AH 48 occurrences. EBH 1 11x, EBH2 6x, LBH 1 25x, LBH 3 2x.

BH 44 occurrences:
1Sm 9.16; 10.1; 13.14; 25.30, 2Sm 5.2; 6.21; 7.8, 1Kg 1.35; 14.7; 16.2, 2Kg 20.5, Is 55.4, Jr 20.1, Ezek 28.2, Ps 76.13, Pr 8.6; 28.16, Jb 29.10; 31.37, Dn 9.25,26; 11.22, Nh 11.11, 1Ch 5.2; 9.11,12; 12.28; 13.1; 17.7; 26.24; 27.4,16; 28.4; 29.22, 2Ch 6.5; 11.11,22; 19.11; 28.7; 31.12,13; 32.21; 35.8.

Sir 2 occurrences: Sir 41.19 B; 46.13 B:

Ep: no occurrences.

Qumran: 2 occurrences:
4QDibHam 4Q504 4.7
11QPs XXVIII.8

Text doubtful:
A.1 Joüon (1936:233) suggests that the difficult Pr 8.6 יְהִי יְהֹוָה, should perhaps be יְהִי יְהֹוָה since it is rendered σεμώνα “noble things” by LXX. Some commentators e.g. Toy (1899:162, 166), suggest that the reading has been corrupted from יְהֹוָה, but Grollenberg (1952:40–41) thinks this unlikely from the graphic point of view. He thinks the original reading was יְהִי יְהֹוָה, from יְהֹוָה understood as a noun, on the analogy of יְהֹוָה יְהֹוָה (8.9), and his suggestion is noted in BHS and followed by Plöger (1984:85–86). See also Gemser 1963:44 and Ringgren 1981:38 “noble”.

A.2 1Ch 27.4 יְהִי יְהֹוָה מָלָא כְּבֵד: this phrase is absent in LXX MSS, and it may have been lacking in the original Hebrew. See Rudolph 1955:178; Myers 1965:179, Mettinger 1976:152.

B.1 Dahood has suggested emending a number of passages in Psalms containing יְהֹוָה “in front of” to יְהֹוָה “prince, leader” as an epithet of Yahweh: Ps 16. 54.5c, 86.14; 138.1 (1965, 1968, 1970:I.86, II.23–24, 25, 292, III.276). Hasel (ThW V, 1986:219) rejects these emendations because יְהֹוָה is nowhere else used of Yahweh.
1. Root and comparative material

A.1 Soggin (1963:58–60) observes that דג and its supposed root are not known in the older WSem languages. There is certainly no obvious relation between the noun and a verb דג, such as we find with other words for rulers, מֶלֶך / מֶלֶכָּל / מֶלֶך / מֶלֶך, מֶלֶכָּל / מֶלֶכָּל / מֶלֶכָּל / מֶלֶכָּל, and even with the derived noun אָיִין / אָיִין. García Martínez, however (1986:188–89), connects the verb דג, adv דג and noun דג.

Several possibilities for the semantics of דג have been suggested:


b) < דג as in דג: i) pass ptc.: Alt (1930:23 n.2; ET 1966:195 n.54) “said” i.e. “designated” (by God), Eichrodt (1933:239; ET 444), Lipinski (1974:497–99) “designated” by God or king, hence “crown prince”, also Noth (1956:156 n.2; ET 169 n.1), Wildberger (1957:454), Birch (1971:64–65), Mettinger (1976: 161, 182). See Hertzberg (1960:67, 64 = ET 82, 84) “the one who has been announced”. However, Gese (1964:12 n.7) doubts that a passive meaning can come from the Hiph‘īl meaning of the root. Buber (1956:126–27) notes the frequent word plays אָיִין/אָיִין and דג/דג, and Shaviv (1984:111, 113 n.90) argues that the frequent use of דג in 1Sm 9.1–10.16 may hint that Hebrew speakers of the time connected דג with the verb דג. Hertzberg (1960:67 = ET 82 n.b) follows Buber in seeing the juxtaposition of דג/דג as more than mere coincidence. However, Brettler (1989:34) is critical of such approaches which confuse a typical biblical word-play with etymology. All the same, popular etymology may provide a clue at least as to the word’s contemporary associations, or as to why a passive ptc. came to have a titular sense. (One could also cite Job 31.37.)


c) A root variant of דג: Glück (1963:144–50), denoting the king as shepherd of his people. His methodology has been criticised by Gese (1964:12 n.7), Richter (1965: 72 n.7), and
Carlson (1964:53 n.1), but Lipinski (1998:512) believes that there is an etymological and semantic connection between the two roots.

A.2 There may be an OArm noun *ngd’* which from the contexts in which it occurs may refer to some sort of official. However, because OArm *r* and *d* are similar in form (the vertical stem of the *Resh* being longer) the reading in some cases may be *ngr’* instead, a word which scholars connect with the Akk word *nāgiru*, “herald”, “high official in Assyria and Elam”, e.g. *nāgir ekalli* (CAD N/I 11.115–8, AHw II 711). The most important occurrence is in Sefire III.10 in a list of those close to the king or owing loyalty to him, between the king’s sons and his officials (*pqdy*). It therefore must have the meaning “officers” or something similar (e.g. Lipinski 1998:509 favours “envoys”). For the reading *ngry* are Dupont-Sommer 1956:32–33, Noth 1961:150 n.88, Degen 1969:21, Lemaire and Durand 1984:119, 145: for *ngdy*, Dupont-Sommer 1948:43–68, Fitzmyer 1995:151–52, Lipinski 1975:56 and 1998:509-511. Segert 1975:542 and KAI I:§224, p. 268 list both possibilities. Another disputed case of OArm *ngd* is *wngd/r’ znh Saqqara 8: “and this commanding officer” (*ngd’*) or “officer, commander, official” (*ngr’*) (see Hasel ThW 1986:V, 204–205). Though there is no debate concerning the reading of *ngdy* Elephantine (Porten-Yardeni I:A6.2 line 8: “drawn up”) and *ngyd/r* in a 5th century text from Memphis, opinion on their meaning is not unanimous: Hasel ThW 1986:V, 205 and DNWSI II:713–14 give bibliographical details.

In later JAram the existence of a noun *nāgōdā* is unquestioned. It has the meaning “leader, ruler, judge”, cf. SamAram *nāgōd* (Tal, 499a), but is derived from the Aram root *ngd*, “to draw, pull”, cf. Mand, Syr *ngd*, and various nouns e.g. *ngada* “extension”, punishment, agony, pain” (Macuch–Drower, Payne Smith). For this reason *nāgōdā* is not etymologically related to *yōn* (Joüon 1936:229), even though some of the renderings of *yōn* by the ancient Versions (q.v.) seem to indicate influence from the JAram word. *nāgōdā* is also used to render *yōn* in Tg Jdg 2.16,18,19 and 1Ch 17.16.

A.3 The root *ngd* appears in OPh *ngd* in a Nora inscription (9th century: KAI 46), but may refer to the name of a colony NGD, to a commanding officer (Cross 1972:13–19), or to a temple overseer (*nāgīd*) (Hasel ThWAT 1986:V, 205–206). The context of Ammon *ngd* in the 6th century Heshbon ostracon 13 is too fragmentary for certain interpretation, but probably refers to a military or official rank (Hasel 1986: V,206).
A.4 Sabaic \textit{ngd} means “highland, plateau”, cf. Mod Arb \textit{nagd} “highland” (Biella 1982:291). ClassArb \textit{nagada} I is often said to have the sense “to be high, rise, overcome, show oneself”, IV “be raised” (e.g. in Eskhult 1989/90:33), but Lipinski 1998:509 denies this, pointing out that the ModArb meaning is “to assist, stand by someone, uphold someone”.  


A.6 Fritz (1976:351), followed by Brettler (1989:34), believes that it is almost impossible to ascertain the original meaning of \textit{dygIn}. Even if we could, as de Boer (1938:13 n.34) points out, “quite often... etymology does not give us an understanding of the value of a term.”

2. Formal characteristics  

A.1 N., m. \textit{qaṭīl} form, but this could be either an active ptc (Barth 1894:§184e; GK §84al; BL 470), or passive ptc (but with active meaning—Rosenthal 1958:7 n.17).  

3. Syntagmatics  

A.1 Common construction with \textit{Ḥ}: Joüon (1936:230) emphasises the preposition’s importance in indicating the scope of the \textit{Ḥ}’s authority:  

a) in Sam-Kgs:  
1Sm 9.16, 1Kg 14.7; 16.2 “over my people Israel”  
1Sm 13.14 “over His people” (cf. 4Q504 [DibHam a] 4.7 “over your people”)  
1Sm 25.30, 2Sm 5.2 “over Israel”  
2Sm 6.21 “over the Lord’s people, over Israel”  
2Sm 7.8 “over my people, over Israel”  
1Kg 1.35 “over Israel and over Judah”  
1Sm 10.1 “over His inheritance”  
Cf. 2Ch 6.5 “over my people Israel”; Sir 46.13 B “over the people”.  
In each case, the authority of the \textit{Ḥ} is over a group of people or nation, but not over an individual.  

b) A similar construction is found in Ch, but in more ordinary contexts:
1Ch 26.24 “over the treasuries”: Joüon (1936:230 n.1) suggests adopting a similar reading instead of נאצmouseenter instead of נאצ注明来源 in 2Ch 11.11.

1Ch 27.16 “over the tribes of Israel, for the Reubenites”

1Ch 9.20 “over them [the gatekeepers]”: 2Ch 31.12 “over them [the contributions and tithes]”.

Here the scope of authority has narrowed and shifted to more administrative duties.

A.2 In later AH, the נָּצָה’s sphere of influence is indicated by

a) the nomen rectum:
2Kg 20.5 “of my people”
Ezk 28.2 “of Tyre”
Dn 11.22 “of the covenant”
Neh 11.11, 1Ch 9.11, 2Ch 31.13; 35.8 “of the house of God”
2Ch 28.7 “of the palace”

b) by מ
Jr 20.1 “in the house of the Lord”
2Ch 11.22 “among his brothers”

c) by ל
2Ch 19.11 “for the house of Judah”

A.3 Most verbs used with נָּצָה describe someone’s appointment as מ or to be מ. Lipinski (1974:497–99) says that נאצmouseenter was the original formula for the act of appointing מ.

1Sm 9.16; 10.1, 1Ch 29.22, Sir 46.13 מ
1Sm 13.14; 25.30, 2Sm 6.21 (without מ), 1Kg 1.35, מ
2Sm 7.8 מ
1Kg 14.7; 16.2, Is 55.4 cf. 2Ch 11.11 מ
1Ch 28.4, cf. 2Ch 6.5 מ
2Ch 11.22 מ
2Sm 5.2 מ
A.4 Apart from Sm–1Kgs, the majority of cases of דָּגִין occur simply as the rank of a named person:

a) verb “to be” understood: 2Kg 20.5, Jer 20.1; 1Ch 9.20; 27.16; 2Ch 19.11; 31.12,13
b) title: Ezk 28.2; Neh 11.11, 1Ch 9.11; 12.28; 26.24; 27.4; 28.7; 2Ch 35.8.

A.5 Nomen rectum:
Jb 29.10 כל...
Dan 9.26 צָא
Ps 76.13 היה
Nomen regens: see above in A.2.

A.6 Juxtaposition: Dn 9.25 מַשֵּׁלח, Jer 20.1 קָפָה

3. Lexical and Semantic Fields

A.1 In synonymous parallelism with מֶלֶך Ps 76.13 (pl); מֵשָׂרֶים Pr 8.6 (pl) (but see Text Doubtful); שַׁד and מֵשָׂרֶים is 55.4.

A.2 In series with other ranks in the Assyrian king’s army, 1Ch 32.21: מִשָּׂרֶים and with other officials in the cult and administration, 2Ch 19.11 מִשָּׂרֶים ... פָּרָדִים 2Ch 28.7 ... cf. 31.12; 2Ch 31.13 with מִשָּׂרֶים

A.3 Appointment as דָּגִין is associated with being anointed 1Sm 10.1; with being king or sitting on the throne (1Kg 1.35, 1Ch 28.4x2, ); being raised up from the dust or from among the people (1Kg 14.7, 16.2) or taken from a lowly occupation (2Sm 7.8)

A.4 The purpose of the דָּגִין is described as saving the people (גָּשִׁית, in a military sense) 1Sm 9.16, or shepherding them (רֵשות) 2Sm 5.2;

Failure to fulfil the commission as דָּגִין can involve disobedience to Yahweh’s commands 1 Sm 13.14, or causing Israel to sin 1Kg 16.2: a דָּגִין’s lack of understanding results in extortion (Pr 28.16).

4. Versions
Joüon (1936:229) notes that there are various translations of τῷ in the Versions, some of which have been unconsciously influenced by the Arm word κτ templateUrl, which by contrast the Tg rarely uses.

LXX

A.1 There are two main renderings, ἴγούμενος and ἀρχών. Joüon (1936:229) argues that the use of the former shows the influence of the Arm nāgôdā. ἴγούμενος 1Sm 25.30, 2Sm 5.2; 6.21; 7.8, 1Kg 1.35; 14.7; 16.2, 2Kg 20.5, Jer 20.1, Dn 9.25 Th; 9.26 Th; 11.22 Th, 1Ch 9.11, 20; 12.28; 13.1; 26.24; 27.16; 2Ch 6.5; 11.11, 22; 19.11; 28.7; 31.13. ἀρχών 1Sm 9.16; 10.1; 13.14 (these three occurrences all refer to Saul); Isa 55.4; Ezk 28.2; 2Ch 35.8; Ps 76.13, Sir 46.13.

ἐπιστάτης 2Ch 31.12

βασιλεὺς Pr 28.16, 1Ch 29.22 1Ch 28.4
tó βασιλεύον 1Ch 28.4

χριστός LXX Dn 9.26

σεμνός Pr 8.6

Omitted? — Jb 29.10; 31.37; Neh 11.11; Dn 9.25 LXX; 11.22 LXX, 1Ch 27.4; 32.21, Sir 41.19.

Tg

A.1 The rendering of all occurrences referring to a national leader (Sam-Kgs, Is 55.4, Ezk 28.2, 1Ch 29.22, 2Ch 6.5) is malkā.

A.2 The rendering in 1–2Ch varies.

srkn “leader, officer” 1Ch 9.11, 20; 13.1; 2Ch 31.12, cf. srk’ 2Ch 31.13; 35.8.

'rkw'n “ruler, elder”, < Gk ἀρχῶν, Jb 29.10; 31.37, 2Ch 11.11, 22; 19.11; 28.7.

ngwd’ “leader, ruler, judge” 1Ch 26.24; 27.4, 16; 28.4. (This rendering is used for ἀρχήν, in 1Sm 8.2, 2Sm 7.11, 2Kg 23.22).

šly't’ “ruler, one with authority” Pr 28.16.

’mkr1 “counsellor, officer ” 1Ch 12.28(27).

rbrbny’ “nobles, great ones” Ps 76.13.

A.3 Jer 20.1: mmuna sgan kāhnayyā “appointed chief of the priests” for τῷ τῷ

B.1
Syr

“truth” Pr 8.6, to provide a better parallel with "טִּתְוָה".

Omitted or in non-translated section or book: Dn 9.25,26; 11.22, 1Ch 32.21.

See Jb 29.10; 31.37, Neh 11.11?, Ps 76.13; Pr 8.6, 28.16.

Vg A.1

There is no obvious reason for the various translations that Jerome employs. His use of dux for most of the “royal” occurrences of πριγ.; and often for the word in the sense of “official” in 1–2Ch suggests that he saw no especial distinction in use of the term. However, we find pontifex used twice in a context where the individual, Azariah son of Hilkiah, is also said to be high priest: see Japhet (1993:211–12) on whether πριγ.; refers to the high priest or is a separate office that may be held by the high priest or by another person of distinction among the clergy.

dux “leader”. All occurrences in Sam-Kgs except 1Sm 10.1 (princeps). Also Jb 29.10, the occurrences in Dan, 1Ch 9.20; 27.16, 2Ch 6.5; 11.22; 19.11; 28.7, Pr 28.16.

princeps “prince” 1Sm 10.1, Jer 20.1, Ezk 28.2, 1Ch 12.28(27); 13.1; 28.4 (pl!); 29.22, 2Ch 11.11; 35.8, Ps 76.13, Jb 31.37.

praefectus 2Ch 31.12.

praepositus 1Ch 26.24.

pontifex “priest” 1Ch 9.11, 2Ch 31.13.

res magnae “great things” Pr 8.6 (cf. Tg “great ones” i.e. nobles, Ps 76.13).

qui regebat 1Ch 27.4.

Om. 1Ch 32.21 (untranslated portion in most Versions).

Pesh A.1 The most common renderings are mdabbrānā and šalliṭ, corresponding closely to LXX’s ἠγούμενος and ἀρχων. Joüon (1936:229) argues that mdabbrānā shows the influence of Arm nāgōdā, as both contain the idea of drawing or leading along.

mdabbrānā “leader” 1Sm 9.16; 10.1; 25.30, 2Sm 5.2; 6.21; 7.8; 1Kg 14.7; 16.2, 2Kg 20.5, Dn 11.22 (pl). verb (inf) lamdabbāru 1Sm 13.14.

malkā “king” 1Kg 1.35, Dn 9.25, 26, 1Ch 28.4, 2Ch 6.5 (in paraphrase of next verse),
Šalliṯ “ruler”  Is 55.4, Ps 76.13, Pr 28.16, Jb 29.10 (pl); 31.37; Neh 11.11, 1Ch 13.1 (doublet), 2Ch 31.12.

Rabbā “great one, noble” 1Ch 12.28; 13.1 (doublet); 2Ch 35.8

Rabaytā “steward” 2Ch 28.7; 31.13 (“of the king”).

B.1 Šarrīṯā “truth” Pr 8.6.

Dašrē (h)wā bayṭēh luqbal bayteh dmāryā “whose house was opposite the House of the Lord” 1Ch 9.11: perhaps reading הָיוּ?

Hawwī “he told” < תָּנַח 2Ch 19.11 (Pesh Ch is based on the Targum of that book, and has many paraphrases and omissions, e.g. 1Ch 26.24; 27.4, 16; 29.22; 32.21, 2Ch 11.11, 22).

5. Exegesis

A.1 The word is not used in the Heptateuch. תָנַח in the ordinary register of “official” is common in later BH, but occurs only once at Qumran and twice in Sir, and two of those 3 occurrences refer to the appointment of David and Saul, not, as one might expect, to military commanders in 1QM or TempScr (Hasel ThW V:219). It never occurs in Ep, even though the word הָיוּ with a similar semantic range is common. The sense found in Sam-1Kings of the leader of the nation re-emerges in Dan, Sir and later medieval Hebrew (Goitein 1962, Ben-Sasson 1976:429–30).

A.2 The issue of most interest to scholars is the precise import of the word in Samuel-Kings, especially in relation to תָנַח and עָבָד. There are several different opinions, based as much on the functions of the תָנַח as described in the narrative as on the possible etymologies of the word (see Root and Comparative Material). The uncertainty concerning the chronology of the sources of Samuel-Kings complicates the matter, and firm views on the sources tend to influence definitions of תָנַח. Ishida (1977:35–45), Halpern (1981:1–11) and Campbell (1986:49 n.69) have summarised the various positions, though their categorisations are slightly different, and most scholars see more than one aspect to the definition of תָנַח.

A.3 The work of Alt (1930:29 = 1966 II:22f, ET 195; and 1951:2–22) takes the designation of Saul as תָנַח by Yahweh as a starting point. He sees the word as a northern, premonarchical term indicating a charismatic leader designated by Yahweh as the future king, and not at all synonymous with תָנַח, which is a Judahite institutional and secular title as opposed to the charismatic and religious תָנַח. (David’s designation of Solomon as תָנַח is thus

A.4 Others also focus primarily on the earlier use of the word to describe Saul and to a lesser extent David. But for them the title תִּמְּצֵי originally meant a war leader, commander of the nation’s militia (cf. תַּמְּצֵי) in the transition from the tribal league to the monarchy: a close semantic relationship to the מָשָׂא is evident in the definition as a temporary charismatic saviour. See Albright (1961:15–16), Bright (1972:185), Hertzberg (1960: ET 83), Noth (1956: 156, ET 1960:169 and n.1), Soggin (1963:54–65), L. Schmidt (1970:91). Cross (1972:13–19; 1973:220–21) is influenced by the possible Arm parallels in the Sefire and Nora inscriptions (see Root and Comparative Material). Birch (1971:64–65) stresses that Saul is anointed as תִּמְּצֵי in order to deliver Israel, and not as תִּמְּצֵי. Richter (1965:71–84) supports the idea that originally תִּמְּצֵי was a tribal title referring to a saviour–judge among the northern tribes, and later indicated the leader of the whole of the Northern Kingdom: it is eventually used to describe Baasha and Jeroboam. He is followed by Yeivin (1961:50: a tribal leader), Soggin (1967:39 n.26), Stoebe (1973:195), Herrmann (1975:137, 143 n.25). L. Schmidt (1970:91, 152, 170–71) goes further in saying that תִּמְּצֵי indicates the chief of the tribal militia. There are some major criticisms of this position as a whole: the term תִּמְּצֵי never occurs before the establishment of the monarchy, as one would expect if it were indeed the title of a pre-monarchical leader, and the hypothesis of a link with the north depends solely on the use of the term in 1Kg 14.7 and 16.2 (Halpern 1981:3–4).

A.5 There is a different school of thought, which regards תִּמְּצֵי as a term for the king-designate, especially one appointed by Yahweh, and not a military leader. This approach would take more account of the later occurrences of the word in 1Kg 14.7; 16.2, 2Kg 20.5 (Jeroboam, Baasha, Hezekiah) and 2Ch 6.5; 11.22, when it is possibly synonymous with תִּמְּצֵי. It also relates תִּמְּצֵי etymologically to תִּמְּצֵי. See Noth (1956: 156; ET 169, 335f), Hertzberg (1960: ET 82 n.b), Thornton “heir apparent” (1963:8), Shaviv (1984:11–12) and most recently Brettler (1989:33) “divine designee”. Soggin (1963:59–60) says that the title was used only between the leader’s designation by God and his actual accession. Lipinski (1974:497–99) sees the application of the title תִּמְּצֵי to Saul as a retrojection of a later term used for the “king-designate” or “crown prince”, chosen and appointed by
Yahweh. Mettinger (1976:151–84) holds very similar views, but considers the concept of the divine designation as יָדָיו post-Solomonic: a secular term has been subsequently theologized (see Williamson’s criticism of Mettinger’s arguments, 1978:507–8). Halpern (1981:7–11) emphasises that every Israelite or Judean יָדָיו eventually ascends the throne (with the possible exception of 2Ch 28.7): “the nagid seems simply to be the object of a divine promise of the throne”: there is an organic relationship with the kingship, with the rite of anointing being a strong link, and that is why the term יָדָיו does not appear in the pre-monarchic period. A slightly different approach is found in Ishida (1977: 48–51), who accepts that the original meaning of יָדָיו was “one designated as ruler of the people” by Yahweh, but believes that it was later used in contexts where the legitimacy of the the holder’s kingship was disputed, for instance when a new dynasty was being established. Campbell (1986:60–61) addresses the problem of the varied use of יָדָיו by reconstructing three stages: in the first, יָדָיו meant “chief” or “leader” in a secular context, then followed a more spiritualised application in the “Prophetic Record” to denote Yahweh’s designation of a man to be king, i.e. an uncrowned leader, and finally both usages continued in the later period, hence the use of יָדָיו for both princes and high officials.

**A.6** The view most at odds with that of Alt is that יָדָיו is synonymous with יָדָיו, at least to some biblical writers and redactors: Buccellati (1959:111), van der Ploeg (1950:45–47), Beyerlin (1961:201), Becker (1977: ET 20), though Seybold (1972:30–31) believes that it also refers to the anointed king’s sacral status, in that he has been appointed by Yahweh. Carlson (1964:52–54) develops this further to say that יָדָיו is a Deuteronomic term for a national leader: although it has the religious connotations of the ideal king, it has nothing to do with a charismatic warrior-leader of the northern tribes. Carlson has been followed to some extent by Veijola (1975:52ff, 129, 139, 141) and Fritz (1976:351). But Halpern (1981:258 n.13) rightly argues that יָדָיו does not occur in Deuteronomy and that Carlson fails to prove that it occurs in the Deuteronomic redaction either. Therefore it cannot be a term for the Deuteronomic ideal king. L. Schmidt (1970:91, 123), who believes that the earlier occurrences refer to a commander of an army, accepts that יָדָיו has become comparable to יִדְּרָע by the time of the writer of 2Sm 7.8. Similarly Levenson (1976:68, 73 n.42) accepts Cross’s translation “commander” as used of David in 2Sm 7.8, but observes that, in Ezk 28, the king of Tyre is referred to as both יָדָיו (v.2) and יִדְּרָע (v.12). Levenson
(ibid.) believes that the semantic ranges of דגין and קָשּׁיoverlap a good deal, but he does not fully explain this claim.

A.7 Further definitions of the sense of דגין include:
b) an ideal shepherd: Glück (1963:144–50). This is rejected by Gese (1964:13 n.7), Richter (1965:72–73 n.7), Ishida (1977:49 n.8), Halpern (1981:257 n.2), though Levenson (1976:68) would see David’s function as דגין, outlined in 2Sm 7.8, as an extension of his occupation as shepherd.

A.8 The Chronicler and Wisdom literature do not use דגין in the same sense as Sam-Kings (Lipinski 1974:497–99). Halpern (1981:11) believes that, in the case of Chronicles, the use of דגין for Levites shows vestigial divine associations, the term being subsequently extended to other adminitrative crown officials, with the title preserving the sense “appointee”. De Vaux (1958:199; ET 129–30) believes that דגין הוא דגין is the Chronicler’s equivalent to the term דגון in the Solomonic list of officials. Japhet (1993:211–12) discusses whether דגון דגון (1Ch 9.11, 2Ch 31.13, cf. 2Ch 28.7; 35.8) refers to the high priest, but concludes that the title דגין “chief officer” is a person of distiction, with a separate office that can be held by the high priest in some circumstances. However, Hasel (ThW V, 1986:216–17) understands דגון דגון as used of Pashhur in Jer 20.1 to refer to his dual role as overseer (דגון) of the temple and high priest (דגון). The term is used to indicate a secular leader, head of a tribe, in 2Ch 19.11, and may retain a military sense in 1Ch 12.28; 27.4, 2 Ch 11.11.

A.9 The identity of the דגין in the book of Daniel (Dn 9.25,26; 11.22) is usually assumed to be the high priest Onias III, who was deposed by Antiochus Epiphanes in 175 and murdered in 171 BCE, though some have suggested that the term refers to Cyrus, Zerubbabel, Joshua ben Jehozadak, or, in Dan 9.26, even Antiochus himself if the reading of MT חֲשַּׂבְתּי is retained (see Montgomery 1927:378, 451; Charles 1929:244, 247–8, 298; Plöger 1965:314; Hartman and di Lella 1978:240, 244; Lacocque 1976: ET 196; Collins 1993:354–56). דגון cannot mean “anointed leader/prince”, according to Hasel (ThW, 1986:218), who holds that the lack of a conjunction renders the hendiadys impossible. But most understand the terms as being in apposition to each other. Mason (1998:358) argues that the reference in 9.25 is to a priest and that the term here suggests an enhanced role for the
priestly line after the exile, as part of the renewal of theocracy hoped for by the Priestly writers and Chronicler. As such it would be an extension of the use of τῷ for Temple officials in Chronicles.

A.10 τῷ is used in Wisdom literature, in the pl. (Jb 29.10 and Pr 8.6) and sg. (Jb 31.37). The Jb occurrences are generally translated as “prince” by both ancient and modern versions, in line with the usual BH sense of a leader or chief. Pr 8.6, however, is often emended (see Text doubtful A.1), and certainly the ancient versions employ a variety of renderings. Lipinski (1998:509–514) takes all three occurrences in what he understands as the Aram. sense of “envoy, speaker” (see Root and comparative philology).

Conclusion:
Etymologically τῷ could mean either “one placed in front/exalted” or “one designated”: a passive meaning seems most likely. The association with τῷ in 1Sm 9–10 suggests that in the popular understanding the word meant “designated, appointed”, though in later Hebrew it is possible that the Arm root ṅgd “draw, pull, lead” had some influence on its interpretation.

Clearly τῷ is a special title for a national leader in Sam-Kings, but the Chronicler, writing in the post-exilic period, uses it for a majordomo: the two meanings co-exist in 2Chr. Campbell’s three stages (1986:60–61) may provide a sensible solution. However, if τῷ was originally a common word in secular currency, denoting some kind of leader, and was later theologized in certain sources (cf. dux in the Roman Republic, and the mid 20th century use of il Duce, der Führer), the use for a high official later would mark a kind of return to the original sense, but it would not explain why the word is not found independently in Ep and Q. On the other hand, if τῷ was a special, sacral term connected to the beginning of the monarchy in Israel, that would explain its sudden appearance in BH and its absence in Ep and Q, but not its subsequent demotion to secular use in BH as a term for a high official who was a subordinate and not a ruler. It is possible that association with the etymologically unrelated but semantically similar Arm nagoda contributed to the secularising and demotion of BH τῷ, but the problem of the word’s subsequent disappearance still remains. Perhaps a later revival of the sacral use (as found once each in
Sir and Q) meant that it was not employed of officials in the latter part of the Second Temple Period.
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