Aaron Koller informs me (e-mail communication) that digital highway signs in New York with messages of the form "traffic moving well until exit X" do not imply that there are traffic jams beyond exit X. The signs mention exit X, he says, only because no information is available about the traffic beyond that point.

[12] Gesenius, *Hebräisches and chaldäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament* (2nd ed.; Leipzig: F. C. W. Vogel, 1823), 551 s.v.; Hengstenberg, *Christologie des Alten Testaments und Commentar über die messianischen Weissagungen der Propheten* (Berlin: L. Oehmigke, 1829), 71–72; Franz Delitzsch, *Die Genesis* (Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1852), 370; and Davidson, *An Introduction to the Old Testament: Critical, Historical, and Theological* (3 vols.; Edinburgh: Williams & Norgate, 1862–63), 1:207.

[13] See, e.g., John H. Bennetch, "The Prophecy of Jacob," *BSac* 95 (1938): 424; Hans-Jürgen Zobel, *Stammesspruch und Geschichte: Die Angaben der Stammessprüche von Gen 49, Dtn 33 und Jdc 5 über die politischen und kultischen Zustände im damaligen "Israel"* (BZAW 95; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1965), 13; J. A. Emerton, "Some Difficult Words in Genesis 49," in *Words and Meanings: Essays Presented to David Winton Thomas on His Retirement from the Regius Professorship of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge, 1968* (ed. Peter R. Ackroyd and Barnabas Lindars; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 86 n. 1; André Caquot, "La parole sur Juda dans le testament lyrique de Jacob (Genèse 49, 8–12)," *Sem* 26 (1976): 19; Hermann Gunkel, *Genesis* (1901; trans. Mark E. Biddle; Mercer Library of Biblical Studies; Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997), 456; Jean-Daniel Macchi, *Israël et ses tribus selon Genèse 49* (OBO 171; Fribourg: Editions Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999), 98; and Kenneth A. Mathews, *Genesis,* vol. 2, *11:27–50:26* (NAC 1B; Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2005), 895.

[14] Sarna, *Genesis* בראשית: *The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation* (JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989), 336; cf. John Skinner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis* (2nd ed.; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1930), 520 note.

[15] The use of עַד with a subordinating conjunction (be it כִּי or אֲשֶׁר) is normally restricted to prose; in poetry, עַד is almost always followed immediately by a finite verb: עַד־יַעֲבֹר (Exod 15:16), עַד־יֹאכַל (Num 23:24), עַד־יָקֹם (Josh 10:13), עַד־יַעֲבָר (Isa 26:20), עַד־יָשִׂים (Isa 42:4), עַד־יֵצֵא (Isa 62:1), עַד־יְכוֹנֵן וְעַד־יָשִׂים (Isa 62:7), עַד־יָבוֹא (Hos 10:12), עַד יַעֲבֹר (Ps 57:2), עַד־אַגִּיד (Ps 71:18), עַד־יַשְׁקִיף (Ps 110:1), עַד יְפַלַּח (Prov 7:23), עַד־יִמַלֵּה (Job 8:21), עַד־יִרְצֶה (Prov 14:6), עַד־אָשִׁית (Lam 3:50). The only exception is עַד אֲשֶׁר־יִרְאֶה (Ps 112:8). Apart from our verse, none of the occurrences of עַד כִּי (Gen 26:13; 41:49; 2 Sam 23:10; 2 Chr 26:15) is in poetry.

surrounded by verbs in the imperfect.[16] The evidence presented below will suggest that this double dose of uniqueness stems from the fact that bracketing 1 is secondary.[17]

Bracketings 2a and 2b

In bracketings 2a ("shall not ever depart") and 2b ("shall not forever depart"), עַד is the last word in the first half of Gen 49:10, separated from כִּי at the beginning of the second half. In that position, it is not a preposition/conjunction but a noun used adverbially. As a noun, עַד is a synonym of עוֹלָם and נֶצַח with the meaning "eternity," as can be seen, for example, in וַיִּתְפֹּצְצוּ הַרְרֵי־עַד, שַׁחוּ גִּבְעוֹת עוֹלָם, "the eternal mountains shattered, the everlasting hills sank low" (Hab 3:6).[18] When used adverbially, these nouns normally take a preposition, as in לָעַד = לְעוֹלָם = לָנֶצַח ("to eternity"); עֲדֵי־עַד = עַד־עוֹלָם = עַד־נֶצַח[19] ("until eternity"); and מִנִּי עַד = מֵעוֹלָם ("from eternity"). However, the poetic dialect often dispenses with the preposition ־ל ("to"), employing a construction reminiscent of the Arabic adverbial accusative: עַד (Isa 57:15),[20] עוֹלָם וָעֶד (Pss 45:7; 48:15; 52:10; 104:5),[21] נֶצַח (Amos 1:11; Ps 13:2). Hence the meaning "to eternity" given above.

These interpretations are discussed by several medieval exegetes. One northern French commentary, *Daʿat Zeqenim*, cites a certain Rabbi Isaac as taking עַד in

---

[16] By contrast, the number of occurrences of עַד אֲשֶׁר surrounded by perfects (thirteen) is smaller than the number of occurrences surrounded by imperfects (twenty).

[17] This is not to say that the use of עַד with subordinating כִּי is a late development in Hebrew. If pre-Islamic Arabic ʿdky ("bis, solange") and Lihyanite ʿdky ("bis zu") (Walter W. Müller, "Das Altarabische der Inschriftern aus vorislamischer Zeit," in *Grundriss der arabischen Philologie* [ed. Wolfdietrich Fischer; 3 vols.; Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1982–92], 1:34) are cognates of עַד כִּי, the combination must be descended from the common ancestor of Hebrew and Arabic.

[18] Etymologically, עַד ("eternity") may be derived from the root *ʿ-d-y ("pass away, disappear"), attested in Aramaic, e.g., שָׁלְטָן עָלַם דִּי־לָא יֶעְדֵּה, "an everlasting dominion that will not pass away" (Dan 7:14); and לא יעידי עביד שלטן מדבית יהודה (*Tg. Onq.* Gen 49:10). If so, it would appear to refer to a time so far into the future that even the heavens and heavenly bodies will have passed away. For the idea, expressed with prepositional עַד, see עַד־בְּלִי יָרֵחַ, "until the moon is no more" (Ps 72:7), and עַד־בִּלְתִּי שָׁמַיִם, "until the heavens are no more" (Job 14:12). The phrase from Daniel may contradict this conception, or it may be elliptical: "an everlasting dominion that will not pass away (until everything else does)."

[19] E.g., ... בִּטְחוּ בַה׳ עֲדֵי־עַד, כִּי, "trust in the Lord until eternity, for . . ." (Isa 26:4); note the כִּי following עַד and separated from it.

[20] Translating שֹׁכֵן עַד as "dwelling forever"; cf. NJPS. Others translate "inhabiting eternity"; cf. Davidson, *Introduction,* 1:205: "It is true that עַד as a noun often means *eternity;* but we are not aware of its being used for *unto eternity, forever,* without the preposition ל before it."

[21] In the second word, the expected *pataḥ* has shifted to *segol*: וָעֶד > וָעַד*. This shift is called an "unclear development" in Hans Bauer and Pontus Leander, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments* (Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1922), 548 §69z. In my view, it is a mirror-image variant of the shift of *pataḥ* to *segol* that is conditioned by a *following qameṣ* separated from it by ʿ (e.g., הֶעָרִים > הַעָרִים*), ḥ (e.g., אֶחָיו > אַחָיו*), etc. (ibid., 216 §21n–o; GKC, 91 §27q); in other words, it is conditioned by a *preceding qameṣ* separated from it by ʿ.

our verse to mean לעולמי עד ("forever") and כִּי to mean שהרי ("since").[22] The comment is too brief to distinguish between bracketings 2a and 2b. In Spain, we find longer discussions that do make it possible to distinguish. Bracketing 2b ("shall not forever depart") is represented in a discussion by Rashba:

> The true interpretation of the verse is as follows: "The scepter shall not depart from Judah forever, because in the end Shiloh, who is descended from him, will come and kingship will return to him. And the reason[23] for this is that all of the tribes had a king or judge [b. Sukk. 28], and there was not one of them that did not rule as a king or a judge, but since this was not hereditary, when it departed, it did so forever. However, the rule of Judah is hereditary . . . , and *if it departs from him, it will not do so forever,* as it did from the other tribes. . . . And the word עד in this place is like לְעַד . . . as in שֹׁכֵן עד "dwelling forever" [Isa 57:15] . . . which is like שֹׁכֵן לָעַד. And that is what the translator [Onqelos] translated: לא יעדי עביד שלטן מדבית יהודה, וספרא מבני בנוהי עד עלמא, דייתי משיחא דדיליה היא מלכותא.[24]

Bracketing 2a ("shall not ever depart") is reflected in the commentary of Rashba's student, Baḥye b. Asher of Saragossa:

> The master, my teacher, Solomon [Ibn Adret] . . . commented that the word עד in this place is like לְעַד. And so the [disjunctive *yetiv*] accent under עד comes to teach that it is not connected with כִּי־יָבֹא שִׁילֹה. And because of this, Onqelos translated עד עלמא, and he translated כי יבא שילה as דייתא משיחא; and he who translates עד דייתא משיחא errs. The meaning of the verse is that, *once the Messiah comes, kingship shall never be cut off from Judah.* That is in accordance with what it says in Daniel (2:44): "[the God of Heaven will establish a kingdom] that shall never be destroyed."[25]

The difference between Baḥye's 2a ("shall not ever depart") and Rashba's 2b ("shall not forever depart") corresponds to a difference in the referent of the verse. According to Rashba, it refers to the period of Judah's decline beginning with Rehoboam: the loss of dominion over the ten tribes will not last forever. According

---

[22] רבותינו בעלי התוספות על חמשה חומשי תורה (Jerusalem: Lewin-Epstein, 1967), section 1, p. ג, lines 23–24. The same comment is published in תוספות השלם (ed. Jacob Gellis; Jerusalem: Mifal Tosafot Hashalem, 1982–), vol. 5, p. נב, col. 2 bot. For a slightly different version, see פירוש רבינו אפרים ב″ר שמשון וגדולי אשכנז הקדמונים על התורה (ed. Ezra Korach and Zvi Leitner; Jerusalem: Julius Klugmann and Sons, 1992), vol. 1, p. קסג, lines 5–7.

[23] Reading הטענה for הטעם.

[24] שאלות ותשובות הרשב″א, 4:53 col. 2 lines 25–39 (#187).

[25] רבינו בחיי: ביאור על התורה (ed. Charles B. Chavel; Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 1966), vol. 1, p. שפג, last line–p. שפד, line 4. The appeal to "the [disjunctive *yetiv*] accent under עד" is difficult to understand, given the presence of a stronger disjunctive, *etnaḥ*, under the previous word. Yosef Ofer notes (e-mail communication) that the use of disjunctive accents with עד is very common in the Bible; thus, no special significance should be attached to that usage in our verse.

to Baḥye, it refers to the messianic period: once the Messiah comes, kingship shall never depart from Judah.

Thanks to Baḥye, bracketing 2a enjoyed some popularity in the seventeenth century. Samuel Archivolti writes in his grammar (1602) that "the *yetiv* under the word עַד comes to disjoin it (from what follows) and to clarify what (it was that) Onqelos translated as עד עלמא, in the sense of עֲדֵי־עַד בְּטְחוּ בַהֹ׳."[26] Menasseh Ben Israel writes something similar in *Conciliador* (1632):

> Also in the same book of *Rabot* (*Be[reshit] Ra[bba]* cap. 99), another interpretation is given to it, understanding the staff as the staff of kingship; and so the translation would be, "The scepter shall not be withdrawn from Judah, eternally [*eternamente*], when [*quando*] he shall come to whom will be (the kingdom)[27] and the gathering of peoples." The musical accent greatly favors this interpretation, for the adverb עַד has a *yetiv* which is disjunctive and separative. Accordingly, this means, "The scepter shall not be withdrawn from Judah, nor a legislator from between his feet, eternally"—and here is a pause; and then it declares that this shall be when [*quando*] the Messiah shall come, whom all nations will gather to, and obey; as Isaiah (11:10) says, "To him will the nations seek."
>
> Onqelos the proselyte [*Anquelos aguer*] gives this same declaration; and so, as R. Bahye notes, what one finds written in correct codices and copies is (not עד עלמא, דייתי משיחא, עד דייתי משיחא, but) עד עלמא, דייתי משיחא "until eternity [*hasta siempre*], when [*quãdo*] the Messiah shall come," (the Messiah) to whom [= to whose kingdom] Daniel (2:44) affirms eternal duration, saying: "[the God of Heaven will establish a kingdom] that shall never be destroyed."[28]

So too the anonymous Jewish scholar from Amsterdam with whom Johann Stephan Rittangel corresponded (in Hebrew) in 1642:

> Onqelos, the translator . . . said: לֹא יעדי עביד שולטן מדבית יהודה וספרא מבני בנוהי עד עלמא. He interprets the word עַד in the aforementioned verse like (the one in) זֹאת־מְנוּחָתִי עֲדֵי־עַד (Ps 132:14), and its meaning is that the kingship shall never depart once the Messiah comes.[29]

In modern times, these bracketings (or something close to them) have been rediscovered by a handful of scholars.[30] They have been ignored by most scholars,

---

[26] Samuel Archivolti (Arkevolty), ערוגת הבושם (Venice, 1602), p. צה. For his appeal to the *yetiv* accent, see n. 25 above. I am indebted to Evelyn Ocken of the Columbia University Libraries for supplying a photograph of the discussion in the first edition. (A scan of this edition is now available on the website of the National Library of Israel.)

[27] This parenthetical insertion, unlike the ones below, is found in the original Spanish.

[28] Menasseh Ben Israel, *Conciliador*, 1:122; I have revised the translation from *Conciliator*, 1:95–96.

[29] Johann Christoff Wagenseil, *Tela ignea Satanae* (Altorf: J. H. Schönnerstaedt, 1681), 3:331.

[30] Arnold B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel: Textkritisches, sprachliches und sachliches* (7 vols.; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908), 1:246; Hermann Kornfeld, עד כי־יבא שילה, *BZ* 8

but they have much to recommend them. They produce a remarkably regular meter:

<div dir="rtl">

לֹא־יָסוּר שֵׁבֶט מִיהוּדָה
וּמְחֹקֵק מִבֵּין רַגְלָיו עַד
כִּי־יָבֹא שִׁילֹה
וְלוֹ יְקֲהַת עַמִּים:

</div>

And they create perfect antithetical parallelism between לֹא־יָסוּר שֵׁבֶט מִיהוּדָה, "the scepter shall not depart from Judah," and (שִׁי לֹה = שִׁילֹה =) כִּי־יָבֹא שִׁילֹה, "rather tribute shall come to him," with asseverative/adversative כִּי used to contradict a preceding clause introduced by the negative particle לֹא.[31]

Bracketings 2a and 2b can each be supported with unambiguous parallels in the Bible. Bracketing 2a ("shall not ever depart") is paralleled by [לֹא תֹסִיפוּ לִרְאֹתָם] [עֹד] [עַד־עֹולָם], "[you shall not see them again] [forever = ever]" (Exod 14:13); [לֹא־יָבֹא לָהֶם בִּקְהַל ה׳] [עַד־עֹולָם], "[they shall not marry into[32] the congregation of the Lord] [forever = ever]" (Deut 23:4); [לֹא־אָפֵר בְּרִיתִי אִתְּכֶם] [לְעֹולָם], "[I shall not break my covenant with you] [forever = ever]" (Judg 2:1); [לֹא־תַכְרִת אֶת־חַסְדְּךָ] [מֵעִם בֵּיתִי] [עַד־עֹולָם], "[You shall not cut off your kindness from my house] [forever = ever]" (1 Sam 20:15); [לֹא־תָסוּר חֶרֶב מִבֵּיתְךָ] [עַד־עֹולָם], "[the sword shall not depart from your house] [forever = ever]" (2 Sam 12:10); [לֹא־יִנָּתֵשׁ וְלֹא־יֵהָרֵס] [עֹוד] [לְעֹולָם], "[it shall not be uprooted or destroyed again] [forever = ever]" (Jer 31:39/40); [לֹא־תֵשֵׁב עֹוד] [לָנֶצַח], "[it shall not be settled again] [forever = ever]"

(1910): 130–31; W. A. Wordsworth, "'Until Shiloh come' (Genesis xlix. 10)," *ExpTim* 49 (1937–38): 142–43. For some reason, Ehrlich felt the need to emend עַד to עֹד. He has been followed in this by Raymond de Hoop, *Genesis 49 in Its Literary and Historical Context* (OtSt 39; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 141. Wordsworth differs from the others in taking עַד as the predicate of a nominal sentence: "And the Lawgiver between his feet is forever." Kornfeld compares the position of עַד in Gen 49:27, and de Hoop (n. 347) compares the position of עַד in Gen 49:26 according to *BHS*.

[31] See Steiner, "Poetic Forms," 221, comparing לֹא אָמוּת כִּי־אֶחְיֶה, "I shall not die; rather I shall live" (Ps 118:17), etc.

[32] In my view, the expression (לֹא־יָבֹא . . . בִּקְהַל ה׳) בוא ב־ (in ב־ means "marry into," with the object of the preposition ב־ being a noun that refers to a family or ethnic group rather than a woman (contrast בוא אל, "enter the bedroom of [a woman]"). Evidence for this interpretation comes not only from rabbinic tradition but also from comparison of וְהִתְחַתַּנְתֶּם בָּהֶם וּבָאתֶם בָּהֶם וְהֵם בָּכֶם, "and (if) you intermarry with them—you marrying into them and they into you" (Josh 23:12), with וְהִתְחַתְּנוּ אֹתָנוּ בְּנֹתֵיכֶם תִּתְּנוּ־לָנוּ וְאֶת־בְּנֹתֵינוּ תִּקְחוּ לָכֶם, "and intermarry with us—you shall give us your daughters and you shall take our daughters for yourselves" (Gen 34:9), and with וְלֹא תִתְחַתֵּן בָּם בִּתְּךָ לֹא־תִתֵּן לִבְנֹו וּבִתֹּו לֹא־תִקַּח לִבְנֶךָ, "and you shall not intermarry with them—you shall not give your daughter to his son and you shall not take his daughter for your son" (Deut 7:3). In all three verses, the reciprocal nature of התחתן ב־ ("intermarry with") is spelled out by means of a two-part appositional explanation. The appositional explanation in Josh 23:12 should also be compared to 1 Kgs 11:1–2: וְהַמֶּלֶךְ שְׁלֹמֹה אָהַב נָשִׁים נָכְרִיֹּות רַבֹּות . . . מִן־הַגֹּויִם, "King Solomon loved many foreign women . . . from the nations of which the Lord said to the Israelites: 'You shall not marry into them and they shall not marry into you.'"

(Jer 50:39); [עוֹד] [לֹא־תִמָּצְאִי], "[you shall not be found again] [forever = ever]" (Ezek 26:21); [לְעוֹלָם] [לֹא־יֵבֹשׁוּ עַמִּי], "[My people shall not be shamed] [forever = ever]" (Joel 2:26, 27); [לְעוֹלָם] [לֹא יִמּוֹט], "[he will not be shaken] [forever = ever]" (Ps 15:5). Bracketing 2b ("shall not forever depart") is paralleled by [לֹא־] [יָדוֹן רוּחִי בָאָדָם לְעֹלָם], "[It is not the case that] [My spirit shall abide in any human forever]" (Gen 6:3); [לְעוֹלָם] [לֹא], "[It is not the case that] [I remain angry forever]" (Jer 3:12); [לֹא־]־[הֶחֱזִיק לָעַד אַפּוֹ], "[It is not the case that] [He retains his anger forever]" (Mic 7:18); [אַל־]־[תִּזְנַח לָנֶצַח], "[do not] [reject forever]" (Ps 44:24); [אַל־]־[תִּשְׁכַּח לָנֶצַח], "[do not] [forget forever]" (Ps 74:19); [לֹא] [יִזְנַח לְעוֹלָם], "[It is not the case that] [He rejects forever]" (Lam 3:31). The existence of unambiguous parallels for each of the two interpretations is conclusive proof that we are dealing with a genuine syntactic ambiguity.[33]

II. The Ambiguity of לֹא־יָסוּר שֵׁבֶט מִיהוּדָה

The words לֹא־יָסוּר שֵׁבֶט מִיהוּדָה are always read as a blessing—"the scepter [= dominion] shall not depart from Judah"—and this is obviously what the context demands. The disambiguating effect of the context is so strong that the ambiguity of the words has not been noticed. Taken in isolation, the words לֹא־יָסוּר שֵׁבֶט מִיהוּדָה can quite naturally be understood as a curse: "the rod [= punishment] shall not depart from Judah."

The validity of this second interpretation can be seen by comparing Job's plea for relief from divine punishment: יָסֵר מֵעָלַי שִׁבְטוֹ, "let him take his rod away from me," or, more literally, "let him cause his rod to depart from over/upon me" (Job 9:34). The wording implies that Job has a divine rod over/upon him, a rod being used to beat him, probably on the back (גֵּו; cf. Prov 10:13; 26:3). Based on this parallel, the words לֹא־יָסוּר שֵׁבֶט מִיהוּדָה can be easily be construed as elliptical for something like לֹא־יָסוּר שֵׁבֶט מִגֵּו יְהוּדָה*, "the rod shall not depart from Judah's back," rather than for לֹא־יָסוּר שֵׁבֶט מִיַּד יְהוּדָה*, "the scepter shall not depart from Judah's hand."

In the first of these interpretations, שֵׁבֶט refers to a rod of punishment and discipline, the שֵׁבֶט מוּסָר of Prov 22:15; in the second, it refers to a royal scepter,

---

[33] On the other hand, when the adverbial and the negative particle are adjacent, the word order disambiguates. When the adverbial precedes (as in English "forever not"), the bracketing of the clause parallels 2a, e.g., [לְעוֹלָם] [לֹא יִבָּנֶה], "[it shall not be rebuilt] [forever = ever]" (Isa 25:2); [לְעוֹלָם] [לֹא־יִמּוֹט], "[he shall not be shaken] [forever = ever]" (Ps 112:6); [לֹא־אֶשְׁכַּח] [לְעוֹלָם] [פִּקּוּדֶיךָ], "[I shall not forget your precepts] [forever = ever]" (Ps 119:93). When the negative particle precedes (as in English "not forever"), the bracketing parallels 2b, e.g., [לֹא] [לָנֶצַח] [אֶקְצוֹף], "[It is not the case that] [I become angry forever]" (Isa 57:16); [אַל־]־[לָעַד תִּזְכֹּר עָוֺן], "[Do not] [remember iniquity forever]" (Isa 64:8); [לֹא] [לָנֶצַח יִשָּׁכַח אֶבְיוֹן], "[It is not the case that] [the needy shall be forgotten forever]" (Ps 9:19); [לֹא] [לְעוֹלָם יִטּוֹר], "[It is not the case that] [He remains angry forever]" (Ps 103:9).

the שֵׁבֶט מַלְכוּת of Ps 45:7. [34] The Bible speaks of the departure of the latter type of שֵׁבֶט in וְשֵׁבֶט מִצְרַיִם יָסוּר, "and the scepter of Egypt shall depart" (Zech 10:11), and the departure of the former type of שֵׁבֶט in יָסֵר מֵעָלַי שִׁבְטוֹ. In short, the entire clause, לֹא־יָסוּר שֵׁבֶט מִיהוּדָה, is ambiguous. This ambiguity appears to play a role in Nathan's prophecies to David.

III. Nathan and Bracketing 2a

At least one inner-biblical interpretation of Gen 49:10 is found in Nathan's oracle. This can be seen most clearly in 2 Sam 7:14–16, the climax of the promise to David,[35] where we find striking echoes of the promise to Judah:

[34] It is by no means certain that we are dealing here with lexical ambiguity (more specifically, polysemy). It is quite possible that this noun had only a single general meaning, viz. "staff," with a variety of applications, rather than a variety of meanings; cf. Menasseh Ben Israel, *Conciliador*, 1:120; *Conciliator*, 1:94: "*Sebet*, according to R. David Kimhi, does not mean anything other than 'rod' [*verga*] or 'staff' [*vara*] . . . and because of that it applies to various things." I am aware of no compelling reason to distinguish the use of the שֵׁבֶט as an instrument of punishment from its use as a symbol of authority. The point is clear in rabbinic comments on לֹא־יָסוּר שֵׁבֶט מִיהוּדָה, such as זה ראש גולה שבבבל שרודה את ישראל במקל, "this is the Babylonian exilarch, who punishes Israel with a rod" (*b. Hor.* 11b); for the use of ר-ד-י to refer to corporal punishment in Mishnaic Hebrew, see Jastrow, 1451, s.v. רדי. Greek σκῆπτρον, used by Aquila to render שֵׁבֶט in Gen 49:10, may also have a single general meaning, if one may judge from the definition in LSJ (1609a, s.v.): "*staff* or *stick*, used by the lame or aged . . . *staff* or *baton*, esp. as the badge of command, *sceptre* . . . used as a *stick* or *cudgel* to punish the refractory." For Akkadian *ḫaṭṭu*, *CAD* (6:153–55) gives "(1) scepter, (2) staff, (3) stick, (4) branch, twig . . ."; it is unclear how many of these are distinct meanings.

[35] Some scholars believe that these three verses go back to the time of the united monarchy, e.g., Tomoo Ishida, *The Royal Dynasties in Ancient Israel: A Study on the Formation and Development of Royal-Dynastic Ideology* (BZAW 142; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1977), 98–99; Antti Laato, "Second Samuel 7 and Ancient Near Eastern Royal Ideology," *CBQ* 59 (1997) 268; William M. Schniedewind, *Society and the Promise to David: The Reception History of 2 Samuel 7:1–17* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 34, 36; and Griphus Gakuru, *An Inner-Biblical Exegetical Study of the Davidic Covenant and the Dynastic Oracle* (Mellen Biblical Press Series 58; Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 2000), 49–50 (with literature), 93. Others believe that they are Deuteronomistic, e.g., Steven L. McKenzie, "The Typology of the Davidic Covenant," in *The Land That I Will Show You: Essays on the History and Archaeology of the Ancient Near East in Honor of J. Maxwell Miller* (ed. J. Andrew Dearman and M. Patrick Graham; JSOTSup 343; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 177; and Omer Sergi, "The Composition of Nathan's Oracle to David (2 Samuel 7:1–17) as a Reflection of Royal Judahite Ideology," *JBL* 129 (2010): 272. For surveys of the various views, see Nahum M. Sarna, "Psalm 89: A Study in Inner Biblical Exegesis," in *Biblical and Other Studies* (ed. Alexander Altmann; Philip W. Lown Institute of Advanced Judaic Studies, Brandeis University, Studies and Texts 1; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963), 39–40; Tryggve N. D. Mettinger, *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings* (ConBOT 8; Lund: Gleerup, 1976), 48–50; P. Kyle McCarter, *II Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes and Commentary* (AB 9; Garden City, NY:

אֲנִי אֶהְיֶה־לֹּו לְאָב וְהוּא יִהְיֶה־לִּי לְבֵן אֲשֶׁר בְּהַעֲוֹתֹו וְהֹכַחְתִּיו בְּשֵׁבֶט
אֲנָשִׁים וּבְנִגְעֵי בְּנֵי אָדָם: וְחַסְדִּי לֹא־יָסוּר מִמֶּנּוּ כַּאֲשֶׁר הֲסִרֹתִי מֵעִם
שָׁאוּל אֲשֶׁר הֲסִרֹתִי מִלְּפָנֶיךָ: וְנֶאְמַן בֵּיתְךָ וּמַמְלַכְתְּךָ עַד־עֹולָם לְפָנֶיךָ
כִּסְאֲךָ יִהְיֶה נָכֹון עַד־עֹולָם:

I shall be a father to him, and he will be a son to me—a son that, when he does wrong, I shall chastise with the *rod* of men and the blows of humans. But my favor *shall not depart* from him as I caused it to *depart* from Saul, whom I caused to *depart* from before you. Your house and your kingdom/kingship shall be secure before you *until eternity*; your throne shall be established *until eternity*.

The phrase לֹא־יָסוּר is, of course, common to 2 Sam 7:15 and Gen 49:10; the echo is amplified by the repetition of the root ס-ו-ר ("depart") twice more in 2 Sam 7:15. Moreover, the phrase עַד־עֹולָם (7:16) is a prosaic counterpart of poetic עַד in Gen 49:10, as understood in bracketings 2a ("shall not ever depart") and 2b ("shall not forever depart"); here too the echo is amplified through repetition.[36] In this case, the second iteration has special prominence thanks to its position at the very end of the oracle.[37]

These echoes can hardly be accidental; Gen 49:10 is a promise of eternal kingship to Judah, and 2 Sam 7:15–16 is a promise of eternal kingship to one of Judah's descendants. The main difference in formulation is that the subject of לֹא־יָסוּר is שֵׁבֶט in the former but חַסְדִּי in the latter. This difference is trivial, since שֵׁבֶט in the former refers to the scepter of kingship and חַסְדִּי in the latter refers to "the continuing divine favor that will maintain the grant of kingship in effect."[38]

It should be noted also that the word שֵׁבֶט is by no means absent in Nathan's oracle; it occurs in 2 Sam 7:14, albeit with a different referent. Adding that verse to the two following ones yields a text that has interspersed within it a sequence of echoes, שֵׁבֶט . . . לֹא־יָסוּר . . . עַד־עֹולָם, a sequence that is at least outwardly similar to Gen 49:10 according to bracketings 2a and 2b. We shall return to this point below.

Each of these echoes functions as what Benjamin D. Sommer, following Z. Ben-Porat, calls "a *marker*, an identifiable element or pattern in one text belonging

---

Doubleday, 1984), 210–17; and Petri Kasari, *Nathan's Promise in 2 Samuel 7 and Related Texts* (Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 97; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2009), 14–19.

[36] The repetition of עַד־עֹולָם has been noted by André Caquot, "Brève explication de la prophétie de Natan (2 Sam 7,1–17)," in *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Henri Cazelles* (ed. André Caquot and Mathias Delcor; AOAT 212; Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1981), 68; and Donald F. Murray, *Divine Prerogative and Royal Pretension: Pragmatics, Poetics and Polemics in a Narrative Sequence about David (2 Samuel 5.17–7.29)* (JSOTSup 264; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 194, 195, 197. According to Murray, it "maximizes the impact of the words" (p. 194) and is "highly emphatic" (p. 195). In my view, it is designed to call attention to the allusion.

[37] Murray, *Divine Prerogative*, 194.

[38] McCarter, *II Samuel*, 208.

to another independent text."[39] According to Sommer, an "abundance of markers pointing back to the older text makes clear that [the author] borrowed from that text," unless "both [texts] utilize stock vocabulary, exemplify a literary form such as a lament, or treat a subject that calls for certain words."[40] Based on this criterion, it is reasonable to conclude that the dynastic oracle (2 Sam 7:15–16) alludes to Jacob's blessing to Judah (Gen 49:10).[41]

The repetition of הֲסִרֹתִי in 7:15 is, in the words of S. R. Driver, "not an elegancy."[42] The shift of person and verb stem from יָסוּר to הֲסִרֹתִי is also awkward. If these stylistic infelicities are intentional, designed to make the audience stop and think, modern scholarship on the verse testifies to the effectiveness of the technique. Petri Kasari, for example, writes:

> Verse 15b repeats in a slightly clumsy and keyword-like manner the main verb סור of v. 15a. This probably caused the textual problems related to this verse. In v. 15a the subject changes from "I" to "my love" and returns in 15b to "I." The change of subject may point to literary-critical problems. Some cumulative evidence may also be found in the fact that the verb סור is used in both Qal and Hiph. without any semantic difference. Chronicles noticed this and corrected both verbs to the Hiph. (2 Sam 7:15b // 1 Chr 17:13).[43]

In this passage, Kasari observes that a verbal root is repeated in a "keyword-like manner" but fails to consider the implications of his observation. Had he done so, he might well have seen that this is, indeed, an excellent example of one use of keywords in the Bible, viz., the linking of texts.[44] In other words, repetition is used here to call attention to an allusion.

Despite this evidence, references to Gen 49:10 are rare in the vast scholarly literature dealing with Nathan's oracle.[45] The reason for this is not difficult to find:

[39] Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66* (Contraversions; Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 11.

[40] Ibid., 22, 32.

[41] For more on allusion and the criteria for distinguishing it from accidental similarity, see Robert Klapper, Gavy Posner, and Mordy Friedman, "Amnon and Tamar: A Case Study in Allusions," *Nahalah: Yeshiva University Journal for the Study of Bible* 1 (1999): 23–33 (with literature); Paul R. Noble, "Esau, Tamar, and Joseph: Criteria for Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions," *VT* 52 (2002): 219–52; Jeffery M. Leonard, "Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions: Psalm 78 as a Test Case," *JBL* 127 (2008): 241–65 (with literature).

[42] S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel* (2nd ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1912), 276.

[43] Kasari, *Nathan's Promise*, 27–28. Cf. Georg Hentschel, *Gott, König und Tempel: Beobachtungen zu 2 Sam 7,1–17* (ETS 22; Leipzig: Benno, 1992), 19, and the literature cited there.

[44] See, e.g., Yairah Amit, "The Multi-Purpose 'Leading Word' and the Problems of Its Usage," *Prooftexts* 9 (1989): 106; Frank Polak, הסיפור במקרא (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1994), 91–93; and Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (2nd ed.; New York: Basic Books, 2011), 118. All of these discussions are based on Martin Buber's studies of what he called *Leitwortstil*.

[45] The only reference I have found is in Schniedewind, *Society and the Promise to David*, 163–64: "4QpGenᵃ column 5 (4Q252 5) begins with a quote from Genesis 49:10 and alludes to

modern scholars are almost universally unaware of the bracketings of Gen 49:10 that take עַד to mean עַד־עוֹלָם. As a result, they have often opted to emend away the awkward formulations in 2 Sam 7:15, with the LXX and 1 Chr 17:13.[46]

I noted above that the interspersed sequence שֵׁבֶט . . . לֹא־יָסוּר . . . עַד־עוֹלָם in 2 Sam 7:14–16 is at least outwardly similar to Gen 49:10 according to bracketings 2a and 2b. But if the שֵׁבֶט of 2 Sam 7:14 alludes to the שֵׁבֶט of Gen 49:10, what are we to make of the fact that the latter is a *scepter* wielded *by* a king while the former is a *rod* wielded *against* a king?[47]

In the previous section, we saw that לֹא־יָסוּר שֵׁבֶט מִיהוּדָה can be interpreted as either a blessing or a curse. It now appears that 2 Sam 7:14–16 alludes to both of these interpretations. The keyword sequence שֵׁבֶט . . . לֹא־יָסוּר . . . עַד־עוֹלָם, where שֵׁבֶט (in the context of v. 14) symbolizes the *punishment* of David's dynasty rather than its *dominion,* appears to be a veiled warning to David's descendants that Jacob's blessing to Judah can easily be transformed into a curse.

Similar echoes of Gen 49:10 can be discerned in another one of Nathan's oracles, 2 Sam 12:10:

וְעַתָּה לֹא־תָסוּר חֶרֶב מִבֵּיתְךָ *עַד־עוֹלָם* עֵקֶב כִּי בְזִתָנִי וַתִּקַּח אֶת־אֵשֶׁת
אוּרִיָּה הַחִתִּי לִהְיוֹת לְךָ לְאִשָּׁה:

> And now, the sword *shall not depart* from your house *until eternity*, because you spurned me, taking the wife of Uriah the Hittite to be your own wife.

Here, too, we have an allusion that collocates "shall not depart" with "until eternity," reflecting bracketing 2a ("shall not ever depart") or 2b ("shall not forever depart"). In this case, the allusion makes the negative interpretation of לֹא־יָסוּר שֵׁבֶט מִיהוּדָה far more prominent than it was in 2 Sam 7:14–16. That interpretation is no longer a veiled warning, lurking in the background of a promise of divine favor; it is now front and center in Nathan's announcement of David's punishment.

---

the Promise in the course of its elaboration of the lemma. . . . It is clear from this text that Genesis 49:10 was regarded by the Qumran community as part of the literary horizon of the Promise." Schniedewind says nothing about the basis for the Qumran community's view, but, if the relevant passage in 4Q252 takes עַד in Gen 49:10 to mean עד דורות עולם (see the appendix below), it is not surprising that it also takes the dynastic oracle (2 Sam 7:14–16) as alluding Jacob's blessing to Judah (Gen 49:10). For the possibility that 4Q252 5.7 mentions Nathan (and perhaps even alludes to 2 Sam 7:14), see Daniel R. Schwartz, "The Messianic Departure from Judah (4Q Patriarchal Blessings)," *TZ* 37 (1981): 265–66; George J. Brooke, "The Deuteronomic Character of 4Q252," in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday* (ed. John C. Reeves and John Kampen; JSOTSup 184; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 127 n. 17; and Juhana Markus Saukkonen, "Selection, Election, and Rejection: Interpretation of Genesis in 4Q252," in *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003–2006* (ed. Anders Klostergaard Petersen et al.; STDJ 80; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 76.

[46] See, e.g., Driver, *Samuel*, 276; McCarter, *II Samuel*, 194–95; and M. Tsevat, "The Steadfast House: What Was David Promised in II Sam 7:11b-16?" *HUCA* 34 (1963): 72.

[47] I am indebted to Jeffrey H. Tigay (e-mail communication) for raising this problem.

It is obvious that the allusions to Gen 49:10 in Nathan's prophecies exclude bracketing 1 ("shall not depart until") by paraphrasing poetic עַד with a prosaic equivalent, עַד־עוֹלָם. Closer examination reveals that 2 Sam 7:16 disambiguates further. In that verse, the words לֹא־יָסוּר . . . עַד are paraphrased twice: once by וְנֶאְמַן . . . עַד־עוֹלָם, "shall be steadfast . . . forever," and a second time by יִהְיֶה נָכוֹן . . . עַד־עוֹלָם, "shall be established . . . forever." These paraphrases disambiguate by eliminating the wide-scope negative particle that makes bracketing 2b ("shall not forever depart") possible; only bracketing 2a ("shall not ever depart" = "shall be forever steadfast/established") remains.

IV. Ahijah and Bracketing 2b

Echoes of Nathan's dynastic oracle have been discerned throughout the Bible,[48] but for our purposes the most important ones are found in Ahijah's prophecy to Jeroboam (1 Kgs 11:38–39):

וְהָיָה אִם־תִּשְׁמַע אֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר אֲצַוֶּךָ וְהָלַכְתָּ בִדְרָכַי וְעָשִׂיתָ הַיָּשָׁר בְּעֵינַי לִשְׁמוֹר חֻקּוֹתַי וּמִצְוֹתַי כַּאֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה דָּוִד עַבְדִּי וְהָיִיתִי עִמָּךְ וּבָנִיתִי לְךָ בַיִת־נֶאֱמָן כַּאֲשֶׁר בָּנִיתִי לְדָוִד וְנָתַתִּי לְךָ אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל: וַאֲעַנֶּה אֶת־זֶרַע דָּוִד לְמַעַן זֹאת אַךְ לֹא כָל־הַיָּמִים:

Mordechai Cogan notes that one text alludes to the other:

> 38. *If you obey all that I command you . . . then I will be with you and I will build a lasting dynasty for you as I did for David.* The phraseology of Nathan's prophecy to David (cf. 2 Sam 7:9a, 16a) is here strikingly adapted to Jeroboam, legitimizing the founding of a rival kingdom in the North. . . . This verse is the strongest case for an original, pre-Dtr prophecy, of Northern origin, legitimizing Jeroboam's rule. . . .
> 39. *and, in view of this, I will humble David's descendants, but not forever.* The phrase "in view of this" . . . has no clear antecedent and, because vv. 38bβ–39 are lacking in LXX, the entire sentence is often seen as "the interpretation of a late reader". . . . But the ideas expressed here need not be altogether secondary. Just as Nathan's promise is reflected in v. 38a–bα, so in the present verse, a reflex of that same promise may be seen.[49]

Ahijah's prophecy alludes directly to Nathan's prophecy and only indirectly to Jacob's blessing; nevertheless, it can be viewed as resolving the syntactic ambiguity

---

[48] See the many examples discussed in Michael Avioz, *Nathan's Oracle (2 Samuel 7) and Its Interpreters* (Bible in History 5; Bern: Peter Lang, 2005), and add the one in Richard C. Steiner, *Stockmen from Tekoa, Sycomores from Sheba: A Study of Amos' Occupations* (CBQMS 36; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2003), 93–94. Particularly relevant here is the thesis of Sarna ("Psalm 89: A Study in Inner Biblical Exegesis," 29–46), who argues that Psalm 89 is not another recension of Nathan's oracle but rather an exegetical adaptation of it to a new situation in a later period.

[49] Mordechai Cogan, *1 Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 10; New York: Doubleday, 2000), 342. Cf. Avioz, *Nathan's Oracle*, 102–3.

of Gen 49:10. According to Ahijah, the more favorable interpretation, 2a ("The scepter shall not depart from Judah ever"), is henceforth off the table. Only interpretation 2b remains: "If the scepter departs from Judah, it shall not do so forever." Ahijah says as much in v. 39: וָאעַנֶּה אֶת־זֶרַע דָּוִד . . . אַךְ לֹא כָל־הַיָּמִים, "I will humble David's descendants . . . but not forever."

Ahijah's prophecy exhibits a significant anomaly in 1 Kgs 11:30–32, 35–36—indeed, a blatant internal contradiction:

> 30. Ahijah took hold of the new robe he was wearing and tore it into *twelve* pieces.
> 31. "Take *ten* pieces," he said to Jeroboam. "For thus said the Lord, the God of Israel: I am about to tear the kingdom out of Solomon's hands, and I will give you *ten* tribes.
> 32. But *one* tribe shall remain his. . . .
> . . . .
> 35. But I will take the kingdom out of the hands of his son and give it to you—the *ten* tribes.
> 36. To his son I will give *one* tribe. . . .[50]

It is obvious that something does not add up when a symbolic representation of twelve tribes being divided between two recipients (vv. 30–31a) is twice interpreted as a promise of ten tribes to one recipient but only a single tribe to the other. The various explanations that have been offered since the Middle Ages are almost beside the point. The anomaly, repeated to underline its deliberate nature, was apparently designed to draw attention to—and exaggerate—the enormity of the impending reversal. The descendants of David and Solomon would no longer have dominion over any tribe worth mentioning other than their own; they would be reduced to something like the status of glorified tribal leaders; the scepter *would* depart from Judah. Solomon's sins had resolved the ambiguity of Jacob's blessing to Judah.

V. Ezekiel and Bracketing 1

Another *direct* allusion to Gen 49:10 is found in Ezekiel 21. In vv. 30–31, the prophet turns to the "chief of Israel" and issues a series of commands, including "take off the crown." In v. 32, he says that this will not come about עַד־בֹּא אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ הַמִּשְׁפָּט, "until the coming of him [= Nebuchadnezzar] to whom judgment [= punishment] belongs."[51] It is widely accepted that this phrase, occurring in the context of Judah's king removing his crown, alludes to the second half of Gen 49:10, עַד כִּי־יָבֹא שִׁילֹה וְלוֹ יִקְּהַת עַמִּים.[52] Kenneth A. Mathews calls it "the first known

---

'interpretation' of our text."[53] For William L. Moran, the allusion serves "to contrast . . . the hope of the past with the reality of the present" and to create a mood of bitter irony.[54] According to Moshe Greenberg, "Moran . . . sees the blessing of Genesis transformed here into a curse."[55] Daniel I. Block expands on this theme:

> The oracle concerning Nebuchadnezzar, the wielder of the divine sword against Judah . . . , ends with a sinister reinterpretation of Genesis 49:10. . . . Ezekiel has taken an ancient word, on which his audience had staked their hopes, and transformed it into a frightening prediction of doom. To Ezekiel Genesis 49:10 is not about tribute and subordination of the world to Judah, but the judgment of Judah by that world's principal representative.[56]

Ezekiel's allusion makes sense only if Gen 49:10 means "The scepter shall not depart from Judah (cf. "take off the crown") . . . until the coming of him [= Nebuchadnezzar] to whom tribute belongs and to whom the homage of peoples belongs." Here עַד indicates cessation rather than culmination; the scepter *would* depart from Judah upon Nebuchadnezzar's coming.

From a linguistic point of view, this interpretation of Gen 49:10 is very different from its predecessors. Take, for example, Ahijah's interpretation: "The scepter shall not depart from Judah . . . forever [עַד]; rather [כִּי] tribute shall come to him and the homage of peoples will be his." Assuming for the moment that Ahijah's interpretation gave rise to Ezekiel's, we may say that the shift was characterized by five changes, which affected:

1. the bracketing of עַד: bracketing 2b > bracketing 1.
2. the meaning and syntactic function of לֹה: "to him," an adverbial modifier of יָבֹא > "belongs to him," a predicative modifier of שַׁי = שִׁי.[57]
3. the syntactic category of שִׁילֹה (= שִׁי לֹה = שִׁי לֹה and וְלֹו יִקְּהַת עַמִּים): independent clauses ("tribute belongs to him, and the homage of peoples belongs to him") > substantivized asyndetic relative clauses ("him to whom tribute belongs, and to whom the homage of peoples belongs").[58]

---

[53] Mathews, *Genesis 11:27–50:26,* 895.

[54] Moran, "Gen 49,10 and Its Use in Ez 21,32," *Bib* 39 (1958): 424.

[55] Greenberg, *Ezekiel 21–37,* 434–35.

[56] Daniel I. Block, "Bringing Back David: Ezekiel's Messianic Hope," in *The Lord's Anointed: Interpretation of Old Testament Messianic Texts* (ed. Philip E. Satterthwaite, Richard S. Hess, and Gordon J. Wenham; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995), 169–70.

[57] The shift makes לֹה agree with the immediately following וְלֹו ("and to him belongs"), which functions as a predicative modifier of יְקְהַת עַמִּים. For the word order of לֹו יִקְהַת עַמִּים (with subject second), cf. לָנוּ הַמָּיִם (Gen 26:20), לֹו מִשְׁפַּט הַבְּכֹרָה (Deut 21:17), and לִי הַכֶּסֶף וְלִי הַזָּהָב (Hag 2:8). For the word order of שִׁי לֹה = שִׁילֹה (with subject first), cf. הַנִּסְתָּרֹת לַה׳ אֱלֹהֵינוּ and וְהַנִּגְלֹת לָנוּ וּלְבָנֵינוּ עַד־עוֹלָם (Deut 29:28).

[58] To clarify the interpretation, we may paraphrase the second half of the verse as עד כי יבא אשר שי לו ואשר לו יקהת עמים; cf. substantivized syndetic relative clauses such as וּבָא אֲשֶׁר־לֹו הַבַּיִת (Lev 14:35) and יָשׁוּב הַשָּׂדֶה . . . לַאֲשֶׁר־לֹו אֲחֻזַּת הָאָרֶץ (Lev 27:24). Cf. also the interpretation of

4. the referent of the suffixed pronouns of לֹה and לֹו: Judah > a king
   (= Nebuchadnezzar).

5. the referent of the subject of יָבֹא: tribute > a king (= Nebuchadnezzar) to
   whom tribute and homage belong.

The extreme linguistic transformation of Gen 49:10 inherent in Ezekiel's interpre-
tation is a faithful reflection of the extreme political transformation of his time.

VI. Zechariah and Bracketing 1

It has often been suggested that a messianic interpretation of Jacob's blessing
to Judah is reflected in Zech 9:9: הִנֵּה מַלְכֵּךְ יָבוֹא לָךְ צַדִּיק וְנוֹשָׁע הוּא עָנִי וְרֹכֵב עַל־
חֲמוֹר וְעַל־עַיִר בֶּן־אֲתֹנוֹת, "Lo, your king will come to you—righteous and victori-
ous, humble, riding on an ass, on a donkey foaled by a she-ass."[59] As recognized
already in antiquity, by Jews and Christians alike, the phrase עַיִר בֶּן־אֲתֹנוֹת in Zech
9:9 cannot be separated from עִירֹה . . . בְּנִי אֲתֹנוֹ in Gen 49:11.[60] Intertwining of the
two verses has been noted in Matt 21:2-7:

---

the name שלמה as שלו, "מִי שֶׁהַשָּׁלוֹם שֶׁלּוֹ, "him to whom peace belongs," in מכילתא דרבי ישמעאל,
48 line 13. For substantivized asyndetic relative clauses in biblical poetry, see Raphael Sappan,
הייחוד התחבירי של לשון השירה המקראית בתקופתה הקלאסית (Jerusalem: Kiryat-Sefer, 1981),
164, 169–70. Examples include לְאֵין אוֹנִים, "to (him who has) no strength" // לַיָּעֵף, "to the weary"
(Isa 40:29), כְּאֵין עֵינַיִם, "like (those who have) no eyes" // כַעִוְרִים, "like the blind" (Isa 59:10), and
בִּידֵי לֹא־אוּכַל קוּם, "into the hands of (those before whom) I am not able to stand" (Lam 1:14; cf.
Josh 7:13 לֹא תוּכַל לָקוּם לִפְנֵי אֹיְבֶיךָ, "you will not able to stand before your enemies"). All of these
examples exhibit more radical ellipsis than "(him) to whom tribute belongs, and to whom the
homage of peoples belongs."

[59] See, e.g., John M. Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," *JBL* 75
(1956): 175; Joseph Blenkinsopp, "The Oracle of Judah and the Messianic Entry," *JBL* 80 (1961):
57; Wilhelm Rudolph, *Haggai – Sacharja 1–8 – Sacharja 9–14 – Maleachi* (KAT 13.4; Gütersloh:
Gerd Mohn, 1976), 179–80; Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford:
Clarendon, 1985), 501–2; Katrina J. A. Larkin, *The Eschatology of Second Zechariah* (Kampen:
Kok Pharos, 1994), 70–72; Iain Duguid, "Messianic Themes in Zechariah 9–14," in Satterthwaite
et al., *Lord's Anointed,* 267–68; Deborah Krause, "The One Who Comes Unbinding the Blessing
of Judah: Mark 11.1–10 as a Midrash on Genesis 49.11, Zechariah 9.9, and Psalm 118.25–26," in
Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals (ed. Craig A.
Evans and James A. Sanders; JSNTSup 148; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 144, 148–
49; Adrian M. Leske, "Context and Meaning of Zechariah 9:9," *CBQ* 62 (2000): 672–73; and
Curt Niccum, "The Blessing of Judah in 4Q252," in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the
Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich* (ed. Peter W. Flint, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam;
VTSup 101; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 252. Others are less certain about the allusion; see, e.g., *Bringing
Out the Treasure: Inner Biblical Allusion in Zechariah 9–14* (ed. Mark J. Boda and Michael H.
Floyd; JSOTSup 370; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 38, 217–18; and Anthony R.
Petterson, *Behold Your King: The Hope for the House of David in the Book of Zechariah* (Library
of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 513; New York: T&T Clark, 2009), 140 (with literature).

[60] For some of the ancient sources, see Krause, "One Who Comes," 149–50; and Maarten

> In the account of the preparation for the triumphant entry, Zech 9:9 forms a fulfilment citation, referring to the eschatological appearance of a king, coming upon an ass and the foal of an ass. In the latter, the Matthean quotation *differs* from both the Septuagint and the Hebrew text of the prophet, but combines vocabulary found in the LXX version of Gen 49:11. . . . The disciples find an ass tied [δεδεμένην] and her foal with her, a scene also described in Gen 49:11, using the same vocabulary.[61]

A connection between הִנֵּה מַלְכֵּךְ יָבוֹא לָךְ—understood by both Jews and Christians as a reference to the coming of a messianic king—and עַד כִּי־יָבֹא שִׁילֹה, has also been posited.[62]

Is there any connection between עַד בֹּא אֲשֶׁר־לֹו הַמִּשְׁפָּט and הִנֵּה מַלְכֵּךְ יָבוֹא לָךְ (Ezek 21:32)? Katrina Larkin implies that there is an indirect relationship:

> Whilst there is probably no direct relationship between Ezekiel 21:32 and Zech 9:9 (although the fact that there is a comparison has been noted by Rudolph: 1976, 179), the very fact that Ezekiel seems to have subverted the promise of Gen 49:10–11 could provide the ground for supposing that Zechariah wished to reinstate it in an eschatological context.[63]

I would go a step further. In my view, Zechariah's messianic interpretation of Gen 49:10–11 is based, in part, on Ezekiel's reading of עַד כִּי־יָבֹא שִׁילֹה וְלֹו יִקְהַת עַמִּים, viz., "until the coming of him to whom tribute belongs and to whom the homage of peoples belongs." It is only in that reading that the subject of יָבֹא in Gen 49:10, like the subject of יָבוֹא in Zech 9:9, refers to a king. In the earlier readings, it was tribute (שַׁי = שִׁי)—not a king—that was expected to come to Judah. The two prophets differ, of course, in their identification of the king (Nebuchadnezzar vs. the Messiah). Accordingly, they also differ in their interpretation of עַד. For Zechariah, unlike Ezekiel, it indicates culmination rather than cessation; the scepter will *not* depart from Judah at the time specified.

Zechariah's messianic interpretation may well have been inspired by the appointment of Zerubbabel, a descendant of David, as governor of Judah. Zerubbabel served in that capacity during the last two decades of the sixth century, and it has recently been suggested that Zech 9:9 dates to that period.[64] A slightly later date is also possible. Davidic leadership continued for one more decade at the beginning of the fifth century, under the joint rule of the new governor, Elnathan,

---

J. J. Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form* (CBET 15; Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996), 88–89 including n. 35.

[61] Lena Lybæk, *New and Old in Matthew 11–13: Normativity in the Development of Three Theological Themes* (FRLANT 198; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002), 80–81.

[62] Rudolph, *Haggai,* 179; Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation,* 502; Larkin, *Eschatology,* 70 (with literature); Krause, "One Who Comes," 147.

[63] Larkin, *Eschatology,* 72.

[64] Paul L. Redditt, *Zechariah 9–14* (International Exegetical Commentary on the Old Testament; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2012), 50–52.

and Zerubbabel's daughter, Shelomith (1 Chr 3:19).[65] According to one plausible suggestion, the compilation of Zechariah 9–14 dates to that time.[66]

Perhaps this limited renewal of Davidic leadership created the sense that the scepter had not departed from Judah after all. In any event, Zechariah's messianic interpretation added a new dimension to Jacob's blessing of Judah—one that had previously been hidden. To be sure, other prophets had promised that Israel's sovereignty would eventually be restored by a worthy scion of David, but Zechariah went a step further, giving the promise more weight by pushing its origin all the way back to patriarchal times.

VII. Another Ambiguous Patriarchal Oracle

The idea that syntactic ambiguity in patriarchal oracles can help them adapt to changing circumstances is not a new one. It is found in traditional Jewish exegesis of וְרַב יַעֲבֹד צָעִיר (Gen 25:23), a clause whose ambiguity is preserved in the translation "and the elder shall the younger serve."[67] As noted by several medieval exegetes,[68] either רַב or צָעִיר can be the subject of the verb, with the other one serving as its object. For רַב as the subject, one exegete compares בֵּן יְכַבֵּד אָב, "a son

---

[65] Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, "The Future Fortunes of the House of David: The Evidence of Second Zechariah," in *Fortunate the Eyes That See: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Seventieth Birthday* (ed. Astrid B. Beck et al.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 208.

[66] Ibid., 216.

[67] It is striking that, with rare exceptions, modern commentators make no mention of this ambiguity. Thus, J. P. Fokkelman (*Narrative Art in Genesis: Specimens of Stylistic and Structural Analysis* [SSN 17; Assen/Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1975], 89) introduces the verse with the words: "Now, too, God gives an unambiguous answer." I have found only two exceptions: Eduard König, *Stilistik, Rhetorik, Poetik in Bezug auf die biblische Litteratur komparativisch* (Leipzig: Dieterich, 1900), 122; and Richard Elliott Friedman, *Commentary on the Torah with a New English Translation* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2001), 88, citing David Noel Freedman. Both of these works compare the ambiguity of the Delphic oracle. The comparison is reasonable for the third clause of Rebekah's oracle (וּלְאֹם מִלְאֹם יֶאֱמָץ, "*a people* shall be mightier than *a people*"), which exhibits *referential* ambiguity. The ambiguous replies attributed to the Delphic oracle are virtually all of that type (e.g., "if you make war on the Persians, you will destroy *a great empire*"); see Joseph Fontenrose, *The Delphic Oracle: Its Responses and Operations, with a Catalogue of Responses* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978), 58–69, 302. The one *syntactically* ambiguous reply attributed to the Delphic oracle is in Latin and believed to be Ennius's invention (ibid., 343).

[68] See the commentary of David Qimḥi on this verse in מקראות גדולות הכתר. See also Joseph Ibn Kaspi, משנה כסף (ed. Isaac Last; Cracow: J. Fischer, 1906), 67; and Aaron b. Joseph ha-Kohen, ספר הג״ע (ed. J. M. Orlian; Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 2009), p. קע, where the phrase "לא כתב "הצעיר should read "לא כתב "את הצעיר, as in תוספות השלם, vol. 3, p. יד, col. 2 top.

should honor a father" (Mal 1:6); for צָעִיר as the subject, another exegete compares אֲבָנִים שָׁחֲקוּ מַיִם, "water wears away stone" (Job 14:19).

Such ambiguities (called "case ambiguities" by modern linguists) are characteristic of biblical poetry, where את (one of the so-called prose particles) is used sparingly, and the rules of word order are relaxed, e.g., כִּי־יַעֲקֹב בָּחַר לוֹ יָהּ, "for Jacob has the Lord chosen for himself" (Ps 135:4), and אִישׁ־דָּמִים וּמִרְמָה יְתָעֵב ה׳, "a murderous, deceitful man does the Lord abhor" (Ps 5:7).[69] In our case, the absence of the accusative marker is correlated with the absence of another "prose particle," viz., the definite article: neither רב nor צָעִיר is marked as definite.

Genesis Rabbah (§63) is the earliest rabbinic source to note the two interpretations:

> If he [= Jacob, the younger] merits, he [= Esau, the elder] will serve, but if not, he [= Esau, the elder] will be served.[70]

According to the midrash, the contradictory interpretations of the oracle will be fulfilled at different times, depending on the merits of Jacob's descendants. An underlying assumption of the midrash is made explicit by Elijah b. Solomon, the Gaon of Vilna: the ambiguity of the oracle leaves room for freedom of choice (תלוי בבחירתו).[71] In other words, the tension between predictive prophecy and free will can be resolved by means of ambiguity.

The two ambiguous patriarchal oracles complement each other; their ambiguity carries the same message. Although Jacob and Judah were destined to rule over their brothers in the long term (cf. Gen 27:29, 37 and 49:8), their dominance at any given point in time was not preordained. It could be suspended temporarily if their descendants were not worthy of their destiny.

VIII. Conclusions

Among the many ambiguities that have helped to make Gen 49:10 one of the most difficult cruxes in the Hebrew Bible, the lexical and syntactic ambiguities of the word עַד are second to none. Ancient and medieval interpreters of the verse took עַד as equivalent to English (1) "ever" (in the phrase "not ever"), (2) "forever" (in the phrase "not forever"), (3) "until" (indicating a point of cessation) and/or (4) "until (not to mention after)" (indicating a point of culmination). These four

---

[69] The former example is discussed in מדרש תנאים על ספר דברים (ed. David Hoffmann; Berlin: H. Itzkowski, 1909), 73–74. The latter example is noted by Yūsuf Ibn Nūḥ (Geoffrey Khan, *The Early Karaite Tradition of Hebrew Grammatical Thought Including a Critical Edition, Translation and Analysis of the* Diqduq *of ᵓAbū Yaʕqūb Yūsuf Ibn Nūḥ on the Hagiographa* [Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics 32; Leiden: Brill, 2000], 100, 210–11). Both examples are ambiguous in isolation but disambiguated by the context.

[70] מדרש בראשית רבא (ed. J. Theodor and C. Albeck; Berlin: M. Poppelauer, 1927), 686.

[71] Elijah b. Solomon of Vilna, אדרת אליהו (Tel Aviv: Sinai, 1969), 12.

interpretations of עַד correspond to three different ways of bracketing the word with the neighboring words in the verse.

These ambiguities did not go unnoticed in the biblical period. During the course of that period, they gave rise to a number of distinct interpretations of the oracle, interpretations that are reflected in the prophecies of Nathan, Ahijah the Shilonite, Ezekiel, and Zechariah. Each interpretation corresponded to a different historical development: the rise of the Davidic dynasty in the time of Nathan; the decline of the Davidic dynasty in the time of Ahijah; the fall of the Davidic dynasty in the time of Ezekiel; and the limited renewal of Davidic leadership in the time of Zechariah. Thus, they allowed the oracle to adapt to the changing fortunes of the House of David, making it possible for each generation to adopt an interpretation that was suited to its own time.

Appendix: עַד as a "Shared Word" in *Targum Onqelos*, 4Q252 (4QCommGen A), and the *Testament of Judah*

There are ancient sources that seem to interpret עַד as if it occurred twice—once at the end of the first half of the verse and again at the beginning of the second half of the verse. I shall call a word that belongs to two separate constituents, one before it and the other after it, a "shared word."[72] Although such words need

---

[72] I am coining this term based on the term "shared consonant," for which see Wilfred G. E. Watson, "Shared Consonants in Northwest Semitic," *Bib* 50 (1969): 525–33; and idem, "More on Shared Consonants," *Bib* 52 (1971): 44–50. Such words, which need not be ambiguous, are most easily recognized in short symmetrical constructions of the form ABA′ , such as לָצוּד צַיִד לְהָבִיא (Gen 27:5), דְּעֵנָב כָּבוּ כַּפִּשְׁתָּה (Deut 32:14), אֶשְׁמֹר צֹאנְךָ תִּשְׁמְּתֶּה־חָמֵר וְדַם־עֵנָב אֶרְעֶה (Gen 30:31), הִתְאַזָּר עֹז ה׳ לָבֵשׁ (Ps 93:1), יִשָּׂאֻהוּ עַל־כָּתֵף יִסְבְּלֻהוּ (Isa 46:7), לִדְרוֹשׁ בָּאוֹב לִשְׁאוֹל (Isa 43:17), (1 Chr 10:13), etc. Hebrew terms for this usage are found in a few medieval commentaries from northern France, commentaries that take וְתִמְנַע at the beginning of Gen 36:12 as belonging to the end of 36:11 as well. In the commentary of Joseph Bekhor Shor (פירושי רבי יוסף בכור שור על התורה [ed. Yehoshafat Nevo; Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 1994], pp. סה-סד), the term is עונה לכאן ולכאן, "responding this way and that way." It is apparently based on the talmudic term עולה לכאן ולכאן, "reckoned this way and that way," referring to a day, year, and so on, sandwiched between two consecutive periods of time and considered as belonging to both; that term, too, appears in Bekhor Shor's commentary (at Lev 25:12; p. רל last line). Aaron b. Joseph ha-Kohen (ספר הג״ן, p. קפד) uses a similar term: קאי לכאן ולכאן, "relating [lit., standing] this way and that way." Another term that may be relevant here is פסוקים שאין להם הכרע, "verses that have no resolution," in rabbinic literature, e.g., מכילתא דרבי ישמעאל (ed. H. S. Horovitz and I. A. Rabin; Frankfurt am Main: J. Kauffmann, 1931), 179 lines 9–15; קטעי מדרשי הלכה מן הגניזה (ed. Menahem I. Kahana; Jerusalem: Magnes, 2005), 83 top and bottom; מדרש בראשית רבא (ed. J. Theodor and C. Albeck; Jerusalem: Wahrmann, 1965), 957–58; *b. Yoma* 52a; etc. For the view that this term refers to verses containing a word that belongs to the preceding constituent *and* (not: *or*) the following constituent, see Yochanan Breuer, ושוב למקראות שאין להם הכרע, in *Israel: Linguistic Studies in the Memory of Israel Yeivin* (ed. Rafael I. [Singer] Zer and Yosef Ofer; Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 2011), 53–63.

not be ambiguous, this one is, and it has a different meaning in each half-verse.[73] This is, of course, a literary device, but it has a linguistic underpinning. In our case, it implies that two consecutive occurrences of עַד, with different meanings, are found in the underlying structure of our verse and that they are reduced to one in its surface structure.

The interpretation of עַד as a shared word is clearly reflected in *Targum Onqelos*:

לא יעידי עביד שולטן מדבית יהודה וספרא מבני בנוהי עד עלמא, עד דייתי
משיחא דדיליה היא מלכותא וליה ישתמעון עממיא.[74]

Here עַד is rendered twice—once as עד עלמא, "until eternity," and a second time as עד, "until (not to mention after)." In the words of S. Pinsker, Onqelos "vacillates in his translation between two opinions" (פוסח בתרגומו על ב׳ הסעפים).[75]

The connection between Onqelos's עד עלמא and MT עַד was discussed time and again by Jewish scholars (and at least one Christian scholar) from the Middle Ages to the early twentieth century.[76] It is, therefore, surprising to find that the connection is barely mentioned in contemporary scholarship. James L. Kugel, for example, writes: "The word 'forever' here does not correspond to any word in the Hebrew original of this verse."[77] Even scholars who searched for examples

---

[73] This feature makes our example similar, albeit not identical, to the so-called pivot in Janus parallelism. For the term "pivot," see Gene M. Schramm, "Poetic Patterning in Biblical Hebrew" in *Michigan Oriental Studies in Honor of George G. Cameron* (ed. L. L. Orlin et al.; Ann Arbor: Department of Near Eastern Studies, University of Michigan, 1976), 178–79; and Scott B. Noegel (*Janus Parallelism in the Book of Job* (JSOTSup 223; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 13. Schramm referred to the ambiguous word הַזָּמִיר in Song 2:12 as "the pivot of a false syllogism," and entitled his discussion "Parallelism of Ambiguity." The term "Janus parallelism" appeared two years later in a similar but less detailed discussion of הַזָּמִיר: Cyrus H. Gordon, "New Directions," in *Studies Presented to Naphtali Lewis,* special issue, *BASP* 15 (1978): 59–60. Another term used by Noegel and others is "polysemous parallelism." This would be an excellent choice were it not for the fact that the parade example, הַזָּמִיר, exhibits homonymy rather than polysemy; thus, a term such as "homonymous parallelism" might be more accurate. Noegel (p. 29) notes that the first scholar to recognize this literary device was David Yellin.

[74] *The Bible in Aramaic* (ed. Alexander Sperber; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1962), 85. The Cambridge Genizah fragments that have this verse (T-S B1.25, T-S B11.48, T-S 288.183) exhibit few significant variants. T-S B11.48 reads יתכנשון with ישתמעון in the margin; T-S 288.183 is the opposite. T-S B11.48 reads יהי for היא. For an example of עד taken by Onqelos as a shared word with not only a different *meaning* in each half-verse but also a different *vocalization* (Exod 22:12), see Jordan S. Penkower, 6 על גלגולי נוסח פירוש רש״י, פירוש רד״ק ותרגום יונתן ליחזקאל כז, *Studies in Bible and Exegesis*, vol. 5, *Uriel Simon Jubilee Volume* (Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press 2000), 338–39.

[75] S. Pinsker, לקוטי קדמוניות לקורות דת בני מקרא והליטעראטור שלהם (Vienna: Adalbert della Torre, 1860), 180 note.

[76] See immediately above and n. 87 below.

[77] James L. Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible as It Was at the Start of the Common Era* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998), 470.

of double translation of this type or in this place have failed to note it. Michael Carasik's list of shared words translated twice in the targums includes an example from Genesis 49, but it is אָרוּר (v. 7) rather than עַד.[78] Roger Syrén's list of double translations in the targums to Genesis 49 includes an example from v. 10, but it is שִׁילֹה rather than עַד.[79]

The disconnect between modern targum scholarship and traditional targum scholarship is particularly striking in the following comment by Moses Aberbach and Bernard Grossfeld:

> TO עד עלמא—not in MT . . . Textually, there may be some connection between MT (כי) (יבא) עד and TO (עלמא) עד, and the combination עד עלמא may have been suggested in part by the Heb. עד; cf. B. Z. J. Berkowitz, חלפות שמלות, Wilna, 1874, p. 54.[80]

It is difficult to reconcile the first two clauses of this comment with the reference at its end, because Berkowitz's book cites Baḥye's view that (a) *Onqelos*'s עד עלמא renders עַד, and (b) עַד is not connected to כִּי־יָבֹא. One gets the impression that Aberbach and Grossfeld did not understand Berkowitz's note; if they were looking for a "connection between MT (יבא) (כי) עד and TO (עלמא) עד," they missed the point entirely.

As we have seen, Rashba and Baḥye cite a different version of *Onqelos*'s rendering in support of bracketings 2b ("shall not forever depart") and 2a ("shall not ever depart") respectively—without any double rendering of עַד. Rashba omits the second עד in citing *Onqelos* (עד עלמא, דייתי משיחא), implicitly rejecting it. Baḥye makes the rejection explicit: "And because of this, Onqelos translated עד עלמא, and he translated כי יבא שילה as דייתא משיחא; and he who translates עד דייתא משיחא errs."[81]

The reading עד עלמא, דייתי משיחא is not well attested in manuscripts and printed editions of *Onqelos*. In Sperber's critical edition, it is attributed to a single source, a Bible printed in Spain (Ixar, 1490).[82] Adolf Posnanski lists three witnesses to that reading, as against forty witnesses to the reading עד עלמא, עד דייתי משיחא.[83]

[78] Michael Carasik, "Syntactic Double Translation in the *Targumim*," in *Aramaic in Post-biblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from the 2004 National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Seminar at Duke University* (ed. Eric M. Meyers and Paul V. M. Flesher; Duke Judaic Series 3; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010), 222–24.

[79] Roger Syrén, *The Blessings in the Targums: A Study on the Targumic Interpretations of Genesis 49 and Deuteronomy 33* (Acta Academiae Aboensis, Ser. A, Humaniora 64.1; Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1986), 17–19.

[80] Aberbach and Grossfeld, *Targum Onqelos on Genesis 49*, 13–14 n. 23; eidem, *Targum Onkelos to Genesis*, 285–86 n. 21. Similarly, עד עלמא is called an "insertion" by Bernard Grossfeld in McNamara et al., *Aramaic Bible: The Targums,* 6:163 n. 24.

[81] See at nn. 24 and 25 above.

[82] Sperber, *Bible in Aramaic*, 85.

[83] Posnanski, *Schiloh: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Messiaslehre* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1904), 27–28. Posnanski's "Editio Sora" is now known to be from Ixar, Spain.

The latter is also the reading of the three Cambridge Genizah fragments of *Onqelos* that have this verse,[84] including one written in Spanish semicursive script.[85] This suggests that עד עלמא, עד דייתי משיחא was the reading in Spain before Rashba and Baḥye. Thus, the reading עד עלמא, דייתי משיחא in the Ixar Bible may simply reflect the influence of these two leading scholars.

A different reading in *Onqelos* was found in a manuscript owned by Abraham Firkowitsch: עד עלמא, ארי ייתי משיחא, "until eternity, for the Messiah will come."[86] This unique reading, accompanied by a variant reading in the MT (*etnaḥ* under עד), is cited by A. Berliner, S. R. Driver, Posnanski, and others.[87] However, it has long been known that Firkowitsch was a forger who tampered with the manuscripts and tombstones that he collected, and "it remains a difficult if not impossible task to determine the original text from the emendations and interpolations."[88] In 1860, S. Pinsker reported that Firkowitsch had shown him a very old manuscript with *etnaḥ* under עד, and he conjectured that that is what Onqelos had in mind when he wrote עד עלמא, "even though Onqelos vacillates in his translation between two opinions."[89] In 1871, after Pinsker's death, Firkowitsch revealed that he owned a "wondrous" manuscript (no. 128 in his catalogue) with the reading ארי ייתי instead of the standard עד דייתי.[90] This reading, he implied, supported the interpretation of an early French Rabbanite[91] and undermined the Christian claim that Judah, once it lost dominion, would never regain it.[92] He added that "had Pinsker seen this precious manuscript, he would not have attributed any vacillation to him [Onqelos] at all, because he would have realized that the hands of others had tampered with it [*Targum Onqelos*]."[93] It is noteworthy that, while Firkowitsch supplied the catalogue number of the "wondrous" manuscript and the numbers of seven other manuscripts with *etnaḥ* under עד,[94] he was vague about the

---

[84] See n. 74 above.

[85] T-S B11.48. For a description of the manuscript, see Michael L. Klein, *Targumic Manuscripts in the Cambridge Genizah Collections* (Genizah Series 8; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 21.

[86] Abraham Firkowitsch [on title page: Firkowitz], בני רשף (Vienna: J. Holawarth, 1871), 14.

[87] *Targum Onkelos* (ed. A. Berliner; Berlin: Gorzelanczyk, 1884), 2:18; Posnanski, *Schiloh*, 28; S. R. Driver, "Genesis XLIX. 10: An Exegetical Study," *Journal of Philology* 14 (1885): 6: "There are traces of another reading which omits עד before דייתי—'shall not depart for ever, when Messiah', &c. . . . So R. Bechai: and one of the Firkowitsch MSS. reads also ארי ייתי for עד דייתי, with *athnach* in the text at עד."

[88] *EncJud* 6:1306, s.v. "Firkovich, Abraham."

[89] Pinsker, לקוטי קדמוניות, 180 note.

[90] Firkowitsch, בני רשף, 14.

[91] The interpretation he cites is similar to that found in our editions of *Daʿat Zeqenim*; see at n. 22 above.

[92] Firkowitsch, בני רשף, 13, 14.

[93] Ibid., 14.

[94] Firkowitsch was referring to manuscripts of what is now known as his first collection. The collection, described in the printed German catalogue of Harkavy-Strack (1875), is avail-

manuscript that he had shown Pinsker fifteen years earlier, identifying it only as "a very old manuscript."[95] One cannot rule out the possibility that the manuscript shown to Pinsker by Firkowitsch was no. 128, and that Pinsker's comment about Onqelos's vacillation convinced Firkowitsch to make the relatively simple change from עד דייתי to עד ייתי.[96]

Two ancient paraphrases of our verse may also reflect the interpretation of עד as a shared word. One is found in 4Q252 (4QCommGen A), col. 5, lines 1–4:

> [לו]א יסור שליט משבט יהודה בהיות לישראל ממשל [לוא י]כרת
> יושב כסא לדויד כי המחוקק היא ברית המלכות [ואל]פי ישראל המה
> הדגלים[97]   עד בוא משיח הצדק צמח דויד כי לו ולזרעו נתנה ברית
> מלכות עמו עד דורות עולם. . . .[98]

A ruler shall not depart from the tribe of Judah. While Israel has sovereignty, David shall not cease to have someone sitting on the throne (because the מחוקק is the covenant of kingship and the clans of Israel are the דגלים)   until the coming of the Messiah of Righteousness, the Branch of David, for to him and his seed has been given the covenant of kingship over his people until eternity [lit., until the generations of eternity].

This is a free paraphrase in which the verse has been rearranged and inter-woven with other biblical verses (esp. Jer 33:15, 17); even so, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that עד דורות עולם and עד בוא משיח הצדק correspond to Onqelos's

---

[95] Firkowitsch, בני רשף, 14.

[96] After reading this conjecture, Jordan S. Penkower examined the microfilm of this manu-script and sent me digital images of the passage, which is stained and difficult to read. Neverthe-less, he was able to ascertain that both the *aleph* of ארי and the *etnaḥ* under עד show signs of being secondary; they are noticeably different from other examples of those signs on the same page. He also examined microfilms of six of the other seven manuscripts cited in n. 94 above (MSS 48, 49, 54, 68, 83, and 87) and reported that "the alternative accentuation that Firkovitch men-tions (*etnaḥta* under עד, instead of רגליו; and רגליו with *ṭipḥa*, instead of *etnaḥta*) is secondary, probably corrections by Firkovitch himself" (e-mail communication). I am greatly indebted to him for this confirmation of my conjecture.

[97] Note the initial *dalet*, agreeing with the reading of the Samaritan Pentateuch: ומחקק מבין דגליו. The word is followed by a *vacat*.

[98] *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (ed. G. J. Brooke et al., in consultation with James C. VanderKam; DJD *22;* Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 205–6; *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations,* vol. 6B, *Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents* (ed. James H. Charlesworth et al.; Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 216–17; *La bibliothèque de Qumrân* (ed. Katell Berthelot et al.; 9 vols.; Paris: Cerf, 2008–), 1:308–11.

עד דייתי משיחא and עד עלמא, respectively. The correspondence was recognized already in the *editio princeps*.[99] What has not been recognized is the possibility that this may be based on a double interpretation of עד. The possibility is greatly enhanced by the double interpretation of שֵׁבֶט in לו[א יסור שליט משבט יהודה], pointed out by several scholars.[100]

The other paraphrase of our verse that may be relevant here is put into the mouth of Judah in the *Testament of Judah* (22:1–3):

> . . . and among men of other nations my kingship will be brought to an end, until the coming of [ἕως τοῦ ἐλθεῖν = עד דייתי] the salvation of Israel. . . . For the Lord swore to me with an oath that my kingship will not fail from my seed [μὴ ἐκλεῖψαι τὸ βασίλειόν μου ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματός μου; cf. LXX οὐκ ἐκλείψει ἄρχων ἐξ Ιουδα] all the days, until eternity [ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος = עד עלמא].[101]

Here again, the correspondence with *Onqelos* has been recognized,[102] but not the possibility that it reflects the interpretation of עד as a shared word.

These sources appear to reflect a combination of bracketings 2a and 1 ("shall not ever depart, until [not to mention after]"). The comment in 4Q252 seems to point to bracketing 2a rather than 2b ("shall not forever depart") when it suggests that Jacob's blessing to Judah has an unstated condition: the scepter shall not ever depart from the tribe of Judah *as long as Israel has sovereignty*. That condition was presumably needed to reconcile bracketing 2a of the blessing with many warnings in the Bible (e.g., Deut 28:36), not to mention historical events; it was not needed for bracketing 2b. Something similar may be true of Onqelos's rendering, which seems to downgrade the referent of שֵׁבֶט to anyone exercising authority (עביד שולטן)[103] and the referent of מְחֹקֵק to a scribe. Such a rendering makes good sense in the context of bracketing 2a but not in the context of bracketing 2b.[104]

---

[99] Allegro, "Further Messianic References," 175 nn. 8–9.

[100] Martin G. Abegg, "The Messiah at Qumran: Are We Still Seeing Double?" *DSD* 2 (1995): 134; Charlesworth, *Pesharim,* 217 n. 59.

[101] M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (PVTG 1.2; Leiden: Brill, 1978), 75; H. W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary* (SVTP 8; Leiden: Brill, 1985), 221 (with minor changes). Cf. Anders Hultgård, *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches* (2 vols.; Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Historia religionum 6–7; Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1977, 1981), 1:170.

[102] Kugel, *Traditions*, 470.

[103] Perhaps anyone with the legal authority to mete out corporal punishment; cf. n. 34 above. *Pace* Kugel (*Traditions*, 470), it is unlikely that שולטן here refers specifically to kingship. *Targum Onqelos* seems to use שולטן here in contrast to מלכות later in the verse ("authority" vs. "kingship"; cf. *Tg. Onq.* Gen 37:8), just as it uses שלטון in contrast to מלך in the previous verse (49:9) ("an authority" vs. "a king"; cf. *Tg. Onq.* Deut 33:20). Symmachus renders שֵׁבֶט in our verse with ἐξουσία ("power, authority"), the Greek noun that is regularly used by the LXX and Theodotion to render Aramaic שְׁלְטָן in Daniel.

[104] Contrast Kugel, *Traditions*, 470: "The real meaning must . . . have been that it [= kingship] would not depart forever, that sometime it would be restored." But see n. 103 above.