



Division

Section

THE BOOK OF PSALMS

VOL. I.

THE
BOOK OF PSALMS

*Translated from a revised text with
Notes and Introduction*

IN PLACE OF A SECOND EDITION OF AN EARLIER
WORK (1888) BY THE SAME AUTHOR

BY

T. K. CHEYNE, D.LITT., D.D.

ORIEL PROFESSOR OF THE INTERPRETATION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE IN THE UNIVERSITY
OF OXFORD, AND CANON OF ROCHESTER

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. I.

THOMAS WHITTAKER

3 BIBLE HOUSE, NEW YORK

1904



TO PROFESSOR HERMANN GUNKEL,

AN ABLE AND ORIGINAL SCHOLAR OF THE YOUNGER GENERATION,

WHO, WITHOUT MINIMIZING HIS DEBT TO THE PAST,

IS FAITHFUL TO NEW LIGHT,

AND USES IT FOR THE INVESTIGATION OF NEW PROBLEMS,

THIS ATTEMPT TO BREAK FRESH GROUND

FOR THE STUDENTS OF JEWISH HISTORY AND RELIGION

IS CORDIALLY DEDICATED.

CONTENTS OF INTRODUCTION, ETC.

1. The expanded view of our object as students of the O.T. makes it the more necessary to test our foundations. The author's conclusion ; the two Psalters, both historically important.
2. Attempt to do justice to the traditional text (LXX. and Massoretic text) which represents the 'newer Psalter.'
3. A revision of the text required, both from a practical and from a critical point of view.
4. The good which will result from it for the comprehension of the psalmists and of Biblical religion.
5. Special benefit to the later history of Israel. The N. Arabian theory. Muşri and the Negeb.
6. The N. Arabian references in the psalms sometimes real, sometimes partly imaginative.
7. Are there any psalms which were composed in the Negeb ?
8. Influences which promoted a healthy religious development in spite of 'the N. Arabian danger.' Receptivity of the Jews. Historical value of the newer Psalter. Neither Psalter primarily a record of theology.
9. The N. Arabian oppression—its extent. Record of it in the Psalms.
10. Summary of contents of Psalter, showing the historical colouring.
11. How to begin the study of this book. Specimen psalms for the new background. Royal psalms. Psalms of immortality.
12. Study of the titles of the Psalms (and of the term Selah). Hopelessness of the problems, while the traditional text supplies the basis.
13. New attitude towards the problems ; new solutions.
14. Historical references appended to the titles.
15. True cause of the traditional assignment of so many pious songs to David. Jeduthun.
16. Grounds on which pre-exilic psalms are still assumed. Kautzsch.

17. Prof. Briggs on the study of the Minor Psalters. Modification of plan suggested.
18. Search for redactional mosaic work (Briggs and Peters). Radical criticism of the text a necessary preliminary.
19. Prospect of large reconstruction of current theories. Suggestion to impatient readers.
20. A sheaf of critical remarks for the more patient reader. i. Colophon in lxxii. 20. ii. The title, 'Of Jerahmeel-ashhur.' iii. 'Songs of Degrees;' bearing of the revised title. iv. The 'Michtam' ('Maacathim') psalms.
21. v. The Elohistie Psalter—its true significance.
22. vi. Relation of the 'Chronicler' to the Psalter.
23. vii. Maccabæan psalms.
24. 'Psalms of Solomon.' True significance and relation to canonical psalms.
25. Controversy as to the 'I' psalms; bearing of the 'Psalms of Solomon' on this matter.
26. Poetical form of psalms. Metre; strophes.
27. Treatment of the text in this edition.
 Concluding Notice (pp. lxx. f.).
 Abbreviations (pp. lxxii. f.).
 Corrigenda and Addenda (pp. lxxiv.—lxxx.).

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. THE ambition of the interpreter of the Old Testament is to study the religious contents of the old Jewish writings in their several strata, with a view to tracing the converging lines of a real and not merely theoretical development of ideas and beliefs, and with all the help that the investigation of Semitic antiquity, of the comparative psychology of peoples, and of anthropology can supply. And to his study of these ideas and beliefs, which sometimes present themselves in unfamiliar forms, he must bring, not the detached spirit of an anatomist, or of a visitor from another planet, but the sympathy born of the consciousness that the essentials of religion are permanent, and that modern thoughts and beliefs may often be folded up in ancient germs. This goal was present to the mind of the present writer, when he wrote the two works entitled *The Book of Psalms, or, The Praises of Israel* (1888), and especially *The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter in the Light of Old Testament Criticism and the History of Religions* (1891).

It is necessary that such books as the Bampton Lectures for 1889 should from time to time be written, and it may be hoped that when the next attempt is made to treat of the important theme of that work, it may be possible to bring out the historical development of the higher Israelitish religion, and its points of contact with other religions, more fully and accurately. But just because the object is so high and the work so arduous, it is one's duty to listen to those voices which call us back for a time to incompletely performed preliminary tasks. In order that the exegesis of the Psalter and the historical illumination of the results of that exegesis may progress, it is urgently necessary to give a keener and more methodical examination to the traditional text. Far be it from me to underrate the value

of that earlier criticism, in which it has been my privilege to participate. But I cannot close myself to the conviction that the old methods have done nearly all that they are capable of doing, and that virtually new methods¹ must be superadded to the old.

I venture at this point to offer a caution to the reader, viz. that if he wishes to comprehend and to do justice to the present attempt, he must study it in the first instance from the author's point of view. It is obvious that any philological work, if criticized from an alien point of view, will appear full of faults, and, if praised at all, will be praised for things which represent the author's inconsistencies and hesitations. Hence the fair-minded reader who is anticipated here will naturally begin by acquainting himself with the conclusion at which the author arrives. The novelty of this conclusion may perhaps put a strain on the reader's patience—for it touches the foundations of Israelitish history, but it may be hoped that he will be compensated for this by gaining some fresh insight into the higher Israelitish religion. Wonderful, indeed, and yet—when closely studied—most natural is the story of the growth of that religion, and we may confidently expect that by unfolding its own secret, the Psalter will throw fresh light on some obscure parts of that story. This is, in fact, as I have often told my readers, my own chief interest, and it appears to me that my present conclusion, bold as it may seem, will be helpful in bringing about this result. That conclusion is briefly this—that we have in our hands, closely but not inseparably united, two Psalters—a newer and an older. The newer is preserved in two chief forms—the Greek of the LXX. and the Massoretic Hebrew text. Both these represent independent recensions of the text,² and underneath both it is still possible, sometimes with more, sometimes with less confidence in the smaller details, to recognize an earlier text of the psalms, which approaches the form which they received from the writers or from the earliest editors.

§ 2. Let an attempt first be made to do full justice to the traditional text, represented alike by the LXX. and by the

¹ See the Prologue to *Critica Biblica*, Part i., and the article, 'Pressing Needs of Old Testament Study,' in the *Hilbert Journal*, July, 1903.

² Cp. Kittel, *Ueber die Notwendigkeit u. Möglichkeit einer neuen Ausgabe der Hebräischen Bibel* (1902), p. 44.

Massoretic recension. The interest of a great textual tradition, whether Sanskrit or Hebrew, is as fascinating as it is manifold. Who, for instance, can take up any important work on Genesis or Samuel or the Psalms, and fail to observe what curious and difficult problems have been suggested by the tradition? Even when the problems have their origin in critically doubtful readings, they have given invaluable stimulus to philologists, and have set them on fruitful tracks of inquiry, the end whereof is in many cases not yet seen. And who can study the current introductions to 'Biblical Theology' without noticing how largely the authors have drawn upon the Psalter, mainly in its traditional form, as an authority for the religion of the early Judaism?¹

Nor is this the only point of view from which the importance of the existing Psalter, and its claim upon the students, may be willingly recognized. Let it be granted that the text has often been injured by the operation of the manifold causes of corruption, and recast by ingenious editors. Still the fact that some at least of the psalms revised by these editors (*e.g.* Pss. xc., cxxxix.) contain passages in highly impressive diction, which have helped to mould the inner life of countless saints of Church and Synagogue, may well make us hesitate to treat such an influential work as unworthy of critical study. Some sense must have been put even upon those collocations of letters and words which strike us most by their peculiarity and improbability. What was that sense? Must we not sooner or later acknowledge that in dealing with such passages philological ingenuity and familiarity with the Arabic or Assyrian lexicon are less necessary than a sympathetic comprehension of the feelings and ideas of the later Judaism? In fact, the study of the traditional text cannot be altogether separated from that of the early traditional exegesis. For this exegesis must be the direct offspring of the interpretation put upon the Psalter by the later editors. In spite of its inconsistencies, it is capable of offering some valuable suggestions to the student of the received text.

¹ I refer of course to those ideas and types of belief which are most fully characteristic of the pious Jewish community. This drawing on the Book of Psalms is most conspicuous in Cheyne, *Origin and Religious Content of the Psalter* (1901), and Smend, *Lehrbuch der alttest. Religionsgeschichte* (1st ed., 1893; 2nd, 1899).

Nor is it only the editors of the consonantal text who claim our respect. We have also to do honour to those self-forgetting Jewish scholars who, by continuous efforts, produced the present elaborate vocalization and accentuation. It has been well said that 'none of the old translators, with the exception possibly of the Targumists, . . . has had so clear an insight into the [possible] sense of the text, and has understood it down to its nicest peculiarities in accordance with the traditional reading.'¹ In fact, the pointing of the text has provided us with an unique and admirable record of the view of the grammatical meaning which has been traditional since the Christian era. Well does it deserve the patient and thoughtful study which a succession of modern scholars, notably Eduard König, have given to it, though one may fear that this patient scholarship has sometimes been unconsciously devoted to propping up unsound conclusions.

§ 3. I have now to explain the grounds on which a revision of the text, which some will call 'ruthless,' and others, as I hope, fundamentally reverent, claims a favourable reception. Let me begin from a practical point of view. In spite of the attachment of most English Christians to one or both of the two old versions of the Psalms which are still current, it is doubtful how much longer educated persons will be satisfied with this. They may of course continue to admire the rhythmic flow of the old versions, and to use them for devotional purposes, because of the trains of thought which many finely expressed passages suggest. But surely such persons cannot help desiring a greater degree of insight into the original meaning of the Psalms than either of these versions can give. The Old Testament as a literature is rapidly taking its place as a historical and literary as well as religious monument of antiquity, and what would the Old Testament be without the Psalter? Now, in spite of the much-improved grammars and lexicons which exist, it can very easily be shown that the words of the Psalms in the traditional text often admit only of a forced translation, and that the supposed connexion of the sentences is often illusory. If so, the historical and literary students of the future will not be satisfied either with an old version or with any existing or prospective revision of it, or even

¹ Buhl, *Canon and Text of the Old Testament*, Eng. Transl. (1892), p. 236; cp. Wellhausen, in Bleek's *Einleitung in das A. T.*, 4th ed. (1878), p. 616.

with a perfectly new version based, or partly based, upon the traditional text. The version that they will need is one that represents a thoroughly revised Hebrew text. It may be far from satisfying a purely æsthetic criticism. It may also run counter to many theological prejudices. But in the light of history it will be intelligible and interesting, and it may well be that the scholars whose critical work renders such a version possible may bring to light some moral and spiritual beauties which had been lost for centuries.

Next, from a purely critical point of view. Great as is our debt to the Massoretic scholars, to the LXX. translators, and to the editors of the Hebrew text who preceded them, we must be under no illusion as to the character of the traditional text. The Old Testament is not altogether in its original form; it has undergone not merely corruption, but editorial manipulation. This is plainer in some books than in others, but nowhere perhaps is it more manifest than in the Psalter. Hence the question before us is, whether we prefer the uncritical conjectures of late editors or those which are suggested by the application of critical methods. Very many passages, as I have said already, admit only of a strained interpretation. Indeed, we may go even further, and assert that on grammatical, lexicographical, and exegetical grounds they are self-evidently corrupt, and that any appearance of plausibility which they may possess is simply due to the skill of an early editor, who, in the interests of edification, applied a well-meaning violence to the unpromising material before him.

The methodical, but (in its range) too limited criticism of the past century has no doubt had some apparent success, but the appearance is too often fallacious. Such a thorough and almost terribly frank critic as Duhm again and again admits this, and my chief complaint of this scholar is that he is not searching enough in his criticism, and speaks of a psalmist with a painful vehemence which would often only be justifiable if he had shown that the received text was what the psalmist wrote. Earnestly do I hope that one result of the present work may be to induce some critics to question whether a strictly 'moderate' textual criticism is really as desirable as they have supposed.

§ 4. Other good results which may be hoped for relate to the ideas, feelings, and aspirations of the psalmists. Were they, for instance, as a body, quite as fiercely vindictive as we have imagined? This may well be doubted. It is true, Ps. cix. must always remain

vindictive, but the text which sound critical method seems to require is at any rate without the worst and the least excusable of the imprecations (see vol. ii., p. 139). And if I am not mistaken, we shall be led to recognize that the highest reason why some of the psalmists wished the peoples hostile to Israel to be severely punished, was that Yahwè might have the glory of pardoning even the deepest iniquity through the repentance and conversion of some part at least of the offending peoples (see Ps. ii., // 23-27 ; xviii., // 101-104 ; lix., // 33-36). It is in harmony with this that the repentant survivors from the judgment on N. Arabia appears to be sometimes, by anticipation, called upon to join in Israel's songs of praise (see e.g. xxix., xvi.-xviii., ciii., cxxviii.). This milder and more humane tone seems to be not infrequent in the latter part of the Psalter. One psalmist indeed (see Ps. lxxxvii.) even appears to have anticipated that a number of N. Arabians hitherto known as Asshurites, Rehobites, and Jerahmeelites would be adopted into the family or community of Zion or Israel—a very similar prospect to that which is held out at the end of Isa. xix. And still more surprising is the disclosure made in Ps. xcix., according to the revised text. For here it is stated (vol. ii., pp. 103 f.) that some of the N. Arabians will not only learn to call upon Yahwè and observe his law, but will be admitted among his priests. I may venture to illustrate this by the statement which, as I have shown elsewhere (see *Crit. Bib.*, p. 49), is probably made in one of the latest parts of the Book of Isaiah (Isa. lxvi. 21). Perhaps if Richard Hooker could have shared these conclusions, he might have been still more inclined to mention 'heroical magnanimity' as one of the qualities displayed by 'David.' I must confess, however, that even so the assignment of such a quality can hardly be quite justified; 'humility' (towards God), not 'magnanimity,' was regarded by the Jews as the queen of the virtues. But it may at least be affirmed that a sense of the bond of humanity was beginning to spring up among some of the authors of the great Jewish Book of Common Prayer and Praise.

It would carry me too far to draw out here in detail all the results which appear to follow for Biblical religion from the revised text. I may, however, point (*a*) to a very probable result of the new study here given to Pss. xlv., lxxii., and ci., viz. that the personal Messianic hope—so dear to us by its connection with the preaching of the Gospel—had not much vigour or vitality in

the circles represented by the psalmists; (*b*) to a result of the new study of Pss. xi., xxxvi.⁽¹⁾, xxxix.⁽¹⁾, lxxiii., lxxvii.¹, xciv.⁽¹⁾, cxvi., which awakens a keen sense of the identity of human nature in East and West, viz. that not only wise men like the writer of the colloquies of 'Job,' but also ordinary pious temple-worshippers were liable to be carried away by a temptation to scepticism¹; (*c*) to the new light thrown on Ps. xlix., as representing a reaction against the tendency to 'deny' God, with which passages in the two little catechisms (so calm and inoffensive in the traditional text) which form the kernels of Pss. xv. and xxiv.¹; and (*d*) to the decisive judgment which can now be given on the question of the hope of immortality in the Psalter (see on Pss. xvi., xvii., xlix., lxxiii.).

§ 5. It is, however, the history of Israel in the post-exilic period which promises to gain most from these researches. And this is only due in part to a more methodical textual criticism. Important as the virtually new text-critical methods, when superadded to the old, may be, it is not less necessary from time to time to accept suggestions as to the application of these methods from a recent historical theory which, plainly enough, has a great future before it. I refer, of course, to the theory (proved by those Old Testament passages in which the occurrence of מְצוֹר and מִצְרַיִם, פּוֹשׁ or פּוֹשִׁים or פּוֹשֵׁן, of אֲשׁוּר or אֲשָׁחוּר or גְּשׁוּר, and of יַרְחֵמָאֵל or אֲרָם—or at any rate of the two former groups of names—as designations of N. Arabian regions or peoples adjoining the land or people of Israel and closely connected with it, is too manifest to be plausibly denied) that some at least of the peoples by which Israel was most directly influenced were those of the N. Arabian border-land. It is only Winckler's unrefuted theory that there was not only a N. Syrian, but also a N. Arabian region called Muṣr or (mât) Muṣri, and his discovery in 1893² (which led on naturally to my own subsequent discoveries) of the name Miṣṣor, Miṣṣur, or Miṣrim (or perhaps Miṣrām)³ in a limited number of Old Testament passages, soon increased by himself

¹ Though not in possession of the full evidence for his statement, Prof. Davison was able to say in 1893 that 'the psalmist does not check [questioning] as impious, but with the spirit of true religion, brings his difficulty to God Himself, and pours out his heart in prayer' (*Praises of Israel*, p. 162).

² 'Das nordarabische Land Muṣri,' in *Altorient. Forschungen*⁽¹⁾, i., 25 ff.

³ So Professor Paul Haupt.

and independently by me,¹ to which the discovery of evidence of a region called Cūsh (also mentioned in the Old Testament), was soon added, which could give that sense of security in the textual criticism and in the historical realization of the Psalms, which we must all earnestly desire to possess.

It appears to me superfluous to exhibit here and to discuss at length the evidence for the existence of a N. Arabian kingdom of Muṣri, which not improbably extended as far as Yathrib, the modern Medina. When even such a cautious scholar as Dr. Rudolf Kittel admits the fact to be one that 'cannot be argued away,' I do not think that Dr. E. A. W. Budge's contradiction (characterized by an able historical critic, J. V. Prášek, as 'useless vehemence') carries much weight.² Winckler himself has so far not found time to reply to the criticisms which have been launched against him, but I know that he contemplates an answer, which will doubtless lose nothing by the delay.³ Provisionally one may refer any perplexed reader to Prof. H. W. Hogg's remarks in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* (col. 4520, note ⁵), in which the comparative value of Dr. Budge's arguments is estimated. To me it has long appeared that the only question among open-minded scholars ought to be, how far may we apply this result in explanation or illustration of Old Testament passages?—to which my own answer is, that in a number of cases it is only such an application which enables us to form a clear, intelligible, and consistent historical picture. It must be remembered, however, that the question of the influence of Muṣri on S. Palestine is only a part of the larger question of the influence on S. Palestine of N. Arabia, and that Muṣri was probably in vassalage to the larger empire of Meluhḥa, which is frequently referred to in the O.T. writings under the name of Asshur or Ashḥur.

¹ Winckler, 'Muṣri' ii. (in *Mitteil. der Vorderasiat. Gesellschaft*, 1898, part iv.; Cheyne, *Enc. Biblica*, art. *Mizraim* (written considerably before 1902, the date of its publication); also other articles, e.g. *Exodus, The: Isaac; Kadesh; Zarephath*, by Cheyne and S. A. Cook in the latter work. Respectful mention is also due to Fritz Hommel for his suggestions on a 'South Palestinian' Asshur (*Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, pp. 239-246), though his textual criticism is not sufficiently methodical. This ingenious scholar's later suggestions of Biblical references to Moṣar, Kōsh, and Ashur (*Aufsätze*, iii. 1, pp. 277 ff.) appeared after my own earlier results, and have not influenced me. The same may be said of Winckler's later suggestions as to the N. Arabian Muṣri and Cush in the Old Testament. Independent work may perhaps have an increased claim on the attention of critical students.

² See Budge, *Hist. of Egypt*, vol. vi., pp. ix.-xxx.; Kittel, article in *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, xiv. 575 (1903); Prášek, *Sanheribs Feldzüge gegen Juda*, part i., p. 11.

³ See Winckler in *Hibbert Journal*, Jan. 1904.

It is assumed in the present work that the deportation of the Jews which has left most traces on the later writings of the Old Testament was, not to Babylonia, but to that part of N. Arabia which was called by the Jews Jerahmeel or the Negeb. It may safely be denied that this region was in antiquity as unproductive as it is to-day. In the Byzantine period it was certainly not so, and the Byzantine culture was doubtless the successor of an earlier culture which made much of the Negeb a prosperous and productive land.¹ That the word 'Negeb' means 'dryness, *i.e.* 'dry land,' has rightly been questioned by Winckler.² So far as I can see, critical and exegetical evidence compels us to deny that such a name as 'dry land' was likely to be applied to the N. Arabian borderland as a whole. The Negeb of the later Old Testament times was probably as different from the land bordering on S. Palestine to-day, as the N. Arabian population of to-day differs from that of antiquity. I refrain from attempting a sketch of the history of the Israelites in the times immediately preceding and following the Exile. Such a sketch would only be effective if thoroughly furnished with evidential notes, and this would take up too much space in an Introduction to the Psalter. The reader would do well to give a thorough study to the portion of *Critica Biblica* relative to the Books of Kings, and if possible to consult from time to time the portions concerned with the prophetic writings. He will thus be able to comprehend better the method and results of the inquiries of which those here introduced form a part. He may also be referred to pages 136-153 of the new edition of Schrader's *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, in which the reader will find the necessary preliminary information, from the pen of Winckler, on the ethnic conditions of N. Arabia in antiquity.³

Some highly probable facts, some fragments of history, may,

¹ The passage (Isa. xxx. 6) which appears to represent the road from the land of Judah to that of מִצְרַיִם (read, Mişrim) as infested by lions and serpents is certainly corrupt (see *Crit. Bib.*, *ad loc.*).

² Winckler compares Ass. *nagbu*, 'a particular kind of land' (*Gesch. Isr.*, ii. 184, note 2).

³ On this work, and on Winckler's manifold original contributions to Old Testament study, see my article 'Babylon and the Bible,' *Hilbert Journal*, Oct., 1903. I may respectfully suggest to critics that while they may not unreasonably question very much of Winckler's reconstruction of Israelitish history, it is an altogether excessive caution which hinders them from accepting in a very full extent his treatment of the subject of a N. Arabian Muşri.

however, be mentioned here, and one of them is that deportation was no uncommon fate of the Israelite and Judahite population. We may safely hold that that section of the people of Israel and Judah which dwelt in the Negeb experienced this at the hands of several N. Arabian kings, and we may find references to one or another of these deportations in the true text of 2 K. xv. 20, xvii. 5 f., xviii. 9-11, xxiv. 12-16, xxv. 7, 11 f., in the original Prophecy of Restoration (ii. Isaiah), in the prophecies in Ezekiel, in the Lamentations, in the story underlying our Ezra and Nehemiah, and at any rate in the early part of the Book of Daniel. That there were also ancient Hebrew writings which referred to Assyrian deportations of Israelites and Judahites, and to a Babylonian deportation of Judahites, is, however, a highly plausible view. The later redactors, certainly, were aware of such deportations, and manipulated the texts before them, so that they should seem to refer to Assyria or Babylon as the 'staff in Yahwè's hand,' but it is improbable that they had any evidence of this except tradition. Cuneiform research and exploration of sites will, it may be hoped, throw fresh light on these dark passages of history.

The exact situation of the districts where the Jewish exiles were placed is of course uncertain. The ancient geography of N. Arabia is unfortunately much less definitely settled than that of Palestine, though the ancient geography of Palestine itself is much less secure than has been supposed. From notices in Ezekiel, however (see *Crit. Bib.* on Ezek. i. 1, 3, iii. 15), we may with much probability assume that some at any rate of the bands of exiles¹ were interspersed in the Negeb among the colonists brought by the king of the N. Arabian Asshur from other parts of his realm (see on 2 K. xvii. 25), and this accords with what criticism seems to have disclosed in the Lamentations and in the Psalter. How far the language of the psalmists is literally correct, and how far imaginative, is no doubt a matter for discussion. Sometimes when they speak as if they were in the lowest depths of the misery caused by the exile, they produce upon us the impression of artificiality. Certainly, too, their use of the terms Mišrites,

¹ It is probable that others were at a greater distance from Palestine. See *Crit. Bib.* on Ezra vii. 7 f.

Zarephathites, Jerahmeelites, Ashhurites (see revised text), seems to be archaistic; a similar view indeed has long been current, to account for certain of the ethnic terms in the traditional text of Ps. lxxxiii. 7-9).

§ 6. It now becomes possible to give a fully satisfactory answer to a question put by our theologian-statesman, Gladstone (*Impregnable Rock*, p. 37).

'Is it conceivable, if the psalms in general owed their origin to the time of the Captivity, that the composer of them should, in numerous and conspicuous cases, have dwelt so long and so often over the details of the Egyptian bondage, and should never but once and briefly have made reference, specific indeed but narrow, to the one recent catastrophe, choosing rather to go back to the centuries dimmed in comparison by the interval of a thousand years?'

The difficulty referred to here is indeed a real one. If the Psalms come either from the 'exilic' or from the early 'post-exilic' period, how is it that, except in the case of Ps. cxxxvii., they present no distinctly Babylonian colouring? Gunkel, it is true, has pointed out some points of contact between passages of the psalms and Babylonian myths, but it is not contended that these points of contact were due to impressions received during the Exile. Not once again is Babylon mentioned; not once is even the Chaldean destruction of the temple so plainly referred to (see Delitzsch on Ps. lxxiv.) as to disarm all opposition. But from our new point of view, the psalmists do, 'in numerous and conspicuous cases,' refer to the calamity, not indeed of a Babylonian, but of a N. Arabian oppression, and the reason why the ancient Mişrite bondage is so much referred to is that, inasmuch as the land of Mişrim was in N. Arabia, the Mişrite oppression was a most fitting type of the Ashhurite or Jerahmeelite oppression. As for Ps. cxxxvii., it should have been plain to us all that, whatever be the true reading of the opening words, there can be no real difference between the name *Babel* and the name *Edom* (see vol. ii., p. 209). Ps. cxxxvii. 1 is not a 'specific but narrow' reference to the Babylonian Exile, but an imaginative representation of the by-gone time when temple-singers were carried by Edomites to the Jerahmeelite Negeb. It is not, however, really different from many other psalms; see especially Pss. xlii.-xliii., and lxiii., in which just such a sad experience of temple-singers is imaginatively and lyrically portrayed.

For this imaginative dwelling on the past there was ample justification. For once at least, and probably more than once, the temple at Jerusalem had been destroyed by N. Arabian foes, who in this way completed the (temporary) extinction of the Jewish people. Indeed, this was but the climax of a long series of outrages, which could not but wound the feelings of all true-hearted Jews. And however inevitable and natural hostility between Israel and N. Arabia may have been, we must admit that the lower forms of this hostility on the N. Arabian side (see *e.g.* Ps. v. 10, xxxv. 16-26, cxx.) indicate a moral inferiority, and we can well understand that this was the bitterest drop in Israel's cup of affliction.

The truth is that the psalms in their original form provided the necessary vent for the pent-up feelings of the Jews under N. Arabian oppression. The writers do not speak for themselves; they are the organs of the faithful part of the Jewish people, and more especially of a society within the society which is spoken of as 'the afflicted ones' or 'the sufferers' (see on Ps. ix. 13)—the same that appears to be personified in Isa. liii. and elsewhere as the 'servant of Yahwè.' There were degrees of violence in the oppression spoken of. Sometimes the psalmists speak with a consciousness that Israel's life as a people is suspended, sometimes with a presentiment that such a suspension is imminent. Sometimes it is merely the grumbling of a storm which has raged its worst that they hear; and sometimes when wronged on a small scale, they seem to keep alive the memory of greater outrages by imaginative reproductions of the situation and the sentiments of an earlier period. At other times, however, they relieve themselves by rising into a far higher sphere, to where 'beyond these voices, there is peace,' and even more than peace—jubilant rejoicing; *i.e.* they write as if the anticipations of faith had been realized, and the great deliverance were past. That there are a few perfectly peaceful psalms (see cxxvii.⁶, cxxviii., cxxxiii.-cxxxvi., cxliv.⁶-cl.), which express the feelings of a quiet and hopeful age, does not affect a general description of the character of the Psalms. The Psalter is throughout coloured by a reaction against N. Arabian tyranny and heathenism.

§ 7. Whether there are any fragments of psalms in our present Psalter which arose during the first suspension of the national life, is a question which cannot usefully be discussed.

The Psalter as it stands belongs to a highly literary age, and contains many passages which presuppose the existence of the Prophecy of Restoration, the expanded Jeremiah, and the Book of Job, all of which (unless the first be an exception) can be shown to belong to a later age. Besides this, it is doubtful whether the interval between the fall and the rising again of the Jewish state was as long as has been supposed.¹ In 2 K. xxv. 27-30 we are distinctly told that a king of 'Babel' called 'Evil-merodach' treated Jehoiachin kindly, and recognized him as king of Judah;² apparently there were other subject princes who were also reinstated as kings. This recognition must have involved the permission to any individuals or families who desired it, to return to their own land,³ and to join in rebuilding their temple or temples. Now the land of the Jews consisted of Judah and of the Negeb (or some part of it). For it appears from 2 K. xxii., xxiii., when critically treated, that Josiah, as the sole remaining representative of Israel, had annexed that part of the Negeb which had been occupied by N. Israel, and repaired the temple of Beth-ishmael or Beth-jerahmeel (an important place in the Negeb, where David and Solomon had dwelt, and the seat of a cultus much objected to by Jeremiah), at the same time, purifying the cultus. If Jehoiachin or his son Shenazzar⁴ was restored to the throne as a petty king, or rather 'prince' (נשיא), under 'Babel' or Jerahmeel, he would have at least a part of the

¹ The שבעים שנה of Jer. xxv. 11 is corrupt: for a parallel, note the שבע שנים of Judg. vi. 1, xii. 9. See on 2 Car. xxxvi. 21.

² Winckler (*AOF*, ii. 198, 439; *KAT*, p. 284) is of opinion that the execution of 'Evil-merodach's' decree was postponed till B.C. 539. This, however, is only a conjecture, rendered necessary by the acceptance of the tradition that the Jews received permission to return and to build the temple from Kōreš (Cyrus?).

³ The Jerusalemites, even if in the Negeb, would naturally wish to return to Jerusalem, while the Israelitish exiles from the Negeb, if faithful to their race and religion, would as naturally wish to return to the Negeb.

⁴ Shenazzar (שנאצר) in 1 Chr. iii. 18 a son of Jeconiah: rightly identified by Sir H. Howorth, Kusters, Ed. Meyer, and Marquart with Sheshbazzar (ששבצר). The full form of the name underlies σαβαρασαρ, σαβαουσαραπος, σαβαρασαραπος, σαμαρασαραπος, given by G (see *E. Bib.*, 'Sheshbazzar') for 'Sheshbazzar.' Both שכן (see on Ps. xcii. 11, cxli. 5) and שכן (cp. 'Eshban' and 'Shelma') may represent ששנאצר; so also indeed may שן (see *Crit. Bib.* on 1 S. vii. 12, xxviii. 4). אצר occurs in Gen. xxxvi. 21, &c., as a Horite (=Ashhurite) clan-name. 'Sheshbazzar' in Ezr. v. 14 (cp. i. 8) is said to have been made *fehū* or 'governor' of Judah by Kōreš, and to have laid the foundation of the temple.

Negeb as well as of Judah¹ given back to him as his dominion. In this case, the temple in the Negeb (which had of course been greatly injured in war-time) would have to be restored as well as that of Jerusalem. It appears that some of the prophets were in favour of this temple (see *Crit. Bib.* on Ezek. xl. 1 f., xlvi. 13, Isa. xix. 18) while others were against it (*Crit. Bib.* on Isa. lxvi. 1 ff.).² Probably enough, this temple too had only a short existence. How unfriendly the surrounding populations were to the Jews, appears from the narratives in Ezra and Nehemiah, which may not indeed be strictly historical works, but which must contain traces of early traditions.³ Possibly too Zech. vii. 7 may refer to some calamity to the Jewish portion of the Negeb which was recent when Zechariah spoke. At any rate, we can well understand that in the time of 'Malachi' the cultus of 'Jerahmeel or Beth-jerahmeel met with an unqualified condemnation from zealous worshippers of Yahwè (see *Crit. Bib.* on Mal. ii. 10-16. When 'Malachi' wrote the only form of worship in the Negeb was heathenish.

But though the temple of Yahwè at Beth-ishmael (=B.-jerahmeel) can only have enjoyed a brief summer of prosperity, we need not doubt that it was a source of spiritual refreshment to many faithful Israelites, especially if it is rightly held, (a) that 'the place which Yahwè thy God shall choose' in Deuteronomy originally meant Beth-ishmael, and (b) that this place is to be identified with the famous Beth-el of ancient legend (see *Crit. Bib.* on Am. vii. 9 f.). But clearly such pious worshippers as we have supposed would want psalms. Are any of these psalms preserved in our Psalter? We may most probably answer in the affirmative, and include among the Beth-ishmael psalms, Ps. cxxii., cxxv., cxxxii., cxxxiii., cxxxiv. and cxxxv.⁽²⁾ Of course, a later

¹ Perhaps not more than Jerusalem and the district about it (cp. Winckler).

² Standing on one of the mountains of Jerahmeel, Ezekiel (who recognizes the Negeb as the Holy Land) plans the erection of a new temple and a new holy city. Another prophetic writer declares that five Mišrite cities shall become Jewish, and one (*i.e.* the principal) shall be Ir-ashšur. From the context it appears that the religious centre of this territory, with an altar to Yahwè, should be here. On the other hand, a third writer represents a temple (in the Negeb?) as quite superfluous, the whole of Ishmael or Mišsor being Yahwè's property. See references above.

³ The שִׁמְרֹן of Neh. iv. 2 is to be read Shimron, *i.e.* the Shimron in the Negeb (see *Crit. Bib.* on 1 K. xvi. 24). 'Sanballat' has come from some ethnic or gentile such as Neballati or Nebaithi. 'Tobiah' is also a Negeb name. Gashou=Gershon=Ashūram. Horonite and Ammonite may also have a N. Arabian reference.

editor manipulated these psalms, as he did most others, to adapt them to the use of pious worshippers at the temple of Jerusalem.

That many of the psalms were intended from the first for the liturgical services at Jerusalem, is of course not open to doubt. A love of the temple almost pervades the Psalter, and for the most part the temple referred to must be that which outlasted all the other temples—those in the Negeb, in Egypt, and on Mt. Gerizim, and became theoretically at least centre of Jewish religion. As we read the psalms we seem to hear sometimes the jubilant songs of the pilgrims (xlii. 4 ; cp. Isa. xxx. 29), sometimes the praiseful shouts of the worshippers (xcv. 1 ff. ; c. 1, 4), nor can there be finer expressions of a nascent spiritual religion, not yet separated from a belief in sacred localities,¹ than we find in Ps. xxxvi.⁽²⁾, lxiii., and lxxxiv. It is true, there are traces of a similar stage of development in the psalms of Beth-ishmael (see especially Ps. cxxv. 1 f.), but the promise of the future belonged inevitably to the sanctuary of Jerusalem. For both temples, indeed, pious worshippers, in the 'full assurance of faith,' claimed perpetuity (cp. Ps. xxvii. 4 f., cxxxii. 14, cxxxiii. 3), but only that of Jerusalem lasted as long as Jewish religion needed such a material prop. Even this temple had its critical periods. It may have been destroyed and rebuilt on more than one occasion before the last ; indeed, without assuming a second destruction in the pre-Maccabean period, it is difficult to account historically for the strong language of Ps. lxxiv. and lxxix.²

There is a point of some interest in this connexion which is very generally overlooked ; it is that, not only in the old days when the temple at Jerusalem was profaned (from the higher prophetic point of view) by a distinctly Jerahmeelite cultus,³ but even afterwards, the temple-ministers, or at any rate the singers, were of Jerahmeelite, *i.e.* N. Arabian, origin. Some of the evidence for this has been given in my article, 'From Isaiah

¹ See *Origin of the Psalter*, pp. 387 f.

² We have at any rate no sufficient ground for adding Pss. lxxiv., lxxix. to the list of Beth-ishmael psalms. It is natural to expect that these psalms would occur in the same collection, near together.

³ See *Crit. Bib.*, part iv., on Kings ; also on Zeph. i. 5, and on Ezek. viii. It is assumed here that the references to the temple-worship in Kings refer to the temple of Jerusalem, not to that in the Negeb. There appears to be an early reference to the Jerahmeelite servants of the Jerusalem temple in 2 S. v. 8 (see *Crit. Bib.*). Ezekiel strongly objected to these N. Arabian ministers (see *Crit. Bib.* on Ezek. xlv. 7).

to Ezra,' in the *American Journal of Theology*, July 1901. It surely ought not to be doubted that the so-called Nethinim (the older view of whose origin is untenable) are really the Ethanites, the 'doorkeepers' or 'porters' (השערים) the Asshurites, the *benē 'abdē Šelōmō*' (A.V., 'the children of Solomon's servants'!) the *benē 'arāb-šalamu* (or *-išma' 'el*).¹ All these were probably guilds of singers (see § 13). We can now understand how the Levites, the 'porters,' the 'singers,' and the Nethinim come to be mentioned together in *Ezr. vii. 7*, *Neh. vii. 73*. The headings of the psalms, when keenly scrutinized, confirm this result. The evidence will be given later. It tends to show that the guilds of temple-ministers (apparently singers) to whose custody various groups of psalms were committed, were of Jerahmeelite origin. To go further, and suppose that the psalms were derived from the Negeb, and illustrate them by the not improbable fact that the main portions of the Books of Job and Proverbs took their origin in the N. Arabian border-land, is unnecessary. Suffice it to be able to say with much probability that the psalmists, though as hearty as they could be in their attachment to pure religion, were of the Jerahmeelite race. If so, it becomes all the more probable that some psalms of the Jerahmeelite temple were carefully preserved by the singing guilds of Jerusalem, and recommended for adoption in the general Israelite hymnal.

§ 8. Once more, I am not writing a historical sketch, and am not to be expected to give an answer here to every conceivable historical question. But there is one question which naturally rises to the lips here, and to which I may at least attempt a provisional answer. It is this: if, for some time after the fall of the Jewish state, N. Arabia still influenced the Jews so profoundly that there was a constant danger of the apostasy of worshippers of Yahwè, or of the introduction among the Jews of practices characteristic of N. Arabian heathenism,² how is it that the heart of the Jewish community remained sound, and a stream of healthy development flowed on without interruption? The answer is that a powerful influence for good was exercised on the community in Palestine, first, by the Law (Deuteronomic or Levitical) and the prophets, and next, by the Jews of Babylonia, who, while adher-

¹ Cp. *Enc. Biblica*, 'Solomon's Servants, Children of.'

² See *Crit. Bib.* on Malachi.

ing steadfastly to the essentials of a Jewish religion, were yet able to absorb and adapt ideas and beliefs characteristically Babylonian and Persian. For one cannot doubt that the same policy of deportation adopted by the Assyrian kings Sargon and Sennacherib was carried out afterwards by Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon, and one may be assured that, though the later Old Testament writings in their original form cannot be said to prove this,¹ the Jewish community afterwards passed under the rule of Persian Governors. It stands to reason that a body of men so highly cultivated as the Babylonian Jewry must have exercised more than sufficient influence on the minds of the best Jews in Palestine to counteract the temptations offered by N. Arabia.

The proof of this is supplied by the later Hebrew literature. Not only did the author of the Priestly Code work up legal material derived from Babylonian sources, but 'thinkers and poets (see the Book of Job) deliberately threw themselves into what may quite innocently be called a mythic revival.' 'The leaders of the Church permitted this; they were content to moderate and turn to wholesome uses a tendency which they could not extinguish,'² and of which we find some fresh evidence in the Psalter (see on Ps. viii., lxxiv.⁽³⁾). It is true that Babylonian influences may sometimes have come to the early Israelites through a N. Arabian channel, but this only shows how ancient the indirect influence of Babylonia on Israel really is, and how legitimate was the course taken by the later Church-leaders. Persian influence upon Jewish belief it is more difficult to prove conclusively. Yet surely the influence which at a later time became so strong must have made itself felt very early. 'Indirectly Persia must have influenced the Jews throughout her vast empire, but directly not so much the Jews in Palestine as the large Israelitish colonies on the east of the Euphrates and the Tigris, which, however, must have transmitted the results to the Jews in Palestine.'³ Certainly it is plausible to hold that the stress laid on righteousness and truthfulness in passages like Ps. xv. 2 and xvii. 3, is not wholly unconnected with the extremely high moral requirements of Zoroastrianism. The Zoroastrian

¹ Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther. Daniel (a larger or smaller part), Tobit, Judith, seem all originally to have had reference to N. Arabian oppression. See in due time *Critica Biblica*, and cp. *Enc. Bib.*, 'Purim,' § 7.

² *Origin of the Psalter*, p. 270. Cp. the context (pp. 266-272).

³ *Ibid.*, p. 281; and cp. *Enc. Bib.*, 'Zoroastrianism,' §§ 20-25.

phrase, 'good thoughts, good words, good deeds,' might have been taken as a motto by the psalmists, and even if the traditional text of Pss. xvi., xvii., xlix., lxxiii. sometimes represents a late editor, and not the original writers, yet the editor's text has a historical value of its own, and we may at least in part ascribe the references which it probably contains to personal immortality and the resurrection to Zoroastrian influences. For though we can seldom draw a sharp line between Babylonian and Persian influence, such a distinction does appear to be in place here.¹

These points of contact prove the receptivity of the Jews; they detract in no important respect from the originality of the Psalter.² As I have shown elsewhere, it is a monument of the church-consciousness of the period of the early Judaism, and it represents the most vital elements in the Jewish faith. These elements, however we account for their historical form, are not borrowed. We must, it is true, draw a distinction between the earlier and the later Psalter, each of which has some distinctive merits, though, from a theological point of view, the later Psalter is the richer.

It would, however, be a great mistake to regard the Psalter in either of its forms as primarily a record of Jewish theology. It is rather, first of all, a record of the changeful emotional experiences of the pious community in presence of the terrible fact of the prosperity of the wicked, who, in the earlier form of the Psalter, are again and again declared to be N. Arabians. In that Psalter, as here presented, too large a place may perhaps be given to temporary circumstances to please us. We have been accustomed to say of the writings of the early post-exilic period, such as the Psalms and the Book of Job, that they 'touch us almost more nearly than the writings of those prophets [Jeremiah and II. Isaiah], because the ideas contained in them have found simpler expression, and are less closely bound up with the historical form.'³ But it can hardly be denied that the phenomena presented to us in the revised text of the Psalms are highly natural. Neither the 'exilic' nor the 'early post-exilic' period was barren of occasions for highly coloured metrical supplications of the community.

¹ See Zimmern, in *KAT* ³, pp. 638 f.; Cheyne, *JRL*, pp. 257-260, *Enc. Bib.*, 543^b-544².

² Hommel's theory that Ps. xciii. may be derived from a Babylonian hymn to Ea is baseless (vol. ii., p. 80).

³ Hastings, *Dict. of Bible*, Extra Volume, p. 45^b (art. 'New Testament Times'), preprint.

Unless we refuse to carry the critical process further, and acquiesce in the meagre narrative which has become traditional, we must admit that pious Jews suffered greatly not only from mere 'contact with the heathen world,' not only from inconsistent fellow-Jews, 'who, with a stronger sense of actualities, plunged vigorously into the relations of life, and sought to help themselves,'¹ but from cruel tyrants of N. Arabian race, and those Jewish apostates ('deniers,' they are called) who abetted them. Now if the trials and sufferings of the Jews were so definite and concrete, must not the writers who gave voice to Jewish feelings have named their tyrants?

§ 9. I do not, however, wish the reader to suppose that the N. Arabians held the supreme power in Judah and in the Negeb all through the period of the original Psalter. It is true, the original form (disclosed by criticism) of Ezra and Nehemiah, Esther, Tobit, and Judith suggests that for a long time the Persians left Judah and the Negeb in the hands of the N. Arabians. But it is difficult not to believe that they did not at last interfere, and in spite of the sceptical criticism of Willrich,² the second-hand statements of the cruelty of Artaxerxes Ochus to the Jews may have a kernel of truth. The defilement of the temple and the 'enslavement' spoken of by Josephus (*Ant.* xi. 7, 1) may perhaps have taken place at this period.³

However this may be, it is probable that N. Arabians of new ethnic connexions were troublesome to the Jews long after the fall of the old Jewish state. For a time indeed a part of Judah and of the Negeb appears to have been ruled by representatives of the ancient Davidic family—representatives so weak and harmless that no umbrage could be given to the Babylonian power. And even when this rule had come to an end (perhaps through the mad ambition of a Jewish prince) we hear of a Nehemiah and a Daniel in high favour at the N. Arabian court, at least if I may refer here to results which are only in course of being established. But upon the whole we may say, in the language of a psalmist, that Israel

¹ *Ibid.* Wonderful vagueness is assumed for writers of Semitic race!

² *Judaica* (1900), pp. 35-39; cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Psalms, Book of,' § 23.

³ Cheyne, *Founders of O. T. Criticism*, pp. 220 ff.; *Origin of the Psalter*, p. 52. Cp. W. R. Smith, *OTJC*,⁽²⁾ pp. 207 f., 438; Ewald, *Dichter des Alten Bundes*,⁽¹⁾ p. 353 (1835), and *Hist. of Israel*, v. 120. But cp. also *E. Bib.*, col. 2425 (G. A. Smith), 3941 (Cheyne).

'walked tremblingly, the Arabians pressing him hard' (Ps. xlii.-xliii., // 15, 26). According to Winckler, the old peoples of the N. Arabian border-land had given place to Kedar and Nebaioth, who in turn were succeeded by the Salamians or Salmzeans and (in the first half of the second century) the Nabatzeans.¹ There is not much hint of this in the Hebrew texts, which generally use the old familiar names for the N. Arabian countries and peoples. Nor can we omit to mention the Edomites, who were from the first among those who annoyed and oppressed Israel (cp. Obadiah), and who are from time to time mentioned with horror by the psalmists (e.g. Pss. xi., xii., xlix., cxxxvii.).²

How constantly the N. Arabian danger occupied the minds of the psalmists, will be best shown by giving a brief summary of the contents of their writings. It will be noticed that the same foes are referred to even in psalms which may be presumed to be of the Greek period. A literary tradition had been formed which could not, as it seems, be broken through.

§ 10. Without further explanation I proceed to summarize the contents of the Psalms from this point of view.

BOOK I.

i. Preface to the large Psalter, including Ethanic psalms, with their preface (ii.). The editor took a fragment of a metrical ps. on the contrasted lots of the good and the bad, and prefixed a didactic passage in irregular rhythm.

ii. Lyric anticipation of the time when the promise of an expanded Canaan made to Israel shall have been fulfilled. The N. Arabian populations will rebel against Yahwè and Israel, and will be forcibly brought back to obedience, unless they prudently renew their submission.

iii., iv. Evening psalms; N. Arabian oppression cannot disturb believers.

v. The temple-worshippers, surrounded by lying foes, pray to be guided aright.

vi. Deep depression at the danger of Israel gives way to faith.

vii.³ Complaints of the insults of the N. Arabian foe, which threaten to pass into a pitiless 'tearing' of Israel. But soon his wickedness will prove his own ruin.

¹ *KAT*,⁽³⁾ pp. 151 f.

² See Torrey, 'The Edomites in S. Judah,' *JBL*, xvii. 16-20 (1898), and cp. Cheyne, *ibid.*, p. 207.

vii.⁽²⁾ Prayer for the redress of Israel's wrongs.

viii. Fragment of lyric cosmogony. The old 'enemy,' i.e. the primæval dragon, is a symbol of the N. Arabian foe. Cp. Ezek. xxix. 3.

ix.—x. An alphabetical poem was broken in two, and the parts became independent psalms. Not, however, in G, which only gives a *διάψαλμα* (ῥῆσ) after ix. 21.

xi. 'What reward has the righteous?' Yahwè's eyes 'keep watch.' Ishmael will disappear. First trace of a sceptical tendency.

xii. Prayer for deliverance from the false-hearted race of Edom.

xiii. Deepening depression, with a corrective appendix.

xiv. The sin of Gebal and Jerahmeel, and its punishment at the great doomsday.

xv. A short moral and religious catechism in metre.

xvi. Israel rejoices in his visits to Yahwè's 'palace,' and in the sure hope of deliverance.

xvii. Israel's self-justification, the ground of his faith that Yahwè will deliver.

xviii. Righteous Israel looks back upon his completed discipline, and gives thanks for his reward.

xix.⁽¹⁾ The glory of God in the heavens, especially in the sun. Second creation psalm (see viii.).

xix.⁽²⁾ Eulogy of the Law. Israel's prayer against apostasy.

xx., xxi. Pious Israel's joy at the prospect of the great deliverance, when N. Arabian foes will cease to trouble.

xxii.⁽¹⁾ Israel's desperate condition; yet he prays on.—xxii.⁽²⁾ Israel at large is summoned to give thanks for the great deliverance. N. Arabian oppression is in the background.

xxiii.⁽¹⁾ Whatever befalls, the flock of Yahwè is at peace;

xxiii.⁽²⁾ Israel anticipates the Messianic feast (Isa. xxv. 6).

xxiv.⁽¹⁾ A second little catechism on the character of Yahwè's true worshippers.

xxiv.⁽²⁾ The victorious return of the divine Warrior (Isa. lxiii. 1-6).

xxv. An alphabetical psalm. Petitions for deliverance, for instruction in the principles of Yahwè's dealings, and for the punishment of Israel's oppressors.

xxvi. Israel's innocence, the ground of his prayer for help.

xxvii.⁽¹⁾ Calm but deep joy in Yahwè, in whose sanctuary is assurance of safety.—xxvii.⁽²⁾ Anxious supplication.

xxviii.⁽¹⁾ Imprecations on the wicked.—xxviii.⁽²⁾ A fragment of thanksgiving.

xxix. Yahwè is now king of Israel and the world ; he sends a message to the surviving Jerahmeelites, conveyed by an awful thunder-storm. The message is that Yahwè has taken his seat as Judge. At this, Yahwè's new subjects are called upon to offer praise and, it may be implied, tribute.

xxx. Israel imaginatively realizes the time when complaint will give way to thanksgiving.

xxxi. A mixture of complaints and thanksgivings. The psalm has been much edited ; it may be composite, though analysis is difficult.

xxxii.⁽¹⁾ Israel's sufferings ; (temporary) relief ; prayer still necessary.—xxxii.⁽²⁾ Didactic.

xxxiii. Quasi-alphabetic (p. 138) ; no title (but see G). Praise and prayer ; Yahwè's character and purpose, Israel's faith.

xxxiv. Alphabetic. Experience proves that Yahwè delivers righteous Israel.

xxxv. A prayer against Israel's foes. Their cruel behaviour ; Israel's self-humiliation.

xxxvi.⁽¹⁾ The wickedness of the oppressor. Second trace of sceptical tendency.—xxxvi.⁽²⁾ Yahwè's lovingkindness is sure.

xxxvii. Alphabetical. A retributive judgment is at hand.

xxxviii. Israel's affliction described under the figure of sickness.

xxxix.⁽¹⁾ The mental agony of unwilling sceptics.—xxxix.⁽²⁾ Faith holds its own under severe trial.

xl.⁽¹⁾ Gratitude for great deliverance. Prayer for the future.—xl.⁽²⁾ Anxiety passes into stern imprecations.

xli. Israel's affliction is again likened to a dangerous sickness.

BOOK II.

xl.—xliii. A company of Jews, in N. Arabian captivity, craves the divine protection and restoration to Yahwè's house. The point of view is imaginative.

xliv.⁽¹⁾ Preface to a lost historical psalm.—xlv.⁽²⁾ Prayer of the innocent martyr-nation. Assumed background of the Exile.

xlv. Celebration of the Messiah as the second Solomon.

xlvi. In the great upheaval of hostile peoples which precedes the great judgment pious Israel remains undaunted.

xlvii. Thanksgiving for the overthrow of Edomites. To faith, the Messianic age has begun.

xlviii. Again, imaginative thanksgivings.

xlix. The fate of all who deny Yahwè, whether Edomites or recreant Israelites.

l.⁽¹⁾ Fragment of a psalm on the Messianic judgment.—l.⁽²⁾ A restatement of the true law of sacrifice.—l.⁽³⁾ A threatening address of Yahwè to hypocrites.

li. Pious Israel, suffering from calamities which prove the greatness of his sins, craves forgiveness, the proof of which will be deliverance from the Edomites.

lii. A prophetic denunciation of the N. Arabian tyrants (cp. cix.).

liii. An Elohistic edition of Ps. xiv.

liv., lv.⁽¹⁾ Pious Israel implores deliverance.—lv.⁽²⁾ The wickedness of the Jerahmeelites.

lvi.—lvii.⁽¹⁾ Fresh supplications for help.—lvii.⁽²⁾ A hymn or praise.

lviii. Faith anticipates the ruin of the 'deniers' of Yahwè who bear rule in the land.

lix. The Arabians prepare to crush Israel. Let Yahwè interpose.

lx. Believing prayer kindles the spirit of prophecy. With Yahwè, unwarlike Israel shall overcome Arabia.

lxi.⁽¹⁾ A wail of persecuted Jews.—lxi.⁽²⁾ Gratitude for a past deliverance, and anticipations of the great doomsday.

lxii. Let Israel be patient; the oppressor will be requited as he deserves.

lxiii. Far from the sanctuary, pious Jews express their longing for Yahwè, and their anticipations of the judgment.

lxiv. Fresh complaints, and comforting anticipations.

lxv. Israel in the latter day gives thanks for his spiritual privileges and for the destruction of his enemies.

lxvi.⁽¹⁾ Praise for the mercies of the Messianic age.—lxvi.⁽²⁾ Grateful Israel will offer the sacrifices which he vowed in his trouble.

lxvii. Anticipations of Yahwè's righteous rule.

lxviii.⁽¹⁾ Praise, and retrospect of Israel's early mercies.—lxviii.⁽²⁾ Yahwè's faithfulness in the past prompts supplication for the fulfilment of his promises in the future.

lxix.⁽¹⁾ Israel's afflictions described; all is known to Yahwè; pay the persecutors their deserts!—lxix.⁽²⁾ Israel imagines himself in the latter day praising his God. Why not? The promises are sure.

lxx. Same as xl. 14-18.—lxxi. Israel in his 'old age' prays for relief, and promises songs of praise.

lxxii. Predictions of the reign of the Messiah.

BOOK III.

lxxiii. A temporary failure of faith. Pious Israel despaired of a recompense, but, giving heed to God's judgments, came to a better mind, and recovered his joy in Yahwè.

lxxiv.⁽¹⁾ Israel's complaints in the deepest misery of the N. Arabian invasion. The point of view is imaginative.—lxxiv.⁽²⁾ Yahwè's ancient exploits. From an anticipative song of triumph.

lxxv. A fragment. The oppressors are warned, on the ground of a divine promise to Israel, not to 'rage' so furiously against the exiled Jews.

lxxvi. Anticipations of the final deliverance.

lxxvii.⁽¹⁾ Another record of temptations to scepticism (cp. lxxiii.).—lxxvii.⁽²⁾ Description of a theophany.

lxxviii. A popular exposition of the early history of Israel.

lxxix. A companion-psalm to lxxiv.⁽¹⁾.

lxxx. An (imaginative?) appeal for help against those who have rent the 'vine' of Israel.

lxxxi.⁽¹⁾ Praise to Yahwè as King of Israel.—lxxxi.⁽²⁾ Yahwè remonstrates with and admonishes Israel.

lxxxii. Yahwè himself announces the impending retribution of the unjust judges.

lxxxiii. Israel's impassioned cry for divine vengeance.

lxxxiv. Exiled Jews long to return to the sanctuary of Zion.

lxxxv.⁽¹⁾ Prayer for the great deliverance.—lxxxv.⁽²⁾ Comforting promises.

lxxxvi. Petitions for protection, intermingled (by an editor?) with thanksgivings.

lxxxvii. The happiness of Zion or Israel, whose family now includes the converted remnants of the peoples round about.

lxxxviii. Despondency with no ray of hope.

lxxxix. Anticipative praise for the great deliverance.—

lxxxix.⁽²⁾ Contrast between the glowing promises of 2 S. vii, and present distress.

BOOK IV.

xc. Appeal of oppressed Israel for help and compensation. The psalm has been recast.

cxxiv.—cxxix. Israel's marvellous escape.

cxxvi. Laughter has given place to tears, but joy will return.

cxxvii.⁽¹⁾ Yahwè is the Watcher ; wherefore be anxious ?

cxxvii.⁽²⁾ Stalwart sons, a blessing.

cxxviii. Domestic blessedness of the righteous.

cxxx. An appeal for the destruction of the enemies of the true religion.

cxviii. Israel professes his humility. Very corrupt text.

cxviii. Reassertion of the promises in 2 S. vii. 12 ff., with a historical setting. The temple of Beth-jerahmeel probably meant. See cxvii., &c.

cxviii., cxviii.⁽¹⁾ The ministers of the same temple are summoned to praise Yahwè.

cxviii.⁽²⁾, cxviii. Praise of Yahwè for his mercies to Israel. The former a Beth-ishmael psalm.

cxviii. Temple-singers look back on the misery of their guild in captivity.

cxviii., cxviii. Thanksgiving and prophecy combined. The latter psalm, as recast, is partly a celebration of divine attributes.

cxv. Israel supplicates for vengeance on its foes.

cxvi. Prayer against the N. Arabians. Afterwards much recast.

cxvii. A cry from the N. Arabian captivity.

cxviii. The same subject ; familiar petitions re-combined.

cxviii.⁽¹⁾ A similar but more eucharistic psalm.

cxviii.⁽²⁾ A fragment on the felicity of Yahwè's people.

cxv., cxvi. Praise of Yahwè's attributes.

cxviii.⁽¹⁾⁽²⁾ Praise of Yahwè, with special reference to Jerusalem.

cxviii.—cl. Call to universal praise.

§ 11. The reader will consult his own interest if he will compare the treatment given in this work to such psalms as xxxv., xlii-xliiii., xlv., lx., lxxiv., lxxix., lxxxiii., cxxxvii. with that found in the ordinary commentaries, not excepting even the least conventional of all—that of Duhm. It will be surprising if these psalms do not appear much more natural and life-like, with the new background, than in a text less thoroughly corrected. Other groups of psalms which call for a similar treatment are the traditional 'royal psalms' (ii., xviii., xx., xxi., [xxviii.,] xlv., lxi., lxiii., lxxii., [lxxxiv.,] [lxxxix.,] [ci.,] [cx.,] [cxxxii.]),¹

¹ The numbers enclosed in [] are those of psalms in which the word מלך does not occur.

and the traditional psalms of immortality (xvi., xvii., xlix., lxxiii.).

Controversy is not the present writer's object, but some consideration is due to G. B. Gray's able attempt (*JQR*, July, 1895, pp. 658-686) to show that even those psalms which, in so far as they refer to a king who is neither Yahwè nor a foreigner, may seem to be necessarily pre-exilic, can be explained as post-exilic without resorting to the improbable hypothesis that they refer to an Asmonæan king (or kings).

He thinks that in Pss. ii., lxxii., xviii., lxxxix., xxi., the king referred to is an idealisation of the people with reference to its sovereign functions, and that the expressions used in these psalms can only, or at least most satisfactorily, be explained by the circumstances, not of an individual monarch, but of the (royal) nation. In Ps. lxi., probably also in Ps. lxiii., the poet speaks in the name of the nation, and consequently appropriates the term 'king.' Possibly Pss. xx. and cx. may be analogously explained. In Ps. xxxiii. the reference is purely proverbial, and Ps. xlv., the interpretation of which is specially difficult, may excusably be left out of account.

This view¹ does but give a sharper outline to a view to which some of the best scholars have been tending—viz., that the ideal king referred to in certain psalms is a representative and virtually a personification of the people. As the text stands, we find post-exilic Israel spoken of as Yahwè's anointed one in Ps. xxviii. 8, lxxxix. 38, 51 [39, 52,], Hab. iii. 13,² and it would have been but a step further to call the people of Israel by the ordinary royal title.

Was this step actually taken? Hardly, if it be true that there are in the prophetic literature distinct announcements of a future ideal Davidic king. The religious phraseology of the Jews would surely have been thrown into hopeless confusion if 'king' sometimes really meant 'king,' and at other times signified 'people.' There were honourable titles enough to give the personified people—'son of Yahwè,' 'servant of Yahwè,' and even perhaps 'Yahwè's anointed one.' The phrase 'Yahwè's anointed one,' if our text is correct in reading it, is specially important, because it 'is either applied or applicable to any one who has received from God some unique commission of a directly or

¹ See also Smend, *Rel.-gesch.*⁽²⁾, pp. 373 ff; Wellh., *IJG*⁽³⁾, p. 207. Smend has now given up the supposed reference of Ps. ii. to Alexander Jannæus (*Rel.-gesch.*⁽¹⁾, p. 384), and holds with Gray.

² See *Psalms* in *SBOT*, p. 176 (cp. p. 164, on ii. 7), and *Isaiah*, p. 196.

indirectly religious character';¹ in other words, it does not necessarily connote royalty. When we consider that psalms addressed to the king, or relating to the king, had probably come down to our psalmists from pre-exilic times, it is very bold to assume that the psalmists sometimes use the term 'king' as an honorific title for the Jewish people.² The conclusion arrived at in the present work is that there are only three royal psalms (xlv., lxxii., ci.). The Messianic belief was held, but was not yet widely popular. The other psalms in the above list have to be thoroughly criticized textually; for the general result see summary of contents of Psalms (pp. xxxi.-xxxii.).

Duhm's opinion on Ps. xlix. also deserves a reference. It is that the psalmist holds a doctrine of the immortality of the pious, connected with well-defined ideas as to the dwelling-place of the good after death. Charles's treatment of Pss. xlix. and lxxiii. (*Enc. Bib.*, cols. 1346 f.) is stronger, because of the setting which he gives these works in the Jewish literature. But in such difficult psalms a keener textual criticism is imperatively demanded. This is the fault of the discussion in *OP*, 381 ff., 406, which has points of affinity to that of Charles. At the same time, it is not for a moment denied that, for the period of the last editor, the existing text, with the traditional eschatological explanation, has a genuine historical value. Theologically, here as elsewhere, his redaction of corrupt passages is full of interest.

§ 12. It is now time to consider the titles or headings of the Psalms in the Massoretic text. I have already alluded to them in connexion with the question of Beth-ishmael psalms (pp. xx. ff.), and mentioned my conclusion that the temple-singers were of Jerahmeelite extraction. The grounds of this conclusion have now to be set forth.

The theories as to the titles at present in vogue have on the whole but little to recommend them. But it was inevitable that here again the prejudice in favour of the Massoretic text should injuriously affect criticism. Speaking of the titles in general, a disinterested Jewish scholar (Ad. Neubauer) observes that

¹ *Origin of the Psalter*, p. 338.

² See *Enc. Bib.*, col. 3942. Toy's clear and instructive essay, 'The king in Jewish post-exilic writings' (*JBL*, xviii. 156 ff. [1899]), does not directly refer to this question.

³ 'The Titles of the Psalms according to early Jewish authorities,' *Studia Biblica*, vol. ii., p. 57.

'when all traditional matter is exhausted, the only remaining resource is the critical method, which, however, on the present subject has as yet made no considerable progress.' As to the tradition the same witness states that from the different explanations (which he quotes at length) it is evident that the meaning of them was early lost. Next, as to the assignment of psalms to David, Solomon, Moses, the bnê Kōrah, &c. (a) With regard to *lēdāwīd* and similar titles, it is asserted by Keil that it was the custom of Arabian poets to attach their names to their works. This, however, cannot be shown. The old poets did not write their poems. Each of them had his *rāwī*, or 'reciter,' who learned each poem, and transmitted it to others.

It is, however, true, as Nöldeke has shown, that late Arabic poems are sometimes ascribed to ancient writers with an object; also that the Arabian narrators would illustrate dry historical notices by poetical passages of their own composition which they assigned to their heroes. This would fit in with the theory (ā) that the 'Davidic' psalms (לְדָוִד) were composed to illustrate a biography of David. But how can any one conceive that lyrics so unsuitable¹ were composed with this object by the psalmists, who were, as we must presume, men of no common intelligence? That the circumstances of David's life are at all a natural setting for the 78 'Davidic' psalms, and that this 'man of war' (1 Chr. xxviii. 3) could have been regarded by a psalmist as capable of writing Ps. li. or Ps. ci.⁽²⁾ is one of the rashest of all possible hypotheses. Then there is the adverse parallel of the titles לְבָנֵי קֹרַח (E.V. 'of the sons of Kōrah') and לְאַסָּף (E.V. 'of Asaph'). On the other side it may be urged, i. that the subscription in Ps. lxxii. 20 *appears* to assert that the preceding psalms were composed by David. But the subscription is at any rate comparatively late, and indeed (see pp. xliii., xlix., lxxv.) is most probably corrupt. ii. It may also be urged that David was regarded in the time of the Chronicler as the founder of the temple services as then organized. That, however, does not account for the selection of particular psalms to bear the honourable title לְדָוִד, and, as Sanday remarks,² we should have expected that the influence of the Chronicler,³ who ascribes to David a

¹ The contrast between Ps. li. and ci. is also worth noticing in this connexion. It is not greater, however, than the contrast between Ps. ci. and Ps. cix. On the position of Ps. ci., cp. Driver, in Sanday's *Oracles of God*, p. 142.

² *Oracles of God*, p. 148.

³ But see § 22.

composite psalm, made up of obviously post-exilic psalms, would have been sufficient to bring the name of David into the titles of the three psalms. iii. Nor is it a safer argument that some of the titles supplement לָדָוֹד by express references to events in king David's life. For such additions only make it more improbable that the psalmists should be responsible for ascribing temple-psalms to David. It still remains, however, to *account* for this enigmatical title.

(b) Equally difficult is the title לְשֹׁלֹמֹה (R.V., of Solomon) in Pss. lxxii., cxxvii. Ps. lxxii., however, consists of anticipations of the benefits to be enjoyed under some great king's rule, which compels us to render, inconsistently, 'for Solomon' (so A.V., following G, εἰς Σαλο(ω)μων). The moderns reject this rendering, assuming that לָדָוֹד means 'written by David,' but give no adequate explanation of the origin of לְשֹׁלֹמֹה. In Ps. cxxvii. G is without this inscription; A.V. renders 'for Solomon.' How unintelligent the psalmist is in both cases made, need not be pointed out. But what does this strange title mean?

(c) The title לְמֹשֶׁה is peculiar to Ps. xc. Grotius comments, 'Not composed by Moses himself, but agreeable to his circumstances and his mind, τίνας ἂν λόγους εἶποι ὁ Μωσῆς.' This implies the rendering 'with reference to Moses,' which is contrary to the analogy of לָדָוֹד. Besides, we must really assume the psalmist to have had intelligence enough to produce something more suitable to the assumed character of Moses. This heading too has still to be explained.

(d) לְבַנֵי קָרַח; what does this signify? If לָדָוֹד means 'composed by David,' לְבַנֵי קָרַח ought to mean 'composed by the benê Kōrah.' This is not an impossible meaning. The psalmists sought no honour for themselves. The only point of interest to chronicle may have been the guild in whose name the psalmist wrote. But who are the benê Kōrah? In 1 Chr. xii. 6 certain Kōrahites are mentioned among those who joined David at Ziklag; evidently Kōrah was the name of a clan (cp. 1 Chr. ii 43). Elsewhere in Chronicles the Kōrahites are referred to as 'keepers of the thresholds' (1 Chr. ix. 19), as 'porters' or 'door-keepers' (1 Chr. xxvi. 1), and as singers (2 Chr. xx. 19). Under which character are they referred to here? And how can the three characters be accounted for? The second question has indeed been answered (see e.g. W. R. Smith, *OTJC*,⁽²⁾ p. 204), but not decisively.

(e) **לאספ**. That the earliest tradition meant 'composed by the singer Asaph' (see 1 Chr. xvi. 5, 7) is improbable. The phrase is clearly=**לבני אספ**, 'composed by the benê Asaph'? In the great post-exilic list we find a group of 128 (or 148) persons described as 'the singers, the bne Asaph' (Ezr. ii. 41, Neh. vii. 44; cp. Neh. xi. 22, 2 Chr. xxxv. 15). But who were these Asaphites?

(f) Heman and Ethan seem to be represented as each the author of a psalm (Pss. lxxxviii., lxxxix.). Presumably the earliest tradition meant by these designations guilds or subdivisions of guilds. But how came they to be described as Ezrahite? In 1 K. v. 9 [iv. 31] Ethan the Ezrahite, Heman, Calcol, and Darda, the sons of Mahol, are mentioned as sages who were surpassed in wisdom by Solomon. Kirkpatrick (*Psalms*, p. 524 f.) assumes that they belonged to the tribe of Judah (cp. 1 Chr. ii. 6), but is puzzled to tell how Heman and Ethan could be both Levites and Ezrahites. Is there really no explanation?

(g) **לִידִיתוֹן** (G, $\tau\acute{\omega}$ *Ἰδιθουν*), **עַל־יִרְוֹתוֹן** ($\epsilon\tilde{\pi}\acute{\epsilon}\rho$ *Ἰδιθουν*). On the analogy of **לבני אספ**=**לאספ** we may assume that **לִידִיתוֹן**=**לבני יד**, i.e. that the early tradition took Ps. xxxix. to be the work of a singing family or guild (cp. 1 Chr. xxv. 3) called Jedithun or Jeduthun. If so, we must suppose that **עַל** in **עַל־יִד** is incorrectly used for **אֶל** or **לְ**. In the title of Pss. xlv. (xlvi.) and xlvi. (xlvii.) G gives $\epsilon\tilde{\pi}\acute{\epsilon}\rho$ *τῶν υἱῶν Κορε*, where M has **לבני־קרה**; i.e., G reads **עַל בְּנֵי ק**. According to modern critics, Jeduthun is identical with Ethan¹ (Stade, *GVI*, ii. 201, note 1, refers to 1 Chr. ix. 16, xxv. 1. 6, 2 Chr. v. 12, xxxv. 15, Neh. xi. 17). But whence came this strange variation of name? Of course, it is open to us to say that 'Jeduthun' is not properly a personal name, but a musical term which ultimately became the name of a chief singer.² But what a strange transformation!

The other technical terms or phrases attached to the text of the psalms are mostly so improbably explained that I will merely refer the reader for the current hypotheses to Bâthgen's or Kirkpatrick's commentary, or to the *Encyclopædia Biblica*

¹ Köberle (*Die Tempelsänger im Alten Testament*, p. 163) supposes that the singer Ethan arose out of Jedithun, 'perhaps under the influence of 1 K. v. 11,' &c. Such hypotheses are virtually a confession of the hopelessness of the question. Clearly we must look for a fresh clue.

² W. R. Smith, *OTJC*(²), p. 143; Köberle, p. 162.

(special articles). Three of these, however, being specially important, may be considered here with reference to current theories.

(a) לַמְנַצֵּחַ, A.V. 'to (R.V., for) the Chief Musician.' The general modern opinion is that הַמְנַצֵּחַ means 'the precentor,' 'the director of the music,' and the ל is thought to intimate that the psalm which follows was handed over to the precentor to be used in the temple services. The Anglo-American lexicon, however, explains, 'Belonging to the Director's collection of psalms' (cp. § 17), assuming (if I understand right) that דוד קרה, בני קרה, &c., were titles of minor Psalters, and that there was a Director's Psalter consisting mainly of psalms taken from the David-Psalter. This is difficult to take in; a more improbable title for a Psalter than 'the Director' can hardly be imagined. And does הַמְנַצֵּחַ really mean the Director of Music? The significance of the fact that, for לַמְנַצֵּחַ, G gives εἰς τὸ τέλος, and has evidently no idea of a possible use of the verb נָצַח in a musical connection, appears not to be generally recognized. It is true, Driver¹ 'doubts greatly' whether 'the ignorance of the LXX.' is very important. 'The LXX.,' he says, in all parts of their translation . . . are apt to stand apart from the Palestinian tradition; they frequently show themselves to be unfamiliar not only with uncommon or exceptional words, but even with those which one would have expected to be well-known.' He illustrates this from נָצַח, the verb of which מְנַצֵּחַ (according to Driver, 'precentor') is the participle. 'It is hardly possible that a word familiarly known in Palestine *circa* 300 B.C., and (in its musical connection) retained in use in the temple services, should have had its meaning forgotten there during the period of one or two centuries which may have elapsed between 300 B.C. and the date at which the LXX. translation of the Chronicles and Ezra was made; yet the translators of these books have evidently no idea of its meaning when used in that connection.' It is admitted, however, that there is no passage in Ezra, and but one in Chronicles, in which נָצַח is used with reference to music, and though Driver says that in 1 Chr. xv. 21 the LXX. 'show themselves to be entirely unacquainted with the meaning of the verb,' it does not appear that modern philology has succeeded in showing what לַמְנַצֵּחַ means. BDB states that בְּכִנּוֹת עַל-הַשְּׂבִינִית לְנִי

¹ In Sanday's *Oracle of God*, p. 146.

means, 'over the bass voices, leading them with **בְּנִזְרוֹת**.' But since 'בכ' is separated from 'לנ' by **הַשְּׂמִינִית**, and since no *proof* of the sense 'bass voices' for **שְׂמִינִית** can be adduced, we may venture to question this interpretation which neither of the two other standard Hebrew Lexicons ratifies. The text is certainly not free from corruption (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Sheminith,' 'Shemiramoth'); and **לְנִצָּח** (= **תְּמִיד**, xvi. 6). The LXX. therefore does not deserve the imputation of ignorance, the verb **נִצָּח** not having yet been proved to have a special musical sense (for an ingenious but very far-fetched suggestion, see Ges.-Buhl); and the fact that it substitutes **לְנִצָּח** for **לְמִנְצָח** suggests that the translator, whose aloofness from Palestine may be exaggerated, knew that there was no real Palestinian tradition on the subject. The Cimmerian darkness can only be mitigated by critical conjecture.

(b) **שִׁיר הַמַּעֲלוֹת** or (cxi.) **שִׁיר לְמ'**. This looks plain enough. i. The most natural rendering is 'song of (or, for) the steps' (so G J). But what can this mean? According to *Middoth* ii. 5 the fifteen psalms so entitled (Pss. cxx.-cxxxiv.) were sung by the Levites at the Feast of Booths on the fifteen steps which led from the Court of the Women to the Court of the Men. Against this artificial explanation, see Delitzsch. ii. It is just possible that **מַעֲלָה** may have been a term for the 'going up' of the returning exiles to Palestine, or of the pilgrims to Jerusalem at the great festivals. The former view is taken by the Peshiṭta, and perhaps by 'Α Σ Θ (*ᾠσμα τῶν ἀναβάσεων*, or *εἰς τὰς ἀναβάσεις*). The latter meets with much favour from the moderns. But 1. the contents of all the psalms in question do not suit these theories, and 2. there is no adequate authority for the supposed use of **מַעֲלָה** (Ezr. vii. 9 may be suspected of corruptness). We must therefore look further.

(c) The word or formula **הַלְלִיָּהּ** also appears, but is not really, quite plain. It is generally found both in M and in G at the beginning of psalms; see cvi., cxi.-cxiii., cxxxv., cxlvi.-cl., and in G the following psalms as well, civ. [cv.], cvi. [cvii.], cxiii. [cxiv.-cv.], cxiv. [cxvi.: 1-9], cxv. [cxvi.: 10-19], cxvi.-cxviii. [cxvii.-cxix.], cxxxv. [cxxxvi.], cxlvii. [cxlvii.: 12-20]. In Pss. civ., cv., cxv.-cxvii., however, M gives 'Hallelujah' at the end of the psalm, and in M's text of Pss. cxxxv. and cxlvi.-cl., as well as in G's text of Ps. cl., 'Hallelujah' occurs both at the beginning and

at the end of a psalm. What does the word or formula mean? The natural explanation is that it was a call to the congregation to join in reciting a psalm, or in responding by a united acclamation of praise. But in the temple, at any rate, the congregation did not join in the service of song. The formula would seem to have grown up in the services of the synagogue. It is stranger that such a formula should not be more extensively found, and strangest of all, because contrary to analogy, that 'Praise ye Yah' should be found as a title at all.

(d) The term סלה plays a great part in recent theories as to the origin and structure of the psalms. How often does it occur? In the Massoretic text, certainly, it is found 71 times in 39 psalms. But the LXX. does not entirely coincide with M, nor indeed do all the groups of MSS. of the LXX. give διάψαλμα (סלה) in all the same places. The true theory ought to throw some light upon this. The following are the references for סלה in M.

iii. 3, 5, 9. iv. 3, 5. vii. 6. ix. 17, 21. xx. 4. xxi. 3. xxiv. 6, 10. xxxii. 4, 5, 7. xxxix. 6, 12. xlv. 9. xlvi. 4, 8, 12. xlvii. 5. xlviii. 9. xlix. 14, 16. l. 6. lii. 5, 7. liv. 5. lv. 8, 20a. lvii. 4a, 7. lix. 6, 14. lx. 6. lxi. 5. lxii. 5, 9. lxvi. 4, 7, 15. lxvii. 2, 5. lxviii. 8, 20, 33. lxxv. 4. lxxvi. 4, 10. lxxvii. 4, 10, 16. lxxxi. 8. lxxxii. 2. lxxxiii. 9. lxxxiv. 5, 9. lxxxv. 3. lxxxvii. 3, 6. lxxxviii. 8, 11. lxxxix. 5, 38, 46, 49. cxl. 4, 6, 9. cxliii. 6.

סלה also occurs, as M and G agree, three times in Habakkuk (iii. 3, 9, 13), and διάψαλμα (סלה) is found twice in the Greek of the 'Psalms of Solomon' (xvii. 31; xviii. 10). It occurs usually but once in a psalm, but in several cases twice and even thrice; Ps. lxxxix. actually has four סלה. The accents connect it closely with the preceding word, as if it formed part of the text; A J T also assume this view. We pass on to the meaning.

(1) There are two streams of tradition. (a) Jewish opinion unanimously makes it a synonym of נצח or עולם; so too Jerome (epistle to Marcella), who holds that it either has a connecting value, or shows that what has been said is everlasting. (b) The Greek of the LXX., followed by ΣΘ (generally), give διάψαλμα. But this word continues to be almost as enigmatical as סלה itself;¹ will the Egyptian Greek papyri some day throw light upon it?

¹ See Suicer, i. 890; Lagarde, *Novæ Psalterii Græci Editionis Specimen*, p. 10; B. Jacob. *ZATW*, xvi. 173 ff. (1896). Kautzsch (*Die Poesie u. die poet. Bücher*, 1902, p. 39) explains 'Verstärktes Spiel.'

(2) According to a widely held opinion סלה indicates a break either in the singing or in the words sung. On this hypothesis, all the psalms with סלה are shown thereby to have belonged to the temple-services. But B. Jacob, who holds this view, is obliged to admit that there are temple-psalms (*e.g.* the so-called Hallelujah psalms, except cvii. and cxv.), which, for some obscure reason, have no סלה. Briggs gives a new form to the theory. He thinks that when a section of a psalm or a prayer was used apart from its context in liturgical service it was followed by a doxology, and that סלה divides a psalm into liturgical sections.¹

(3) Etymological explanations. Most moderns connect סלה with √סלל 'to raise.' This makes it a call for the musicians to strike up (so König, *Lehrgeb.* ii. 530), or a direction to 'lift up' a benediction or doxology (Briggs). The former explanation is thought to be confirmed by the combination of 'Selah' in Ps. ix. 17 with 'Higgaion,' usually rendered 'loud playing' (see, however, vol. i., p. 36, on *l.* 74), also by an examination of the passages in which 'Selah' occurs. It is admitted that there are 'Selah-' passages which do not suggest that there is a need of a louder accompaniment. But in these cases it is thought that the סלה may have been either misplaced or inserted in error. Unfortunately the etymological basis of this theory is precarious. Hence, as a last resource, Paulus Cassel conjectured that סלה may represent the Greek ψάλλε (against which, however, see Bähgen), and G. Dalman that it may be the Greek σελίς, which means, not only 'page' or 'column,' but also 'the space between two lines.' It will be seen, however, that all the other words on our list can be explained without the help of Greek. Once more it becomes plain that criticism must either take a step in advance, or confess itself beaten.

§ 13. How this is to be done, is no matter of uncertainty. Our only hope can be in a deliberate and persistent use of the methods, new as well as old, of critical (as opposed to arbitrary) conjecture. The following conspectus presents revised results of such a course of action—results open in several cases to further modification. If the results are negative, they are also positive; and who can say that the explanations for which, with extreme

¹ See Prof. Briggs, 'An inductive study of Selah,' *JBL*, xviii. 132 ff., and cp. Miss E. Briggs' learned paper on Selah in *AJSL*, xvi. 1-29. See also B. Jacob, 'Beiträge,' &c., i. Sela, *ZATW*, xvi. 129 ff. (1896); Parisot, 'Signification musicale de Selah-Diapsalma,' *Rev. biblique*, 1 Oct., 1899, pp. 573 ff.

deliberation, substitutes are offered, are worthy of their place in commentaries and lexicons which are otherwise, even if far from perfect, at any rate neither unprogressive nor unmethodical? It should be added with reference to the historical or quasi-historical references appended to a number of titles, that it has seemed most convenient to give these separately.

1. *‘Alāmōth, upon (עַל-עֲקָמוֹת)*, xlv. [xlix.]; *Ma‘ālōth, the (הַפְּעִילוֹת)*, and *Ma‘ōlōth, for the (לְפַעֲלוֹת)*, cxx.-cxxxiv. [לְמַ' in cxxi.]; *Mahālath, upon (עַל-מַחֲלַת)*, liii., and with the addition of *L'annōth (לְעֲנוֹת)*, from *עֲקָמוֹת*, lxxxviii.; *Nehilōth, upon the (אֶל-הַנְּחִילוֹת)*, from *אֶל-מַהֲלוֹת*, v. All these (for עַל = אֶל = לְ) originated in *לִישְׁמַעְאִלִים* or *לִירַחְמַאִלִים*, i.e. ‘of the Ishmaelites,’ ‘of the Jerahmeelites.’ The latter is the origin of the forms containing ח (cp. *מַחֲלִי*, *מַחֲלוֹ*); the former, of those containing ע. So in Ps. ix. *לְבַן עַל-מוֹת* (see 18) should be *לְבַנֵי יִשְׁמַעְאִלִים*. ‘of the Ishmaelites.’ The ‘Ishmaelites’ or ‘Jerahmeelites’ are singers (see p. xxii.). The title *שִׁיר לְמוֹעֲלוֹת* may be more correct than *שִׁיר הַנֵּן*; it probably means, ‘Of Asshur: of Ishmael’ (see 30), two alternative titles combined, both assigning the psalm to a Jerahmeelite guild.

2. *Al-tashēth (אֶל-תְּשִׁחַת)*, lvii., lviii., lix., lxxv., and *Aiyeleth haš-šihar, upon (עַל-אַיְלֶת הַשִּׁחֹר)*, xxii. The former from *אֶל-אַשְׁחֹר*, ‘of Ashhur’; the latter from *אֶל-יִרַחְמַאִל-אַשְׁחֹר*, ‘of Jerahmeel-ashhur.’

3. *Asaph, of (לְאַסָּף)*, l., lxxiii.-lxxxiii. Asaph = Abiasaph, certainly a N. Arabian name, to be grouped with Saph (2 S. xxi. 18), Joseph,¹ and perhaps Shaphat, Şephath, Sarephath.² On the analogy of *אֲבִיתָר*, Abiasaph = Arāb-asaph. In Ex. vi. 24, 1 Chr. ix. 19, xxvi. 1 (reading *בֶּן אֲבִיסָף*), we find Abiasaph (the best vocalization) a Korhite, while in 1 Chr. vi. 39 (cp. *v.* 43) Asaph is a Gershomite. Now *גֵּרְשֹׁם* is closely connected with *גִּישׁוֹר* = *אַשְׁחֹר*; for ‘Korhite’ see 12. In Ezr. ii. 41 (Neh. viii. 44) ‘the singers, the benē Asaph’ are grouped with families certainly N. Arabian (see *Crit. Bib.*). The *benē haš-šōrīm* come next, or rather the *benē asshurim*, i.e. the Asshurites (see 10); in Ex. vi. 24 a brother of Abiasaph is called *אַסִּיר*, doubtless a corruption of *אַשְׁחֹר*.

¹ One of the benē Asaph, in 1 Chr. xxv. 2, 9, is called ‘Joseph.’

² Cp. the intermediate form *סַפְרַת*, Neh. vii. 57; also *אַסְפָּסָף*. Num. xi. 4, probably from *צַפְתִּים = אֲסַפִּים* (*Crit. Bib.*).

Next come the *Nethinim*, i.e. the Ethnaites, and the *bené 'abdē šelōmo*, or rather the *bené 'arūb-šalamū*. All these are probably temple-singers (see p. xxii.), and certainly N. Arabian.

4. *David*, of (לְדָוִד), prefixed to all the psalms of Bk. i. except i., ii., x., xxxiii.; to 21 in Bk. ii.; to 1 in Bk. iii.; to 2 in Bk. iv.; and to 17 in Bk. v.; in all to 78. [Ps. xcvi. should perhaps be added.] Lagarde takes a step in the right direction when he says,¹ 'One division of the temple choir could be named after David, another after Heman, or Korah, or any one else, just as English professors can be called Margaret, or Savilian, or Hulsean, &c.' It is most probable, however, that the other names in phrases like לְדָוִד are Negeb clan-names. Now, though there may have been a clan-name Dōd, it is not to be expected here; the clan to which such a large number of psalms was assigned must have borne a more important name than Dōd. We have, as it seems, a triple clue to the meaning of לְדָוִד. (a) In Pss. xvi., lvi.-lx. לְדָוִד goes with מַכְתָּם, i.e. מַעֲכָתִים, 'Maacathites,' a gloss on דָּוִד. See 16. (b) Pss. xxxix. and lxii. have the double title לִידִיתָן or עַל־יְדִוְתָן and לְדָוִד, and Ps. lxxi. (lxx.) in G's Hebrew text may have had the double title לְדָוִד and in a corrupt form לְבְנֵי יְדִוְתָן (ϰιων ιωραδαβ). (c) Ps. xlv. in the second part of its title has יְדִידָת, which probably comes from לִידִיתָן, i.e. לְעֶרְבֵי אֵיתָן (see 10). We may plausibly assign the same origin to לְדָוִד, the intermediate stage being לִידִוְתָן. It should be noticed that in lxxii. 20 עַרְבֵי אֵיתָן comes from בְּנֵי יִשְׁמַעְאֵל, which is a gloss on עַרְבֵי אֵיתָן [M. דָּוִד], and that in cxlv. 10 אֶת־דָּוִד is an intrusive and incorrect gloss on עֲבָדוֹ. Observe that in the titles of xviii. and xxxvi. לְעַבְדֵי יְהוָה is a corruption of לְעַרְבֵי יְרַחְמָאֵל; לְדָוִד follows. The conjecture that דָּוִד ultimately comes from עַרְבֵי אֵיתָן is thus confirmed.

5. *Ethan the Ezrahite*, of (לְאֵיתָן הָאֶזְרָחִי), lxxxix. How can Ethan the Levite also be an Ezrahite or Zarhite, i.e. a Judahite (see p. xxxvii.)? The question has wrong pre-suppositions, which need not here be examined. Ethan the Ezrahite, in 1 K. v. 11 [iv. 31] is the name and title of a foreign sage; in 1 Chr. ii. 6 he is made a son of Zerah (cp. Gen. xxxviii. 30). Zerah, too, occurs as a Cushite and Edomite name (see *E. Bib.*, 'Zerah'). The

¹ *Orientalia*, ii. 23. Zenner accepts this view (*Zt. f. luth. Theol.* xv. 361 f. [1891]); König (*Einleit.* p. 395) rejects it.

origin of Zerah or Ezraḥ is no doubt אֶשְׁחֹר (the name of a district or districts in the N. Arabian border-land. Read לאיתן האֶשְׁחֹרִי, i.e. 'assigned) to the Ashḥurite Ethan (clan).'

6. *Gittith, upon the* (עַל־הַגִּתִּית), viii., lxxxi., lxxxiv. Either from עַל־הַנְּגִינֹת, or directly from עַל־הַשְּׁמִינִית, for which see 26.

7. *Heman the Ezrahite, of* (הַיְחִיָּן הָאֶזְרָחִי), lxxxviii. To be explained on the analogy of 5. 'Heman,' of course, is a clan-name. In 1 K. v. 11 (iv. 31) Heman is a son of Mahol, i.e. a Jerahmeelite, but in 1 Chr. ii. 6 he is a son of Zerah = Ezraḥ. הַיְחִיָּן is either a corruption of תִּיחִיָּן (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Heman'), or, better, of אַחִימָן (Ahiman), Num. xiii. 22, cp. 1 Chr. ix. 17, where it is the name of a family or guild of the temple-ministers called שְׁעָרִים ('porters'), or rather אֶשְׁשֻׁרִים (Asshurites). Now תִּיחִיָּן is probably formed from יְחִיָּן, and אַחִימָן is an early corruption of יִרְחִמְאֵל. יִחִיָּן and יִרְחִיָּן being identical, the title describes Ps. lxxxviii. as assigned to a Jerahmeelite or Asshurite clan named (probably) אַחִימָן.

8. *Hallelujah* (הַלְלִיָּהּ). The difficulties already mentioned suggest that the word is corrupt. Comparing הִלֵּל (Isa. xiv. 12) and מְהַלְלֵאל (Gen. v. 12), we may trace its origin to לִירְחִמְאֵלִים.

9. *Higgaion* (הַגִּיּוֹן), ix. 17, followed by שְׁלֵה, and xcii. 4, followed by בְּכַנּוֹר. Both passages are corrupt (vol. i., pp. 33, 36; vol. ii., p. 87).

10. *Jeduthun, of, or, upon* (לִידֻתוֹן, xxxix. ; עַל־יְדוּתוֹן, lxii. ; יְעַל־יְדוּתוֹן, lxxvii.); *Loves, Song of* (שִׁיר יְדוּת), xlv. Jeduthun(?) is mentioned with Asaph and Heman in 1 Chr. xxv. 1 ff., 2 Chr. v. 12, xxxv. 15, and with Heman alone in 1 Chr. xvi. 41, thus taking the place of Ethan (cp. 1 Chr. xv. 17). Clearly either יְתוֹן or יְתוֹן must represent אֵיתָן : how, then, shall we explain יְדוּתוֹן or יְדוּתוֹן? Lagarde (*Uebersicht*, 121) supposes that the right phrase was עַל־יְדוּתוֹן אֵיתָן, 'to be performed (or, preserved) through (or, by) the guild, or choir, of Ethan.' But then how shall we account for the phrase בְּנֵי יְדוּתוֹן (1 Chr. xvi. 42)? The clue is suggested by the fact that names both of clans and of persons often consist of two names of districts or clans combined. Notable instances are, 1. Obed-edom, who in 1 Chr. xvi. 38 is called a son of Jeduthun, and whose name should rather be read Arab-edom (or Arab-aram); 2. 'abdē selōmō (Ezra ii. 55 = Neh. vii. 57), rather 'Arab-salamu (see p. xxii.); and 3. Rab-šakeh, 2 K. xviii.

17, rather Arab-cush. ידים almost certainly comes either from אָרָם (= 'ירח') or from עָרַב. The latter alternative is here adopted (cp. on בִּידֵי, Ps. cxli. 6). The benê Jeduthun were, according to 1 Chr. xvi. 42, 'at the gate' (לְשַׁעַר), i.e. 'door-keepers,' שַׁעֲרִים; but there is clearly some misunderstanding connected with these 'door-keepers.' Most probably the original designation of the benê Jeduthun (or, Arab-ethan), as well as of the benê Shallum (Ezra ii. 42) was אַשְׁשֻׁרִים, 'Asshurites' (cp. 3). That יִדְוֹתָן or יִדִּיתָן really comes from אִיתָן is confirmed by the titles of xviii. and xxxvi. (see 4; end). Observe that in the title of c. לִידְוֹתָן has become לְתוֹדָה. See also 4, 13, and 28. Lastly, as to שִׁיר יִדִּיתָן. Shīr and Jedidōth are brought together by a mistake. יִדִּיתָן is a corruption of יִדִּיתָן;¹ cp. the combination of לְדוֹר and לִידִּי referred to under 4. For שִׁיר, see 30. 'Song of loves' (or, 'love') is quite unsuitable.

11. *Jonath-elem-rehokim, upon* (עֲלֵי־יוֹנָת אֵלֶם רְהוֹקִים) lvi. Cp. *E. Bib.*, s. v. That עֲלֵי־נִינּוֹת comes from עֲלֵי־נִינּוֹת (cp. liv. f., lxi.), is obvious. Nor can we hesitate under אֵלֶם רַח to see אֶל־הַקְּרָחִים, 'to the Korhites.' See 11.

12. *Korah, of the sons of* (לְבָנֵי קָרַח), xlii., xliv.-xlix., lxxxiv. f., lxxxvii. f. The origin of the southern clan Korah is variously traced to Esau and to Caleb (see *Enc. Bib.*, s. v.). The key to the name is furnished by 1 Chr. xii. 6, where הַקְּרָחִים interrupts the list of names, and has evidently come in from the margin, where it stood as a variant to בְּנֵי יִרְחָם (v. 7, end). Cp. also Num. xvi. 1, 'Korah, ben Izhar [from Ashhur], ben Kehath [from Maacath].' The sum of the matter is that קָרַח (in which Hebrew wit may have seen 'baldness')² is a distortion of יִרְחָם = יִרְחָמָאֵל. The distortion, however, obtained an independent existence. The clan of the benê Korah were originally, of course, not 'door-keepers,' but first Asshurites (cp. 9) and then singers. Thus the questions asked on p. xxxvi. are answered.

13. *Mahalath, upon.* See 1.

14. *Maschil* (מִשְׁכִּיל), xxxii., xlii., xlv. f., lii.-lv., lxxiv., lxxviii., lxxxviii. f., cxlii. An examination of the titles shows that it stands in close relation to לְמִנְצָח. In *Enc. Bib.*, 'Maschil,' it is

¹ So already Staerk (*ZATW*, xii. 136), with יִדִּיתָן as an alternative original.

² Cp. *Crit. Bib.* on 2 K. ii. 23, xxv. 23.

suggested that it may be a corruption of the same word that underlies 'לכני', viz. perhaps לְכִישָׁבֶן (see 19). More probably, however, it comes from לכישד, i.e. לְכִשָּׁם, 'of Cusham.' This would be a gloss on the abridged composite title לְכִנְנָה.

15. *Memorial, to make* (R.V. מְגִיָּדָה, or 'to be sung at the presentation of the Azkārā (Del., Bāthgen), or 'to confess [sin]' (B. Jacob).¹ Corrupt. Read לְאֶשְׁחֹר; cp. השחר, xxii., title (see 2).

16. *Michtam* (מִכְתָּם), xvi., lvi.-lx. G (B א &c.), in Isa. xxxviii. 9 gives προσευχή, and G¹ ᾠδή, προσευχή, for M's מכתם. This may point to מִתְחַנֵּן (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Michtam'); cp. on הנכת, xxx., title. It is easier, however, to suppose that מכתם comes from מִעֲבָתִים; cp. מעבת מכות, 2 Chr. ii. 9 (see *Crit. Bib.* on 1 Chr. v. 25). מכתם is always combined with דוד, on which, or rather perhaps on לערב איתן, it appears to be a gloss. That is, 'Arab-ethan' is equivalent to 'Maacathites.' See 4.

17. *Moses, the man of God, of* (לְמֹשֶׁה אִישׁ־הָאֱלֹהִים), xc. Read לִישְׁמִעֵאלִים [ירחמאלים]. See vol. ii., pp. 75 f.

18. *Mūth-labben, upon.* See 1.

19. *Musician, to the chief* (Kautzsch, *dem Musikmeister*: לְכִנְנָה). Prefixed to fifty-five psalms, and mostly followed by לדוד (lxvi. and lxvii. are exceptional); also in the subscription of Habakkuk's prayer (Hab. iii. 19; see *Crit. Bib.*, p. 171). The older explanations being altogether inadequate, we must look further. Two courses are open to us. 1. It would be natural that the word or words expressing the assignment of a psalm to a certain singing guild should be introduced by a word which certified the due transference of the psalm to the temple authorities. Such a word would be לְכִישָׁבֶן, 'as a thing deposited' = 'to be laid up in store' (an Aramaism). 2. The evidence that the titles are largely made up of N. Arabian ethnics or clan-names, borne by the singing-guilds, has, however, increased so much, and we have also now so much more proof of the existence of compound names like Obed-edom (from 'Arab-aram'), that we can hardly doubt that לְכִנְנָה comes from [הַיְכֹל־חֶזֶר], i.e. יִרְחַמְאֵל־אֶשְׁחֹר.

¹ *LIT.*, xviii. 52, 63 ff. (similarly in 1 Chr. xvi. 4).

It will then appear that *למנ* and *על-אילת השחר* in the title of Ps. xxii. mean the same thing, *i.e.* the abridged form *כננצה* was followed by a gloss conveying the name accurately.

20. *Negînōth*, with (*בְּנִינֹת*), iv., vi., liv. f., lxxvii., lxxxvi., Hab. iii. 19 (with superfluous ' attached), and once (lxi.) on *Neginath* (*עַל נְגִינֹת*, but G & J T imply *בְּנִינֹת*). If *למנצה* means 'to the director of music' it is natural to explain 'בכנ' 'with the music of stringed instruments.' This makes a weak explanation of 'למ' still weaker; how superfluous to admonish the director! There must have been editorial manipulation. Some indistinct word was converted into *ננינות*, and *על* (*אל*) was then (except in lxi.) altered into *ב*. In vi. *בנג'* is followed by *על-השמינית*, which was no doubt originally a correction of 'בנג', but is not the original phrase. See 26.

21. *Nehilōth*, on the. See 1.

22. *Praise* (*תְּהִלָּה*). See vol. ii., p. 233.

23. *Prayer* (*תְּפִלָּה*), xvii., lxxxvi., xc., cii., cxlii. Cp. lxxii. 20.

24. *Psalm* (*כְּזִמּוֹר*). 'כ' is an unexplained word. As in the case of *לכנצה*, two courses are open. 1. Considering (*a*) that the normal position of *כְּזִמּוֹר* appears to be either before or after the formula stating to which singing guild the particular psalm was assigned, we may assume that 'כז' is a corruption of some word stating that the psalm was duly admitted or inscribed. And considering (*b*) that from xlvi. onwards *כְּזִמּוֹר* shows a very strong tendency to associate itself with *שיר*, we may plausibly assume that *שיר* is a fragment of the word which is the true original of *כְּזִמּוֹר*. The word that will occur to most is *רָשׁוּם* 'marked' (Dan. ix. 21); see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Psalms.' The strongest objection to this is that *לכנצה* is most probably a corruption of a compound district-name, and that if *רָשׁוּם* meant 'marked,' we should expect to find it sometimes prefixed to 'לכנ' (*i.e.*, *ירחמאל-אשחור*). 2. The second course is to seek for the district- or clan-name out of which the corruption *כְּזִמּוֹר* may have arisen, and our clue is the observation that 'כז' and *שיר* are closely related, and that the easiest explanation of *שיר* (see on שור, Ps. xviii. 30*b*, and *Crit. Bib.* on שיר, 2 S. i. 18) is to regard it as a slightly corrupt fragment of *אשיר*. It will thus appear that *שיר כְּזִמּוֹר* (so xlvi., lxi., lxxxiii., lxxxviii., cviii.) represents *שיר כְּזִמּוֹר* (so lxxv.,

lxvii. f., lxxv. f., lxxxvii.) represents לַיְרַח אֲשׁוּר 'of Jerahmeel-asshur.'

25. *Selah* (סֶלָה). The learned ingenuity of critics having been baffled, we are driven to suppose that the text of the 74 passages containing סֶלָה (see p. xl.) is corrupt.¹ (a) סֶלָה might conceivably represent some word embodying a direction to the scribe, such as לְשִׁלֵּם, 'supplement,' or לְשִׁלֵּם, 'for supplementing.' If so, the word either directs the scribe to supplement a defective place in the MS., or intimates that an insertion has been made. It might also be conjectured that the traditional Jewish interpretation (סֶלָה = עֵלָם or לְעֵלָם) arose out of an early corruption of שָׁלֵם or לְשִׁלֵּם. (b) Considering, however, the frequency of corruptions of אֱלֹהִים and of יִרְחֵאֵל, and observing that כִּי and ס are liable to confusion, it seems more probable that סֶלָה, which apparently forms part of the text, and certainly never occurs in a title, comes in some cases from אֱלֹהִים, and in others from יִרְחֵאֵל. An examination of the 74 passages confirms this idea. Probably the last editor, finding סֶלָה written by mistake (for אֱלֹהִים) in Ps. iii. 3, 5, 9, jumped to the conclusion that it was an ancient technical term connected with the liturgical service, and scrupulously retained סֶלָה wherever he found it, especially at the end of a verse.²

26. *Sheminith, on the* (עֵלֶּה־הַשְּׁמִינִית), vi., xii. Now that we have found how often שָׁכַן is a corruption of יִשְׁמַעֵאל = יִשְׁמַעֵאל (see on xcii., l. 17, vol. ii., p. 88). The original of this and the related phrases (see 6, 11, 20, 27, 28) is אֱלֹהֵי־יִשְׁמַעֵאלִים.

27. *Shiggaion* (שִׁגְיוֹן), vii.; plural, with עַל prefixed, in Hab. iii. 1. A corruption of שְׁמִינִית (כִּי = גִּי); see 26.

28. *Shōshannim, upon* (עַל־שִׁשְׁנַיִם), xlv., lxix.; *Shōshannim-ēdūth, upon* (אֶל־שִׁשְׁנַיִם יְעֻדוֹת), lxxx.; *Shūshan-ēdūth, upon* (אֶל־שִׁשׁ יְעֻדוֹת), lx. שִׁשְׁנַיִם and שִׁשׁ are corruptions directly or indirectly of יִשְׁמַעֵאלִים (see 26), and יְעֻדוֹת of יְרִיתוֹן (see 10).

29. *Solomon, of* (לְשָׁלֹמֹה), lxxii., cxxvii. Either from לְשָׁלֹמֹה, 'of Shalamu' (cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Salmah'), or better, from לְיִשְׁמַעֵאל, 'of Ishmael.'

¹ Grimme was the first to suspect that סֶלָה might be sometimes due to textual corruption.

² In lv. 20, lvii. 4, Hab. iii. 3, 9 סֶלָה occurs, abnormally, in the middle of a verse.

30. *Song* (שִׁיר), in the titles of thirty psalms, also (שִׁיר) in Ps. Sol. xv., xvii. (titles). On origin, see 24. For 'song of degrees,' see 6 ; for 'song of loves,' see 9.

31. *To teach* (לְלַמֵּד), lx., and 2 S. i. 18. Either a dittograph of לְדוֹר (Renan), or, better, miswritten for לִירְחִמְאֵל.

To this may for completeness be added (*a*) an extremely probable correction of לִיהוּה אִשְׁר־שֵׁר, 'which he sang to Yahwè,' in Ps. vii., title, viz. לִירְחִמְאֵל אִשְׁר, 'of Jerahmeel-asshur' ; and (*b*) the probable restoration of the original text of the subscription in lxxii. 20, where דוֹר בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל has come from [בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל]. It is too superficial an explanation of M's text that the corrupt reading לְדוֹר in the titles had arisen before the subscription referred to was inserted (cp. pp. xliii., lxxv.).

The words or phrases which have been considered relate generally, as one can hardly help believing, to the singing guilds. There are also portions of the titles which, in their original form, appear to contain suggestions as to the contents of the psalms ; to this we will return presently. It is proper to remark here that from the preceding conspectus of results it would appear that the current historical view of the development of the guilds of singers cannot be adhered to. That the singers originally called benê Asaph gradually split up into many families, some of which called themselves with special emphasis benê Asaph, others benê Jedithun, others benê Heman, is a conjecture entirely based on questionable readings of the traditional text. There is no reason why there should not have been, from the very beginning of the services in the second temple, several guilds of singers. The title benê Asaph seems to have been specially favoured, but this does not prove that it was the original title of the collective body of singers. We have seen already (p. xlii.) that Abiasaph was sometimes described as a Korhite ; and it is not at all likely that there was a time when there were Asaphite but no Korhite singers. Asaph is also described as a Gershomite, *i.e.* an Asshurite, and this reminds us that the titles of Pss. lxxv. f. connect 'Asaph' with 'Shir,' *i.e.* Asshur. It is probable too that the title חֲמִישִׁיָּבְרִים, prefixed to בְּנֵי אָפַף in Ezra ii. 41, was originally intended to refer to the בְּנֵי הַשְּׁעָרִים (rather אֲשׁוּרִים), the נִיתָנִים (rather אֵיתָנִים) and the בְּנֵי עֲבָדֵי שְׁלֹמֹה (rather עֲבָדֵי יִשְׂמַעְאֵל) ; *i.e.*, all

these clans were devoted to the service of song. If there was any general term for the singers other than **הַמְשֻׁרִים**, it was probably (as we may infer from the titles of the Psalms) 'Asshur-jerahmeel,' or 'Jerahmeelites,' or 'Ishmaelites.' The last of these names has also perpetuated itself (in a disguised form) in the title of a later collection of psalms, the so-called *ψαλμοὶ Σολομῶντος*¹ (see pp. lxiii. f.). Arab-ethan, however, is little less widely spread as the title of a great singing guild or company; the name 'Ethanin' was subsequently disguised as 'Nethinim' (see p. xxii.). The Korhites (Korahites) may perhaps have been a different guild, though in 2 Chr. xx. 19 the Kohathites and Korhites seem to stand for the singers. But all these names, when closely examined, turn out to come from the Negeb, or N. Arabian border-land, and to be, genealogically, closely related.

§ 14. We now return to those portions of the titles which, if our criticism is correct, originally referred to the contents of the psalms. I may venture to remind the reader that again and again elsewhere,² when speaking of O. T. narratives and prophecies, I have maintained that these have been altered from earlier narratives and prophecies, partly misread, partly misinterpreted, so that they present historical and geographical statements widely differing from those originally conveyed. These transformed passages are analogous to the transformed psalm-titles. If by taking this course I help to rehabilitate the authors or supplementers of the titles, this can hardly be reckoned to my discredit. Such harsh criticisms have been passed on the supposed unintelligence of the unfortunate editors of the psalms that a plausible critical defence of them may appeal to those who can put aside prejudice, and look at facts with a single eye. The reader will doubtless supplement this conspectus by a reference to the translation and notes.

(a) Ps. iii. At the approach of the sons of Arabia and the sons of Ishmael.

(b) Ps. vii. With reference to the Arabians, the Cushites, and the sons of Yaman.

(c) Ps. xviii. The words of Israel in the day that Yahwè

¹ Cp. **משלי שלמה**, Prov. x. 1, xxv. 1, *i.e.* **משלי ישמעאל**.

² See *Critica Biblica*, Parts i.-iv., and articles in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

delivers him from the hand of all the Arabians and from Jerahmeel [Ishmael].

(d) Ps. xxxiv. When Maacath, the benê Arab-jerahmeel, and Ashhur are plucked up.

(e) Ps. li. Concerning the house of Ishmael.

(f) Ps. lii. Concerning the house of Jerahmeel.

(g) Ps. liv. (Concerning) the Zarephathites [Jerahmeel].

(h) Ps. lvi. (Concerning) the Jerahmeelites.

(i) Ps. lvii. (Concerning) the Jerahmeelites [the benê Ishmael].

(k) Ps. lix. (Concerning) the Ishmaelites and the benê Jerahmeel.

(l) Ps. lx. At the oppression +of Israel+ by Aram-jerahmeel and Aram-miṣṣōr.

(m) Ps. lxiii. When he (the guild of Arāb-ethan) was in the wilderness of Jerahmeel.

(n) Ps. cxlii. When he (the guild of Arāb-ethan) was in Jerahmeel.

(o) Ps. cxliii. When the benê Arāb-ishmael pursued. (Based on lxx.)

(p) Ps. cxliv. Concerning the captivity. (Based on lxx.)

The single traditional element retained is the assumption (surely a necessary one) that the second part of the titles of these psalms describes the occasion of the psalms. According to the earlier tradition this occasion had to do with the N. Arabian oppression. Space will only allow us to give some explanatory hints; the reader will, of course, have taken some pains to enter into the point of view from which the text of the psalms has here been revised.

(a) It is assumed that here as elsewhere פני represents בני ; אבשלום is a combination of ערב and ישמעאל ברח comes from קרב. (b) על־ערבים וְכוּשִׁים וּבְנֵי יִמִּין Or, יַעֲרַבְפוּשׁ יַעֲרַבְפוּשׁ. Or, יַעֲרַבְפוּשׁ יַעֲרַבְפוּשׁ. (c) אשר אישר is no more a part of the appendix to the title than דבר ליהוה in Ps. vii. ; see 'Corrigenda in Titles,' (b). את and הוֹאֵת are redactional. השירה comes from ישראל. ערבים=איביו (cp. on vii. 9). יד, as elsewhere, may be a fragment of ירחמאל ; מכף and מיד together are improbable. שאול, of course, = ישמעאל. (d) Read יַעֲרַבְפוּשׁ יַעֲרַבְפוּשׁ וּבְנֵי עַרְב־יִרְחָמָאֵל וְאִשְׁחֹר. It is the *anticipated* uprooting of Jerahmeel. וילך comes from ירחמאל, a correction perhaps of בלד. (The personal

name אבימלך is a popular distortion of 'יערב ירה'. (e) בת for בית, as in Isa. x. 32. ישבע, like ישניע = 'ישני'. The rest is redactional. (f) ירחמאל = אחימלך. Expansion again. (g) Both הזיפים and נסתתר represent צרפתים. ענינו may come directly from עמון. But even if so, its indirect origin is ירחמאל. (h) באחו comes from ירחמאל = מאהר. י and ר confounded; באחו suggested to the latest editor connecting the psalm with the story in 1 S. xxi. 10 ff. (i) [ב]ברחו and [ב]ניערה both = ירחמאל. בני ישני = בני ש'. (k) בשלח, שאול, and וישמרו may all have arisen out of defective forms of 'ישני'. בית להמיתו may represent בית-ירחמאל. (l) See vol. i., p. 260. (m) יהודה mis-written for 'ירה', i.e. ירחמאל (see *Crit. Bib.* on Judg. xix. 1. (n) מיערה = ירחמאל (cp. *Crit. Bib.* on 1 S. xxii. 1). (o) G^B, ὅτε αὐτὸν ἐδίωκεν Αβεσσαλωμ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ: ברדף אתו בני יערב ישמעאל. (p) G^B, πρὸς τὸν Γολιαθ (Γολιαθ, T); אֶל-הַגְּלִיּוֹת.

§ 15. It will be a relief to many minds to discover how such a strange thing as the assignment of a large number of extremely pious songs to David came to pass. We have no occasion to resort to the ingenious but artificial hypothesis that one of the minor Psalters bore the name 'David,' and that, when the true significance of the title was forgotten, the psalms in the collection were supposed to be all the work of David, and so received the superscription *lūdāwīd*. The true cause of the phenomenon was that the name Jeduthun or Jedithun was difficult to transcribers, and, supposing that the corrupt word which lay before him in the different headings, where (as is now very probable) Jeduthun should have stood, must represent some well-known name, the last editor converted it, wherever it occurred, into *lūdāwīd*, without thinking of the historical improbability of the view of David thus produced. His real reason was that a badly written דות or דית (a fragment of ידותן or ידיתן) approached more nearly to דוד than to any other known personal name. But he may also have thought of the tradition of the musical skill of David in 1 S. xvi. 16, 23; and though the songs ascribed to David in 1 and 2 Sam. are not religious, yet in post-exilic times David became such a saint that it is to him rather than to Solomon the idolater that the Chronicler assigns the preparations for the building of the temple, and, among other internal arrangements, those relating to the music (see 1 Chr. xxiii. 5, xxv. 1, 2 Chr. viii. 14, xxix. 25). This does not, of course, prove much as regards the

date of the last editor, for the point of view represented by the Chronicler can neither have begun with him, nor have ceased after his time.

§ 16. It is strange, but true, that the belief in Davidic and, in general, pre-exilic psalms but slowly disappears. Vatke in 1835 suggested that 'single songs may have survived in the mouth of the people, and in an altered shape have passed into our Book of Psalms, or at least have exerted an influence as ancient models.'¹ It is indeed intelligible that some critics, jealous for the honour of early Israelitish religion, should declare themselves unable to form a satisfactory picture of pre-exilic religion without some distinct evidences that the teaching of the prophets had begun to produce in individuals a sense of personal communion with God. It is also intelligible that the discovery of extremely early Babylonian hymns should have awakened a desire to be able to point to comparatively early Israelitish hymns, and that the modern longing to find organic development everywhere should have produced in some critics an inclination to be somewhat easy in the matter of evidence for early Israelitish hymns, which must, as they rightly assume, have been produced, and have influenced the form, if not the ideas, of the later psalms.

The grounds on which even such a scholar as Prof. Kautzsch still maintains the existence of some pre-exilic psalms in our Psalter appear to be three in number.² 1. The references to a king in Pss. xx., xxi., xlv. 2. The 'energetic denial of the necessity of the sacrificial ritual' in xl. 7, l. 8 ff., li. 18 f. 3. The 'manifold traces of antique phraseology' in the Psalms. The first of these grounds has, from a conservative textual point of view, been much weakened by G. B. Gray's able essay on the Royal Psalms. The second involves the rejection of the very plausible theory that different views were taken in post-exilic times as to the origin and importance of the sacrificial cultus. Such differences, however, are to be found in other great religions (*e.g.* Brahmanism, Zoroastrianism, Christianity); why not also in early Judaism? No one would be so unwise as to suggest that any of the psalmists, at any rate if temple-singers, were directly opposed to the sacrificial system; but there were probably not a few psalmists who wrote with a view to the synagogue-worship, and, even apart

¹ *Die Religion des A. T.*, i. 291 ff. Vatke was answered by De Wette in a famous article in the *Theol. Studien und Kritiken* for 1837.

² *Outline of the Hist. of the Lit. of the O. T.* (1898), p. 143.

from this, no psalmist who had any affinity to Jeremiah (see Jer. vii. 22 f., viii. 8) could miss the sublime truth that obedience and thanksgiving were the true 'divine service.'¹ It is highly improbable that Prof. Kautzsch regards Dr. B. Jacob's treatment of psalms like xl., l., and li.² as adequate and satisfactory. Kautzsch does not deny the spiritualizing Jeremianic tone of these psalms; but he accounts for this by the theory that they arose before the priestly code, *i.e.* that they are of pre-exilic origin. Now, the theory of late pre-exilic psalms influenced by Jeremiah, to which in my former commentary I myself inclined, will not stand a close examination. Jeremiah's influence was felt not so much by his contemporaries as by posterity—a posterity which, to do honour to the spirit of prophecy, thought fit to expand largely the contents of the roll of Jeremiah's works. And with regard to the difficulty of conceiving how utterances of a non-sacrificial view of religion could have found admission into the larger Psalter, one may fairly ask how, after Pss. xl. and li. had been admitted into 'Davidic' collections,³ and Ps. l. into a fasciculus of 'Asaphite' psalms, the psalms referred to could have been finally rejected by any editor. I may also express the opinion that the predilection of the guardians of religious classics for uniformity belongs to a more advanced stage of theological development.

With regard to the argument from 'antique' phraseology, one may admit its force provided that the facts can be established. Prof. Kautzsch speaks on one occasion of the '*arugo vetustatis*,'⁴ which all the labours of editors could not remove from certain early psalms. But is this 'antique rust' genuine? Kautzsch himself would surely admit that 'antique' forms, ἀπαξ λέγόμενα, &c., may often be due merely to accidents in the transmission of the texts, or even to affectation;⁵ and his own very long list of corruptions in the text of the psalms (see *Die heil. Schrift*, 'Beilagen,' pp. 60 ff.), which might easily have been made considerably longer, detracts from the force of his remark.

¹ See *OP*, pp. 364-367, and cp. *Enc. Bib.*, 'Jeremiah,' § 4. end.

² *Z.ATW* (1897), xvii. 67, 273-279.

³ For argument's sake I here admit the term 'Davidic.'

⁴ *Theol. Studien u. Kritiken*, 1891, pp. 577 ff.

⁵ Darmesteter asserts the 'archaism' of the Gāthās, as compared with the language of the Avesta, to be an affectation (*Le Zend-Avesta*, iii., Introd., p. xciii.).

§ 17. Prof. Kautzsch, however, has not exhausted the possible grounds for holding that there are pre-exilic psalms, or pre-exilic elements in psalms. It is Prof. Briggs to whom we may look for a completion of the round of arguments, so soon as his expected commentary has appeared. I think that some passages from an article¹ which, unlike most reviews, not merely states his opinion of the work reviewed, but also justifies his criticism by stating how he would himself treat the subject, are deserving of quotation. 'For some years,' he says, 'I have been working on the theory that there was a Director's Psalter [מִנְצִיחַ; see p. xxxviii.] made up by a selection from several earlier minor Psalters, and that this Director's Psalter is the real backbone of our present Psalter, about which the final editor grouped his entire material.' Of these minor Psalters the most important was one which bore the name 'David.'² He does not deny that some of the later psalms in M, as well as in G, were ascribed to David by a misunderstanding, but he holds that 'the great mass of the Davidic psalms in all the books were taken from a Davidic Psalter, not composed by David, but gathered together from different authors and periods of composition under David's name.'

With regard to the psalms of Asaph and the Korahites, Prof. Briggs regards it as important that they contain the psalms most commonly assumed to be Maccabæan, which is adverse, though not exactly fatal, to the present writer's theory in *The Origin of the Psalter* that the second section of the Psalter originated before the third.

In Books iv. and v. he finds 'at least two minor Psalters, viz. the group of Pilgrim psalms,—all of the same pentameter measure, with a single exception which has been obtruded upon the group for liturgical reasons,—and a group of "Hallels" which were originally together, but which have been broken in two at the final arrangement of the Psalter. The Royal Psalm [see vol. ii., p. 89], which rivalled in length the Law Psalm, no. 119, has been broken up, while the Law Psalm has remained intact.' It seems to him, therefore, 'that we must allow a considerable interval for the composition of these psalms of

¹ Review of Cheyne's *The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter* in *The New World*, June 1892, pp. 356 ff.

² This is also the view of Robertson Smith and Bickell, and has been described as 'probable' by the present writer (*OP*, p. 190) and more recently by Kautzsch.

the minor Psalters, the collection of these minor Psalters, and their comprehension and distribution in our present Books iv., v.,¹ and that the theory advocated in the book under review does not give sufficient time for this.

To the present writer, however, it appeared more bold than wise to hope for much result for the chronology of the Psalter from the study of the minor collections as such, and without in any way disregarding these, as Olshausen formerly and Bâthgen quite recently did, it seemed still more important to form fresh groups of psalms for oneself by noting affinities of ideas, situation, and phraseology, and upon these to base working hypotheses as to the periods to which the members of the respective groups belonged. This principle has already been carried out by Ewald (*Psalmen*⁽²⁾, 1866), and was afterwards adopted by A. Rahlfs with reference to eleven psalms (xxii., xxv., xxxi., xxxiv. f., xxxviii., xl., xlix., lxxi., cii., cix.¹ To build theories of the chronology of the psalms primarily on considerations respecting the length of time required for the growth of the Psalter² by the inclusion of minor Psalters (or portions of them), is surely too hazardous, even if in addition to this we analyze the individual psalms with a view to tracing redactional modifications, and discovering elements of diverse origin pieced together by editors. For this might easily lead on to the assertion of a pre-exilic and even Davidic origin for certain psalms (or parts of psalms) which would be inconsistent with the most critical and defensible view of the history of Israel's religion.³

¹ יי and יי in den Psalmen (1892). The date assigned by Rahlfs to these psalms is late in and soon after the Exile.

² Besides Drs. Briggs and Peters, Prof. Sanday deserves to be mentioned in this connexion (see his Bampton Lectures on Inspiration, 1893, pp. 256 f., 270 ff.).

³ Prof. Briggs writes thus: 'It seems to us that he [the present writer] has not given sufficient attention to the marks of earlier language, style, and religion in many of these psalms, and that a sound criticism still finds some psalms of David, more psalms of the prophetic period, and many exilic psalms, while the great mass of the Psalter will remain where Prof. Cheyne puts it,—in the Persian, Greek, and Maccabæan period' (*New World*, June 1892, p. 350). It may, however, be permissible to quote the following remarks: 'From the point of view of the history of art, not less than from that of the history of religion, the supposition that we have Davidic psalms presents insuperable difficulties' (*Origin of Psalter*, pp. 192 f.). 'It is not unnatural to imagine a Davidic element in Pss. xviii. and lx. Only we must be on our guard against pleasant illusions. No concession can be made which a conservative of the old school would think worth accepting. The religious reorganization of the people in Ezra's time was too complete to allow any considerable influence to archaic liturgical formulæ' (*Ibid.*, pp. 193 f.). As to psalms of the prophetic period, the present writer has, since 1889, never wavered. 'We have no sufficient grounds for thinking that the religious teaching of the higher prophets found any wide acceptance among the people' (*Enc. Bib.*, col. 2939).

§ 18. One admission, however, may be willingly made. It is plain that both Prof. Briggs and Dr. J. P. Peters¹ had a much fuller perception than I had myself of the amount of redactional mosaic work in the Psalter. At the same time, hardly any inquiry is more difficult than this. It is surely better to be too slow than too quick, and while by no means inclined to stationariness in the analysis of the psalms, I would suggest that there is a preliminary work of the utmost importance, not referred to by Prof. Briggs in his frank and interesting article, viz. the study of the text of the psalms with a view to seeing whether there is not an underlying text of a different character, which has been first of all corrupted in the early stages of its transmission, and then manipulated, to produce an edifying sense.

§ 19. I am afraid that this opens a rather unpleasing prospect. If the present inquiries are upon the whole rightly planned, and if the results are in any considerable degree correct, the current theories of the origin and growth of the Psalter will have to be largely reconstructed. If any reader is impatient to attempt this work, he will do well to start from some judicious statement of a not too 'advanced' character, such as that of the late Prof. Robertson Smith in his well-known article² (1886), and rewrite this in proportion as he has assimilated the new material. The stress laid in that work on the minor Psalters is no detriment to it for such a purpose, for the student must at any rate begin with these, though he must not stop short with them. Such a person must, however, remember that there are a number of groups, proved to be such not only by affinities of contents but by local juxtaposition, which are not referred to in that article. As in the case of the proverbs, psalms are sometimes put together which, by their general similarity, as well as by their juxtaposition, appear to come from the same source—a small collection of psalms. But an acquaintance with the details of the text-critical work is so all-important that I would rather not 'largely reconstruct' the theory of the growth of the Psalter until I can presume that students have sufficiently assimilated the new material.

§ 20. I venture, however, to present the patient reader with a sheaf of critical remarks. i. It has become even clearer than

¹ Article on the Psalter, *New World*, June 1893, pp. 287 f.

² The main part of this, sometimes condensed, sometimes expanded (with due notice of such expansion), will be found at the beginning of the article 'Psalms' in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.

before that the colophon in Ps. lxxii. 20 is 'a witness to the gradual enlargement of small psalm-collections.' We now find it at the end of a psalm bearing the title 'of Solomon,' but it must originally have been the subscription to a great collection, containing psalms called 'of David.' So at least one was wont to put the matter, the misplacing of the colophon being ascribed to a scribe's error.¹ Now, however—if the reader accepts my guidance—it is plain that it was no oversight, but a deliberate transference that took place. The colophon originally referred only to the 'Ethanite Psalter' (so I would designate the collection of the earlier psalms entitled 'Of Arab-ethan'); it was transferred to the end of Ps. lxxii., with a view to include that psalm (originally entitled 'of Ishmael'), and consequently the words, 'the sons of Ishmael,' were appended to 'Arab-ethan,' as a correction.

ii. It may further be noticed that the title לִירְחֻמֵּאל אֲשֶׁחַר ('of Jerahmeel-ashhur'), which is probably to be substituted for the enigmatical לְמוֹנֵצָה, reminds us of the phrase traditionally misread as סֵפֶר הַיָּשָׁר (R.V., 'the book of Jasher'), but originally (as now appears) read as סֵפֶר אֲשֶׁחַר ('the book of Ashhur'). It is not impossible that both the Ethanite, the Korahite, and the Asaphite psalms, and also the three passages expressly quoted from the 'book' referred to in narratives (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Jasher'), came from the same collection of poems, which was placed under the guardianship of the singing guild, or guilds, of Jerahmeelites, Ishmaelites, or Ashhurites.

iii. The so-called 'Songs of Degrees' were, as the revised title ('[Of] Ashhur, [of] the Ishmaelites') may seem to suggest, entrusted to the custody of the guild or guilds of Ashhurites or Jerahmeelites. It is, however, just possible that not only a part, but the whole, of this group of psalms came from the sanctuary at Beth-ishmael (see pp. xix. f.). In this case the terms 'Asshur' and 'Jerahmeelites' in the headings would here possess a special meaning of their own.

iv. As to the 'Michtam' ['Maacathim'] psalms (xvi., lvi.-lx.), I doubt whether they are rightly viewed as having originally formed a little group of psalms.² Even from a conservative textual

¹ See *OP*, p. 8, where the parallel of the repeated וַיִּנְצַח in Jer. li. 64 is referred to.

² Delitzsch has summed up the external features which seem to him common to the Michtam-psalms (introd. to Ps. xvi.), and Prof. Briggs praises Duhm for grouping these psalms together (*New World*, March 1000, p. 176).

point of view there is no overpowering necessity for this, and the revised text does not encourage the supposition.

§ 21. v. On the Elohistie redaction of Pss. xlii.-lxxxiii. (*i.e.*, Book ii. and the first part of Book iii.), the last word has hardly yet been spoken. The facts, of course, are quite plain. 'Yahwè' occurs only 30 times in Book ii., 'Elohim' 164 times; 'Yahwè' only 13 times in Pss. lxxxiii.-lxxxviii., 'Elohim' 36 times. In Ps. l. 7 we even find, 'I am Elohim, thy Elohim,' instead of 'I am Yahwè, thy Elohim' (cp. lxxxi. 11). That this is not what the original psalmist wrote, appears from the facts, 1. that Ps. liii. is only another recension, with some peculiar variations, of Ps. xiv., and 2. that Ps. lxx. is a repetition of xl. 14-18 (except that the opening word is omitted), while the opposite change is only once made. Now, since there is no obvious reason why the editor of a large and comprehensive collection should have made this alteration only in Pss. xlii.-lxxxiii., we must suppose that there was a time when these psalms formed (or formed part of) an Elohistie Psalter. But what was the motive of the editor? It has been suggested by Lagarde that he destined this Psalter for the use of the Levites, who, at the time of the redaction, were not allowed to pronounce the name Yahwè, and most scholars are agreed so far as this—that the phenomenon stands in connexion with the increasing avoidance of the name Yahwè in the later period.¹ It is not clear, however, why the redactor, if reverence was his motive, left 'Yahwè' anywhere in the altered psalms, and it is equally strange that presumably late psalms, such as Pss. cx. and cxviii., are Yahwistic rather than Elohistie, that in Daniel's prayer and confession in the name of Israel (Dan. ix.) the name Yahwè occurs seven times, and that the Hebrew Sirach (though not as constantly as the Book of Proverbs) uses that divine name. The matter has, I think, to be reconsidered in view of a probable result of textual criticism, which will have to be expounded at some length in connexion with Gen. ii. 4b,² and which is referred to briefly in the 'Addenda' to Part iv. of *Critica Biblica*, viz. that the God of Israel was habitually called, at any rate in Judah and the Israelite territory in the Negeb, not only Yahwè, but also Yahwè-jerahmeel, and even Jerahmeel alone. The compound name indicates that there

* ¹ Dr. J. P. Peters, however, is confident that 'in most cases "Yahwè" is a later addition, due to a Yahwistic revision of Elohistie psalms' (*New World*, June 1893, p. 200).

² In the portion of *Critica Biblica* vol. ii. containing Genesis.

is but one God of Israel and Jerahmeel (*i.e.* of the land of Israel in Palestine proper and in the Negeb), which, considering that Israel learned the worship of Yahwè in the N. Arabian border-land, certainly does appear to be in accordance with history. The Negeb was in fact Israel's Holy Land; there (as textual criticism tends more and more to show) were its earliest and most venerated sanctuaries, and thence came its most ancient legends. It is not strange then that some of the pre-exilic writers should have used Jerahmeel or Yahwè-jerahmeel (editorially changed into Elohim and Yahwè-elohim) as names of Israel's God, nor need it surprise us if some of the redactors of psalms¹ used as a divine name, not only Yahwè, but Elohim, *i.e.* the name which in later times was a current adaptation of, and substitute for, Jerahmeel. 'Elohim' might indeed be a name for 'the Deity,' but its use in the Old Testament where we might have expected Yahwè most probably arises, not in general from a reverent objection to limiting the universal Sovereign, but from an attachment to a name which reminded men of the ancient Holy Land. And the change of 'Jerahmeel' into 'Elohim' is to be accounted for by the growing repugnance of faithful Jews to the corrupt heathenish cultus of the very large non-Jewish portion of the population of the Negeb. This may be enough—not indeed to satisfy the natural curiosity of the reader—but to open the door for a consideration of the possibility that the Elohistic redaction of a large group of psalms can be accounted for by more concrete facts than has hitherto been supposed, and that 'Elohim' in these psalms (like Šebā'oth in Yahwè Šebā'ōth) is virtually a proper name, and not an abstract term for deity, used in place of a name for Him in whom all true Godship is centred.²

§ 22. vi. A widely-held theory respecting the relation of 'the Chronicler' to the Psalter also needs a reference here. Must we really hold that Pss. xevi., cv. 1-15, cvi. 1, 47 f., also cxxxii. 8-10 were known to the Chronicler? As generally expressed (see *e.g.* Strack, *Eintz.*³, p. 116) this involves holding that Book iv. already existed when the Chronicler wrote. But the division between Books iv. and v. was probably not made till the final redaction of

¹ We must remember that the families of singers from which so many of our psalms come were most probably of Jerahmeelite (*i.e.* N. Arabian) origin. See pp. xxi. f., xlix. f.

² It is not denied that the psalms of the Elohim-Psalter originally had the name Yahwè rather than Elohim.

the Psalms, *i.e.* undoubtedly, till after the time of 'the Chronicler.' It is also less probable that the dividing doxology in Ps. cvi. 48 originally contained the words וְאָמְרוּ כָּל־הָעָם אָמֵן, 'and let all the people say, Amen,' than that these words were taken, with one slight and necessary alteration, from 1 Chr. xvi. 36, where we read, at the close of the strange composite psalm, וַיֹּאמְרוּ כָּל־הָעָם אָמֵן, 'and all the people said, Amen.' This at least is Wellhausen's view (Bleek's *Eint.*⁽¹⁾ 506, n. 1), which, however, seems to need supplementing. It is probable (1) that the whole of the close of Ps. cvi.—*viz.*, *ev.* 47 f.—is borrowed from 1 Chr. xvi. 35 f.¹ (beginning וַיֹּאמְרוּ הוֹשִׁיעֵנו and ending וְהָיָה לְיְהוָה [חֲלִילֵי־יְהוָה]), and (2) that both the close and the opening (*ev.* 1-5) are accretions on the main body of that psalm, which had been handed down in an incomplete form, and needed some such additions to make it usable. As a consequence, we cannot commit ourselves to the view that 1 Chr. xvi. 34 is borrowed from cvi. 1 (which may well be later than the Chronicler). The formula was a conventional one, and occurs in cvii. 1, cxviii. 1, cxxxvi. 1. Nor can we venture to assert positively that it was the Chronicler who copied xcvi., cv. 1-15 (see 1 Chr. xvi. 8-33) and cxxxii. 8-10 (see 2 Chr. vi. 41 f.). The books of Chronicles, like other books, passed under the hands of redactors, and it is very possible that the insertions from the Psalter referred to were made by one of these.² We cannot, therefore, safely use the critical argument which is often based on these insertions.

§ 23. vii. On the question of Maccabæan psalms I cannot be entirely silent. The keenest modern critics have admitted a considerable number of such psalms. Among the most recent may be mentioned Merx, who undertakes to show³ that even in Book i. there are manifest traces of Maccabæan transformation of early psalms, whilst Ps. ii. itself is of the very latest period, and Duhm, who assigns Pss. xii.(?), xiii.(?), xxiv. c(?), xxxv., xliv., lv., lxix. a. lxxiv., lxxvii., lxxix., lxxxiii., cxviii., cxlix., to the Maccabæan struggle, and a still larger number to the subsequent period. Certainly the text as it stands strongly favours a Maccabæan date

¹ This passage consists of a current liturgical prayer, and a liturgical benediction and doxology (similar to those placed by editors at the end of Books i., ii., and iii.).

² Similarly Reuss, Stade, and Duhm.

³ *Festschrift zu Ehren von Daniel Chwolson*, 1899, pp. 198 f.

for Pss. xlii. (xlii. *a*), lxxiv. (lxxiv. *a*), lxxix., and lxxxiii.¹, unless indeed we see our way to follow Robertson Smith and assign these psalms to the imperfectly attested oppression of the Jews by Artaxerxes Ochus (see p. xxv.). It is true, Schechter objects² that the parallelisms between xlii. 19 and Sirach xlii. 11*c*, and between lxxiv. 10*f*, 13, and Sirach xxvi. 6*f*. in the recently discovered Hebrew text exclude a Maccabæan date. Of these, the first is of no significance, and with regard to the others one might well suppose that the impassioned prayer in Sirach xxxvi. 1-17, together with xxxv. 18-20, was inserted during the Syrian oppression, for it is certainly unique in the Wisdom of Ben-Sira. And above all, the reader must be warned that the text of all these four psalms needs a searching examination before it can be used for critical purposes. Certainly I cannot deny the plausibility of the view that the Psalter as a whole was edited in the time of Simon the Maccabæe, as a consequence of the re-dedication of the temple in B.C. 165, and that some psalms of very recent origin were then inserted. But I cannot point to these psalms. Throughout the Psalter there is a background, sometimes real, sometimes to a certain extent assumed, which is plainly N. Arabian. Nowhere can it be shown to be evident that the real enemies of the Jews are Syrian Greeks. It is nevertheless plausible to hold that in the later psalms this is the case, and that conscious archaism is responsible for the continued references to the N. Arabians. And supposing that Ps. ii. (untitled) was inserted as a preface to the 'Ethnic' Psalter, one might regard Ps. i. (also untitled) as the introduction to a large Psalter of the pre-Maccabæan Greek period, in which that smaller hymnal was included. To take up or to reject these hypotheses, however, would be inexpedient without a preliminary study of the text and contents of the psalms from our new point of view. I should like to add a caution against following those critics who deny the possibility of Maccabæan psalms on the ground that the Hebrew text of Ben Sira contains so many unbiblical words, idioms, and constructions. For the correctness of many parts of that text is liable to the greatest

¹ So Bâthgen, Kautzsch, and Cornill. König (*Eint.*, p. 403) can only recognize one Maccabæan psalm (lxxiv.). Driver (*Introd.*,⁽⁶⁾ p. 385) stands nearer to Kautzsch than to König. The only member of the above group of four psalms which he omits is xlii., but, as a compensation, he includes doubtfully lxxxiii. Still, he allows (p. 386) the attractiveness of Robertson Smith's Ochus theory.

² *Wisdom of Ben Sira* (Cambridge, 1899), pp. 26, 37.

doubt, and those unbiblical elements may to a great extent be traced to deep-seated corruption of the text.¹

§ 24. We must not digress to consider the other religious hymns and elegies contained in the Old Testament and, one might add, in the Apocrypha and the New Testament. But we cannot pass over the 'Psalms of Solomon.' This collection of eighteen psalms, written in Hebrew, and now only extant in a Greek version, contains the essence of Pharisaic Judaism, and has therefore been called by Ryle and James the 'Psalter of the Pharisees.' According to Duhm, there are also not a few Pharisaic psalms in our Psalter, and some of these, directed probably against Alexander Jannæus and his adherents, seem to him to have a striking resemblance to most of the 'Psalms of Solomon.'² Elsewhere he expresses surprise that the critics have not recognized how near chronologically the Davidic Psalter is to the Solomonic. Frankenberg,³ too, has arrived at a somewhat similar result; only he assigns the Psalms of Solomon, together with a (large?) group of canonical psalms, to the period of the Syrian persecution. The existence of points of contact may be granted; but the canonical Psalter, much edited as it has been, contains nothing that can be compared with the language of the other Psalter on eschatology and on the Messianic expectation.⁴ To this I must add that, in my judgment, Kusters is right⁵ (against Frankenberg) in denying that there is any distinct reference in the Psalter of Solomon to contemporary history. The psalms appealed to by Frankenberg as proving a Maccabæan date, and by Wellhausen⁶ as proving a reference to the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey in 63 B.C., really refer, according to Kusters, to the catastrophe of 586 B.C.

On this subject I venture to agree with the Leyden critic, and I can therefore use the references to the capture of Jerusalem in the 'Psalms of Solomon' to illustrate Pss. lxxiv. and lxxix. But

¹ If Nöldeke (*ZATW*, xx. 84 ff. [1900]) errs at all, it is by understatement of the amount of corruption.

² *Psalmen*, 'Einleitung,' p. 22.

³ *Die Datirung der Psalmen Salomos* (1896).

⁴ See Charles, *Enc. Bib.*, 'Eschatology,' §§ 64, 66. With this general view Kirkpatrick agrees (*Psalms*, Introd., pp. xxxvii. f.).

⁵ *De historische achtergrond van de Psalmen van Salomo* (Verlagen van de Koningl. Akad. van Wetenschappen, iv. 2), 1898.

⁶ *Die Phariseer und die Sadducæer* (Beilage), 1874.

it is doubtful whether we can stop short here. It seems probable that the writers of these psalms continue the tradition of the N. Arabian captivity and oppression.¹ For want of the Hebrew text we cannot finally prove this point; but our experience with the canonical Hebrew psalms hardly permits us to feel much uncertainty. The 'Psalms of Solomon' are highly imitative, and among the signs of this imitativeness we may surely recognize the heading of each of the psalms, ψαλμὸς τῷ Σαλωμων, i.e. לְשִׁלְמֵה כְּזִמּוֹר, which may have come from [ל] יְרַחֲמֵאל לִישְׁמַעֵאל, '[Of] Jerahmeel: of Ishmael' ('Ishmael' a gloss on 'Jerahmeel,' or *vice versa*). The alternative is to assume that the headings of the Hebrew psalms had been already corrupted, and that the collector thought it appropriate to put *mizmōr lišēlōmō* by the side of *mizmōr lēdāwīd*. It is possible that some may prefer this view.² If, however, we grant that the so-called 'Psalms of David' have been much edited and manipulated, it is reasonable to presume that some manipulation was undergone by the 'Psalms of Solomon.' I confess that, just as כְּשִׁלְמֵה in Prov. x. 1, xxv. 1, has probably arisen out of מְשִׁלְי יְשְׁמַעֵאל, it seems to me that the heading ψαλμοὶ Σολομῶντος is most naturally accounted for by our former explanation. This implies bringing up the latest Psalter to a period not far removed from that of the canonical psalms.

§ 25. Another point in which the so-called 'Psalms of Solomon' continue an older tradition is that on the whole they represent the feelings of the personified community, or at least of its central point—the body of strict, law-observing Jews. This interpretation has for some time past been given by many

¹ In *Is. Ser.* ii. 26 [30], where the death of the 'dragon' is related, ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρέων Αἰγύπτου may represent עַל-הַרֵי מִצְרַיִם, 'on the mountains of Mišrim,' and ἐπὶ γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης יָבֵן עַל-אַרְצֵן יָבֵן, 'on the land of Jaman (=Jerahmeel).' So, too, in τ. 29 [33] ἐγὼ κύριος γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης may be based on a faulty text, which should have run, אֲנִי יָדוֹן אֶרֶץ יָבֵן, and in xvii. 15 [17] ἐν μέσῳ ἔθνων συμμάκτων may be a misinterpretation of בְּתוֹךְ עַמֵּי עֲרָב, 'amidst the peoples of Arabia.'

² The editor might have copied מְזִמּוֹר, and explained this as 'song.' The word occurs, at least if it is not a corruption, in the Heb. text of Sirach xlix. 1 (of secular songs; G. μουσικά).

critics¹ to the 'I' and 'me' of the canonical psalms; and though other critics prefer to hold that the 'I' and 'me' of many psalms indicate that in their original form these psalms were the effusions of individuals, which were adapted to more general use by omissions, additions, and other alterations, this view is by no means natural, and indeed cannot be applied to a strictly revised text. To compare the practice of those who prepare hymn-books for congregational Christian use is hardly permissible, the awakening of individual consciousness in the Western nations since the introduction of Christianity having no parallel in the Semitic East. Those hymns in the O.T. which were traditionally supposed to be the utterances of individuals (1 S. ii. 1-10, Isa. xxxviii. 10-20, Jon. ii. 2-9 [3-10]) turn out to be nothing of the kind, but simply expressions of the faith of the pious community of Israel. The same may on the whole be affirmed of the 'Psalms of Solomon.' The truth is that the controversy as to the 'I'-psalms is not so important as has been supposed. It is not a part of the larger question as to the date of the psalms, for the representation of a body of men as a single being is primitive; 'I'-psalms might, if the tone of thought and the social background permitted, be pre-exilic. Nor does it greatly affect the exegesis of the psalms, except indeed when by means of forced interpretations Duhn and B. Jacob endow the speakers of the psalms with a vigorous and almost self-assertive personality. Between those who contend that the speaker of a psalm (or of a part of a psalm) is a representative or typical pious Israelite, and those who regard the speaker as the community itself personified, there is, exegetically, but a slight difference. And yet this difference is not to be wholly disregarded. A close study of the psalms, especially in

¹ See especially Smend, *ZATW*, viii. 49 ff. [1888]. This able critic, however, has since 1888 somewhat modified his original position, and in his *Lehrbuch der AT Rel.-Gesch.*,⁽²⁾ p. 361, says that he is in essential agreement with Cheyne, *Origin of the Psalter*, pp. 261 ff. Driver, too, has made progress in this direction since the first edition of his Introduction (see ed. 6, on the Psalms). For a full consideration of the subject, see also Cheyne, *Bampton Lectures on the Psalter*, Lecture vi. (with the notes); Beer, *Individual- und Gemeinle-Psalmen* (1894); Coblenz, *Ueb. das betende Ich in den Psalmen* (1897); H. Roy, *Die Volksgemeinde u. die Gemeinde der Frommen im Psalter* (1897); D. Leimdörfer, *Das Psalter-ego in den Ich-Psalmen* (1898); Thaddäus Engert, *Der betende Gerechte der Psalmen* (1902). Cp. also Schuurmans Stekhoven, *ZATW*, ix. 131 ff. [1889]; Budde, *Theol. Lit.-ztg.*, May 14, 1892, col. 254; J. Robertson, *Croall Lectures on the Psalms*; and Kautzsch, *Die Poesie u. die poet. Bücher des A. T.* (1902), pp. 49-51.

connexion with a keen textual criticism, will probably show the greater naturalness (from the point of view of *Völkerpsychologie*) of the latter way of accounting for the phenomena. Occasionally, of course, e.g. in xxxiv. 11 [12], xlv. 2 [1], lxxviii. 1 f., cvi. 4 f., there is no possible doubt that it is the poet himself who speaks; but these passages are widely different from those about which somewhat too lively a dispute has arisen among critics of the Psalter. The evidence of the heading of Ps. cii. cannot rightly be brought against the view here recommended; the 'afflicted one' (עֲנִי) there spoken of is manifestly the pious community (cp. עֲנִי, lx. 3, lxxvii. 4).

The chief names on the other side¹ are those of Nöldeke, B. Jacob, and Duhm. According to Nöldeke (*ZATW*, xx. [1900], 2 f.), the 'I'-psalms refer as a rule to the poet himself; this is based on the observation that in the songs in the Hebrew text of Ecclus. li. 2-12 and 13-20 it must be Ben Sira who speaks.² Very different is the view of B. Jacob (*ZATW*, xvii. [1897], 544 ff.), who maintains that psalms were composed for the use of individuals who had some sacrificial rite to perform in the temple, as a means of deliverance from sickness, or as a thank-offering for recovery, and goes so far as to define the Psalter (in opposition to Olshausen and many others) as 'ein Gemeindeopfergesangbuch—das hat uns סלה gelehrt,—ein Privat(opfer)gebetbuch—das sollte להזכיר zeigen.' To these we may add Duhm, who, as a commentator, represents the same tendency, and carries the individualizing interpretation of the speakers of the psalms to an extreme. The objections to this view will appear to any student of Duhm's always clear and consistent, but too often strained, exegesis.

§ 26. The poetical form of the Psalms cannot here be treated at length. To enter into the intricacies of the subject a special monograph would be required. Grimme's *Psalmprobleme* (1902) breaks much fresh ground, but his results appear to me very

¹ I do not mention König (*Eint.*, p. 400), because he admits the representative character of most of the individuals who are the supposed speakers in the psalms. In Ps. xxiii., however, the speaker, he thinks, is not the collective community (Sened), but a fugitive, who is cut off from visits to the temple, like David, according to 1 Sam. xxvi. 19. (But surely the speaker in this and parallel psalms is the company of faithful Israelites and diligent frequenters of the temple, who formed the *kernel* of the post-exilic Judean community).

² This observation of Nöldeke, however, is hardly self-evident so far as li. 2-12 is concerned.

difficult to accept. Still he deserves much credit for his willingness to adopt even radical remedies, where he finds a sufficient reason for them. Prof. Briggs has remarked¹ that the study of the measurement of the line, and the strophical arrangement of the psalms, combined with the study of their grouping, throws fresh light on the Psalter. But this is only true on condition that we emancipate ourselves completely from conventional opinions as regards the general accuracy of the Massoretic text. I must confess that Duhm's work, 'dictatorial' in tone as it may be, and often as I must differ from its results, has been more suggestive to me, as regards the poetical form of the Psalms, than any other which has appeared since Bickell's *Carmina Vet. Test. metricè*,² and to his interesting, though too short, article 'Poetical Literature' in the *Enc. Biblica* I would refer the student. By far the larger number of psalms are (to borrow a term from Prof. Briggs) trimeters. So also thinks Duhm. There are, however, also tetrameters, pentameters, and hexameters. As a rule, the metre of a psalm is consistently carried out. When a psalm falls into two distinct parts which differ in metre, this implies, not that the psalmist for some reason changed his metre, but that a redactor joined together two psalms or fragments of psalms. It may also happen that a brief liturgical addition has been made in a different metre. Once or twice only (*e.g.* Ps. cxl.) have I met with a psalm, in which, through the author's or rather the compiler's carelessness, the metre varies, and once (Preface to Ps. i., *i.e.* *ῥῶ.* 1-3) with a passage which is rather to be called rhythmical than metrical.³

On the question whether true strophic divisions are still traceable in the Psalms I confess myself unable to say much, evidence being deficient. That 'Selah' has anything to do with strophes (as Grimme and others think), has been denied already (see p. xli.). Refrains, however, are of course an infallible criterion of strophes. Every one therefore admits strophes in xlii.-xliii., xlvi., xlix.; with hardly less certainty we may point

¹ *Presbyterian Review*, Oct. 1888, p. 661.

² Sievers' *Metrische Studien* appeared too late to influence me considerably. Vol. i. abounds in observations of facts, and acute, even if not always adequate, explanations. He has thought it necessary to take the textual tradition as his basis, which often makes a successful restoration of the metrical arrangement impossible.

³ Prof. Paul Haupt, however, by clever manipulation, reduces even this troublesome passage to metrical consistency (*A/SL*, 1903, pp. 129—142).

to strophes in Ps. cvii. Various forms of alphabetic structure appear in seven psalms (ix.-x., xxv., xxxiv., xxxvii., cxl., cxix., cxlv.). The supposed acrostic in Ps. cx. is highly precarious.

§ 27. I now pass on to the treatment of the text in this edition. I have independently come to the same conclusion as Bernhard Duhm, who, to emphasize the need of a more sceptical attitude towards tradition, points out¹ that 'in many passages, by which the modern critic passes unsuspectingly, the tenor may be due rather to the old Jewish redactors than to the author himself.' I have not, however, given the reins to fancy; such a course was only permissible in the first half of the last century. In the first stage of inquiry I have been accustomed to note with care the occurrence of the vertical stroke called *Paseḳ* and *Legarmeh*, and I have often found the suspicion awakened by *Paseḳ* confirmed by other phenomena of the text. This is but the further development of a hint given by J. Olshausen,² who thinks that *Paseḳ* sometimes indicates the presence of glosses and interpolations (he refers to Ps. ix. 7; xvii. 4; xviii. 7; xxxi. 12). A similar view was expressed by von Ortenberg in an article in Stade's *Zeitschrift* (vii. 301 ff. [1887]). This scholar considers the *Paseḳ*s and *Legarmeh*s to be indications of the thorough redaction bestowed on the Hebrew text. In all probability the vertical stroke was intended — somewhat in the manner of Origen's obelos — to mark the insertions made in the text by an early editor. Later on, it was used by the scribe to indicate interpolations (such as the name of God, or synonymous words, or prophetic formulae, or notices on the name of the author, or on the origin of the book). The article was good pioneering work, and is not refuted by that learned textual scholar Dr. Wickes (*ZATW*, viii. 149 [1888]), who appears to have no comprehension of any but a strictly conservative point of view. Grimme's section on *Paseḳ*-*Legarmeh*³ is much wider in its range than the article of von Ortenberg. I have not been able, however, to use it, owing to the advanced state of my own work when it appeared, and will only add that, while not denying that *Paseḳ* may sometimes have other more special references, I have found it true in my own experience that it often gives warning of a corrupt and manipulated passage in the traditional text.⁴

¹ *Das Buch Hiob übersetzt*, Preface, p. vi. ² *Lehrbuch der hebr. Sprache*, p. 86 f.

³ *Palmenprobleme*, pp. 147-165.

⁴ This appears to be also Duhm's view.

In the next stage I have used the versions, seeking suggestions from them as to passages which need further examination. After this I have used, in addition to the older and now much improved methods, a gradually accumulated experience of the habits of the scribes and editors in dealing with indistinctly written or, to them, incomprehensible passages, and of recurring types of corruption, as a means of correcting the text. I have also welcomed the control derived from the new N. Arabian theory which has now such a large amount of support from textual criticism elsewhere—having solved many problems which were otherwise insoluble—that one cannot refuse to apply it to the Psalms. Lastly, I have, to the best of my ability, considered the claims of metre, first determining the metre by the help of the sound passages of a psalm, and then completing the restoration of the unsound passages by accommodating the new reading to the metre. That the total result is often open to revision, no one can know so well as myself. But I cherish the conviction that here as well as elsewhere I have discovered not a few textual facts, and that even my errors will very often be found to be on the line of truth, and that if others adopt my expanded method, there will be many more such confirmations of my results as those reported in my note on Ps. ii. 11 (vol. i., p. 8). There is at any rate nothing for me to apologize for. The need of a more searching criticism of the text of the Psalter was great, and a step in advance could only be taken by one who was not afraid of revising his printed opinions, and of studying the phenomena of the text of the Old Testament on a large scale.¹ Once more, let me repeat that what I have called (see p. viii.) the ‘newer Psalter’ is not, in my judgment, superseded by the discovery of the older one. Stimulus to the higher life can still be derived from it, and it has, and must ever have, the attraction of its priceless associations. Sometimes, however, even religiously, the older Psalter is finer, and in any case a lover of the Bible is bound, if he can, to find out how it came into existence. And it is surely permissible to prophesy that religion and history will yet ‘kiss one another,’ as predestined friends and allies.

ROCHESTER,

September 30, 1903.

¹ See an examination of the text of the more obscure parts of the Old Testament by the present writer, now in course of publication by Messrs. A. & C. Black, London. The Prophets, 1 and 2 Samuel, and 1 and 2 Kings are out.

CONCLUDING NOTICE.

IN the preceding Introduction some passages have been taken, with or without modification, from the article 'Psalms, Book of' in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. It may be within the knowledge of some readers that in this and several other articles in that work a somewhat new plan was adopted—viz. to begin with a statement of the position of criticism fifteen or twenty years ago, and then to give some account of the new problems and correspondingly new solutions which have emerged since then, or are now coming into view. No better sketch of the earlier criticism and its provisional results could, as it appeared, be had than the article 'Psalms,' by the late Prof. Robertson Smith, in *Enc. Brit.*¹⁹ This was printed by the author in 1886, and virtually re-indorsed by him in *OIJC*⁽²⁾ (1892). This keen scholar was, however, not unaware that the criticism there presented would ultimately need much revision, expansion, and (if new facts came to light) correction. Friendship can never justify a lover of truth in holding back his best knowledge. Hence in the second part of the article 'Psalms' in the *Enc. Bib.* much was given in advance from the present work, as the MS. then stood. But what investigator would tie himself to any printed or written page? When a new and remunerative method is applied—virtually for the first time, it is inevitable that in the course of completing a MS. for press imperfect results should be corrected, and previously unobserved points should have to be utilized. Hence the necessity for the pages of *Corrigenda and Addenda* (errata are included) which the reader will kindly not overlook (see pp. lxxiv.—lxxx.); he is requested to make reference to those pages at the places to which the *Corrigenda* and *Addenda* belong, and may be reminded that the process of printing such a work is a slow one. Another point may also be referred to. It seemed needless to repeat here the long list of books and articles on the Psalms given in *Enc. Biblica*, cols. 3965-3967. A reference, however, is called for to a forthcoming work by Gunkel (to whom we are already indebted for critical work on some passages of the psalms in his *Schöpfung und Chaos*), consisting of a series of translations and explanations of psalms originally published in German periodicals.

Also to articles by J. C. Matthes, 'Die Psalmen und der Tempeldienst,' *ZATW*, xxxii. 65-82 (the psalms mostly the utterance of the community, and the Psalter a temple-hymnbook; contrast Duhm, *Psalmen*, p. xxiv.), and by Paul Haupt, 'The Poetic Form of Psalm i.' (see p. lxxvii., note³), and to A. Rahlfs, *Die Berliner Handschrift des sahidischen Psalters* (Transactions of the Göttingen 'Gesellsch. der Wissenschaften,' philology and history, new series, vol. iv., no. 4).

Grünme's *Psalmenprobleme: Untersuchungen über Metrik, Strophik und Peseq des Psalmenbuches*, 1902 (the work of, probably, our leading metrician), has already received due recognition, and Wellhausen's supplement to his critical notes on the text of the Psalms in *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, vi. (1899), 193—187, though already mentioned in *Enc. Bib.*, col. 3967, may here again be specially referred to. This able work, though it proves the care with which the older methods have been applied by the author to many passages, also exemplifies the urgent need for the application of new and more potent methods to those deeper problems which even Wellhausen by the means which he adopted could not solve. A similar remark applies, I fear I must add, to many of the text-critical conjectures of that giant-scholar, Lagarde. The criticisms in the Prologue to my *Critica Biblica* (see especially p. 4) may here be compared.

Lastly, I have to mention the works of two little-known English scholars. One is a translation of the Psalms from a corrected text by Street, an Anglican Clergyman, in 1790 (2 vols.); the other is an unpublished collection of text-critical notes on the Psalms by Mr. N. Herz, a Christian-Jewish scholar, who kindly placed his work at my full disposal, and from whom I have now and then been able to borrow, and oftener to record, interesting emendations. I need not add that Mr. Herz is in no way responsible for anything beyond the text-critical suggestions expressly assigned to him here.

September 30, 1903.

ABBREVIATIONS.

In general, the abbreviations are those which are used in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, and therefore do not differ greatly from those to which the readers of such works are accustomed. Some of them, however, may be given here (see *Enc. Bib.*, vol. iv., pp. ix.-xxviii.).

M=Massoretic Text ; G = the Septuagint ; ¹A = Aquila ; Σ = Symmachus ; Θ = Theodotion ; S = Syriac (Peshitta) ; J = Jerome ; T = Targum ; E' and S' = the fifth and sixth Greek versions in Origen's Hexapla.

Bä. = Bähgen ; Bi. = Bickell ; Che.⁽¹⁾ = Cheyne, *Book of Psalms*, 1888 ; Dr., Driv. = Driver ; Du. = Duhm ; Dys. = Dyserinck ; Gr. = Grätz ; Kau. = Kautzsch ; Kirkp. = Kirkpatrick ; K̄i. = K̄imhi ; Kr., Krochm. = Abraham Krochmal ; Kön. = König ; Lag. = Lagarde ; Wellh. = Wellhausen ; Wi. = Winckler.

AJSL = American Journal of Semitic Languages.

Ass. HWB = Delitzsch, *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch*. *BDB* = Hebrew and English Lexicon, by F. Brown, with the co-operation of S. R. Driver and C. A. Briggs (Oxford, Clarendon Press).

Crit. Bib. = *Critica Biblica*, Parts i.-iv., by T. K. Cheyne (A. & C. Black, 1903).

Exp. T. = Expository Times. *Ges.-Bu.* = Gesenius' *Handwörterbuch*, edited by Buhl (1899). *JBL* = Journal of Biblical Literature (Boston, Mass. ; in England, J. Parker and Co.). *JQR* = Jewish Quarterly Review. *JRL* = Jewish Religious Life after the Exile, by T. K. Cheyne (1898).

Indiv. u. Gem. Ps. = *Individual- und Gemeinde-Psalmen*, by G. Beer (1894).

J. of Theol. St. = Journal of Theological Studies.

J. Prot. Th. = *Jahrbücher für Protestantische Theologie*.

OP = The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter, by T. K. Cheyne (1891).

OTJC. = The Old Test. in the Jewish Church, by W. Robertson Smith ; second ed., 1892.

SBOT = The Sacred Books of the Old Testament, by various scholars, edited by Paul Haupt (Psalms, Hebrew, 1895 ; English, 1898).

Siegfr.-Sta. = *Hebräisches Wörterbuch*, by C. Siegfried and B. Stade (1893).

Stellung = *Die Stellung der Israeliten und der Juden zu den Fremden*, by A. Bertholet (1896).

Styl. = *Stylistik*, by F. E. König (1902).

Th. T., Theol. Tijdschr. = *Theologisch Tijdschrift* (Leyden).

WF = translation of Psalms by Wellhausen-Furness in *SBOT*.

ZATW = *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* (edited by Stade).

Where 'Smend' occurs with page-reference, see Smend's article, 'Ueber das Ich der Psalmen,' *ZATW*, viii. 49-147 [1888]; where 'Coblenz,' see Coblenz, *Über das betende Ich in den Psalmen* (1897); where 'Roy,' see Roy, *Die Volksgemeinde und die Gemeinde der Frommen im Psalter* (1897).

Words inclosed in [] represent Hebrew words inserted for metrical reasons, without authority from the traditional Hebrew text (M & G); those inclosed in ++ have been added merely to clear up the English sense.

CORRIGENDA AND ADDENDA.

* * * Owing to the length of time occupied by the printing, a number of corrections and additions have become desirable (see p. lxx.).

I. RELATIVE TO TITLES OF PSALMS AND TO SUBSCRIPTION OF BOOK II.

- (1) Pss. iv.-vi., and all the לִמְנַצָּה psalms. For 'Deposited' read 'Of Jerahmeel-asshur'; in Ps. xxii. read the same words for 'Of Ethan the Zarhite,' or rather omit them (the Hebrew words were a correction of לִמְנָ); and in xxxii., xlii., xliv. &c. (the מִשְׁכִּיל psalms) for 'Deposited' read 'Of Cushan.'
- (2) iii.-vi., and all the מְזִמֹּר psalms. For 'Marked' read '[Of] Jerahmeel.'
- (3) iv., vi., viii., xii., lx., lxi. For 'Ethanites' read 'Ishmaelites.'
- (4) v., ix., xlvi., xlix., lii. For 'Salmah' (or 'Salmath') read 'the Ishmaelites.'
- (5) xvi., lvi.-lx. (the מִכְתָּם psalms). For 'a supplication' read '[Maacathites].'
- (6) xviii., xxxvi. After 'Of Jerahmeel-asshur' ('Deposited') read 'Of Arāb-jerahmeel'; and in Ps. xviii. after 'Of Arāb-ethan' insert 'Of Jerahmeel-asshur' (= M's אֲשֶׁר לַיהוָה, transposing; דְּבַר represents a dittographed דְּבַר).
- (7) xxii. For 'Deposited. Of Ethan the Zarhite' read 'Of Jerahmeel-asshur.'
- (8) xxx. For 'Supplication of Sabbath' read 'Supplication. [Of] the Ishmaelites.' תַּחֲנֹנָה comes from תַּחֲנֵן. תַּחֲנֵן הַבַּיִת corresponds to שַׁבַּת in xcii. 1, and to בַּת שֶׁבַע in li. 1. הַ and שׁ confounded; cp. Ezek. xxxix. 2. שְׁשֵׁאתִיד miswritten for הַשׁ.]
- (9) xxxviii., lvii., lviii., lix., lxx., lxxv. For 'Of Ethan the Ezrahite' read 'Of Ashhur.'
- (10) xlv. For 'Cushanites' read 'Ishmaelites.'
- (11) li. For 'Sabbath' read 'Ishmaelites.'

- (12) xlvi. 1, &c. (שיר מזמור). For 'Marked' read '[Of] Asshur-jerahmeel'; and in lxviii. 1, &c. (מזמור שיר) for 'Marked' read '[Of] Jerahmeel-asshur.'
- (13) lxv. 1. For 'Marked: of 'Arab-ethan' read '[Of] Jerahmeel-asshur. Of 'Arab-ethan.'
- (14) lxxv. 1. For 'Marked. Of Asaph. Marked' read '[Of] Jerahmeel-asshur. Of Asaph.'
- (15) cx. 1, &c. For 'Marked' read '[Of] Asshur.'
- (16) lx. Before 'of 'Arab-ethan' insert 'a supplication,' and after it 'of Jerahmeel.'
- (17) lxxii. V. 20 should run thus: 'Finished are the praise-songs of 'Arab-ethan [the bené Ishmael]'. The words in [] represent a variant.

II. RELATIVE TO PSALMS AND NOTES ON PSALMS.

(VOL. I.)

- P. 3. Crit. note on Ps. i., l. 4. Duhm (1899) and P. Haupt (1903) also adopt בִּירְאֵת. See Haupt. 'The Poetic Form of the First Psalm,' *AJSL*, xix. 129-142.
- P. 3. Ps. ii., introd., l. 3. Omit 'Smend.' See General Introd., pp. xxxii. ff. (on royal psalms).
- P. 5. Ps. ii., l. 20. For 'Geshur' read 'Ishmael, and alter crit. note, p. 8. עֲרַב יִשְׁמָעֵאל sometimes = יִשְׁמָעֵאל, or more strictly יִשְׁמָעֵאל. See *Crit. Bib.* on 1 S. xvii. 7, Judg. iv. 3 and cp. אֵיזָבֵל.
- P. 7, l. 3. Read certainly וְנִשְׁחַתְתָּה אֲרָמְנוֹתֵיהֶם | וְנִשְׁחַתְתָּה אֲרָמְנוֹתֵיהֶם. Cp. on lxxiv. 9. Or, if we will, we may recognize the suffix מוֹ (exilic or post-exilic; Diehl).
- P. 8. On Ps. ii., ll. 22 f. Add 'ארץ seems to be redactional.'—On Ps. ii., l. 25. Sievers (*Metr. Stud.*, 582) sees at least that בר נ' is unintelligible. Beer (*Th. Lit. ztg.*, May 23, 1903, col. 323) goes further, but is unaware that the priority of the best conjecture is mine. Grimme's נִשְׁקֵי נָפֶר, 'kiss the master,' is both improbable and superficial. Paul Haupt (*Univ. Circular*, Baltimore, June 1903, p. 906; cp. *AJSL*, xix. 134) thinks that בר in M = בר, 'field, land, ground,' Job xxxix. 4, and in Talm. (cp. *Ar. barr.* 'land'), and Ember (*ibid.*) restores בר ברעדה נִשְׁקֵי נָפֶר, overlooking a plain dittography. Haupt (*AJSL*, xix. 130) is for a Maccabæan origin of the psalm (coronation of Aristobulus, 105-104 B.C.).
- Pp. 10, 11. Translate Ps. iii., l. 11, thus: 'In Jerahmeel to thee I cry.' For קוֹלִי read בִּירְחֵמְאֵל (see on lxxvii. 2), and for אֱלֹהֵיהוּהָ read אֱלֹהֵיךָ: יהוה may = ירה' (*i.e.* it is a correction of קוֹלִי).—P. 11. For סֵלָה read סֵלָה.

- P. 20, foot (*l.* 12). For 'Supplement' read 'Jerahmeel,' as footnote. סלה for חבל (from 'ירה'), as often. It is a gloss on 'ערבי', *l.* 9.
- P. 22. On Ps. vii.¹, *l.* 5. Grimme (*Psalm.-prob.*) reads גאות for זאת. Palaeographically possible, but inadequate to parallelism.
- P. 25, *l.* 15. For 'heights' read 'height.'—Ps. viii., *l.* 1, read 'name²!'
- P. 29, note², and p. 33, midway. Translate *v.* 21 thus: 'Destroy Jerahmeel, O Yahwè! | Let the nations know that they are but men.' For שיתה read תשחית, and for מורה להם read ירחמאל. The סלה, as elsewhere, probably represents ירחמאל (a marg. correction).
- P. 43. On Ps. xiv. Does this psalm, and also lxxiv.¹, refer to the destruction of the temple at the close of the regal period, or to some subsequent destruction or profanation? In the former case the writer throws himself back in imagination to a long-past period.—In *ll.* 2, 3 of introd., for 'It differs, however,' read 'As in Pss. xi., xii., the objects,' &c.
- P. 44. *ll.* 9, 10 should be marked as (verses) 5, 6.
- P. 44, *l.* 8. For 'Kenn,' read 'Kenn.' (*i.e.* Kennicott).
- P. 45. Omit short note on *l.* 10.
- P. 51. Ps. xvi., *l.* 17. For 'then' read 'thou.'
- P. 54. Note on 5, end. Add, 'For עצבותם read צבאות, "armies (of)."'
- Pp. 64, 70. Ps. xviii. The four lines forming *v.* 5, 6 must be considered with cxvi. 3. They have probably grown out of two, which should run thus—
- ספוני חבלי ירחמאל
קדמוני כוקשי ישמעאל
- The question as to a reference to the Babylonian Waters of Death now becomes superfluous. See however Zimmern, *KAT*³, pp. 576, 642. נחלי קליעל יבעתוני and חבלי שאול סבבוני are variants to *v.* 5*a*. But כות comes from 'רח', and שאול from 'שנ' (as in Isa. xxviii. 15, 18). Consequently one couplet has been lost.
- P. 68. Note on *ll.* 25 f. (end). See Zimmern's explanation from Babylonian sources, in *KAT*³, p. 631.
- P. 69. First crit. note. ויאמר (*v.* 2) may = ירחמאל (cp. *Crit. Bib.* on 2 S. i. 18*a*), a marg. gloss on ישמעאל (underlying 'שאול').
- P. 85, *l.* 6. Add. 'סיה', as often, comes from 'אלהים.'
- P. 92, *l.* 14 from top. P. Haupt defends the reading כארו (*Univ. Circular*, June, 1903); Grimme (*Ps.-prob.*) adheres to כארי, 'zermalmen.'
- P. 95, *l.* 6, and p. 96, to open first crit. note. For 'thy glory' read 'thy works.' שִׁיךְ should be כִּיעֶשֶׂךְ (cp. on cxxxviii. 2).

- P. 97, *l.* 8 from foot. Read **הַשִּׁיעַנִּי**, and omit reference to cii. 19.
- P. 98, *l.* 7. For 'probably' read 'possibly.'
- P. 103. Ps. xxiv.⁽²⁾, *l.* 17. For 'the God' read '[the God].'¹—P. 104, foot. Add, 'In *l.* 17 insert **אלהי**. The closing **סלה** is an imitation of *v.* 6; G omits.'
- P. 105, *l.* 7. For 'want' read 'wont.'—Ps. xxv., *l.* 2. For 'my soul' read 'me' (cp. crit. n.).
- P. 112, *l.* 8 from foot. For 'xxviii.'² read 'xxvii.'⁽²⁾
- P. 115. Ps. xxvii.⁽²⁾, *l.* 10. For 'the Ishmaelites' read 'Arabia and Cush.'
- P. 118, *ll.* 3, 8. Read 'M **קְמוּרֵי**.' and (*l.* 8) **עָרַב וְכוּשׁ**. Cp. crit. note on Ps. xxxv., *l.* 13.
- P. 121. Ps. xxviii., last crit. note. Add, 'cxxxii. 10.'
- P. 134. Ps. xxxii.⁽¹⁾, *l.* 12. For '[all] those,' &c., read 'those of Ishmael,' and omit 'Supplement [Selah].'¹—In p. 136, *l.* 4 of note on *ll.* 11 f., read **מִישְׁמְעָאִים**. Cp. the corrupt **יִסּוּבְבֵהוּ** in *lv.* 11. For 'the Selah,' &c., read 'סלה is a corruption of **יִרְהַמְאֵל** (gloss.'²
- P. 140. Crit. notes, *l.* 1. For 2 read 4.
- l.* 144. Ps. xxxv., introd., *l.* 16. For 'Jer. *l.* 34' read 'Jer. i. 34.'
- P. 156, *l.* 5. With regard to **רַחֲבִית** for **בַּהֲמָה**, cp. the case of *Jon.* iv. 7, where (see *Crit. Bib.*) **בַּהֲמָה רַבָּה** represents **רַחֲבוֹת** (**רַבָּה** = **רַחֲבַת** [ח], a correction of **בַּהֲמָה** [רַחֲבָה]).
- P. 159. Ps. xxxvii., *l.* 78. Read rather, 'And prospering like the cedar of Jerahmeel.'
- P. 164. On *ll.* 77 f. (beginning), for **נַעֲלָה** read **מַעֲלָה**.—**וּמְתַעֲרָה**: rather **וּמִצְדִּיקִית**. The difficult **כְּאֹזְרַח רַעֲנָן** can now be explained. 'ר' comes from **יִרְהַמְאֵל** (intermediate reading, **רַחֲמָאֵן**): see *Crit. Bib.* on 'ר' **עֵצֵן**, *Dt.* xii. 2. **אֹזְרַח** represents **אֹרְזוּ**, with a ח appended from **רַחֲמָאֵן** = 'רַח'.
- P. 179. Ps. xl.⁽²⁾ For 'Mišrites' read 'Asshurites,' and, five lines lower, for **מִצּוֹר** read **אֲשׁוּר**; cp. on Ps. lxi.⁽¹⁾, *l.* 9.
- P. 180 (top). The following lines, composing Ps. xl.², have accidentally been omitted:—
- | | |
|--|----|
| 1 Be pleased, O Yahwè! to rescue me, hasten to my help! | 14 |
| Let them turn back with shame together that seek after | 15 |
| my soul. ¹ | |
| Let them retreat with confusion that delight in my harm. | |
| Let them be appalled for their +malicious+ joy that say, | |
| Aha, aha! | 16 |
| Let them rejoice and be glad because of thee— all that | |
| seek thee, | 17 |
- ¹ To take it away. (Unmetrical interpolation.)

Let them say continually, Great is Yahwè, | who desire thy deliverance.

And I am one in misery and in need ; | O Yahwè ! hasten to me.

18

Thou art my helper and my deliverer : | O my God ! tarry not.

P. 188, *l.* 6 from foot. Read 'is פניו.'

P. 191. On *l.* 28. Theod. C. Foote (*JBL*, 1902, part i.) follows Lagarde.

P. 193. Ps. xlv. ², introd., *l.* 1. For 'maytyr' read 'martyr.'

P. 195, *l.* 1. Read, 'Thou givest up thy flock.' Cp. crit. note.

P. 198, foot. (Add.) For Paul Haupt's view of Ps. xlv. see *AJSL*, xix. 135 f. It 'consists of ten couplets with three beats in each hemistich.' The end of the title in M, מושביל שיר יודרת, with the alteration of מ into א, becomes hemistich 1, 'A love-song with skill I indite.' בנות מלכים and 'ביק' in *ṣ.* 10 are amplificative plurals.—Prefix ⁽¹⁾ to footnote ('Gunkel,' &c.).

P. 198. (Add this to par. 3.) If *bath Miṣraim* is correct (and probably it is), it is an evidence of the very late date of the psalm. For the earlier reading of 1 K. iii. 1, ix. 16 referred to the king of Miṣrim (in N. Arabia) as the father-in-law of Solomon. See *Crit. Bib.* on 1 Kings.

P. 199, *l.* 2. For 'Reuben' read 'Ruben.'

P. 203, *l.* 10. For *ασεδ* read *ασεδ*. The suggestion is that G's *ασεδεα* was originally *ασεδ*, *i.e.* הסד, a corruption of חשר = אשחר.

P. 210. On Ps. xlvii., *l.* 7. Add, 'הללו probably comes from סלה; cp. on lxxviii. ², *l.* 33.'

P. 237. On lii., *l.* 5 f. Insert, 'For רע כטוב read מְרִמּוֹת ו, "tricks and." Also for סלה read וְשָׁלוֹם.'

P. 239. On liv., *l.* 8. Add, 'סלה has come from a repeated אלהים.'

P. 245. On *ll.* 21-24. Or הוות might come from מוענת = חמת.

P. 246. On *ll.* 41 f. Before יענה insert הוא (represented only by ו). סלה, as usual, is a fragment of an ethnic. Grimme, however, reads סלע, 'rock,' *i.e.* God.

P. 257. On *l.* 32. For 'my day of distress' read 'the day of Ishmael' (ביום ישמי). See crit. n. on cii. ⁽¹⁾, *l.* 4.

Pp. 260 f. Ps. lx., crit. note on Title (end). Add, 'In *ṣ.* 2*b*, in accordance with numerous parallels, שנים עשר אלה has come from ישבן אשר כאל = אשהור, ורממאל, ישמעאל, glosses on אָרם. See on 2 S. viii. 13.' In Title insert '[of] the Maacathites' (לְמַצְתָּיִם); M כיבתם).

- P. 263, Ps. lxi.¹, l. 2. At right hand insert 3.
- P. 274. Ps. lxxv., ll. 1 f. 'God in Zion' can hardly mean 'God who art in Zion' (Kön., *Styl.*, 18). There is no full parallel.—ll. 11 f. For 'Jerahmeelites' read 'Ashhurites,' and for 'Rehoboth' read probably 'Jerahmeel.'
- P. 277. On ll. 11 f. For ירה' read אשחורים (cp. on נקצותם, Judg. xviii. 2), and for בקר read ירחמאל (see on cxxx. 6).
- P. 283. Ps. lxxvi.⁽²⁾, ll. 11 f. König's treatment of the difficulties (*ZATW.* xviii., 1898, pp. 247-251) fails to satisfy me that the text is right.
- P. 284. Ps. lxxvii., ll. 3, 10. Add, 'סלה, as often, comes from אלהים.'
- Pp. 286, 292 f. On Ps. lxxviii.⁽¹⁾, ll. 36 f., and lxxviii.⁽²⁾, l. 6. Restore 'Bashan' (a N. Arabian district, see *Crit. Bib.* on Num. xxi. 33).—On p. 292, l. 9 from foot, omit 'read הר הנגב,' &c., and on p. 293, l. 5, for כושן read ישמעאל. The final נ in שנאן is dittographic. ישנ, as in cxxvii. 2, and like אנוש in lvi. 2, &c. represents ישמעאל. Consequently on p. 286, Ps. lxxviii.⁽¹⁾, l. 42, read 'Ishmael' instead of 'Cushan.'—Lastly, Ps. lxxviii.⁽²⁾, l. 5, 'Seir' should be 'Asshur' (the N. Arabian Asshur); see crit. note.
- P. 297. Ps. lxxviii.⁽²⁾, ll. 26 ff., end. For 'be made' read 'he made.'
- P. 299. Ps. lxxix.⁽¹⁾, l. 38. Read, 'From Ishmael deliver me speedily' (כיישמעאל כיהר השיני). Cp. crit. n. on cii.⁽¹⁾, ll. 4, 6.
- P. 310. Ps. lxxii., introd. P. Haupt (*Univ. Circ.*, June 1903, p. 54a) may be mentioned with Hitzig, Reuss, &c.
- P. 316. After notes on Ps. lxxii., insert 'BOOK III.'

(VOL. II.)

- Pp. 29-31. Ps. lxxx., l. 2. Read, 'O Shepherd of Israel! give deliverance.'—As footnote to 'Yahwè,' ll. 9, 39, insert 'Elohim.'—In crit. note on ll. 1 f. (p. 31), for האירה read השיעה, and for נגהך read נגהך.—On ll. 17 ff. (p. 30), refer to note on civ. 15.
- P. 39, note ¹. Add, 'We can then account for סלה, which so very often comes either from אלהים or from ירחמאל.'
- P. 41. Ps. lxxxiii., l. 16. Add note on 'Peleth,' 'Jerahmeel.'—P. 44, note on l. 16. Add, 'סלה = ירחמאל, a gloss on Peleth.'
- Pp. 50, 52. Ps. lxxxv., introd., l. 5. For 'even' read 'been.'—Ps. lxxxv., introd., l. 2. For 'M T' read 'M.'
- P. 57. On Ps. lxxxvii., l. 3. Add, 'סלה is a dittographed אלהים:—P. 58. On l. 7, end. Add, '[or rather סלה = אלהינו (see l. 9)].'
- P. 61. On l. 24. Add, 'סלה (not in G) = אלהים.'
- P. 63. Ps. lxxxix.⁽¹⁾, introd., last line but one. For 'Gunbel' read 'Gunkel.'

- P. 66, *l.* 6. Insert, 'The סלה in *z.* 5 = either אלהים or ירחמאל.'
- P. 67. On lxxxix., *ll.* 13-16. On M's text cp. König, *Styl.*, p. 180.
- P. 88. On xcii., *l.* 17. Add, 'It is one objection to M that the horns of the wild ox (ראים) are somewhat short.'
- P. 109. Ps. cii., *l.* 4, 6. Read, 'Guard me in the day of Ishmael ;
'In the day of Jeralmeel deliver me.' Cp. above, on Ps. ix. (title).
- P. 123. On civ., *l.* 35. For further parallels for the asshur-tree, see *Crit. Bib.* on Dt. xii. 2.
- P. 151, *ll.* 1, 3. For 'good' read 'food.'
- P. 157. Ps. cxvi., *l.* 3. For 'nets' read 'toils.'
- P. 189. Ps. cxxvi., introd., *l.* 2. Add, 'and its present abasement.'

THE PSALMS.

PSALM I.

SINCE only *ll.* 10-15 are metrical (trimeters), this psalm must be composite. The metrical portion comes from a psalm dealing with the contrasting lots of the righteous and the wicked, and probably consisting of two six-line stanzas, one of which had become illegible, and was replaced by a late editor to the best of his ability. The date of this prefixed portion is evident. It belongs to the period of the great moralistic movement (*Prov.*), and takes us into the chamber of the Bible-student (cp. *Eccus.* xiv. 20); *Josh.* i. 8 (late) is strikingly parallel to *l.* 5. See on *ll.* 4-8. It will be noticed that this portion contains three moral class-names, one of which is not found elsewhere in the *Psalter* (see below); the original psalm seems only to have contained two ('righteous' and 'wicked'); also that the inserted portion refers to individuals, whereas the original psalm must have referred to the righteous and the wicked collectively. It would seem that, in shaping the inserted portion, the editor had in view the need of a preface to a large *Psalter* of the pre-Maccabæan Greek period, which included the *Ethanic Psalter*. *Ps.* ii. doubtless already occupied its present position at the head of the *Ethanic Psalms*, and the editor sought, by the catch-words אֲשֶׁרִי, דָּרַךְ, הִנֵּה, אַבְדָּה, and אַבְדָּה, to produce an external parallelism between the two prefaces, *Pss.* i. and ii. This, together with the circumstance that *Ps.* ii. has no title, led many of the ancients, both Jews and Christians, to regard *Pss.* i. and ii. as a single psalm (see *Acts* xiii. 33 *Lag.*, *Tisch.*, *Treg.*, and cp. *Berachoth*, 9b, and for an exhaustive collection of evidence *Lagarde*, *Ps. Gr.* 16-18). This is clearly a mistake. Nothing in *Ps.* i. corresponds to the vivid scene-painting in *Ps.* ii. *ll.* 1-14. We cannot even suppose (with *Hengst.* and *Hitz.*) that they are separate works by the same author.

As to phraseological affinities: The argument based on these is less important than that from ideas, to which nevertheless it supplies useful support. (1) A combination of grounds lead us to refer the *Book of Proverbs* with full confidence to the post-exilic period. If we are convinced of this, we shall be at once inclined to refer *Ps.* i., especially the inserted portion, to that period, because of the ethical class-names used in this psalm; that there is also a marked coincidence of idea between *Prov.* and the original part of the psalm needs no showing. (2) The affinity of lines 1-4 to *xxvi.* 3-5 and *cxii.* is also striking; now *Ps.* *xxvi.* is post-Jeremian, and *Ps.* *cxii.* a Hallelujah psalm. Observe too that *Pss.* i. and *cxii.* both begin with אֲשֶׁרִי and end with הַתְּאֵבָדָה; indeed, according to our critical corrections, the last line of both psalms is the same. (3) The parallelism between *ll.* 6-8 and *Jer.* xvii. 8 is less important, but must not be neglected. That *Jer.* *l.c.* is the earlier passage may be assumed (see *OP*, 240). Most accept it as *Jer.*'s work; if so. *Ps.* i. *ll.* 6-16 is presumably exilic or post-exilic. But far more probably *Jer.* xvii. 5-8 is a post-exilic insertion; observe its individualistic character and its superfluosity. This seems to push down the date of even the earlier part of *Ps.* i. to a somewhat late period.

Later Preface.

- 1 Happy the man that walks not in the counsel of the wicked, 1
 Nor places himself in the way of sinners,
 Nor has a seat in the conclave of scoffers ;
 And whose delight is in the fear of Yahwè, 2
 And who muses on his law day and night !
 He is 'like a tree planted by running streams, 3
 Which brings forth fruit in due season ;
 Its foliage does not fade,'
 And whatever he undertakes he achieves.

Fragment.

- 10 Not so fare the wicked, not so ; 4
 +They are+ like chaff which the wind drives away.
 The wicked will not maintain themselves in the judgment, 5
 Nor the sinners in the assembly of the righteous.
 Yea, the course of the righteous Yahwè regards, 6
 But the expectation of the wicked will perish.

1-3. **Happy**, *i.e.* richly rewarded for his goodness, is the man who keeps apart from the wicked and studies the Scriptures. The original description of the righteous man (which was presumably in trimeters) has been replaced by a later passage (cp. Josh. i. 8). *Wicked* is one of three titles of the party opposed to Ezra's policy of religious isolation. For רשעים and חטאים, see on ix. 18, xxv. 8. לצים 'scoffers' is not one of the psalmists' words (another reason for supposing vv. 1-2 to be a later insertion). ערין is synonym. with ערין, 'tyrant,' in Isa. xxix. 20 (late), and with זר, 'arrogant,' in the definition of לץ in Prov. xxi. 24. לץ in G is λοιμός; so in Prov. xxii. 10, xxix. 8, but in Prov. xx. 1 ἀκόλαστος (Σ λοιμός). See also 1 Macc. x. 61 (|| παράρμοι). It means one who by his practice shows contempt for the Jewish religion.

4-8. Apparently imitated from Jer. xvii. 5-8; cp. also Josh. i. 8 (opening words). The phrase 'muses day and night' (cp. cxix. 148) is very characteristic of the Greek period, when the study of the Scriptures was the chief bulwark of the Jews against heathenism.

So in the Avesta (*Vendidad*, xviii. 6) it is the nightly search for 'the holy Wisdom, which makes man . . . cheerful at the head of the Kinvat bridge, which makes the true Athravan.' The law of Yahwè means all sacred writings. *Running streams*, פלגי נים, a late phrase (cxix. 136, Is. xxxii. 2, Prov. twice, Lam. and Job once each). פלג also in Ps. lxx. 10, and (plur.) xlv. 5 (but see notes), Is. xxx. 25 (late); פלגות, Ju. v. 15 f., probably corrupt; Job xx. 17 (late), 'streams' || נחלי (see Budde). In Jer. xvii. 8 יבבל takes the place of פלגי נים, and in Is. xxx. 25, פלגים is explained by יבלי נים. On the whole, artificial watercourses are probably meant. Though Ass. *falzu* means a canal, there is no reminiscence of Babylonia here; Palestinian agriculture supplies the figure (cp. Eccles. ii. 5 f.; Eccles. xxiv. 30; Is. lviii. 11). *Planted*, or transplanted, fruit-trees being spoken of. Aq. μεταφυστευμένον; so also xcii. 14 (see Field). שתל is rare in Heb.; Hos. ix. 13 should be removed from the list of passages (see Nowack). In Syriac translations from the Greek

š'thal sometimes at least appears as the rendering of μεταφύτεω (Lagarde, *Spec.* 13). The school of R. Janai adopted this distinction between שתל and נטע, and interpreted Ps. i. 1 accordingly (*Aboda zara*, 19). On the other hand נטעים and שתילים are both rendered in G νεόφυτα; cp. also Is. v. 7, νεόφυτον = נטע.

9. **He achieves** (makes to prosper). The old Hebrew doctrine that prosperity attends the righteous is adopted. The psalmist, however, is aware that the reward may in some cases be delayed. Hence he refers next to a sifting process through which the community of Israel will have to pass.

10-12. The author of the original psalm masses all the wicked together, without giving details of their conduct. Other psalmists enable us to repair his omission (see *J. R. L.* 117 ff.). The figure of the *chaff* describes equally

well the worthless inner nature of the wicked and their fate. Threshing-floors were usually on eminences, to take advantage of every breath of wind (Is. xvii. 13). In Jer. xvii. 6 the corresponding figure is taken (perhaps) from the stunted juniper of the desert; see 'Heath,' *Enc. Bib.*

13 f. The wicked, who now scandalise the pious, shall, when a greater judgment-day comes round, be separated from the true Israel (see *OP*, 254, 374, 406). This the Psalmist infers from the fact of which he has experience that the wicked, as a rule, meet sooner or later with a just retribution.

15. **But the expectation . . .** According to the common reading, the psalmist forms the image of a track fading away in the desert (cp. Job vi. 18). This, however, would have been expressed more clearly. The true idea is that the wicked who expect 'never to be moved' (x. 6) will be grievously disappointed, whereas the interests of the righteous are safe in the hands of Yahwē.

Critical Notes. 1 f. S transposes בדרך and בעצת. Ol. changes בעצת (twice) into בעדת, which G confirms in v. 5.

4. M בתורת. Read probably ביראת; so La. formerly (*Ps. Gr.* 12), Nestle (*Marg.* 32), cp. S, Sirach vi. 37. When a tautology can be so easily corrected, let it be corrected. Cp. xix. 10a and lxxxvi. 11b, G.

10. Add לא כן, G, Bā., We., thus completing a trimeter. The על-כן which opens v. 5 has perhaps arisen out of a marginal לא כן.

11 f. Omit כי אם, an expansion of a dittographed כנני. G adds ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς, but we need not go out of our way to make the line prosaic. Omit על-כן; the passage is explanatory of ll. 10 f. עלכן seems to be a corruption either of עלפני [י] (cp. G's addition to v. 4) or of לאכן (see on l. 10). Note the warning Pasek.

14. M דרר, an unpleasing repetition, due, as so often, to a scribe's error. Read תקנות, which suits the verb better (ix. 19).

PSALM II.

FOUR stanzas of trimeters. For the contents see exegetical notes. The psalm has been much mis-understood. There is no reference either to the cruel Alexander Jannæus (Hitzig, Duhm, Smend, Bertholet) or to any other Jewish king. As elsewhere, the person who speaks in the first person (v. 7) is the pious Jewish community, regarded as a living organism. It is only the words משיחו and מלכי which suggest a reference to a king, and these words are probably corrupt. It was to Israel as the representative of the idealized David that the promise of the lordship of an expanded Canaan was understood by the post-exilic writers to have been made. A Messianic reference, in the narrower sense of the phrase, is only to be assumed when something in the contents of a psalm

(e.g. xlv., lxxii., ci.?) compels us to suppose that a person, and not the pious community personified, is intended. See 'Psalms,' *Enc. Bib.*, §§ 24, 29.

The psalmist places himself in imagination in the age of the fulfilment of the promise. The 'nations round about' think to annul the claims of Yahwè and his people by once more invading and laying waste his land and destroying his sanctuary. The idea of an attack on Israel's holy land by confederate neighbouring peoples was characteristic of post-exilic times (see Ezek. xxxviii., Joel iv. [iii.], Zech. xiv.); it is the leading motive, not only of Ps. ii., but also of Pss. xlvi., xlviii., lxxvi. It is possible indeed that the names of these nations may have acquired a symbolic character (cp. Is. xxxiv.), but the primary idea was that of a combined attack on the land of Israel by the nations round about. The reference to Zarephath, Jerahmeel, &c., is to be explained by 2 K. xxiv. 2 (corrected text), where all the populations mentioned are to the S. or S.E. of Palestine (Cushites, Edomites, Mişrites, Amalekites, or Jerahmeelites), which probably joined the 'Babylonians' in the great invasion of Judah (see 'Obadiah, Book of,' *Enc. Bib.*). The many psalms expressing an intense hatred of these peoples are, as we shall see, partly imaginative commemorations of the invasion of Judah by Edomites and others, partly deeply felt complaints of the continued aggressiveness of these races, which were akin to Israel. See intrs. to Pss. xlii.-xliii., lv., and cp. Ps. xviii., where (as here) the Jerahmeelites, &c. may perhaps be viewed symbolically. Among phraseological parallels notice especially those suggested on lines 8-14. For other studies of Ps. ii. see Beer, *Indiv. Psalmen*, 1-3; Cheyne, *OP*, 238-241; *Christ. Use of Psalms*, 37-52.

Pss. i. and ii. together (note the אֲשֶׁר in i. 1 and ii. 12) form a preface to a large Psalter (p. 1). The circumstance that Ps. ii. (like Ps. i.) has no title creates a presumption that the date is late. At the same time it is conceivable that the title may have been removed, when the psalm acquired its present position; the parallel 83rd psalm is the last of the psalms of 'Asaph.' If the idea of a world-empire were certainly expressed in Ps. ii. we might be tempted to bring the psalm down to the time of Alexander, whose conquests would probably stimulate the growth of that idea. But we cannot be sure of this. At any rate the psalm was in existence when the 17th of the Psalms of Solomon (see v. 24) was written; Ps. ii. 9 is there applied in a strictly Messianic sense. The text of Ps. ii. therefore, had already become corrupted and editorially manipulated. The Talmud (*Berachoth*, 7b) makes Ps. ii. refer to the wars of Gog and Magog. Both these names, as it happens, are probably corruptions of fragments of 'Jerahmeel' (also distorted into 'Hamon-gog' and 'Ir-hamonah,' Ezek. xxxix. 15 f.!).

- | | | |
|----|--|----|
| 1 | Why do the nations conspire, | 1 |
| | The peoples meditate treason? | |
| | The Jerahmeelites take up their station, | 2 |
| | The Mişrites range themselves in order, | |
| | Against Yahwè, against his loyal one;— | |
| | 'Let us break down their sanctuaries, | 3 |
| | Let us destroy their palaces.' | |
| | He that is throned in heaven laughs, | 4 |
| | The Lord †of all† mocks at them. | |
| 10 | At once he pursues them in his anger, | 5 |
| | And in his hot wrath affrights them— | |
| | The Marshal of Israel—Yahwè. | 7a |
| | On his dwelling-place he has mercy, | 6 |
| | On Zion his holy mountain. | |

He said to me, 'Thou art my son,	7b
I thy God have begotten thee.	7c
Ask +this+ of me, and I will grant thee	8
The nations as thine inheritance,	
The land's utmost parts as thy possession.	
20 Thou shalt subvert Zarephath and Geshur,	9
Thou shalt beat down Jerahmeel and Miššur.'	
O ye Jerahmeelites, show prudence ;	10
Take warning, ye men of Zarephath.	
Become subject to Yahwè with fear,	11
Do homage to him with trembling,	
Lest he be angry, and ye perish in a moment ;	12
For soon doth his wrath kindle !	13
28 Happy all those that take refuge in him !	

1-7. A vivid description, parallel to lxxxiii. 4-6. The poet sees the 'nations round about' (Joel iii. [iv.] 11, cp. 4) plotting together to invade and lay waste Yahwè's land. He pronounces it to be treason, for the claim of Yahwè and his people to the sovereignty of Canaan in its fullest extent is well known to these nations. According to the ordinary view—viz. that the confederates are far distant nations—the psalmist falls short of perfect naturalness; how could those nations have known or recognized Yahwè's claim? But, since Israel's ancestors came from the N. Arabian border, the God of Israel would naturally claim that region for himself. *Their sanctuaries, their palaces*, cp. lv. 5, lxxiv. 9, lxxix. 1, lxxxiii. 13. *His loyal one, i.e. Israel.* See crit. note.

8-14. How Yahwè, in the poet's imagination, destroys the rebels. Parallel, lxxxiii. 16. The 'laugh' of Yahwè is a poetic expression for a peal of thunder. Cp. xviii. 8-20, where Yahwè is represented as appearing in a thunder-storm and rescuing his loyal servant Israel from his enemies. Later on in the same Psalm (?) it is Israel who crushes all who oppose him, but he does this in Yahwè's strength; it is a miracle. How indeed, except by a miracle, could Jewish pietists cope with fierce Edomite warriors? Yahwè, then, not Israel, is the true victor; he has a tender regard (יְהוָה) for his threatened temple (*l. 13; contrast Lam. ii. 6f.*). But the Israelites, as

the phrase 'Marshal (מַחֲקֵק) of Israel' (as lxviii. 27b, Is. xxxiii. 22) shows, follow their divine Leader. *Laughs, mocks.* Parallel, lix. 9. *Pursues, affrights.* Cp. lxxxiii. 16; lix. *lines 21, 23.*

15-21. Before the revolt of the Jerahmeelites, Israel had received a divine oracle. As presented in this stanza it consists of three parts, 1. a declaration of Israel's divine sonship, 2. a promise of the land of Canaan in its utmost extent, and 3. a command to extirpate the bitter enemies of Israel on the N. Arabian border. *Thou art my son.* If this were addressed to the Messianic king we might suppose the divine sonship spoken of to mean membership in the college of heavenly, supernatural beings which is presided over by the Most High (cp. lxxxix. 6-8). True, there is no evidence that the historical Israelitish kings claimed to be members of that heavenly society, and even in lxxxix. 27f. it is not probable that such a claim is implied for the Davidic king. Still the Assyrian and, yet more extravagantly, the Egyptian kings did advance the claim, and in the post-exilic age it might conceivably be advanced for the Messianic king in connexion with the view that the earthly kingdoms had celestial patrons (cp. *OP*, 130, 252; *Christ. Use of Psalms*, 43). Note, however, that in lxxii. 1 the Messianic king is called, not the son of God, but the 'king's son.' Of course with our revised text the temptation to adopt this

theory disappears. Sonship is to be taken in the same metaphorical sense as in Hos. xi. 1-4. Isa. lxiii. 16, lxiv. 7, Mal. ii. 10, Dt. xxxii. 6 (cp. 15, 18). The words, *I thy God have begotten thee*, will then relate, not to any new dignity conferred on the person addressed, but to the divine purpose, which dates back to the earliest age in Israel's history, of making Israel the human agent in establishing the divine kingdom upon earth. No 'to-day' is needed, because God knows no yesterday. *The land's utmost parts*, אַפְסֵי אֶרֶץ. Cp. lxxii. 8, Mic. v. 3 [4], Zech. ix. 10. In all these passages 'land,' not 'earth,' is the most probable rendering.

20. **Thou shalt subvert.** Cp. lxi. 7, cx. 5-7. The phrases 'subvert,' 'beat down' imply the figure of a house (cp. 'house of Israel' &c.). Zarephath and Jerahmeel, *i.e.* Edomites and N. Arabians, if they remain incorrigible, must be laid low (cp. xviii. 30, lii. 7, lx. 10, lxxxiii. 10-12,

cxxxvii. 8f.). On 'Miššur' see *SBOT*, 'Isaiah,' Heb. p. 140.

22-28. Here the psalmist interposes; his tone is mild and persuasive. He appeals to the enemies to show a regard for their own true interest. Yahwè is a jealous God; let them propitiate him by becoming his faithful servants. He concludes with a declaration of the happiness of true believers, which is meant presumably for Gentiles as well as Jews—*i.e.* for those Gentiles (including even Edomites) who have found admission as proselytes into Yahwè's fold. The received text absurdly calls upon heathen kings to 'exult with trembling.' See crit. notes. [Grimm, *Liturg. App.*, 12 f., would omit l. 28 (*v. 12c*) as a 'euphemistic liturgical appendix,' which 'disturbs the parallelism, nor is it required by the context.' But in each stanza of seven lines there must be one line only loosely connected with the rest. It is barely possible, however, that אֲשֵׁרֵינוּ has displaced the original close of the psalm.]

Critical Notes. 1 f. מִרְנִישֵׁי. A very doubtful Aramaism; cp. on lv. 15, lxiv. 3. Read קִשְׁרָה. Lines 1-4 are quite consistent. First comes the plotting; then the mustering of the troops; then the watchword with which they take the field.—מִרְיָק; involves a premature statement. As in iv. 3, read שְׂקָר, here = 'treason.'

3 f. M's יִתְצַבּוּ is right (see last note). Gr., La., We., Du. read יִתְצַבְּבוּ following M of lxxxiii. 4 (but see note).—מִלְכֵי; read יִרְחַמְאֵלִי, *i.e.* יִרְחַמְאֵלִים. Pss. xlvi. and lxxxiii. are here our guides.—מִרְוֹנוֹת. מִרְוֹנוֹת = רוֹן. Read probably וּמִצְרִים. מִנִּי. In itself, no doubt, רוֹנוֹת is unobjectionable (though יָהּ — would be more natural); cp. Ass. *ruzzumit*, with Prince, *J. B. L.*, xvi. 175 f. רוֹנוֹת should probably be read in Judg. xvi. 30 &c.; and רוֹן for נוֹר in Gen. xlix. 26, Dt. xxxiii. 16, Lam. iv. 7; also in Is. xliii. 27a. It is also found in Sirach xlv. 4 (שְׂרֵי נוֹיִם).—M נוֹסְרוּ יָהּ; נוֹסְרוּ יָהּ seems superfluous on the common theory of נוֹי, the meaning of which word, however, says Bā., is 'uncertain.' A's ἐπαρρησιάζαντο suggests a connection with סוֹד. Sirach (xlii. 10), as represented, gives the form הַסְתַּוִּיד (Hal. הַסְתַּוִּיד). This might suggest a denom. סוֹד, but does not warrant נוֹסְרוּ, which, in spite of S, ought not to be rendered 'take counsel.' G T suggest נוֹצְרוּ (so Gr., Lag., Gu.; cp. xlvi. 5). But both here and in lxxxiii. 4 (for יִעֲרִיבוּ סוֹד) we should probably read יִעֲרִכוּ שְׂדֵר || יִתְצַבּוּ.—M מִשִּׁיחוּ. An early error for

חֲסִידוֹ (ד = ח, ש = ס, מ = ח). Cp. on xx. 7a, xxviii. 8, lxxxiv. 10, cv. 15. The error implies that the Messianic belief had gained strength since the completion of the Psalter.

10. M's text gives one beat too much, nor can 'ידבר אל' be said to be parallel to 'יבהלנו'. Take one more suggestion from Ps. lxxxiii. (v. 16), and read 'או ירדפם באפו'. Street and Bi.² read 'ידברם', but the sense 'subdue' is very doubtful, and here does not suit the parallelism.

12. M 'אספרה אל-חק יהוה'. But 'אל חק' is surely not to be justified by the cases in which 'the ל of reference has become a new exponent of the accusative' (Kön., *Synt.*, p. 367); indeed the cases mentioned by Kön. (xxii. 31b, lxix. 27b, cx. 1) need testing. On the various ancient views of the text see Bā., *Jahrbh. f. pr. Theol.*, 1882, p. 594. To amend 'אל' into 'את' (Houb., Kenn., Bi.², We., Du. alt.) is too slight a remedy for the strangeness of the text. Where else is a divine oracle described as a חק? And why has the king to brace himself up to communicate the oracle? Next, we notice that, if we follow M's text, the second stanza will have one line too few, and the third one too many. Evidently 'אספרה וגו' or that from which it may have been corrupted, should be transferred to the second stanza. It will also be observed that, according to the structure of the other stanzas, the three middle lines should form a tristich. We have, therefore, if possible, to detect underneath 'אספרה יהוה אל חק יהוה' something which will form a tristich with lines 3 and 4, and will also fit in well with the closing distich. The required words are 'יהוה חקק ישראל יהוה' (see exeg. note). The letters were misarranged and partly corrupted.

13 f. Of M's 'נסכתי' Bā. frankly confesses that the meaning is 'again uncertain.' The Assyrian *nasiku*, 'prince,' may indeed mean properly 'one constituted,' but were the Israelites conscious that 'נסיך,' 'prince,' came from a root נסך, 'to constitute'? 'AE' render 'נסכתי' *ἐδιασάμην*, *J orditus sum*; but the sense of meaning is here unsuitable. Σ has *ἔχρισα* (T 'רביתי'); cp. Acts iv. 27. It is true that some (e.g. Ges.; We. *Heid.* 118) explain 'נסיך' as primarily 'one anointed'; but this is most questionable (see 'Anointing,' *Enc. Bib.*). Nor would 'I have anointed . . . on Mount Zion' be natural; hence T inserts 'וכינתיה'. Houb., Kenn., Street, Du. follow G (*κατεστύθη βασιλεὺς ἐπ' αὐτοῦ*) in reading 'כלכו' and 'קדשו'. It would be plausible to supplement this by reading 'נוסדתי'; cp. G in Prov. viii. 23 *ἐθεμελίωσέ με = נוסדתי*? But, in spite of 'יפד' in 1 Chr. ix. 22, this is hardly natural. The truth is that the traditional view of the close of the second stanza will not hold; it produces the effect of great abruptness. There must be deep corruption in the text. Not improbably we should read 'יעל-משכנתיו יחכול'; and in next line 'קדשו ל'. 'אל (= על) fell out. 'ני, as often, 'כו. 'ו in the suffix fell out.—16. M 'היום'. The position of this word is unnatural. As often,

יוס most probably disguises a longer word (cp. on lxi. 9, end). Read אֱלֹהֶיךָ.

20 f. Neither תִּרְעַם (M; cp. Lag., *Semitica*, i. 22 ff.) nor תִּרְעַם (lxxviii. 71 f.), as G S J, Ilgen, Lag., Now. read, is correct. The whole passage is highly inappropriate, and must be closely examined. Inspection reveals the following underlying passage :—

תִּהְרַם צָרְפַת וּנְשׂוּר
יִרְחַמְאֵל וּמִצִּיר תִּתְצֵן

22 f. The Jerahmeelites and the Zarephathites cannot be dismissed abruptly. וְעַתָּה מוֹלָכִים has arisen out of יִרְחַמְאֵלִים. Did the scribe begin to write יִרְחַמְ, and then remember that the transformed edition of the psalm had מוֹלָכִים? שֵׁפֶט sometimes takes the place of צָרְפַת; cp. on cix. 31, cxli. 6, and cp. 'Shaphat,' *Enc. Bib.* Similarly in Mic. iv. 14 צָרְפַת has become שֵׁבֶט (see 'Micah, Book of,' *Enc. Bib.*). Read, in l. 23, צִרְפַתִּים.

25. M נִשְׁקוּ-בֵר : וְנִילֵו בְרַעְדָּה : (G, καὶ ἀγαλλιῶσθε αὐτῷ ἐν τρόμῳ. δράξασθε παιδείας, inserting לו, which might easily fall out after נִילֵו. J too (see Lag.) may have read וְנִילֵו לו. But the invitation to exult (נִילֵו) violates the parallelism, and is inconsistent with בְרַעְדָּה. Nor is Lagrange's 'faites le cercle' (*Rev. Bibl.*, ix. 88) more than a palliating remedy. The phrase which follows is equally improbable. Hommel (*Aufsätze*, ii.) would have us render 'kiss ye (the god) Bir,' assuming Bir to have once been a designation of Yahwè as well as of Rammân. This has only the value of a record of Hommel's impression that such a pronounced Aramaism as בֵר 'son' is inconceivable in a psalm where we also find בְנֵי. Certainly the defences of the omission of the article offered by Del., Bâ., and Kön. are highly unnatural. 'Kiss a son' is nearly as senseless as 'kiss wheat' or 'kiss a pure one,' and in any case נִשְק 'to kiss' would require to be followed ל or (better) לְרַנְלֵי. Add to this that בֵר נִשְקוּ is rhythmically superfluous, and that the subject of the following verb is 'Yahwè.' In these circumstances it is useless to emend נִילֵו into חִילו (Ew. Gr.), which produces a tautology with רַעְדָּה (see xlvi. 7), or to change בֵר into בְהִיר (Ilgen; cp. 2 S. xxi. 6), or בו (Hu., against usage). The truth is that נִשְקוּ בֵר (where either בֵר should be בְר or else עַדָּה has been accidentally lost) is a marginal correction of נִילֵו (לו), בְרַעְדָּה, which has intruded into the text (*Jeru. Rel. Life*, 1898, p. 112 note); so, subsequently,¹ Marti, Duhm, Prince (*J. B. L.* xix. 3). Thus we have two competing readings, נִשְקוּ and נִילֵו. Neither is correct;

¹ K. H. Grimm's reference to this theory (*Liturg. App.* 13) warns me to point out that the priority is mine, and to ask consideration for הַשְתַחֲוּ.

נִשְׁקוּ and ג' are both corrupt fragments of הִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ, to which לוֹ (in גילו) should be added. Gr.'s החזיקו במוסר, and La.'s מוֹסְרוֹ נִשְׁקוּ (מוֹסְרוֹ), 'put on his bonds,' spoil the metre. Gr. appeals to G T; but G T really understand בַּר as = תוֹרָה. Duhm suggests וּשְׁחוּ; this is insufficient for metre, and does scanty justice to the material supplied by M. Read, therefore, certainly, וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוּוּ לוֹ בְּרַעְדָּה. Note the warning פֶּאֶסֶק after פֶּן יֵאָנֶפֶן.

26. M וְתִאֲבָרוּ דָרְךָ. Though the accus. דָרֶךְ is grammatically defensible (Kön.), the sense produced is poor. Herz, בְּדָרְךָ. But to correspond to כִּמְעַט we require בְּרִנֵּעַ (ג and כ confounded, ב and ד).

PSALMS III. AND IV.

Ps. iii. trimeters; Ps. iv. tetrameters. The opening psalms of the Ethanic Psalter, meant apparently for evening use, the Jewish day beginning with the evening. So Lagarde. The more common view, which makes Ps. iii. a morning and Ps. iv. an evening hymn, is in itself improbable, considering the similarity of the situation in the two psalms, and appears to have arisen out of a corruption in the text (see crit. note on iii., l. 9). Wellhausen, indeed, disagreeing alike with Lagarde and with Bähgen, thinks that the tenses in iii. 6 and iv. 9 are all to be treated as presents, and denies any special application to evening or morning (*Skizzen*, vi. 166); this, however, can hardly be called a natural view. Now as to the reference of the psalms. They presuppose certain troubles of the pious community, arising from the hostility of the neighbouring populations; the Arabians and Jerahmeelites (cp. lxxxiii. 7 f.) are specially mentioned. It is probable (cp. l.⁶³) that there were many unworthy Jews who were in alliance with the non-Jewish oppressors; these appear to be referred to as 'deniers (of God)' in iv. 3 (cp. l. 22, corr. text). There is, however, no actual war at the present moment; the enemies are content with the deadly weapon of a lying tongue (iv. 3), which, perhaps, implies accusations brought by the Edomites against the pious Jews. The overlordship of Palestine apparently belongs to some third people (the Persians?). The plans of the enemy, however, have failed, and in the future too God will make them fail. The psalmist advises his opponents much as the author of Ps. ii. advises the Jerahmeelites (iv. 5 f.), but he is evidently most hopeful of touching the feelings of the Jews among them. He also meets the scoffs of contemptuous pessimists who are perhaps not open enemies; at least he tells us why these scoffs have no effect upon him (see on iv. 9-12). Ps. iii., ll. 1-12, records the prayer of pious Israel for Yahwē's help; ll. 13, 14, and (in the main) Ps. iv. its gratitude for deliverance. Whether this deliverance is some small event or the anticipated Messianic interposition is a question. But so much at least is certain—that the speaker is the pious community. No other theory is satisfactory. That pronounced egoist Nehemiah would certainly have introduced some personal touches.

The points of contact in ideas and phraseology between Ps. iii. and iv. are unmistakable. The second part of the title of Ps. iii., which as it stands is historically absurd (cp. 2 S. xviii. 31-33, xix. 1-4), when gently corrected in accordance with the text-critical parallels in other titles, is highly suitable to the contents of both psalms. Psalms parallel in contents are v.-vii., ix.-xiv., xvii., xxvii.⁽¹⁾, lii.-lix. (see *OP*, 227), and lxii.

Marked: Of 'Arab-ethan. At the approach of the sons of Arabia and the sons of Ishmael.

	1
1 O Yahwè ! how many are my foes !	2
+How+ many there are who start up against me !	
+How+ many there are who say to me,	3
'There is no help for thee in thy God !'	
But thou, O Yahwè ! art a shield about me,	4
My pride, and the exalter of my state.	
Unto thee, O Yahwè ! I cry ;	5
From thy holy mountain mayest thou answer me.	
I have laid me down and shall fall asleep,	6
10 For the lovingkindness of Yahwè supports me.	
I fear not the people of the Arabians	7
Who beset me round about.	
1 Thou hast smitten all Arabia and Jerahmeel,	8
The Cushites [and] Geshurites thou hast scattered.	
* * * *	
* * * *	

Liturgical Appendix.

To Yahwè belongs +true+ help ;	9
Be thy blessing, O God ! upon thy people.	

1-4. The utterance of an unwarlike, praying community. In *l.* 3 רְבִים is commonly misunderstood. The speakers are persons *outside* the community of Israel. Cp. Roy, *Die Volksgemeinde*, 21. On their cruel speech cp. xlii. 4, 11, lxxi. 11.

6. **Of my state.** Lit. 'of my head.' Cp. Eccus. xi. 1, xx. 11, Ps. xxvii. 6, cx. 7.

9. In these troublous times peaceful sleep seems miraculous.

13. הִפִּיתַי is sometimes taken as an argument why God should help, =

'thou hast ere now smitten,' sometimes as a joyous outburst of faith = 'thou hast decreed to smite' (the perfect of confidence). A precative perfect (see Kön. § 172 f.) is also not impossible. From the perfect of confidence (cf. Driver, *Tenses*, § 20) to the precative the transition is easy. Most probably, however, the perfect may be historical; in other words, the latter part of the psalm, which seems to have been imperfectly transmitted, may have been (like Ps. iv.) an expression of gratitude for deliverance.

17 f. Editorial and liturgical appendix (following Olshausen).

Critical Notes. Title. Read בְּקִרְוֹב בְּנֵי יַעֲרָב וּבְנֵי יִשְׁמַעֵאל. This is in harmony with the contents (iii. *l.* 11, iv. 3). The editor ingeniously adapted it to the corrupt לְדָוִד. Probably the true words were already in part miswritten. Cp. titles of Pss. vii., xviii.

¹ Arise, O Yahwè ! succour me, O my God ! for.

'Selahs.' The three 'Selahs,' vv. 3, 5, 9, are corruptions of אלהים; other cases will occur. סלה is very often a mere corruption.

4. M T J לו. Rather לך (so S), corresponding to לַנַּפְשִׁי, 'to my soul' = 'to me.' M באלהים; so T 'A S J. More suitably G Θ, באלהיו. But best באלהיך; so S. Cp. אלהי (insertion in ver. 8).

7f. M קולי אל-י'. ק' is generally regarded as a second subject. Cp. xvii. 10, xxvii. 7, lxvi. 17, lxxvii. 2 (?), cxlii. 2 (?). This is grammatically possible; the same idiom exists in Assyrian (Del., *Weltschöpfung*, 138). But in each of the above cases there is reason to hold that the text is corrupt. In our passage nothing is gained by the emphatic קולי, and the personal address to Yahwè is causelessly abandoned. Read אֱלֹהֵי יְהוָה. קולי and אל come from two imperfect fragments of אֵלֵךְ; כ became ק. As a consequence read תענני and קדשך. ויענני (M G S) is certainly wrong; ויענני ('A E' S' J) is better.

9f. M G שכבתי. אשכב is more natural (iv. 9). This is not an arbitrary emendation. The corruption presently to be mentioned involved altering אשכב.—M ואישנה. Read ואישן. ה is dittographed (cp. Kön., *Synt.*, § 200b).—M הקיצותי ה. 'ה nude positum displicet' (Lag.). Elsewhere (see xvii. 15b) we shall find חסרך corrupted into בהקיץ. Comparing xciv. 18, read כִּי חָסַר י'.

11. M מרַבְּבוֹת עֵם. An error which burdens the psalmist with a needless exaggeration. Read מֵעַם עַרְבִים. Cp. a similar corruption in xlili. 1 and elsewhere; also xxvii. 3.

13f. Omit v. 13a and כי in b as an editorial gloss (cp. Du.). Bi. would rather omit v. 8b. M has אֶת־פֶּלֶא־אִיבֵי לְחֵי. אִיבִים in vii. 6, xxxi. 9, and elsewhere probably comes from עַרְבִים, 'Arabians,' and לְחֵי (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Lehi') is one of the current distortions of יִרְחֹמְאֵל. Probably (cp. *l.* 11, iv. 2) we should read אֶת־פֶּלֶא־עַרְבֵי וִירְחֹמְאֵל. Note that T and S (S?) read לְחֵים (which Lag. adopts); G [לְ]חֹנֵם. To strike on the cheek is an *insult*, not a deadly act (Job xvi. 20, Mic. iv. 14).—M שְׁבִי רַשְׁעִים שְׁבִרְתָּ. Read perhaps וְאֲשָׁרִים פִּירְתָּ (see on xlvi. 7b). גֶּשׁוּר = אֲשָׁר (Geshur).

(PSALM IV.)

Deposited. Of the Ethanites. Marked: Of 'Arab-ethan. 1

1 He answered me when I called— | the God who rights me; 2
When the Jerahmeelites struck terror | he heard my prayer.

Ye deniers +of God,+ how long | will ye multiply insults? 3
-How long+ will ye love falsehoods, | and seek for lies?

5 But mark how signal | is the kindness Yahwè has shown me ; 4
Yahwè hears me | when I call upon him.

Take warning, perish not ; | show prudence in your ways: 5
Offer sacrifices that are right, | and put your trust in Yahwè. 6

Many there are who say, | 'No more will good fortune visit
them !

10 God has veiled | the light of his countenance.'

O Yahwè ! thou hast put | gladness into my heart 8

More than in the time of our corn | and our new wine and
our oil.

In peace will I at once | lay me down and sleep, 9

For thou, O Yahwè, | causedst me to dwell securely.

2. Cp. iii. 3.—3. **Ye deniers (of God).** The phrase includes Jewish and non-Jewish believers (see Ps. xlix.). Much difficulty has been caused by 'sons of men (בְּנֵי אִישׁ) in the received text. The phrase is far too undistinctive to be correct. Lines 3-8 are a remonstrance analogous to that in ii. 10-12. *Will ye multiply.* M's text speaks of insults to a mysterious 'glory,' in which some see the royal or highpriestly dignity, others the national honour—*i.e.* the power of maintaining Israel's independence. But the whole phrase is suspicious (see below). The seeming parallel in lxii. 5 is no parallel; there too the text is corrupt. The 'insults' are presumably those expressed in iii. 3, iv. 7.

4. **Falsehoods . . . lies.** Cp. on lxii.

5. False accusations appear to have been brought against the faithful Jews by their unfaithful brethren and by the non-Jewish populations, to conciliate the Persian (?) or perhaps Greek rulers.

5. 'Your intrigues are doomed to failure; my life exhibits a series of deliverances springing from the divine lovingkindness' (see on xvii. 7, xxxi. 22). On חֶסֶד cf. *OP'*, 370 ff; *Enc. Bib.*, 'Lovingkindness.' הַפְּלֵה 'has separated, made unique.' Cp. Ex. xxxiii. 16, Israel is rendered unique by having Yahwè's attendant presence.

7, 8. **Take warning . . .** 'Reflect before it is too late, and your course ends in ruin. A time may come when prayers and sacrifices will be of no

avail (Prov. i. 28). Repent and offer sacrifices which are at once legal and morally valuable; the legal and the moral to our psalmist are one. The ordinary view, based on M, is most unsatisfactory. 'Let wholesome fear deter you from persisting in this course of action, which is nothing less than sinful' (Kirkp.). But how very vague an exhortation,—'Tremble and do not sin'! Contrast ii. 11. רָגַז might just as well mean, 'Be angry.' It is true, Bishop Horsley (following G and Eph. iv. 26) adopts this, explaining, 'Do not let your anger carry you into overt acts of sin.' Unsuitable, no doubt; but would the psalmist have used language capable of being so explained?

9-12. The scoff of the enemy, and the pious community's answer. The enemy, who is established in the land of Israel, pronounces that the God of the land is angry with the Jews ('has veiled the light of his face:,' cp. lxxx. 1, 4). Israel answers that it has but lately received a signal proof of the divine favour, which has given it an inward joy (*l.* 11; cp. *l.* 5), far greater even than that of the merry harvesters (cp. Hos. ix. 1, Isa. ix. 3). 'Although the fig-tree may not blossom . . . yet I will rejoice in Yahwè' (Hab. iii. 17 f.). Contrast Hos. vii. 14. On the text see crit. note. *Ol.* is certainly wrong in thinking that the anxious multitude of Israelites referred to, as he thinks, in v. 7a offer a prayer to Yahwè in v. 7b. This would be inconsistent with *ll.* 11 f.

Critical Notes. 1, 2. Lag. (with best MSS. of G) reads עֲנֵנִי because of הרחבת. This seems right, though the fact that 'הר is in the perfect is not conclusive. For though 'בצר הר' gives a plausible sense, the phrase is not only peculiar, but wanting in special appropriateness. We expect some point of contact with that part of Ps. iii. in which Israel's trouble is referred to (v. 7). 'הר is plainly wrong, and the superfluous הנני ought to help towards correcting the text. We want an ethnic name virtually equivalent to ערבים (iii. 7). With בני חנים (מ = נ) and רחבת before us, we cannot doubt that the name is ירחמאלים. Read, therefore, in *l. 2a*, 'בַּעֲרֹן יִר', and for וְשָׁמַע read שָׁמַע.

3. M בְּנֵי אִישׁ. Read הַמִּכְהָשִׁים (see on xlix. 3).—M לְכַלְמָה; פְּבָדִי also S Σ. G, כְּבָדִי לֵב לָמָּה; 'A J, פְּבָדִי לְכַלְמָה (see Lag.). Disregarding metre, Houb., Bredenk. (*Gesetz u. Proph.*, 71), We., and Roy (p. 58) follow G. Both readings are awkward, and produce a bad parallelism. Read תִּרְבּוּ כְלָמוֹת. M's סלה is a corruption of כלמה, repeated in error from the preceding line.—4. M רִיק. Parallelism requires שָׁקֵר (ii. 1).

5 f. Read חֲסְדוֹ לִי (xxx. 22), with Hare (in Horsley), Dy., Gr., Che.¹, Kau., We., Herz.—M יִשְׁמְעֵנִי. For clearness read יִשְׁמְעֵנִי (G, Bi.). Note of abbreviation lost.

7. M וְאֵל־תִּהְיֶה אֱמֶרֶתִי, in connection with which וְדַמּוּ must be taken, for it is really a second corruption of the word, which has also been corrupted into תהטאו and into אמרו. Similarly על־משכבכם and בלבבכם are both corruptions of the same word. רנו is of course also wrong; the obviously correct word is הוֹסְרוּ (ii. 10b). The three words 'תח, אמרו, and דמו are corruptions of תִּאבְדוּ. In 'תח, ה has come out of ב, and ט out of ד; in אמרו, מר = בד; in דמו, דמ = דב. In בלבבכם comes from על. על־משכבכם is, perhaps, a corruption of על־מַעְגְלֵיכֶם; ע became ש, ג became כ, ל became ב.

Note that G Σ omit ו before דמו; S (rightly) prefixes it to על. דמו might of course be retained in the sense of 'be silent in penitence,' but this would require על־עִפּוֹר. The explanation given above is adequate and supported by numerous parallels elsewhere. M's סלה is a corrupt fragment of הַשְׁפִּילוּ (ii. 10a), the parallel to הוֹסְרוּ. Read therefore—

הוֹסְרוּ וְאֵל־תִּאבְדוּ
וְעַל־מַעְגְלֵיכֶם הַשְׁפִּילוּ :

9 f. M יִרְאֵנוּ. Rather יִרְאֵם נו and מ confounded.—M נִסָּה. T renders נִשָּׂא, to which most (e.g. Kōn. i. 631) assent. But the imperative of נִשָּׂא is שִׂא; נִסָּה in x. 12 is corrupt. Here too there is corruption.

We might read נִשְׁתָּ = נִשְׁאָתָ (parallels in Nu. xi. 11; Job i. 21). But a break in the parallelism is unpleasing. Budde (*T. L. Z.*, 1896, col. 561) derives from Pesh. the reading נִסָּה for נִסָּה, and פָּנִי for פָּנִי. This is both easy and probable. But עֲלֵינוּ remains unaccounted for. It is, however, one of the many corruptions of אֱלֹהִים, which restore, and the text will be in order.

11 f. Prefix יְהוָה from ver. 7 (so S). For ׀ (twice) read נִי. נִי and נִי are frequently confounded with נִי. After the corn and wine G S mention the oil. Accordingly insert וַיִּזְהַרְנוּ (Gr. ׀). Omit רְבוּ, which comes from a dittographed רְנוּ. רְבוּ was early found difficult (Judah ben Bileam in I E).

14. Omit לְבָדָר (M G), a corruption of לְבָדָר (Lag.), which in turn is a corruption of a duplicated לְבַטָּחָ. To keep both לְבָדָר and לְבַטָּחָ, rendering 'solitarily+but+securely' (cp. Dt. xxxiii. 28 and parallels), does not give a good sense. Israel at this time did not dwell 'solitarily,' *i.e.* free from the intrusion of other peoples (Ol.). Nor can לְבָדָר be referred to Yahwè, for it adds nothing to the force of the sentence to say that Yahwè had no allies. Duhm deserves credit for omitting לְבָדָר, but his view that it is a Judaistic gloss ('Israel, and no other nation') is improbable.

PSALM V.

PENTAMETERS. According to the received text, a prayer of the inner circle of pious Jews which gathers at the morning and evening sacrifices to ask for guidance and for the overthrow of Israel's foes. The enemies spoken of might be of Jewish blood—men who from time to time presented themselves in the temple for a formal worship which had no effect on their daily life (Ps. l. 16). And certainly it cannot be denied that such persons are included under the class-names 'wicked doers,' 'speakers of lies,' &c. But the leaders of the opposition to the Jews commemorated in this and other psalms are the Jerahmeelites and other neighbouring peoples. The prospect is Messianic. The speaker is pious Israel; the expression 'my king' (v. 3) is of itself almost enough to show this; even in Sirach li. 1 (quoted on the other side by Beer) it is the community which speaks. Merx's view (Chwolson's *Festschrift*) that the speaker is a priest in the Maccabæan period, who owns no king but Yahwè, is precluded by the corrected text (see on v. 4). Cp. Roy, *Volksgemeinde*, 59. Pss. xv., xxiv.⁽¹⁾, and l.⁽²⁾, also xxvi., xxvii., and xxviii., contain parallels to our psalm.

Deposited. Of Salmath. Marked: Of 'Arab-ethan. 1

1 Harken to my words, O Yahwè! | heed my meditation; 2
Listen to the sound of my crying, | my King and my God! 3

For against me Jerahmeel draws near, | his voice he
makes to be heard; ¹

3b, 4

Jerahmeel has pleasure in wickedness, | he fears no calamity.

5

¹ Jerahmeel and Zarephath draw near.

The impious cannot stand up | before thine eyes ;¹ 6
 Thou abhorrest those that speak lies, | those of Edom
 and Jerahmeel. 7
 But I, so great is thy lovingkindness, | can enter thy
 house, 8
 I can bow down toward thy holy temple, | revering thee.
 O Yahwè ! lead me in thy righteousness | because of
 Ishmael : 9
 10 Make thy way even before me | * *
 For there is no sincerity in their speech, | insults are
 +in+ their heart ; 10
 An open grave is their throat, | +though+ they speak
 flatteringly.
 Bring destruction on them, O God ! make foolish | [all]
 their counsels ; 11
 Push them down for their many crimes, | for they have
 defied thee.
 . But let all that trust in thee rejoice, | for ever let them
 shout, 12
 Let all that love thy name be glad, | and exult in thee.
 For thou, O Yahwè ! blessest | the righteous [with
 lovingkindness] ; 13
 [Him that trusts in the Most High]—with favour | thou
 crownest him.

1. **My king**, *i.e.* Israel's king. See xliv. 5, Isa. xxxiii. 22, xli. 21, xliii. 15. See introd.

3. **Jerahmeel draws near**. Cp. iii. 7, iv. 2, xxvii. 2, &c. The reference in M to the morning sacrifice (?) is enigmatical. Not less so is the phrase 'I will look out.' Not patient waiting (Mic. vii. 7, Hab. iii. 1), but impatient importunity is the fundamental tone of this psalm. *His voice*. The loud cries of these enemies are often referred to (xlv. 17, lxxiv. 4, &c.).

4. Cp. x. 6, iv. 23 (?). M's ינרך is very improbable.

5. **The impious**. If we adhere to M's הוֹלְלִים we had best render 'mockers.' The Aphel of the verb in

Syr. means 'to mock,' and T gives the synonym כִּתְלַעְבִּין (cp. מִלְעָבִים, 2 Chr. xxxvi. 16). But the sense is not perfectly satisfactory (see lxxiii. 3, lxxv. 5). G's παράνομοι (so also lxxv. 5, but in lxxiii. 3, ἄνομοι) is vague. B D B explains 'boasters,' but does not the sense 'to boast' belong to a different root? (see Ges. - Bu.). 'Madmen' would perhaps be better (cp. Poel and Hithpoel). It is very doubtful, however, whether any ethical sense was developed out of הָלַל; in Ass. the only ethical sense is 'pure, holy.' It is better, therefore, to suppose an error of the text. See crit. n., and for נבל see on xiv. 1.

¹ Thou hatest all wicked doers.

7. **I ... can enter thy house.** Cp. on Ps. xv. Sinners have to fear the 'fire in Zion' (Isa. xxxi. 9; cp. Isa. xxxiii. 14). But the speaker, not being of the class just described, can safely enter Yahwè's courts, which are indeed his fortress (xxvii. 4 f.).

8. **I can bow down &c.** See on xxxviii. 2.

9. **Lead me . . .** Yahwè is the shepherd of Israel, whom he leads in the right paths—those which he has prescribed (so Ol., Du.). See on xxv. 5, xxxvii. 11. So 'thy way' = the way in which I should walk (cxliiii. 8).

'Make' it 'even,' says pious Israel, *i.e.* free from calamity (xxvi. 12, Isa. xxvi. 7), lest the neighbouring peoples should say, 'Where is thy God?'

16. **All that love thy name;** so xxv. 14^b (corr. text), lxix. 37, cxix. 132. The 'name of Yahwè' is his glory, or the place where his glory dwells, and to love it is to honour it (exclusively) by ceremonial acts.

17. **The righteous,** צְדִיק *i.e.* the faithful community. Cp. vii. 10, xxxi. 19, lviii. 11f., lxxv. 11, Isa. xxiv. 16, xxvi. 7.

Critical Notes. 1. M הַגִּינִי. The Rabbis assumed two Heb. roots meaning 'to murmur, meditate' (הגג and הגה). Certainly there is a Syr. root הגג (*O P.*, 464). But here, as in xxxix. 4, corruption is very probable. Read הַגִּינִי (xix. 15).

4. The whole of τ . 4 is corrupt. Herz, indeed, would (most ingeniously) read, for בקר אַעֲרֹךְ, בְּקֹר וְעָרַב. But this is not enough. The speaker is in deadly peril: to refer to his morning and evening oblations is unnatural. Merx (*Chwols. Festschrift*) renders 'I arrange and cleanse for thee' (Arabising), supposing an allusion to a ritual practice. Cp. Lagarde (*Psalt. Gr.*, 34 ff.) and Duham. Read probably פִּי עָלִי יִרְחַמֵּאל קָרַב הַשְּׂמִיעַ קוֹלוֹ. So historical colouring is restored. At end of v. 4 read קָרַבוּ יִרְחַמֵּאל וְצָרְפֶת (a variant).

4. M's כִּי לֹא אֵל (Pasek after כִּי) is one of the many disguises of יִרְחַמֵּאל.—For יִגְרֹךְ read יִגֹּר (see exeg. note).

5. For הוֹלְלִים read probably נִבְלִים, a class-name which could hardly be omitted here. נבלים is corrupted elsewhere. At end of τ . 6 M inserts a gloss.

6. תִּתְעַב is too strong; destruction is referred to later. Read תִּתְעַב (תִּתְעַב represents this as a correction). יהוה is superfluous. For אִישׁ וּמְרֻמָּה read אֲדָמִים וִירְחַמֵּאלִים (cp. on li. 16, lv. 24).

9. M שׁוֹרְרִי. Again in xxvii. 11, liv. 7, lvi. 3, lix. 11. G ἔχθροί μου. Σ ἀποθλιζόντες με. But an ethnic name is wanted; read either גְּשׁוּרִים or, better, יִשְׂמַעֲיָאל (see on lix. 11^b).

11. M בְּפִיהוּ. Read, with the Vss., בְּפִיהֶם Du.; less correctly, בְּפִינוּ, Lag., Bâ., We., Merx.—M נִכְוָהָה. Read נִכְוָהָה (Gr.); cp. Isa. lix. 14.—M הַהוֹת. Rather חֲרָפוֹת. So xxxviii. 14, lii. 4, cp. lxii. 7. 3. The contrast is between words of simulated friendliness and the insults of open hostility. See lxii. 5.

13. M הַאֲשִׁימִים. Read, more suitably, הַשִּׁמִּים (Lag., Gr., Merx);

cp. Joel i. 18, where read נִשְׁמוּ (Merx, We.).—M יִפְּלוּ כַמַּעֲזוֹתֵיהֶם; a strange expression. Dy. and We., יִפְּלוֹם מִ; too superficial. Read סִבֵּל כָּל־; see 2 S. xv. 31, Isa. xlv. 25.—M בָּרַב. Better כָּרַב (G J); so Du., Merx.

16. M ותסך עלינו ועלנו. We. makes sense by omitting the first ו, and treating 'ת על' as a relative clause. But this is unnatural. The cæsura in the verse should be at ירננו (cf. Isa. lii. 8). עלינו is surely a dittogram of עלנו. יתסך must be corrupt; it should represent a verb parallel to יע. We expect ישישו (xl. 17). ך may have sprung from ו, and both ס and ת from ש. The wrong reading was natural when the dittographed יע had become עלינו. Herz, עלנו ותסך.

17 f. Insert חסך (metre and parallelism); also perhaps בַּטַּח בְּעַיִן חֶסֶד. Omit כַּצְנָה (an unsuitable figure). Wellh. proposes צַנְפָּה. But כַּצְנָה comes probably from בָּרַצַּן; רַצוֹן which follows is a correct variant. Point תַּעֲטִרְנִי.

PSALM VI.

TRIMETERS. A record of still deeper depression (cp. Ps. xxxviii., and the thanksgiving in Ps. xxx.). The trouble from the foreign (and native) enemies is now at its height. The sufferer owns himself guilty, but has no clear comprehension of his guilt (l. 2). He has been constant in the recital of Yahwè's praises (ll. 9 f.), and in consequence appeals to Yahwè's reasonableness:—if the speaker should actually sink into the nether world, what would become of those songs of praise and thanksgiving in which He delights (cp. xxx. 10, 13)? The speaker is well-nigh exhausted. His bodily frame is wasted away, and even at night his tears cease not to flow. That literal sickness (Ewald, B. Jacob, Duhn) is not meant, ought to be clear. It is the insults (l. 18) of the speaker's foes which have robbed him of the joy of life. Nor is it an individual who speaks. It is a fact (in spite of Sellin, *De Origine*, 27 ff.; see notes below on ll. 1, 4) that expressions partly the same and partly similar are put into the mouth of Israel, and we know that Hebrew writers could go to a great length in personifying their people, and even an association of persons within their people (Isa. liii. 1, Ps. xxii.). The case is exactly parallel to that of Ps. xli., about the interpretation of which there can be no reasonable doubt. That individual Israelites, who felt the sorrows and sufferings of their nation as their own, would put much personal feeling into their recitation of this psalm, is a matter of course; but the 'I' who speaks is primarily faithful Israel, not any Israelite, and least of all a sick Israelite. The sickness is quickly put aside; the enemies are the enemies of Israel and of Israel's moral standards—'wrong doers,' led by Arabians from the border lands.

There are still critics who hold to the individualistic interpretation, which shows a want of insight into the numerous passages in which Israel is certainly not personified by a poetical figure, but rather regarded as in reality a living organism, in accordance with the primitive sense of the solidarity of all the members of a community. That the early Israelites, like the early Babylonians, had songs of sickness, is probable enough. But that sick persons, either in pre-exilic or (much less) in post-exilic times, used this or any of our psalms when they came to offer a propitiatory sacrifice, is a view which requires far more argument than B. Jacob has offered for it (*ZATW*, 1897, p. 56); this scholar actually seems to think that Ps. vi. and parallel psalms may have been written for lepers. To some it appears more plausible to suppose that this and other psalms were originally individualistic,

but have been converted into psalms of the community (Laue, *Die Ebed Jahwe Lieder*, p. 52; Coblenz, 165). This, however, is surely a modified survival of the old church view that the psalms were composed by great (inspired) individuals with reference to their own circumstances, and is unsatisfactory. Such individualistic psalms as exist in the Psalter are unmistakable; psalms of mixed character do not exist. And it should never be forgotten (against B. Jacob) that the individualism which may be found in the Psalter is coloured by the strongest Israelite feeling. Mere personal misfortunes are not, and could not be, referred to in the Psalter.

- Deposited; of the Ethanites. Marked: of 'Arab-ethan.* 1
- 1 O Yahwè! use not thine anger to punish me, 2
 Nor thy fury to chastise me.
 Revive me, O Yahwè! for I languish, 3
 Heal me,¹ for my frame is wasted.
 My soul too is greatly affrighted; 4
 And thou, O Yahwè! how long?
 Return, O Yahwè! rescue my soul; 5
 Deliver me for thy lovingkindness' sake!
 For in Deathland there is none that recites thy praises; 6
 10 In Sheol who will give thee thanks?
 * * * * *
 * * * * *
 * * * * *
 [Yea,] I am worn out with sighing. 7
 Every night I drench my bed;
 I bathe my couch in my tears.
 Mine eye is sunken with sorrow; 8
 It perishes with the insulting of the Mišrites.
 Away, all ye wrong doers; 9
 20 Yahwè hears the sound of my weeping.
 Yahwè hears my supplication; 10
 Yahwè receives my prayer.
 Be they shamed and sore terrified; 11
 In a moment be all mine enemies put to shame!

1. Nearly as in xxxviii. 2. Both passages are dependent on Jer. x. 24. Note that in Jer. x. 19-25 (probably post-exilic) the speaker is Israel. The expressions are startling, but the idea of 'covenanted mercies' is an advance upon

the primitive idea of God's unreasonable and excessive irascibility.

4. **Heal me.** A figurative expression. The wounds referred to are the calamities of the people, viewed as the punishment of sin (xli. 3). It is true,

¹ O Yahwè!

in Jer. xvii. 14 an individual appears to utter the same prayer; but we can hardly doubt that Jer. xvii. 5-14 is a late insertion in Jeremiah, and certainly the indications in the present context all point to pious Israel as the speaker. Cp. also Ex. xv. 26, Isa. vi. 10, xxx. 26, lvii. 18 f., Hos. vii. 1, xi. 3.—*My frame*, lit. 'my bones.' So xxxi. 11, xxxii. 3, xxxv. 10, xxxviii. 4, li. 10; cp. Lam. i. 13, iii. 4, Heb. iii. 16. Cp. the use of עָצָם for *res ipsa*.

7. **Rescue my soul.** Cp. in Ass. *sūzubu napīsta*, 'to rescue the soul, or life.'

9. **In Deathland.** מוֹת 'death,' is a synonym for Sheol (ix. 13, xxii. 16, lxxviii. 20, lxxxix. 49, cvii. 18; cp. Rev. i. 18, vi. 1, xx. 13 f.—*None that recites*. Thanksgiving for His lovingkindnesses

was Yahwè's favourite 'sacrifice' (l. 14). The continued existence of Israel was, therefore, assured. See Isa. xxxviii. 18 (Israel is the speaker, and the same figure of sickness is employed). Cp. *OP*, 385.

14 ff. **I am worn out** . . . Jer. xlv. 3 is parallel. An individual (Baruch) is there referred to; but the passage looks as if it had been framed on the basis of psalm-passages (cp. 'Jeremiah,' *Enc. Bib.*). Pious Israel, imagined as an individual, could certainly be said to 'bathe his couch in his tears;' cp. lxi. 4, and note that in lxiii. 7 pious Israel says that he 'remembers God upon his bed.'

15 f. Observe that the Misrites (= Arabians) are the leaders of the party whom Israel regards as opposed to righteousness. Cp. on Ps. xi.

Critical Notes. 3. מִהֲנִי. Read הֲנִי (Gr.). See on xii. 5—M כִּי אֶמְלֵל אֲנִי. Whether we take אֶמְלֵל as an adjective or as a participle without preformative, the form is unique and improbable. In spite of the grammatical remarks of Del. and Kön. (i. 247; ii. 375), it is hard to believe that אֶמְלֵל, if genuine, is not 3 sing. perf. The occurrences of אֶמְלֵל elsewhere are numerous: 1 S. ii. 5, Isa. xvi. 8 (see *SBOT ad loc.*), xix. 8, xxiv. 4, 7, 9, xxxiii. 9, Jer. xiv. 2, xv. 9, Hos. iv. 3, Joel i. 10, 12, Nah. i. 4 (read דָּלְלוּ אֶלְנִי בְשֵׁן וְאֶמְלֵלוּ פִרְחֵי לְבָנוֹן; see Gray and Che., *Exp.* Sept.-Oct. 1898), Lam. ii. 8. There is no adjective אֶמְלֵל, Neh. iii. 34 being corrupt (see Guthe in *SBOT*; cp. Che., *Enc. Bib.*, 'Sanballat'). Read either כִּי-אֲנִי אֶמְלֵלְתִּי (transposing אֲנִי, יהָ being absorbed in pronunciation by הֲנִי, or כִּי-אֶמְלֵלְתִּי, supposing אֲנִי to be a fragment of a second superfluous רִפְאֵנִי. In the latter case אֶמְלֵלְתִּי was written אֶמְלֵל, whence אֶמְלֵל.

4 f. Omit יהוה. Twice in two stanzas is often enough. Metre gains.—M נִבְהָלוּ (cp. *l.* 5). Read בָּלוּ (Brüll, Hal.). See xxxii. 3.—M נִפְשֵׁי. Read probably אֶף-נִפְשֵׁי. אֶף easily dropped out before נִפְ, and ו was supplied.

7, 9. Read שׁוֹבְהֵי-יָהּ.—M זָכְרָךְ. Read מִזְכִּירְךָ (lxxi. 16); G, ὁ μνη-
μοεύων σε. Bi., זָכְרָךְ.

14 f. Prefix גַּם (Bi.), for metre.—18. M בְּכֶל־מִצֵּחַ. Read בְּכֶל־מִצֵּחַ (see on vii. 2, lxxxix. 51), with Bi. Notice כֹּל in l. 19.—M צָרָרִי. Read probably מִצָּרִים (analogy of other psalms).—M אֲשַׁחֵה. Wellh. suggests אֲשַׁחֵה 'I melt' (from the Syriac).

20 f. M שָׁמַע (twice). Read יִשְׁמַע (Gr.); י precedes.

24. M יִשְׁבֹּר; clearly by transposition from יִבְשׁוּ (a dittogram). G already had יִשְׁבֹּר; A even insert εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω.

PSALM VII.—I.

TRIMETERS. The same theme of persecution. The aggressors (who are here personified) may have accused the Jewish community of misdeeds of which it is innocent. The faithful members of the community clear themselves by an oath, not unlike the great 'oath of clearance' in Job xxxi.; the duties which it claims to have performed are those which a late prophetic writer presses on the attention of the formal religionists who unhappily cling to the post-exilic community (Isa. lviii. 2). Note the points of contact between *ps.* 13 f. and xi. 2; between *ps.* 6 (end) and Lam. ii. 11; and between *ps.* 2 (my pursuer) and Lam. v. 2, where the 'pursuers' are, as here, the peoples to the S. and S.E. of Judah (cp. *l.* 9, 'Let the Arabian pursue'). For the personification of the enemies, cp. *Pss.* ix.—x., lv. Lines 23, 24 may be a later insertion (see, however, note). According to Duhm, the contending parties are two heads of irreconcilable parties among the post-exilic Jews. The one seeks to destroy the other, because he believes himself to have been injured by him, while this one protests his innocence. Religion 'plays not much more than a decorative rôle.' A grievous disparagement of a perfectly sincere hymn to Yahwè! Riehm thinks it a plausible view that David, who protests his innocence towards Saul in 1 S. xxiv. 12 f., 16, xxvi. 18, 23 f., composed the psalm towards the end of his wanderings. Surely this need not be criticized. The only question is, did it suggest the heading? If so, we must read 'Saul ben Kish' (instead of 'Cush'). Another possibility would be 'Shimei ben Kish,' or even 'Mordecai, ben Shimei, ben Kish' (Esth. ii. 5). That David foresaw Mordecai, is mentioned in Targ. *sheni* on Esther. On these points, see *OP*, 229, 243. It is probable, however, that those parts of the headings which, as they now stand, suggest occasions in the life of David for the composition of psalms, are not always pure guesses, but, when most wide of the mark, arise out of misunderstanding and misread earlier headings.

In the *Masechet Sopherim* xviii. 2 it is stated that this psalm was used at the feast of Purim (one name of which was ἡ Μαρδοχαιῶν ἡμέρα, 2 Macc. xv. 36.) Cp. on *Ps.* xxx.

[Of] the *Ethanites*. Of 'Arab-ethan. With reference to the
Arabians, the Cushites, the Jerahmeelites. 1

- | | | |
|----|--|---|
| 1 | In thee, O my God Yahwè! I take refuge; | 2 |
| | Deliver me from the insults of my pursuer; | |
| | Lest he tear my living body as a lion, | 3 |
| | Rending it when none doth rescue. | |
| | My God Yahwè! if I have plotted crimes, | 4 |
| | If any injustice mark my hands, | |
| | If I have robbed the destitute of his cloak, | 5 |
| | And not covered the flesh of the naked, | |
| | Then let the Arabian pursue my soul, | 6 |
| 10 | [Let him press after it], and overtake it, | |
| | Let him trample my life to the earth, | |
| | And pour out my liver into the dust. | |

Supplement.

Surely again he whets his sword,	13
His bow he has bent and made ready ;	
Deadly weapons at me doth he aim,	14
His shafts to press me hard he prepares.	
Truly, with malice he may travail,	15
Mischief he may conceive, but delusion will be its issue.	
A pit he may dig and hollow out,	16
20 But into the pitfall he makes he will tumble.	
On his own pate his mischief will return,	17
On his own skull his injustice will descend.	
I will give thanks unto Yahwè according to his righteousness,	18
And chant hymns to the name of Yahwè for ever.	

2. **My pursuer.** See introd.

3. **My living body,** נַפְשִׁי. See Kôn. *Synt.* § 30.—*As a lion.* Cp. x. 9, xvii. 12, xxii. 14, 22, lvii. 5, Isa. v. 29.—5 רָרַף with הַשִּׁיג, as xviii. 38.

7 f. **If I have robbed . . .** Cp. xxxiv. 11b ; the enemy does that which the speaker indignantly disclaims having done. 'Cloak,' cp. Am. ii. 8a, Dt. xxiv. 17b.—*And not covered . . .* Cp. Isa. lviii. 7, Job xxxi. 19 f.

10-12. **Soul, life, liver,** are here synonymous (see on xvi. 9).—*Pour out ;* cp. Lam. ii. 11.

13. **Surely again . . . אִם-לֹא יִשׁוּב.** Pious and unwarlike Israel sees the Arabians preparing for a fresh attack (cp. xvii. 11). He is assured by his faith that it will be futile. Yahwè's 'righteousness' (l. 23) will soon be manifested in a great retribution (the Messianic). It is true most translators, both ancient and modern, render, 'If he (the wicked man) turns not, he (God) whets his sword. . . . (But) behold, he (the wicked man) travails with mischief,' &c. These changes of subject, however, are very awkward ; Bâ., Beer ('94), We., Kôn. *Synt.* 355, 567), and, lately, Duhm, explain as above. Metre, in fact, positively requires this. After the inserted passage (vii.⁽²⁾) has been removed. אִם-לֹא יִשׁוּב connects itself naturally with the protestation in ll. 9-12, as Bickell has pointed out.

But surely we must also read וְלִי for וְלוֹ in l. 15. Otherwise, after וְאֵל זַעַם, it would be most natural to render אִם-לֹא יִשׁוּב 'if he (the wicked man) does not turn,' in spite of the fact that the remainder of the passage is opposed to this view. For the figure of the arrows, cp. xi. 2.

16. **To press me hard** (see crit. n.). Most moderns render M, 'His arrows he makes into flaming ones,' and find a reference to the fire-charged darts (cp. Eph. vi. 16) hurled by the enemy into a besieged town in Greek and Roman times. Difficult and far-fetched in the extreme. It would be more plausible to find a reference to Yahwè's arrows, the lightnings (xviii. 15), if Yahwè were the warrior intended. But even then the construction would remain difficult. In the corrected text יַפְעֵל is || to הַכִּין, as פִּעֵלָת is || to כּוֹנְנֵי יָדַי in Ex. xv. 17, and לִי is explained by לְדַלְקָנִי.—17 f. Cp. Job xv. 35.

19. Fraud is often, apparently, the chief weapon of the enemies of the psalmists. *Pit, net, snare* are their favourite figures. This points to a time when the outrages of the N. Arabians had to some extent been checked.

23 ff. This couplet may possibly be a later liturgical insertion which has displaced the original closing couplet. But this is not strictly necessary ; the

psalmist is himself a liturgical poet.—*His righteousness*, soon to be manifested in act (see on xi. 7a).—*For ever*. We must remember that the speaker is the community (cp. on ix. 3) which never dies. The traditional text, however, has יהוה עליון, an appositional phrase (cp. lvii. 3). On עליון, Elyōn, see ‘Names of God,’ *Enc. Bib.* Elyōn, or El Elyōn, is a favourite divine name with post-exilic writers. We must not, however, assume with Geiger (*Urschr.*,

S2 ff.) that θεὸς Ἐψιωτός in the Apocrypha always = El Elyōn; it may mean either this or אלהי שמים (see B. Jacob. *ZATW*, 1896, 147. The occurrence of Elyōn in a psalm would be a subsidiary argument for post-exilic date (cf. *Ps.*⁽¹⁾ 18; *OP*, 83 f.); Davison and other English objectors have erred in not frankly recognizing this. Hitzig’s rendering (so G. Hoffm., *Phön. Inscr.*, 50) is not possible in the Psalter. Cp. Nestle, *Marginalien*, pp. 32-34.

Critical Notes. Title. Tradition is wholly wrong. אֲשֶׁר־שָׂר comes from רָשׁוּם ‘marked’ (like מְזוּמֹר and שִׁיר). לִיהוּה probably comes from לְאִיתָן, a correction of לְדוּד (= לְעֶרְב אִיתָן=לִידִיתוֹן). עַל־דַּבְרֵי is from כּוֹש בְּדִמְיֹנִי (cp. 1 S. ix. 1, 4, same corruption). G’s *χουσαι* attests כּוֹשֵׁי (Cornill), a relic of כּוֹשִׁים.

2. M כּוּפְלָה. Read כּוּפְלָמַת (see on vi. 8).—M רְדַפֵּי. Read רְדַפֵּי (Gr.).

4. M פָּרַק ‘snatching away’? So Hu., Bā., but against usage. (On פָּרַק, G *ἀδικία*, Nah. iii. 1, see note on xvii. 4.) ‘Setting free’ is possible (cp. on xlvi. 5, cxxxvi. 24). If we adopt this, we must either prefix וְאִין, following G S (so Kenn., Str., Bi., Gr., Che., Sta., We., Du.), or else read פָּרַק אִין וּמְצִיל (cp. Lam. v. 8), cp. Bā. The text seems corrupt. Read קָרַע (Hos. xiii. 8).

5. M אֲמַעֲשִׂיתִי זֹאת. For זֹאת Gr. reads זְמָה (|| עֲזָל). But the corruption lies deeper. Read אֲמַעֲשִׂיתִי מְזֻמּוֹת.

7 f. M אֲמַעֲזִיבֶנְיָ לְתִי שְׁלֹמִי רָע. As the text now stands, זֹאת is the object at once of נִמְלֹתִי and of שְׁלֹמִי = מְשַׁלֵּם (Ol.). This cannot be right. The next line is equally difficult. M’s וְאֶחְלַצָּה is defended by Bā. But can we venture to give the Aram. sense ‘despoil’ (cp. *Σ ἀνήρασαι*) to the common Hebrew word חָלַץ? G has ἀποπέσωμαι(?). Following T S, Houb., Kr., Dy., Gr., Che., Du., read וְאֶחְלַצָּה. This is at any rate better than giving ו an adversative sense (so Kön., *Synt.*, § 360c), and treating v. 5b as parenthetical. But the corruption is more deeply seated than we have ventured to suppose. However it be rendered, the sense of the distich cannot be called satisfactory. What we require to account for ll. 9-12 is a repudiation of accusations of hateful crimes. Read probably אֲמַעֲזִיבֶנְיָ שְׁמִילַת רֶשַׁע וּבִשָּׁר עָרוֹם לְאֶכְפְּתִי. The letters were mixed up and corrupted, as so often. (In l. 7 Str. and Herz have both suggested רָע שְׁלֹמִי.)

9 f. M יִרְדֶּה, a combination of two readings, יִרְדֶּה and יִרְדֶּה; tradi-

tion vacillated. So Pinsker (Del., *Psalmen*); cp. Kön., ii. 563. אוֹיֵב should, as often, be עֶרְבִי. Read, as *l.* 10, יִדְבֵק אֶחָרֶיהָ וַיִּשָּׁג. Cp. Duhm.

12. M וּכְבוֹדִי. Read וּכְבֹדִי (see on xvi. 9); so Houb.—M יִשְׁפֹן; the sense 'depressit' or 'projecit' (Ges.-Röd., *Theo.*) is arbitrary. Read יִשְׁפֹד (Houb., Kenn., Str.); see Lam. ii. 11. In Sir. xliii. 19^a the Cairo text has יִשְׁכֹן, the marg. יִשְׁפֹד.

16f. M וְלוֹ. Read וְלִי (see above).—M לְדַלְקִים. Read לְדַלְקֵנִי (Lam. iv. 19).—24. M עֲלִיּוֹן, a corruption of עֲזָלָם [ל]. Cp. on ix. 3.

PSALM VII.—2.

PENTAMETERS. The change of metre and the difference in the contents, perhaps also the 'Selah' at the end of *v.* 6, combine to show that *vs.* 7—12 form a unity. It is a prayer for the redress of the wrongs inflicted on Israel by the Edomites. Halévy finds a 'solution of continuity' between *v.* 7 and *v.* 8, which he remedies by moving viii. 3 hither. The supposed remedy, however, is opposed by metrical considerations, and textual criticism can suggest something better for both contexts. Note the disappearance of the late word גִּבּוֹר (cf. *OP*, 464; Sellin, *De Orig.*, 102. Note also the exquisite title of Yahwè in *l.* 8b.

1	Arise, O Yahwè! in thine anger, uplift thyself in thine indignation ;	7
	Rouse thee, O my God! for my redress, and awake for my right.	
	Let the assembly of [the sons of] the Ishmaelites swear by thee ;	8
	Let not the Jerahmeelites ¹ any more crush thy people.	
	Right me, O Yahwè! according to mine innocence, according to my ways ;	9
	Test my reins and my heart, thou righteous Judge.	10b
	Let Yahwè be my protector, +who is+ the succourer of the upright in heart,	11
	Yahwè—a righteous Judge, a refuge from Jerahmeel.	12

3 f. M gives a bad sense. Can it be the assembly of the peoples who are to be judged that is spoken of? Anyhow this requires that witnesses should be introduced as a preliminary to the judgment (cp. *l.* 4, 6). These witnesses might naturally be the inhabitants of heaven and (so far as they are not implicated in any crime) of earth. More especially those of heaven, who are

above earthly frailties, and yet not to be compared with Yahwè, might seem fit for the purpose (lxxxix. 6-8). *By them*, i.e. surrounded by them (lxxxix. 8b; cp. Isa. vi. 1) *on the height* of heaven, stands the throne of Yahwè. A bolder course, however, appears more satisfactory (see crit. n.). M's reading is very confusing to exegesis. 'Return thou to the height' can only mean

¹ Jerahmeel, wicked ones (*v.* 10a)?

'return to heaven.' Such an address would be intelligible if it came at the end of a description of a divine judgment, but is not in place at the beginning. To explain שׁוֹבָה, 'resume thy judicial functions' (K̄imḥi, Hu., Bā.) is not permissible. That the received text should be so far from yielding a good sense, is unfortunate, but we can at least see traces of a possible and even probable text.

5. Note the characteristic post-exilic claim to (legal) righteousness; cp. on xvii. 4 f., xliv. 18-23.

Critical Notes. 1 f. Note Paseḵ after יהוה: the context was indistinctly written. M gives בעברות צוררי 'at the wrath of my foes'? or 'in the wrath due to my foes'? 'A and most moderns prefer the former view, Θ J T the latter. Parallelism and metre, however, require us to read בעברתך (so Hal.), taking it with הנשא, and leaving צוררי for the next line; otherwise we might, with Budde (in We.. *Skizzen*, vi. 167), read בעבור צוררי. צוררי has not improbably come out of [ל]צדקי. כִּשְׁפֹט צוֹת, which is as awkward as עניתני in xxii. 22, is a combination of words belonging to both parts of the line, viz. להקיצה and למשפטי. אֱלֹי should be אלהי (cp. on xviii. 3). Read—

עוֹרָה אֱלֹהֵי לְצַדִּיקִי | וְהִקְיִצָה לְמִשְׁפָּטִי

3 f. Insert בְּנֵי (metre), and for לְאֲמִים (since nothing indicates that the great judgment-day is meant) read יִשְׁמְעוּ אֵלִים.—M תִּסְבְּבֶךָ. Read תִּשְׁבַּע בְּךָ.—M שׁוֹבָה. Rashi, Döderlein, Dathe, Reuss, Smend, Bi., Dy., Gr. &c. read שְׁבָה (cp. ix. 5). This, however, does not remove the difficulties of the text. It is plausible, and agreeable to parallel cases, to take over מִן יְדִין עֲמִים from ṽ. 9, and gently emend it, and to read (omitting יהוה as a gloss), יִרְחֲמֵאֵלִים אֱלֹהֵי שׁוֹבֵי | לְדַבַּר עַמְּךָ.

5 f. M וּכְמִינֵנִי עָלַי. וּכְתַמִּי עָלַי is most unnatural. Read וּכְמִינֵנִי עָלַי. The corruption arose from a scribe's misarrangement of the letters.—As to M's insertion at the head of ṽ. 10, רַע (with Paseḵ after it) is a miswritten fragment of רשעים; יִרְחֲמֵאֵל springs from a miswritten יִרְחֲמֵאֵל. 'Jerahmeel, wicked ones,' is a gloss on 'Jerahmeelites' in L. 4 or 'Jerahmeel' in L. 8.—תִּכְוֹנֶנִי springs from תִּכְוֵן, which is a variant to בָּהֶן in v. 10^b; צַדִּיק is a repetition. Read probably (cp. xxvi. 2^b), בָּחַן לִבִּי, וּכְלִיֹּתִי.

7 f. M כִּינֵי עַל-אֱלֹהִים. Yabwè, his servants' shield-bearer! עָלַי would improve the sense; but the context throws doubt on the referenc

6. The *wicked* and the *righteous* are the enemies of the pious community (whether of foreign or native origin) and pious Israel respectively. Cp. ix. 6, lxviii. 3, cxviii. 15, 20. צַדִּיק is a collective. Cp. *OP*, 293 f.; Smend, *Rel.-gesch.* 401.

8. זַעַם The growling of an irritated animal may be the root-idea (cp. Ges. 0³¹). Cp. Num. xxiii. 7 f., Prov. xxiv. 4, Isa. xxx. 27, Hos. vii. 16, where זַעַם is closely connected with speech.

to a shield. The covenant-name of God is also wanted. Read יְיָ עֲלֵי יְהוָה (Zech. ix. 15). Now we see how the י in עֲלֵי dropped out.—M וַיֵּל זַעַם בְּכָל-יוֹם 'a God who is wrathful every day'? is a statement at once vague and alarming—not natural at the end of a psalm or stanza. אֵל is a fragment of יְהוָה. The same word, almost in full, appears as בְּכָל-יוֹם (ר and ב, ה and כ confounded). Read מִיַּעַן מִיֵּרַחֲמֵנוּ.

PSALM VIII.

TRIMETERS. A fine fragment of a poetical cosmogony. The only passage which seems to conflict with this view, and to introduce ideas not perfectly germane to it, is certainly corrupt. The 'enemy' spoken of is not any Persian or Syrian king, but the dragon of chaos, in whose destruction all men are as much concerned as Israel. All mankind, then, should sing this song in its various tongues; 'our Lord' is certainly not a mere nationalistic phrase. 'Man is the world's high priest' (George Herbert), though, as the psalmists think, he can only rise to the heights of his grand destiny by the aid of Israel (cp. *OP*, 366). Yet the psalm is thoroughly Jewish, and if we had it in its complete form, we should doubtless see this more clearly. Like Ps. civ., it implies the Messianic belief (in the larger sense). The idealism of these poetic cosmogonists has a prophetic significance. The present sadly imperfect creation points to a new and better creation in the future (cp. Heb. ii. 8). The same result follows from the universal lordship of Yahwè ('our Lord'). To become a fit theatre for the great king's visible assumption of his crown, nature as well as Israel must be regenerated. What comfort lay in this for an oppressed people, and what stimulus to religious thought!—Parallels are pointed out in the notes.

Deposited. Of the Ethanites. Marked: Of 'Arab-ethan. 1

- 1 ¹Our Lord! how glorious is thy name²!
 Thou hast stretched forth the heavens as a tent.
 In the days of old thou didst array thee with strength³ 3
 To still the enemy, the assailant.
 When I see the work of thy fingers, 4
 Moon and stars which thou hast fashioned,
 What is man that thou shouldest think of him, 5
 Or one of earth's race that thou shouldest befriend him?
 Thou madest him scarce less than the divine ones, 6
 10 With glory and with state didst thou crown him;
 Thou madest him to rule over the works of thy hands, 7
 Thou didst place [them] all under his feet.
 Sheep, and oxen, and camels, 8
 Also the beasts that rove,
 The birds of the sky, and the fishes 9
 Which traverse ocean-paths.⁴

¹ Yahwè. ² In all the earth. ³ Because of thy foes.

⁴ Yahwè our Lord! how glorious is thy name in all the earth.

1-4. The first stanza in the received text is very incoherent and obscure. In the corrected text the psalmist glorifies Yahwè, Lord of Israel and of all nations, for the wonders of the nightly sky, with a reference (as Duhm, independently of the present writer, has seen) to the destruction of the dragon (see on lxxiv. 14, lxxxix. 11, and 'Dragon,' in *Enc. Brit.*), which was followed, according to the traditional creation story, by the production of heaven:—'He smote her as a . . . | into two parts; || one half he took, | he made it heaven's arch.' Compare *l.* 3 with *Isa.* li. 9. Another parallelism between *l.* 4 and *xliv.* 17, which has led Merx (in the *Chwolson Festschrift*) to make the Psalm Maccabæan, will not bear a close examination, text and date of *xliv.* 17 being in dispute.

1. **Our Lord.** A synonym for Yahwè in *Neh.* viii. 10, x. 30, *Psalm* cxxxv. 5, *cxlvii.* 5.—**אַדִּיר**; cp. on *xciii.* 4.—*Thy name*, i.e. thy manifestation of thyself (see on *liv.* 3); or, thy monument (*Isa.* lv. 13). The poet suggests a connexion between **שָׁם** and **שָׁמַיִם**.

5. **Thy fingers.** The old mythologic habit of mind revived in these later poets (cp. *l.* 12, *xix.* 2, *cii.* 26).

7 f. Cp. *cxliv.* 3, but *not* *Job* vii. 17 f., which is no 'despairing parody' of a psalm, **וּתְפַקְדֵנוּ** in *Job* being incorrect (see on *xvii.* 3). Notice that the human species is first mentioned;

then the individual man. So in *Gen.* i. 26 the creation of man as a race is first spoken of; then that of the first human pair. **תְּפַקְדֵנוּ**; cp. **פְּקָדָה**, *Job* x. 12, of divine providence.

9. **מִיעוֹט מֵאלֹהִים.** Our learned Milton renders, 'scarce to be less than gods;' cp. *Gen.* i. 27, **בְּצַלֵּם אֱלֹהִים** 'in the image of gods.' Ewald (at first), 'little less than God' (so *Hi.*, *De.*, *Bä.*, after *AΣΘ*); but as God to our psalmist is Yahwè, and is the Being addressed, this is unsuitable. Ewald's later rendering (*Lehre der Bibel von Gott*, iii. b, 100, n. 2) was 'than (high) angels' (cp. *G.*), which paraphrases too much. To the Hebrew consciousness there was no unseemliness in calling the heavenly beings **בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים** (see on *Job* ii. 1) or **אֱלֹהִים** (see *lxxxii.* 1?), not merely because they were the 'interpreters and executors of the divine will' (Ew.), but because Yahwè and those who composed his court belonged to the same class of superhuman beings (*ēlōhīm*). *G.*'s rendering *παρ' ἀγγέλους* is but an evidence of the angelological tendency of the later Jews (cp. *G.*, *xcvii.* 7, *cxviii.* 1, *Isa.* ix. 5, *Job* xx. 15).

10. **Glory and state, כְּבוֹד** and **הֹדָר**, are special attributes of Yahwè (*xxix.* 1, 4, *civ.* 1, *cxlv.* 5).

13. **And camels.** Cp. *Gen.* xii. 16, *Ex.* ix. 3, *1 Chron.* xii. 40.

Critical notes. 1. Omit **יהוה** and **בְּכֹל־הָאָרֶץ** (amplifying glosses).

2. **מִי אֲשֶׁר־תָּנָה הוֹדָה עַל־הַשׁ.** **אֲשֶׁר**, as often, was put in by an editor to patch up a connexion. **תָּנָה** is plainly corrupt. Ingenuity is of no avail; **נָתַן** is not the right verb, and the root **תָּנָה** 'to celebrate,' is not secure. *G.*'s *ἐπιψθθη* suggests **נִעְלָה** (cp. *xlvii.* 9), but looks too much like a guess. Buhl (*Ges. HWB* (13)) suggests **נָטָה**. The writer proposes, **נָטִיתָ כְּאֵהָל הַשׁ** (cp. *Isa.* xl. 22). This suits the context, and the faults presupposed in MT are agreeable to analogy. **עַל־** before **הַשׁ** in MT is due to a dittographed **הַל** (perhaps a fragment of a correction).

3f. For Hal.'s view of v. 3 see on vii. 8.—**מִיָּפִי עֹלָלִים** ¹ **וְיֹונָקִים** **עָזוּ יִפְדָּתָ עֵזוּ** (note *Pasek*). The first difficulty in M arises out of the preposition; 'to found out of' is not a regular idiom, nor is it any gain to read

with Merx, יִסְרַתָּ עוֹ, 'thou hast chastised obstinacy' (cp. Dan. viii. 23). The next is the want of a natural connexion both between *l.* 3 and *l.* 4, and between both lines and the context. Apart from this, 'infants and sucklings' might no doubt be a figurative expression for humble-minded Jewish believers (cp. cxxxi. 2, M; see note in 1st ed., and *Aids to Criticism*, 234). Read probably עוֹ לְבַשְׁתָּ עוֹ (an allusion to Isa. li. 9). Omit וּמִתְנַקֵּם as a miswritten וּמִתְנַקֵּם (ditto-graphed), and לִמְעַן צוֹרְרִיד as a gloss.—M וּמִתְנַקֵּם. But surely vindictiveness is not a sin to a Semite. Read וּמִתְקוֹלִים (xvii. 7, lix. 2, Job xxvii. 7, &c.), with Nestle (*Marginalien*, 34, not mentioned by Duhm). Nah. i. 9 (G) shows how easily קוֹם and נָקַם could be confounded. Cp. Cornill on Ezek. xxv. 12-14. See on xlix. 17.

5. M inserts שְׂמִיךְ, a corruption of מִעֲשִׂיךְ (written in error and left). G corrects into שְׂמִיךְ. Smend reads שְׂמִיךְ, but metre opposes.

12 f. M כָּל. Read כָּלָם (Bi.^o). See next note.—M כָּלָם וְאֵלִפִים כָּלָם. The form כָּלָם is improbable, and כָּלָם is weak. Read כָּלָם וְאֵלִפִים כָּלָם. (Herz אֵלִפִי כִבְלָה 'domestic cattle.')

15 f. M וּדְגֵי הַיָּם עֵבֶר. וּדְגֵי הַיָּם עֵבֶר is too isolated. Read וּדְגֵי הַיָּם עֵבֶר; G τὰ διαπορευόμενα.—The repetition of *v.* 1 at the end is to make up for the lost second part of the psalm.

PSALMS IX. AND X.

PARTLY trimeters, partly tetrameters, indicating either the imperfect skill of the psalmist in the management of his metre, or the interference of a second writer with the original poem. The second hypothesis is the more probable. Originally the poem was, no doubt, a perfect alphabetical psalm, at least so far as relates to the consistency of the metre and the number of stanzas. A later writer however, broke it into two parts, which became independent psalms through the insertion of what now forms ix. 20 f. (notice 'Selah,' = 'for supplementing,' after *v.* 21). Possibly an earlier and more gifted editor allowed himself still greater freedom, altering and partly rewriting certain stanzas. The only fairly well connected portion of the original psalm which we can with probability point to is *v.* 2-13 (*ll.* 1-24). Here there is complete unity of situation and probably consistency of metre (trimeters). The pious community sings praise to Yahwè for his overthrow of Israel's enemies, and calls upon its several members to make known his exploits. The **ד** stanza, it is true, has perished; we may venture, however, to assume that it only gave a further development to the ideas of the **ג** stanza, for there seems to be a designed contrast between אָבַד in *l.* 12 and יֵשֵׁב in *l.* 13. The **ט** stanza presupposes the same situation as the stanzas **א** to **ז**. But it consists of tetrameters, and is preceded by another stanza (**ח**) also in tetrameters, which implies that the speaker cannot at present sing Yahwè's praises because he has sunk down to the gates of Deathland, and can only cry for pity. The **י** stanza (tetrameters) predicts a reversal of the fates of the wicked and the suffering righteous respectively. The **י** stanza, which (according to the present restoration of the text precedes the **כ** stanza) begins with a

complaint of Yahwè's inactivity, and passes into a description of the conduct of the wicked : both this and the \beth stanza consist of tetrameters. The stanzas \beth to \aleph (\beth and \daleth are wanting) continue the description of the wicked, who in *ll.* 53, 55, 59 appear as the Jerahmeelites or Arabians.

At first we have chiefly tetrameters ; then trimeters (*ll.* 51—58). The \aleph , \beth , and \daleth stanzas consist of tetrameters ; the speaker pleads with Yahwè to interpose for the pious. The ψ stanza however, consists of trimeters. It opens with a prayer to Yahwè to break the power of the tyrant, and concludes with an anticipative exclamation on Yahwè's assumption of his royalty and the destruction of the wicked.

It would seem, then, that two or three hands have been concerned in producing the present Ps. ix.-x. We must not, however, exaggerate the inconsistencies of the psalm. Critics seem to have done this through not having recognized that \aleph in ix. 6, 16, 18, 20 f., x. 16 is corrupt. The same enemies are spoken of throughout ; they are rich men, and nominal believers in God ; we cannot venture to say that they are exclusively Jews, but Jews are certainly prominent among them (see on *l.* 33). And though the tone of the stanzas \beth to \daleth is on the whole much more subdued than that of the stanzas \aleph to \beth , yet the \daleth stanza is certainly as depressed in tone as any of the later stanzas, and the second part of the ψ stanza is as idealistic as any of the earlier stanzas. There is indeed no absolute inconsistency between the triumphant and the complaining parts of the psalm. The triumphant parts simply bear witness to the strength of Jewish faith. The perfects in the Hebrew are either 'prophetic' or, as perhaps \aleph in *l.* 72, 'precative.' The destruction of the enemies of Israel is really still future ; it will not become a fact before the Messianic age. Faith regards the advent of Yahwè as so sure that it can truthfully speak of it as past. Still, the sufferings of true Israelites are great, and almost crushing ; the tone of triumph may therefore quite naturally give place after a time to that of longing. The psalm may indeed be composite, but the writer who (putting aside corruptions) brought it into its present form, was probably not conscious of producing inconsistencies thereby. Note the points of contact in ix. 18, x. 6, with *l.* 22, xviii. 37. These and similar phenomena (see notes) make an early date impossible. The enemies are the Jerahmeelites or Arabians, and the psalm is presumably, like so many of the parallel psalms, of the late Persian period. The judgment referred to is of course the Messianic. The extirpation of the Arabian invaders and oppressors was a necessary feature of it (cp. Joel iii. [iv.]). Other views, such as Halévy's (*REJ*, janv.-mars, 1891 ; last years of Exile) and Beer's (p. lxxii. ; after fall of Persian empire), have an insufficient basis, and imply that \aleph is correct. On the critical difficulties of the psalm cp. Bickell (*Carm. I. T. metrice*, 1882, pp. 4-6) ; T. K. Abbott (*Hermathena*, 1899, 21 ff.) ; Grimme (*ZDMG*, l., 569 ff.) ; Ro-senthal (*Z.ATW*, 1896, p. 40) ; Staerk (*St. u. Kr.*, 1897, 468 ff.).

Deposited. Of the sons of Salmah. Marked: Of Arab-ethan. 1

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | \aleph Heartily do I thank thee, O Yahwè, | 2 |
| | I will tell out all thy wonders ; | |
| | I will rejoice and triumph because of thee, | 3 |
| | I will chant hymns to thy name for ever. | |
| | \beth Because mine enemies, turning to flee, | 4 |
| | Have stumbled and perished at thine +angry+ coun-
tenance ; | |
| | Yea, thou hast established my right and my claim, | 5 |
| | Thou hast sat on the tribunal of justice. | |

- 1 Thou hast quelled the traitors, and hast destroyed them, 6
 10 The wicked thou hast wiped out for ever ;
 Their castles are deserted for aye, 7
 They have disappeared, their name has vanished.¹
- 7 He himself will abide for ever ; 8
 He has set up his throne for judgment :
 The world he will judge with righteousness, 9
 To the peoples he will give sentence with justice,
- 1 So that for the crushed he is a sure retreat, 10
 Proved as a helper in trouble ;
 So that those that know thy name trust in thee, 11
 20 For those that seek thee, O Yahwè, thou forsakest
 not.
- 1 Chant hymns to the +king+ enthroned in Zion, 12
 Declare his exploits among the peoples,—
 For the distress of the orphans he remembers, 13
 He forgets not the cry of the sufferers.
- 7 Pity me, O Yahwè ; behold my suffering ; 14
 From the gates of Deathland mayest thou lift me up ;
 That I may recount all thy famous deeds, 15
 That in the gates of Zion's people I may triumph at thy
 succour.
- 20 The traitors are sunk in the pit which they made, 16
 30 In the net which they hid their own feet have been
 caught.
 Yahwè makes himself known ; he has established the
 right, 17
 In his own hands' work the wicked has been snared.
- 1 The wicked will turn to flee and will stumble— 18
 All the traitors that deny God.
 For not alway will the needy be forgotten, 19
 The sufferers' hope will not be lost for ever.²

¹ The 7 stanza is wanting.

² Arise, O Yahwè, let not him that hates me triumph : 20
 Let the traitors be judged before thee.
 Set a watch over them, O Yahwè ; 21
 Let the traitors learn that they are but men. *Supplement.*

- 5 Why standest thou afar off, O Yahwè, x. 1
 Hiding thine eyes at the cry of thy servant ?
 In his pride the wicked crushes the sufferer ; 2
- 40 Let them be caught +themselves+ in the plots they
 have devised !
- 3 For the wicked boasts of his gratified desire, 3
 Triumphant in his glory he blasphemes Yahwè :
 [He has said in his heart,] 'God does not examine,' 4
 All his designs are only for doing evil.
- 5 Fierce are his purposes to defy thee, 5
 His course he makes to prosper by insults :
 He has said in his heart, 'I cannot be shaken ; 6
 Mine ancles will not fail.'¹
- 7 His mouth is full of +words of+ trickery ; 7
 50 +Stored+ under his tongue are +words of+ mischief and
 trouble :
 In the wilderness he destroys the righteous, 8
 On the highways he slays the innocent.
- 9 Jerahmeel watches the sufferer,
 As a lion in the thicket he lurks ; 9
 The Arabian catches the sufferer,
 And the crushed one falls into his toils. 10
- 3 * * * * *
 * * * * *
- Jerahmeel says, 'God has forgotten ; 10 (end), 11
 60 He has hidden his face ; he cannot see it.'²
- 12 Arise, O Yahwè ! neglect not the crushed one, 12
 Forget not [the sighing] of the sufferers !
 Why does the wicked blaspheme Yahwè ? 13
 +Why+ says he in his heart, 'Thou dost not examine' ?
- 14 Thou hast seen misery and vexation, 14
 Thou hast heard the desire of the crushed one,
 [When] Jerahmeel terrifies the orphan,
 Thou provest thyself his helper.

¹ The 3 and 4 stanzas are wanting.² For ever.

- ו Break thou the arm of the terrible, 15
 70 Examine the injustice of the oppressors.
 Yahwè is king for ever and ever ; 16
 The traitors have perished from his land.
 ת The desire of the sufferers thou hearest, O Yahwè, 17
 To the musing of their heart thine ear is attentive !
 [Awake] to right the orphan and the crushed ! 18
 Let not the blasphemers still continue to triumph !

9. **The traitors**, i. e. 'apostates,' בְּנֵי־מִצְרַיִם. So in *Ps.* 18, 21, x. 16, and, in *M.* xxv. 3, lix. 6, cxix. 158 ; cp. *Jer.* xii. 1, *Prov.* ii. 22 &c. A regular parallel to רְשָׁעִים. The term applies primarily to Jews, but in a large sense also to non-Jews, Yahwè being *de jure* king of all nations. Cp. on *Isa.* xxiv. 5.—11. *Their castles*. The poet might conceivably mean those of Babylon or of Susa; but, having the key in our hands, we cannot doubt that he means one of the capitals of the Arabian peoples, i. e. the Jerahmeelites, Mišrites, Edomites. Cp. xlix. 12, lxi. 26, and note reference to the 'castles' of Miššur (מִצְרַיִם) instead of צִר) and Edom in *Am.* i. 10, 12, and to the 'castle (or citadel) of foreigners' in *Isa.* xxv. 2, where the context (*Ps.* 10, reading מִצְרַיִם for מִצְרַיִם) shows that the city which has been destroyed is the capital of Mišrim.—13—16. Cp. cii. 26 f., vii. 8, xcvi. 13, xcvi. 9.

22 ff. Cp. xvi. 3, 10, cv. 1, *Isa.* xii. 4.—*The orphans*, i. e. the Jews. Cp. x. 14, 18, lxxviii. 6, xciv. 6, cxlvi. 9.—*The sufferers*, עֲנָיִים (כְּר. עֲנָיִים). A standing term, not for the Levites (as *Gr.* strangely supposes), but for those strict servants of Yahwè who considered themselves to represent the true Israel, and who felt the consequences of Israel's subjection to foreigners more acutely than their neighbours. Hence they are sometimes distinguished from the mass of Israelites. Between עֲנָיִים and עֲנָיִים

there is no clearly marked difference in usage; *Kt.* and *Kr.* sometimes vary (as here, and in *ver.* 19, x. 12). The former, however, ought properly to mean 'one who is bowed down,' the latter, 'one who bows down.' The word 'sufferer' does for both words according to English literary usage.¹ Cp. *Rahlf's, עני und ענו in den Psalmen* ('92); *Cheyne, Jew. Rel. Life*, 115—124; *Ryle and James, Psalms of the Pharisees*, index, s.v. πτωχός.

26. **The gates of Deathland** (i. e. of Sheol, vi. 6). So cvii. 18; *Isa.* xxxviii. 10. The Assyrian city of Death had seven walls and gates (cp. *Mt.* xvi. 18).

29 f. **Pit, net**, figures for well-devised plots (cp. vii. 16, x. 9, xxv. 15, xxxv. 7 f., lvii. 7). The great plot of the enemies of the Jewish people and religion is that described in lxxxiii. 5. The retribution would be destruction by divine judgment (cp. *Jer.* l. 24, *Ezek.* xii. 13, xvii. 20). Cp. *Ašurbanipal's* phraseology (*KB*, ii. 190 f.), 'the net of the great gods, my lords, from which there is no escape.'

33 *M.* has, 'the wicked shall return to Sheol,' i. e. to a state of nothingness; or, as most, 'shall depart to Sheol.' In the latter case, *Job* xxx. 23 is compared. But both places need to be corrected.

In *Job*, *Duhm* corrects תִּשְׁבְּבֵנִי (from יִשָּׁב). The psalmist, too, must have used a much more impassioned language. See *crit. note.*—*That deny God*; same phrase in *Mix.* 14, l. 23 (אלורה).

¹ The best of men
 That e'er wore earth about Him was a sufferer,
 A soft, meek, patient, humble, tranquil spirit.

To blaspheme God (x. 3 f.) = to deny Him. It is most natural to suppose that here, as in l. 23, the offenders spoken of are of Jewish birth. The two passages which might be quoted in favour of a reference to the heathen (xxii. 28, xciv. 10) are both certainly corrupt.

Insertion (ver. 20. 21). *Set a watch*. The traitors are to be confined, like the mythical dragon (Job vii. 12).

39. **The wicked**, a collective term (see l. 40). Lines 41 ff. give an ideal type of the wicked man which reminds us of Ps. lii. Deceit, violence, boastfulness characterize him.

42 ff. **Glorify**, i.e. riches (xlix. 17 f.). —*Blasphemes Yahwè*, viz. as a god who either cannot or will not protect his servants.—*Does not examine*, with a view to requiring satisfaction; cp. ll. 64, 70 בַּל לֹא; for other instances, see Kôn., *Styl.* 279 (l. 29).

45 f. He disbelieves in God's judicial activity because no signs of it are within his horizon. Cp. Job xxiii. 13 f., xxiv. 1. He appears to prosper by the *insults* which he lavishes on Yahwè and his servants.

48. From xviii. 37. The improbable expression, 'To all generations I shall not be in adversity' (RV), disappears; see crit. n.

51. The senseless reference to the 'villages' disappears; see crit. n.—54. Cp. xvii. 12.

70. **Examine into**, i.e. punish; see on l. 43. Street, 'punish the impious' (תַּדְרוֹשׁ רָשָׁע וּבָל). See crit. n.—72. *Have perished*, or 'shall perish' (perf. prec., see Kôn., *Synt.* 72; cp. introd.).—*His land*. Not as if limiting the divine sovereignty. Yahwè is the judge of the world (ix. 9), and yet his throne is in Zion, and Israel is 'his own possession' (cxxxv. 4). So 'my land,' Joel iii. 2. No one polluted by 'wickedness,' and animated by that fierce hatred to Israel and its Law which possesses idolaters, can in the future exist there (Nah. i. 15; Isa. lii. 1). A psalmist (civ. 35) goes beyond this, and longs for a time when the whole earth shall cease to be marred by the presence of the 'wicked.'

Critical Notes. 1. Read אֲנִי (G, Bi.).—4. M יִעָלוּ. Read עֲלוּם [לְ]. Cp. on vii. 18.

8. Omit שׁוֹפֵט, a corruption of a dittographed יִשְׁבֵּת. So metre is restored.

9 f. M גְּנִים. Read בְּגָדִים. Same confusion in ll. 29, 34, 72, lix. 6, &c.—M אֲבָרַת רָשָׁע שָׁמַיִם. To restore symmetry, read אֲבָרַתָּם (end of l. 9), and continue רָשָׁעִים כָּהֵיטָ לְעוֹלָם. שָׁמַיִם is produced by dittography.

11. M נִעְזְבוּ אֲרַמְנוֹתֵיהֶם. וְעַד: הָאֹיֵב! תִּמְנֵן הַרְבוֹת. נִעְזְבוּ אֲרַמְנוֹתֵיהֶם perhaps becomes אֲרַמְנוֹתֵיהֶם again in Job iii. 14b (OL). Note Pasek.

12. M presents אֲרַמְנוֹתֵיהֶם again under the disguise of עֲרִים נֹתֵן. Omitting this, read נִשְׁבַּתִּי אֲבַד זְכָרִי. On G and T, cp. Dr. J. Taylor, *Exp. T.*, v. 131.

13, 15. M's וַיְהוּהוּ seems to be an expansion of הוּהוּ, which word replace from ver. 9a. In l. 15 read וַיִּשְׁפֹּט.

17 f. M דָּדָה: so x. 18, lxxiv. 21. Read נִדְבָה. See on l. 53. G here τῶ πέντητι, but elsewhere ταπεινωθῶ, ταταπεινωμένος.—M כִּישָׁב לְעֵתוֹת בְּצָרָה. The repetition of כִּישָׁב is improbable; experience leads one to doubt whether the same word was repeated in the second line of a distich as

often as the received text represents. 'לע' בצ', also in *l.* 38 (x. 1); the fem. plur. is incorrect (see on xxxi. 16). Evidently הַ— and ות should change places. Read לעזרת בצרה; Gr. less probably לעזרה בצרות. משגב remains to be corrected. Gr. errs in not taking suggestion enough from xlv. 2. Read נמצא, which of course ought to precede 'לע' ב'; the scribe transposed, as a consequence of the corruption משגב.

23. M פִּי־דַרְשׁ דְּמִים אוֹתָם זָכַר is obviously wrong; some one has proposed יִתּוֹם. Parallelism requires פִּי־שֹׁבֵר יִתּוֹמִים זָכַר.

27. Read, with Kt. and Vss., תְּהַלֵּתֶיךָ; see lxxviii. 4.

32. Point נִנְקַשׁ with G S 'A T J, Ew., Ol., Bö., Bā., We., Du. See on xxxviii. 13.—M appends סֵלָה הַגִּיּוֹן סֵלָה. But see on *l.* 74.

33. M's לִשְׂאוּלָה is unique in the O.T., and the sense is unsatisfactory (see note above). Read יִשׁוּבוּ אַחֲרֵי רַשָּׁעִים וַיִּבְשְׁלוּ; see *l.* 6.

Insertion after l. 36. M אֶל־יַעֲלֹז שׁוֹנְאֵי. Read אֶל־יַעֲוֶה אֲנֹשׁ (see on lii. 9, and cf. *l.* 76 and xciv. 3).—מִוְרָה may be either מוֹרָה or מוֹרָה. מוֹרָה (cf. *d*) is adopted by G S. That Yahwè is often described as a Teacher is certain (see on xciv. 10). But how can Yahwè set or appoint himself as a teacher? מוֹרָה is the reading of M 'A Θ E' J T; it is taken as = מוֹרָא 'terror.' But this is arbitrary, and the sense obtained is weak. Read either שְׂמוֹרָה (see on xxxi. 2) or מוֹשְׁמָר, and for להם read עֲלֵיהֶם. See note above.

38 f. M תַּעֲלִים לְעֵתוֹת בְּצָרָה. Cf. on *l.* 8. Read [עֵינֶיךָ] תַּעֲלִים בְּנִיאוֹת רָשָׁע. Cf. Lam. iii. 56. Houb., תַּעֲלִים.—M בְּנִיאוֹת רָשָׁע. Cf. Lam. iii. 56. Houb., תַּעֲלִים.—M בְּנִיאוֹת רָשָׁע יִדְלַק עֵנִי. But 'pursues the poor' does not go well with 'in pride.' The verb must be wrong. Read בְּנִיאוֹתוֹ רָשָׁע יִדְבָּא, and see on *l.* 43. The 'crushed' are again and again referred to (see on *ll.* 53, 61).

41. M הִלֵּל. Read יְהַלֵּל (Gr.); cf. cvi. 5. G ἐπαινεῖται.

42. Some find here the juxtaposition of two readings, בָּרַךְ and נֵאִין, the former a euphemism¹ for the latter. So Geiger (*Urschr.*, 269), and after him Merx, Bi., Buhl (*Luthardt's Zt. f. Kirchl. Wiss.*, '81, 229). But בָּרַךְ is really a mutilation either of בְּקָרְבוֹ or (which I prefer, cf. xlix. 17 f.) בְּכַבְדּוֹ. וּבִצְעַ is also corrupt; a reference to unjust gain specializes too much. What was it corrupted from? It is hard to say. יְהַלֵּל suggests מִשְׁתַּבַּח, indistinct fragments of which might be delicately combined into וּבִצְעַ. All runs smoothly now, but certainty is wanting.

¹ See Geiger, *l.c.*; Beer, *Text des B. Hebr.*, 3.

43 f. M פְּנֵיבָה אִפּוֹ. An unparalleled phrase. Read certainly בְּגִּיּוֹתָו. 'רָשַׁע בִּג' is a marginal correction of בְּגִיּוֹת רָשַׁע in *l.* 39, which has intruded into the text at this point and supplanted אָמַר בְּלִבּוֹ (cf. *l.* 64).—M אין אלהים, which is attached to כָּל מִן. The construction is most improbable. אלהים, it seems to me, does double duty. It is (1) the object of יִדְרֵשׁ, from which it is now wrongly separated, and (2) it represents quite another word, which it somewhat resembles, and has supplanted. Read בְּלִי־יִדְרֵשׁ אֱלֹהִים אֵף לְהִרְעֵ כָּל מִן (אֵף and אֵף were easily confounded). G, however, followed by Abbott, attaches 'נֵאִין to *v.* 4.

45 f. M כִּירוֹם כִּשְׁפֹטִיךְ כִּינְגָדוֹ. Gr.'s כִּי־רָם and Grimme's מִרִים (suggested by G's *ἀνταυπεῖται*, and the ἤρται of another vers.) are insufficient (Abbott סָרוּ). Analogy may here be an imperfect guide; what it suggests is כִּי־רָם מִחֲשַׁבְתִּי לְנִגְדוֹ.—Line 2 (misplaced) appears in two forms in M: כִּי־יָלוּ דְרָכּוֹ בְּכָל־עֵת and כָּל־צִוְרֵי־יָפִיחַ בָּהֶם. In the latter, כָּל־צִוְרֵי = יִצְלִיחַ, and this is the true original of יָחִילוּ (cp. T's מִצְלָחִין for יָחִילוּ, as We., and virtually Lag., Gr., Merx, Sievers hold. Cp. xxxvii. 7. [Hal. reads יִשְׁכִּילוּ.] רִיִּו is a fragment of דְּרָכּוֹ בָּהֶם. דְּרָכּוֹ בָּהֶם seems to be a corruption of בְּחַרְפּוֹת; בְּכָל־עֵת, of בְּכָל־מַת. We can choose between these two readings. The result is [בַּח] יִצְלִיחַ דְּרָכּוֹ בְּכָל־מַת. The difficulties of the interpreters sufficiently prove the extreme doubtfulness of M's text. It is needless to recount these. Ley points out the metrical improbability of the weak בָּהֶם at the end of the line (*Leitfaden*, 36). Cp. ii. 3; xix. 5 is no evidence to the contrary.

48. Read וְלֹא יִכְעַדוּ קָרְסָלֵי (cp. xviii. 37^b, xxx. 8 corr. text). Out of לְדוֹר וְדוֹר קָרְסָלֵי written twice over has produced אֵשׁ לֹא בָרַע אֱלֹהִים. This seems to be the whole secret of the troublesome passage. Gr.'s אֲשָׁרֵי was a step in the right direction.

49. M's אֱלֹהִים (with Pasek) is accounted for above.—Read מִרְכּוֹת and omit וְתַךְ; תַּךְ is a dittogram of תַּח.

51 f. M בְּמִצְרַיִם אֲשָׁר יֹשֵׁב. Every single word is strange. Lag. (*Agathangelus*) and independently Herz suggest רִצְחֵי. The former corrects G thus, ἐγκάθηται ἐνεδρεύματι πλυσίων (רִצְחֵי). But 'in a lurking-place of murderers' is very odd, and אֲרַב is superabundantly represented. Read probably יִשָּׁר בְּמִדְבָּר צְדִיקִים (cp. Jer. iii. 2).—For מִסְתַּרִים read בְּמִסְתָּלוֹת. It now becomes needless to read לְהִרְגַּן (G S J, Gr., Bā.).

53. Here we first meet with the strange word חִיִּיכָה, pointed as if 'thy host'; in *v.* 14 (*l.* 67), חִיִּיכָה in pause (!); in *v.* 10 (*l.* 59) plur. חִיִּיכָה, but Kt. חִיִּיכָה, i.e. 'a host of downcast ones' (חִיִּיכָה). Since Schultens (*Opera minora*, 182 f.), most have assumed a word חִיִּיכָה

(Ew.) or **הַלְּבָה** (Kön. ii. 1, 118), 'dark,' 'unfortunate'; see *BDB*. One might also suppose **הַכְּלָה**; cp. **הַכְּלִילִי** and Ass. *akkulu*, 'troubled' (root-idea, darkness), *ikkillu*, 'lamentation.' As if the psalmist had not words enough for 'miserable' without hunting up a very obscure one, not to be found even in Job! 'A strange and as yet unexplained word,' says Wellh. But we have the key to it, knowing who were the chief oppressors of the Jews in Palestine after the fall of the Jewish state. Read **יִרְחַמְאֵל**; cp. the error in v. 5 (*l.* 4). G guesses, *εἰς τὸν πέννητα* (here); *τῶν πέννητων* (*v.* 10); *ὁ πτωχός* (*v.* 14), as if **דָּלִים, דְּלִים, אַבְיוֹן**. This involves reading **עֵינַיִם יִרְחַמְאֵל יִצְפֶּה**. In fact, M's phrase **עֵינַיִם יִצְפֶּה** is very questionable. Most justify it by Prov. i. 11, 18, but **צָפוּ** there means 'to lie in wait,' which is unsuitable here. Hence Ol., Gr., Hal., Herz suppose the root **צָפֶה** 'to watch' (cp. I E *ad loc.*), reading **יִצְפֶּיךָ**, or the like; cp. xxxvii. 32. G *ἀποβλέπουσι*. Most probably we should read **עֵינַיִם יִרְחַמְאֵל יִצְפֶּה**. The corruption of 'יר' into a supposed adjective **הַלְּכָה** involved the misreadings **עֵינַיִם** and **יִצְפֶּיךָ** (of which **יִצְפֶּנוּ** is a corruption).

54. M **בְּסִטְבָּה**; J, Ol., Bā. **בְּסִטְבָּה**. Read **בְּסִטְבָּה** (Lag., We., Ginsb.); cp. Jer. iv. 7. G in both passages *μάνδρα*. **בְּמִסְתֵּר** (with Pasek) is dittographic.

55. **יָרַב**, repeated, is hardly right. Read **יִרְחַמְאֵל**, **עֵרְבִי**; **יִרְחַמְאֵל** is dittographic.

56. Dittography again. **בְּמִשְׁכּוֹ** and **בְּמִשְׁכּוֹ** (where ר is an imperfect ק) both come from **בְּמִשְׁכְּתוֹ**. **בְּעֵצוֹמַיִם** (עֵצוֹמַיִם, a dual, = claws, Ew. Ol.!) seems to be a corruption of the other plur. form **בְּמִשְׁכְּשׁוֹ**, and **יִשָּׁה** a corrupt fragment of this word. Next we have to explain Kt. **וְדָכָה** or **וְדָכָה**; Σ *ὁ δὲ θλασθεῖς*; J *et confractum* (so 'A S). K̄r., however (and some MSS. and edd.) **וְדָכָה**. G *ταπεινώσει αὐτόν*; T **וְדָכָה** = **וְדָכָה** (in fact, **דָּכָה** in K̄al is not used). Presuming this to be *l.* 1 of the **צ** stanza, Grimme would read **צָדִיק נָדָּח** (Abbott **צָדִיק נָדָּח**). But dittography and corruption have to be allowed for. Accepting Grimme's **נָדָּח** let us read, as *l.* 56, **וּבְמִשְׁכְּתוֹ נָדָּח נָפֵל**.

59 (Lines 57 f. are lost). That the original of **יִרְחַמְאֵל** is sufficiently clear (compare **כ** and **כִּי** in various forms of writing). Omit **בְּלָבוֹ**, perhaps an editorial adjustment of a dittographed fragment of **יִרְחַמְאֵל**, of which **כָּלֵב** (Caleb) may be also a corruption.

61 f. M **יִרְחַמְאֵל**; but some MSS. and edd. **יִרְחַמְאֵל** directly after **יְהוָה**? (see on iv. 7)? Read, almost as v. Ortenberg (*Textkritik*, 1 ff.), **יִרְחַמְאֵל יִצְפֶּה**; cp. Di. and Dr. on Dt. xxxii. 18 (**תָּשִׁי**). Insert **אֲנַחַת** (metre). Cp. *l.* 65.

63. Read **יִנְאֵץ** (note Pasek).

65—69. Note the three Pasesks. Lines 65 f. have been mixed up. *תביט לתת בידך* (verss. *כי אתה* [ש] *מעֲתָה*). For *תביט לתת בידך* (verss. *כי אתה* [ש] *מעֲתָה*), we should read *לְתַאֲבֵת נִדְכָה (שְׁמַעְתָּה)*. *לְתַאֲבֵת* must be taken together, as = *לתאבת*, a correction of *תביט* = *תאבת*. 'To lay (it) in thy hand' (M) is very odd. Duthe compares Isa. xlix. 16!

67 f. M *עֲלִיד יַעֲוֹב חִלְכָה*, by an ellipsis of *דָּבָרוּ* 'his cause' (Ol.). But there is corruption. *חלכה* and *עליד* represent a dittographed *ירחמאל*. *יתום* is metrically superfluous in *l.* 68. Read therefore *פִּי יַעֲרֹץ יִרְחַמְאֵל יְתוּם*, and continue, *אֲתָהּ הָיִיתָ אֲזָרוּ* (*אָזָרוּ* with We., Du.).

69—72. For *רָשַׁע* read *עָרִיץ*. Omit *ורע* (from dittographed *זרוע*?). For *רָשַׁעוּ בְּלִתְמַצָּא* read *עוֹל חֲמִצִּים*. *רש* is simply dittographed. Gr., Du. follow G, pointing M's verbs as passives; We. reads *אֶל־תִּשָּׂא*. But no doubt seems to be possible. For *נֹיִם* read *בְּנִדְרִים* (see on *l.* 9).

74. M *תִּכְוֵן לְבָם*; vague, and against parallelism. Hi., We., Du., *לְבָבָךְ*, i.e. 'thou settest thy mind to judge,' &c. But is this natural? G rightly sees that *תכין* must represent a noun, but *ἑτοιμασίαν* (*תְּכִוּנָה*) does not help us. Read *הַגִּיזוֹן* (xix. 15). Strangely enough, the marginal correction *לבם הגיון* passed into the text at a most unsuitable point, and became *סֵלָה הַגִּיזוֹן* (ix. 17; cp. on *l.* 32).

75 f. Prefix *עִוְרָה* (Bi.), and for *דָּךְ* read *נִדְבָה* (*l.* 17). For *לְעָרִץ* read *לְעֵלֶץ* (cp. on lii. 9), and for *כְּוִדְהָאֲרֵץ* read *כִּנְאֵץ* (cp. *l.* 13, xv. 4). Omit *אָנוּשׁ*, a corruption of *כִּנְאֵץ*. *כְּוִדְהָאֲרֵץ* springs out of a correction of *אָנוּשׁ*.

PSALM XI.

TETRAMETERS (double dimeters). Textual criticism throws a bright light on the meaning of the Psalm. The immediate occasion is the ravages of the Jerahmeelites. But the psalmist sees in these only a specimen of the perpetual strife between the evil, who have power in their hands, and the good, who are defenceless. The weak-minded among the good ask, What reward has the righteous (*l.* 6)? The psalmist meets the anxious question by pointing to the divine omniscience and the certainty of the Messianic judgment. Soon the Arabian intruders will be expelled, and the upright people will see God's face in a land entirely their own. The opening words coincide with those of Ps. vii., which, as the title probably says, has reference to hostile Jerahmeelites. The two psalms (i.e. vii.¹ and xi.) may with much profit be closely compared; e.g. the description in // 3—5 is parallel to that in vii. 13f. The discouraging words in *l.* 2 may remind us of iii. 3 and iv. 7; cp. *לִנְפֹשׁ*, xi. 1, iii. 3. The parallelism however, is perhaps imperfect; the speakers here may conceivably be despondent Jews. But the same spirit of indomitable trust which pervades Pss. iii. and iv. is plainly visible in Ps. xi. Ps. lxiv. is also parallel; we find there the same representation of the Arabians as the leaders of the band of wicked and deceitful

men—a band which by no means exclusively consists of non-Jewish members, the same figure of the arrows, and the same confident assurance of a coming retribution for the wicked. Notice in Ps. lxiv. the same designation of the righteous as **יְשֵׁרֵי לֵב**. Cp. also Ps. cxl. **בְּנֵי־אֲדָם**, as xii. 2, xiv. 2.

That the speaker is the pious community, can hardly be disputed (see Hengstenberg, and cp. Coblenz, 97 ff.). Smend indeed, following Olshausen, supposes a leader of Israel to be meant (*Rel.-gesch.*(²) 382, 457), but as in the case of Pss. iii., iv., lxii., this is quite unnecessary, and leads to inconsistencies in exegesis.

Deposited. Of 'Arab-ethan.

I

- 1 In Yahwè I take refuge ; | how can ye say to me,
 'Dread Jerahmeel | and the folk of the Arabians.
 For behold the Arabians | bend the bow, 2
 Those of Jerahmeel | aim the shaft,
 'To shoot in a place of ambush | at the upright in heart. 3
 When the wicked work ruin, | what reward has the
 righteous' ?
 Yahwè is in his holy palace, | Yahwè's throne is in heaven; 4
 His eyes keep watch, | they view the race of Edom.
 Yahwè loves the righteous, | but the wicked he hates. 5
 10 The Ishmaelites will give way, | the Maacathites, the
 Rehobothites ; 6
 A horrible blast | is the portion of Cusham.
 For Yahwè is righteous ; | righteous dealing he loves ; 7
 The upright will behold | his face for ever.

2. **Jerahmeel, Arabia.** Cp. xlv. 2, l. 15, lxxiv., l. 8.—5. *In a hiding place.* Cp. lxiv. 5.

6. **What reward, &c.** This strikes the keynote (see *Intro.*). Cp. lxxiii., cxvi.

7 ff. Cp. Ps. xiv.—10. The savage imprecation in M's text gives way to criticism. Cp. cxlii., on which ? : 12 is a commentary. The dream of pious

Israelites is the Holy Land for the Jews only.—11. *A blast of horror.* A simoom may be thus described.

13. **Will behold his face.** AV's rendering, 'His countenance doth behold the upright,' though the Vss. (except J) support it, is against usage ; see also cxl. 14. The speaker's view of the future is Messianic in the larger sense (see on xvi. 11).

Critical Notes. 2. Most moderns prefer the נַדָּה of Kt. The Vss., however, prefer נַדָּי. They also favour צִפּוֹר [בְּנֵי], whereas M has הִרְכָּבֵי צ'. 'Like a bird' (cxxiv. 7) is an obvious but a very poor correction. Israel's dispiriting advisers would not have said 'flee like a bird.' הַר and הִרְכָּב are not less unsatisfactory. מִן־הַרְחֹק (Isa. xxii. 3b) would be possible in lieu of הִרְכָּב. But we want some definite colouring, and knowing that רָקַם is a common disguise of יִרְהַמְאֵל, and that 'Jerahmeel' appears again and again in these psalms, we may safely

correct **הַרְכַּם** into **מִירַחֲמָאֵל**, combining with this **נִגְדִי** for **נִגְדִי**, and **מַיִם עֲרִיבִים** for **צַפּוֹר** (from **עֲרִיבִי**). Cp. iii. 7. [Wellh., *Skizzen*, vi. 168, defends M's text, but not plausibly.]

3 f. M **הֲרַשְׁעִים**. But historical colouring is deficient. Read **הַעֲרִיבִים** (**ב** and **ש** confounded, cp. Ezek. xxii. 25, Cornill). M **עַל־יָתֵר**. Why mention the string? Read **יִרַחֲמָאֵל** [ים].

5. For **בְּמִזְרָחֵי** ('in midnight gloom'?—xci. 6) read **בְּמִזְרָב** or **בְּמִזְרָבָא** (x. 8, corr. text). Transposition and slight corruption of letters; **ל** was dittographed. Gr., **בְּמִזְרָף**. Street (alt.), Lag. **בְּמִזְרָפֵל**.

6. M **פִּי־הַשְּׁתוֹת יִהְרָסוּן**. **שְׁתַּת** in Isa. xix. 10, is corrupt, and so is **הַשְּׁתוֹת** here. It is usual to render 'the pillars,' or 'the foundations.' What the 'pillars' are, is obscure, nor is this fresh figure in itself probable. Philologically, too, the justification of **שְׁתַּת**, plur. **שְׁתוֹת** from a supposed **שְׁתָּה** *ponere*, is weak. G S presuppose **הַשְּׁתוֹת** (*ἡ καταγρισιω*). Read certainly **פִּי־הַשְּׁחִיתוּ הַרְשָׁעִים**. M **צִדִּיק מִה־פָּעַל**. This may indeed be grammatical (Driver, *Tenses*, § 19; Müller, *Synt.*, § 31; Kön., *Synt.*, § 171c), but gives a very poor sense. Read, not **מִה יַפְעֵל** (Ol., We.; cp. on lx. 11), but **פָּעֵלֹ**. This carries us into the heart of Jewish religious problems.

8. M **עֵינָיו יִחוּזוּ עַפְעַפְיוּ יִבְחֲנוּ**. G, however, has for the first two words, *οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν πένητα ἀποβλέπουσιν. ἰ.ε.* (**לְנִדְכָה**) **עֵינָיו תַּצְפִּינָה**, where the middle word is arbitrarily and unmetrically introduced from x. 8. **עֵינָיו צ'** is certainly the right reading; **תַּצְפִּינָה** has been corrupted into **עַפְעַפְיוּ**; G's text, which was a fusion, also represents **עַפ'**, for it continues *τὰ βλέφαρα αὐτοῦ ἐξετάζει. יבחנו* (G *ἐξέτ.*) must be a corruption of **תַּחְזִינָה**; this is exactly the sort of corruption which takes place in these contexts. Thus the passage becomes **עֵינָיו תַּצְפִּינָה תַּחְזִינָה בְּנִי־אָדָם**. (Notice here that U, Syr.-hex., and Theodoret give, instead of *εἰς τὸν πέν.*, *εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην*; this, as Bā. saw, is **לַחֲלֵד**, and this, as Bā. did not see, is a corruption of **לַחֲלֵכָה** (**לְנִדְכָה**). Thus the common text of G and the text of U are based on the same Hebrew text, which contains an interpolation from x. 8).

9 f. Read **יִהְיֶה צִדִּיק אֲהַב**. The **י** in **יִבְחֲנוּ** (M G) comes from a dittographed **ו**. M's **אֲהַב חֲמוּס** (ו) is superfluous, and easily accounted for. **אֲהַב** (or **חֲבֵב**?) is properly a marginal correction of **יִבְחֲנוּ**. After this had intruded into the text, **ו** was prefixed and **חֲמוּס** attached, to make sense. G'A make **וּרְשִׁיעַ** the second accus. to **יִבְחֲנוּ**; but should not **יִבְחֲנוּ** have preceded **צִדִּיק**? Bi.⁽¹⁾ makes it do so; but the sense is still not perfect. Metre, sense, and textual criticism are only satisfied by the solution here proposed, which includes the correction of **נִפְשׁוּ** into **שָׁנָא** (**נ** and **כ** confounded).

10. M's **יִמְוֶטוּ** becomes in the || passage cxi. 11, **יִמְוֶטוּ**, *i.e.* **יִמְוֶטוּ**. The psalmist is full of the iniquity of the Jerahmeelite immigration into Palestine. **פְּחִים** can now be accounted for. Read **יִפְטוּ יִשְׁמְעֵאלִי** **וּמַעֲבֹתֵי וְרַחֲבוֹתַי**. Cp. on xviii. 49.

11. M **זִלְעָפוֹת**, certainly corrupt. Read **פְּלָצוֹת** (see cxix. 53), and continue **מִנַּת פִּי־שֶׁם** (cp. on xvi. 5a).

13. M **יִשָּׂר**. Read **יִשְׂרִים** (Bi.); cp. G *εὐθύτητας* (A^{c.3} A). — M **פְּנִימוֹ**. Has Hebrew a suffix of 3rd sing. in **ם** or **נו**? There may be no theoretic objection to it (see Ges.⁽²⁶⁾ § 103 f.; Kön. ii. 1, p. 446a). But there is perhaps no sound example of it. In **עַל־יָמוֹ**, Job xxii. 2, the **מ** is dittographic. Cp. Diehl, *Das pron. pers. suff. 2 u. 3 pers. plur.*, '95, pp. 20 f. In our passage read certainly **פְּנִי עוֹלָם**.

PSALM XII.

TETRAMETERS (double dimeters). A 'cry of the sufferers' (l. 9). The world is narrowed to Palestine, and here the speakers can see no human virtues. Fraud is the weapon with which they are attacked; their only refuge is a divine promise. In the contents of this oracle there is some affinity to Isa. xxxiii. 10. The pessimism of ll. 1, 2, reminds us of xiv. 1; the description in ll. 3—6 of v. 10; and that in ll. 7f. of lvii. 5. Note the Aramaizing **גְּבוּר** (see on l. 1f.); the strang word **זָלַת** disappears in a corrected text.

Deposited. Of the Ethanites. Marked: Of 'Arab-ethan. 1

- 1 Deliver me, O Yahwè, | for the loyal one disappears, 2
 For the sufferers perish | through the race of Edom!
 Falsely do they speak— | each one to his neighbour, 3
 With flattering lips, | with a double heart they speak.
 May Yahwè cut off | all flattering lips, 4
 And the [froward] tongue | that speaks grandly,
 Of those that say in their heart, | 'Our tongue is our sword, 5
 Our teeth are our spear; | who lords it over us?'
 [Arise, O Yahwè; | deliver, O my God,] 6
 10 For the cry of the sufferers, | for the groaning of the needy.
 'Now will I arise,' | Yahwè saith,
 'I will deliver [the upright] from the toils of the wicked.'
 Yahwè's promises | are unalloyed promises, 7
 [Like] silver well-tried, | seven times refined.
 Mayest thou, O Yahwè, preserve me, | and guard me 8
 from Jerahmeel,¹
 For the righteous one disappears | through the race of 9
 Edom!

¹ Cushites, Geshurites, Jerahmeelites.

1 f. The same circumstances (i.e. the Jerahmeelite oppression in Palestine) may possibly be referred to in Isa. lvii. 1. **חֶסֶד** and **עֵנִי** are regular parallels. **נָנִיר** intrans., so lxxvii. 9, but probably not vii. 10 (*q.v.*). **תִּנְנִיר** in Sirach xliii. 4 ϵ is difficult and suspicious.

4. **With a double heart.** See on xv. 2 (*l.* 4).—7 f. Cp. lvii. 5.

11. The Psalmist falls into the tone of prophecy ('**עֵתָה אֲקוּם יְאֹנָר** ') occurs in Isa. xxxiii. 10). The community, not any chosen individual, is

now the depository of the divine Spirit (cp. on Isa. lxiii. 11).

13. **Unalloyed**, *i.e.* with no admixture of falsehood; contrast **כֶּסֶף נְכוּס**, Jer. vi. 30. Similar references to the promises (**אִמְרוֹת**, G *λογία*) of Yahwè occurs elsewhere; see e.g. xviii. 31, xix. 10 (corr. text), cv. 19, cxix. 140; and cp. Prov. xxx. 5, Wisd. vii. 24 f., James iii. 17. On the refining process, cp. Isa. xlvi. 10, Mal. iii. 2 f. To say that *ll.* 11 f. will be obscure till we know more about the technical details of this process (We., Nestle), is needless despondency (see *crit. n.*).

Critical Notes. 1 f. Read **הוֹשִׁיעֵנִי** (so G).—M **חֶסֶד**. We. would read **חֶסֶד**, but **אֲמוּנִים** in *l.* 2 should be **עֵנִיִּים**. Cp. *l.* 10.—M **פָּסוּ**. Read **אֶפְסוּ** (Gr., La., Du.). See lxxvii. 9. **נֶאֶפְסוּ** is also possible. **אָדָם** should be **אָדָם**.

6. Read perhaps **לְשׁוֹן לְצִים**.—7 f. Read **אֲשֶׁר אֶזְכְּרוּ בְלִבָּם לְשֹׁנָיִם**. **ל** is the sole relic of **בְּלִבָּם**, which metre requires. M is wildly wrong, but one can see at once how the errors arose. **נָנִיר** is not to be justified from Dan. ix. 27 (see Bevan).

9 f. Insert **קוֹמָה יְהוּה הַשִּׁיעָה אֶלְהֵי** (Du.); so completing the stanza.—For **כִּשְׁד** read **כִּשְׁע** (v. 3; cp. Job xxx. 24, xxxvi. 19); so Gr.

12. M **אֲשִׁית בִּישַׁע יִפִּיחַ לוֹ**. **יִפִּיחַ** 'puffs out'? see on x. 5, xxvii. 12. Plainly this cannot be right. G *παρησιάζομαι ἐν αὐτῷ* (cf. S S). Hence Dathe and Bâ. would read **אֶפְיַע לוֹ** (**ע** and **ח** confounded; cf. xcvi. 11). This is supported by the translations of **הוֹפִיעַ** in *l.* 2 (G), lxxx. 2 (S), xciv. 1 (G S). Certainly **אֶפְיַע** is just the word to expect in such a context, but, as Kôn. remarks (§ 380 f.), **א** 'לו' makes a halting conclusion to the verse. Read rather **אֲשִׁיעַ יְשָׁרִים כְּחַבְלֵי רֶשַׁע**, where **רֶשַׁע** corresponds to **בִּישַׁע**, and **חַבְלֵי** to **יִפִּיחַ**. **יְשָׁרִים** fell out through its likeness to **אֲשִׁיעַ**. See next note.

14. M **צָרוּקָה בַּעֲלִיל לְאָרְצֵי**. **כַּעֲלִיל** is a great *crux interpretum*; not a hopeless one, however. Various solutions have been offered. (1) Peiser (*ZATW*, '96, pp. 295 f.) would read **בְּרִיל**, on the presumed authority of J, who gives 'separatum a terrâ.' But **צָרוּקָה בְּרִיל**, 'purged in respect of tin,' does not give a good sense; no psalmist could have used it. (2) Nestle (*Exp. T.*, March '97) reads **בַּעֲלִיל** (rejecting the final **ל** in **בַּעֲלִיל** as a dittogram), and renders 'in a crucible.' But **בַּעֲלִיל** in

Prov. xxvii. 22, should mean 'with a pestle'; the sense of 'crucible' is unascertained, and is opposed by the New Heb. usage. And even apart from this, would a Hebrew poet choose an uncommon and ambiguous word like **עָלִי** in preference to **כִּנּוֹר** (cf. T **בכורא**)? (3) In *Psalms*¹ I took **בעליל** to be a gloss on **אָפִיעַ לוֹ**; the word is in fact explained in *Rosh ha-Shana* 21*b*, by **בְּנָלָי**, which agrees in turn with S's paraphrase of **אָפִיעַ לוֹ**. But the exact sense of Talm. **בעליל** is very uncertain, and the true explanation seems to me to be different. (4) **בעליל לארע** is, equally with **בישע יפיה לו**, a corruption of **בחבלי רשע**. These words (now corrupted) stood perhaps already in their wrong order, and a corrector wrote them in the margin in the right order. From the margin this correction (now corrupted) made its way into the text of ver. 6. We have, therefore, no occasion to accept the plausible correction of Houb., Dy., Che.⁽¹⁾, Peiser, &c., **הָרֵץ** 'gold' for **אָרֶץ** [ל]. It is only of silver that the poet speaks. Now as to G's *δοκίμιον τῆ γῆ*. On this see Deissmann, *Neue Bibelstudien*, 90, whose suggestion, however, is not good; *δοκίμιον* (*δοκιμείον*) certainly = **מִצְרָף** in Prov. xxvii. 21. Cp. controversy in *Exp. T.*, viii. ('97), pp. 236, 287, 336, 379, 432.

15. M **תשמרם**. Read **תשמרני**. G *φυλάξεις ἡμᾶς*: **נִי** = **נו**, as often. Similarly read **תצרני**. Houb., Dy., Bi., Kau., We. adopt **נו**—for both verbs. Less probably; cp. *l. 1*.—M **כִּן־הָדוֹר זו** 'from such a race as this'? Cp. Delitzsch on **דוֹר**. But **זוה** = **זו** is strange, preceded by **הָדוֹר**; it is not enough to call this 'poetic.' Metre shows that either **כִּן־הָדוֹר זו** or **לְעוֹלָם** is intrusive. Both words are in fact very pretty corruptions, and spring from the same original **יִרְחַמְאֵל**. Note *Pasek*, and see next note.

16. M **כָּרְם זֶלֶת לְבָנֵי אָרָם** (v. l. **זֶלֶת**). Hal.'s view that **רָם** = **כָּרְמָה** (cp. T), is not happy. Nor will any slight correction, such as **כָּרְם** (cp. *χαρμ* in Orig. *Hex.*), 'the vineyard of Israel' [see *Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.*, '82, 601], or Schwally's **כָּרוֹ כְּזוֹמוֹת** [*ZATW*, xi. 258], or even Herz's bolder correction, **כָּרְמִים סֶלֶת**, suffice to mend **כָּרְם זֶלֶת**. Using a little thought, however, as to what is required as a complement to *l. 15*, we can readily correct it. Read **כִּי־נִכְרַ צְדִיק**; see *ll. 1, 2*. **ז = צ**; **ל = ד**; **ת = ק**. [Budde's defence (*Exp. T.* xii. 139 f.) of **כָּרְם זֶלֶת** involves reading **דוֹר זֶלֶת**, and has little plausibility.] How *v. 9a*, **כְּבִיב רִשְׁעִים יִתְהַלְכוּ**, got into the text, is an insoluble enigma according to Duhm. The words, however, are a monument of a late editor's skill. He had before him a corrupt and unintelligible form of the words **בְּשִׁים וְאֲשָׁרִים וִירְחַמְאֵלִים**, which is a gloss on **יִרְחַמְאֵל** in *l. 15*.

PSALM XIII.

TETRAMETERS (double dimeters). Again a psalm of pious Israel; every single expression can be paralleled from unquestionable psalms of the community. Ps. cxvi. may be specially compared. It is true many have viewed Ps. cxvi. as a psalm of any and every pious Israelite. Needless however.

Note that lines 10—12 are probably a later addition (see note).

Deposited. Marked; Of 'Arab-ethan. 1

- 1 How long, O Yahwè, | wilt thou forget thy loyal one? 2
 How long wilt thou hide | thy face from me?
 How long wilt thou increase | pain in my soul, 3
 Anxiety in my heart | by day and by night?
 How long shall mine enemy | be successful against me?
 Look hither and answer me, | O Yahwè my God! 4
 Lighten mine eyes | lest I lie down in Darkness,
 Lest mine enemy say, | 'I have prevailed against him.' 5
 My foes triumph, | for I [almost] totter; * * * *

Liturgical Appendix.

- 10 But as for me, in thy lovingkindness, | O Yahwè, is my
 trust; 9
 At thy deliverance | my heart shall triumph;
 I will sing unto Yahwè, | for he has been my benefactor.

1. **Forget, &c.** Cp. lxxvii. 10.—
 6. *Lighten mine eyes*, as Ezr. ix. 8, cp.

1 S. xiv. 27, 29.—צְלֹמוֹת, a title of
 Sheol; see on xxiii. 4, cvii. 10.—9. *I*
 [almost] totter; cp. xxxviii. 17, xciv.
 17 f. Contrast xvi. 8.—12. נִמְלֵ עָלַי
 Cp. Cyrus cylinder inscr., l. 19, *igmilu*
kullatan, 'confers benefits upon all

sides' (*KB* iii. b, 124 f.; said of
 Marduk).

10—12. I follow Olshausen. Cf.
 Grimm (*Liturg. App.* 15). Neither
 critic observes that the appendix is so
 arranged as to complete the third
 strophe which had become imperfect.
 G obscures this by tacking on vii. 18b.

Critical notes. 1. מִתְּשַׁכַּחְנִי נִצַּח. Duhm renders, 'How long
 dost thou forget me continually?' remarking that 'for ever' (so Del., Bâ.,
 Kau. render) implies a very strange notion of eternity, and drawing a
 distinction between נִצַּח 'continually' and לְנֶצַח 'for ever.' This dis-
 tinction, however, cannot be made out, and equally difficult is the render-
 ing 'altogether,' from the root-meaning 'perfection' (see Ges. *Thes.* 906).
 Considering how unsuitable the meaning 'for ever' is in such passages
 as xiii. 2, and how often נִצַּח is corrupt (see *JQR*, xi. 400—403), it becomes

natural to suspect the text (so also in lxxix. 5, lxxxix. 47, &c.). On the analogy of the corrected text of xvii. 15*b* it seems best to read הַשֵּׁבַח עַד-אֲנָהּ. The only alternative would be to read אֲנָהּ-עַד הַסִּדָּף.

3 f. M אֲשִׁית. Read (תֹּאסִיף) תּוֹסִיף. M עֲצוֹת. Read עֲצָבוֹת, or better עֲצָבָת; so Secker, Street, Dy., Gr., &c., after S.—Add וּלְיֵלֶה, G (A^{ca}); so Kenn., Street, Ley, Bi. Gr., Du. Others (Nöld., Lag., Bā., Kau., We., J. Taylor in *Exp. T.*, v. 336) prefer יוֹם יוֹם, but this is metrically insufficient.

7. M פְּנֵי-אֵינִן הַמּוֹת, where הַמּוֹת is taken to be a bold expression for שְׁנַת הַמּוֹת. Lag., לְמוֹת 'into death.' But xciv. 17 suggests a more thorough remedy. The figure of 'tottering' (l. 9; cp. xciv. 18) naturally goes together with that of sinking down into the dark world of Sheol, and this suggestion is further confirmed by the preceding phrase, 'Lighten mine eyes.' Read certainly פְּנֵי-אֵינִן צִלְמוֹת.

8 ff. M יִכְלֹתוּ: Usage and metre require יִכְלֹתִי לוֹ (cxxxix. 2, Gen. xxxii. 26, &c.); G πρὸς αὐτόν. So Duhm.—Insert כְּמַעַט (Du.), which easily fell out between כִּי and אֲמוֹט.—Read perhaps יִגַּל (cp. on xiv. 7).

PSALM XIV.

PENTAMETERS, except in the appendix. The psalm is parallel to Pss. xi., xii., xxxvi.⁽¹⁾, xlvi., lxxiv. It differs however from Ps. xi. inasmuch as the objects of the scrutiny of the Most High are not mankind in general, but the sons of Edom, who have provoked Yahwē by their profane conduct towards the temple of Jerusalem (cp. lxxiv.⁽¹⁾), and by plotting the ruin of the pious Jewish community (v. 6). They are virtual atheists, for they deny the moral government of Yahwē (cp. ix. 18, x. 4). The psalmist predicts their destruction.

It is hoped that by textual criticism the psalm has been lifted out of the class of merely general psalms, and has become a worthy companion of Ps. lxxiv.⁽¹⁾, to which the reader may be referred (see introduction). The judgment foretold is that of the great Messianic doomsday, when the Edomites, the arch-enemies of Israel, and all who do wickedly, shall be destroyed. Some critics¹ have found a parallelism between v. 6 and Jer. x. 21, 25, and have supposed a reference to the Scythian invasion (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Scythians'); others again have thought that Antiochus Epiphanes ('the fool') or one of the Syrian generals, such as Lysias or Nicanor (see Olshausen), may be aimed at. But it is certain that v. 4 is deeply corrupt, and scarcely doubtful that Jer. x. 17—25 (as a whole or in part) is post-exilic.² It may even be reasonably doubted whether there are prophecies on the Scythians anywhere either in the Book of Jeremiah or elsewhere.

There exists a duplicate recension of the psalm, viz. Ps. liii. (described variously as a 'Mahalath,' i.e. Salmæan, and a 'David,' i.e. Ethanic, psalm. Apart from less important variations, the distinctive peculiarities of Ps. liii. are—1. that, while in Ps. xiv. the *Tetragrammaton* occurs four (three?) times, in Ps. liii.

אלהים is substituted for it, and 2, that in liii. 6 (= xiv. 51.) we read that the evil-doers were seized with a panic, for God had scattered the bones of the

¹ E.g. Ol., Del., Bā., Grimme in *ZDMG*, 1896, p. 567.

² See N. Schmidt, *Enc. Bib.*, ii. 2388, and Duhm's Commentary on Jeremiah.

besieger, who was put to shame, God having rejected him. As a whole, this may at first appear to be less plausible than the form of text in xiv. 5f. (M); but it is probable that it is really nearer to the original text. The true text however must, it would seem, be different.

Besides the commentaries see K. Budde's study on Ps. xiv., *Expos. Times*, March, 1901; Cheyne, *OP*, 197, 215 f. On the interpolation after v. 3 in many MSS. of G, quoted in Rom. iii. 13—18, and turned into Hebrew in cod. 649 Kenn, (a Heb. Lat. Psalter at Leyden), see Field, *Hexapla*, on Ps. xiv.

Deposited. Of 'Arab-ethan.

- 1 Gebal says in his heart, | 'There is no God.' 1
 He has destroyed the castles of Jerusalem, | the habitations
 of Zion.
- From heaven Yahwè looked down | upon the sons of Edom, 2
 To see if there were any that cared | for the sanctuary of
 God.
- The Jerahmeelites were in excitement, | they concerted
 together, 3
 They profaned the habitations of Zion, | and her precious
 things,
- Shall they not be afraid— | all the clans of On? 4
 Put to shame shall be the Jerahmeelites; | backward shall
 they turn,
- Utterly panic-stricken are the wicked ones, | for God
 pursues them. 5
- 10 The hosts of the tyrants are disgraced, | for Yahwè has
 rejected them.

Liturgical Appendix.

Oh that from Zion were come the deliverance of Israel! 7
 When Yahwè restoreth his people to life,
 Jacob will exult, Israel will be glad.

1. **Gebal.** Used here, as in lxxxiii. 8 (certainly) and in lxxiv. 18b and 22b (probably) as a synonym for 'Edom.' In the Targums and in the Samaritan version of the Pentateuch, and, somewhat rarely, in Pesh. (see e.g. Ecclus. i. 26, where Pesh. and Vet. Lat. read 'Seir' for 'Samaria'), it represents the Hebrew 'Seir.' Eusebius, too (*Onom.* 125), speaks of Idumæa as 'now called Gebalene.' The name evidently comes from Ar. *jibâl*, 'mountains,' 'mountain-country.' It here represents the

Edomite people, personified as in lii. 3. Cp. xxxvi. 2, where the 'princes of Jerahmeel' (|| 'leader of Edom') is also a personification. No doubt a good sense is given by the common reading נבֿל 'the impious one,' i.e. collectively, 'the party of the impious' (cp. xxvi. 4b, xxxix. 9, l. 18?, but not lxxiv. 18, 22); cp. הַנֶּבֶל. l. 10. One who is נבֿל is, not merely a dull or

unintelligent person, but a recklessly immoral man (= a 'son of Belial'); cp. Isa. xxxii. 6. This sense suits all passages with נבל, not excepting Dt. xxxii. 6 (where נבל must have the same sense as in *zv.* 21, i.e. 'impious'). The root-meaning may be 'shameful, contemptible' (cp. *Enc. Bib.*, 'Nabal'). But though 'the impious one says in his heart,' &c., is quite a correct statement, it is more probable that the true reading is a name equivalent to Edom, because of the ascertained reference to the Jerahmeelites in *l.* 8, if not in *l.* 5, and the probable reference to the Edomites in *l.* 3.—*Says in his heart.* So *x.* 6, 11, 13. The persons referred to were, from a practical point of view, deniers (see on ix. 18) and blasphemers (see on xv. 4.) of God. Cp. also *lv.* 20b (corr. text), 'void of piety is the house of Jerahmeel; | they fear not God.'—2. *He has destroyed*, &c. Lines 1 and 2 briefly sum up the complaints of Ps. lxxiv.⁽¹⁾ The ingenuity of the editor who converted *l.* 2 and the sequel into a denunciation of the immorality of the non-Jewish peoples in general and of faithless Israelites (see *OP*, 342), must be admitted. The form of the last clause and of *l.* 6 in M's text reminds us of Jer. v. 1; see also Ps. xiii. 2—3. According to the received text Yahwè, from his heavenly throne, scrutinizes the human race, to detect, if possible, a single truly religious person. But not one can he discern. In Ps. xi. the same divine scrutiny is affirmed, but the Psalmist assumes the existence of righteous men as a matter of course. It will perhaps be said that the writer of Ps. xiv. does so too in *zv.* 4—6. True; but in *zv.* 1, 3, according to M, this writer expressly denies that there are any righteous men at all. This ought to make us suspect the text, and dig down till we can bring out something better and more consistent with the sequel. See crit. notes.

3. **Upon the sons of Edom.** Cp. Gen xviii. 20 f. The Edomite hosts have concerted their meeting; Yahwè notices this, and looks to see whether any one draws them back from their profanation of the temple.

5. See introd. Parallel, ii. 1, xlvi. 5, lvi. 6, 8, lxxxiii. 6.—6. Cp. Ps. lxxiv. 7, Isa. lxiv. 11 [10], Lam. i. 10.

7. **Be afraid.** Less probably,

'know, experience' (the consequences of their folly); cp. Hos. ix. 7, Job xxi. 19. See crit. n.—*All the clans of On.* Cp. xcii. 7, lxxviii. 18 (corr. text). On was the name of a region in N. Arabia (see Hab. iii. 7, where On, Cushan, and Misrim are most probably mentioned together). The name also found its way into Judah and Benjamin (Jerahmeelite families). Still, the received reading, 'all the workers of wrong,' is not impossible. See crit. n.

8. Among other parallels, cp. lvi. 10 (corr. text), 'The Arabians will be put to flight. | The Jerahmeelites [will stumble].' The received text is corrupt; 'eaters of my people have eaten bread' seems impossible. The slight corrections indicated in the course of the crit. note, do not touch the heart of the problem.

9. Is the verb retrospective or prospective, i.e. does the poet look back on the destruction of Sennacherib (Theod. M ps., G. Baur, Hitz.), or of some post-exilic tyrant (Ol.), or does he look forward to a retributive judgment which is very soon to take place? Duhm is certainly right in adopting the latter alternative. Cp. xlvi. 6, and, for the picture of the pursuing God, ii. 4 (corr. text), xxxv. 5. The troublesome דָּשָׁ in M is corrupt (see crit. n.).

—10. Parallels, v. 11, *lv.* 24b (corr. text). See crit. n.

11 ff. Line 11 is an ejaculation (cp. on xxvii. 12), and the whole appendix is designed to relieve the intense gloom of the preceding psalm (cp. Grimm, *Liturg. App.*, 16 f.). Zion and deliverance are closely connected ideas; cp. cxxi. 1, Isa. lii. 7 f., lxvi. 6.

12. **Restores his people to life.** The ordinary reading (on which see especially Preuschen, *ZATW* xv. 1—74) has as yet received no satisfactory explanation. It is true, there is no certain pre-exilic evidence for the phrase שָׁבַת שְׁבוּת . We might therefore render '(when Yahwè) reverses the captivity,' and suppose the phrase to have been suggested by the sad experiences of the captivities. For transitive שָׁבַת see Num. x. 36, and cp. G; note also the analogy of Ar. *raġa'a* 'rediit.' and also 'reduxit.' Barth's view (*ZDMG* xli. 617 f.) also

deserves attention. He thinks that the phrase means literally, 'to collect the collection (of a people, or of a man),' comparing Ar. *thabā*, 'collegit' (more common in stem II. than in stem I.). An Arabic proverbial saying of the same type means 'to restore what is in disorder.' König (*Synt.* § 210 f.) is half inclined to accept this view, but the existence of two synonymous roots **שׁוּב** and **שָׁבַה** seems to the present writer very improbable. On the whole, considering 1. how many of the lexical problems of the O.T. are only apparent, being due to textual corruption,

and 2. that some at any rate of the passages which contain **שׁוּת שְׁבוּת** must be corrected, it seems the most critical course to seek for a critical correction of the reading (here and elsewhere). No figure for national disorganization is more frequent and more expressive than that of death; and there is reason to think that it is this figure which is really employed by the poet. Thus this liturgical addition to Ps. xiv. becomes exactly parallel to that beautiful passage, cxxvi. 1, 2. See crit. note.

Critical Notes. 1. M **נָבַל**, an enigmatical term which should probably be corrected into **נָבַל** (lxxiv. 18, 22?—lxxiii. 8). The editor, who did not understand the historical background of the psalm, or who wished to efface references to it, changed this into **נָבַל**. See exeg. note.

2. The vague generality of M is intolerable. Underlying the text we may probably see these words,—**הַשְּׁחִית אֲרָמְנוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּישְׁפְנוֹת צִיֹּן** (cp. Lam. ii. 2, 5). **אֵין עֲשָׂה טוֹב** implies the transposition of **צִיֹּן**; **א** and **צ** confounded, as in **און** in Isa. i. 13 (cp. G). **עֲשָׂה** comes from **מִשָּׂח** (= **מִישַׁח**). As a matter of idiom, neither the **עֲלִילָה** of M in xiv. 1, nor the **עוֹל** in liii. 2, is very satisfactory.

3 f. Point **בְּנֵי-אָדָם** (see xii. 2, xciv. 10 f., corr. text), and so restore colour.—M **מִשְׁפִּיל דֵּרֶשׁ אֶת-אֱלֹהִים**. Good Hebrew, but too vague. Read, transposing two words, and reading **ק** for **כ**, and **ד** for **ל**, **דֵּרֶשׁ אֶת-מִקְדָּשׁ אֱלֹהִים מִשְׁפָּן** would also be possible, but for the repetition of this word.

5. M **הַפֵּל קָר**. Ps. liii., **כָּלֹ סָג**, but **סוֹג** in K^{al} is doubtful (see on lxxx. 19). First, **הַכֵּל** and **כָּלוֹ** come from **יִרְחַמְאֵלִים**; cp. **חֲלָקִי** in xvi. 8 (crit. n.). Next, remembering ii. 1, &c. (see exeg. n.), we see underlying **סָר** and **סָג** (combined) the familiar **רָגְנוּ יִרְחַ**. **יִרְחַ** can have two beats.—M **נֶאֱלָחוּ** (so too Ps. liii.). **נֶאֱלַח** again only in Job xv. 16, where read **נִנְעַל**. Here we should restore **נִנְעָדוּ**; cp. xlvi. 5. But **נֶאֱלָחוּ** also represents another word (see on l. 6).

6. First part as *l. 2b* with the addition of **הַלְלוּ** (underlying **נֶאֱלָחוּ**).—M **אֵין נִסְ-אָחָד**. Read probably **וַיִּחַמְדֵּיהָ** (Isa. lxiv. 10, Lam. i. 10).

7. M **יִדְעֵי**; G **ז** J T and some MSS. **יִדְעֵי** (so Hi., Kamph., Nowack). The latter is preferable, but **יִרְאֵי** is still better.—M **כָּל-פְּעֻלֵי אֹן**. This may perhaps be right, but it looks like an ingenious

editorial substitute for בַּלְאֲלֵפִי אֹן (see xcii. 8, corr. text ; lxviii.⁽¹⁾ l. 42). Cp. Hab. iii. 7, where אֹן has again become אָן (Perles, *Analekten*, 66), and the name Beth-aven (Beth-on).

8. M אֲכָלוּ עֲמֵי אֲכָלוּ לָחֶם. Impossible. Easier would be אֲכָלוּ אֲכָרֵי לַחְמֵי לָחֶם [אלהים]; or לָחֶם עֲנִיִּים (but why not בְּשֵׁר?). For ritual sense of לָחֶם see Num. xxviii. 2, Lev. iii. 11, xxi. 6. The 'food of Yahwè' would be the fat pieces of the sacrifices; the priests might be the persons referred to (cp. Mal. i. 6—8, 10a). But in such a passage as that before us no superficial correction is of value. Hence, too the אָכַל וְלָחֶם of Bevan and Wellh. (*Skizzen*, vi. 168), the אֲכָלוּ לָחֶם of Bâthgen, and the אֲכִילַת of Lagarde (*Symmikta*, i. 162) will not help us. What we want is plain after the foregoing emendations. לחם as elsewhere (גִּימְלַח, בֵּית־לַחֶם) comes from יִרְחַמְאֵל, and l. 8a should probably run, יִפְלְמוּ יִרְחַמְאֵלִים. — M יְהוּדָה לֹא קָרְאוּ. Read יְשׁוּבוּ לְאַחֹר (ix. 4, lvi. 10); ק and ה confounded.

9 f. Cp. Merx, *Hiob*, p. lv.—M שָׁם, followed by Pasek. Read לֹא־הָיָה פָּחַד בְּיַאֲלֹהִים פֹּר, —M רָשָׁעִים. In Ps. liii., where two corrupt forms of the true text stand side by side. The true reading probably is [בְּיַאֲלֹהִים רֹדֶפִים]. לֹא־הָיָה is one of the odd disguises of אֱלֹהִים which we sometimes find in the Psalms; בְּדוֹר and פֹּר are both miswritten for רֹדֶף.—M עֲצַת עֲנֵי תְבִישׁוּ. Ps. liii., עֲצָמוֹת הַנֶּדָּה הִבִּישְׁתָּה. Merx (*l.c.*) prefers the second form. More wisely, Bâ. and Duhm use this as a means of correcting the first form, but with the same freedom which we should claim in the critical use of an ancient version. In xiv. 6 (= l. 10) they read עֲנֵי הַבִּישׁוּ [מִעֲצַת] מִעֲצַת, 'with the plot (or plots) against the wretched (עֲנֵי *gen. obj.*) they are put to shame,' correcting M's תְּבִישׁוּ in accordance with G's *κατασχύθησαν* in liii. 6. Certainly the 3 pers. plur. is much more probable than 2 plur. or 2 sing., and the מ in the עֲצָמוֹת of Ps. liii. is probably genuine (as Prof. T. K. Abbott also sees). But 'plots of the wretched' for 'plots against the wretched' is not acceptable. Read most probably מִחֲנוֹת, and note that עֲרִיצִים occurs, close by the second recension, in liv. 5. How is this obtained? מִחֲנוֹת is doubly represented; in Ps. liii. by חֲנָף (so G) וְחַת, and in Ps. xiv. by עֲנֵי ת (ע probably comes from מ); עֲרִיצִים in Ps. liii. by עֲצָמֵי, and in Ps. xiv. by עֲצָ (ק comes from ס). Not impossibly, however, for 'עַר' we should read מִצָּרִים, Mišrites (see on liv. 5).—M מִחֲסֵהוּ. Ps. liii., מִיֶּאֱסָם, which makes the best sense.

12 f. M בְּשׁוּבוֹ יִשְׁבוּת. Both here and in lxxv. 2 and cxxvi. 4, the phrase שׁוּבוֹת שְׁבוּת, and in cxxvi. 1 שׁוּבוֹת שִׁיבוֹת, are more than

probably corrupt (see exeg. note). Note too that the trans. שׁוֹב is a very doubtful element in the vocabulary of the Psalter, lxxxv. 5 being probably corrupt. Let us now turn to the other O. T. passages quoted for transitive שׁוֹב. The only pre-exilic passage is Nah. ii. 3, where we should perhaps read כִּי יִשָּׁב (Kön., Synt. 3226a). Dt. xxx. 3, Jer. xxx. 3, Ezek. xxix. 14, Hos. vi. 11, Joel iv. 1, Am. ix. 14, Job xlii. 10 (Kr.), are all exilic and post-exilic. The correction, therefore, must be one specially suited to the exilic and post-exilic periods. Read בְּשׁוֹבֵב נִפְשׁ יִגָּל, and see further on lxxxv. 2b. — Read perhaps יִגָּל (see on xiii. 6).

PSALM XV.

TRIMETERS. This is at once a psalm of teaching and of rebuke. There are those who frequent the temple-services without observing the 'weightier matters of the law.' They are no true citizens of Zion; and the blessing of security amidst the troubles which precede the Messianic deliverance will not be theirs. Religion is morality; our psalmist is in complete accordance with Zech. viii. 16 f., which expresses the conditions on which Yahwè will deliver his people, and make them no longer a curse but a blessing. The object of the psalm is to erect an invisible but effective wall of partition between true Israelites—the *'aniyyim* and those who are influenced by them—and those merely formal Israelites who are in league with the openly lawless ones. See l.⁽³⁾ and cp. v. 5—8, xxiv. 3—5. Isa. xxxiii. 14—16 (cp. *OP* 237, and, on the true text, *SBOT, Isa.*, Hebrew edition, 21, 107), Ezek. xviii. 5—9. Evidently this psalm is intended for the ordinary man; we must not look here for the highest Israelitish ideal. Renan calls it 'une petite Thora abrégée'; cp. Bertholet, *Die Stellung*, &c., 193.

Marked: of 'Arab-ethan.

- | | | |
|----|--|----|
| 1 | O Yahwè! who can be a guest in thy palace? | |
| | Who can dwell upon thy holy mountain? | |
| | He that lives blamelessly and acts righteously, | 2 |
| | And speaks the truth unfeignedly. | |
| | He that slanders not his fellow, ¹ | 3 |
| | And utters no scandal against his neighbour, | |
| | In whose sight a blasphemer is despicable, | 4a |
| | But the fearers of Yahwè he honours ; ² | 4b |
| | He that puts not out his money at usury, | 5 |
| 10 | And takes no bribes against the innocent ; | |
| | He that acts thus [is secure], | |
| | For all time he cannot be shaken. | |

¹ That does no ill to another.

² The Jerahmeelite is despised.

1. **Who may be a guest,** כִּי

יִנְיָר. This and the parallel passages in which the same phrase occurs (v. 5?—lx. 5), or in which the same idea is expressed (xxiii. 6b, xxvii. 5, xxxi. 20 f., xxxvi. 8—10, lxx. 5), are protests against the heathenish acceptance of phrases like 'Guest of God' (Ger-sakkun = Guest of Sakkun, Ger-melkart = Guest of Melkart, Ger-astart = Guest of Astarte, Ger-hekal = Guest of the temple). 'To be the guest of Baal or Ashtoreth, or the false Yahwè, was to be a frequent visitor to the shrine of the god, to be lavish in sacrifices, and punctual in all ceremonial duties, and the reward of the "guest" was to have a share of the sacrificial feasts, and a mystic connection with the deity, which ensured supernatural protection. To be the guest of the true Yahwè was indeed different from this, but still something to be enjoyed, and not merely hoped for. It was to have solved the enigma how it was possible to dwell in Yahwè's house all the days of one's life; it was to present spiritual sacrifices in a spiritual temple.'² The phrase 'guest (gēr) of Yahwè' by no means expresses a timid though earnest legalism.³ It does indeed express humility, but not timidity. Such a gēr is sure that his 'guestship' will endure while life shall last, and, like the Israel of which he is a member (lx. 5), he can sing for joy. Cp. οἰκέοι τοῦ Θεοῦ, Eph. ii. 19.

4. **Unfeignedly,** בְּלִבְבוֹ; contrast xii. 3, בַּלֵּב וּלֵב. i.e. with

duplicity (cp. 1 Chr. xii. 33). בְּ makes both cases adverbial. Cp. 'Heart,' *Enc. Bib.* The later Biblical writers represent truth-speaking as the special note of the true Israelites, as opposed to the lying and fraudulence of their opponents (see Isa. lix. 3, 4, 13, and cp. *JRL*, 115, 121 f.). Note the same phenomenon in Zoroastrianism (see the Gāthās *passim*, and cp. the horror of lies expressed by Darius). The Egyptians, however, vied with Israelites and Persians; cp. the great 'negative confession' pronounced before the tribunal of Osiris (Maspero, *Daun of Civ.*, 188 ff.). The Israelites were slow to recognize the full range of truthfulness. Cp. on xvii. 2.

7. **A blasphemer.** The idea of נִאָּץ is contemptuous rejection (especially of the true God, or of men or things connected with Him), whether expressed in word (as here, and in x. 3, lxxiv. 10, 18, also in Num. xiv. 11, 23, Isa. lii. 5), in thought (as in x. 13), or in act (as in 1 S. ii. 17, 2 S. xii. 14, where omit נִאָּץ, Isa. i. 4, v. 24, Jer. xxiii. 17). The persons meant are the Jerahmeelites and any unworthy Israelites who may abet them (cp. lxxiv. 10, 18).

9. **He that puts not out, &c.** To the poor (and pious) Jew such a man lends without interest (xxxvii. 26, cxii. 5; cp. Prov. xxviii. 8). See Ex. xii. 24, Dt. xxiii. 19, Lev. xxv. 37, and 'Usury,' *Enc. Bib.*—10. Cp. Ex. xxiii. 8, Dt. xvi. 19, Prov. xvii. 23.

Critical Notes. 1. M בְּאֵהֶלֶךָ. Read בְּהִיכָלְךָ. Similar errors in xix. 5, xxvii. 5 f., lxi. 5, lxix. 26, lxxviii. 60, lxxxiv. 11.

5. M לֹא רִגַל עַל-לְשֹׁנוֹ, 'he carries no slander on his tongue' (Del.), 'he is not nimble (cp. new Heb. רִגִּיל) with his tongue' (Bä., Du.). Neither rendering satisfies. Parallelism suggests לֹא רִגַל עַל-שִׁכְנוֹ. כ in שכנו became effaced; then the ל in על was dittographed.—Omit M's לֹא-עָשָׂה לְרַעְהוֹ רַעְהוֹ (also in G), a gloss.

¹ See note in Che., *Psalms*, ed. 1; Driver, note on Dt. xvi. 22; Renan, *Discours et conférences*, 318.

² *OP* 387; cp. 429, *Jew. Rel. Life*, 250. ³ Robertson Smith, *Rel. Sem.*² 78.

7. M נַמְאִים, a mere synonym of נְבוּזָה. G *πονηρευόμενος*, which is neither נֶאֱשָׁם (Herz) nor נִבְאָשׁ (Du.), but a paraphrase of נַמְאִים. Read מִנְאִין, a synonym of נִבְּרָן.

8. M's נִשְׁבַּע לְהִרְעוּ וְלֹא יִכָּר is (to me) unintelligible. The usual explanation of לְהִרְעוּ (from Lev. v. 4) is unnatural; the supposed parallel in xxxix.⁽⁶³⁾ cannot be maintained. G S presuppose לְרַעוּ = לְרַעוּהוּ; so Ginsburg, We., Herz. For יִכָּר Kön. (i. 466) prefers יָכָר (analogy of עָע verbs). But the word, however explained, is not satisfactory here. The correction of נַמְאִים into מִנְאִין (l. 7) suggests a more probable reading of the whole clause, viz. נְבוּזָה יִרְחַמְאִילִי, which is a gloss on l. 7.

11. Omit Maḳḳef and insert נִכוּן (cp. S).

PSALM XVI.

TRIMETERS. The speaker (i.e. the pious community), rejoices in the sure hope of deliverance from the oppression of its enemies—the Edomites and other races of N. Arabia. In spite of all his sufferings he continues to praise and bless Yahwè, and his one delight is to visit the sanctuary, where he renews that sense of Yahwè's presence and protection which keeps his inner being in perfect peace. Israel is God's 'loyal one,' whom He will not suffer to perish. The Messianic age, and with it the deliverance and glorification of Israel, is at hand. When it comes, life will be life indeed. Yahwè knows the way to this life; he will show it to his people, and fill them with joys past imagining. Cp. on Ps. xvii.

The strongly individualizing tone of the psalm makes it plausible to surmise that the hope of immortality is held out in it to the individual, at any rate if we can satisfy ourselves that there are other psalms (xlix., lxxiii.) in which the same hope is still more clearly expressed. Such an interpretation of those psalms, however, is inadmissible; xlix. 15 f. and lxxiii. 23 f. are not correctly presented in M's text. Nor is the phraseology of Ps. xvi. inconsistent with the view that the endless life referred to in the psalm is that of the pious community of Israel (cp. Ps. xvii.). The individualizing tone of Ps. xvi. is not stronger than that of Pss. iii., iv., and vi., and only proves the strength of the feeling of the solidarity of pious Israelites. Cp. *JAL*, 241—244.

According to Duhm, 'apart from the conventional opening there is no petition and no direct thanksgiving.' In the text as here represented, however, there are both. Few psalms perhaps gain more in clearness of sense and in depth of colouring from a keen textual criticism. For other views, based on the traditional text, see the commentaries and O.T. theologies, and cp. *OP*, 197 f.; 'Eschatology,' *Enc. Bib.*

A supplication. Of 'Arab-ethan.

1

1 Hear me, O God! according to thy lovingkindness;

Give ear, O Yahwè! to my words.

2

I long to visit thy palace,

3

And in thy sanctuary is all my delight.

	How many are the armies of Jerahmeel,	4
	The hosts of Edom and Ishmael!	
	Preserve me, O God! from Zarephath,	
	From Maacath and Cusham-jerahmeel.	5
	The sons of Ammon have fallen upon me,	6
10	Yea, thine inheritance they have broken in pieces.	
	I bless Yahwè who will deliver me,	7
	Yea, from Jerahmeel will he preserve me.	
	Yahwè do I magnify continually,	8
	With him at my right hand I shall stand firm.	
	Joyous is my heart and my mind ; ¹	9
	My body also also rests securely.	
	² My soul then will not yield to Sheol,	10
	Thy loyal one thou wilt not abandon to ³ the pit ;	
	Thou will make known to me the path of life,	11
20	Thou will satisfy me with joys in thy presence.	

2. **Give ear.** Cp. v. 2, xvii. 1-3. The connection between visits to the temple and security from danger is obvious (cp. v. 4, xxvii. 3-6).—5. Cp. iii. 2, and for the collection of ethnic names, lxxxiii. 7-9. The editor, who had to make the best of a corrupt text, seems to have lived in a time when there were many semi-heathen Jews who combined the worship of Yahwè with that of other deities, and whose libations of wine to pagan deities were to him as offensive as the blood of a human sacrifice (cp. the phrase 'the blood of grapes,' Gen. xlix. 11). R. Smith, however, thought that literal blood-libations were meant, and that these were connected with the rite of pouring out the blood of a sacrifice at the base of an altar, which, though extinct among the Israelites, may still have been in use among the 'peoples of the land' (*Exp.* 1876, pp. 341 ff. ; cp. *Rel. Sem.*⁽²⁾ 230). He illustrates by Isa. lxxv., lxxvi. (cp. *Introd. Is.* 316, 364 ff. ; *Jewish Religious Life*, 29 f.). But כִּדָּם ('consisting of) blood,' is so awkward that we shall do better to seek for some suitable correction of the reading. It would be strange if this

Psalm had no reference to the arch-enemies of the Jews. See crit. note.

8. The editor has shown great skill (cp. Jer. x. 16, and li. 19 in G), but has not produced a clear piece of Hebrew.—*Maacath.* See lx. 8, and cp. 'Maacath,' *Enc. Bib.*—*Cusham-jerahmeel*, i.e. the Jerahmeelite Cusham or Cush. See 'Shechem,' *Enc. Bib.*—10. *Thine inheritance*, i.e. Canaan, as lxxiv. 2, xciv. 5. 'Thine' involves an appropriate argument. In itself, however, 'mine inheritance' is unobjectionable ; cp. cv. 11, Dt. iv. 21, xv. 4, Jer. xii. 14, Ezek. xxxv. 15.

14. בְּלִיאָמוֹת (or לֵא) occurs four times again (x. 6, xiii. 5, xxx. 7, lxii. 3 = 7). In none of these cases is it probable that an individual is the speaker.

15 f. The bond of חֶסֶד between Yahwè and his worshipping people secures them from destruction. A dichotomy, not a trichotomy, of human nature is presupposed. לֵב 'heart,' כִּבֶּד 'liver,' and נַפְשׁ 'soul' (*I.* 10)

¹ Exults.

² For.

³ See.

are treated as virtually synonymous. So in Assyrian, the Sabbath is called *nuh libbi*, but it might as well be called *nuh napišti*, or *nuh kabitti*.¹ Indeed, to the Assyrians and to the Hebrews the heart and the liver are alike organs of the life of the soul. Both are the seats of emotion, but the heart is also the seat of the will, the conscience, and the understanding. The heart thinks, is both an Assyrian and a Hebrew phrase.

Hence we can render לֵב 'mind,' and פֶּבֶר we can paraphrase 'soul' or 'heart.' The extent of the Hebrew use of כֶּבֶד, 'liver,' has been almost overlooked, owing to the Massoretic vocalization. Observe that the only trace in the O.T. of the prophetic faculty often assigned to the liver is in Ezek. xxi. 26 (the king of Babylon). See crit. n.

16. **Rests securely.** Cp. iv. 10, where pious Israel speaks.

17 f. **Sheol**, i.e. the nether world and the *pit* (שְׁחַת), vii. 16, ix. 16, xlix. 10, lv. 24, ciii. 4) are synonymous. Sheol is imagined as a great pit, narrow above (lxix. 16, cxli. 7). A whole people can descend into this abyss (see Isa. v. 14, Ezek. xxxii. 17—32). Israel, however, will escape this dire fate. —*Thy loyal one*, or, 'thy pious one.' The חֲסִיד is a אִישׁ חָסֵד (cp. xii. 2, xliii. 1), one who practises חֶסֶד (see 'Loving-kindness,' *Enc. Bib.*). The

חֲסִידֵי יְהוָה are the faithful worshippers of Yahwè, xxx. 5, xxxi. 24, xxxvii. 28, l. 5, cxxxii. 9, 16, cxlv. 10, cxlix. 5, 1 S. ii. 9, Prov. ii. 8; hence the title Ἀσιδαίων in the Maccabæan rising (see 'Asideans,' *Enc. Bib.*). In the corrected text of xx. 10, xxi. 8, and xxv. 16, also in M T of lxxxvi. 2, Israel, as here, is called חֲסִיד; and in cxlv. 17 (so Jer. iii. 12) the epithet is given to Yahwè himself. חֲסִיד is in fact the bond which unites Yahwè and the community of Israel. Possibly in cxlix. 5 חֲסִידִים has acquired the special meaning 'Asideans'; at any rate, the persons spoken of had exchanged the student's chamber for the field of battle. The Asideans are defined in 1 Macc. ii. 42 as 'every one that offered himself willingly for the law.' Cp. *OP*, 48.

19. **The path of life**, as Prov. v. 6 (sing.), ii. 19 (plur.). More is meant than merely 'the course of action which leads to happiness'; the phrase is Messianic (cp. on xci. 16). So 'the path of glory,' lxxiii. 24^b (corr. text).

20. Cp. xvii. 15, xxxvi. 9 f.—*In thy presence*; cp. xxi. 7^b (same use of אֵת). As the text stands, that passage may refer to the personal Messiah. But in the true text it is probably Yahwè's 'loyal one' (חֲסִיד) who is referred to, precisely as here.

Critical Notes. (Title) תִּכְתֵּם comes either from תִּהְנֶנּוּ (see 'Isaiah,' *SBOT*, Heb., 117), or from תִּחַנְּהָ (cp. on xxx. 1).

1. M שְׂמִרְנִי אֵל פִּי־חֲסִיתִי בְּדָ. Apart from metre and context this might be right. On metre indeed we must not dwell much, in beginning our study of the psalm; but it is plain that the context refers, not to danger, but to persons or things in which the speaker has pleasure. This is not affected by the circumstance that 3 (which should contain the second half of the first stanza) is admittedly very corrupt; the correctness of כָּל חֲפְצֵי בָם can hardly be questioned. We might

¹ *Kabittu*, 1. liver, 2. disposition, Muss-Arnolt; 1. liver, 2. inward part = centre, Jensen (*Kosmol*, 11, note); but Del. only 'Gemüth.' In Heb., however, only לֵב, not פֶּבֶר, has the secondary meaning 'centre.'

emend שמרני into אֲזַמְרֶךָ, for שמר and זמר are liable to be confounded (see *c.g.* lix. 10) But adopting this, it* will be difficult to obtain a fully satisfactory parallelism for the first couplet. A better solution of the problem can be devised, and one that will fit in with corrections which we shall have to propose for subsequent errors in the text; compare the opening of Ps. xvii.

שְׁמַעֲנֵי יְיָ בְּחִסְדֶּךָ
אֲמַרְי יְהוָה הַאֲזִינָה

2 ff. The proposal for *l.* 2 has now to be justified. Most critics abide by the judgment of Olsh. ('53) that while we should certainly read אמרת or אמרתי (Houb., *Ew.*, *De.*, *Kau.* [cp. *Ges.-K.* § 447], *Kön.* i. 151; cp. *G S J*), the rest of *v.* 1, 2 may be retained. On the other hand, it may be urged (1) that the ordinary view of *v.* 2 pays no regard to parallelism, and (2) that 'my welfare is not above or beside (?) thee' is a very unnatural form of expression for 'Thou art my highest, or my only, good.' None of the Vss. take this view. S S J T translate as if they read בל בלעדיך, an inelegant reading adopted by Houb., *Bi.*, *Che.*¹⁾, *Du.* The rendering of G (A R U, B omits) is peculiar—*τὼν ἀγαθῶν μου οὐ χρείαν* (or *χρ. οὐκ*) *ἔχεις*, *i.e.* לך טובתי בליעל לך, which is interesting from its presupposing the still generally current explanation of בליעל. It is wrong, however, being produced by dittography. Next, as to the parallelism. Verses 2 and 3 in M are closely connected, but *v.* 1 appears like 'a short introit, without any parallel clause' (*Del.*). Clearly we cannot accept this as original. The text of *v.* 2b must be corrupt, and in correcting it we can have no help from the Vss. *Wildeboer* (*Freestbundet van Prof. de Goeje*, '91, pp. 47 ff.; *Theol. Tijdschr.*, '93, pp. 610 ff.) proposes טובתי בעלתך, 'the (chief or only) good of thy wedded one' (cp. *Isa.* lxii. 4). *Wellh.* and *Herz* take another course. Both start from G's *χρείαν οὐκ ἔχεις*. The former reads בליעל for עליו, and (strangely enough) connects ב with *v.* 3, rendering in *v.* 2, 'Thou, O Lord, art my good.' The latter, by a too mechanical application of a method which is sometimes useful, produces the unpleasant clause, טוב תיבל בל יעלך. The root of the evil, however, lies deeper, and in attacking it we must aim at a suitable connection with *v.* 1. If we emended שמרני into אזמרך, we might correct אמרת ל into ארמךך (see on cxviii. 2-4). But אתה אדני will not be a bad parallel alike to כחסדך and כי חסיתי בך. Taking all things into consideration, the solution offered above seems to be the only possible one.

Line 3 should be read תאבתני לפקד היכלך. לפקד is represented in M by לקד in לקדושים and by בל (= לפ). [היכלך = עליך]. ושים, with אשר בארץ [אשר] dittographed, and המה אדירי represent two attempts to write ומוקדשיך. Critics have been hindered partly by

their want of a correct method, partly by their disregard of metre. Bā. values G too highly. The text represented by it can be only an editorial conjecture, which, however skilful, assumes an irregular use of הַמָּוֶה, and is opposed to parallelism and context. By retroverting G (see *St. Kr.*, '80, p. 754) he produces כָּל לְקַדְוֹשִׁים בְּאֶרֶץ הַמָּוֶה יִדְוֶהוּ] כָּל בָּם חִפְצוֹ (cp. Isa. xlii. 24, lxii. 4). Emendations, suggested by Isa. lxii. 4, have also been proposed by Beer and Wildeboer. Hitzig's view is different. He acutely explains the last words of *v.* 3 thus, 'Let it (viz. David's present, 1 S. xxx. 26) be for the holy ones who are in the land' (i.e. the priests). Bi. (1882), somewhat similarly, viewed the words as an explanatory gloss; 'This relates to,' &c. (so Che., '88; Du., '99).

5. M אַחַר כְּהָרוּ יִרְבוּ עֲצָבוֹתָם. If this is to be construed with M's כְּהָרוּ יִרְבוּ, it is awkward in the extreme. Combining suggestions of Wellh. and Dys., Duhm reads יִרְבוּ עֲצָבֵיהֶם אַחֲרֵיהֶם הָרוּ, 'those whose images are many the other (Jews) praise,' viz. by taking part in heathen repasts (see the context); Wellh. emends הָרוּ into אָנְכִי. It would be simpler to read יִרְוֶהוּ כִּי־עָצְבוֹתָם (cp. xxxvi. 9), and continue אַחַר בְּהָרוּ (בַּחַר, a special word for a worshipper's entering into mystic relation to his god). Bā., in *JPT*, '82, p. 603, proposed הִמְרִירוּ (for כִּהָרוּ), but see Lag. *Mittheil.*, iii. 11. Bā. has himself withdrawn this, and despairs of the text. But, though the new emendation proposed above is in itself possible, it does not restore the true text. The key to the problem is in the little word אַחַר which (like אַחַר in 1 Chr. vii. 12 and אַחֲרָה in 1 K. xii. 30) is one of the many corrupt fragments of יִרְחֵמְאֵל. יִרְבוּ and כִּהָרוּ are both corruptions of כִּהָרְבוּ; כִּהָרוּ, however, also represents another fragmentary form of יִרְחֵמְאֵל.

6 ff. M בַּל־אִסִּיד נִסְפִּיהֶם מִדָּם. See exeg. note. בַּל אִסִּיד may be disregarded; it has arisen out of יִרְחֵמְאֵל, the letters of which were first transposed (through the scribe's ignorance of history) and then corrupted; יִרְחֵמְאֵל was probably a marginal correction. וּבִל־אִשָּׁא which follows is a similar corruption of יִשְׁמַעְיָאֵל. נִסְכֵי is probably miswritten for מִנְחֵי (כ and ס again confounded). מִדָּם represents either אִדָּם or אִדָּמִים; see on li. 16.—M אֶת־שִׁמּוֹתָם עַל־שִׁפְתָי. The initial אֶת seems to be an editorial insertion. שִׁמּוֹתָם may come from שִׁמְרָנִי; certainly this is favoured by the context. אֵל=עַל naturally comes from [מִנְצֵרֶפֶת]. Then follows, in M, a conglomerate of editorially transformed corruptions. The clearest are כּוֹסֵי and נּוֹרֵי, i.e. כּוֹשֵׁם (cp. xi. 6b) and יִרְחֵמְאֵל חֲלִקֵי too is really an ethnic name (cp. חֲלִקֵי הַתּוֹ, Hilki [ah])—a popular corruption of יִרְחֵמְאֵל; cp. הַכֵּל in xiv. 3a. As for מִנְתַּי and תּוֹמִיד (for which Hi., Dy., Bi., Che.⁽¹⁾, We. read תְּמִיד; Lag. תּוֹמִיד), one can hardly fail to see underlying them both מִנְעִינְתַּי (the

southern Maachah); אתה may also perhaps represent מעַתָּה=אתם (cp. 'Metheg-ammah,' *Enc. Bib.*). גורלי is plainly from ירחמאל. This latter word should probably (see 'Shechem,' *Enc. Bib.*) be attached to כושם rather than to מעַתָּה. Read therefore, as stanza 2:

מִדֶּרְבִּי צְבָאוֹת יִרְחַמְאֵל
 מִחֲנֵי אָדָם וַיִּשְׁמַעֲאֵל
 שְׁמֵרְנִי אֵל מִצָּרֶפֶת
 מִפְּעֶכֶת וְכוּשָׁם יִרְחַמְאֵל

9f. M בנעימים is suspicious, and the whole of v. 6 is inconsistent with the cry for divine protection. 'Sweet,' 'delightful,' &c., are no doubt idealistic titles of Canaan (cvi. 24, Mal. iii. 12, Jer. iii. 19, Ezek. xx. 6, 15, Dan. viii. 9, xi. 6, 41), but we do not expect any one of them here. ירחמאל = המלים = הבלים (cp. 'Hamul,' 'Mahol,' *Enc. Bib.*), an early correction of גורלי. Read, as l. 9, נִפְלוּ עָלַי. —M בְּנֵי־עֵמוֹן. —M אֶפְרַח־נַחֲלֵת שְׁפָרָה עָלַי. עלי is a correction of לי (l. 9). The whole line should run, אֶפְרַח־נַחֲלֵתְךָ שְׁפָרֵנוּ, נחלתי (G S, Ol., Gr., Bi., We., Du.) is also possible.

11. M יִעֲצָנִי; plausible (see lxxiii. 24), but against context. Read יוֹשְׁעָנִי.

12. M אֶפְרַח־לִילוֹת יִסְרוּנִי כְּלִיֹּתַי. Wrong; it is not man's 'reins that teach him, but God. לילות too is unexpected. It comes from כליות (cp. on xvii. 3, לילה). כל, however, is of course not correct. If יִסְרוּנִי (יִסְרָנִי) is right, we might read בְּמִעְגְּלוֹתַי (xvii. 5, xxxii. 8^b, corr. text). But we require some reference to the foes. Read אֶפְרַח־יִרְחַמְאֵל יִשְׁמַרְנִי. יִשְׁמַרְנִי is supported by שויתי (v. 8), an unexpected and improbable word, which seems to have come from ישמרני, a dittogram, perhaps a correction of a scribe's error.

13f. M G לִנְנָדִי. Possible; but hardly probable with מימינו. Read אֲנִידִי || אֲבָרְךָ, l. 11. Cp. xlv. 8, lxxi. 8, 14f.—Read כִּי־הוּא.

15. Omit לכן (note Pasek), which mars the metre, and springs from a premature לבי. כי and כן are often confounded.—Omit וַיִּגַּל (metre). —M כְּבוֹדִי. G ἡ δὲ σῶσαί μου. Point כְּבָדִי. So Houb., Street, and more recently Hi., Hal., Ball, Di. In Gen. xlix. 6 G has τὰ ἡπατά μου. Cp. vii. 6, xxx. 13, lvii. 9, cviii. 2, also Isa. xvi. 11 (reading כְּבָדִי for קָרְבִי; cf. Lam. ii. 11).

17f. Omit כי (note Pasek), and לראות (metre).—Kt. חסידך. But Kr. חסידך, and so Vss., the best MSS. and edd., also Del., Bā., Che.⁽¹⁾,

Du. Cp. on lxxxix. 20. The superfluous ם was caused by the ם preceding ך; for parallel cases see Gen. xvi. 5, Ezek. ix. 5, 1 S. xxvi. 8, where too the ך̄ri deletes the ם. Wellh., however, and Matthes (*Th. Tijdschr.*, 1901, p. 545) adhere to Kt.

20. מ שבע. Read certainly תשביעני (contrast to ירוי, *l.* 5). G *πληρώσεις με*.—M G append נעמות בימינך נצה. Strange, that all the stanzas of Ps. xvi. have four lines except (at first sight) the fifth; also that the four preceding lines all have a verb, while the fifth has none, which is the more remarkable, as the adverb [ל]נצה follows. The truth is that for the present text we should read חסד במשכנותיך. This is also the true close of Ps. xvii. By accident it was copied into Ps. xvi. from the column in which Ps. xvii. was written. Cf. 'Psalms Book of,' *Enc. Bib.*

PSALM XVII.

TETRAMETERS. A prayer of the pious community (cp. Coblenz, 102). The speaker bases his sure confidence that his prayer will be answered on his proved fidelity to Yahwè. After crying aloud for help against the Jerahmeelites, pious Israel enters into an earnest self-justification (*ll.* 3-10). He then appeals for protection, as Yahwè's client, in the sanctuary (*ll.* 11-16). He describes the imminent danger in which, regarded apart from Yahwè, he stands (*ll.* 17-24), and being of sensitive nature (for Israel must be represented in colours borrowed from the Israelites), he breaks out into a vehement demand for a terrible retribution to his enemies (*ll.* 25-28). He doubts not that prayer will be granted, for the Messianic age is close at hand, when Yahwè's *hāsīd* (pious one) will be admitted to a more completely satisfying vision of the divine countenance in the sanctuary (*ll.* 29 f.), which cannot be till the land of Israel has been relieved from the blighting presence of Israel's deadly foes. Who those foes are, we learn from the probably true text of *ll.* 2, 7, 21 and 26, where they are called the tribe of Jerahmeel, Edom, Zarephath and the Geshurites; indeed, the parallelism between this psalm and Pss. v., vii., x., xi., xvi., xviii., xxii.,¹ especially the four latter, would seem to leave no doubt that the peoples of the N. Arabian border are referred to. It should be added that Pss. xvi. and xvii. are also closely connected by their parallel ending, and that both are akin to the large group of psalms expressing ardent love of the temple, and especially to Pss. xxvii. and lxi.,—psalms on which not a little fresh light can be thrown. Like Ps. xvi., this is a psalm of national, not personal, immortality.

The psalmist has often been accused of abruptness in his transitions. But this supposed abruptness is due to textual corruption. Criticism, which can do much to remove this corruption,² at the same time unfortunately reveals a want of literary originality in the psalm. Some of the ideas and forms of expression which are most characteristically post-exilic are to be found here. The points of contact with the nine psalms mentioned above are specially remarkable. In this connexion it may be noticed that the reading הַבְּלִי כֹת in *l.* 19, if correct, points to a date long enough after that of Ps. xviii. for the text of that psalm

¹ Observe that a part of the description of the terrifying 'snares' and 'floods' given in Ps. xviii. recurs in xvii. 10 (restored text), and that the representation of the Jerahmeelites or Edomites as lions, wild oxen with pointed horns (?), and traitors given in Ps. xxii. recurs in passages of Ps. xvii.

² From another point of view several criticisms of the text of Ps. xvii. are offered by J. Kennedy in a not yet (March, 1902) published paper. See on *ll.* 1, 24.

(z. 5a) to have become corrupt; the interval between the two psalms must not, however, be exaggerated; textual corruption evidently began very early. In conclusion, it is somewhat strange that Duhm should represent Ps. xvii. as the work of a Pharisee, as if assertions of legal righteousness began with the party called Pharisees, and should even emend פָּרִיץ (z. 4) into פָּרִישׁ or פְּרִישׁ 'Pharisee.' Surely none of the psalms can safely be brought down to the age of the Pharisees, or indeed ascribed to an individual of any age.

Prayer. Of 'Arab-ethan.

1

- 1 Hear my cry, O Yahwè ! | attend unto my wail ;
 Make haste to rescue me | from the tribe of Jerahmeel,
 Let my sentence proceed | from thy presence [in righteous-
 ness] ; 2
 Let thine eyes view | [the pious] with exactness.
 If thou triest my heart, | if thou provest my reins, 3
 No deceit wilt thou find, | in my heart is no [wrong].
 From the courses of Edom, | from the ways of Zarephath— 4
 I have kept myself, O Lord ! | from the paths of liars.
 My steps follow close | in thy courses ; 5
 10 My feet waver not | [in thy paths].
 O Lord ! I call upon thee, | thou wilt answer, O [my]
 God ! 6
 Bend down to me thine ear, | hear my speech.
 Separate thy loyal one | in thy sanctuary, 7
 And keep him close | in thy habitation.
 Preserve me, O Lord ! | in the courts of thy house, 8
 With the shadow of thy wings | cover thou me.
 From the (angry) face of the wicked | deliver thou me, 9
 To the greed of mine enemies | [abandon me not].
 The snares of Deathland | encompass me, 10
 20 The floods of ocean | affright me ;
 [For] there surround me | the troop of Geshurites, 11
 With pointed horns | they mangle me (?).
 They attack me like lions | which watch for prey, 12
 [They encompass me] like young lions | which lurk in
 coverts.
 Arise, O Yahwè ! | and make him bow down ; 13
 Rescue my soul | from the wickedness of the godless.

Do thou, O Yahwè ! rain | hot coal upon them ; 14
With a horrible blast | do thou fill their belly.

As for me, by [thy] righteousness | I shall behold thy face ; 15
30 I shall be satisfied with thy lovingkindness | in thy
habitation.

1 f. **רנה**, 'wail,' || **תפלה**, 'prayer,' as Jer. vii. 16, xi. 14.—*With lips that are truthful.* Truthfulness is a primary note of the righteous character in early Judaism—truthfulness towards men (v. 9, xv. 2 [note], li. 3, Isa. liii. 9, lix. 4), and also towards God (lxvi. 18 f.). The prayer of the untruthful wicked must be an abomination (v. 4 f.; Prov. xv. 8, 29).—5 f. *If thou triest*, &c. The community can speak thus more easily than the individuals. 'Reins,' || 'heart,' as vii. 10 (gloss?), xxvi. 2, Jer. xi. 20, xvii.

10, xx. 12, where too **בהן** or **צרף**, or both words, occur; also in lxxiii. 21. 'Heart' = conscience. Cp. 'Heart,' 'Reins,' *Enc. Bib.* Our revised text is without the troublesome word **לילה**, which led Duhm to suppose that this was an evening psalm; just so (*l. 7*) it is without the unseemly phrase, 'the word of thy (God's) lips.' In *l. 8* notice the interesting word **פְּרִיץ**.

The word also occurs in Jer. vii. 11, Ezek. xviii. 10, Dan. xi. 14, but not in the true text of Ezek. vii. 22 (read **צִרְפָּתִים**, see *Crit. Bib.*), and of Isa. xxxv. 9 (read **חֵית הָאֲרִיץ**). It means, not 'a violent one' (= robber), but 'a liar' = **פְּהָשׁ** and (partly) **בַּיַד**.

The noun **פְּרִיץ** occurs probably in Nah. iii. 1 (M's **פָּרַק** is unsuitable) and in Jer. vi. 6 (read **עֵיר הַפְּרִיץ**; cp. G). The root is **פָּרַץ**, 'to lie,' - *Ass. paristu* (so Ruben for **פָּרַץ** in Nah., *loc.*); in Hos. iv. 2 read **בָּאֲרִיץ** (G, Ruben). On Duhm's suggestion (**פְּרִישׁ** for **פְּרִיץ**) see above.—13. **הַפְּלִיָּה**; cp. Ex. viii. 18, but not Ps. iv. 4 (see *crit. n.*).—**חֲסִידֶךָ**; cp. on xvi. 10.

14. Cp. xxvii. 5. **מִשְׁכְּנֹת**, Yahwè's dwelling, the temple, as xlvi. 5, lxxxiv. 2, cxxxii. 5. So in *l. 30*.—15. The revised text deprives us of a parallelism with Dt. xxxii. 10 f., Zech. ii. 8. Certainly the received text (*v. Sa*) is plausible; Tylor has shown that the pupil of the eye is connected elsewhere in folk-lore with the soul (*Prim. Culture*, i. 389). But parallelism is opposed to the common text.

17. **פְּנִים**, 'angry face,' as xxi. 10.—18. So xxvii. 12. Lines 19—28 (*v. 10*—14) seem to be illustrations of striking passages in Pss. xi., xviii., xxii.; see *crit. notes*.—21. *Geshurites*, i.e. the N. Arabian oppressors, probably = 'Maacathites' (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Geshur,' ii.). Cp. iii. *Sb.* Or perhaps read 'Ishmaelites' (see *crit. n.*).

23 f. **אֲרִיה** and **כִּפִּיר** are collectives (like **אֲרִי**, xxii. 14^b).

29. *Behold thy face*. So xi. 7, cxl. 13; cp. xvi. 11. On the divine Face, cp. Dillm. on Ex. xxxiii. 14. The **תְּמוּנָה** of M may have been suggested by Num. xii. 8. The view of the editor apparently was that Israel and (note **בְּהַקִּיץ**) each faithful Israelite would enjoy the same privileged vision of Yahwè as 'my servant Moses' (Num. xii. 7); cp. *OP*, 388 ff., 407, 426, 439, 444, and Baethgen's commentary. It is true, some (e.g. Smend, *ZATH*, 1888, p. 95) explain **הַקִּיץ** of the hoped-for divine intervention in behalf of Israel. But this bare use of the infinitive is unparalleled, and the expression 'I shall be satisfied with thy form,' is intolerable. Hence Beer (*Indiv. psalmen*, 18) and Wellh. regard **תְּמוּ** as the subject of **הַקִּיץ**. The 'awaking of God's form' is taken to mean the revelation of the divine glory at the judgment. This, however,

is also unparalleled. If this view of the construction were correct, it would be necessary to emend תַּנְי into אֲמוֹנֶתֶךָ or rather (see *Jewish Rel.*

Life, p. 241) קִנְיֶאתֶךָ. If, however, we put aside the current exaggerated belief in the Massoretic text, and apply a stricter critical method, a much better result can be obtained (see crit. n.).

Critical Notes. 1. M יהוה וצדק. G, κύριε τῆς δικαιοσύνης μου, i.e. 'O Yahwè, who art my righteousness' (see on xviii. 2). But this is against the parallelism. Either צדק has come in from the margin, where it was perhaps placed as having been omitted in *v.* 2a, or (as J. Kennedy acutely suggests) it is a corruption of צַעֲקָתִי. In the former case, רַנְתִּי should be placed in *l.* 1a, and תַּפְלַתִּי in *l.* 1b (cp. lxi. 1, and see on *l.* 2). But the latter suggestion is the better.

2. M's בְּלֹא שִׁפְתַי כִּרְמָה is strange Hebrew, and the whole clause, 'Give ear unto my prayer (that is uttered) with no deceitful lips' (Driver), is a weak supplement to 'Hear my cry, attend to my wail.' Ps. xvi. 4-6 leads us to expect a reference to the N. Arabian oppressors, and, quite without a thought of this passage, the present writer has found himself compelled in another psalm (xliiii. 1) to emend מַרְמָה into יִרְחַמְאֵל. Instead, therefore, of giving תַּפְלַתִּי a double rôle (1. as parallel in *l.* 1b to רַנְתִּי, and 2. as the representative of כִּתְפַלֵּל), it is most probable that we should, on the analogy of xliiii. 1, read *l.* 2 thus,

חֹשֶׁה לְפִלְטָנִי | כִּמְשִׁפֶּתֶת יִרְחַמְאֵל :

חֹשֶׁה for האזינה (cp. on lxxx. 2a) is not as difficult as it may seem, for the נִי in the latter word may have come from תַּפְלַטָּנִי (letters mis-arranged). בְּלֹא appears to be from האל=כלא (a bit of יִרְחַמְאֵל).

3 f. Insert צדק, as a || to מִיִּשְׁרִים (cp. ix. 9). The adverbial accus.; cp. Jer. xi. 20 שִׁפְטֵ צַדִּק בְּחֵן כְּלִיֹּת וְלֵב (l. 6). Also insert חֲסִיד (metre and sense). Both words easily fell out after יֵצֵא and תַּחֲוִינָה respectively.

5. Note Pasek after לְבִי. Read תַּצְפֵּר, תַּבְחֵן; the imperf. is more natural. M's צַרְפַּתִּי is an expansion of צַרְפַּת, which is a correct alternative reading to פַּקְדַּת. Cp. Job vii. 18, where read תַּצְרַפְּנִי (see on viii. 5). We have already referred to לִילָה, which is against parallelism. A writer in *Journ. of Sacred Lit.*, n.s., iv. 340, proposes כְּלִיֹּת (|| לֵב). But this is insufficient. Read כְּלִיֹּתִי (Gr.); this was written 'כליֹּת'. The same corruption occurs in xvi. 7 and (see on lxxvii. 7) Job xxxv. 10b.

In *l.* 6 (end of *v.* 3) M's זַמְתִּי, which Kôn. (ii. 518, n. 3; *Synt.* § 231a) accepts. Most (e.g. Dathé, Hu., Per., Bi., Bâ.) prefer זַמְתִּי or זַמְתִּי; cp. G 'A Ʒ J S T (alt.). But זַמְתָּ, 'wicked plan,' does not suit the context, which rather suggests מַרְמָה. ז and ר, ת and כו are regularly

confounded.—M בל־יעבר פי. This might be post-Biblical Hebrew (*Yoma*, 86a, עֵבַר עֲבָרָה, 'he trespassed a trespass'; cp. *OP*, 466). The whole phrase must be corrupt. פי will be accounted for presently. For בל־יעבר read בְּלִבִּי אִין | אָן | און and כורמה און are parallel (xxxvi. 4).

7 f. M בְּדַבֵּר שְׁפָתֶיךָ; G presupposes בדברי. M's reading is inadequately defended by cxix. 13. The parallel line suggests מִדְרָכִי; in fact, דבר and דרך are frequently confounded (see e.g. xxxix. 2). For שְׁפָתֶיךָ we expect either a class-name or an ethnic. Since אדם should presumably be read אָדָם (xii. 2, xiv. 2), 'ש' should probably be צָרַפֶּת; Edom (or Aram = Jerahmeel?) and Zarephath were practically synonymous. See xlv. 17a, where 'Zarephath' and 'Gebal' appear to be combined. Cp. 'Zarephath' in *Enc. Bib.* Duhm proposes to read לְפִעֲלֶתְךָ אָדָם, 'deinem Thun schweige ich.' But if a verb were wanted, we should expect a phrase like כָּלֵאתִי רִנְלִי (cxix. 101, Prov. i. 15). 'לפ' not improbably comes from כִּמְעַגְלוֹת. The second כִּי became נ; the first is represented by פי at the end of v. 3. ל is ditto-graphic. Passing on, אני is an imperfectly written אדני. It has produced the omission of נ in נשמרתי (so we should read with Wellh.; in Josh. vi. 18 read הַשְּׁמָרוּ). Continue כִּי אֶרְחֹת (S, Bā., Gr., We.). On פָּרִיז see exeg. note.

9 f. Read תִּמְכּוּ; the descriptive infin. is not in place (see xxxv. 16). In l. 10 (end) insert בְּדַרְכֶיךָ (metre and parallelism), with Bickell.

In l. 11 the changes אֲדָנִי and אֱלִי are too simple to need defence. But in l. 13 we have to use our methods boldly, if we would not unduly disparage the capacities of the psalmist. The clever translator Street reads חֲסִי בָךְ = חֲסִיךָ. G has τοὺς ἐλπίζοντας ἐπὶ σε (similarly S). These are petty expedients. A perfect cure can only be effected by a remedy based on a wide experience of the ways of the scribes. For 'חושיע ה' read בְּכִמְקֵישֶׁךָ. Obviously חֲסֵדֶיךָ should be חֲסִידֶיךָ. For l. 14 M gives us material which needs careful critical handling. As it stands, no reasonable exegesis is possible. Beyond doubt, the passage must be taken together with xvi. 11 (see below, on l. 30). מִמִּים בִּימֵי is parallel to the false reading נִעְמוֹת בִּימֵי ('pleasant things in thy right hand!'), and both readings spring from מִמִּתְקוֹ; בְּמִישְׁכַּנְתֶּיךָ = מִמִּתְקוֹ (מ = נו; כ = פ; ז = ק). Cp. xxvii. 5.—In l. 15 כְּאִישׁוֹן בְּתַעֲצִיבֵנִי is too short, and is not favoured by parallelism. עֵין comes from בְּחִצְרַת בֵּיתֶךָ. כְּאִי' בת is a distortion of בְּחִצְרַת בֵּיתֶךָ. In l. 17 זֶן שְׂדוּנִי is hardly tolerable. Aramaisms are not, as a rule, probable, but here שִׁיזִיבֵנִי at once suggests itself. l. 18 should perhaps be בְּנִפְשׁ אִיבֵי אֶל־תִּתְנֵנִי. Cp. xxvii. 12.

In *l.* 19 we have to combine material from *v.* 9 (end) and *v.* 10 (beg.). Robertson Smith (*Rel. Sem.*⁽²⁾, 379) thought that a particular part of the *viscera* was meant (Ar. *hilb*). But would חֶלֶב, 'midriff,' have been used side by side with כֶּבֶד, 'liver,' as the seat of the feelings? Duhm (after Dys.) would read חֶלֶב לִבְנוֹ, 'their heart is become fat,' continuing סָגְרוּ פִינֵה; not satisfactory. חֶלֶב לִבְנוֹ should be חֶלְבֵי מוֹת (?) (חֶלְבֵי?); see xviii. 6, on which our passage is dependent.—20. Read, to match *l.* 19, שִׁבְלֵי יַמִּים יִבְעֲתוּנִי; cp. xviii. 5, lxix. 3. The correction is justified by sound method. דָּבְרוּ probably comes from a dittographed fragment of שִׁבְלֵי.—21. מֵאֲשֶׁרנו עָתָה סִבְבוּנִי. What can 'אש' mean? 'At each of our steps'? Surely this is superfluous, nor does it suit סִבְבוּנִי. If, however, we grant that the enemies referred to in the neighbouring psalms are the N. Arabian peoples, and that a name for one of these peoples was גִּשׁוּר (often written אֲשׁוּר = אֲשַׁחֲרוּר), we shall at once be disposed to correct אֲשֶׁרנו into גִּשְׁרִים. G, ἐκβάλλοντες or ἐκβαλόντες, *i.e.* perhaps [פִּי] סִבְבוּנִי עָתָה is also suspicious. Read perhaps | גִּרְשׁוּנִי [פִּי] סִבְבוּנִי, and compare xxii. 17. The alternative to 'גש' is יִשְׁמַעֲאֱלֹהִים (cp. אֲנוּשׁ from 'יש'. lvi. 2, *crit. n.*). רַשְׁעִים would be too vague.—The material supplied in M for *l.* 22 is again full of corruption, which Grätz, Nestle, Wildeboer (*ZATW*, 1896, p. 323; 1897, p. 180), and Duhm have treated somewhat too superficially. We may expect to find another allusion to the true text of Ps. xxii., where the N. Arabian oppressors are most probably described (*v.* 13, 17) both as 'lions' and as 'wild oxen with pointed horns.' If so, read בְּקַרְנֵי הַיֶּשֶׁן בְּתַתְּנִי. For בארץ see next note.

In *l.* 23 for דְּמִינוּ (G ὑπελαβύμε, דְּמִינוּ) read certainly יִקְדְּמוּנִי (cp. xviii. 6, 10); see below. ק is represented by צ in בארץ (see on *l.* 22); באר comes from [י] כאר, 'as a lion,' written too soon.

In *l.* 24 for יִכְסֹף read probably יִשְׁקֹד (cp. Jer. v. 6). Kennedy's clever and plausible reading יִשְׁקִיף would mean, not 'look out,' but 'look down.' Point לְאֶרֶץ (Gr.), and insert יִקְפּוּנִי, which easily fell out before כִּכְפִיר. It was replaced in the margin, and now appears in M, corrupt and mutilated, as פָּנִי קִרְמוּה, which precedes it, represents יִקְדְּמוּנִי (a correction of דְּמִינוּ). To read יִשָּׁר for יִשָּׁב (cp. יִשָּׁר for יִשָּׁב in x. 8) would only be possible if שָׁר ever meant 'to lie in wait' (see Ges.-Buhl).

In *l.* 25 read וְהִכְרִיעֵהוּ; in *l.* 27, for the impossible כִּרְשַׁע חֲרָבָד read probably כִּרְשַׁע כְּפָרִים (cp. on xxxiv. 11). כְּפָרִים is also possible; in xxii. 21 כִּפִיר has become חֲרָב.

We now encounter one of our greatest textual problems. מִנִּיתִים יִדָּךְ must be corrupt, but only a weak critic would add 'hopelessly.' יִדָּךְ,

like יהוה in lxxvii. 3, probably comes from יהוה. Then comes the ditto-gram מַחֲלֵד, and the extraordinary group of characters—חֲלָקִים בַּחַיִּים. The key to the latter exists in Job (see xx. 23). The true text runs, תִּמְתָּר עֲלֵיהֶם גַּחֲלִים; in Job, *l.c.* בַּלְחֹמוֹ should certainly be גַּחֲלִים. Errors constantly arise both through the transposition of letters and through the substitution of similar or kindred letters. Thus מַחֲלֵד = חֲלָקִים, and חֲלָקִים = חֲלָקִים. Still stranger but only a little less certain examples of this follow. (וּצְפוּנָד) וּצְפוּנָד בַּחַיִּים should most probably be וּרְחַ פְּלִצְנוֹת (see on xi. 6). Thus we get a parallel for גַּחֲלִים. תַּמְלֵא is correct (see Job xx. 23). שְׁבַע is superfluous both for sense and for metre. Most probably it comes from אֲשַׁבְּעָה, which was written too soon, through the scribe's eye glancing at what is here reckoned as line 30.

In the closing couplet, *ll.* 29, 30 (= *v.* 15), read בַּצְדָּקָה; דָּ fell out after ק. Not so easily corrected is the very doubtful תְּמוֹנֶתְךָ. Resuming our consideration of this (see *exeg.* note) we may remark that it would not be unnatural to transfer נַעֲמוֹת בִּימוֹנְךָ from xvi. 11 (where it is metrically superfluous) to xvii. 15, supposing a *lapsus oculi* on the part of the scribe. But the expression is by no means natural. Certainly the theory of *lapsus oculi* will most easily account for the existence of these words (נַעֲמוֹ בִּימוֹ) at the end of xvi. 11, but the further problem remains to discover the word, or the words, out of which the improbable phrase referred to, and also the equally false parallel reading תְּמוֹנֶתְךָ, may have arisen. There is only one possible solution, בְּמִשְׁבְּרוֹתֶיךָ. בְּמִשְׁבְּרוֹתֶיךָ still remains. Beyond doubt this has arisen out of חֲסִדְךָ. The decisive proof is that חֲסִדְךָ is the only word out of which the troublesome נַעֲמוֹ at the end of xvi. 11 can have arisen.

PSALM XVIII.

THE whole psalm is in trimeters, which are disposed in stanzas of eight lines each. Originally it was shorter; stanzas 3-5 are a later insertion,¹ which may, however, be due to the author of the original poem, for it is a fine specimen of this class of compositions, and the want of a theophany would at once have been seen to be adverse to the popularity of the work (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Theophany'); it is moreover in the same metre as the original poem. The first critical question relates to the speaker of the poem. One might very naturally regard the psalm as a 'dramatic lyric,' and suppose David to be the speaker, the exaggerations being viewed as having the character of virtual Messianic predictions (cp. *OP*, 206). This is the theory expressed in the liturgical appendix (*v.* 51, unless *c.* is a later addition), but is hardly correct. From the bold assertion of legal righteousness and from the Deuteronomistic phraseology it is plain that the pious community is the speaker. With the imaginative licence of faith, righteous Israel looks back

¹ Hupfeld and the present writer (see *OP*, 205, 223) have both entertained the idea of the composite origin of the psalm. The view here adopted, however, is due to Lohr (see his commentary on 2 S. xvii.).

upon its completed discipline, and gives thanks for the divine loving-kindness, and for the reward apportioned to it. The poet is an ardent monotheist (*v.* 32), and a strict adherent of the doctrine of retribution, in connection with the Messianic belief in its wider form.

How greatly exegesis is the gainer from a more courageous and methodical treatment of textual problems, hardly needs to be stated. It would be difficult to deny that stanza 4 (*v.* 11-13) has been relieved of much obscurity and incoherence. Many other flaws (see *e.g.* *ll.* 52, 61 f., 91 f., 96, 101) in this artificial but certainly not contemptible poem have, we may hope, been removed, and the recovery of references to the Jerahmeelites and N. Arabians (a general term) in stanzas 1, 9, 13, 14 is an important element in the parallelism which critical exegesis reveals between the second part of Ps. xviii. and Ps. ii.

The Davidic origin of Ps. xviii. has been thought to be guaranteed by the existence of a second recension of the psalm in 2 S. xxii. This chapter however, together with the *māshāl* in xxiii. 1-7, probably forms the latest addition to the Books of Samuel, and no weight can be attached to the argument which Baethgen and others have based upon it. The closing verse both in 2 S. xxii. and in Ps. xviii., which refers to Yahwē's anointed king and to David and his posterity, is a late liturgical appendix (*v.* indeed may be an appendix to the appendix), and the title of the psalm which represents it as David's song of thanksgiving for his deliverance out of the hand (כַּיָּד) of all his enemies and out of the hand (יָד) of

Saul, has reached its present form through editorial manipulation of an already corrupt text under the influence of a faulty theory. The true text of the psalm (when emended according to the analogy of other titles) does not refer at all to David.¹ Indeed, the appearances of a pre-exilic (even though not Davidic) origin² are altogether illusory. The idealistic religious and political outlook in *v.* 26, 44, 50, the Deuteronomic view of the 'covenant' in *v.* 21-28, the Deuteronomic expressions in 22-24, and the points of contact with Dt. xxxii., xxxiii., exclude such an origin for our psalm. For it took time for the ideas and language of Deuteronomy (which, moreover, is no longer in its original form) to affect religious literature. The psalm, however, must be earlier than Pss. cxvi. (*v.* 3 f.) and cxliv. (1 f., 6 f., 10), Prov. xxx. (*v.* 5), and Hab. iii. (*v.* 19), which, at any rate in their present form, are dependent upon it.

[The points of contact with Dt. xxxii., xxxiii., are *v.* 10, 11, 32, cp. Dt. xxxiii. 26; *v.* 12. cp. Dt. xxxii. 11; *v.* 31, cp. Dt. xxxii. 4 (Prov. xxx. 5); *v.* 32 (צוּר, a divine title), cp. Dt. xxxii. 4, 15, 18, 30 f., 37 (Is. xlv. 8, 1 S. ii. 2); *v.* 32 (Eloah), Dt. xxxii. 15, 17; *v.* 32 (idea), Dt. xxxii. 30a (Is. xlv. 5a). The parallelism between *v.* 44 and Is. lv. 4 f. is of slight importance, for most probably Is. lv. 3-5 is a very late insertion, made after Ps. xviii. had become misinterpreted as a triumphal ode of David.]

According to Duhm, a more precise date can be assigned. He connects this as well as other psalms with the history of Alexander Jannæus, who had a strong interest in asserting his strict legal righteousness against his Pharisean enemies. *Vv.* 5-7 are supposed by Duhm to describe Alexander's defeat at Asophon or Gadara. It is very improbable, however, that any individual is referred to. The claim of warlike ability is not more surprising in this psalm than in Ps. ii. 9 and cxlix. 6 (see on these psalms), and the bitterness towards the Edomites was perennial, while the loud assertions of innocence are most intelligible (see above) in the mouth of the community.

We spoke of a second 'recension' of the psalm in 2 S. xxii. Certain MSS. of G in 2 S. xxii. (see on *ll.* 19, 82, 93, 108 of our version) do in fact appear to represent a peculiar recension based on a somewhat different Hebrew text from that implied by the ordinary Greek text, which both in 2 S. and in Ps. inclines on the whole to M's text of Ps. xviii. Subtle speculations as to the origin and relation of the two Hebrew texts (2 S. and Ps.) are hardly called for. See further Baethgen, *Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.*, 1882, pp. 605 ff.; Ley, *Leitfaden*, 41 f.; H. P. Smith, *Samuel* (on 2 S. xxii.), and *Presbyterian Review*, 1885, pp. 630 f.; W. H. Bennett, *Hebraica*, 1887, pp. 65-86; König, *Einleitung*, pp. 401 f.; Sievers, *Metr. Stud.* ii. 515 ff. Cp. also Joel Müller, *Massechet Soferim* (1878), pp. 115 f.

¹ See 'Psalms,' *Enc. Bib.*, § 45; cp. § 12.

² Cp. *OP*, 204-207.

Deposited: of 'Arab-ethan. The words of Israel in the day that Yahwè delivers him from the hand of all the Arabians and from Ishmael.

- 1 I will extol thee, O Yahwè! +source of+ my righteousness, 2
 My rock, my fortress, mine asylum, 3
 God who art my strength, in whom I take refuge,
 My shield, my horn of victory,
 My sure retreat, my shelter, my stronghold,
 Who deliverest me from the men of Cushan.
 Who can utter the righteous acts of Yahwè, 4
 Or who recount his deliverances?
- The floods of Deathland had snatched me away, 5
 10 The billows of Ruinland had overwhelmed me,
 The snares of Sheol had encompassed me, 6
 The toils of Gloomland had come against me.
 In my distress I called upon Yahwè, 7
 I cried +for help+ unto my God ;
 He heard my voice from his palace,
 My cry reached his ears.

Later insertion (ll. 17—40).

- He threatened, and the earth did rock, 8
 The foundations of the mountains trembled,
 They swayed to and fro, because he was wroth ;
 20 Smoke went up from his nostrils, 9
 Fire from his mouth devoured,
 Glowing coals flashed forth from it.
 He bowed the heavens and came down, 10
 While a mass of clouds was under his feet.
- He mounted the cherub, and flew ; 11
 He came swooping on the wings of the wind ;
 Darkness he made his minister, 12
 The clouds [of heaven] his angels ;
 His quiver [he prepared in] the heaven,
 30 [And his bow in] the clouds of the sky ;
 From before him passed his servants— 13
 Hail and burning coals.

In heaven Yahwè thundered, 14
 The Most High sounded with his voice¹ ;
 His arrows he shot, he scattered them, 15
 Lightnings he hurled, and affrighted them.
 The ocean-channels came into view, 16
 The world's foundations were laid bare—
 At thy threatening, O Yahwè,
 40 At the violent blast of thy nostrils.

*

He reached from high heaven and grasped me, 17
 He drew me out of the vast waters ;
 He snatched me from an enemy too strong, 18
 From haters too mighty for me ;
 They came upon me in the day when I faltered, 19
 But Yahwè proved my support.
 He brought me forth into an open space, 20
 He rescued me, because he took pleasure in me.
 In proportion to my righteousness Yahwè dealt with me, 21
 50 In proportion to the purity of my hands he requited me,
 Because I observed the ways of Yahwè, 22
 And did not forsake his paths,
 For all his ordinances were +constantly+ before me, 23
 And I turned not aside from his statutes ;
 So I was loyal toward him, 24
 From guilty acts I kept myself.
 And Yahwè requited me in proportion to my righteousness, 25
 In proportion to the purity of my hands which he saw.
 Towards the covenant-keeper thou showest thyself a
 covenant-keeper, 26
 60 Towards the loyal one thou showest thyself loyal ;
 But towards the violent one thou showest thyself violent, 27
 And towards the proud thou showest thyself more than
 man.
 Yea, it is thine to deliver a humble people, 28
 But the eyes of all haughty ones thou art wont to abase.
 Yea, thou² art my lamp, O Yahwè ! 29
 My God illumines my darkness.
 Yea, with thee I can break Jerahmeel, 30
 With my God I can divide Geshur.

¹ Hail and burning coals.

² Lightest.

	God ! flawless [is his work] !	31
70	[Right are all] his ways ! Well-trying is Yahwè's promise, A shield is he to all that take refuge in him !	
	Yea, who is God except Yahwè ?	32
	Or who is a Rock save our God ?	
	The God that bound me about with strength,	33
	And girded my loins with heroic might,	
	That gave me feet like the hinds,	34
	And enabled me to stand on heights,	
	That trained my hands for battle,	35
80	And mine arms to +use+ a bow of bronze.	
	Yea, thou gavest me thy succouring shield,	36
	Thy helping right hand sustained me ;	
	Thou madest broad my steps where I went,	37
	Mine ancles faltered not.	
	I pursued mine enemies and overtook them ;	38
	And turned not until I had destroyed them ;	
	I struck them so that they could not rise,	39
	But fell under my feet.	
	Thou didst gird me with strength for battle,	40
90	Thou didst bow down mine assailants under me.	
	Thou didst give me mine enemies as a prey,	41
	My right hand seized my haters.	
	They cried, but there was none to deliver ;	42
	+Cried+ unto Yahwè, but he answered them not.	
	I beat them as small as the dust of the market-place,	43
	I swept them away as the mire of the streets.	
	Thou didst deliver me from the folk of the Arabians,	44a
	Thou didst rescue me from the men of Cusham ;	49c
	Thou madest me the head of the nations,	44b
100	People whom I knew not became my servants.	44c
	The sons of Gebal sought me eagerly ;	45b
	The Ishmaelites became obedient unto me ;	45a
	They brought frankincense and gold,	46
	The Geshurites presented choice gold.	
	Praised and blessed be my Rock,	47
	Exalted be God my deliverer,	
	The God that granted me full revenge,	48
	And crushed peoples under me,	

That rescued me from the [people of the] Arabians, 49a
 110 That preserved me from Jerahmeel. 49b
 Therefore I will give thanks unto thee among the nations, 50
 To thy name, O Yahwè! I will chant hymns.¹

2. **Mine asylum.** The speaker has been in as much danger as if he were followed by the avenger of blood.—4. *My horn.* Cp. lxxxix. 18.—7 f. Imitated in cvi. 2. *Cusham*, i.e. the N. Arabian Cush (cp. *Enc. Bib.*, 'Cush,' 2), see l. 98.

9—12. He has sunk (in a figure) into the ocean whose waters bathe the foundations of the world (xxiv. 2), and bound the vast city of the dead on every side. The expression, 'the floods of Deathland' (= Sheol), and the parallel phrases are figurative; the psalmist means 'the men of Cusham' (l. 6), i.e. the N. Arabian oppressors (cp. on xvii. 10, lxix. 3—5, lxxxviii. 17). The basis of the expression is derived from Babylonian mythology—'Even if, O Gilgames, thou didst cross the sea, what wouldest thou do on arriving at the waters of death,' are the words of the goddess Sabitu to Gilgames, who is on his way to the hero of the Deluge in Paradise (Jeremias, *Vorstellungen*, 86 f.; Maspero, *Dawn of Civ.*, 585). Surely in a mythological text *mê miti* means more than merely 'destructive waters' (Jensen). — *Ruin-land.* The second of the four names of the underworld, mentioned again (certainly) in Isa. xxxviii. 17 ('the pit of Ruin-land,' reading בליעל for בלי). Belyya'al ('Belial') may be a Hebraized form (involving a popular etymology, 'one comes not up again') of Bilili, the non-Semitic Babylonian name of the goddess of the underworld and of vegetation. Unlike Tammuz, Bilili 'appears to be unable to come forth again from the world of the dead' (Jensen, *Exp. Times*, ix. 41). Another name for the goddess of the underworld was Allatu, and we gather from Clermont Ganneau's bronze plaque (see Maspero, *Dawn*, 691) that Allatu was conceived of as a monster. Very possibly בליעל was popularly derived

from בלע, 'to swallow up'; thus perhaps we may account for the *y* in בליעל (cp. König's remark on the insertion of *y* in the names of animals as a 'determinative,' *Lehrgeb.*, ii. 402).

Thus too we see how בליעל (in 'sons of Belial') might come to mean 'destructiveness,' or the like. It will be noticed that the נחלי ('rivers of') of M has become נלי, 'billows of,' in our revised text (see crit. note). The objection made to the most probable explanation of our passage on the ground that Bab. mythology does not know of a river Styx, is, therefore, pointless. Duhm, who renders 'die Bäche des Untergangs,' certainly does not hit the poet's meaning. See further 'Belial,' *Enc. Bib.*, and (on 'Bilili') Jensen, *Kosmol.*, 225, 275.

17—24. Duhm is severe upon this description of a theophany; the lavish imagery, he says, is disproportionate to the final result, which is merely the deliverance of a Jewish warrior. How can this be admitted? Rhetoric no doubt there is; imitation of 'older passages' (hardly Jer. xvii. 4, Isa. lxxv. 5, but rather Ex. xix. 16 ff., xx. 18, Isa. xxix. 6) no doubt there is; but the grandiose character of the description is not in excess of the occasion, which is the final deliverance of Israel with the Messiah at its head. In reality, the whole passage is a reflexion of an older mythology; the later parts (e.g. xix. 2—7, and Job) delight in these archaic revivals. Have they not a right to their taste?

25 f. **The cherub,** || 'the wings of the wind.' Probably the poet identifies the cherub with the storm-wind; cp. civ. 3, Isa. xix. 1. So Ninib (Adar) is called *rakab abibi*, 'he who rides on the tempest' (Del. *Ass. HWB*, 4a). See 'Cherub,' *Enc.*

¹ That gives great victories unto his king,
 That shows lovingkindness unto his anointed,
 Unto David and unto his offspring for ever.

Bib.; Smythe-Palmer, *Nineteenth Century*, Jan., 1901, p. 341. Lines 25-28 and 31 f. are imitated in civ. 3 f.

29 f. **His quiver, his bow.** Cp. lxxvii. 18, Lam. iii. 13, Hab. iii. 9, 11.—31 f. *His servants.* Cp. 27 f.; Eccus. xxxix. 29, 31.—39. גַּעְרָה. Cp. civ. 7.

41. Cp. lvii. 4.—42. For the figure cp. lines 9 f., lxix. 2 f.

47. *He brought me forth, &c.* Cp. xxv. 17, cxlii. 8, cxliii. 11.—*Because, &c.* Cp. xxii. 9, xli. 12. Thus the poet leads on to the colossal self-assertion which follows.

49 f. The help given to the speaker is the reward of his righteousness (*l.* 49); Yahwè too is righteous—He deals with every one in exact accordance with his deserts (*l.* 50). This is the two-fold theme of *ll.* 50-58 and *ll.* 59-62. Cp. vii. 9; xvii. 1-5.

51-54. Note the Deuteronomic phrases דְּקוֹת, פְּלִיכוֹשֶׁפְּטִים, שְׂכִיר. *ll.* 23 is also Deuteronomistic (2 K. iii. 3, xiii. 2, 6, x. 29, 31); see crit. note.

59 f. חֶסֶד, implying that חֶסֶד is the bond of the covenant; cp. 'Lovingkindness,' *Enc. Bib.* Even Yahwè therefore can be called חֶסֶד; cp. cxlv. 17, Jer. iii. 12. 'Liebreich' (Ol.) is a misleading rendering. — תְּמִים, not here 'flawless' (as *l.* 69), but 'entirely devoted' (as *l.* 55), חֶסֶד.

61 f. גְּבוּר. 'tyrant,' in a bad sense, as lii. 3. Its natural parallel is עֲתָק; the proud speech of oppressors is specially meant (xxxii. 19, lxxv. 6, xciv. 4, 2 S. ii. 3).—תְּתַפְּלֵא (see crit. note); cp. Isa. xxix. 14. It is one of the chief gains of strict criticism that we are no longer obliged to excuse the language of the Psalmist as that of the 'natural man' (Ol.). There is no parallel to the daring statement of M elsewhere.

63 f. Observe that יַגִּי (= יַגִּי) represents *ll.* 59 f.; while רַמִּים

corresponds to *ll.* 61 f., and supports the correction עֲתָק in *l.* 62. עַם עֵינִי, as Zeph. iii. 12; cp. on ix. 13.

69-72. See Dt. xxxii. 4, Prov. xxx. 5, and cp. on xii. 7.

73 f. **Who is God, &c.** Cp. 1 S. ii. 2, 2 S. vii. 22, and especially Isa. xlv. 8. We can hardly lay stress on אֱלֹהִים (*v.* 31a), as proving the late date of the Psalm. For though אֱלֹהִים may be a late, artificial formation from אֱלֹהִים (references in Ges.-Bu.), yet we cannot be sure that both here and in Isa. xlv. 8 אֱלֹהִים may not have been substituted for אֱלִי, which word is here read by 2 S. See further 'Names of God,' *Enc. Bib.*—*A Rock*, צִוּר; so *v.* 47; cp. Dt. xxxii. 31. Ἐ, Θεός, which is a correct paraphrase.

75 ff. Cp. the triumphal hymn of Thotmes III. (Brugsch, *Hist. of Eg.*, i. 370 ff.), where in ten strophes the god Amen describes the victories of the king, and ascribes them to himself ('I came, and thou smotest . . .') In the sanctuary of the temple of Thotmes III. at Karnak, the god Set of Nub teaches his royal pupil to shoot with the bow (Baedeker, *Upper Egypt*, 140). This illustrates *ll.* 79 f.

77 f. Found again, with two variations, in Hab. iii. 19.—*Like hinds.* Cp. 2 S. ii. 18, 1 Chr. xii. 8.

79 f. Cp. cxliv. 1. This explains the warlike ability ascribed to pious Israel in cxlix. 6 f., ii. 9 (?).

83. **Thou madest broad, &c.**, i.e. gavest me strength to step out (cp. Isa. lxiii. 1). So Job xviii. 7.—85. The 'enemies' are primarily the N. Arabian oppressors, as *ll.* 97 ff. show; the title of the Psalm is perfectly right.

87. **I struck them, &c.** Cp. ii. 9 (and note).

89. Nearly a repetition of *l.* 75. So *l.* 90 virtually repeats *l.* 88.

94. **Unto Yahwè**, i.e. for pity. Duhm, however, thinks of the internal strife of the Jews under Alexander Jannæus.

97 f. **The Arabians and the men of Cusham** (nearly = Jerah-

meel) are here, as elsewhere, the chief enemies of the Jews in the age of the Psalter. Cp. lxxvi. 19 (corr. text), where the 'remnant of Maacah,' it is said, will bow down to Yahwè.

101. **Sought me eagerly.** Cp. Isa. lv. 5. How unworthy the text-reading ('gave feigned submission') is, need not be shown at length. See crit. note. Though the psalmist uses the conventional language of oriental imperialists (cp. Sargon's inscriptions), he really cherishes the hope that not a few belonging to the conquered nations

will submit to the true God. Cp. ii. 10-12, and specially lix., ll. 21-24, lxxxiii., ll. 32-36.

103 f. Cp. lxxviii. 31 and lxxii. 10 (corr. text); Isa. lx. 6. The *chains* are link-chains (Ar. *silsilah*).

105. **כִּהְלֵל**; xlvi. 2, xevi. 4. cxlv. 3.

111. **Among the nations**, i.e. in the outer circle of nations—those which had not been hostile to Israel. Cp. Isa. lxvi. 19.

Critical Notes. Title. On **לְעֶבֶד יְהוָה** (cp. xxxvi.), see Introd. The second part has been thoroughly disguised by a later writer. The differences in form in the Psalter and in 2 Sam. are unimportant, with the exception of the last; **כִּי־יָד** has been *altered* in 2 S. into **כִּי־בָרַךְ** for the sake of uniformity. The warning Paseḵs in M, after **הַדָּבָר** and after **בְּיוֹם** should be noticed. To restore a true historical colour, on the analogy of the restored title of Ps. vii., read **דְּבַר־יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּיוֹם הַצִּיל יְהוָה אוֹתוֹ** **כִּי־בָרַךְ פֶּלֶא־עֲרֵבִים וּמִי־שָׁמַעֵאל**. It may be admitted that the writer has very cleverly adapted the (indistinctly written) title to the corrupted prefix **לְרוּד**. M. Heilprin ingeniously suggests **שְׁאוֹל** (Sheol); cp. *zvi.* 5, 6.

1. M **אֲרַחֲמֶךָ**. The Vss. confirm this, but the context does not favour it. Even apart from this, 'I love thee' needs to be followed by 'with all my heart.' And, as the decisive argument, **רַחַם**, 'to love, is Aram. (cp. Ass. *râmu*), not Heb.; see S. **נ** and **ח** are confounded. The **וַיֵּאמֶר** of 2 Sam. should put us on the right track; it springs from **אֲרַחֲמֶךָ** (xxx. 2). This is read by Ol., Hi., Dy., Bi., Gr.—2 S. omits **חֲזָקִי**, or rather **צִדְקִי** (see on xvii. 1). As a title of God **חֲזָקִי** or **חֲזָקִי (?)** is unexampled. **צִדְקִי** is natural, because it expresses the leading idea of the psalm. Cp. on cxliv. 2.

2. Omit the dittographed **יְהוָה**.—M **כִּי־פִלַטִי**; 2 S. **כִּי־פִלַטִי לִי**; cp. cxliv. 2. Rather, as Del. (note) and Duhm, **כִּי־פִלַטִי**. Cp. lv. 9, also Cant. iv. 4, where **תַּלְפִּיּוֹת** has grown out of **כִּי־פִלַטִי** (|| **כִּי־פִלַטִי**).

3. M **אֱלֹהֵי צוּרֵי**; 2 S. **אֱלֹהֵי צֹר**. Read **אֱלֹהֵי עֵז** and **צֹר** confounded (see on xxviii. 8).

5 f. Insert **וּכְנוּסֵי וּמְעֵזֵי כִּי־אִישׁ פָּשָׁם תִּשְׁעֵנִי**. See partly 2 S. The eight-line stanza requires such an insertion. For **כִּי־אִישׁ**, cp. *l.* 110. The **כִּי־שָׁעִי** of 2 S. represents both **כִּי־אִישׁ** and **כִּי־שָׁעִי**; it is conflate. For **פָּשָׁם** cp. *l.* 98.

7 f. M אָקָרָא מִהֶלֶל; none of the rival explanations (see Ol., Now., Bā., Du.) can make this appear natural. Read almost certainly, מִי וּמִן אֵיבֵי וּמִן יִסְפֵּר יְשׁוּעָתָיו. וּמִי יִסְפֵּר יְשׁוּעָתָיו. M's מִן אֵיבֵי וּמִן יִסְפֵּר would be just plausible enough to escape censure, if we had not the corrected text of *l.* 7 to guide us. It is, however, not free from exegetical difficulty. The historic presents (Kön.) also are not natural. Nor can מִן אֵיבֵי, in a passage which is otherwise suspicious, be passed over without question. מִן is indeed defensible before א (in prose, it often occurs before the article), but it should be noted that מִן in *τ.* 14, 2 S., and in *τ.* 49 M, is corrupt.

9. M אֶפְפוּנֵי חֲבֵלֵי כְּוֹת. 2 S. needlessly prefixes כִּי; it also attests אֶפְפוּנֵי. Yet this is certainly wrong. True, אֶפְפָּא occurs again in M of cxvi. 3, Jon. ii. 5, but both expressions are based on the present passage; and in M of xl. 13, which is also obviously imitative. It is very probable that all these passages have been harmonized. This leaves but one real witness for אֶפְפָּא—a word without any clear linguistic affinities. G reads differently—*περιέσχον με*, *i.e.* perhaps הַקְּפוּנֵי (cp. G xxii. 17), in both psalm-passages (but *περιεχύθη* in Jon.). More probably right is קָפוּנֵי. חֲבֵלֵי too is corrupt (see *l.* 11) in spite of cxvi. 3. Most prefer the variant מִשְׁבְּרֵי of 2 S., which is supposed to mean 'breakers.' M gives this word again in xlii. 8, lxxxviii. 8, xciii. 4 (G everywhere *μετρωρισμοί*). But the sense is a very odd one; the only certain sense of מִשְׁבֵּר is *matrix*, 'the mouth of the womb' (2 K. xix. 3, Isa. xxxvii. 3, Hos xiii. 13). Corruption must be assumed; probably we should read שִׁבְבֵלֵי¹, which became corrupted into שְׁבֵרֵי. The prefixed כִּי is clearly dittographic in xciii. 4, and hardly less plainly in 2 S., where the preceding כִּי, as often, was mistaken for כִּי. Of this prefixed כִּי the initial ח in חֲבֵלֵי (M of Ps.) is a corruption; שׁ fell out. Cp. on xl. 13, xlii. 8. For כְּוֹת in *l.* 9 Klo. prefers מַיִם (Luc. in 2 S. *ὑδατα*), but against the parallelism.

10. M נַחְלֵי בְּלֵיעַל יִבְעֵתָנִי. נַחְלֵי, like נַהֲרוֹת (xxiv. 2), might mean the ocean-streams. Still it is more natural to read נַחְלֵי (xlii. 8⁽³⁾—lxv. 8, &c.). This was probably corrupted first into נַחְלֵי (cp. *τ.* 9, 14), and then into נַחְלֵי; see a parallel in cxxiv. 4. יִבְעֵתָנִי (which might suggest בְּלֵיעַל for בְּלֵיעַל) is not favoured by parallelism. Read probably שִׁטְפוּנֵי (cp. lxix. 3); שׁ = ע, ט = ת, פ = ב.—12. M כְּוֹת. Read probably צְלִכוֹת (see note above). Thus we get four names for the nether world.

16. M G here insert לִפְנֵי (weak variant to 'בֵּאוּ'). 2 S. is without לִ' ת.

¹ Accidentally not found in M in the sense of 'floods.'

17 f. For 'ותנ' read וַיַּגְעַר (Nestle, *Marg.* 21). 2 S., Kr., וַיִּתְגַּעַשׁ ; Luc. ἐπέβλεψε.

27 f. This and the next line are not very clear or suitable. 2 S. and G (Ps. and Sam.) suggest וַיִּשֶׁת (so Gr.), but that is a trifle. Should not סתרו be מִשְׁתָּרְתוֹ (civ. 4)? Cp. בסתר from מִשְׁתָּרְתוֹ in xci. 1. סביבותיו seems to have arisen partly out of a dittographed מִשְׁתָּרְתוֹ, partly out of עָבִי. סכתו is a corruption of מִלְאכֵי. Read as l. 28, עֵבִי שָׁמַיִם 'מל'. This fits the context.

29. M השִׁבַּת־מַיִם, hardly probable after חֲשָׁךְ in l. 27. In 2 S. 'השבת נו', 'a sifting (= sprinkling) of water;' a post-Biblical root and sense (השרים, 1 K. vii. 33, is corrupt). Read probably יִכִּין אֲשַׁפְּתוֹ (השרים), 1 K. vii. 33, is corrupt). Read probably יִכִּין אֲשַׁפְּתוֹ בַּשָּׁמַיִם. Note the reference to arrows in l. 35, and cp. Hab. iii. 9, 11. The loss of matter here in M is not so great as that in the next two lines in M of 2 S.—M's עָבִי שְׁחָקִים is a fragment of the line, וְקִשְׁתוֹ בְּעָבִי וְסַכְתוֹ שְׁחָקִים may easily have been lost through its resemblance to סכתו and השכת. Bā. and We., with 'ΑΣ (ἐν παχύτητι) point עָבִי, 'thickness (of)'; but this does not help. G, ἐν νεφέλαις, in 2 S. also ἐπάχυνεν, a doublet.

31 f. M כִּינְגָה נִגְדוּ עָבִי עָבְרוּ. Read certainly יַעֲבְדוּ כִּינְגָה נִגְדוּ עָבִי עָבְרוּ. נגה is a miswritten נגדו. Cp. ll. 12 f. 2 S. omits עָבִי and עָבְרוּ, and reads בָּעָרִי for עָבְרוּ, with the assent of Street (1790) and Woods (*Hebraica*, '87, p. 262). Du., following Bi., reads עָבִי שְׁחָקִים כִּינְגָה, 'a thicket of clouds without brightness.'

33 f. 2 S. reads מִן־שָׁמַיִם. This can be accounted for. מ is dittographed; נ comes from ב. Cp. on l. 7 f.—Omit גַּחֲלֵי אֵשׁ (G).

36. Read וּבָרַקְתָּ, combining M here and in 2 S.; or וּבָרַק וּבָרַק. G in 2 S. has καὶ ἤστραψεν ἀστραπὴν; cp. cxliv. 6. M's רב (in Ps.) cannot be defended by Gen. xlix. 23, where רבו is a fragment of וַיִּרְבְּהוּ. רב is clearly a fragment of ברק. Cp. Ass. *baraku*, 'to flash.' So Bennett, Klo., Bā., Kau.

37. M כִּי־בָ; 2 S. יָם (so Che.¹¹, Bā., Gunkel). Read perhaps יָמַיִם (Gr., Klo.).

43. M עָ. Read כִּי־עָ (T, Klo.). Neither of the views given by Bā. is satisfactory; cp. Kön., *Synt.*, §§ 277h, n. 1; 334m. כִּי easily fell out after בִּי.

45. M בְּיָוִם אֵי־י. This is too strong; it was not a אֵי־י. Read בְּיָוִם אֲמִיעַד.

49. Read וַיִּגְדַּלְנִי (G).—52. M וְלֹא רָשִׁיעַתִּי מֵאֱלֹהֵי, should mean, 'I have not been wicked in my God's judgment' (see Job iv. 17). But

however rendered, it is against parallelism. Read certainly **וְלֹא עֲזָבְתִי** (cp. xvii. 5).

54. Read, with 2 S., **לֹא אֲסוּר מִכִּינָה** (cp. note above). **כִּינִי** after **אֲסוּר** (so M) is superfluous; see Josh. xi. 15. Klo.'s doubtfully suggested **חֲקָתוֹ** (cp. Job xxxviii. 10) is improbable.

60. M **גָּבַר**; 2 S. **גִּבּוֹר**. Omit as a dittographed **גָּבַר**. See next note. Luc. in 2 S. implies no **גָּבַר** (*μετὰ ἀθῶον*). So Klo.

61. M **וְאִם-גִּבּוֹר תִּתְּנֶנְבֶר**; 2 S. **תִּתְּנֶנְבֶר**. Read **וְאִם-גִּבּוֹר תִּתְּנֶנְבֶר** (Klo.). There is a trace of this reading in M's **גָּבַר** (**גִּבּוֹר**) in l. 60. Thus the antitheses become complete.

62. M **עֵקֶשׁ**, not a suitable || to **גִּבּוֹר**. Read either **עֵשֶׂק** or (better) **עֶתֶק**; cp. on lxxiii. 8.—M **תִּתְּפֹלֵל**, most unsuitable. 2 S., **תִּתְּפֹלֵל**. Read **תִּתְּפֹלֵל** (Job x. 16).

64. M **עֵינַיִם רְנוּת** (a reminiscence of cxxxi. 1). Better, as 2 S., **וְעֵינַיִךְ עַל-רַגְלַיִם**, where, however, **כַּעַל** should be **כָּל** (Klo.) Correct accordingly.

65. Omit **תֵּאִיר** ('lightest,' cp. Isa. xxvii. 11, Mal. i. 10). **תֵּ** arose from dittography; **אִיר** from **אֹרִי**, a gloss on **נְרִי** (Klo.). Read **אֵלֹהֵי יְהוָה יְהוּדָה נְרִי**.

67. M **גִּדּוֹד**. Luc. in 2 S. *πεφραγμένος* = **גִּדָּר**. So Lag., Klo., Bā., Che.¹⁾, Kau. But the corruption lies deeper. **גִּדּוֹד** comes from **גִּלְעָד** (cp. the allusion in lx. 9), and **גִּלְעָד** (as occasionally elsewhere) comes from **גִּלְגָּל**, or rather **יִרְחֲמָאֵל**. See ll. 97 f. That **אֲרִיץ** should be **אֲרִיץ** is generally admitted.

68. M **אֲדַלְגֵּ-שׁוֹר**. So 2 S. But **שׁוֹר** 'wall' only occurs again in Gen. xlix. 22, and **דִּלְגֵּ** should be followed by **עַל**. Read **אֲחַלְקֵנִי שׁוֹר** (cp. allusion in lx. 8).

69. Read probably **הָאֵל תַּמִּים [פַּעֲלוֹ וַיִּשְׂרִים כָּל-] דַּרְכָּיו** (Bi.). The stanza requires an insertion; the sense too is improved. Cp. Dt. xxxii. 6, which Sievers has overlooked.

72. Read **לְכָל-חֹסִים** (metre). Cp. Ley, *Leitfaden*, 43.

76. There is deep-seated but not incurable corruption. The **תַּמִּים** of M and G cannot be right. 'Soundness' can no doubt be predicated of individuals (Prov. i. 12; cp. Job xxi. 23), but not of a 'way' or 'career.' Du.'s rendering 'wohlbehalten' shows how unsuitable the epithet is here. No slight correction will avail. Parallelism suggests **וַיַּחְזֵר כְּתִנֵּי** **גִּבּוֹרָה**. **ר** in **וַיַּחְזֵר** is attested by 2 S. (**וַיַּחְזֵר**, which is too summarily dismissed by the critics). **ג** by 1's. (**וַיַּחְזֵר**); **ח** and **ת** are often confounded. **נִי** in **כְּתִנֵּי** was mistaken (as often) for **כִּי**. **ג** in **גִּבּוֹרָה** became **ב**; **ב** became **ד**.

78. M בְּמוֹתַי, where י is dittographic. Read בְּמוֹת (G in Ps. and 2 S., also in Hab. iii. 19). So Gr., Klo., Kau. Dt. xxxiii. 29 is not parallel.

80. M וּנְחַתָּהּ, fem. sing. before the verb in plur. (Kön., *Synt.*, § 348 o), or a survival of a 3rd plur. perf. in â (Peters, in Kön., § 348 v). 2 Sam. has וּנְחַת. The word is *said* to mean, ' (so that . . .) presses down ' ; but it *ought* to mean, ' and (the bow) is broken. ' The proper word would be וְהַדְרִיכָהּ. T gives, ' makes my arms as strong as a bow of bronze ' ; similarly Klo., וּנְחַתְךָ. This, however, is not natural. וּנְחַתָּהּ represents לְ; וּזְרוּעֵי לְ; וּ and י dropped out, נ and ר, ע and ח, were confounded; ל became ה.

82. M וּיְמִינְךָ תִּסְעַדְנִי, which can barely be reckoned as a trimeter. In 2 S., M has only וְעֵנֶתְךָ תִּרְבְּנִי. M, in Ps., gives after the above וְעֵנֶתְךָ תִּרְ, which must be miswritten for וְעֵזְרְךָ תִּרְחִיבֵנִי (ע is due to Ol.) ; the עֵנֶת of Yahwè ('A E' *πραότης σου* ; so J) is hardly a possible expression ; indeed, G Θ in Ps. give ἡ *παιδεία σου* (so S), and G in 2 S., but unnaturally. תִּרְחִיב has arisen out of the next word תִּרְחִיב. Read ' וּיְמִין עֵזְרְךָ תִּסְ.

84. M קָרְסָלִי need not be questioned, though an Aramaism (see T, Ps. l. 11), and though G here has τὰ ἔχρη μου (עֲקָבְתִּי). [In 2 S. G. gives τὰ σκέλη μου, but one of Luc.'s two renderings is ἐν ταῖς τριβύβους μου, i.e. בְּמִסְלֵתַי.] קָרְסָל also in x. 6b and xxx. 8 (corr. texts).

91. M עָרַף. Read טָרַף (cxxiv. 6). The phrase נָתַן עָרַף means ' to flee. ' In Ex. xxxiii. 27 the same correction is required.

92. M וּכְשֵׁנֵי אֲצִמִּיתָם, but neither sense nor metre is satisfied. Read וּכְשֵׁנֵי מִצָּאָה יְמִינִי (cp. xxi. 9). יתם is a perfectly regular corruption of יְמִינִי.

93. For יִשְׁעוּ 2 S. has יִשְׁעוּ (so Ol.).—94. עַל 2 S., correctly אֶל.

95. For רוּחַ Lag., Bâ. (and now Du.) read רָחֵב, correctly. But כַּעֲפַר־אֲרֶץ is superfluous. 2 S. simply אֲרֶץ.

96. For אֲרִיקָם, 17 MSS. Kenn. and 7 de R. have אֲדִיקָם, supported by G S T in Ps. 2 S has אֲרִיקָם אֲדִיקָם, two rival readings side by side. Ew., Ol., Gr., Bâ., Gr. prefer אֲדִיקָם ; We. and Du. waver between this reading and אֲרִיקָם. Hi., Del., Klo., however, follow Ps. (M). It seems to me that the reading which has most claims is אֲרִיקָם, because from this we can account for the rise of the other readings. But it is surely not less unsuitable than they are. We must, therefore, look behind it for the true reading, which, in my opinion, certainly is אֲבִיעָם. See the striking parallel, 1 K. xiv. 21.

97. M כַּרְיָבֵי עָם (2 S. עֵנִי). A reference to civil wars is altogether unsuitable. Some definite historical allusion is to be expected. Read מִיַּעַם עֲרָבִים; cp. xliii. 1, &c.

98. M in both texts makes this *v.* 49 *c*; thus one stanza is too short, another too long. So Du.; Bi. transfers *v.* 49 *b*.—M הָקִים; 2 S. הַקִּים. Read פָּרַשׁ (*l.* 6). Cp. the frequent corruption of 'כ' into שָׁכַם.

101 f. 2 S. gives the right order of the lines (Bi., Klo., Du.).—M בְּנֵי נֹכַר. Read בְּנֵי נֹבֵל, and restore historical colouring (lxxxiii. 8).—M לִי יִכְחָשׁוּ; 2 S. יִתְכַחֲשׁוּ (Cp. Dt. xxxiii. 29, Nif.). Most since Ges. have ascribed to כַּחַשׁ in this passage, in lxxvi. 3, lxxxii. 16, and in Dt. *l.c.* the sense of feigned submissiveness (*BDB* gives no alternative). But, as a meritorious but forgotten scholar (J. Rogers, *Psalms*, 1834, ii. 176) well remarks, 'Ges. adduces no evidence to prove this, nor is the supposition borne out by the context in any of the passages.' On the other hand, Rogers does not justify the sense 'to submit.' Doubtless we should everywhere correct either into שָׁחָה (Hithp.) or better into שָׁחַר. Read here יִשְׁחָרוּ לִי (cp. Job viii. 5).—M's text of *v.* 45*a* curiously disguises the Ishmaelites (for another disguise see title). Read יִשְׁמָעֵאֵלִים יִאֲזִינוּ לִי. Cp. הָאֲזִין in Neh. ix. 30.

103. M G בְּנֵי־נֹכַר. Clearly an error, caused by *l.* 101. Read לְבִנְהָ לְוָחָרָן (cp. Isa. lx. 6). ל dropped out, owing to the preceding לִי; יָ also dropped out (illegible?). We certainly need a reference to the tribute of the foreign vassals.

104. M וַיִּחָרְגוּ; 2 S., וַיִּחָרְגוּ (so Klo.). Neither הָרַג 'to tremble' (Aram.), nor חָגַר 'to gird on,' or 'to bind,' or 'to limp' (another Aram. sense, adopted by G in Ps.—*ἐχώλασαν*) gives a satisfactory meaning. Luc. in 2 S., ἐλυτρώθησαν, perhaps = וַיִּפְרְקוּ (הָרַר 'to liberate,' Aram., is hardly the root, as Nestle, *ZATH*, '96, 324, supposes). The right word must surely be וַיִּקְרְבוּ.—M מִמִּסְכָּרֹתֵיהֶם; in 2 S., suff. עָם. An unsuitable reading suggested by וַיִּחָרְגוּ? Luc. in 2 S., ἐκ τῶν δεσμῶν αὐτῶν. Klo., מוֹסַרְתֵיהֶם. But the corruption lies deeper than Klo. supposes. Some form of tribute must be referred to. Read most probably נְשִׂוּרִים בְּתָם, and on Mic. vii. 17 see *Crit. Bib.*

105 f. M חֵי־יְהוָה (followed by וּבְרֹדֶף and וַיִּירוּם). חֵי and יִירוּם seem to go together, and to imply a 'triumphant' declaration respecting Yahwè; בְּרֹדֶף too can, of course, be taken as declaratory. But this view does not suit the close of a psalm, and elsewhere חֵי־יְהוָה means *ita Deus vivat*. There must be error in the text. Read probably כִּהְלֵל הַיְיָ the second י in M is dittographic.—For וַיִּירוּם read וַיִּרָם (cp. Ol.).

108. M וַיִּדְבֵּר. G here ὑποτάξας; in 2 S. παιδεύων. There מתבר ('broke'), but in xlvi. 4 ילַטַל ('killed'). 2 S., מוֹרִיד, which Klo. and Briggs prefer. But this is surely one of those easy corrections to which the ancient editors were too prone. xlvi. 4, evidently a parallel passage, has וַיִּדְבֵּר, which should mean 'drove together,' and is impossible. After repeated consideration, I must decline We.'s correction (here and in xlvi. 4) וַיִּרְבֵּד, 'he stretched out as a pavement' (Mishn. רִבֵּד, Targ. רובדא) as too far-fetched an expression. Nor is Herz's וַיִּדְרֹךְ quite natural with תַּחֲתֵי. I suspect that the right word is וַיִּדְכֵּא; cp. Lam. iii. 34. The corruption into וַיִּדְבֵּר first arose in xlvi. 4, owing to the retroactive influence of יבחר (note ב and ר) in v. 5. Then an editor adjusted xviii. 48 to xlvi. 4.

109. M מֵאֵיבֵי אֶף. אֶף springs from פֶּף (cp. title), which fell out both in 2 S. and originally in Ps. In Ps., however, it was restored in the wrong place in the distorted form אֶף (Klo.).

110. M מוֹרֶקְמִי; cp. 2 S. וּמֶקְמִי (plainly an early conjectural correction). Read מִרְחֶמְאֵל; ר became נ, ח became ק. תִּרְוֹ is not the natural verb. Read תִּשְׁמְרֵנִי; cp. xliii. 1.

111 f. Duhm prefers to relegate v. 50 to the margin as an interpolation, and to adopt v. 51 for the text. Certainly v. 51 is intended as a continuation of the description of Yahwè's mercies in vv. 47-49; וְעַל־כֵּן connects better with vv. 36-46. But the introduction of 'his king' and 'his anointed' should make us pause. There is no reference elsewhere in the psalm to the royal character of the speaker. And it is fitting that, as the psalm began with 'I will extol thee,' so it should close with 'I will give thanks to thee.' וְעַל־כֵּן sums up the whole contents of the psalm.

PSALM XIX.—I.

TETRAMETERS. Subject, the glory of God in the heavens, and especially in the sun. Unless the remainder of the poem, which presumably related to the moon and the stars (cp. on l. 1), was omitted by the editor, on the ground that these luminaries were treated of in Ps. viii., we must suppose that the editor only had this fragment before him. Whether the poet had access to ancient hymns to Yahwè as maker of the sky, we cannot tell. The Aramaism הָהָה, not to urge רָקִיעַ, confirms the natural view that this psalm of creation (see on l. 1) is post-exilic. Psalms xix.¹ and xix.² may quite possibly have been combined in the Greek period. See on Ps. i. (also composite, but of later date). On the composite psalm, cp. *Christian Use of the Psalms*, 55-70.

Deposited. Marked: of 'Arab-ethan.

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | The heavens tell out the glory of God, | 2 |
| | The sky reports the work of his hands. | |
| | Day pours out tidings unto day, | 3 |
| | And night shows knowledge unto night. | |

Their sound travels into all the earth,	4 <i>b</i> , 5 <i>a</i>
Their words are heard at the end of the world ;	5 <i>a</i>
Surely thou hast stablished chambers.	4 <i>a</i> , 4 <i>b</i>
For the sun thou hast appointed his palace.	5 <i>b</i>
He is like a bridegroom issuing from his alcove,	6
10 And joys like a hero to run on his road ;	
At one end of the heavens is his going forth,	7 <i>a</i>
To the other he pursues his circling course ;	
? And there is nothing hidden from his heat ?	7 <i>b</i>
* * * * * *	

1. **Tell out.** So Wycliffe, finely. Probably the sun, moon, and stars are meant, or, more precisely, the spirits who were popularly believed to be the tenants of the heavenly bodies. As the stars sang for joy at creation (Job xxxviii. 7), so now they 'tell out' and 'report' God's first and greatest work (so Du.). אַל, not יהוה, because the whole human race listens to this 'report' (הַגִּיד, as I. 6, xcvi. 6). רָקִיעַ. Nine times in Gen. i., four times in Ezek., once in Dan.; also in cl. 1. Not in Job, not even in xxxvii. 18. See Driver, *Journ. of Philology*, xi. 212, but cp. Cornill, *Einl.*, 65.

3 f. 'A wonderful verse; of all those which glorify God in nature, one of the most beautiful' (Du.). There is an uninterrupted tradition of creation's wonders. The days and nights are represented as having had an independent, transcendental existence (cp. Job iii. 1-10). יְבִיעַ—conveys the notion of an inspired stream of words (cp. lxxviii. 2), unless the Hifl has lost its proper significance, so that the word means simply 'utter' (cp. Ges.-Bu.). הִוָּה, Aram., elsewhere only in Job (five times, incl. xiii. 17).

7 f. A distant echo of the old Babylonian sun-myth. The heavenly vault has two gates; from one the sun issues at dawn; by another he returns in the evening. The bolts of heaven are mentioned in the Creation story. This

also illustrates the phrase 'the gate of heaven' (Gen. xxviii. 17). On the chamber of the sun and the portals of the sky, see also Enoch xli. 5 and lxxii. See Karppe, *Journ. As.*, janv.-févr. '97, pp. 88 ff.; Pinches, in Hastings, *DB*, i. 193*b* (top).—הַכִּיָּן, as in l. 1 of the fragment of 'Solomon's psalm' (*OP*, 212). הַיֵּכָל, a good exchange for אֹהֶל! Clément Marot, the Huguenot translator, felt this. He paraphrases, Dieu en eux ha posé Palais bien composé Au Soleil clair et monde.

9. **Like a bridegroom.** A primitive solar myth (cp. 'Sun,' *Enc. Bib.*) has died down into a metaphor. Cp. Rig Veda, ix. 86, 32 (of the setting sun), 'The husband of the wives approaches the end' (Max Müller). A bridegroom is also the symbol of youthful vigour; cp. *Pirke Aboth*, v. 21, 'He who is eighteen years old is (ripe) for the *huppah*.'—From his alcove. See Joel ii. 16. The *huppah* was a part of the nuptial chamber curtained off for the bride, and probably a survival of the wife's separate tent (Gen. xxiv. 67).

10. **Like a hero, &c.** *Edlu*, 'lord,' 'mighty one,' is a frequent epithet of Samaš, the Babylonian sun-god (Muss-Arnolt, *Ass. Dict.*, 19). The sun's swiftness reminds us of the picture of a warrior in xviii. 34, and of the 'horses of the sun,' 2 K. xxiii. 11 (but see 'Nathan-melech,' *Enc. Bib.*). Cp. also Sirach xliii. 5*b* in G, 'and by his word he (the sun) runs (his) course.'

Critical Notes. 5 f. Our first step must be to combine material from *v.* 5*a* and *v.* 4*b*, viz., בלי נשמע קולם and בכל-הארץ קום. The latter reading is correct so far as קולם is concerned. קום ('A, *ὁ κανὼν αὐτῶν*) is impossible. G (*ὁ φθόγγος αὐτ.*), Σ (*ὁ ἦχος αὐτ.*), and J (*sonus eorum*) may perhaps have read קולם, though elsewhere G renders קול by *φωνή*, and Bā. thinks that the translators understood קו like *τόνος* from *τείνω*. At any rate, קולם is right (note Pasek, which refers probably to קום). [Budde (*Exp. T.*, Dec. 1900, pp. 140 ff.) renders M, 'over the whole earth reaches their measuring-line,' and sees in קו a poetical term for the arch of heaven, which 'is, as it were, the measuring-line, the measure of the whole earth.' Is this natural? and why the suffix -ם? Kraetzschmar (*Exp. T.*, Sept. 1901, pp. 567 f.) would therefore read קבם 'their arch (?)'. But יצא surely does not mean 'rises up.' Does not the parallelism decide the true reading?] בלי in *v.* 4*b* is a corruption of כל-הארץ. נשמע probably comes from נשמעו, which is wanted for *L.* 6, to complete sense and metre.

7 f. Here we must first combine material from *v.* 5*b* and 4*a*, viz. בהם לשמש שם אהל בהם and אין אמר ואין דברים. Both represent editorial attempts to make sense of two corrupt readings of the same passage; observe the Pasek after שם in *v.* 5*b*. Naturally enough, some critics (*e.g.* Ol., Bi., Che.¹, We., Du.) have rejected *v.* 4 as an extremely weak gloss. But here, as often elsewhere, this easy course is a mistake. בהם in *v.* 5*b*, as in lxxxix. 3*b*, represents הַכְנֹת = הַכְנֹ, and underlying *v.* 4*a* we detect אֵף שֶׁם הַכְּנֹת הַדְּרִים. דברים and חדרים, אין and אף, are easily confounded. In אמר we notice that an imperfectly written ש has become an א, while ר and ו together have become ה; אין is an expansion of ינ, influenced by the first אין.—For שמת שם אהל read שמת; see crit. n. on xv. 1, and note the parallelism between חדרים and היכלו. Herz refers to an ancient opinion in IE that אהל is a derivative of אהל (הלל) 'to shine,' and conjectures that ש in שם is dittographed, and that we should read מאהיל; cp. the incorrect form יאהיל, Job xxv. 5. Gr. is content with בים for בהם, while Ol., Bi., Che.¹, We., Du. (?) assume a lacuna between מליהם and לשמש.

12. Read perhaps עֲדֹקְתָּנוּ (על for עֲד, as xlvi. 11).

13. This line in M is prosaic and deficient by one beat.

PSALM XIX.—2.

PENTAMETERS. Far inferior to six.¹, but valuable as a record of the love which the expanded law-book had already attracted among pious Jews, who transferred to it a part of the child-like love and fear which they felt for the Father of Israel, recognizing that their whole moral and spiritual life had been

placed by it upon a new basis. Cp. Pss. i., cxix., cxlvi. 19 f., Dt. iv. 8. Truly, 'the word was very nigh' to the writer, '(it was) in his mouth and in his heart, that he might practise it' (Dt. xxx. 14). Vainly does Sellin (*De Origine Carminum*, 92) attempt to date the psalm in the time of Josiah. Dt. iv. 8 (cp. Ps. xix. 10*b*) is no part of Josiah's law-book, and the tremulous conscientiousness of ll. 9, 10 is specially characteristic of the next age after Ezra, when there was also a constant danger of the 'great transgression' (l. 12) of apostasy. Observe the point of contact between l. 5 and xii. 7; the promise is that of the Messianic deliverance (see e.g. Dt. xxxii. 36-43). The psalm is liturgical. See on ll. 9, 13, and cp. Coblenz, 104 ff. Ll. 15 f. being of the same metre as the rest of the poem, I see no occasion to view it as a later addition (Budde, *TLZ*, 1896, col. 561 f.; Grimm, *Liturg. Abh.*, 10 f.).

- 1 Perfect is Yahwè's law, | refreshing the soul, 8
 Sure is Yahwè's declaration, | making wise the simple ;
- Right are Yahwè's behests, | rejoicing the heart, 9
 Spotless is Yahwè's commandment, | enlightening the eyes ;
- Pure is Yahwè's promise, | enduring for ever, 10
 True are Yahwè's ordinances, | right altogether,
- [The statutes of] Yahwè are more precious | than gold,
 than fine gold, 11
 His words are sweeter than honey, | than droppings of the
 comb.
- By thee too is thy servant cautioned ; | observing them
 brings a great reward. 11
- 10 Who can discern failings ? | from unnoticed +failings+ acquit
 thou me. 13
- Protect thy servant also from the insolent, | let them not
 rule over me ; 14
 Then shall I be blameless and guiltless | of the great trans-
 gression.
- Let the words of my mouth and the musing of my
 heart | appear acceptable 15
 Before thee continually, O Yahwè, | my Rock and my
 Redeemer !

1. **Refreshing the soul.** See on xxiii. 3.-5. *Pure*, i.e. free from error, true (see l. 6). Cp. xii. 7.

6. **Right altogether.** Cp. Dt. iv. 8, Ps. cxix. 7, 62, &c.—7 f. *More precious . . . sweeter.* Cp. cxix. 72, 127, 103. The same figures for the preciousness and sweetness of wisdom, Prov. ii. 4, iii. 14 f., viii. 10 f., 19, xvi.

16, 24, xxii. 1, xxiv. 13; Job xxxviii. 15 ff. In fact, wisdom and the law became synonymous; cp. Eccus. xxiv. 23.

9, 11. **Thy servant**, i.e. Israel, or rather the true Israel—the company of the suffering and faithful righteous; cp. xxvii. 9, xxxi. 17, lxix. 18, lxxxvi. 2, 16, lxxxix. 40, cxvi. 16, cxix. 125,

exliii. 2, 12 (cp. on Isa. xlii. 1), but not cxxxvi. 22, where 'Israel his servant' refers to the Israel of the distant past. This view of 'thy servant' is confirmed by *l.* 14^b, 'my Rock and my Redeemer.' נִזְהָר, 'cautioned,' 'diverted from a dangerous path' (Bevan, *Daniel*, 202; Schulthers, *Homonyme Wurzeln*, 22).

10. **Fallings**, שְׁגִיאוֹת (ἀπ. λεγ.), i.e. errors due to ignorance or inadvertence (Lev. iv., v., xxii., Num. xv. 22-26); cp. 'Sins of Ignorance,' *Enc. Bib.—Unnoticed*. Cp. Lev. v. 3, 'and it be hid from him.'—*Acquit thou me*, i.e. remit to me the punishment.

11. **From the insolent**, כְּזָרִים. Kön. (*Synt.* p. 147), 'from arrogant

thoughts and endeavours.' But this does not suit 'rule over me.' The meaning is that under a foreign yoke Israelites are in constant danger of breaking the law, and even of apostatizing (cp. ἡ ἀποστασία, 1 Macc. ii. 15). 'Backsliding' brought ancient Israel to ruin; the great object of Ezra was to prevent a recurrence of the old evils and the old punishment. The 'insolent' are the oppressors of the pious, whether of non-Jewish or Jewish race; cp. cxix. 21, 51, 69, 78, Mal. iii. 15. 'השֵׁף כֹּן', 'protect from,' as lxxviii. 50.

16a. Prayer, a spiritual sacrifice; cp. cxli. 2.—*Rock . . . Redeemer*. Titles of Yahwe in relation to Israel (cp. introd.).

Critical Notes. 5. M יראת; note Pasek after 'י. A fresh term for Law is required. Read certainly אִמְרַת (xii. 7, xviii. 31, Prov. xxx. 5). So Gr., and, since this was written, D. H. Müller and Kautzsch.

7 f. Read, with D. H. Müller (*Strophenbau u. Responsion*, 60),

חֲקֵי יְהוָה נִחְמָדִים | מִזֶּהָב וּכְפֹז
דְּבָרָיו מְתוֹקִים מִדְּבַשׁ | וְנִפְתַּח צוּפִים

M's הַנְּחֻמָּדִים is not clear, and we expect such a common title as חֲקִים not to be omitted. Metre too gains by Müller's excellent restoration.

11 f. G reads כְּזָרִים. Pasek indicates uncertainty.—Read אַתָּם (Ol., &c.).

14. Insert הַתְּכִיִּיד, Ley (G διαπαντός, as xvi. 8, &c.). Note Pasek in *v.* 15^a.

PSALMS XX. AND XXI.

TRIMETERS. Psalms xx. and xxi. are among the most enigmatical in the collection. Can the reference to 'the king' be correct. Let us first of all assume the traditional view, and consider how best to explain these psalms. I. Who can the king be? Theodore of Mopsuestia long ago thought of Hezekiah (Bä., *ZATW*, 1885, p. 93); among the moderns Hitzig takes this view. Josiah has also been suggested for Ps. xx. (Renan; Che.; see *OP*, 199, 208). Kautzsch even goes so far as to say (*Abriss*, 207; *O. T. Lit.*, 143) that Pss. xx., xxi., xlv. can only be understood as pre-exilic songs; this, however, is too hasty a conclusion. For if on other grounds the psalms must be post-exilic, we may be sure that it is only our own narrow vision which prevents us from seeing how to understand aright the references to a king. Now it is certain (*a*) that there is nothing in the linguistic forms, or the choice of phrases, or the religious ideas to distinguish these psalms from the other psalms in the first 'David'-collection. (*b*) And that very

bitterness in the tone of xxi. *ll.* 17-22, which may seem to suggest an early period of development, is really a subsidiary evidence of a late date. For whenever the sufferings of the Jews were specially intense, they broke into expressions akin to those in Ps. xxi.; spiritual development could not but be checked so long as the hostility of the nations imperilled Israel's very existence (*OP*, 295). (c) The oracular or prophetic tone of parts of these twin-psalms may also appear to favour an early date. These parts are no doubt somewhat akin to the promises of Nathan in 2 S. vii., which are commonly held to be pre-exilic. But those promises were a favourite theme of post-exilic poets (cp. Ps. lxxxix.), and such poets, inasmuch as they carried on the work of the older writers, and were conscious of speaking in the name of a divinely inspired people, were wont to claim prophetic inspiration; the Psalter is full of evidences of this. See especially Pss. lx., cx. (d) The transition from 'we' to 'I' in xx. *l.* 13 (cp. lxxxv. 9), and the reference to Zion as the theocratic centre (cp. xiv. 7, lxxviii. 36) are also indications of lateness. (e) Among the late phrases, notice **רִיבֵנָה**, xxi. 14;

cp. lviii. 6, 12, xlvi. 11. Cp. also xx. 8 with xxxiii. 17, cxlvii. 10; xxi. 5 with xlv. 3, lxi. 7.—II. Can we indicate any one part of the (O.T.) post-exilic period as more probably the date than another? (a) The bitterness of the tone in Ps. xxi. would be appropriate to the period of Antiochus Epiphanes. In xxi. 7f. there might be a glance at the victories of Judas over the Syrian cavalry at Emmaus and Beth-zur (*OP*, 199). This would imply that Simon the Maccabee was the 'king'¹ (see on *v.* 4 and on Ps. cx.). Smend (*Rel.-gesch.* 385) as well as the writer, formerly at least, have accepted a Maccabæan date, and if a reference to contemporary history be indispensable, the date proposed in *OP*, 199, is the most probable one (cp. note on xxi. 1-12). But though Maccabæan psalms in the first Psalter are not in the abstract impossible, there are the weightiest reasons for hesitating to accept them, except under stronger pressure. (b) Might the king be a high-priest? So Beer, *Gem. Ps.* p. lxiv. Certainly the post-exilic high-priest enjoyed not a little of the old regal prestige. If, among his other privileges, he could wear a golden **כִּנֹּר**, it was not much exaggeration to call him 'king' (Philo does so), especially in the temple where it was traditional to sing psalms referring to the king. See *OP*, 200, 218f. (c) Might the king, at any rate in Ps. xxi., be the idealized people (Gray, *JQR*, July, 1895, p. 685)? This is only one step in advance of the theory (see on xxvii. 8) that the people of Israel is now and then called 'Yahwè's anointed.' But that theory is improbable. As long as an almost royal high-priest existed in actuality, and the ideal king almost existed in pious imagination as the leader and representative of the people, it is not likely the Jewish sentiment would have approved such a bold transference of the old individualistic title 'king' to the community. (d) Might Zerubbabel be meant? This is Beer's alternative view (cf. on lxi., lxxxix., cx., cxxxii.); Sellin (*Zerubbabel*, 189f.) also holds it.² It is a plausible theory (cp. *JRL*, 6, 8, 14-16). But Zerubbabel's aspirations (assuming some probable inferences from Haggai and Zechariah) can hardly have succeeded so far as to justify the composition of war-lyrics in his honour as Messianic king. (e) Might the king be the Mes-siah? This view attributes great imaginative licence to the psalmist, but the vivid realization of the Messianic hope may conceivably have led to such extravagances. Such imaginative licence certainly does appear to have been taken in the composition of Pss. xlv. and lxxii.; but these two psalms stand in a class by themselves, being both obviously addressed to a personage poetically modelled on the conventional Solomon. We should, however, find ourselves compelled with less justification to suppose a similar imaginative licence in the composition of Pss. xx., xxi. (cp. *JRL*, 104 ff.; *Christian Use of the Psalms*, 73-79), if no better solution presented itself.

It appears to the writer that such a solution is provided by a keen textual

¹ Cp. *Crit. Rev.*, Jan. 1893, pp. 25f.

² So too *Studien zur Entstehungsgesch. der jüd. Gemeinde*, ii. [1901], 189. In his earlier work, *De origine carminum* &c. [1892], pp. 44ff., Sellin insisted earnestly on the necessity of a pre-exilic date.

criticism. In Pss. lxi. and lxiii. it is even more necessary than here to question the correctness of the readings *כִּלְיָהּ*, *הַמְלִיךְ*, and this fact justifies us in hoping for a corresponding solution of our present problem. On the analogy of similar combinations of transcriptional errors elsewhere we have to correct 'the king' into 'thy loyal one' (see crit. notes on xx. 7, xxi. 8). God's 'loyal one' (*חֲסִיד*, see on xvi. 10) is the pious community, whose salvation in time of trouble brings joy to each and all of its members (xx. 6a), and who can permissibly be described both as a person and as a collection of persons (xx. 10a and b; xx. 6, xxi. 2). The deliverance referred to is the Messianic.

Deposited. Marked : of 'Arab-ethan. 1

- 1 May Yahwè answer thee in the day of distress ; 2
 May¹ Jacob's God set thee on high !
 May he send thee help from the sanctuary, 3
 And uphold thee +with aid+ from Zion !
 May he remember all thine offerings, 4
 And accept all thy requests !
 May he grant thee thy heart's desire, 5
 And accomplish all thy purpose !
 We will shout for joy at the succour granted thee, 6
 10 And exult because of the name of our God ;
 For Yahwè has succoured his loyal one, 7
 [And] answered him from his holy heaven.
 Cusham and Jerahmeel are strong ; 8
 For our part we gather strength through² our God.
 As for them they bend forward and fall, 9
 But we arise and stir up our courage.
 O Yahwè ! give succour to thy people, 10
 And answer us when we cry.

1-9. Pious wishes of Israelites gathered in the temple at the morning or evening sacrifice. At such a solemn time the individual Israelite realized that 'Israel' had a personal life greater than his own, and capable of being viewed as distinct from his own.

5 f. Prayer and offerings are naturally combined; special prayer gave a special meaning to the sacrifice. Hence the prayer in cxli. 2.—*Requests*; see on xxi. 3 b.

10. **The name of our God**, *i.e.* the presence of Yahwè amongst his people, specially in the temple. See *Enc. Bib.*, 'Name.'—11. *Has succoured*, *i.e.* on the occasion referred to in l. 9; *רוֹשִׁיעַ* is the future perfect. The psalm points forward to the culminating succour of the great judgment, when all Israel's foes, represented by the bitter N. Arabian oppressors, will be put down.—*His loyal one*. See on xvi. 10.

¹ The name of.

² The name of Yahwè.

13 f. See crit. note. The contrast between the natural strength of 'Cushan and Jerahmeel,' and the supernatural strength (cp. xviii. 35) of pious Israel is well indicated by a variety in

the conjugation of the same verb.—15. The tense is the perfect of confidence. Hence in *l.* 17 'succour' is still prayed for. Cp. xxviii. 9.

Critical Notes. 2, 14. M, for uniformity (see *l.* 10) and for reverence, inserts **שֵׁם יְהוָה, שֵׁם**.

6. M gives this line in two forms, (1) **וְעוֹלָתֶךָ יִדְשְׁנָה סֵלָה** [3 MSS. Kenn., 1 de R., S T, **עוֹלָתֶיךָ**], and (2) **יִבְלֵא יְהוָה כָּל-כִּשְׂאֵלוֹתֶיךָ**. Evidently **יִדְשְׁנָה** (cp. Kön. ii. 510) is wrong; we have to read **יִרְצְנָה** with Gr. (**ש** and **צ** confounded). **דִּישָׁן** means 'to cleanse from ashes.' The psalmist certainly would not have risked misunderstanding, by using the word in the sense 'to reduce to ashes' (Ki.; cp. 1 K. xviii. 24, 36), or in the sense 'to account, or declare, fat' (Bä., Kau., Du., &c.), or in the Arabizing sense 'accipere munus altaris' (Kenn.). **יִבְלֵא** is merely a repetition from *v.* 4b; **סֵלָה** is a corrupt fragment of **כִּשְׂאֵלוֹתֶיךָ**; so too is **עוֹלָתֶיךָ**. See also on *ll.* 11 f.

10. M **נִדְגַל**. Ass. *diglu* must not be claimed on behalf of EV's rendering (also Ibn Ezra's), for *diglu* does not mean 'banner,' but 'object of gaze.' **דגל** as a Heb. root is incapable of critical proof (see *JQR*, xi. 232-236, and cp. *Enc. Bib.*, 'Ensign,' 'Tirzah.' Ol. (?), Bi., We., Du. read **נִגְדַל**, but **נִדְגַל ב** does not mean 'to magnify.' Street, **נִגְדַל**. But *μεγαλυνθῆσόμεθα* in *G^B*, to which these scholars appeal, represents not **נִגְדַל**, but **נִגְבִּיר** (cp. *v.* 8b in *G^B*.) *B^{ab}NA* in *v.* 6 and *A^{*}* in *v.* 8 give *ἀγαλλιασόμεθα*, i.e. **נִגְיַל**, which in *v.* 6 is certainly right (so Gr.).

11 f. Most probably **עֵתָה** and **יִדְעֵתִי** in M are both fragments of **עוֹלָתֶיךָ** (see on *l.* 6, end), and should therefore be omitted, while **כִּשְׂיָחוֹ** comes from **חֲקִסְדוֹ**. Cp. on ii. 2, xxviii. 8, lxxxiv. 10, cv. 15), and on **כִּשְׂיָחוֹ** in Isa. xlv. 1 see *Crit. Bib.*—Read **וַיַּעֲנֶהוּ** (ו absorbed in preceding suffix).

13. As to the construction of **בַּגְּבוּרוֹת יִשַׁע יְמִינוֹ** opinion is divided (cp. Bä. and Kau.). The phrase is metrically superfluous, but is too difficult to be a gloss. The following clause in M G is also difficult. The distinction between those who trust in chariots and those who trust in horses is artificial; besides the all-important verb 'trust' is omitted. We also have a right to expect some reference in Ps. xx., as well as in Ps. xxi., to the N. Arabian enemies. May not such a reference be latent in the traditional text? Nothing almost is commoner than editorial transformations of passages relative to the Jerahmeelites on the basis of an already corrupt text. May not this be one of the

transformed passages? Looking at *v. 7b* and *v. 8a* we notice that each contains one of the regular distortions of **יִרְחֵמְאֵל**, viz. **יְמִין** in *v. 7b* (cp. 1 S. ix. 1, &c.) and **אֱלֹהִים** in *v. 8a* (cp. 1 S. xvii. 2). I propose, therefore, as *l. 13*, **יְגִבְרוּ כְּוָשִׁם יִרְחֵמְאֵל**, supposing that *v. 7b* and *v. 8* present two variant forms of the same line. I give the order of the words in accordance with *v. 7b*, so that **בְּגִבּוֹר** corresponds to **בְּרַכְבּ**, **תִּישַׁע** to **בְּ[ס]וֹסִים**, and **יְמִינֵי** to **אֱלֹהִים** and **וְאֱלֹהִים**.

14. M **נִזְכִּיר**. Read **נִגְבִּיר**; G^B *μεγαλυθυσιόμεθα* (see on *l. 10*, and cp. xii. 5, G); so S and Street, Gr., Bā. **הַזְכִּיר**, 'to make solemn mention of' (Isa. xlviii. 1), will not suit *l. 15*.

16. M **וְנִתְעוֹרֵר** (cxlvi. 9, cxlvii. 6); G *ἀνωρθώθημεν*, J *erecti sumus*; scarcely defensible. Read **וְנִתְעוֹרֵר** (Gr., Herz).

17 f. M **הַפְּלֶקֶת**. Read **עֶמְדָה** (xxi. 8). See *Enc. Bib.*, 'Psalms,' § 33, ii.—Read **וְעִנְנֵי**, and attach **הַמֶּלֶךְ** (*i.e.* **עֶמְדָה**) to *l. 19* with G and most moderns.

Deposited. Marked : of 'Arab-ethan.

- | | |
|--|---|
| | 1 |
| 1 O Yahwè ! for thy help thy people is glad, | 2 |
| Because of thy succour he greatly exults. | |
| The desire of his heart thou hast given him, | 3 |
| The request of his lips thou hast not rejected. | |
| For thou didst meet him with blessings of prosperity, | 4 |
| A crown of fine gold thou didst set on his head. | |
| He asked of thee life, | 5 |
| And thou gavest him endless days. ¹ | |
| Great through thy succour is his glory, | 6 |
| 10 With splendour and state dost thou endow him. | |
| Yea, thou makest him thy fellow, | 7 |
| Thou gladdenest him with joy in thy presence. | |
| For thy people trusts in thee, O Yahwè ! | 8 |
| Through thy loving-kindness, O Most High ! he will remain
unshaken. | |
| Thy hand will reach all thine enemies, | 9 |
| Thy right hand will lay hold on them that hate thee. | |
| Thou wilt put an end to those of Rehoboth and of Ishmael, 10 | |
| Thy presence, O Yahwè ! will annihilate them : | |
| The Zarephathites thou wilt make to perish from the land, 11 | |
| 20 And the Mišrites from the face of the ground. | |

¹ For ever and ever.

For they have formed an evil aim against thee, 12
 The Jerahmeelites have devised outrages.
 For thou wilt put an end to Aram and Cusham, 13
 Those of Rehoboth thou wilt rebuke to their face !

Liturgical Appendix.

Exalt thyself, O Yahwè ! in thy strength ; 14
 We will sing and strike the lyre to thy might.

1-12. The people of Israel imagines itself in the coming ideal period when the 'desire of its heart' will be fully granted. Note allusions in *l.* 1, 3 to *xx.* 3a, 7a. What is it that pious Israel craves? It is to rejoice for ever in the consciousness of God's favour. For clearly *l.* 8 and 12 must be taken together. Cf. *xvi.* 10 f., and note that *Ps.* *xvi.* is another utterance of the pious community. The phrase 'the request of his (my) lips' occurs again in *lxi.* 6 (corr. text) with reference to the gift of eternal life for the people of Israel. Cf. also *xci.* 15 f., where the gifts of glory, deliverance (succour), and length of days אָרְךָ יָמִים, as in

l. 8), *i.e.* eternal life, are represented as granted in answer to prayer. The mention of a *crown of fine gold* (*l.* 6) is remarkable. If an individual were referred to, we might see in it a reference to the recognition of Simon the Maccabee as high priest and prince, and suppose the 'crown' to be the 'sacred crown' (כִּוֶּן) of pure gold on

the high-priestly tiara (*Ex.* *xxix.* 6, *xxxix.* 30; cf. *Eccles.* *xlv.* 12). But a Maccabean reference has been considered and rejected above. The crown intended can only be metaphorical. Man, simply as ruler of creation, is 'crowned with glory and state' (*viii.* 6 f.); and Israel is, ideally, 'a royal dynasty of priests' (*Ex.* *xix.* 6), and is destined to become the 'head of the nations' (*Ps.* *xviii.* 44).

8. For ever and ever, עוֹלָם וָעוֹד. If an individual (whether Simon or the Messiah) were referred to, this would mean that the prince who is eulogized would live on in his successors.

It appears, however, to be Israel's eternity which is spoken of (see above).

10 ff. הוֹד וְהוֹדָה: cf. *viii.* 2, 6; *civ.* 1.—תְּשׁוּבָה, עָלֵינוּ; cf. *lxxxix.* 20.—*Makest him thy fellow* (see *crit.* n). No 'evil man' or 'deviser of ruin' can have fellowship with Yahwè (*v.* 5, *xciv.* 20), but Israel, God's son and servant, is a member of the divine household. Contrast *Hos.* *iv.* 17 (Ephraim, a 'fellow of idol-gods').—*Joy in thy presence.* Cf. *xi.* 7, *xvi.* 11, *cxl.* 14.—בֵּל יְמוֹת—*So* *xvi.* 8 (Israel).

15-26. If we adhere to M, we may well be uncertain whether this part is addressed to Yahwè or to the king. Hupfeld decides for Yahwè, but almost all others (Ol., Del., Now., Bâ., We., Du.) are on the opposite side. It would be strange, however, that the psalmist should turn round in this fashion (hence Halévy would incorporate *vv.* 9-14 in *Ps.* *xx.*); strange too that the vengeance of the king should (in the traditional text) be described in such glaring terms, and without any reference to the all-powerful aid of Yahwè. The text, moreover, is full of improbabilities, and the corrections favour an address to Yahwè. It is the great judgment which is referred to, when the enemies of Israel, represented by the N. Arabians, will be destroyed. Though this act of justice or of vengeance can be ascribed to Israel (*cp.* *Pss.* *ii.*, *xviii.*), yet it is only through Yahwè that Israel will triumph, and sometimes Yahwè himself is described as the warrior who puts down the foes (see *Ps.* *cx.*; *Isa.* *lxiii.* 1-6).

Critical Notes. 1 M בִּיעוֹד. Rather בִּיעוֹרָךְ (Nöldeke); cf. *xx.* 3.—M's כִּלְךָ springs from עִמָּךְ. Cp. on *l.* 13.

2. Omit **מָה** (not in Vss.). The scribe began to write **מָאֵד**; his successor, in error, wrote **מָה**.

4. M **אֶרְשֶׁת**; may we compare Ass. *eristu* (Del., *Prol.* 54 f. and *Ass. HWB.*)? Surely the style of the psalm is too plain to admit of such a far-fetched word. Read **מִשְׁאֵלֶת** (Gr.), or less probably **שְׂאֵלֶת** (cvi. 15). See xx. 6, xxxvii. 4, lxi. 6 (corr. text).

8. Metre suggests that **עוֹלָם וְעַד** is an interpolated gloss on **אֲרֵד יָמַיִם**.

11. M **בְּרָכוֹת**, (rich in) blessings? or, (the centre of) formulae of blessing (cf. Zech. viii. 13)? But this does not yield a proper parallel to L. 12. Read **חֲבִירָה** (see note above).

13. M **הַמְלִיךְ**. Read **עִמָּךְ** (see on xx. 10).—M **יְהוָה**—an editorial correction. Read **בְּךָ**.—M **בַּחֲסֵד**. Read **בְּחֶסֶדְךָ**.

16. M **תִּמְצָא**, an unpleasing repetition. Read **תִּתְכַוֵּךְ**. Duhm **תִּבְוֵא** (with accus.?).

17-24. M's text (opening of *v.* 10) expresses the anticipation that (as most understand) the king will make Israel's enemies like a fiery furnace (**בְּתַנּוּרֵי אֵשׁ**, preceded by *Pasek*), *i.e.* will destroy them so that they appear like a fiery furnace. Surely vindictiveness could have found a less artificial expression. The remainder of *v.* 10 supplies us with too much material for a single trimeter. Presumably the whole of *v.* 8 is corrupt. Is it likely that **פְּנִיךָ** was said of the king? And is not **וְתֹאכְלֵם אֵשׁ** a very lame conclusion to a verse or stanza? *V.* 11 is better, but can **פְּרִי** be used as a synonym for **זֶרַע**? Lam. ii. 20 is hardly quite parallel. *V.* 12 as Hebrew is just good enough to have escaped severe criticism, but the controversy over **נָטוּ** (cp. Bähg. and Wildeboer *ZATW*, xvii. 179) suggests that all cannot be right; critics also appear to have taken **בְּלֹ יוֹכְלוּ** too easily. In *v.* 13, however, the text is altogether impossible, **תְּשִׁיחֵמוּ שְׂכָם** is literally 'thou wilt make them [to be] back,' though König vainly tries to make out **שְׂכָם** to be the accusative of relation, and for **תֵּשׁ** compares passages in which the object of **עָשָׂה** is to be supplied from the context. Most critics compare xviii. 41, and obtain the general sense, 'thou wilt put them to flight'; xviii. 41, however, is certainly corrupt. Apart from the context T's rendering might be plausible, 'thou wilt make them (*viz.* thy people) as one shoulder' (cp. Zeph. iii. 9). M's **בְּכִיֹּתֶיךָ** is equally improbable. AV, to make sense, inserts 'thine arrows.' It would be simpler to substitute **הַצֵּיִךְ** for **בְּכוֹ**. But we have no right to do this. And even were it otherwise, how improbable that the fitting of the arrows on the strings should come after the putting of the enemies to flight! **תִּכְוֹנוּ עַל-פְּנֵיהֶם** is also a strange expression. Returning to the passage after a wider experience of parallel

corruptions had supplied a key to a very large number of passages, the writer would emend thus,—

17	תִּשְׁבִּית רְחֹבוֹת וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ אֱלֹהֵי	10
	פְּנֵיךָ יְהוָה יִבְלָעֵם	
	צָרָפְתִים מֵאֶרֶץ תְּאֵבֵד	11
20	וּמְצָרִים מִפְּנֵי אֲדָמָה	
	כִּי־נָתַנְנִי עַל־יָד רָעָה	12
	חָשְׁבוּ מְזֻמָּה יִרְחֲמֵאֱלִים	
	כִּי־תִשְׁבִּית אֶרֶם וְכָשֶׁם	14
	רְחֹבוֹתַיִם תּוֹכִיחַ עַל־פְּנֵיהֶם	

For פְּנֵיךָ in *l.* 18 cp. Lam. iv. 16, and note that בָּאֶפֶס in *v.* 10 is an interpolation.

PSALM XXII.—I.

TRIMETERS. A prayer 'out of the depths.' No individual can be the speaker. Is there any one so prosaic as to maintain that either David, or Jeremiah, or Ezra could have used these words? Nor can the depressed Jewish people be the speaker; stanzas 3 and 4 show that an Israel within the larger Israel here pours out its griefs and woes. These woes it shares with all who have not practically rejected the Jewish law, and found means to conciliate those whom true Israelites ought, so far as possible, to shun, but a spiritual sorrow is theirs, which the mass of imperfect though not faithless Israelites cannot fully realize. They are constant in prayer, but how useless it seems! Unbelievers jeer at their folly; can such a 'worm' as Israel (*v.* 7) be said to have a God? Faithless Israelites, who know the phrases in which at this period faith delights, apply them sarcastically (*v.* 9). By word and deed they do their best to kill the faithful community. They are not indeed clothed with regal authority; they can but commit so many outrages and speak such bitter words (some of which may for a moment seem to Israel to be true) that Israel feels—though God all the while knows that it is not so—at the point of death. Note the parallels in Isa. xli. 14 ('worm,' 'redeemer'), xlix. 7 and liii. 3 ('despised of men'); xlix. 8 ('from the womb'); xlix. 14 ('Yahwè has forsaken me'), and in Job xix. 13 ff., xxx. 9 ff.

If we hold that Isa. xl.-lv did not reach its present form till after the time of Ezra, it will be impossible to make Ps. xxii.¹ earlier than the very close of the Persian period, and a later date is not excluded, considering the influence of Job. Cp. *OP*, 230 ff.; Smend, 76 ff.; Coblenz, 136 ff. The view of Duhm and Winckler that the poet is himself the subject of the psalm, and that he wrote it while languishing in a Babylonian or a Jewish dungeon¹ is opposed to a sound textual criticism and exegesis. The poem represents a company or community. It is 'a complaint of highly-strung sensitive natures, brought up on the doctrine of earthly retribution, and surprised that they meet with the contempt and ignominy which are only worthy of malefactors. And the grandeur of the psalm consists in this—that in spite of the terrible strain put upon their faith, this divinely given quality does not fail them. Though God seems to have forsaken them, He is still their God.'² Happily there is but one voice among critics as to the spiritual beauty of the poem.

Cp. Winckler, *AOF*(²) i. 177 ff.; J. Döllner, 'Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Ps. xxii. (xxi),' *Theol. Quartalschrift*, xxii. (1900), 174 ff.

¹ Duhm makes him a victim of the party-fights of the later Asmonæan kings, Winckler no less a person than king Manasseh.

² *Christian Use of the Psalms*, 93f.

Deposited. Of Ethan the Zarhite. Marked: Of 'Arab-ethan. 1

- 1 O my God! to me give ear; 2
 Why hast thou forsaken my soul?
 [Why] keepest thou so far off, not to hear
 The words of my cry, O my God?
- I call by day, but thou answerest not; 3
 By night, but thou interposest not for me;
 Yet Thou art Jacob's Holy One, 4
 The God who is Israel's confidence.
- In thee our fathers trusted, 5
 10 They trusted, and thou didst deliver them;
 To thee they cried, and they found escape, 6
 In thee they trusted, and they were not shamed.
- But I am a worm and no human creature, 7
 Insulted by mankind, and by all people despised.
 All that behold me jeer at me, 8
 They open their lips wide, and wag their heads +with a
 scoff,+ —
- 'Let God redeem him, let Him deliver him! 6
 Let him rescue him, seeing He delights in him'!
 Yea, Thou wast my refuge when I was born, 10
 20 My confidence when I was on my mother's breasts.
- On Thee have I found support from my birth, 11
 Thou hast been my God from my mother's womb;
 Remain not afar, [O Yahwè], 12
 Trouble is near, there is no helper.
- Strong wild oxen surround me, 13
 With pointed horns they mangle me;
 Fierce lions that raven and roar 14
 Stretch open their jaws towards me.
- [Within] I am poured out like water, 15
 30 And all my bones are out of joint;
 My heart has become like wax,
 It has melted away within me.
- [My palate] is dried up like grass, 16
 My teeth stick together in my jaws;
 With my crying my throat is parched, 17c
 And upon mine eyelids is the gloom +of Deathland + . 16c

Strong lions surround me,	17a
A troop of wild oxen encircles me ;	17b
My body is wasted by reason of my pains,	18
40 +But+ they give a kick to my wounds.	
The traitors walk to and fro,	19
And jeer at the anguish of my soul.	
But Thou art Yahwè, keep not afar off ;	20
Thou art my God, hasten to help me.	
Snatch my soul from the young lion,	21
My life from the paw of the greedy lion ;	
Deliver me from the mouth of the fierce lion,	22
Withdraw me from the horns of the wild oxen.	

* * * * *

2. For God to 'forsake' the soul means death (xvi. 10). And how can Yahwè forsake the soul of his loyal one (xvi. 10, xxxvii. 28, xciv. 14)? The loyalty of man presupposes that of God. But Zion herself complains, 'Yahwè has forsaken me' (Isa. xlix. 14).—4. Duhm, who retains דברי שאנתי (lit. 'the words of my roaring'), takes דברי in the sense of 'matter.' The sense is possible enough in *prose* style, but improbable in poetry. Duhm compares 1 S. x. 2, 1's. lxx. 4; but the latter passage is corrupt.

6 ff. **Thou interposest not**; lit. 'thou liftest thyself not up,' *i.e.* 'arise not from thine inaction to assert thy sovereignty.'—*Jacob's Holy One*. So Isa. xxix. 23, where, as here, 'Jacob' and 'Israel' are parallel.—*Israel's confidence*. This strikes the key-note of the beautiful stanza which follows (see *crit. n.*). Those who adopt M's text suppose that the psalmist gives a new turn to the old phrase 'enthroned upon the cherubim' (lxxx. 2, xcix. 1) by substituting 'the praise-songs of Israel' for 'the cherubim.' The true 'chariots of deliverance' (Hab. iii. 8) are, not the mythic cherubim, but the prayers and praises of God's people (cf. viii. 3 in M's text). This view I have elsewhere supported (1's.⁽¹⁾; *OP*, 327), but it is certainly over-subtle, and a freer attitude toward M's text enables me to abandon it.

9-12. The appeal to Israel's past history. Cf. lxxvii. 5-8. *Our fathers*;

so xlv. 2, lxxviii. 3. Clearly Israel is the speaker (Lag., *Orientalia*, ii. 63), or rather the Israel within Israel.

13-16. **A worm &c.** Israel speaks, not some self-pitying individual. Cf. Isa. xli. 14. In the light of these two passages it should be clear that Isa. iii. 14, liii. 2 do not refer to an individual.—*Despised*. Cf. Isa. xlix. 7, liii. 3.—*Jeer at me*, &c. Cf. xxxi. 12 ff., xxxviii. 12, xli. 6 ff., lxix. 8 ff., lxxxviii. 9, 19, Lam. ii. 15 f., iii. 46, and especially Job xxx.

17-20. **Let God redeem him, &c.** A reference to a favourite title of Yahwè in the Prophecy of Restoration (see Isa. xli. 14, xlix. 26, and often). Cp. xix. 15. The correction of the text adopted removes a great linguistic stumbling-block (see *crit. n.*).—*From my birth*. Lit., 'from the womb,' כִּרְהֵם. Cf. lxxi. 6, Isa. xlvi. 8.—*On thee*, &c. Again compare lxxi. 6.

25. From this point onwards the greatest misunderstanding has been caused by corruptions of the text. Lagarde's ingenuity in explaining the choice of the several animals (*Orientalia*, ii. 63 f.; cf. *OP*, 232) is beyond question, but he presupposes the corrupt readings of M's text. Tobiah the Ammonite, Geshu the Arabian, Sanballat the Samaritan are not referred to under the respective symbols of bulls of Bashan, lions, and dogs, for the only animals which a strict criticism can recognize

appear to be 'wild oxen' (רָאִים) and 'lions' (אָרִי, נָפִיר, לָבִיא). Both kinds of animals are symbols of the oppressors of the Jews. רָאִים naturally suggests יִרְחַמְאֵלִים, *i.e.* the 'wild oxen' are the Jerahmeelites. The 'lions' may conceivably include oppressors of native Jewish origin (cp. Zeph. iii. 3).—*With pointed horns.* On these dangerous horns (which were prized as trophies by the Assyrian hunter-kings), see on xcii. 11a. The passage seems to be imitated in xvii. 11, lxxviii. 31 (corr. text).

29–36. Vital strength fails; dis-solution seems at hand.—29. *I am poured out.* So, of the heart, Josh. vii. 5 (cp. *l.* 31); of the soul, xxvii. 8 (corr. text), xlii. 5 (M).—33. Cp. lxix. 4, cii. 5.—34. A little different from Job xxix. 10.—35. Nothing is more difficult than to get a fit sense out of the received text. The text-critical problem seems now to have been solved. See crit. note.—36. Cf. Job xvi. 16.

38 ff. Some critics (Ewald, Winckl., Duhm) have supposed that the much-tried speaker is in prison or in the stocks, while a 'crew of evil-doers,'

also symbolically called 'dogs,' but really gaolers or rude warriors (Wi., Du.), gloat over his sufferings. This view however is based on textual error. Similarly the odd picture of the wounded man counting up his bones (or, his pains), while the 'dogs' enjoy the spectacle, vanishes into thin air like that other strange picture of the wild dogs mangling his hands and his feet. To some, the picture may seem strange, even as a more correct text presents it. But we must remember that the speaker is in reality a collection of persons. The wild oxen and the lions (*i.e.* the oppressors¹) cannot all at once destroy Israel. The moral and physical sufferings of many Israelites may have wasted the national 'body,' but some life still remains. At present, all that the fierce beasts can do is to worry their victims, and to aggravate the pain of the wounds by 'kicking' them. *Give a kick*, cp. 'the paw of the greedy lion' (*l.* 46). Imitated in lxix. *ll.* 49 f. On lines 41, 42, which one would gladly have kept on account of the familiar application, see crit. note. Bâthgen's comment is, 'Israel resembles one slain on the battle-field, whose garments the soldiers divide among themselves by lot.' But is there anything in the context to favour this?

Critical Notes. 1 f. מֵאֵלֵי אֱלֹהִים. G ó θεός ó θεός μου πρόσχες μοι; Bi. הקשיבה לי. Read אֱלֹהֵי הַקְּשִׁיבָה (cf. on xviii. 3 אֱלֵי). The repetition of אֱלֵי is not probable in a highly artistic poem (2 K. iv. 19 is therefore not parallel; in Jer. iv. 19 the first כִּיעִי is dittographic; see G). Soon after we have אֱלֹהֵי. The first אֱלֵי is in one sense dittographic.—עֹזְבַתִּי נִפְשִׁי. Read עֹזְבַת נִפְשִׁי (cp. lxxxviii. 15). נִפְשִׁי written in a shortened form, or else half-effaced, was taken for the suffix נִי. On the origin of ζαφθαυει in D of Mt. xxvii. 46 and Mk. xv. 34 see Chase, *Syro-Lat. Text of Gospels* ('95), 107; König, *Exp. T.*, Feb. 1900, 237 ff.

3 f. מֵרְחֹק מִיְשׁוּעָתִי דְבַרִי שְׁאֲנִיתִי, 'far from my deliverance are the words of my roaring;' so G 'A Σ Θ E' S' J T—a weight of authority by which Bâ. feels overpowered (so Del., Kön. *Synt.* § 348σ); Bâ., however, takes 'deliverance' = 'deliverer.' Most unnatural, even if we read רְחֹקִים (cp. on cxix. 137). Read probably תְּרַחֵק מִיְשׁוּעָתִי [לְמַה] יְשׁוּעָה. —תִּי, written 'י, was absorbed by יְשׁוּעָתִי יְהוָה.

¹ Lagarde's detailed explanation of symbols (see on *l.* 25) reminds one of commentators' disputes on the first canto of Dante.

and **שאנה** are elsewhere confounded (xxxii. 3; Job iii. 24). Street, Hi., Dy., Gr., Che⁽¹⁾, We. read **כִּישְׁעֵרַי** (cp. on lxxxviii. 2). This, however, does not fit in well.

6. M **וְלֹא דוֹכִיָּה לִי**. G *καὶ οὐκ εἰς ἀντίαν ἐμοί* (so Hatch, *Biblical Greek*, 191, rightly corrects *ἀνοίαν*), probably reading **רְכִיָּה**, for elsewhere G decidedly does not recognise **דוֹכִיָּה**. The word 'ד' is non-existent (see on xxxix. 3, lxii. 2, lxx. 2). S here has **סוּן לְכַלִּי** 'et non respicis.' This is but a guess. In xxxix. 3 'ד' has grown out of **תְּמִיד**. This suggests **תָּרוֹם** for our passage. Cp. Isa. xxx. 18, 'he lifts himself not up to have compassion on you.' 'To lift oneself up,' = to interpose, with sovereign power, for the oppressed.

7 f. M **וְאַתָּה קָדוֹשׁ יוֹשֵׁב**. The moderns mostly make a stichus of the first two words (see Rahlfs below), but wrongly. G *σὺ δὲ ἐν ἁγίῳ κατοικεῖς*; S (Field) *ἐν ἁγίοις*. J 'et tu sancte habitator.' Halévy too and Duhm connect **יוֹשֵׁב** with **קָדוֹשׁ** (cp. Isa. lvii. 15). Bi., too weakly, inserts **יהוה** (metre). The only adequate remedy is to read **וְאַתָּה ק' יַעֲקֹב**. **ע**, with perhaps a fragment of **ק**, grew into **ש**.—M **תְּהַלֹּת יִשְׂרָאֵל**. Most moderns connect this with **יוֹשֵׁב**, and suppose that 'enthroned upon the praise-songs of Israel' is a spiritualizing development of the antique phrase 'enthroned upon the cherubim.' For an exposition of this view see my note in P's.⁽¹⁾, and *OP*, p. 327; cp. also especially Rahlfs, **עני** *und* **ענו** *in der Pss.*, pp. 35 ff. Rahlfs is very sure that M is correct, and defends the very short stichus **וְאַתָּה קָדוֹשׁ** by a reference to **וְאַתָּה הוּא**, cii. 28. All this is very questionable, and (so far as the development theory is concerned) too modern in spirit to be probable. It is only rendered necessary by the prevalent veneration for M's text, and is opposed to the tradition represented by G J (*ὁ ἕπαινος ἱσρ.*, *laus Israhel*). Hal. prefers to follow G J, but a line of two words, neither of which can have more than one beat, is intolerable. Gr. inserts **תְּהַלֹּת** after **יוֹשֵׁב** and **נִזְרָא** before **תְּהַלֹּת**. This is regarded by Rahlfs as plausible, though unnecessary. But it gives us too much material: a shorter and simpler distich is required. Read **אֱלֹהֵי תוֹחֶלֶת יִשׂ** (see xxxix. 8; lxxi. 6c; cix. 2, corr. text). **אֱלֹהֵי** fell out, through its resemblance to **תוֹחֶלֶת**. As a postscript, I mention Herz's **ת' יוֹשֵׁב בֵּית ת'**, Winckl.'s **יוֹשֵׁב קְהֵלֶת**, and Duhm's **בְּדָ תְהַלֵּת יִשְׂרָאֵל** ('Israel's praise is of thee').

16 f. M **יַפְּטִירוּ**; 'they cause to break through,' or 'they release (insults)'? Surely not. Read **יַפְּעֵרוּ** (Gr.); see Job xvi. 10.—M **נָל־אֵל־**, inf. abs. from **גָּלַל** (Kön., *Synt.*, 114, n. 2), or imper. kal. (Ol., Del., Bā., &c.). G S J, Bi., Bā., Du. **נָל־אֵל־** (G *ἤλαπισεν*; Mt. xxvii. 43, *πέποιθεν*).

We., יִגַּל אֱלֹהֵי. But an accusat. is indispensable, and whichever of the above readings we adopt, the sentence is rough, and the parallelism incomplete. Brüll suggested יִגַּלְהוּ; Hal. גַּלְהוּ (so Che., *JQR*, Oct. '97, 13; *Jew. Rel. Life*, 120); Wi. דַּגְלֵ אֱלֹהֵי (against this see Che., *JQR*, Jan., '99, 236). One fault common to all these suggestions is the not taking account of יהוה. The covenant-name of God is not to be expected here. The correction which alone does perfect justice to the textual phenomena is אֱלֹהֵי יִגַּלְהוּ. אֱלֹהֵי was misplaced, and hence misread אֱלֹהֵי. יהוה includes both the preformative and the affirmative of יִגַּלְהוּ. Cp. on xxxvii. 9a.

19. Two plain corrections. נָחִי and (lxxi. 6) גָּזִי are both fragments of מִחֲסִי; ה and ג, ס and ז confounded. (But in Mic. iv. 10 נָחִי should be האנחי, Gr.). Also for מִבְּטַחִי read מִבְּטַחֵי (G S J, Gr., We.); see lxxi. 5.

21. 23. M's הַשְּׁלַכְתִּי is most unnatural. Read נִסְמַכְתִּי (see on lxxi. 6). Less probable is הוּחַלְתִּי, or (Wi.) הַשְּׁלַמְתִּי (Job v. 23). The latter should mean 'I have been made thy friend.'—Insert יהוה (metre).

25. M פָּרִים רַבִּים. 'Many bulls'! Most improbable and against analogy. Read certainly (or אֲבִירִים) רֵאמִים בְּבִירִים (see on ll. 37 f, and on lv. 19). Wi., בְּפִירִים רַבִּים with just discernment of the problem. The *re'emim* must have been mentioned before l. 48.

26. M אֲבִירֵי בָשָׁן. In lxviii. 16, 23, 'Bashan' is due to corruption. So here. As Wi. points out, 'the cows of Bashan are symbols of fatness, never of strength.' But Wi.'s reading, אֲבִירֵי הַשָּׁן is not quite satisfactory; read בְּקַרְנֵי שָׁן (see l. 48). א and ק confounded. G (*ταύροι*) *πίστες*, *i.e.* either דָּשָׁן or שָׁמֶן; see G, lxviii. 16.—M בְּתִרְוֵנִי, 'surround me'? So *c.g.* BDB, citing Judg. xx. 43, Hab. i. 4. But in Judg. read בְּתִרְתִּי (Moore; cp. G), and in Hab. מַחֲרִיד (Gr.). Here certainly read בְּתִרְוֵנִי. The lexicon gains. בְּתִרְ, Job xxxvi. 2, = 'to wait.'

27. Read אֲרִיֹת טֹרְפִים וְשֹׁאֲגִים.

29. M נִשְׁפַּכְתִּי. The par. passage, Lam. ii. 11, suggests that a noun should stand here. Read probably נִשְׁפַּכְנוּ כִּיעֵי. A play on כִּים and כִּיעֵים.

33. Note Pasek. M בְּחַרְשׁ. Read בְּחַצִּיר (cf. cii. 5).—M פָּחִי. Read חָפִי (an early emendation, see Ibn Ezra), with Ol., Ew., Bā., &c.; cf. lxix. 4.

34. M וּלְשׁוֹנֵי מַדְבַּק מִלְקוּחֵי. But 'ל is fem.; 'מַדְ requires בְּ or

ל after it; and 'כל' should mean 'tongs' or 'snuffers.' Read וְשָׁנִי
מִדְּבָקִים בְּלִהְיִי.

35 (v. 17c). פְּאָרִי יְדֵי וְרַגְלֵי (some copies and edd. פְּאָרִי). On the other hand, some edd. have as Kr. פְּאָרוּ, and some MSS. and the Complut. ed. have פְּאָרוּ = פָּרוּ. The Vss. mostly presuppose some verb; G ὠρξάω, Ἀ ἐπέδησαν (?) and ἠσχυναν (two editions?), S כּוּצוּ, J vinxerunt. Σ, however, gives ὡς λέων (for proof, see Taylor, *Genizah Palimpsests*), and T the conflate rend., נִכְתִּין הֵיךְ כְּאַרְיָא, 'they bite like a lion.' On these renderings cp. Bā., *Jahrb. f. prot. Th.*, 1882, p. 27; Del., *Complutens. Varianten* (1878), p. 27; Zenner, 'Textkrit. Bemerk.,' *Theol. Quartalschr.*, 1900, pp. 174 ff. It is not fruitful to discuss what readings (other than כְּאַרְיָא or כְּאַרוּ) the translators may have had in their minds. T, for instance, suggests עָרְקוּ (Job xxx. 17); S suggests קָרְעוּ. But the rends. are but guesses. Many moderns, from De Rossi onwards, claim the *exigentia loci* as a decisive proof of the reading כְּאַרוּ; Bā. and Now. add that in all probability the extant Heb. MSS. should only count as *one* witness, being all apparently derived from a single archetype. Lag., however (*Orientalia*, ii. 64), is confident that v. 17 is misplaced, and stood originally between v. 14 and v. 15. If this be correct, we have two stanzas, each consisting of seven stichi (viz. vv. 13, 14, 17 and vv. 15, 16), and, if we read כְּאַרְיָא in v. 17c, we obtain a parallel for the אַרְיָא [כ] in v. 14b. But (1) it is obvious that as a rule the stanzas have eight lines, and it is practically certain that the three stichi grouped in M T of v. 16 should rather be four; (2) the exegetical difficulties of v. 17c are not removed by Lagarde. Wellh. tries to improve upon Lagarde by placing v. 17 (except c, which, with Olsh., he relegates to the margin) after v. 13. He thus obtains a somewhat better connexion for v. 18, and makes the פָּצוּ of v. 14 intelligible. The objections to this plan are (1) that it makes seven stichi, (2) that הַמָּה in v. 18b is too far removed from the descriptive title to which it points. The view of Ol. just referred to need not, in my opinion, be discussed; it is the resource of despair. Before mentioning what I venture to think the true reading, I am bound to record some earlier conjectures. The simplest plan is, with Kön. (*Synt.*, p. 681), or we might say, with Σ, to read פְּאָרִי, unless, with Pococke and Reinke, we regard כְּאַרְיָא as defectively written for כְּאַרְיָא. The next easiest conjecture is that of Herz, נִקְרוּ (Job xxx. 17). In 1888 I gave a qualified preference to Brüll's כְּתָרוּ, 'surround' (cf. Ju. ix. 31, תְּרַכְּבֵנּוּ for אֲרֻכְבֵנּוּ), since proposed anew by Perles and Winckler. But 'surround' is imaginary (see on l. 26). Gr. and Hal. adopt the old guess אָסְרוּ; Kr., Dy. פְּאָבוּ; Duhm פְּאָרִי. All this proceeds on the mistaken assumption that the error lies solely in פְּאָרִי. The whole line is corrupt, and the correction must be sought for in one of the parallel passages—

lix. 4; for plainly the throat had to be mentioned somewhere. The archetypal MS. was correct in rejecting ם as the final letter. It also gave the first word very nearly right, but erred in retaining ידי ורגלי, which, indeed, on all the theories as yet proposed, is unexpected, unnatural. Read בְּקִרְאֵי נְחֹר גְּרִנִּי. Plainly this belongs with the other descriptive clauses referring to parts of the body, and all that is now needed is to correct another suspicious clause (v. 16c) so as to provide a parallel for it. Let us see whether our wish can justly be gratified. (The order 16a, 16b, 17c, 16c is Bickell's.)

36. M gives, as v. 16c, וּלְעֶפְר־מֹות תִּשְׁפֹתֵנִי. The 'dust of Death-land' is not an impossible expression. In ed. I I compared *Descent of Istan.* l. 8, 'the place where much dust is their food.' But עֶפֶר would have quite sufficed; the addition of מֹות is unnecessary (see on xxx. 10). תִּשְׁפֹתֵנִי must be wrong; if 'thou wilt place me' is the meaning, a commoner word would certainly have been chosen (see lxxxviii. 7). The tense too is surprising, and, lastly, there is no clause anywhere to which it (v. 16c) can be regarded as parallel. The text is wrong; can we correct it? Yes, if we may combine it with another clause which lacks a parallel, viz. 17c. The mention of the throat suggests that of the eye, and at once one remembers Job xvi. 16, וְעַל-עֵפְעֵפִי צִלְמוֹת. This is the original reading here. מֹות is dittographic. תִּשְׁ comes from צִל transposed; פֶּת = מֵת; נִי = מִי is dittographic.

37. Omit כִּי (dittogr., נִי precedes in M), and insert רְבִים (G κύνες πολλοί) as part of the traditional text). On this we have now to operate. We do not want the 'dogs.' In *OP*, 232, I described Lag.'s symbolic explanation of the different animals (*Op*, ii. 64) as 'plausible'; I fear I must retract this. There is no parallel (see on lix. 7) for the use of the pariah-dogs of Eastern cities as a symbol for the enemies of Israel, and in the last extant couplet of Ps. xxii.⁽¹⁾ only lions and wild oxen are referred to. Read לְבָאִים בְּבִירִים (cp. on lix. 7). Wi., פְּלָאִים, 'jailers'; hardly. J 'venatores,' following 'A Θ (so Hieron. in *Anecd. Maredsol.*), = פְּלָבִים.

38. M עֲדַת כְּרָעִים. Against context and parallelism. Read certainly מִרְאִים (l. 48). So רֵאמִים in Isa. xxxiv. 7 should be מִרְאִים.

39. M אֶסְפֵּר פֶּלַעַצְמוֹתַי. The idea of being reduced to a skeleton would not have been so expressed. Nor is the *idea* of 'reckoning up my wounds' (another reading) a probable one. Read בְּשָׂרִי כָלָה מֵעֲצָבוֹתַי. עֲצָבוֹתַי is right (T. Gr., Wi.), but the corruption lies deeper than Gr. supposes. (עֲצָמוֹת in error for 'עֲצָבוֹת' occurs in Job vii. 15.)

40. M יבִטּוּ יֵרֵאוּבֵי. The idea of gloating on sufferings is both autologically expressed, and unsuitable to the parallelism. Read

יִבְעֲטוּ בְּנִכְאָבִי (Dt. xxxii. 15; in 1 S. ii. 29 the reverse change is required; see Klo.).

41 f. Read:—

יִתְהַלְכוּ בְּגֵדִים לָהֶם
וְלַעֲמִיל נִפְשֵׁי יִלְעִיגוּ

M is most unsuitable. The error, יִפִּילוּ גֹרֵל, in *l.* 42 closely resembles that in Ob. 11, יִדוּ גֹרֵל, for יִגְדִּילוּ, *i.c.* יִלְעִיגוּ.

44. M אֵילֹתַי: G ἡ βοηθεία μου. Lag. (*Or.* ii. 7) explains this ἀπ. λεγ. as an Aramaism. But if so, why not simply אֵילִי (see on lxxxviii. 5)? Such forms in וַת are no doubt characteristically late ('lateborn linguistic expedient,' Kōn. ii. 204), but this only explains how a scribe came to think of reading אֵילֹת; it does not justify us in accepting it as original. Read אֵלִי אֶתָּה (Gr.).

45 f. M מְחַרֵּב, against parallelism. Read certainly מִכְפִּיר (cf. on xvii. 13; lxxiv. 19).—M כָּלֵב יִחְדָּתִי. Read לְבִי[א] חֵיתִי. כָּלֵב is due to a harmonizing editor (see on *l.* 37). יִחְדָּה as a title for the soul is most unnatural. G even gives τὴν μονογενῆ μου (so xxxv. 17), and so helped to produce an artificial sense, 'precious,' 'dearly beloved.' Observe that יָחִיד in xxv. 16, lxxviii. 7 is equally suspicious. Gr., We., agree as to חֵיתִי.

48. M רִמִּים, G μονοκερώτων. Defective form of רִמְיִים (cf. on *l.* 38). La. (*Or.* ii. 64) alters to פְּרִים, because the wild ox is 'hardly a dangerous animal.' A mistake; see on xcii. 11. פְּרִים in *l.* 25 is wrong.—M עֲנִיתִי. Is this a designed violation of parallelism, leading on to the second part of the psalm? It must be so, assuming the text to be right, if grammatical usage is to be followed, for עֲנִי cannot be a consecutive perfect (Ewald). But the grammarians (even Kau. in Ges.-K. § 119 ff) are all too conservative. G τὴν ταπεινώσιν μου and Σ (Field) τ. κάκωσιν μ. read עֲנִיתִי or עָנֹתִי (?); a guess. Thrupp, We. עֲנִיתִי. But the parallelism requires a verb. Read, not תִּעַנְנִי, but תִּשְׁבִּנִי (xxxv. 17).

PSALM XXII.—2.

TRIMETERS. The Israel within Israel performs its vow of proclaiming God's faithfulness and reasserting the Messianic promise in the great assembly (cp. xl. 10 f., xxxv. 18?). Pss. xl.⁽²⁾, lxix.⁽²⁾, and cii.⁽²⁾ are parallel to xxii.⁽²⁾ The nationalism of the psalm forbids us to suppose that it is merely an ordinary liturgical formula to be used by an individual when paying his vows in the temple, or to be sung in his name by the temple singers. Duhm, who holds this poor theory, refers to Job xxxiii. 26–28 and Ps. lxvi. 13–20. But in Job *l.c.* he adheres to the difficult

reading **יִשָּׁר**, in spite of the *Paseḵ* which follows it, vainly attempting to remove the difficulty by pointing **יִשָּׁר**, 'sings'; and though the writer of lxi. 13 ff. may be a full believer in animal sacrifices, he cannot have intended his work for the use of an individual (see introd. to lxi.⁽²⁾). Both in xxii.⁽²⁾ and in lxi.⁽²⁾ the background is that of the N. Arabian oppression of Israel.

- 1 I will discourse of thy glory to my brethren, 23
 In the midst of the assembly will I praise thee.
 Ye that fear Yahwè, praise him; 24
 All ye of Jacob's offspring, honour him.¹
 For he has not despised [his prisoners], 25
 Nor rejected the cry of the sufferer;
 He has not hidden his face from him,
 But when he called unto him, he heard.
 His faithfulness I will not conceal in the great assembly, 26
 10 My vows will I perform before his worshippers,
 Hope on, ye sufferers! and ye shall rejoice, 27
 Let those that are zealous for Yahwè praise him.
 The Jerahmeelites shall seek eagerly for Yahwé, 27 (end), 28
 The Ishmaelites shall do obeisance before him,
 All the princes of Miṣṣur shall do obeisance, 30
 Before him shall all Arabians kneel.
 The offspring [of Jacob] shall honour him, 31
 His worshippers shall declare his righteousness;
 They shall relate to the next generation
 20 That he has wrought [for us] deliverance from Jerahmeel.

1-8. When the Messianic deliverance has taken place, the Israel within Israel (*i.e.* the 'Servant of Yahwè,' or the association of strictly pious Jews) will summon their 'brethren' (*i.e.* faithful Israel at large) to join them in praising God for his great deeds. *Ye that fear Yahwè*. Probably there is here no real antithesis to the 'seed of Israel,' as if proselytes were meant. In xv. 4, lxi. 16, **רְאֵי יְהוָה** is simply a term for worshippers of Yahwè.—*Prisoner, sufferer*, collective terms (cp. lxi. 34).

9. Closely parallel to xl. 11.—10. *My vows, &c.* In the light of cxix. 31 f. we see that the 'vows' consisted in songs of praise. Cp. l. 14, lvi. 13, lxi. 9, lxx. 2, cxvi. 14.—11 f. The deliverance is only real to faith. Hence the Israel within Israel, addressing all

who have learned the true lesson of suffering, bids them 'hope on,' and the time for rejoicing will come. Cp. lxi. 33.

13-20. The grounds of this confidence. The Messianic promise is certain; the most bitter of the foes of Israel will recognize that Yahwè alone has divine power, and accept him as their sovereign. And for itself Israel anticipates that its work of praise will never end. Age after age the message will be handed on that Yahwè delivered his people from its most cruel foe. Cp. xlviii. 14, lxxi. 18, cii. 19.—The editorial reconstructions of corrupt passages are of great interest. One of them (in v. 30, rightly read) implies the hope of the resurrection (cp. Dan. xii. 2). See crit. notes.

¹ And be afraid of him, all ye of Israel's offspring.

Critical Notes. 4. Omit last stichus of M (a variant).—5 f. Insert אֶת־אֲסִירוֹ (Ixix. 34).—M יִנְנוֹת. ἄπ. λεγ., and unsuitable as the object of שָׁקַן; cp. ix. 13, cii. 18. Read צִעֲקַת. So the present writer in *JBL*, xv. (1896), p. 198; cp. We., *Skizzen*, vi. 170. צ precedes; נו comes from an imperfect ק. G τῆ δέησει = רָנַתִּי.—9. M בַּאֲתֶדְךָ, 'caused by thee' (cxviii. 23)? Impossible. Read אָבִיתוּ (Gr., אַבְתֶּדְךָ). ו fell out; כ belongs to the next phrase.—M תִּהְלֹתִי. Read (taking over כ) לֹא־כִחַדְתִּי (xl. 11).

11. M וּשְׁבַעְעוּ יֹאכְלוּ. But if the figure of the great Feast (xxiii. 5) had been introduced, more would have been made of it. A reference to sacrifices is precluded by a couplet in a parallel psalm (Ixix. 32). Comparing Ixix. 33 (corr. text), read יִחַלוּ וְיִשְׂמְחוּ. For construction see xxxiv. 6 and xl. 4 (corr. text). Note Pasek.

13 f. M's לָעוּ לְבַבְכֶם יַחֲוִי is an editorial expansion of a corruption of יִרְחַמְאֵלִים יִזְכְּרוּ and יִשׁוּבוּ are two competing variants (note Pasek); read יִשְׁחָרוּ.—כָּל־אֶפְסֵי אָרֶץ is probably another editorial expansion; the original text must have had כָּל־יִשְׁמַעְאֵלִים אָרֶץ was perhaps attached after אֶפְסֵי had grown out of שְׂמַאי. The verb to which 'כל' belongs is יִשְׁתַּחוּ. For לִפְנֵיךָ read לִפְנֵינוּ, with Vss., except T. and Houb., Horsley, Halévy. Cp. Duhm. כָּל־מִשְׁפַּחוֹת is analogous to כָּל־אֶפְסֵי, i.e. it represents 'כל־יש'; גוֹיִם is the editor's addition.—At this point in M (v. 29) comes a collection of corruptions of ethnics, viz. כִּי לַיהוָה = יִרְחַמְאֵל; הַמְּלוּכָה also = יִרַח (so in Ob. 21; see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Obadiah'); וּמוֹשֵׁל = יִשְׁמַעְאֵל; בְּנוֹיִם = יִרְחַמְאֵל. Most textual critics simply insert הוּא (וְהוּא מוֹשֵׁל); so G, καὶ αὐτὸς δεσπότης. But the whole of v. 29 is weak.

15. M אָכְלוּ; G ἔφαγον. Most (Pinsker, Bruston, Gr., Du., &c.) read אָל. Experience, however, warns us to reject slight remedies in such a corrupt passage. Beyond doubt, אָכְלוּ is a corrupt fragment of יִרְחַמְאֵלִים, originally perhaps a correction referring to our l. 13. דַּשְׁנֵי־אָרֶץ is also clearly wrong. Brüll suggests שְׂכָנֵי, Smend and Renan יִשְׁבֵי, Kr. יִשְׁנֵי, which We. does not indeed adopt, but considers to have been an early error, which produced the 'gloss' לֹא חָיָה; Duhm רִשִי ('poor'). אָרֶץ, however, must be an ethnic, viz. either אֲשִׁוּר = נָשׁוּר or כִּצְוּר. The latter is the more probable (cp. on ii. 10). דַּשְׁנֵי can now be corrected into רוֹזְנֵי. Read כָּל־רוֹזְנֵי כִצְוּר.

16. M בְּלִי־יֹרְדֵי עֶפְרַיִם. Probably suggested by the false reading יִשְׁנֵי (above). But an ethnic is wanted. Possibly 'י' and 'נ' both represent

corruptions of עַרְבִים (cp. lxxii. 9, corr. text).—The impossible words וּנְפֹשׁוּ לֹא הָיָה וּנְפֹשׁוּ represent another group of ethnics. וּנְפֹשׁוּ (G S imply וּנְפֹשׁוּ) comes from יִשְׁמְעָאֵל, and לֹא הָיָה from יִרְחַמְאֵל. Originally perhaps corrections. נ miswritten for ל, פ for כ are frequent; so also is the prefixing of the second part of a corrupted word.

17 f. Between זָרַע and יַעֲבֹדְנִי something has fallen out. T gives זָרַע יַעֲקֹב; G Θ read זָרַעִי (so Houb., Bā.). Rather זָרַע יַעֲקֹב יַעֲבֹדְנִי (cp. *l.* 4). So Du., who continues 'כל־זרע ישראל יעב'; but the parallelism of 'יכב' and 'יעב' is imperfect. That כ and ע are confounded is certain (e.g. כל and על). Moreover, from our metrical point of view, we cannot afford to insert so much. For *l.* 18 we must utilize יְבֹאוּ וַיְגִידוּ יְבֹאוּ וַיְגִידוּ, only יבאו seems to have no special force. Read, for יבאו וַיְגִידוּ, יבאו וַיְגִידוּ.

19. Wellh. suggests זָרַע יַעֲבֹדְנִי יִסְפֹּר לְאֲדָנָי לְדוֹר יבֹא. This stichus is of course not to the taste of metrists. לְדוֹר יבֹא (G γεγενῆ ἢ ἐρχομένη) is adopted by Bā., Che.⁽¹⁾ Du., but is not a probable idiom here; besides, Duhm's reading (יִסְפֹּר וגו') produces a tetrameter. Read probably יִסְפֹּרוּ לְדוֹר אַחֲרוֹן. The letters אדני represent ארנו, a mutilated אחרון (cp. cii. 19). The scribe wrote לאח in error, and therefore supplemented it by לדור.

20. M נולד לעם, i.e. to the people that shall be born (G J). The critics accept this, comparing the 'imitation' עַם נִבְרָא in cii. 19. Both phrases are questionable, and if genuine would have been elucidated by the author. Comparing Dt. xxxii. 6 f., we should rather expect them to refer to ancient Israel (Dt. xxxii. 6 f.), not to the children of living Israelites. נולד surely comes from רמל, and לעם from כאל; both are fragments of יִרְחַמְאֵל. In Isa. xxxviii. 15, xlv. 23, עֲשֵׂה is a corruption of הוֹשִׁיעַ. For similar necessary corrections see Ps. xxxvii. 5, lii. 11, Isa. lxiv. 3 (the only passage where Duhm notices this). Here, however, it is best to read כִּי מִיִּרְחַמְאֵל הַשִּׁיעֲנִי.

PSALM XXIII.

PENTAMETERS. A composite psalm, framed on the model of xxii. In xxii.⁽¹⁾ Israel was opposed by lions, and seemed to have no helper. In xxiii.⁽¹⁾ he is too happy in the felt presence of his Guide to dread even the darkest ravine (צלמות in xxiii. 4 and in xxii. 16 corr. text). In xxii.⁽²⁾ God's sufferers look forward to a feast (*v.* 27); in xxiii.⁽²⁾ the community pictures this feast with delight. It is the Messianic feast, as in xxxvi.⁽²⁾, which is referred to; the corrected text of *l.* 1, 2

makes this clear. As in Isa. xxv. 6, the feast is spread in Zion, *i.e.* in the temple-courts, and as in Ps. xxvii. 5 the speaker's one desire is to be sheltered for ever in that home of peace. Who is the speaker? In xxiii.⁽²⁾ Israel as a matter of course. There can be no private feast in the kingdom of God; this is one of the 'Guest-psalms' (*OP*, 236). In xxiii.⁽¹⁾, as the text stands, there is nothing to prevent a primary reference to the second or idealized David, *i.e.* the Messiah; in xviii. this personage (probably) gives thanks for his deliverance from the darkness of Death-land. But there is also nothing to suggest this. In lxxx. 2 Yawè is called the "shepherd of Israel," and repeatedly the same figure is expressed or implied (see on *l.* 1 f.; Isa. xl. 11 is specially parallel). The shepherd's tending, moreover, is said to be 'for his name's sake,' and his full name is 'Yawè the God of Israel.' But of course a secondary reference would have been permitted by the poet to the individual, in so far as his joys and sorrows arose out of his position as an Israelite, *i.e.* in so far as he lived to show forth God's glory (cf. Isa. xliii. 7). See the fine description of a 'lamb of God' in *Ecce Homo*, ed. 2, p. 8.

For the national reference see the Targum, Theod. Mops. (in *ZATW*, '85, p. 94), Kimhi, Hengstenb., Ol., Reuss, Smend, Cheyne, Bâ., Coblenz, &c. The composite origin has been maintained by von Ortenberg (*ZATW*, '87, p. 308) and Frupp (*JQR*, 1892, p. 672). The latter well says, 'The table, the oil, the cup, the temple, have nothing to do with the shepherd life of 1-4, and the divine goodness and mercy that follow (6) are not the care and guidance that lead (1-4).' Probably the small fragment which constitutes xxii.⁽¹⁾ was felt to require a supplement.

XXIII.—1.

Marked: Of 'Arab-ethan.

1

1 Yawè is the shepherd [of Israel]; | [no good thing] do I lack.

In [a place of] tender grassy pastures— | there he makes me lie down.

2

To fountains of living water | [Yawè] leads me to drink;
He guides me in the paths that are right | for his name's sake.

3

Even if I walk through a glen darksome as Hades, | I fear no hurt;

4

[? Neither lion nor young lion do I dread?] for thou art with me.

* * * * *

Thy pastoral rod, thy staff, | that tranquillizes me.

XXIII.—2. (*Fragment.*)

1 Before me thou arrangest a table | within thy courts; 5
My desire thou satisfiest with rich foods, | my cup thou fillest to the brim.

Surely goodness and loving-kindness will attend me | all my life long;

6

And I shall dwell in Yawè's house | for endless days.

1 f. The Vg. gives 'Dominus regit me'; hence the Wycliffite, 'The Lord gouerneth me'; an unconscious ratification of the true view of the psalm, as the utterance of the Israel within Israel. The text, however, is incomplete; it suffers from the same corruptness as the close of Ps. xxii.⁽²⁾ *Line 1*, for instance, runs in M's text, 'Yahwè is my shepherd; I lack not,' which is very abrupt and incomplete, if we compare it with lines 3 and 4. The supplied words are only conjectural. The figure of the divine shepherd is no doubt an ancient one; the ruler is his people's shepherd. In Gen. xlviii. 15 the phrase 'the God who tended me' is put into the mouth of Israel's reputed ancestor (Israel, not Jacob): Gen. xlix. 15, however, is corrupt. As the shepherd of his people Yahwè is described in lxxiv. 1, lxxix. 13, xc. 7, c. 3; cp. xxviii. 9, lxxvii. 21, lxxviii. 52, lxxx. 2, Is. xl. 11, lxiii. 13 f., Jer. xxxi. 9, Ezek. xxxiv. 41, Mic. vii. 14. See introd.—דְּשָׁנָה denotes the quality of the young sprouts of grass—sappy, green, tender (cp. 'Grass,' *Enc. Bib.*). In Joel ii. 22 דְּשָׁנָה should be rendered 'sprout luxuriantly,' not 'become green.'

3. f. **Living waters, מַיִם חַיִּים** (12 times in O.T.) properly = springing water (so Gen. xxvi. 19, RV), but wells being so often sacred to some supernatural being (W. R. Smith, *Rel. Sem.*, 135, 166), late writers could use 'springing water' as a symbol of the blessings promised by their religion (see on xxxvi. 10, and cp. John iv. 10 f.). Such a symbolic use is in-

dicated here by the parallel line. מַעְגְּלֵי צַדִּיק means, not only 'straight paths,' but 'paths of (religious) rightness,' or, as above, *paths that are right*. The same phrase occurs probably in xxxii. 8 and lxvii. 5 (corrected texts); cp. also Prov. iv. 11, where דֶּרֶךְ חַכְמָה corresponds to מַעְגְּלֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, *i.e.* paths of uprightness (in daily life). The 'right paths,' then, are the courses of action prescribed by God's law, of which it is said (xix. 8) that it 'revives the soul.' If Israel walks steadily in these paths, it will be rewarded by the sense of God's favour, and sooner or later by material goods. The ethical and the material sense may not yet be sharply distinguished, but we can see that the ethical sense is destined to become the exclusive one.—*For his name's sake, i.e.* as the God of Israel; cp. Isa. lxiii. 16, 19.

5. צְלֻמוֹת, a favourite word in Job (iii. 5, x. 21 f.) for deep darkness like that of Sheol. Cp. xviii. 6b (corr. text), xlv. 20, cvii. 10, 14.

xxiii.⁽²⁾ 1 f. See especially xxxvi 9, Isa. xxv. 6 (cp. introd.).—4. The individual cannot dwell in Yahwè's house for ever, but the community can. The psalmist thinks in the first instance of Yahwè's house on Mount Zion. There Israelites can best learn what communion with Yahwè means. But there is a greater Israel beyond the limits of Palestine. A larger conception of 'Yahwè's house' and of communion with God could not therefore help being formed. Cp. *OP*, 387 f., *JRL*, 251 ff. לְאֶרֶץ יְמִים, as xciii. 5, Lam. v. 20. Cp. xxi. 5.

Critical Notes. 1. Read רֵעָה יִשְׂרָאֵל (lxxx. 2). 'יש' was probably omitted through its resemblance to לֹא אֲחֹסֶר; probably the letters had been mixed up. Also insert כָּל־טוֹב (xxxiv. 11) or טוֹב. Change from objective to personal form of statement, as in cxxi.; 'Israel's keeper' (v. 4), then 'Yahwè is thy keeper, [O Israel],' v. 5.

2. Read בְּמִקּוֹם נ' ד' ; G εἰς τόπον ἀλόγης. Then insert שָׁם ; G ἐκεῖ. Metre.

3. M עַל־מַיִם כִּנְהוֹת יְנַהֲלֵנִי : נַפְשִׁי יִשׁוּבָב. This might perhaps do for a line, were it not for the superfluous second verbal clause, which prevents perfect parallelism with *ll.* 2, 4. There are also exegetical difficulties.

'נ' יש is indeed plain enough; the spokesmen of the community continually ask to have their 'breath brought back' to them, to be refreshed or revived (see on lx. 3). But what does 'מי כִּנַּי' mean? 'Water of rest'? The plural *might* be abstract (so G K, § 124*e*). But what a vague expression! Does it mean gently-flowing water? or water by which one can rest? or, taking the plural strictly, water with resting-places? For this sense of 'נ' cf. Nu. x. 33, 'the ark . . . went before them . . . to seek out a resting-place (כִּנּוּחָה) for them.' The two latter explanations are preferable. The idea of tranquil waters would have been expressed differently (cp. Isa. viii. 6), nor was there any object in mentioning the calmness of the waters; the dangers of the flock arose from wild beasts, not from rough waters. But has not enough been said in *l.* 2 of the choice of spots to rest in? If, however, this objection be overruled, we still have to justify יִנְהַלְנִי. Friedr. Del. (*Proz.*, 17 ff.) thinks that the sense required is 'he makes me to lie down,' and—to suit this and other passages (more especially Gen. xlvii. 17, 2 Chr. xxviii. 15, xxxii. 22)—compares נָהַל with Ass. *nā'ālu*, a synonym of *rabāsu*, 'to lie down.' Craig (*Hebraica*, Oct. '93, p. 80) and R. D. Wilson (*Presb. Rev.*, Apr. '85, pp. 319 ff., where two roots נָהַל are assumed) have more or less followed Del.; Kau. (*Th. LZ*, Oct. 30, '86) rejects his view after an examination of the passages, which, though careful, is not keen enough in its criticism. Though agreeing with Kau.'s result, I am obliged to re-examine the passages. Observe, then, first, that G gives in Ps. xxiii. 3 and in Gen. xlvii. 17 ἐξέθρεψεν; in Ps. xxxi. 4 διαθρέψεις. In Gen. *l.c.* at any rate (see Ball in *SBOT*) and in Ps. xxxi. 4 G is right; we have to read תִּכְלֹכְלֵנִי ויִכְלֹכְלֵנִי. In 2 Chr. xxxii. 22 G has κατέπαυσεν (cp. xiv. 6, xv. 15, xx. 30); read וַיִּנַּח לָהֶם (so J, Bertheau, Kittel, &c.); and in xxviii. 15 we should read almost certainly (without G's help) וַיִּכְלֹכְלֵנִי וַיַּנְהִילֵנִי בַּחֲמִיאָה וְקָלִי וַיַּנְהִילֵנִי (cp. 2 S. xvii. 28 f.). There still remain Ex. xv. 13, Ps. xxiii. 2, Isa. xl. 11, xlix. 10, li. 18, and ('התנ') Gen. xxxiii. 14. In all these passages, unless indeed Ps. xxiii. 2 be an exception, the sense 'to lead' or 'lead gently' (as a flock is led to drink) is satisfactory. I admit that, if we keep the text of Ps. xxiii. 2, the sense 'to lead' is inadequate. But the sense 'to support' or 'nourish' (G), derived from 'יכל', is equally so. Therefore כִּי מִנְחוֹת (itself not a satisfactory phrase) must be wrong. We naturally look for help to II. Isaiah, this being a Deut.-Isaianic psalm. Isa. xlix. 10 contains the promise וַיִּגְלִי־מִבּוֹיָעֵי מַיִם יִנְהַלֵּם. Now we have recovered the word which restores perfect sense, and we can also get rid of the troublesome little clause נַפְשֵׁי יִשׁוּבָב. The word is כִּיבוֹיָעֵי; נַפְשֵׁי and יִשׁ are both miswritten forms of this word; יִשׁ may have been originally a *correction* of the already corrupt word which preceded it. Read, as *l.* 3, וַיִּגְלִי־מִבּוֹיָעֵי מַיִם תַּיִם יְהוָה יִנְהַלְנִי. יְהוָה, represented perhaps by 'י, would easily fall out. מַיִם תַּיִם is accounted for

thus. **נ** in **כַּנְחוֹת** is the last letter of **מִיָּם**; **נ** and **ו** both represent **י**; the final **ת**, as so often, has arisen out of **ם**. **הַיָּיִם** is not authorized by II. Isaiah, but is an improvement (see above).

7. Prefix conjecturally **לֹא־אֶדְאָג מִפְּרִי מְיֹאֲרֵי**, suggested by Ps. xxii.

8. **יִנְחֶנִּי**. But one who has such a Guide has nothing to sorrow for. Read **יִנְחֹנִי** (cf. on cxxxviii. 7); Isa. xiv. 3 is just parallel. **נוֹה** and **נָהַם** confounded, as in Gen. v. 29 (see Ball), and the passages cited by Nestle in *Exp. T.*, viii. 239, x. 48. Gr. **תְּנַחֲנִי** (repetition; see *l.* 4).

xxiii.⁽²⁾ 1. **נִגְדַּד צִרְרֵי**. 'A very picturesque trait! They must look on quietly, how the table is spread, and how the psalmist sits down at it' (Hengstenberg). Rather, a blot on the psalm, only to be tolerated under necessity. If **נִגְדַּד** is right, **צִרְרֵי** must be wrong, because it is against parallelism. But **נִגְדַּד**, too, is wrong. Read **בְּקֶרֶב הַצִּירִיךְ**. How constantly the psalmists localize their happiness thus! So *l.* 1 corresponds to *l.* 4.

2. **דַּשְׁנַת**. No great reliance can be placed on M in such a case as this. Read probably **תְּדַשֵּׁן** (Gr.).—**רֵאשִׁי**. But the verb should be **סוּדָה** or (Am. vi. 6) **מַשֵּׁחַ**. **רֵשֶׁן** is a special word of Proverbs (xi. 25, xiii. 4, xv. 30). In the two former passages it goes with **נִפְשֵׁי**. Read certainly **נִפְשֵׁי**; cf. on lxiii. 6 (same phrase). **נ** dropped out after the **נ** in **שָׁכַן** (final letters very slowly became the rule); **פ** and **ר** were confounded; **א** was inserted by the editor.—**רִוְיָה** (*ἀπ. λεγ.*). Read **הַתְּרוּהָה**. Cp. again on lxiii. 6.

3. **טוֹב**. Point **טוֹב**, to match **חֶסֶד** (xxv. 7).

4. **וּשְׁבַתִּי**, implying a wrong exegetical view (cf. T), unless we suppose the points to indicate a preference for the perf. of **יָשַׁב**. Read **וַיִּשְׁבַּתִּי** (Gr., Kau., We.; cf. S J).

PSALM XXIV.

Two striking little chants (the latter incomplete) are here combined. Both are in trimeters, but while the first is in quatrains, the second is in triplets. Ps. xxiv.⁽¹⁾ is the counterpart of Ps. xv., except that it has what may be styled a theoretic introduction (*ll.* 1—4), which, it is barely possible, may have come from another hand. The chant describes the character which will be recognized by the divine Judge as a passport to Messianic blessedness. The theoretic basis is this. The God of Zion is also the creator and proprietor of the world. He is therefore not a God in the likeness of man, and cannot be hoodwinked or propitiated by the wicked. He is the Holy One, and requires holiness of his votaries, which includes the absolute renunciation of false gods, especially of the god of Jerahmeel (a lunar deity? See *Crit. Bib.* on Zeph. i. 5).

Ps. xxiv.⁽²⁾ is a companion-passage to Isa. lxiii. 1-6. The divine Warrior has either returned from his victory over his and Israel's enemies, and stands before the gates of Jerusalem, or is about to enter in triumph the chief city of the Jerahmeelites. It thus becomes needless to look out for a victory which may have been celebrated by the singing of this triumphal song, or to select one of the two reported post-exilic rededications¹ of the temple—that in B.C. 520 (Halévy, *Rev. scmit.*, Oct. 1894, p. 297) or that in B.C. 165 (Duhm). The temple indeed is not referred to at all, and though the psalm is a song of triumph, it is nothing less than the great Messianic victory that is meant.

Stade (*Akad. Reden.*, 70) endeavours to show that the division of the psalm into two independent songs is unnecessary. But all that he shows is that both passages have a broadly Messianic reference, *i.e.* that the editor had a good reason for combining them. In the revised text the combination is still more amply justified (note the reference in both passages to 'Jerahmeel').

The LXX. adds to the title τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτων, *i.e.* שֶׁל אֶחָד בַּיּוֹמֵי הַשָּׁבָע, 'of the first day of the week.' This is supported by the Jewish liturgy; cp. *Rosh ha-shānā*, 31a, where R. Akiba connects this assignment with the reference of the psalm to the creation. On the Christian application, see *OP*, 204, 223; *Christian Use of the Psalms*, 99-109.

XXIV.—1.

Marked: Of 'Arab-ethan.

- 1 Yahwè's is the earth and all that it contains ;
 The world, and those who dwell in it.
 For he +alone+ founded it upon ocean, 2
 And established it upon +ocean's+ streams.
 Who may go up +to worship+ on Yahwè's mountain ? 3
 Or who may stand in his holy place ?
 He that has innocent hands and a pure heart, 4
 That has not sworn to Jerahmeel ;
 He shall receive a blessing from Yahwè, 5
 10 +Yea,+ a privilege from his delivering God ;
 Such a one shall lay low the wicked, 6
 He shall trample on the profane ones of Jerahmeel.

XXIV.—2.

(The opening has fallen out.)

- 7 Lift up your heads, ye gates,
 +Yea,+ lift yourselves up, ye portals of Jerahmeel, 7
 That the King of Glory may enter !
 10 Who, oh who, is the King of Glory ? 8
 'Yahwè, the Strong One, the Hero,
 Yahwè, the Hero in battle.'

¹ Hupfeld's supposition of a reference to the first (pre-exilic) dedication is quite out of the question. Not to press the phrase פִּתְחֵי עֵינֹם (which seems to be corrupt), where is there any mention of the ark (cp. 1 K. viii. 3 ff.)?

Lift up your heads, ye gates, 9
 +Yea,+ lift yourselves up, ye portals of Jerahmeel,
 That the King of Glory may enter.

Who, oh who, is the King of Glory? 10
 'Yahwè, the God of Hosts,
 18 He +alone+ is the King of Glory.'

1, 2. It is the privilege of Israel to have been brought into specially close contact with 'the everlasting God, Yahwè, the creator of the ends of the earth' (Isa. xl. 28). But who is the true Israelite? Both full-born Jews and (cf. Ps. lxxxvii.) proselytes need to know this, for Israel is growing out of a mere nation into a church. Those who enter the sacred precincts unbidden have good cause to fear, for this great God may hurl the thunders of his wrath upon them—nay, at a coming awful day, he *will* do so (see on v. 5-8; xv.).

3. **Ocean, יַמַּיִם**, (see on viii. 9).

A 'mighty ocean' (Bab. *afsu daninu*) encompasses the earth. Contrast Job xxvi. 7, where God is said to have suspended the 'north' (see *Enc. Bib.*, col. 1149, n.⁽¹⁾) on space (תהו? הבלים). The psalmist's view is no doubt the earlier one. So cxxxvi. 6; cp. on civ. 5. —*Streams, נהרות*. So xciii. 3; cf. נחלי, xviii. 5; נהר (|| ימים), Jon. ii. 4. There is no sharp distinction between 'river' and 'sea' in Semitic; cp. *nāru marrātu*, 'the bitter stream' (see Del., *Par.* 182; *Enc. Bib.*, 'Mera-thaim'). Homer, too, calls the world-ocean *πρωταύς*.

7 f. God can see the stains on the hands and heart (conscience) of a criminal. The true Israelite constantly keeps hands and heart clean (xxvi. 6, 10, lxxiii. 13). The imitator in Isa. xxxiii. 15 omits the heart, but adds ears and eyes. בר־לבב again in lxxiii. 1; cp. Job xvii. 9. Contrast Prov. xx. 9. —*Sworn to Jerahmeel*. The danger from Jerahmeelite idolatry was not confined to pre-exilic times. The power of Jerahmeel seemed to be a witness to his divinity.

10. **A privilege, צדקה**, something that it is 'righteous' for him and not for others to receive, so perhaps Isa. liv. 17. There are Arabic and Himyaritic parallels. G adopts another equally special sense, viz. 'a gift of mercy,' *ἐλεημοσύνη* (so Σ, xxx. 2, and another Greek version at cv. 3, cxii. 3).

11 f. In what does the privilege consist? In laying low the oppressor—the 'profane' Jerahmeelites.

xxiv.⁽²⁾ 8. **Ye portals of Jerahmeel**. Does this mean the gates of Jerusalem, which was originally peopled by Jerahmeelites (see 2 S. v. 8, revised text), and in Isaiah's time could poetically be called 'Jerahmeel' (see Isa. xxix. 1, revised text, and *Crit. Bib.*)? or the chief city of the Jerahmeelites? Is the divine Warrior to be imagined at the end of his journey from the field of battle (cp. lxxviii. 19)? or is he just about to occupy the conquered hostile city? Either view is possible, but the latter (cp. lx. 11) seems the more probable.

9 ff. **King of Glory**. The divine glory is meant (Isa. iv. 5, Ezek. iii. 23, &c.; cp. אֱלֹהֵי, xxix. 3). The questioner in l. 10 is, not the personified gates (Bä.), but a bystander (cp. Isa. lxxiii. 1 f.). The answer is given, not by an angelic choir (Theodoret), but by the poet, who is imaginatively present.—*The Hero*. Cp. lxxviii. 65, ciii. 20, Ex. xv. 3.

17. **Hosts, צבאות**, *i.e.* perhaps all the supernatural or superhuman forces in the world in whom the Jews of the psalmist's age believed. Cp. *Enc. Bib.*, 'Amos,' 'Names of God.'

Critical Notes. xxiv.¹¹ 8. Omit אֲשֶׁר, editorial insertion. The following words, לֹא נִשָּׂא לְשׁוֹא נִפְשׁוּ, not only afford a poor climax to *l.* 7, but contain a very doubtful idiom (cp. Hupf.-Nowack). After this comes another little clause, which, though inadequate as a climax, is better Hebrew. According to analogy, it may be regarded as a superior various reading. נִפְשׁוּ and נִשָּׂא are both corruptions of an incompletely written נִשְׁבַּע. As to לְשׁוֹא and לְכַרְמָה it is no doubt plausible to view them as alternative and equivalent expressions. But much more probably לְשׁוֹא comes from לֹא נִשְׁבַּע, and לְכַרְמָה [ל], as in *cix.* 2, &c., from יִרְחִמְאֵל. 'Swearing to (*or* by) Jerahmeel' (the god of the Jerahmeelites) was a heinous offence (see *Crit. Bib.* on Zeph. i. 5). Read therefore וְלֹא נִשְׁבַּע לִירְחִמְאֵל (a relative clause). [כְּר. נִפְשֵׁי, though supported by MSS. and edd., and by Saad., Ibn Janah, Rashi, and Kimḥi, has no critical value, being plainly suggested by Ex. xx. 7 ; see Bā.]

11 f. M דְּרִשׁוּ (Kt.), דְּרִשְׁוּ (Kr.), and פְּנִיךָ יַעֲקֹב. Two doubtful phrases. The latter is supported by 'A Σ E' S' J and Vet. Lat. ; S, however, inserts אֱלֹהֵי ; while T reads פְּנֵי יַעֲקֹב, and G פְּנֵי אֱלֹהֵי. Houb. and most moderns follow S ; Duhm prefers G ; Whitehouse (after J. S. Bright) sees an allusion to Gen. xxxii. 31, and proposes כִּיעֲקֹב. The latter is a less superficial correction, but does not go to the heart of the problem. Evidently the mischief is centred in יַעֲקֹב, which is plainly corrupt. A corruption of what ? The answer is suggested by *l.* 8. As in some other passages, יַעֲקֹב must have displaced יִרְחִמְאֵל. דָּרִשׁוּ is also too improbable to stand. What we require in *ll.* 11 f. is a *description* of the blessing referred to in *ll.* 9 f. The text must have been nearly as follows : כֹּה יִרְיֵד רִשְׁעִים וַיִּכְבֹּשׁ חֲנֹפֵי יִרְחִמְאֵל. At the end is no 'musical note' (G *διάψαλμα*), but a corruption of חֲנֹפֵי = יִרְחִמְאֵל (a correction perhaps of יַעֲקֹב). We shall often have a similar experience.

xxiv.² 8, 14. M פְּתָחֵי עוֹלָם, a vague expression, variously interpreted as 'ancient' (Ew., Del., Bā., &c.) and as 'everlasting doors' (G, J, Hengstenberg, Hupfeld). But what appropriateness has either title in this context ? Perles (*Anz.*, 68) proposes פ' אוֹלָם 'gates of the temple porch' (2 Chr. xxix. 7). This is in connexion with his theory that the psalm commemorates the restoration of the temple cultus by Hezekiah—a restoration of which we know nothing from trustworthy sources. In *Enc. Bib.*, col. 1409, note 1, I proposed פְּתָחֵי עֲלִיּוֹן 'portals of the Most High,' comparing Gen. xxi. 33 (J²), where Abraham invokes Yahwè as אֱלֹהֵי עוֹלָם, which cannot possibly be correct, and is emended by Renan into אֱלֹהֵי עֲלִיּוֹן. The two passages are no doubt analogous ; but after completing my revision of Ps. lxxviii., I see that thorough criticism requires us to read in both passages neither עוֹלָם nor עֲלִיּוֹן, but יִרְחִמְאֵל, a word which we often meet with in mutilated fragments like עֵלָם or אֵלָם. See *exeg.* note.

PSALM XXV.

QUATRAINS of trimeters. Each couplet of a quatrain begins with a letter of the alphabet, but there is no ך couplet (cp. Ps. xxxiv.), and the ך couplet is only produced by a very plausible conjecture, for the text apparently gives two couplets for ך, but none for ך. There is also (as in Ps. xxxiv.) a supernumerary ך couplet, which many suppose to be a liturgical appendix. It is certain, however, that we no longer have it in its integrity, because (1) the appendix is not in the metre of the psalm, (2) to use 'Elohim' instead of 'Yahwè' is not the want of the psalmist, and strange in Book i. of the Psalms, and (3) 'Israel' is nowhere else mentioned in the psalm. On the analogy of a late Jewish custom Lagarde¹ supposes the supernumerary couplets in Pss. xxv. and xxxiv. to be separate acrostics, indicating 'Pedahel' and Pedajah' as the names of the respective writers (cp. *Enc. Bib.*, 'Pedahel,' 'Pedajah'). These couplets, however, admit of a safer explanation, not indeed as implying a difference of pronunciation between ך and ך,² but as completing the respective quatrains. Certainly the principle invoked by Lagarde might easily be carried to very inconvenient lengths, and produce very undesirable additions to the literary history of the Israelites.

The psalm is described by Bâthgen as 'a series of sayings with petitions for help against the enemies, guidance in the right way, forgiveness of sins, preservation, and liberation.' The second and third of these subjects have, if we adopt the revised text, to be omitted, and in their place instruction in the principles of Yahwè's dealings with Israel, and the punishment of the sins of Israel's oppressors should be introduced. The speaker is the pious Jewish community (cp. *ll.* 1, 3 with *l.* 5), or more strictly the inner circle within that community (see on Ps. xxxiv.). Note also (1) the phrase 'for the sake of thy name' (*l.* 21) the name intended is 'Yahwè, the God of Israel,' and (2) the epithet חָסִיד 'pious,' 'loyal' in *l.* 32 (revised text), cp. xvi. 10 *b.*, lxxvi. 2 *b.* The apparent inconsistency in *ll.* 23-28 arose out of the exigencies of the acrostic form of composition. In *ll.* 2, 5 *f.*, 9, 12, 13, 16, 22, 33, 37 *f.*, 42, the most bitter national foes are mentioned by name.

Of 'Arab-ethan.

1

- 1 Unto thee, O Yahwè! do I cry,
 [Preserve] my soul [from] the Ishmaelites.
 In thee I trust, let me not be disappointed; 2
 Let not mine enemies deride me!
 Yea, let those of Jerahmeel be disappointed, 3
 Let the traitors of Jerahmeel turn back:
 Thy ways, O Yahwè! cause me to know, 4
 Teach me the paths that are thine.

¹ *Academy*, Jan. 1, 1872; *Symmikta*, 1877, p. 107. Rahlfs (עני and עני, p. 41), G. Hoffmann, and Duhm favour Lagarde. Cp., however, Geiger, *Jüd. Zte.*, x. (1872), pp. 133 ff., B. Jacob, *ZATW*, xvi. (1896), p. 153, note; Beer, *Indiv.-ps.*, p. 30; Cheyne, *OP*, 248.

² Kön. *Lehrgeb.*, i. 37. Jerome (on Dan. ii. 45) remarks, 'Notandum autem quod P litteram Hebraeus sermo von habeat, sed pro ipsa utatur Phe, cuius vim Græcum Φ sonat'; i.e. his teachers did not distinguish between ך and ך. Cp. Grimm, *Liturg. App.*, 8 f.

	Cut off the Jerahmeelites for their wickedness,	5
10	For thou art my delivering God.	
	Remember thy compassion, O Yahwè !	6
	And hold back those of Jerahmeel.	
	The sins of ¹ Ishmael do thou remember, ²	
	Because of thy goodness, O Yahwè !	
	Good and upright is Yahwè ;	8
	Therefore will he lay low Jerahmeel.	
	He leads the sufferers in the right course,	9
	He teaches the poor his way :	
	All his paths are lovingkindness and faithfulness	10
20	To regards of his covenant and his admonitions.	
	For the sake of thy name, O Yahwè !	11
	Forgive not the iniquity of Jerahmeel.	
	Who is the man that fears Yahwè ?	12
	Him will He instruct in the way that He chooses.	
	He himself will abide in prosperity,	13
	And his offspring will inherit the land.	
	The secret of Yahwè is for those that fear Him,	14
	And his blessing for those that love his name.	
	Mine eyes are ever toward Yahwè ;	15
30	It is he who will bring my feet out of the net.	
	Look towards me, and take pity upon me,	16
	For I am one that is pious, one that suffers.	
	Those of Jerahmeel afflict me,	
	But do thou bring me out of my distresses !	
	Attentive be thine ears to my weeping,	18
	And hear the sound of my sighs !	
	Behold those of Jerahmeel,	19
	And those of Ishmael and of Cush :	
	Preserve my soul, and deliver me ;	20
40	Let me not be disappointed, for in thee do I trust.	
	The wicked are consumed out of the land,	21
	And the Misrites Yahwè has cut off.	
	He sets free ³ * * *	

* * * * *

¹ Jerahmeel and. ² According to thy lovingkindness.

³ (Set free) Israel, O God ! from all his distresses.

4. **Deride me.** So xxii. 8, lxxx. 7; cp. xliv. 14, lxxix. 4, cxxiii. 4.—6. *The traitors*, cp. on ix. 6.—*Turn back*, i.e. let their attack be fruitless (cp. vi. 10b, &c.).—7 f. The *ways* and *paths* of Yahwè are his course of action towards Israel and Israel's enemies. How deeply the mysterious ways of God preoccupy all thoughtful Jews is manifest from Pss. xlix., lxxiii., xcii., xciv., &c.—9. *For their wickedness.* Again and again (ll. 13 ff., 22, 41 f.) the psalmist emphasizes the fact that the Jerahmeelite oppression was contrary to the fundamental laws of morality (cp. Pss. x., xciv.).—10. **אלהי ישעי** (so Isa. xvii. 10) possesses a new force in the revised text.—13-15. Notice the beautiful parallelism of the couplets in the restored text. **יִשָּׁר** might conceivably mean 'gracious,' but most probably there is a contrast between the 'goodness' and 'uprightness' of Yahwè and the evil, unrighteous, insincere character of the Jerahmeelites.

17-28. **In the right course =**

Critical Notes. 1 f. Sievers, in his metrical arrangement, finds *l. 1* both short and unmetrical; following G (B A A) he takes in **אלהי** from *v. 2*. Bickell and Duhm admit the shortness, but omit **אלהי** as a superfluous addition, and, as *l. 2*, supply from *v. 5c* **אוֹתָךְ קִיַּיתִי פֶלֶאֱהִים**. Matthes (in Kue., *Ond.*², iii. 205) takes a hint from lxxxvi. 3b, 4b, and reads **אלֵךְ יְהוָה אֶקְרָא | נַפְשִׁי אִשָּׁא אֶל־אֱלֹהִי**. The insertion of **אֶקְרָא** in *l. 1* is good; but it has not been observed that **נַפְשִׁי אִשָּׁא** is deeply corrupt. Besides, we require, if it may be, a touch of historical colouring, and much more passion; and, from the experience we have already gained in Pss. i.-xxiv., we can obtain this. Read **אלֵךְ יְהוָה | שְׁמִרְנִי מִיִּשְׁמְעָאִים**. The **ר** in **שְׁמִרְנִי** fell out, and what remained became **נַפְשִׁי** (the same case again in xlii. 7a). **אִשָּׁא** together with **אלהי** (cp. G) represents **יִשְׁמְעָאִים**.

4. M **יַעֲלֶצְנִי**. But **עֲלֶץ**, like Ass. *elēsu*, always means 'to exult,' never 'to mock'; this too would require **בִּי**. Read **יִלְעָגְנִי** (Gr.); **לִי** follows quite regularly (ii. 4). G *καταγελασάτωσάν μου*.

5. M **בְּלִי קִיַּיִךְ לֹא גַם**. Sievers suggests the omission of **כֹּל**. On metrical grounds, however, as Sievers himself holds, this step is unnecessary. Apparently he feels the expression to be an awkward one; **כֹּל** adds nothing to the sense. Besides, **גַּם** ought to introduce a climax. Quite possibly **כֹּל קִיַּיִךְ** may come from **הַלְכִיִּיר**, i.e. **יִרְהַמְאִלִּי**. This suits all the conditions of the case, and should be right.

in 'the way that He (Yahwè) chooses' (*l. 24*). It is this that the **עֲנִיִּים** (i.e. pious Israel) find so hard to believe; they require much 'teaching'; 'the secret' (*l. 27*) is only revealed to those who practise the 'fear' and 'love' of Yahwè's name (cp. on v. 11). The 'wilderness' may be the right way to Canaan, suffering and oppression the prelude to the enjoyment of an empire. *He himself . . . his offspring*, an inconsistency (see introd.), for, of course, the poet means Israel. Cp. Ps. xxxiv. (introd.). To 'abide (**לִוֶן**) in prosperity' and to 'inherit the land' are synonymous. *The secret* (**סֹדֶר**), or 'the intimacy': cp. Prov. iii. 32 f., and Frankenberg *ad loc.*

30. **The net**, fitly referred to in connexion with the **בְּגָדִים**, 'traitors' (*l. 6*); cp. ix. 16 (note).

41. **Consumed out of the land.** The 'holy' land was 'defiled' by the presence of heathen (cp. xxxvii. 9, 38, and especially civ. 35).

6, 8. The second **יבשו** should be **יִשְׁבוּ** (cp. vi. 11). The very awkward **ריקם** of course = **ירחמאל** (cp. *Enc. Bib.*, 'Rekem'). The art. and the **ם** in **הבגדים** are editorial.—Read **וארחותיך** (G 2 Sievers), for metre.

9. M **הִדְרִיכֵנִי בְּאִמְתָּךְ וְלִמְדֵנִי**. Ewald and Duhm omit **לְמֵ** as a repetition from **עַ. 4b**; but metre opposes this. That something is wrong is suggested by Pasek, but without the key we could not say what. A glance at **ולמדני** shows that it comes from **ירחמאלים**, and this is confirmed by our finding at the end of **עַ. 6** one of the ordinary corruptions of **ירחמאל**, viz. **כל־היום** (cp. on xlv. 23, lvi. 2, lxxiv. 22). The truth is that **כל־היום**, viz. **אותך קויתי כל־היום** (**עַ. 5b**), which has so embarrassed us all, and which Wellh. and Sievers have treated as an imperfect **ו** couplet (G, in fact, prefixes *καί*), is really a doublet to **הד' ולמדני**. But what is it that underlies these two corrupt readings? Evidently a prayer against Jerahmeel; and since it is the **ה** couplet, we cannot be wrong in correcting **הד'** and **קויתי** into **הַכְרִית**, and **באמתך** and **אותך** into **בְּרַעַתְךָ** (see on liv. 7).

12. M **וְחִסְדֵיךָ כִּי נִיעוֹלָם הָמָּה** (placing **וְה'** in **עַ. 6a**). The sentence is 'very badly constructed,' says Sievers, but slight remedies such as he suggests are useless. Read **וְחִסְדֵי יִרְחַמְאֵלִים** (xix. 14). **יך** and **כי** both = **יח**, which, with **נִיעוֹלָם** (**מאֵלִים**), represents **ירח' המה** (= **חומר**) also comes from **ירח'**.

13. Note the warning Pasek. The editor has desiderated a contrite appeal for the forgiveness of Israel's sins. But the psalmist is conscious of Israel's rectitude. **נעורי ופשעי לא** is a recast of **ירחמאל וישמעאל**; metre, however, requires the excision of **ירח' ו**. **זכר־לִי אַתָּה** is metrically superfluous, and seems to be a recast of **אל־תִּזְכֵּר**; **כחסדך** is doubtless editorial.

16. M **עֲלֵכֶן יוֹרָה הַטָּאִים בְּדַרְךָ**. Obviously 'sinners' must be wrong. In ed. 1, following Bickell, I read **הַטָּאִים**, 'those that miss their aim' (so lately We., Du.). But this is difficult, and the context suggests a reference to Jerahmeel. **בדרך** belongs to a familiar type of error, and may (cp. **בכרכרות**, Isa. lxvi. 21) represent **ירח'**; so also may **הַטָּאִים**, through editorial manipulation. **יורה** = **יוריד**.—18 f. For **ענוים** read **אביונים** (Gr.), and, for metre, read **כל־ארחותיו** (Sievers).

22. As in *l.* 13, the expression of penitence is due to the editor. Read **אל־תִּשָּׂא לְעֵינַי יִרְחַמְאֵל** (cp. cix. 14). Fragments of **אל־ת'** became **וּסְלַחְתָּ**.

28. M **וּבְרִיתוֹ לְהוֹדִיעֵם**, 'intolerable' (Sievers); also inexplicable.

See Duhm's resource of despair. Surely **סוד** and **ברית ליראיו** and **וברפתו לאהבי שמו** ought to be parallel. Read (*l.* 28)

32. M **יחיד**, 'an only one'? 'Desolate,' 'friendless' is an imaginary sense. Read **חסיד** (Gr.); cp. lxxxvi. 2.

33 f. M. **הרהיבו**, 'admittedly gives no sense' (Bä.). Neither **הרהיבו** ('have terrified,' Bâ.), nor **הרחיב** (Merrick, Hupf., Kau., We., Sievers, &c.), nor **הרחק** (Du.) is an adequate remedy. Both **לבבי** and **הרחיב** surely must be fragments of **ירחמאלים**. Read 'צרוני ירח' (cxxxix. 1 f.), reserving the traditional **ו** in **הרחיבו** for the next line ('**ומי**)

35 f. *Vz.* 18 and 19 ought to give the **ק** and the **ר** distichs, instead of which we have two **ר** distichs. Independently, Duhm and the present writer have sought to remedy this. Duhm (improving upon a conjecture of Ew.) supposes that *v.* 19 began with **קדם**, but was forgotten by the scribe, who afterwards wrote it in the margin, from which it was re-inserted in the text, in an altered form, after instead of before *v.* 18 (for **איבי קדם**, cf. xvii. 13, xviii. 19). But 'confront mine enemies' does not fit in well; on the other hand, **ראה** is quite natural (cf. iii. 2). The **ק** distich must have become partly illegible, and have been restored by conjecture. The result is a very poor, weak sense. Read, rather, comparing cxxx. 2,

קִשְׁבוֹת אֲזַנֶּיךָ לְדַמְעֹתַי
וּשְׁמִיעַ לְקוֹל אֲנַחְתִּי

37 f. In *l.* 38, **ושנאת חמס שניאוני**, 'a hatred of (leading to) injustice,' is very strange. As we go on, we shall find more and more how fond the psalmists are of accumulating the ethnic names of their foes. One of these, 'Ishmael,' is frequently corrupted into some word with **נ** instead of **ל**; another, 'Cushim,' as frequently assumes the disguise of **חמס** (see e.g. Ps. xviii. 49). This suggests how to emend the rather poor words of *l.* 37. The whole couplet becomes ('Ishmael' being *twice* represented), **ראה ירחמאלים | וישמעאלים וכשים**.

41 f. *L.* 42 is metrically incomplete; Bi., Che.¹⁾ Du. supply **יהוה** from G. But this is not enough. The whole couplet is improbable. Whose 'perfectness' and 'uprightness' are meant? Yahwè's or Israel's? Either view can be defended. Just as the Zoroastrians had an Amesha-spenta called Obedience, so Israel might personify its loyalty and righteousness as angels (cp. xliii. 3, lxi. 8). Yahwè, too, is called **ישר** (Dt. xxxii. 4), and might be called **תמים** (cp. xviii. 26). But all this is highly improbable. We must take the **ת** couplet here with that in xxxiv. 22, and read **תפני רשעים מארץ | וכצרים הכרית יהוה**.

Note that **יִשְׂר** represents both **רשעים** and **כִּיָּאֲרִץ**, and that **נִי** in **יִצ'**, as often, = **נִי**.

43f. Point perhaps **פְּדָה**. What follows ought to connect as well with the preceding passage as the corresponding couplet in Ps. xxxiv. See introd.

PSALM XXVI.

TRIMETERS. Innocence and especially love to Yahwè's house claim their assured recompense. The character described here is that of the pious community of Israel to which the psalmist belongs. Cp. Ps. i., but observe that in Ps. xxvi. the chamber of the scribe has not yet come into competition with the temple. The community is conscious of its separateness from the opposition-conclave of the lawless (see on 7. 9; there is, however, some danger in resorting to the temple, and so gratifying the deepest longings of true believers. To suppose, with Ewald, that a prevalent sickness was the occasion of the psalm, would be a great mistake. Ver. 9 rightly understood points forward to the great Messianic judgment. Cp. Pss. xxv., xxvii., and partly ci. G prefixes **πρὸ τοῦ χρισθῆναι** (**Δαυειδ**), probably an interpretation of **לְכִישׁוּה**, a corrupt form of **לְזַבְחִים**.

Of 'Arab-ethan.

		1
1	Right me, O Yahwè, for I walk in integrity, In thy paths I waver not.	
	Prove me, O Yahwè, and try me, Test my reins and my heart.	2
	For thy goodness is my pattern, In thy truth do I walk.	3
	I do not sit +in conclave+ with men of falsehood, I do not commune with the impious. ¹	4
	I have a desire for the dwelling-place of thy glory,	6, 8
10	For thine altar, O Yahwè, do I long, That I may publish with the voice of thanksgiving, And tell out all thy wondrous works.	7
	Snatch not away my soul with sinners, Or my life with the shedders of blood, Whose mouth talks of crimes, And their right hand is full of treachery.	9
	As for me, I walk +still+ in integrity ; Set me free, [O Yahwè,] have pity upon me.	10
	My foot stands on level ground,	11
20	I bless Yahwè in his temple.	

¹ I hate the assembly of evil-doers.
And do not sit +in conclave+ with the wicked (7. 5).

2. Contrast lxxiii. 2.—3, 4. Cp. xvii. 3.—5. לִנְגַד עֵינַי. Cp. ci. 3. חסד אלהים (2 S. ix. 3), *i.e.* such goodness as God shows to his people is the standard of my acts (cp. Hos. vi. 6; Jer. xxii. 16).—6. *In thy truth*, *i.e.* in the only true, trustworthy course of action—that which Yahwè prescribes (lxxxvi. 11, cp. v. 9), the path of his commandments (cxix. 35), which are truth (xix. 9b). Cp. Eccles. xli. 19.

7 f. **Men of falsehood.** Cp. l. 16.; xxiv. 4; cxliv. 8.—*With the impious.* See on xiv. 1 (נָבֵל), and below, on ll. 13–16. שׁוֹא is parallel to נְבִלָה here, as אָוֶן in Isa. xxxii. 6.

9. Cp. xxvii. 4. The temple may be equally well called the ‘dwelling-place’ of Yahwè (lxxxiv. 1) and of his glory (cp. I K. viii. 10 f.). It will be noticed that the difficult phrase about ‘washing the hands in innocence’ disappears from the corrected text. We are thus not compelled to imagine an allusion to the rite prescribed in Ex. xxx. 17–21 (P). The reference in M to processions round the altar (cp. on cxviii. 27) also disappears. It is enough that the speaker loves those sacrifices best in which the most important element is thanksgiving (cp. xxvii. 6). See crit. n.

13–16. The true Israel deprecates being merged in the same body with the ‘sinners,’ or false Israelites, in its midst. Both classes may frequent the

temple, but outside the sacred precincts they form different societies (lines 7, 8; i. 1, 5). To join the company or conclave of the ‘impious’ would render a man liable to the same fate with them. Cp. on l. 18. According to M the unjust rich are the persons specially referred to; their ‘right hand’ is said to be full, not of ‘treachery’ (as in our text), but of ‘bribes,’ *i.e.* presumably those which they receive as judges; cp. Mic. vii. 3. But the description is not free from difficulty. V. 10a and b are not parallel, and in spite of cxxxix. 19, 24 (reading בַּצֵּעַ) it is not natural to describe ‘a shedder of blood’ by saying that his hands are full of ‘bribes.’ The idiom in v. 10a has also much strangeness. For the text here adopted, cp. cxliv. 7, 11.

17. אֵלֶיךָ, ‘I go on walking,’ in spite of all temptations and hindrances.—פְּדִנֵי, cp. xxv. 22, where ‘set Israel free’ justifies the assumption that in Ps. xxvii., as well as in Ps. xxv., the true Israel is the speaker.

19. The ideas of breadth and levelness are connected; he who broadens a path will not have omitted to level it (cp. iv. 2, v. 9). Note the perfect עֲבִדָה. Instead of saying, ‘When my course meets with no hindrance, I will bless Yahwè,’ believing Israel imaginatively realizes the future as if it were the present. *On level ground . . . in his temple*; fresh points of contact with Ps. xxvii. (zv. 11, 6).

Critical Notes. 1 f. Omit אֲנִי, inserted from l. 17. There אֲנִי is helpful and appropriate; here it is not wanted, and spoils the metre.—M וְבִיהוּה בַטַּחְתִּי. This does not cohere at all with לֹא אֲמַעַד, nor does it suit the address to Yahwè in l. 1. יהוה is not unfrequently misread, and really represents a fragment of some other word. Read here וּבְאַרְחֻתֶיךָ. Cp. xvii. 5.

8. M נֶאֱלָמִים. As Gr. and Herz. have seen, ‘the hidden’ (or ‘self-hiders’?) cannot be a unique class-name = ‘deceivers.’ Gr. proposes נַעֲלָזִים (cp. Jer. xv. 17); Herz. מְלַעֲיָנִים. G guesses (μετὰ) παρανομούντων, as if הוֹלְלִים. The right reading should be clear. נֶאֱלָמִים = נְלֵאמִים = נְבִלִים = נְלָמִים. For an exact parallel see on lviii. 2a.

9 f. Verses 6 and 8 in M and G are extremely singular. ‘To wash

the hands in innocence' is an unexampled expression for 'to keep the hands innocent'; nor can we say that 'to encircle the altar of Yahwè' is a suitable phrase for the parallel line. The cohortative אֲסַבְּבָה is unexpected (see, however, Kön., *Synt.*, p. 92, § 198a); and the compound phrases in *v.* 8a and *b* (especially that in *b*) are also, though grammatically possible, hardly probable. Add to this that, if the psalm is composed of four-line stanzas, the two stichi of *v.* 8 seem to be superfluous. A comparison of *v.* 6 and *v.* 8 shows that *v.* 8 (apart from יהוה אהבתי) consists of corrupt dittographic corrections of כפיו בנקיון in *v.* 6, and, אֲסַבְּבָה being suspicious, it becomes probable that יהוה אהבתא represents a marginal correction of the insufficient יהוה at the end of *v.* 6. A comparison of the || passages xxvii. 4, lxxxiv. 3 suggests further that 'longing,' not 'loving,' is the idea which must have been expressed by the verbs of *v.* 6; in short, that אֲרַהֵן should be אֲחַפֵּן, and that אהבתי should be תִּאֲבָתִי. It is now plain that the corrupt variants in *v.* 8 both represent כִּשְׁפֹן פְּבוֹרֶךְ, *i.e.* מִשְׁכֹּן (rightly written once) assumed three corrupt forms, *viz.* מִעוֹן, מִקוֹם, and נִקְיוֹן. Cp. on lxxiii. 13*b*.

15 *f.* M אֲשֶׁר־בִּידֵיהֶם זָמָה. By rights this should make only a dimeter. But the chief difficulty is exegetical. Can this phrase mean 'whose hands show the marks of crimes'? Other objections are mentioned above. Comparing cxliv. 7, 11, read אֲשֶׁר־פִּיהֶם דָּבַר זָמָה; *v.* 16 is still represented in בִּידֵיהֶם. In *l.* 16 שָׁהַד should be יִשְׁקַר, completing the || to cxliv. 7.

18. Metre bids us insert יהוה, which (written as 'י) easily fell out after פִּדְנִי.

20. M בְּמִקְהָלִים. The plur. is suspicious; besides, מִקְהָלוֹת in lxviii. 27 and (place-name) Num. xxiii. 25 is corrupt. Read here בְּמִוְהֵיכָלוֹ. Cp. xxvii. 6.

PSALM XXVII.

PENTAMETERS. Two psalms are combined, the one full of calm but deep joy in God and affection for the temple, the other (which is incomplete) a psalm of anxious supplication. In both, Israel is the speaker; the individualizing explanation of *v.* 10 (Coblentz, 169) is not at all necessary (see Bā.) even if M's text be accepted, and is not favoured by the rest of the psalm, which is full of points of contact with psalms of the community. xxvii.⁽¹⁾ is specially parallel to iii., iv., xxiii., xxvi., lxi., lxiii.; and xxviii.⁽²⁾ to v., vi., xxxi., xxxv., xxxviii. For the references to Israel's foes, cp. Ps. lxxxiii. *l.* 13 is a liturgical appendix, like xiv. 7.

XXVII.—1.

Of 'Arab-ethan.

1 Yahwè is my light and my succour; | whom have I to
fear?

Yahwè is my life's fortress; | at whom have I to tremble?

When Jerahmeelites press about me | with Geshurites and
Mišrites, 2

When Arabians lie in ambush to kill me, | they +will+
stumble and fall.

If Ammon encamp against me, | my heart will not fear ; 3
If Jerahmeel assail me, | I will keep trusting in him.

One thing of Yahwè I crave, | that is my request¹— 4
That I may give thanks in Yahwè's abode, | and bless in
his temple.

For he hides me in his sanctuary—in the day of trouble ; 5
10 He covers me in the shelter of his palace, | from those of
Mišsur he guards me.

He exalts my head above the Arabians | in the covert of
his house ; 6

Now therefore will I offer in his palace | sacrifices of
thanksgiving.²

1. **My light.** Here only ; but cp. 'thy light,' Isa. lx. 1, and for the figure, iv. 7, xxxvi. 10. On קָנֵעוֹ, see Ges.-Buhl, s.v., and cp. on xc. 1.

3. **Press about me.** Or, 'assail me.' No doubt עַל קָרַב implies a hostile intent, but not necessarily 'attacking' ; cp. cxix. 150 (קָרַבוּ) with ps. 95 ('waited for me'), 110 ('laid a snare for me'). The object in the present case is stated to be 'to behold my disgrace' ; for so we should most probably read, not 'to eat up my flesh,' an unnatural figurative expression, and in l. 4 we hear of 'ambush' (a *certain* correction). Cp. lix. 4, where the 'men of blood' (ט. 3) are represented as preferring ambush to open warfare.

4. **Lie in ambush.** Cp. Jer. iii. 2, where, however, the play on words (אָרַב, עָרַב) is wanting.— They +will+ stumble and fall. The perfects are best taken, not as recording past experience (Hu., Ol., Kön.), but as 'perfects of confidence.' See xx. 9 (הַמָּוֶה כָּרַעוּ).

5. Cp. iii. 7.—8. See xxvi. 12, and cp. c. 4, 'Give thanks unto him, bless his name.' To praise God is pious Israel's chief pleasure and duty, lxxxiv. 5, xcii. 1, cxlvii. 1, cv. 1—3, &c. The correction adopted surely gives a fresh spiritual beauty to the psalm.— 11. *He covers me, &c.* Cp. xxxi. 21, lxi. 5.—13. *Sacrifices of thanksgiving,* as cvii. 22. Hu. takes the phrase symbolically (l. 14), but this is hardly natural.

Critical Notes. 3. Let us first consider M's לֹאֵכַל אֶת־בְּשָׁרִי. אַתְּ as a mark of the accus. is exceedingly rare in the first half of the P'salter. If we add to this the fact that "to eat my flesh" is far too harsh in this context, I should be inclined to read לֹכְלֹת בֶּשֶׂר, the two א having crept in through association of ideas' (Herz). Gr. retains M, but makes 'to eat up my flesh' = 'to slander me' (cp. τ. 12), an Aramaizing and Arabizing sense

¹ To dwell in Yahwè's house all the days of my life.

² I will sing and chant hymns to Yahwè.

(see Ges.-Bu.), which we can hardly assume in Biblical Hebrew. The passage can, however, be corrected much more safely in the light of Ps. lxxxiii. and 2 K. xxiv. 2 (Cushites, Edomites, Misrites, Amalekites, or Jerahmeelites). עֲלֵי כַרְעִים, as in xcii. 12, represents יִרְחַמְאֵלִים (two beats); note Pasek. So also does אֶת־בְּשָׂרִי לֶאֱכֹל. comes from וַיִּשְׁמַעְאֵלִים, and צְרִי from מִצְרִים. Read, therefore,

בְּקֶרֶב יִרְחַמְאֵלִים | וַיִּשְׁמַעְאֵלִים וּמִצְרִים

4. עֲרַבִי clearly represents first of all עֲרַבִי, but probably also בְּאֲרוֹב, which is required to make sense (prefix to עֲרַבִי). For לִי הִנֵּה read perhaps לְהִתְנִי.

5. מַחְנָה. But just before we have תַּחְנָה; note also Pasek. תַּחְנָה מַחְנָה is not beautiful, and how can מַחְנָה be fem.? In Gen. xxxi. 9 הָאֶחָת is an error (see Ball *ad loc.*). Read probably עֲמוֹן (lxxxiii. 8).

6. מַלְחָמָה is clearly wrong. Read יִרְחַמְאֵל. So the last historical touch is added. M's בּוֹאֵת (so too G) if unnatural; it is miswritten בּוֹטָה. The closing word בּוֹטָה is a misplaced correction of בּוֹאֵת. It has expelled בּוֹ, which, however, is indispensable after בּוֹטָה.

7. The words omitted as a gloss (at the suggestion of Duhm) are nearly a verbal quotation from xxiii. 6. They overload the material to be brought into stanzas. See on l. 8.

8. M לְחַזוֹת בְּנִעְסֵי. The sense of נִעַם (G *τερπνότης*; Σ *κάλλος*) is disputed. Ges., *Theol.*, says, 'de sacrorum splendore' (so de Wette, Bü.); Hu., 'it is the kindness of a host towards his dependents or guests'; Del., 'the gracious self-revelation of Yahwè.' To each of these views there are obvious objections. The first mentioned, however, has at least the merit of accordance with the reference to the temple in l. 8b. But the phrase is very odd Hebrew, and both here and in xc. 17 there seems to be corruption. As a remedy here Herz proposes לְחַסוֹת בְּמִעוֹרֵי. Clearly מִעוֹן is right; in xxvi. 8 the mistake here made by M is made by G, which has *εὐπρέπειαν* (M *מִעוֹן*). But חָסָה is specially appropriated to trust in God, and unsuitable here. We want something which shall be parallel to the word underlying בָּקַר. Surely לְבַקֵּר cannot mean 'to visit in the morning' (cp. v. 4), as We. supposes; as in 2 K. xvi. 15, there must be corruption. G's *ἐπισκεπτεσθαι* (לְבַקֵּר?) does not help us; it is a conjecture suggested by the wrong reading לְחַזוֹת (*τοῦ θεωρεῖν*) just before. Is there no pair of verbs descriptive of the religious occupation which Israel most earnestly desires, *i.e.* as the gloss (see on l. 7) suggests, dwelling for ever in Yahwè's house? Surely there is; and if we read lxxxiv. 5, it will be plain that the words indirectly suggested by the gloss are לְהִדְרוֹת and לְבָרַךְ (see *exeg. note*). In the

former **הד** easily became **חז**, and, by transposition and exchange of **כ** for **ק**, **ברך** (the latter word) as easily became **בקר**.

9 Kr. **בִּסְפוּ** (so most vss.); better Kt. **בִּסְפָה** Σ (so Ol., Now., Bâ., We.), cp. xxxi. 21, Isa. iv. 6. But the true reading is **בְּמִקְדָּשָׁיו** (cp. on lxxvi. 3).—10. **בִּסְתֵר** is tautological after **יִסְתַּרְנִי**. Read probably **בִּסְפַת**; after **כ** had fallen out **ר** was naturally added. For **אֲדַלּוּ** read **הִיכְלוּ** (see on xv. 1).—M **בְּצוֹר יְרוּמִנִי**. Read **יִשְׁמְרֵנִי** (cp. on xviii. 49).

11. **וְעַתָּה** (*v.* 6), which in some MSS. is followed by *Pasek*, should open *l.* 12. **יְרוֹם** should probably be **יָרִים**.—Read **עֲרֵבִים** (*l.* 4).—**סְבִיבוֹתַי** makes a very poor half-line. *G* *ἐκύκλωσα (καὶ ἔθυσα)*, *i.e.* **סוּבְבֹתַי**, which Bâ. adopts; cp. xxvi. 6. Rather perhaps **בִּסְתֵר בֵּיתוֹ**; such coalescing is nothing uncommon.

12. Read **בְּהִיכְלוֹ** (see on *l.* 10).—M **זְבַחֵי תְרוּעָה** (cp. Num. x. 10?), a most improbable phrase. *G* *θυσίαν ἀλαλαγμοῦ*, but also *θ. αἰνέσεως*, or *θ. αἰν. κ. ἀλ.* (see Swete). Cp. Job viii. 21, where M has **תְרוּעָה**, but *G* *ἐξομολογήσεως* = **תוֹדָה**. In Ps. cvii. 22, cxvi. 7 *θυσίαν αἰνέσεως* = M's **זְבַח תוֹדָה**. **תְרוּעָה** comes from **תְרוּה**, miswritten for **תוֹדָה**. So Herz.—The closing words of *v.* 6 are evidently a later addition (Du.); they spoil the stanza.

XXVII.—2.

- 1 Unto thee, O Yahwè ! do I cry ; | have pity upon me, and
answer me ; 7
For my heart and my flesh languish, | my soul I pour out
+in tears . 8
[I say] do not thou hide | thy face from me ; 9
Be not angered at thy servant, | be thou my help.
Cast me not off, nor forsake me, | O God +who art+ my
succour ! 10
For mine acquaintance have forsaken me, | and who will
take me in ?
Show me thy way, O Yahwè ! | [redeem me, and have
pity upon me ;] 11
Lead me on an even path | because of Ishmael.
[In thy lovingkindness] abandon me not | to the greed of
my foes, 12
10 For the Ishmaelites vent their rage upon me, | and those
of Jerahmeel.

Liturgical Appendix.

May Yahwè grant me to see | the courts of his house. 13
 1 Be strong, let thy heart be firm ; | yea, wait for Yahwè.

2. Parallel to vi. 3, 4, 7b. See also xxii. 15, 'I am poured out like water,' with special reference to the heart, as here to the soul. In xlii. 5 the text is doubtful. In Lam. ii. 19, pouring out the heart 'like water' before Yahwè, *i.e.* expressing the inward sorrow, by which the central forces of a man are as it were dissolved, is represented as a means of acting upon the divine will.—4. *Thy servant*, *i.e.* Israel, as xix. 12.

6. As in parallel descriptions, it is one of the most bitterly felt sorrows of the suffering but righteous community to be forsaken by the whole body of its friends. כִּי־דָעִי; cp. lv. 14, lxxxviii. 9, 19, where Israel is the speaker, and Job xix. 14. M's text, as generally understood, is beautiful, but is not strictly in place here (see *crit. n.*).—*Who will take me in*, *i.e.* as a guest or 'client,' with the claim to protection

which, among Semitic nations, appertains to a guest.

7 f. Cp. lxxxvi. 11, xxvi. 12, cxliii. 10, and see on v. 9.—9. בְּנַפְשׁ צָרִי; cp. xli. 3, Ezek. xvi. 27.

10. **Geshur, Ishmaelites, &c.**, representatives of the malicious neighbouring populations. Cp. xxxv. 11, 12, liv. 4, 7, lxxiv. 3, and other passages.

13 f. Line 13 is a little prayer (to be sung by one part of the chorus?) which adapts the preceding composite psalm to general use (cp. xiv. 8). Pious Israel's one great wish is to enjoy unhindered participation in the temple services. To this is added an address (to be sung by the other part of the chorus?) to pious Israel, bidding it maintain the 'patience of hope' in Yahwè. Cp. xxxi. 25.

Critical Notes. 1. מ קוֹלִי אִקְרָא. The words are united by the accents, but the supposition of a second subject is unnatural (cp. on iii. 5). G's τῆς φωνῆς μου ἧς ἐκέκραξα is not much better. Read 'אִלֵּיךְ אִק' (see on iii. 5).

2. M is here very strange. T throws no light upon it. J gives, *Tibi dixit cor meum, quæsiuit vultus meus*. Ol., Bâ., We., follow M, and render, 'Thine, saith my heart, is (the word), "Seek ye my face,"' which resembles a very doubtful view of xxii. 2 (end), held by Ol. and Bâ. How is M to be corrected? We might plausibly suppose בְּקִשׁוֹ פָּנַי to be a corruption of פָּנַי [את] אֲבַקֵּשׁ. There might have been two readings put side by side, which only differed in the order of the words. G in fact has ἐξέζητησα τὸ πρόσωπόν σου τὸ πρόσωπόν σου Κύριε ζητήσω. But for ἐξέζητησα there are the var. ll. -ησεν and ζητήσω; cp. Σ σὲ ἐζητεῖ τὸ πρῶσ. μου. (Cp. further Bâ., *Jahrb. f. pr. Th.*, '82, 618). But in G's time the text of the Psalms was already so corrupt that we must look behind both G and M; in fact, if we did adopt one of the two supposed readings, we should still have to explain לֶךְ אֲמַר לְבִי, which, however, will not yield a satisfactory sense. The first thing that strikes us is the poor connexion between 'Thy face, Yahwè, do I seek,' and 'Hide not thy face from me.' It is not likely that פָּנַי occurred in two successive

1 Wait for Yahwè.

lines, nor indeed that after the earnest appeal in *l.* 1, the psalmist thought it necessary to state that he 'sought Yahwè's face' at all. Let us remember the habits of the scribe, and look underneath אַבְקִישׁ. If the word *is* wrong, the word out of which it has been produced is אֲשַׁפֵּךְ. And since פָּנַי and פָּנֶיךָ are no doubt competing readings, let us read פָּנַי, and correct it to נַפְשִׁי, which goes naturally with אֲשַׁפֵּךְ, and corresponds to לְבִי in *l.* 2*a*. (The ש fell out owing to the nearness of another ש.) בְּקִשׁוֹ must also be wrong. It stands after לְבִי; can we be wrong in correcting וּבִשְׂרִי; and so completing the triad 'heart,' 'flesh,' 'soul' (cp. xvi. 9 f.)? The whole pentameter should run, | פִּי אֶמְלֵל לְבִי וּבִשְׂרִי | נַפְשִׁי אֲשַׁפֵּךְ. The initial ל in מ'ס לָד, and the ר in אֶמְרָה, have come from the second syll. of אֶמְלֵל. See exeg. note.

3. To complete the half-line prefix אֶמְרָה (xci. 2, cii. 25), which perhaps fell out owing to the nearness of another אֶמְרָה in M (71. 8).

4. Read אֱלֹהֵי תְּהַאֲנֶה בְּעַבְדְּךָ (Dt. i. 37), and הִיָּה עֲזָרְתִּי (G; Du.); ה and ת confounded.

6. מ פִּי־אָבִי וְאִמִּי עֲזָבוּנִי. The sense of this often quoted passage is not clear. Is the clause hypothetical (Hu., Ew.) or historical? And are 'father' and 'mother' symbols of the nearest friends of the community of Yahwè-worshippers? Or are Isa. lxiii. 16 (cp. xliii. 27?), Jer. xxxi. 16 parallel passages, so that Jacob and Leah or Rachel respectively would be the parents intended, and the (rhetorical) complaint would be that the cults by which the people at large thought to compensate for the ineffectualness of the authorized cult of Yahwè had proved vain helps? And how could Yahwè be said to become Israel's protector at this advanced period of history? The very phrase, 'Cast me not off, nor forsake me' (*l.* 5), implies that Yahwè had given proofs enough of his protecting care for Israel. We must therefore also consider *l.* 6*b*, וַיְהוּהוּ יִסְפְּנִי. Gr.'s ἰσπεῖν (G, προσελάβετό με) is no improvement. If the speaker is sure that Yahwè either 'has taken him in,' or 'will take him in,' how comes he to fall again into the tone of anxious supplication? We should expect the happy declaration, 'Yahwè taketh me in,' to have been expanded (cp. Isa. xlix. 15), and to have been followed by jubilant praise. There is some error in the text, and many parallels suggest an adequate correction. Read פִּי־מִיָּדַעַי עֲזָבוּנִי וְכִי הוּא יִסְפְּנִי. If פִּי־מִיָּדַעַי were written דַּעִימִי and דַּעִי might easily become אָבִי and אִמִּי respectively, and since נִי and כִּי are constantly confounded, the כִּי in וְכִי would easily drop out as a repetition. And then it would be almost inevitable that וַיְהוּהוּ should become וַיְהוּהוּ.

7 f. To complete the line, insert פָּדַנִי וְהַנְנִי (xxvi. 11*b*). הַנְנִי would very easily fall out before נַחֲנִי.—Read יִשְׁכְּנֵנִי אֵל (see on v. 9, lix. 11).

9. Prefix **בחסרך**, the three last letters of which resemble **שרר** in the preceding word, and would therefore easily fall out.

10. M **יִקְוֹנוּ**. Read **יִקְוֹנוּ**.—M **עֲדֵי־שֶׁקֶר**. Slander was no doubt one of the chief forms of the hostilities from which the Jews of Palestine suffered, according to the Psalter. But observe 1. that 'slander' and 'false witness' are not the same thing, and 2. that we cannot take this passage apart from xxxv. 11, where the appearance of a forensic reference is due to textual corruption. Read most probably **יִשְׁמְעֵאלִים**. M **וַיִּפֶּה חֲמוֹס יִפֶּה** is a very doubtful *ἀπ. λεγ.*; see on xii. 6. Read probably **וַיִּרְחֹמֵאלִים**.

11 f. M **לֹלֵא הָאֲמִנְתִּי**. The 'extraordinary points,' both above and below, bid us cancel **לֹלֵא** (Ginsb., *Introd.*, 333; cp. Baer's note, and Berlin in *JQR* xii. 732). G does not go so far as this, but it only recognizes **לֵה**, which it misreads **לֵה** (*καὶ ἐψεύσατο ἢ ἀδικία ἐάντη, ζ'. 12*). R. Josè (*Berachoth*, 4a) only cancelled **לו**, *i.e.* read **לֵא הָאֲמִנְתִּי**; so Abbott (*Essays*, 24). Gr. takes **לו** to be a corruption of **לֵי**, which he attaches to *ζ'. 12*); he too makes **לֵא** a prefix to **הָאֲמִנְתִּי**. None of these expedients produces a satisfactory sense. Whether we read 'I am confident' or 'I despair' (of seeing Yahwè's goodness), the clause does not fit on suitably to the preceding petitions. 'I am confident' says too much, unless indeed it were followed by 'for Yahwè has heard my supplication' (vi. 9), and even then some abruptness would be noticeable. Besides this, the prescribed cancelling of **לֹלֵא** has to be accounted for. In lxxvii. 2 **לִילֵה** comes from **אלהים**; most probably **לֹלֵא** has the same origin; most probably, too, the initial **הָאֲמִנְתִּי** springs from the **הים** in **אלהים** (which was written as a correction of **לֹלֵא**). And now the secret of **הָאֲמִנְתִּי** reveals itself. **הָאֲמִנְתִּי** has been just accounted for: **נתי** must surely come from **יִתְנֵי**, a mutilated form of **יִתְנֵי**.—M **לְרִאוֹת בְּטוֹב יְהוָה**. This cannot be right if **אלהים** precedes. Another difficulty is caused by **בֶּאֱרֵץ חַיִּים**, with which M G close the passage, and which is metrically superfluous, unless indeed, with Duhm, we prefix something to it by conjecture to form the last line of the psalm. **אֶרֶץ**, however, in M's text, is not unfrequently corrupted from something else, and the analogy of xiv. 7 leads us to suspect that *ll.* 11. 12 rather form a liturgical appendix. Most probably **בֶּאֱרֵץ חַיִּים** (cxvi. 9) is a corruption of **חֲצֵרֵת יְהוָה**. If so, **בְּטוֹב** should certainly be **בֵּית** (**ת** and **ט** confounded, **ב** ditto-graphed). Thus we get two variants **בֵּית** and **חֲצֵרֵת**. Considering that **אלהים** precedes, we should probably take something from each reading, and restore thus: **חֲצֵרֵת בֵּיתוֹ | אֱלֹהִים יִתְנֵי לְרִאוֹת**. See *exeg.* note.—The gloss (*l.* 12) explains itself.

PSALM XXVIII.

PENTAMETERS, with cæsura; a composite psalm. xxviii.⁽¹⁾ is evidently a fragment; after imprecating a just vengeance on the wicked (cp. xxvi. 9 f.), the psalmist probably described his own very different character, and uttered an earnestly believing prayer for his own deliverance 'according to God's righteousness.' *V.* 5, which is a mosaic of borrowed phrases, was apparently inserted by an editor to make the incompleteness of the fragment a little less visible. He must also have added xxviii.⁽²⁾, which is a jubilant hymn of thanksgiving, without reference to any definite circumstances. *V.* 8, 9, which are in a different metre (if they are metrical at all, which Duhm naturally doubts), form a liturgical appendix. It has been asked whether 'Yahwè's anointed one' (*v.* 8) is a prophet (Hitz.), a high priest (*OP*, 233, 350, note^a), a king (Hu., Del., Bâ., &c.), or the entire people (Reuss, Gr., Beer). Certainly Hitzig's identification of the psalmist with the prophet Jeremiah is plausible, if the psalm be a literary whole; cp. *v.* 3 with Jer. ix. 7; *v.* 4 with xxv. 14; and *v.* 5 with xxiv. 6, xlii. 10, xlv. 4. But *v.* 5 and 8f. are later insertions, and, even apart from this, such points of contact only prove the acquaintance of later psalmists with the Book of Jeremiah. There is also a grave doubt whether כִּישִׁירוֹ, 'his anointed,' in *v.* 8, is the correct reading.

XXVIII.—1.

Of 'Arab-ethan.

1

- 1 To thee, O my Rock! I cry, | hide not thy face,
Lest, if thou spurn me, I resemble | those that have gone
down to the pit.
Hear my supplicating voice | when I cry unto thee; 2
[Answer me,] when I raise my hands | towards thy holy
shrine.
Destroy me not with the wicked, | with the workers of
wrong, 3
Who speak to their neighbours of peace | while mischief
is in their hearts.
Give them, O Yahwè! the due of their deeds | and of
their evil practices, 4
As their hands have wrought, do thou pay them, | give
them their deserts.¹

XXVIII.—2.

- 1 Blessed be Yahwè! for he has heard | my supplicating
voice; 6
Yahwè is my Rock and my Shield, | in him my heart trusts. 7
With the sound of melody will I magnify him, | with songs
will I praise him.

¹ Because they regard not the deeds of Yahwè, and the work of his hands,
he will pull them down, and not build them up.

5

Liturgical Appendix.

Yahwè is a Rock for his people, 8
 He is +rich in+ succour for his loyal one.
 Do thou give succour to thy people, 9
 Do thou bless thine inheritance ;
 Do thou tend them and carry them
 To the utmost age.

(xxviii.¹). 2. **If thou spurn me**, lit. 'turn in silence from me.' השהה applied to Yahwè, Isa. lxii. 1, 6, lxiv. 11, lxv. 6 ; Hiph. xlii. 14, lvii. 11.—*I resemble*, &c. So lxxxviii. 7 (corr. text), cxliii. 7.

3. Cp. xxxi. 23.—4. *Shrine*, דְּבִיר, The 'holy of holies' is meant, = the *parakku* in the Assyrian temples. Cp. v. 8, 1 K. viii. 29, Dan. vi. 10 ; *OP*, 320, 331.

6. **Speak . . of peace**, &c. So xxxv. 20, xii. 3, lv. 22. The *gloss* (τ. 5) comes partly from Isa. v. 12^b, partly from Jer. (see introd.) Note that Yahwè is spoken of in the third person, in spite of τ. 3.

(xxviii.²). 1. קול תחנוני, as *l.* 3. The phrase, however, is common (xxxi. 23, lxxxvi. 6, cxvi. 1, cxxx. 2, cxl. 7.

(Appendix). 5. **Tend them**, רעם. See on xxiii. 1, lxxx. 2.

Critical Notes. xxviii.¹ 1. יהוה, a scribe's error (note Pasek), corrected afterwards (צורר).—M אֱלֹהֵתְּהָרֶשׁ כּוֹפְנֵי ; tautological. Miswritten for אֱלֹהֵתְּסֵתֶר פְּנִידָה (cxliii. 7).—4. Insert עֲנֵנִי (Bi.) ; metre.

6. M תְּמַשְׁכֵּנִי. This use of מִשְׁךְ is unexampled. Read probably תִּשְׁכְּדֵנִי (ד became כ ; cp. בכור for ברוד, 2 S. xix. 44).

7. Insert יהוה (G^s c^a ; Bi.).

xxviii.² 2. M עָזִי ; G βοηθός μου = עֲזָרִי. Rather צָרִי (see on App., *l.* 1).

3. M וְנִעְזַרְתִּי וְיַעֲלֶז לְבִי. G καὶ ἐβοηθήθη καὶ ἀνέθαλεν ἡ σάργξ μου, *i.e.* וְנִעְזַרְתִּי וְיַעֲלֶז לְבִי. Here ז in the second word of the text has dropped out, while שארי is a corruption of [נ]שירי in τ. 7^b, which changed places with לבי. G's text is evidently worthless. But is M's text very much better? It is plausible to take ויעלז as a (preferable) variant to וניעזרתי. But ויעלז לבי is not enough for the first half of *l.* 3, nor would לבי have been repeated so soon: we need not therefore consider how to emend τ. 4 as to form a parallel to ויעלז לבי. We must, of course, correct M, without help from G, simply by remembering the common errors of scribes, and assuming that ישיר in *l.* 4 is right. The remedy is plain. Read בְּקוֹל זְמִירָה אֲנִדְּלֵנִי קוֹל. בקול fell out, owing to the measures of לבי. וניעזרתי is a corruption of ובמזרה = ובזמ' ; ויעלז לבי ; of אגלד לנו = אנדלנו.

4. Here **מִשִּׁירֵי** comes from **[ב]שִׁירִים**, and **אֶהְיֶה לְנֶפֶס** from **אֶהְיֶה לְנֶפֶס**. The supposed parallels for **אֶהְיֶה לְנֶפֶס** are untenable (see *JBL*, 1899, pp. 210 f.). *LL*. 3, 4 are now parallel to *lxix.* 31.

(App.) 1. **יְהוָה עֵץ**. Soon after follows **וַיִּמְעַן עֵץ**. 'עֵץ' (for which *G* reads **כָּבֵד**) is a correction of **עֵץ**. But a more probable correction is **צָר**. What divine title could take the precedence of 'Rock' (see *xviii.* 3)? **ז** and **ר**, **ע** and **צ** are confounded. Similarly *xlvi.* 2, *lix.* 10, 18, *lxxxii.* 2, *cxviii.* 14.—**לִכְבוֹד**. Read probably **לְעֵבֹד** (cp. *xxix.* 11), with some MSS. *Bö.*, *Ol.*, *Hu.*, *Kr.*, *Dy.*, *Gr.*, *Bi.*, *Kön.*, &c., after *G S.* Cp. on *Isa.* *xxxv.* 8 (*SBOT*).

2. **כִּשְׂיָחוֹ**. Read probably **חֲסִידוֹ**; see on *ii.* 2, *xx.* 7a, *lxxxiv.* 10, *cv.* 15.

PSALM XXIX.

TETRAMETERS. If stanzas 2-4 stood alone, we might call this a hymn on the glory of God as exhibited in the thunder-storm. But in spite of Goethe's splendid development of hints derived from this psalm: in its traditional form (see Prologue to *Faust*¹), the reference to the divine kingship in *v.* 10 at once makes it improbable that this was all that the poet intended. Theophanies too are commonly described under the image of a thunder-storm, to which we may add that another psalmist certainly interpreted *Ps.* *xxix.* as relative to the final consummation of the history of Israel and the world—the visible assumption by *Yahwè* of his sovereignty (see *xvii.*). A corrected text of *v.* 10a confirms this writer's interpretation, and makes the reference to *Yahwè*'s manifested sovereignty still more obvious, and a corrected text of *v.* 1a, which is based on the parallelism of many other psalms, and avoids the exegetical difficulty inherent in the traditional text, and also of that enigmatical passage *v.* 9b, finally removes all obscurity from the situation intended in the psalm. It may briefly be described thus:—Israel's waiting-time is over; *Yahwè* has announced himself by mighty acts as the king of Israel and the world. He now sends a message to the survivors of the *Jerahmeelites*; it is conveyed by a thunder-storm which bursts over the *Jerahmeelite* country to the south of Palestine. A vivid description is given of the awe-inspiring phenomena of the storm, and the sons of *Zion* and *Jerahmeel* are called upon (at least, according to a plausible conjecture) to join in singing praise to the great king; the latter, it is true, are also summoned to bring tribute. The two last lines sum up the grounds of this celebration. *Yahwè* is now visibly the king of the whole world, and his dominion will last for evermore. In a brief liturgical appendix the community prays for the realization of this glorious vision. *Ps.* *xvii.* (see *introd.*) is parallel.

There is therefore no occasion to regard our psalm as specially mythological in its phraseology. For the literary revival of a mythological interest in post-exilic times (*OP*, 202) there is abundant evidence (cp. on *xix.* 1-7), but the representation of thunder as 'Yahwè's voice' is too common and conventional to prove this; the inferior heavenly beings, of whom we hear in *Job* *i.* 6, *ii.* 1, disappear from the text of our psalm.

The supposed reference to the Deluge in *l.* 21 is also illusory. But there is a reference (*l.* 5) to the waters of the super-celestial ocean, which indicates an acquaintance with *Gen.* *i.* (P).

According to the title in *G*—*ἑξῆς τοῦ ἁγίου (ἑξῆς τοῦ) σκηνησ (= σκηνοπηγίας)*, our psalm was sung in the time of the second temple on the last day (*ἑξῆς τοῦ*, *Lev.* *xxiii.* 6) of the Feast of Booths (but cp. *ZATW*, 1902, p. 130). Now, however, it is used as a Pentecost psalm.

¹ Doch ihr, die ächten Göttersöhne,
Erfreut euch der lebendig reichen Schöne, etc.

- Marked: Of 'Arab-ethan.* 1
- 1 Ascribe unto Yahwè, O ye sons of Jerahmeel,
Ascribe unto Yahwè glory and strength :
Ascribe glory, O ye Ishmaelites, unto Yahwè, 2
Worship Yahwè, Rehoboth and Cush.
- The voice of Yahwè +sounds+ over the great waters, 3
[Yahwè,] the God of glory, thunders :
[His] voice Yahwè [utters] with power ! 4
[His] voice Yahwè [utters] with majesty !
- The voice of Yahwè breaks the cedars, 5
10 Yahwè shatters the cedars of Gebalon (?) ;
He causes Gebalon to skip like a calf, 6
Sirion like a young wild ox.
- The voice of Yahwè cleaves [the rocks,] 7
[The stones he cleaves with] fiery flashes ;
The voice of Yahwè makes the wilderness to tremble, 8
The wilderness of Kadesh Yahwè makes to tremble.
- The voice of Yahwè shakes the oaks to and fro, 9
[The trees of] the forests Yahwè strips :
* * * *
20 * * * *
- [? Ye sons of Zion, exult in your king,]
Ye sons of Jerahmeel, chant hymns to his glory.
His seat Yahwè has taken to judge the world ; 10
For ever will Yahwè hold his seat as king.

Liturgical Appendix.

- May Yahwè endow his people with strength ! 11
May Yahwè bless his people with welfare !

1. **Ye sons of Jerahmeel.** At the point of time assumed by the psalmist the 'lighting down' (Isa. xxx. 9) of Yahwè's 'arm' has taken place, and the surviving Jerahmeelites are expected to do homage to their all-righteous sovereign (cp. xviii. 45, lxx. 3; also xcvii. 2). Another psalmist (xcvi. 7) seems to paraphrase by [משפחות עמים אֲרָמִים?]. The ordinary reading (see crit. n.) is most

inappropriate, as Ol. long ago saw. There is no parallel (except indeed xcvii. 7, which seems to be corrupt) for such an assumption of authority over superhuman beings. And strange in the highest degree is the direction to 'worship Yahwè in sacred adornment' (so M in *τ.* 2*b*). Even earthly worshippers would not need to be reminded of the necessity of putting on festal attire; and to the celestials the reminder would be worse than needless.

4. Almost all critics retain M's **בהדרת קדש**, and render 'in sacred attire.' But does the phrase **ה' ק' ד'** mean this elsewhere? In 2 Ch. xx. 21 should we not render 'praising the sacred (or, divine) Majesty (*i.e.* the Ark, see lxxviii. 61) when it went forth'? The context, however, does not favour a similar rendering here. See crit. n.

5. **The voice of Yahwè**, *i.e.* thunder, with its attendant lightning and whirlwind. Cp. lxxviii. 34.—*The great waters*, *i.e.* not the Mediterranean Sea (Schröder, Bâ.), nor the storm-clouds (Del., Hu., Driv., &c.), but the 'waters above the heavens' (cxlviii. 4; cp. on civ. 3); so already ed. 1, after Reuss; Duhm agrees.

9-12. It is usually supposed that the storm passes from Lebanon in the north to Kadesh (*l.* 16) in the south. This, however, is a mistake. The psalm is altogether concerned with the Jerahmeelites. 'Gebalon,' which is often confounded with 'Lebanon,' was possibly a general term for the mountains on the southern border of Palestine (|| 'Sirion'). See *Enc. Bib.* 'Sirion.'—*Like a calf*; cp. cxiv. 4, 6.—*Like a young wild ox*, which climbs the mountains with ease (so Assyrian evidence).

13. **Cleaves the rocks**, &c., *i.e.* the rocks of the stony mountain-

plateau to the S. of the Negeb (see 'Negeb,' *Enc. Bib.*).—15 f. **יְהוָה יִחַל**. So Sirach xliii. 17 (Heb.), but with **מַדְבָּר אֲרָצוֹ** for **יְהוָה יִחַל**.

17. **Shakes the oaks**. Cp. Isa. vii. 2b. The poet ascribes all the effects of the storm to 'Yahwè's voice' (see on *l.* 5). According to M it is the premature calving of the hinds (**אֵילֹת**) which is referred to: cp.

Ewald's note. But elsewhere it is inanimate nature which is referred to, nor would the timid hinds have been the one exception to the rule.

21-24. See introd. The received text of *l.* 22 may have arisen under the influence of Isa. vi. 3. The editor doubtless thinks of the heavenly palace of Yahwè (xi. 4, xviii. 7). But the psalmist has in his mind the capital city of Yahwè's earthly empire. 'To judge the world' means 'to rule the nations.'—*His seat*, &c. Cp. viii. 8, ix. 5, 8. There is no reference either to the Deluge (Del., Bâ., &c.) or to the heavenly ocean (Reuss, Du.: cp. *l.* 5). Such an abrupt reference to the Deluge is very improbable, while to explain **לְמַבוֹל** as if it meant 'in his upper chambers which are on (**עַל**) the flood' is too bold. See crit. n. On the Appendix, cp. xxviii. 8.

Critical Notes. 1. M **בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים**; 'O ye divine ones'? But see on lxxxix. 7. Some MSS. (Kenn., de R.) have **ב' אֱלֹהִים**; G *νιότης κριών* (so J S); cp. perhaps Hos. xiv. 2b. This is a mere alteration to improve the sense. Read **בְּנֵי יִרְחַמְיָאל**.

4. Some change appears necessary. **בְּחַצְרוֹת ק'** (G S) is plausible, but is opposed by the ||, xcvi. 8 f. In both passages read probably **רְחֹבוֹת וְכוֹשׁ**. Rehoboth and Cush are representatives of the Jerahmeelite race.

5. In *v.* 3b M has **עַל־כַּיִם רַבִּים**, a variant to the first clause, which supplies the missing word **רַבִּים**.—6. Insert **יְהוָה** (cp. *l.* 10).—7 f. Read **קוֹלָל**, and insert **יִתֵּן**.—9 f. Read (twice) **יִשְׁפַּר** (cp. *l.* 15 f.). **לְבָנוֹן**, *i.e.* a southern Lebanon, is possible, but see next note.

10 ff. For **לְבָנוֹן** and **הַלְבָּנוֹן** read **גְּבֻלָּתוֹ**? (see on lxxviii. 16 f.); transfer **גב'** from *v.* 6b to *v.* 6a, and read **יִרְקִיד** (Bi., We.). The

reading וירקיד suggests that וירקיד was originally followed by a miswritten ירחמאל (ק=ה; ד=ל).—שְׁרִיֹן. יִשְׁעִיר is a needless correction.

13 f. Insert סְלָעִים יַחֲצֵב בְּ צָרִים (צב precedes) and בִּ. Nearly so Bickell, Duhm.

17. M יְהוֹלֵל, transitive, against Job xxxix. 1. Read יִקְלָקֵל (Ezek. xxi. 26).—M אֵילוֹת. Against this, see above. Lowth, Secker, Street, Thrupp, Dy., Gr., Bi., Che.⁽¹⁾, Du. read אֵילוֹת, but this plur. is nowhere found. Read perhaps אֵילִים.

18. Read perhaps עֲצֵי יְעָרִים עָצִי; י' יַחֲשֵׁף עָצִי easily fell out before יע. M's יערות was influenced by אֵילוֹת; i.e. first אֵילִים was corrupted into אֵילוֹת, and then this produced יערות.

21. Supply conjecturally from cxlix. 2, בְּנֵי צִיּוֹן גִּילוּ בְּמַלְכֵכֶם, in antithesis to l. 22. The Israelites and Jerahmeelites are henceforth at one as servants of Yahwè (cp. lxvi. 2-4).

22. M אִכָּר כָּבוֹד, i.e. 'in his upper sanctuary all his ministers utter "Glory" before him' (T)? But can this be expressed in so few words? And is the sense suitable (see above)? Read וּבְנֵי יִרְחַמְאֵל זָמְרוּ כְבוֹד (cp. ll. 1-4). Other cases exist elsewhere of the confusion of זָמַר and אִכָּר.

23 f. On M's לְמַבּוֹל see *Psalms*¹⁾, pp. 379 f. Sense and metre gain by correcting it into לְשֹׁפֵט תֵּבֵל. לְשֹׁפֵט must have become illegible; לְתַבֵּל was then conjecturally altered into לְמַבָּל.—Read וַיִּשֶׁב.

PSALM XXX.

SIX stanzas, each of three tetrameters, and one closing dimeter. Pss. vi. and cxxvi. are strikingly parallel. The prayer in ll. 15-20 is like an amplification of that in vi. 6, and the saying on the change from sorrow to joy of the similar saying in cxxvi. 5. The title apparently connects it with a dedication festival, and most moderns (see e.g. Wellh., *Skizzen*, vi. 171 f.) agree in fixing on that described in 1 Macc. iv. 52 ff., which was the origin of a permanent institution (τὰ ἑγκαίνια, John x. 22). חֲנֻכַּת הַבַּיִת is therefore supposed to be a later addition to the title, though if so it ought to have come at the end. According to *Sopherim* xviii. 2 it was anciently sung at this festival. But there is no parallel for such a reference to a quite late institution in a psalm-heading, and experience warns us to distrust appearances in the headings. The common view of this obscure phrase (adopted in *OP*) is wrong, simply because the text is incorrect. See Introduction.

The speaker is not an individual, as Hitzig, Duhm, and even Beer suppose, but the inner circle of the righteous 'poor,' which sometimes (e.g. xxii. 23. xxxii. 6) distinguishes itself from the great mass of Jews who, not being transgressors (פְּשָׁעִים) or traitors (בְּגָדִים), may be called חֲסִידִים (*hasidim*, not yet a party-name), but who need to be stirred up and instructed. Note the parallelism between l. 13 and xviii. 37. Hitzig was struck by an apparent resemblance between the situation of the psalmist and that of Jeremiah at a critical period (he compared at one time Jer. xxxvii. 11 ff., at another Jer. xxxviii. 1-16). See the remarks against a similar theory on Ps. xxxv.

Marked : Supplication of Sabbath. Of 'Arab-ethan. 1

- 1 I extol thee, O Yahwè, | for thou hast raised me +from
the depth+, 2
And not suffered the Arabians | to rejoice over me.
O Yahwè my God, | I cried unto thee, 3
And thou didst heal me.
O Yahwè ! thou hast brought up | my soul from Sheol, 4
My life thou hast drawn up | from among those sunk in
the pit.
Chant psalms to Yahwè, | ye his loyal ones, and give thanks 5
To his holy name.
For if, when angry, he is furious, | when appeased he
shows us favour ; 6
10 Weeping +has its turn+ at eventide, | but mirth +comes+
in the early morning.
I indeed had said, | so careless was my heart, 7
' I shall never be shaken.'
But behold, in thy fury | thou madest mine ancles to fail, 8
Thou didst hide thy face, | I was filled with dismay :
I said, ' I shall not see thee, | O Yahwè my God,
In the land of the living.
What gain will my blood bring thee, | my going down into
the pit ? 10
Can the +realm of+ dust give thee thanks, | or declare thy
faithfulness ?
Hear, O Yahwè, | be favourable, O my God, 11
20 Be to me a succour.'
My wailing thou hast changed | into dancing and [singing], 12
Hast loosed my sackcloth, | and girded me with joy,
That my lyre unto thee | may make ceaseless melody,¹ 13
+Yea,+ for ever will I thank thee.

1. **Drawn me up**, from Sheol (l. 5 ; cp. lxxxviii. 4-6). Clearly the national death and resurrection are referred to (cp. Hos. xiii. 1, vi. 2).—4. *Didst heal*. For the figure, cp. Dt. xxxii. 20, ' I wound, and I heal ' ; Ex. xv. 26, Isa. vi. 10, Hos. vii. 1, xi. 3, Ps. vi. 3, xli. 5, &c.—*His name*.

Properly זָכַר is the invocation of a divine name in worship, with the recital of the deity's titles to praise and gratitude (vi. 6, cii. 13, cxlv. 7 ; and cf. the *zikr* of the Moslems, Hughes, *Dict. of Islam*, 703 ff.) ; then the name itself, as here, cf. cxvii. 12, Ex. iii. 15, Hos

¹ O Yahwè my God.

xii. 6. So Ass. *zikru* (constr. *zikir*), 1. the calling of a name, 2. a name.—
10. Cp. cxxvi. 5. The language is proverbial, and may be applied to the ordinary vicissitudes of life. Here, however, there is a special Messianic reference. The 'early morning' is the last great deliverance which Israel will need to experience. When permission was given to rebuild the temple, it seemed as if the Messianic day had dawned (cp. *svi.* 11, 12). But trouble returned, and again Israel was face to face with the danger of national extinction. Now 'mirth' has returned, and

Israel trusts that this time he will be able to 'thank God for ever' (*l.* 24).—
11. *So careless . . .* Cp. on xxxix. 4.—
12. *I shall never . . .* So x. 6, xvi. 8, lxii. 3, 7.—13. *Mine ancles.* Israel speaks. Cf. xviii. 37 (the people, not the Messiah, nor David, is the speaker).—
15 f. Cf. xxvii. 13, Isa. xxxviii. 11a.—
17. *My blood.* Clearly not the death of an individual by violence is meant, but national extinction. In *l.* 4 the figure of sickness is employed (see above).—
18. — See on vi. 6, and ('dust') on xxii. 30.

Critical Notes. 2. מ אִיבִי. Read perhaps עֲרֵבִים, the psalm being so vivid.

6 f. For חִיתִי מְשִׁיתָ read חִיתִי מְשִׁיתָ (xviii. 17). נוש fell out between ית and יתי, which indeed coalesced. ני comes from a dittographed נ. — Read מְיֹרְדִי (Kt.), with G Θ S. Kr. מְיֹרְדִי postulates a new infin. יֹרְדִי, in spite of *l.* 17.

9 f. M בְּרֵנֶע בְּאֵפּוֹ חַיִּים בְּרֵצוֹנוֹ. The antithesis is imperfect; חַיִּים can neither be rendered 'a life time' nor 'life eternal.' Isa. lix. 7, 8, is not parallel. G ὀργή, which is not נְעָרָה (Gr.), but רָנּוּ (Herz). Read 'פִּי יִרְנֶנּוּ בְּאֵפּוֹ יִחַנְנוּ בָרִי.' ים in חַיִּים easily arose out of נָנוּ.— Omit יִלְזֶן, as unsuitable and unmetrical. It is a corruption of a dittographed לִבְקָר.

11. M בְּשִׁלּוֹי, for בְּשִׁלּוֹתִי (Hu., Sta., &c.) a doubtful assumption. Ol. suggests reading שִׁלּוֹתִי. But metre requires two beats. Read בְּשִׁלּוֹתִי לְבִי; לְבִי and לוֹת confounded.

13. M יהוה בְּרֵצוֹנְךָ הֶעֱמַדְתָּהּ לְהַרְרִי עוֹ. which Bā. renders, '. . . thou hadst strongly founded my mountain' (*i.e.* Zion); הֶעֱמַד עוֹ, very strange. T, להַרְרִי עוֹ (cf. Ibn Ezra), so too Hu. If we go so far, we must also read הֶעֱמַדְתָּנִי, with Riehm, Che.⁽¹⁾, Kau., We. [SBOT], or הֶעֱמַדְתָּי (Giesebr., We. in *Skizzen*). But the sense requires a transition to Yahwè's anger. Read, with Gr., הִמְעַדְתָּהּ (same error in Ezek. xxix. 7). Gr. also reads בַּחֲרוֹנְךָ; it is easier, however, to correct בְּרֵצוֹנְךָ; ז became צ, נ became ג. Also for יהוה we must certainly read וְהִנֵּה, and for לְהַרְרִי עוֹ (which Gr. keeps) קָרַסְלִי (xviii. 37; cp. on x. 6). ק passed into ה, ס into ע, ר was dittographed, and ז inserted. [Tradition wavers; G S read לְהַרְרִי].

15 f. M אֶלְיֶךָ יְהוָה אֶקְרָא וְאֶל־יְהוָה אֶתְחַנֵּן. The requirements both of metre and of sense are imperfectly satisfied. Something much [more

forcible is required to link *ll.* 13 f. to *ll.* 17, 18. We can see from *ll.* 17 f. that the psalmist either takes suggestions from or gives suggestions to the author of the psalm of Hezekiah. Let us then suppose another point of contact between the two poems. Read אֲמַרְתִּי לֹא אֶרְאֶה יְהוָה (Isa. xxxviii. 18). This became indistinct. לֹא became לִי (in אֵלֶיךָ). אֶרְאֶה became אֶקְרָא. אֱלֹהֵי became וְאֵל. אֲמַרְתִּי became אֶת. חָנַן הַיְיָ became חָנַן (cf. *l.* 9 *b*). אֲתַרְתִּי came off badly; it is only represented by אֶךְ in אֵלֶיךָ.

19-21. Read חֲנַנִּי אֱלֹהִים, and for לְמַחֹל וְלִשְׁיִר read לְמַחֹל לְיְהוָה. In 19, 20, G Σ give perfect (cf. *Hi.*). Cf. G iv. 2.

23. M כְּבוֹד, *i.e.*, acc. to Bā., 'praise,' as in cxlix. 5(?). Read כְּבוֹרֵי כְבוֹרֵי (Gr.). G ἡ δόξα μου, καὶ μὴ κατανυγῶ, from which Hu., Che.⁽¹⁾, We., Du. adopt כְּבוֹרֵי (but see on vii. 6). Herz, אֶמְרֵךְ וְלֹא אֶדַם, לְמַעַן אֶזְכֹּר כְּבוֹדְךָ וְלֹא אֶדַם.

PSALM XXXI.

INEXAMETERS.—Unoriginal in form as this psalm may be, it expresses (at least, its kernel, *zv.* 9-19) a very definite state of mind. Depressed, despised, slandered, insulted, persecuted, the speaker pours out his heart to Yahwè. In spite of his sighs and tears (which are 'before Yahwè,' *l.* 22) he still trusts on, for his past history has been to him a revelation of Yahwè's character. The admixture of an eucharistic element (*zv.* 2-9, 20-25) calls for remark. Are these thanksgivings anticipative? Are they not rather an indication of the unreflecting, mechanical manner in which the original psalm (*zv.* 9-19) was edited? Duhm, however, thinks that the fault belongs to the original writer, and the uncertainty is such that we can hardly venture on a disintegration of the psalm.

Who are the enemies referred to? Chiefly the idolatrous foreign oppressors of Israel (Arabian Misrites, *l.* 27); in *zv.* 12, however, besides neighbouring peoples, those members of the Jewish people who have made dangerous concessions to non-legal or even pagan usages may be intended. Pious Israel ('thy servant,' *zv.* 17) is therefore the speaker (see *zv.* 7, 15, 19-21); the reference to the speaker's 'guilt' in *zv.* 11^b arises from a slight corruption of the text.

The complaints remind us occasionally of the Books of Job and Jeremiah; Jeremiah has indeed been imagined to be the author (Hitzig). Cp. *zv.* 11 with Jer. xx. 18; *zv.* 18 with Jer. xvii. 18; cp. also *zv.* 23 with Lam. iii. 54. Most of the earlier critics add *zv.* 14^a, Jer. xx. 10 to this list. But, as Bickell has seen, the words which now stand in *zv.* 14^a, and which are both unmetrical and ill-adapted to the context, are a later insertion (cp. on lxxix. 6 f.); probably they are also corrupt (see note). The psalm (see *ll.* 9, 28) is quoted from in Jon. ii. 4, 9. See also on Ps. lxxi. The probable reference to Ezek. xxxii. 19 ff. (see on *l.* 20) should also be noted.

Theodore of Mopsuestia acutely describes this psalm as 'a prayer of the people in Babylon for return.' With more probability Bā. and Beer refer it to the time of Nehemiah, when the Jewish community was harassed by a variety of opponents. This suggests an explanation of the difficult phrase כְּבוֹרֵי כְבוֹרֵי (*zv.* 22); the words, however, are more than probably corrupt. Duhm on the other hand, reckons this among the latest products of the Psalter. This would be a safer view if, like Ps. xxxiii., the psalm had no title, and surely it is difficult to say positively that the phrases of the psalm cannot have already become conventional at the close of the Persian period. Perhaps too *zv.* 9-19 formed the original psalm, and the rest was added later (see above).

Deposited. Marked: Of 'Arab-ethan.

- 1 In thee, O Yahwè, I take refuge ; | let me not be dis-
appointed for aye ! 2
- Rescue me in thy righteousness ; | * * * *
Bend down thine ear to me, | deliver me speedily, [O
Yahwè !] 3
- Be to me a sheltering rock, | from the sons of Mişşur
deliver me.
- Yea, thou art my high rock, my stronghold, | * * * * 4
And for thy name's sake, do thou lead me, | do thou
sustain me, [O Yahwè].
- Free me from the net which they have hidden for me ; |
thou art my shield, [O Yahwè]. 5
- To thy keeping I commit my breath, | my deliverer, thou
faithful God ! 6
- The Mişrites and Ishmaelites oppose me, | as for me, I
trust in Yahwè. 7
- 10 I will exult and rejoice in thy kindness, | * * * * 8
For my misery thou hast seen, | thou knowest the pains
of my soul,
Thou hast not delivered me into the Arabians' hand, | but
hast put my feet in an ample space. 9
- Take pity on me, Yahwè, for I am in trouble, | * * * * 10
Mine eye is sunken with sorrow, | my soul and my body
[are terrified].
- Yea, my life is used up with anguish, | my years [dis-
appear] in sighing ; 11
- My strength fails through my misery, | and my bones [are
burned up] like hay.¹
- To my fellows I am a mark for insult, | to my neighbours
a thing to toss the head at, 12
[My kinsfolk] and acquaintance keep away +from me+, |
* * * *
- Those that see me abroad [abhor me, | those that pass by]
flee from me :
- 20 I am accounted as the dead Jerahmeelites, | I am become
like those mortally wounded with the sword.² 13

¹ (My bones are fallen away) through the insulting of my foes.

² For I hear on all sides the chatter of the Arabians, | of Jerahmeel, of Ishmael.

- But as for me, in thee, O Yahwè, do I trust, | I profess,
 'Thou art my God': 15
- Before thee are all my tears;¹ | make thy face to shine
 upon thy servant.² 16, 17
- Let me not be shamed, for I invoke thee; | let the wicked³
 be given up to Sheol, 18
- Let the calumnious lips be struck dumb, | which speak
 against the righteous in haughtiness!⁴ 19
- How rich is thy liberality to those that fear thee, | thy
 recompense to those that make thee their refuge! 20
- In the covert of thy wings thou hidest them, | +yea,+ in a
 shelter from the tongues of the Arabians. 21
- Blessed be Yahwè! for he has shown me singular kind-
 ness | in the midst of Arabians and Mišrites. 22
- But I—in my consternation, I had said, | I am driven away
 from thy presence. 23
- Surely thou heardest my voice,—+yea,+ my supplication
 when I cried unto thee.
- 30 +Therefore+ love Yahwè, all ye his loyal ones, | * * * 24
 Yahwè keeps faith to the upright, | and requites those
 that show haughtiness.

* * * * *

Liturgical Appendix.

Be strong, take courage, | all ye that wait for Yahwè!

1-6. Full of conventional, but not, therefore, meaningless phraseology. Cp. vii. 2, xi. 2, xxv. 2, 20, xvii. 6^b, xviii. 3, xxiii. 3 (note on כָּלֶכֶל), lv. 23. Lines 1-5 have been prefixed to P's. lxxi.

8, 11, 12. Theodoret sees here a reference to past deliverances as the ground of present confidence. But the perfects may be expressions of confidence in the future. In l. 8, however, פְּדִיתָהּ seems to be corrupt. *To thy keeping*, lit. 'to thy hand,' finer than 'to thy hands' (G, Lk. xxiii. 46). In Lk. *l.c.* a new turn is given to the sense. *My breath*, *i.e.* my life (Job

x. 12). Cp. 'breath of life,' Gen. ii. 7, vi. 17.

9. Surely Jon. ii. 9 alludes to our psalm, not our psalm to that of Jonah (Duhm).—12. *In an ample space*. Cp. iv. 2, xviii. 20, xxvi. 12.—11. אִשְׁרָי, for יַעַן אִשְׁרָי, as often; Ἐστῆ.

14. Cp. vi. 7 and 4; *my soul and my body* (בְּטַנִּי), cp. xlv. 26.

17-19. Cp. the descriptions in xxii. 8, xxxviii. 12, xli. 10, xlv. 15, lv. 14, lxix. 9, lxxxviii. 9, 19, Job xix. 13 ff., Isa. liii. 3^b.

20. It is usual to illustrate and

¹ Snatch me from the hand of mine enemies and from my pursuers.

² Succour me in thy kindness, O Yahwè. ³ Be shamed. ⁴ And scorn.

defend M by Job xix. 14^b, Hos. viii. 8, Jer. xxii. 28. But the expressions are *not parallel*; those in *v. 12a* are strange in the extreme. 'I am forgotten like a dead man out of the heart': מְלוֹב is otiose (Duhm compares כִּפָּה).

Dt. xxxi. 21, but there כִּפָּה adds something to the sense = 'so that the mouth utters it no more'. 'Like a lost or perishing vessel.' Hebrew writers, however, say 'like an unvalued vessel.' Comp. Jer. xxii. 28. The idea, too, of *v. 12a* is unsuitable. The context shows that the speaker is not forgotten. What is true is that those who insult and abhor him, and who plot against his life, consider him as good as dead. *As the dead Jerahmeelites* (see crit. n.). The reference (as in lxxxviii. 6, cxliii. 3) is to some great slaughters of Jerahmeelites or Edomites, possibly those mentioned in 2 S. viii. 13, 1 K. xi. 15 f., 2 K. xiv. 7. As *l. 20b* shows, the psalmist is thinking of Ezek. xxviii. 10, xxxi. 17, xxxii. 19 ff. (see *Crit. Bib.*).

21. **Thou art my God.** Israel's public confession of faith (xvi. 2, De. vi. 4).—25. See lvi. 9. The new reading gives a fine sense and one adapted to the context; it relieves us from the double use of 'hand,' and it is linguistically defensible. As a proverb in vague but suggestive English, however, we can, of course, retain the familiar words of A.V., which have been illustrated by Browning in *Rabbi Ben Ezra* (stanza 1), just as A.V.'s equally seductive rendering of a corrupt

reading in cxxvii. 2 has been glorified by Mrs. Browning.

24. Cf. xii. 4, xciv. 4. שֶׁקֶר, like Ass. *tašgirtu*, may mean 'calumny.'—25. *How plentiful*. . . Cf. xxxvi. 7. The abrupt transition suggests that either the writer corrected or completed his own work in a later mood, or that an editor (a master of metre like himself) did this for him. Line 26 does not indeed flatly contradict *l. 24*, but it implies that the speaker has taken the calumnies too much to heart. Why should Israelites for a moment lose the serenity which befits the dwellers in Yahwè's covert? It was in 'trembling haste' that the psalmist in the name of Israel had spoken so excitedly. Cf. *Introd.*—26. Cf. lxi. 5, xxvii. 5, Isa. iv. 6. *The tongues of the Arabians.* Cp. *v. 14*, cxx. 3 f.

28. בְּחַפְזִי. So cxvi. 11; cp. xxx. 7a. There is an allusion to (*b*) in Jon. ii. 5. See crit. n.

30. **Love Yahwè.** The inference from Israel's experience is that all Israel's members should worship and obey Yahwè alone. The expression is ritual in its origin; hence the love of Yahwè can be commanded (see *OP*, 378).—31. אֲמוּנִים. G ἀληθείας ἐκζητῆί Κύριος; also Σ J Hitz, *Del.*, *We.*, *Duhm.* 'A T J, followed by Street, *Hal.* (*Rev. sém.* iii. 36), and Kautzsch, 'the faithful.' *Duhm* supplies לְאֵהָבֵי; see, however, *crit. note.*—32. Cp. xxvii. 14, xxxiii. 18^b, 22^b.

Critical Notes. 3, 6, 7. Restore יהוה ('*y*'), which fell out after '*y*'.

4. M לְהוֹשִׁיעֵנִי לְבֵית מִצְוֹדוֹת. The connexion is on both sides not smooth, and some historical colouring is desirable. Read מִבְּנֵי מִצְוֹר הוֹשִׁיעֵנִי. מִצְוֹר הוֹשִׁיעֵנִי in מִצְוֹדוֹת is dittographic; בֵּית and בְּנֵי are sometimes confounded.

6 f. M וְתִבְלַף לִנִּי. Two synonyms. Read וְתִבְלַף לִנִּי (lv. 23; Sirach xlv. 24, xlix. 9). See on xxiii. 2. S implies וְתִנְחַמֵּנִי.—M מִעֵזִי. The psalmist has adopted from xviii. 3 צוֹר, מִעֵזִי, and מִצְוֹדָה; can he forget to quote מִנְגִּי? G ὑπερασπιστῆς μου.

8. M פְּדִיתָה אוֹתִי; the perfect and the אַת with suffix are both unnatural. Read מִנְפִּלְטִי. This became אֶפְדֵּתִי. תִּי was dittographed

and א transferred. פדית remained. Omit יהוה (* repeated from אותי). [Wellh., *Skizzen*, vi. 172, sees the difficulty, and boldly cancels 'פ א'.]

9. For M's שנאתי, G S J T, Houb., and many moderns (*e.g.* König, *Eint.*, 74) read ת—. But the whole half-line is suspicious. What can השמרים mean here (Jon. ii. 5, (משמרים)? And why this isolated reference to idol-worship? Lagarde's correction from Isa. v. 12 is clever, but unsuitable. Halévy is on the right scent, but he only proposes שְׁנֹאוֹנֵי. Probably we should read thus, וְיִשְׁמְעֵאלִים וְיִשְׁנֹאוֹנֵי. Cp. an error in xxv. 19b.

11 f. M בצרות ידע ב. בצרות depends on ix. 10, x. 1, where, however, the pointing is wrong. G *εσωςας εκ των αναγκων τησ ψυχης μου*, against parallelism. Read איוב מעצבות.—M. Read ערבי.

14 ff. Insert נבחהלה (vi. 4) with Bi.; T, Kenn., Houb. also supply a verb.—Insert פנו (xc. 9). For בעוני read בעני (S; cp. l. 11) or בעני (G S, Bā., Du.). For עשו (repetition) read נחרו (cii. 4).

17. M כיפל צוררי היתי חרפה ולשכני מאד. Pasek before מאד. As metre shows, ככלצ' (moved to v. 11) is an interpolation from vi. 8b. Read לרעי לרעי היתי חרפה ולשכני כנוד ראש. ראש easily fell out after רי. Lag., Bi., כנוד. But metre requires ראש (so xliv. 15). Herz מורא (before Duhm's work).

18. M חדלו קרובי ומידעי; short and poor. Read חדלו קרובי ומידעי (cp. Job xix. 14, rightly arranged [see Beer]). חדלו fell out.

19 f. M's ראי בחוץ נדרו מכניני evidently contains parts of two half-lines. Complete the first by תעבוני (Job xix. 19); the second by נחשבת, ירחמאל = בלעם. Cf. lxxxviii. 5 (corr. text), cxliii. 3, and read, comparing נחשבת, ירחמאל = בלעם. See exeg. note.—M כנתי ירחמאל כהללי (so G). Read כנתי ירחמאל כהללי (Ezek. xxxii. 21, &c.). See on lxxxviii. 6. At this point the Heb. text (M G) makes an insertion, derived from Jer. xx. 10, where (as here) the text is corrupt, and (see *Crit. Bib.*) to be restored thus,—פי שכינתי, —. This has been linked to the context by another insertion (see M), opening with בהוסדם or rather (G T, Gr., La., see on ii. 4) בהועדם.

22-24. M בידך עתתי. In 1 Chr. xxix. 30 עתים appears to mean 'critical times,' and if the parallelism prescribed a word with this meaning

in *l.* 25, we should have to read עֲתִי with Nowack. But considering 1. that we do not expect such a word in *l.* 25, and 2. that the only other passages (ix. 10, x. 1) in which the fem. plur. form עֲתוֹת occurs are corrupt, we have no other course but to correct the text. Gr. proposes עֲזָרְתִי (see on lxxx. 16). But even this does not produce a perfect sense, unless we venture to correct בִּידֶךָ into בִּשְׁמֶךָ. The clue to the true reading is supplied by lvi. 9. Read לְנִגְדֶךָ כָּל הַדְּמוּתוֹתִי. Then follows a short unmetrical insertion, הַצִּילֵנִי וְגו'. *V.* 17^a (עבדך) makes a good parallel to 'I profess, thou art my God.' Again, a little insertion follows (הוֹשִׁיעֵנִי וְגו'). Verse 18^a is right, then comes an inserted יִבְשֵׁנו. For יִדְמוּ read, not יִרְדוּ (cf. G S), but יִסְפְּרוּ (cf. *l.* 12, and see on lxiii. 11).—After עַל-צִדִּיק M G read עֲתָק, which seems to be a corruption of a dittographed עַל-צִדִּיק. [Duhm omits 'על-צ' as a variant to עֲתָק.] M G append וְבוֹ.

25 f. M's אִישׁ-רַצְפָּנֹת is a variant to אִישׁ תַּצְפֹּנֶם (see *v.* 21, M). We need not therefore trouble ourselves to render צָפֹן differently in two successive Massoretic verses.—M פִּיעֲלָתָהּ. Read פִּעֲלָתָהּ.—M appends נִגְדַת בְּנֵי אָדָם, not a gloss, but miswritten and misplaced. The text is still further disarranged in M by the tautological prefix תַּסְתִּירֶם (derived from xxvii. 5); note Pasek.—M פִּנְיָהּ. Read פִּנְפִּיָהּ (xvii. 8, lxi. 5), with Goldziher (*Mythos bei den Hebr.*, 137; Eng. tr. 117).—M מִרְכְּסֵי אִישׁ. Assyriology (cp. Del., *Ass. HWB*, s. v. *rik'su*) cannot justify the impossible רַכְסֵי. Ol. suggests מִאֲנָשֵׁי רַכְבִּי (Ezek. xxii. 9; cf. on Ps. xvii. 3). G's ἀπὸ παραχῆς ἀνθρώπων is a mere guess. T's גִּידוּחֵי springs from tradition, but from a faulty one; cf. its rend. of רַכְסֵי in Isa. xl. 4. Herz suggests מִרְנוֹת (cf. Hitz's earlier view). The truth, however, probably is that מִרְכְּסֵי אִישׁ is simply a corrupt and misplaced duplication of מִרְיֵב לְשָׁנוֹת עֲרָבִים, or rather (for this is probably the true reading) לְשָׁנוֹת עֲרָבִים (cp. on xxxv. 1, xliii. 1).

27. M בְּעִיר מְצוֹר. S ὡς ἐν πόλει περιφραγμένῃ. We., בְּעִת מְצוֹר (or מְצָר); Hal., בְּעִת מְצוֹק. But the analogy of lx. 11 leads one to expect the Misrites to be mentioned. We have also to account for נִגְדַת בְּנֵי אָדָם, now misplaced in *v.* 20. נִגְדַת should probably be בְּקָרֵב (see on xxiii. 5). בְּנֵי עֲרָבִים (so read!) is a variant to עֲרָבִים (so read for בעִיר, comparing lv. 10!). Line 27^b should therefore run, בְּקָרֵב עֲרָבִים וּמְצָרִים.

28. M נִגְזָרוֹתִי (ἀπ. λεγ.). Some MSS. נִגְזָרוֹתִי (cp. on lxxxviii. 6). Jon. ii. 5, נִגְזָרוֹתֵי; so E' ἐκβεβλήμαι. This is more forcible, and suits 'עֵי כִּינְנָד' best; so Gr., Hal., Du.

29. M עֲלֵי־יָתֵר. As Herz points out, G T make this qualify עֵשָׂה; from T he infers a reading יָתֵר, which (cp. Zech. x. 4) he takes to be a figurative expression for 'ruler.' But is this probable? It is true, the statement produced by עֲלֵי־יָתֵר ('according to abundance'?) does not tally with lxii. 13. G arbitrarily gives τοῖς περισσῶς ποιούσιν ὑπερφηανίαν. We expect something like this,

אֲמוֹנִים נִצֵּר יְהוָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל | וּמִשְׁלֵם כָּל־עֵשָׂה גֵאוּה

32 f. Line 33 does not fit on well to ll. 29, 31, and seems to be an appendix. So B. Jacob (*ZATW*, xvi. 153) and Grimm (*Liturg. App.*, 12).

PSALM XXXII.

TETRAMETERS (double dimeters). Evidently a composite psalm, for the didactic passage, vv. 8-10, has a new commencement, and is an utterance, not of Israel, but either of the poet or, much more probably, of Yahwè (see on v. 8). It contains an exhortation and a promise addressed to each individual Israelite—the influence of the individualizing educational movement recorded for us in Proverbs is unmistakable. Vv. 3-7 have also often been interpreted in an individualistic sense, and assuming this view to be correct, and that the speaker in vv. 8-10 is the same individual who has (*ex hyp.*) related his experience of the good results of confession of sin in vv. 3-5, we should have no difficulty in maintaining the unity of the psalm. This assumption, however, is untenable, not only from the point of view of a sound exegesis of vv. 8-10, but from that of a careful exegesis of vv. 3-7. If the longer passages of psalms in the same strain are rightly understood as utterances of the pious community (see *v.g.* vi., xxxi., xxxviii., cii.¹), we cannot interpret vv. 3-7 differently. The speaker must be Israel, whose body (*i.e.* organization) suffered so severely through calamities, but whom God delivered from the consequences of its sin, as soon as it frankly confessed its guilt (v. 5). The reference is manifestly to the captivity and its consequences, which may be regarded as extending to the time of Nehemiah and Ezra (cp. the confessions of sin in the Books of Nehemiah and Ezra). There may indeed be a flood of fresh troubles before the final deliverance comes, but the preservation of a remnant in the huge trouble of the past gives an assurance that no loyal prayerful Israelite will be washed away by the flood, and Israel as a whole gratefully counts upon the divine guardianship (vv. 6, 7). A liturgical preface (vv. 1, 2) and appendix (v. 11) are added (cp. xli.). For the individualizing application of v. 1 compare the inserted passage xl. 5; also the heading of cii.

The phraseology and ideas of both parts of Ps. xxxii. are characteristically post-exilic. The mere fact that הִסִּיד is used in v. 6 as a class-name is decisive; so too is the extreme sensitiveness of conscience implied in vv. 3-5. Post-exilic also is the conception of the teachership of Yahwè (see *OP*, 236, 249). Nor is the survival of the retribution-doctrine opposed to this, as the Books of Job and Proverbs show. Cp. on Ps. li.—The corruptions of the text have led to much misunderstanding. Observe that only one 'Selah' is correct (v. 7).

XXXII.—1.

Deposited. Of 'Arab-ethan.

1

Liturgical Preface.

Happy is he whose transgression is removed, | whose sin is covered!

- 1 Watch over me, O God ! | pity me, O Yahwè ! 2
 [For] I am needy, | and my spirit is sad.
 When thou wast mute at my crying | my frame wasted
 away, 3
 For by day and by night fell heavily | thy hand upon me. 4
 Affrighted was my body | by the heat of thine indig-
 nation ;¹
 I made known my sin, | I covered not my guilt. 5
 I said, I will confess | my transgressions to Yahwè ;
 My guilt thou didst remove, | my sin thou didst forgive.
 For this let prayer be made | by every loyal one to thee ; 6
 10 When thy floods² overflow, | such a one they cannot
 reach.
 Thou art unto me a covert, | from my foes mayest thou
 guard me, 7
 In the time of favour mayest thou set me free | from [all]
 those that encompass me.

Supplement [‘Selah’].

XXXII.—2.

- 1 I will instruct thee and teach thee | the way thou
 shouldest go, 8
 I will guide thee by my counsel | in paths that are right.
 Be not thou like the horse | and the senseless mule, 9
 Which by bit and bridle | are brought to thy side.
 Many are the pains | [of the evil-doer and] of the wicked ; 10
 But he who trusts in Yahwè | with lovingkindness will He
 encompass him.

Liturgical Appendix.

- Rejoice in Yahwè, | and exult, ye righteous, 11
 Shout ye, and sing for joy, | all ye upright in heart.

xxxii.⁽¹⁾ *Title.* With G transpose
 נִשְׁכַּל (see Introd.) and לָדוֹר.

1, 2. This seems to be the cry
 which afflicted Israel uttered according
 to *l.* 3. The usual reading in *v.* 2*b* is

‘and in whose spirit there is no guile.’
 This clause, however, does not fit on
 well to the statement that the forgiven
 man, whose sin is not reckoned to him,
 is truly happy. For if ‘no guile’
 means ‘no attempt to make oneself

¹ O God.

² Great waters.

out better than one is,' this negative characteristic may surely be assumed in the man whom the searcher of hearts has pardoned; besides which 'in whose spirit' should rather be, 'in whose mouth' (Isa. liii. 9). But this is not the only difficulty in M's text, which is very corrupt (see crit. n.).

3. The text reads, 'I was mute,' *i.e.* made no confession of sin. Such backwardness was all the more remarkable because the speaker says (according to M) that he never ceased crying, and because in *v.* 4 God's conduct, not man's, is spoken of. Usually crying (xxii. 2, same word) is a synonym for impassioned prayer, and prayer implies confession of sin; usually too 'silence' is the term for Yahwè's inattention to the distress of his people (xxviii. 1, &c.). Duhm thinks that **שאנתי** means 'the sore sickness which forced a cry of pain from me'; but how can this be?

9 f. See introd. The overflowing waters may be a figure for the divine wrath (Isa. xxx. 28, Nah. i. 8), but more probably (ep. Isa. viii. 7 f.,

xxviii. 2, 15, Jer. xlvii. 2, cp. Dan. ix. 26) here, as in cxxiv. 4 f., an attack on Israel by foreign foes is meant. The exemption promised to the *hāsīd* corresponds to that of the 'believer' in Isa. xxviii. 17.

11 f. The prayer in *ll.* 1 f. is virtually repeated, but in a calmer tone. The phrases are familiar ones; cp. xxvii. 5, xxxi. 21 (**סֵתֶר**); xii. 8, xxv. 21, xxxi. 24 (**נֹצֵר**), lxix. 14, Isa. xlix. 8 (**עֵת רְצוֹן**). 'Encompassing' foes, as iii. 7, xxviii. 6, cxviii. 10-12. The 'time of favour' is the great 'Messianic' deliverance.

xxxii.⁽²⁾ 1 ff. Is it the poet (Calvin, Hu., Du.) or Yahwè (Ol., Ew., Hi., Bā.) who speaks? xxxiv. 12 favours the former view so far as *ll.* 1 f. are concerned; xxv. 8, 12 the latter. But *ll.* 3 f. can hardly be assigned to a human teacher. Israel is likened to domestic animals in Hos. x. 11. xi. 4, Dt. xxxii. 15, &c., and contrasted with them, as here, in Isa. i. 3. See crit. n.

• *Critical Notes.* xxxii.⁽¹⁾ As we have seen, *v.* 2*b* is quite out of place here. The second **אשרי** followed by **אדם** is also unexpected; indeed the whole of *v.* 2*a* appears superfluous after *l.* 1. Nor are *v.* 1, 2 at all a natural introduction to the following descriptive passage. Either they are a liturgical preface, or (since *v.* 2, as we have seen, is partly superfluous, partly out of place) the true beginning of xxxii.⁽¹⁾ underlies M's text of *v.* 2. Our first suspicion rests on **אדם**, which word is not unfrequently corrupt, and remembering the frequent severance of words by scribes, we correct **לאדם לא** into **אלהים אשרי**; **אשרי** may easily have come out of **שמיר[נ]**. **שמיר** in xl. 18 comes from **חושה** (lxx. 2); here, however, it has more probably arisen out of **חוסה**. Read, therefore, **שמירני אלהים | חוסה עלי יהוה**.

2. Read perhaps **פִּי־אֲבִיוֹן אָנִי | וְרוּחִי כָרָה**

3. **כִּי הִחַרְשֵׁתִי בְּשִׂאֲנָתִי** being inconsistent with **בְּשִׁנְגָתִי**. But **שִׁנְגָה** is not found in the Pss.; **שִׁנְיָה** (xix. 13) is an ἄπ. λεγ. Read **ע' ב' שִׁנְיָה בְּשִׁנְיָתִי**. Omit **כִּלְדוּיִם** as a variant to **כִּי יֹכֵם** (*l.* 4). For **שִׁנְיָה**, see on xxii. 2.

5 f. **מִן־יְדֵי לְשִׁדִּי** (? **בְּחִרְבָּנִי**) **בְּהַרְבּוֹנֵי מַיִן**. 'My moisture' (T **רוֹטְבֵי**) can only be justified (for **לְשִׁדִּי**) by a fanciful use of Arabic (see Lexicons); **לֶשֶׁד** in Num. xi. 8 = *ἐγκρίς*, a kind of oil-cake. Hence Ol. and Bi. correct into **לְשִׁנֵּי**. But this ought to be followed by **לְחַרְשׁ**

(cp. xxii. 16). Nor do they attempt to correct the suspicious *ἀπ. λεγ.* 'חרב. Herz proposes *בְּחֵבֶר נְקִיץ* (or *בְּ-שֵׁדִי*) 'Shaddai . . . like a vexed friend.' Surely the right reading is, *נִבְהַל בְּשָׂרִי*, *בְּחֵרוֹן אַפָּי*. The changes are all simple, and the sense is good. The *סלה* at the end of *ז.* 4 is probably a corruption of *אלהים*.—M *אוֹדִיעֶנָּה*. But a historical present is not natural here. Read *הוֹדִיעַתִּי* (Bi.; cp. G). M's reading was produced by the *אודה* in *ז.* 9.

7. M *אוֹדָה עָלַי*. Contrary to usage; it is not enough to quote *על התודה* in Neh. Contrary also to metre. Read *אוֹדִיעַ* (cp. *ז.* 6). *לִי* in *עָלַי* represents *לִי*; the scribe afterwards wrote *לִיהוּהוּ* in full after *פִּשְׁעֵי*.

8. M *וְאַתָּה נִשְׂאָת עֵינַי וְאַתָּה נִשְׂאָת עֵינַי* (Pasek after *וְאַתָּה*). The pleonasm *חֲטִי* is strange; and *סלה* is hardly to be expected here. Read *וְעֵינַי נִשְׂאָת וְחַטָּאתִי סָלַחְתָּה* in M is a fragment of a dittographed *נִשְׂאָתָה*. Nearly so Gr. *סלה* is misleading, as often (*e.g.* Pss. xxxix, lxxviii).

9. M *לֵעֵת כִּי־אֶרְקֹךָ*. *רַק* is supposed to belong logically to *אֶלְוִי*, though separated by three words from it, and *לֵעֵת כִּי־אֶרְקֹךָ* to be equivalent to *בְּהַמְצָאוֹ*, Isa. lv. 6. But the three words *לֵעֵת כִּי־רַק* present the clearest marks of corruption, nor can *רַק* possibly mean 'surely.' Several corrections have been offered. (1) One, adopted by the writer in 1887-88, is due to Lagarde. *כִּי־אֶרְקֹךָ* he takes to be miswritten for *כִּי־אֶרְקֹךָ*. He then continues *קוֹל שִׁטָּף*. But *קוֹל* ('at the sound of') is not what we expect. (2) Duhm supposes *רַק כִּי־אֶרְקֹךָ* to be a combination of two readings *כִּי־אֶרְקֹךָ* and *כִּי־אֶרְקֹךָ*. (3) Gr. alters *רַק* into *רִצּוֹן*. I think, however, that we can perhaps improve upon these. *כִּי־אֶרְקֹךָ* is a corruption of *כִּי־אֶרְקֹךָ* (*נו* = *כו*), and this word, as also in xl. 8, is a corruption of *שִׁבְלֵיךָ*. *כִּי־אֶרְקֹךָ* is a gloss upon this, and *לֵעֵת* is the original out of which *לֵעֵת* has arisen (*ע* = *ש*, *ת* = *ט*). Cp. lxix. 16, where *שִׁבְלֵיךָ* and *שִׁבְלֵיךָ* again occur together.

11 f. For *כִּי־אֶרְקֹךָ* read *כִּי־אֶרְקֹךָ*.—M *רַק כִּי־אֶרְקֹךָ* both here and in lvi. 8 must be wrong; and *רַק* also, though attested by G. *רַק* comes from a second *כִּי־אֶרְקֹךָ*, which is a corruption of *כִּי־אֶרְקֹךָ*. Continue *כִּי־אֶרְקֹךָ*. Cp. G *λίτρωσαι με ἀπὸ τῶν κυκλωσάντων με*.—The 'Selah' seems to state that a supplement is to be made here from another MS (*לִישָׁלִים*).

xxxii. 2. M *אֶרְקֹךָ עָלַי עֵינַי*. G *ἐπιστηριῶ ἐπὶ σέ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς μου*, perhaps reading *אֶרְקֹךָ* (?); cp. Schechter and Taylor on the

Heb. text of Sirach iv. 28. But the material is not enough for a double dimeter. We must both correct and fill it up. Read probably צדק בכי עגלי בנעצתי בנחך אנהך (lxxxiii. 24, xxiii. 3). א is the only remnant of the first word. כי עגלי and עלי are two fragments of כי עגלי (כי = נו). ד in עליך may come from ק, a fragment of צדק. Some such restoration is required by the sense. [עצה in Prov. xvi. 30 must also be corrupt.]

3 f. M תהי, Read תהי (Gr.).—M הבין. Read בינה (G σύνοσις; Gr.).—M קרב אלך בל קרוב. Surely עדיך, 'his trappings' (?) cannot be in apposition to ורסן! בל before קרוב (infin.?) is against usage. Hence von Ortenberg would take 'ק to be a proleptic perfect. He reads עד יובל קרוב אלך; for the rest he agrees with M (*Textkritik*, 6 f.). But לבלום is a suspicious-looking ἀπ. λεγ., and, not less than בל which follows, represents יובל or יובלו. As for עדיך, Herz has rightly seen that ע is a corruption of צ. He would read צידה לבלע כבלי קרב. But the sense of this is not satisfactory, and metrical requirements must be considered. צדיו (צדיו) and אלך both contain elements of a forgotten word, viz. לצדך. קרב is intrusive; as was pointed out in ed. 1, it is an interpolation suggested by the faulty reading בל עדיך. Read simply יובלו לצדך. To defend G's *σιγάρες αὐτῶν* as a rendering of M's עדיך, seems to me extremely difficult. We. refers to עריך, ciii. 5, which he renders 'thy mouth.' But see note on that passage.

5. Insert לַמַּרְעֵי וְ, or the like.—M הרנינו. The form הרנין seems to occur in lxxv. 9, Job xxix. 13 as a trans.; in lxxxi. 2, Dt. xxxii. 43, also in Sirach xxxix. 35, as an intrans., and so also here. It may, however, be imaginary. In our passage metre suggests the irreproachable reading הריעו ורננו. In Dt. xxxii. 43 read עם עמו. רננו (see G). The scribe began הריעו, but, noticing his error, closed with ננו. Out of הרננו arose הרנינו. In Job xxix. 13 read ופי אל' יברכני (G); vs. 12 f. are an interpolation (Budde). Still the corruption was early enough to have existed in the Psalter of Ben Sira.

PSALM XXXIII.

TRIMETERS. The faithful are summoned to praise God for His mercies to Israel, whom the nations had purposed to destroy (v. 10). He has delivered His people; no wonder, for He is the Creator (v. 6) and knows the secrets of the heart (v. 15). Israel's unwarlike character is no disadvantage; it presupposes consciousness of its true and only strength, which is its persistent clinging to Yahwè. The 'purpose' mentioned in v. 11a is no doubt the establishment of Yahwè's kingdom with Zion for its centre.

The psalm is quasi-alphabetic, containing twenty-two couplets (cp. xxxviii. f., cxlvi., Lam. v.) ; there is a clearly marked division after *v.* 11 (*ll.* 21 f.). It is full of points of contact in ideas and phraseology with late writings : כִּנְסִים, however, must not be used as evidence (see on *l.* 13). It can hardly be of earlier composition than Pss. cxliv.—cl., which were collected and perhaps composed in the Asmonæan period ; its resemblances to these psalms (cp. also cxv. 9–11, cxviii. 15, 20) are manifest. The phrase ‘a new song’ in *v.* 3, and the tenses in *vv.* 10, 13, 14 suggest a recent time of upheaval of nations, in which Israel had been fortunate, while (*v.* 16) kings and great warriors had fallen. Even apart from this, the extreme imitativeness of the psalm pushes its date further down than those among which it is placed.

That the psalm must be pre-exilic because of כִּי־לֵךְ in *v.* 16 (Bä.), is a hasty inference. כִּי־לֵךְ is quite indefinite. An early Maccabæan date is not inconceivable.

There are points of contact with psalms plausibly regarded as Maccabæan. If Judas Maccabæus is correctly represented in 1 Macc., he had faith in the divine power to give victory to those who were not strong, and he, and still more his supporters, could have joined in singing *vv.* 16, 17 (see *OP* 195). Still an earlier date is by no means impossible. *Vv.* 16, 17 might refer to the kings overthrown by Alexander the Great, or perhaps to the wars of the Diadochi (so Halévy, *Rev. sém.* iii. 45), and *v.* 10 to the cruelty of Artaxerxes Ochus towards the Jews, if this can safely be regarded as historical. The truth is that suspicions of a plot to destroy their national existence, and somewhat premature thanksgivings for full deliverance, are oft-repeated phenomena in the sacred lyric poetry of the Jews.

The circumstance that the psalm has no heading, either in the Hebrew or in ἄσθ (Origen), has caused some surprise. Has לָדָר dropped out (‘very probably,’ Bä.)? or were xxxii. and xxxiii. originally one psalm (Venema, cp. ix.–x. ; xlii.–xliii.)? For the former view, G’s heading, τῷ Δαυὶδ, might be adduced, if we could place more confidence in G’s accuracy in such particulars. For the latter, the strong resemblance between xxxii. 11 and xxxiii. 1 may seem to plead (cp. Grätz) ; but the metres of xxxii. and xxxiii. differ. More probably xxxiii. was inserted after xxxii. by the latest editor just because of this (accidental) resemblance, and also because of the point of contact between *v.* 18 and xxxiv. 16 ; moreover, xxxiii. and xxxiv. may both be classed as alphabetic psalms.

- | | | |
|----|--|---|
| 1 | Sing for joy in Yahwè, ye righteous ! | 1 |
| | The song of praise befits the upright. | |
| | Give thanks to Yahwè with the lyre ; | 2 |
| | With the lute and the horn play unto him. | |
| | Sing unto him a new song ; | 3 |
| | Strike the strings aloud with the clang †of the horn†. | |
| | For the word of Yahwè is right, | 4 |
| | And all his doing is in faithfulness. | |
| | He loves righteousness and justice, | 5 |
| 10 | The earth is full of the lovingkindness of Yahwè. | |
| | By the word of Yahwè were the heavens made, | 6 |
| | And all their host by the breath of his mouth. | |
| | He stored the sea in †vast† pitchers, | 7 |
| | He laid up the ocean in treasuries. | |
| | Let all the earth fear Yahwè ; | 8 |
| | Of him let all the world’s people be in awe. | |

- For he spake, and it came into being ; 9
 He commanded, and there it stood.
 Yahwè has annulled the purpose of the nations, 10
 20 He has foiled the designs of the peoples.
 Yahwè's purpose will stand for ever, 11
 The designs of his heart to all generations.
- Happy the nation whose God is Yahwè, 12
 The people he has chosen for himself as a heritage.
 Out of heaven Yahwè looks down, 13
 He beholds all the human kind ;
 From his firm habitation he gazes 14
 Upon all who dwell on the earth—
 He who knows the recesses of their hearts, 15
 30 Who takes note of all their works.
 A king is not victorious through a great army, 16
 A warrior does not win escape by mightiness.
 A horse is not to be trusted for victory, 17
 Nor can it rescue by its great strength.
 Nay, the eye of Yahwè is on those that fear him, 18
 On those who put their hope in his lovingkindness,
 To deliver their soul from pestilence, 19
 And to keep them alive in famine.
 Our soul waits on for Yahwè ; 20
 40 He is our Rock and our shield.
 Yea, our heart rejoices in him, 21
 Yea, we trust in his holy name.
 Let thy lovingkindness, O Yahwè, rest upon us, 22
 According as we have put our hope in thee.

1 f. Terms for pious Israel ; cf. xxxii. 11 (appendix), xcvi. 12, cxlvii. 1, and especially cxi. 1. On instruments, see crit. n., and cf. Del. *ad loc.* ; Driver, *Jel and Amos*, pp. 234 f. ; We., *Psalms* (appendix) ; and art. 'Music,' in *Enc. Bib.*

5. **A new song.** See introd., and cf. xl. 4, lvii. 9 (corr. text), xcvi. 1, cxlv. 9 (from *v.* 2*b* and *v.* 3*a*), cxlix. 1, Isa. xlii. 10, Judith xvi. 13, Rev. v. 9.

7-18. Yahwè's moral attributes ; his creatorship. The favourite post-

exilic themes. — *Right*, or 'upright,' 'truthful,' cf. xix. 9. So in xxv. 8, xcii. 15, Yahwè is 'upright.'—Note parallelism of 'word' and 'doing.' To will, with God, is to speak, and also to do.—Creation by a word ; cf. cxlviii. 5, Gen. i. 3 ff., Isa. xlvi. 13*b* ; Ecclus. xliii. 26, and the well-known Bab. parallel (see 'Creation,' § 27, *Enc. Bib.*).—10. So cxix. 64.—13. The laying-up of the waters, winds, &c., in store-chambers (cxxxv. 7, Jer. x. 13, Job xxxviii. 22, Enoch xli. 4) took place at Creation. See Karppe, *Journ. asiat.* ix. ('97), 75. 'Sea' is not a

term for the 'waters above the heavens' (Hitz.); the parallel word תְּהוֹמוֹת (plur. excellentiv, like יָמִים in xxiv.

2) clearly means the earthly ocean. True, in Job xxxviii. 37, the 'pitchers of heaven' are the clouds, and the store-chambers of the winds, the snow, and the hail are, of course, celestial. But the terrestrial waters too were kept in reservoirs, and these could equally well be called 'pitchers' and 'store-chambers,' or 'treasuries.'

20. See introd.—21. Cp. Isa. xl. 8,

Critical Notes. 2. מַבְבֵּל עָשׂוֹר. G ἐν ψαλτηρίῳ δεκαχόρδῳ; Ἄ (Field) ἐν νάβλα δεκάδος. In M (but not G) of xcii. 4 the מַבְבֵּל and the עָשׂוֹר appear to be distinguished, and Ibn Ezra (comparing xxxv. 14, Jer. xi. 19) supposes an asyndeton here. Jos. (*Ant.* vii. 12, 3) says that the νάβλα has twelve φύγγοι (cp. Gr., pp. 67 f.). But we only know עָשׂוֹר in the sense of 'ten days,' or, 'the day which completes the decad' (= the tenth day). Read certainly מַבְבֵּל וְעָשׂוֹר; cf. cl. 3, and see on xcii. 4, cxliv. 9.

13. M פָּנָס (Isa. xxviii. 20). Miswritten under the influence of כָּנַד. Read certainly חָסֵן (the usual parallel to אָצַר).—M פָּנַד מִי (Ex. xv. 8; cf. lxxviii. 13). But parallelism and context are against this. All Vss. except E' (which agrees with M), presuppose פָּנָאד, 'after the manner of a wine-skin'; so Houb., Ew., Ol., Dy., Gr., Che.⁽¹⁾, Bā., Kau., Duhm, We. (*Skizzen*, vi.). This, however, is a strange expression. A comparison of Job xxxviii. 37 suggests the true reading כָּנַד מִי = בְּנַלְמִי = בְּנַבְלִים; the initial ב fell out. This suits the parallelism. See note above.

29. M הִיצַר יַחַד. הִיצַר is difficult. Is it to be taken with לְבָס, as if 'the hearts of them all,' or with הִיצַר, 'who alone formed' (Duhm, cf. Ezr. iv. 3²)? Parallelism is opposed to both views. Read הִיִּדַע יִרְפְּתֵי. יִרְפְּתֵי became יִדַע, after which יַד easily fell out. כ, as often, became ה; ת became ד; transposition followed.

31. M הַמֶּלֶךְ. Omit the article (cf. G). [So Duhm.]

40. M עִוְרָנוּ. More probably צִוְרָנוּ see on xxviii. 7 f., and esp. lxxviii. 35.

xlvi. 10, li. 6, lv. 8 ff.—22. Cp. Jer. xxix. 11, Isa. lv. 8 f.—23. Cf. cxliv. 15, Dt. xxxiii. 29.—24. Cf. lxxiv. 2, Dt. xxxii. 9, and see on lxxxii. 8.

25—28. Cf. xi. 4, xiv. 2, cii. 20.—29. Cf. on vii. 10.—31 and 33, 32 and 34, are parallel. The two couplets generalize from facts of recent experience. Cf. xx. 8, cxlvii. 10, Prov. xxi. 31.—35. Cf. xxxiv. 16.—37. 'Death,' i.e. probably 'pestilence' (Jer. xv. 2; cf. 2 S. xxiv. 3).

39. **Waits on,** הַכְתָּה (cvi. 13).

PSALM XXXIV.

AN alphabetic psalm in eleven quatrains of trimeters. The earliest editor probably considered it to be the twin-psalm to P's. xxxv., for the original title which we seem to discern underneath the absurd title relative to an occasion in the

life of David represents Ps. xxxiv. as commemorating the flight of hostile Jerahmeelites and Geshurites. These foes are expressly mentioned in Ps. xxxv., where the danger caused by them is vividly described. The reference in xxxiv. 8 to the 'angel of Yahwè' who 'encamped' (in the past) around faithful Israelites might in fact naturally be connected with a similar reference in the prayer in xxxv. 5, 6. It is only Part i., however, which has the character of a hymn of praise; Part ii. is more like a sermon. After v. 11 (close of Part i.) G plausibly gives a *διάψαλμα* (see crit. n. on l. 20). As in Ps. xxv., the 1 couplet is wanting, and there is a supernumerary 2 couplet, which, however, is wanted to complete the last quatrain.¹

The speaker in l. 11 (cp. xxv. 16b) calls himself a 'sufferer' (עֲנִי) who cried to God on a special occasion and was answered. The view (*OP*, 248; so too *Ol.*, *Now.*) that 'each pious Israelite' is meant here fails to do justice to the nationalistic character of the psalm. The 'sufferer' is, not indeed Israel simply, but the inner circle of the pious (see on xxii. 26), which alone thoroughly deserved the name of Israel, and which had among its chief functions to pray for Israel as a whole and to lift up the standard of those who were behindhand in religious attainments. They cry as one man to Israel's God, and He delivers the whole community (which is no doubt relatively righteous) in answer to their prayers (*ll.* 7 f., 33 f.). Then the community, in its wider sense, realizes Yahwè's loving-kindness, ceases to blush at its 'desertion' by its God (*l.* 10), and joins in the grateful songs of the association of the עֲנִי ('suffering ones').

The association referred to contained, not only ordinary prayerful and obedient Israelites, but psalmists, wise men, and prophetic writers. The author of Ps. xxxiv. is at once psalmist and wise man; hence he addresses his readers in the affectionate style of the wise men towards their disciples (*Prov.* i. 8, ii. 1, iii. 1, &c.). This helps to account for the emphasis laid on the reality of earthly retribution.

The whole poem is as markedly post-exilic as Ps. xxv., to which it has so strong an affinity. In this connexion we may note the changed meaning of מלאך יהוה (*ll.* 8, 9), which originally meant the personal revelation of Yahwè, but here (as in xxxv. 5 f.) most probably means the protective angel of the community, Mal'achi's מלאך הברית; cp. *Zech.* iii. 1 ff., and *Nowack's* note. With respect to Lagarde's theory as to the name of the author, see introd. to Ps. xxv. Cp. a 'Note on Pss. xxxiv. and xxv.' by E. G. Hirsch in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, April, 1902, which came out too late to be considered in the critical notes.

Of 'Arab-ethan. When the hosts of those of Jerahmeel and of Geshur fled. 1

I will bless Yahwè at all times; 2
 Be his praise continually in my mouth !
 Of Yahwè let my soul make her boast ; 3
 The sufferers will hear and rejoice.

With me magnify Yahwè ; 4
 Together let us exalt his name.
 Zealously I approached Yahwè, and he answered me, 5
 And rescued me out of all that I dreaded.

¹ K. J. Grimm, *Liturg. Aft.* 8 ff., after a consideration of most other theories, comes to the conclusion that v. 23 is a later addition, designed to provide the psalm with an auspicious close. I would rather say that the original poet had this design in framing the couplet, for I take the stanzas to be each of four, not of two lines.

- Look unto him and ye will be cheered, 6
 10 Ye cannot be put to the blush.
 There is a sufferer who cried, and He¹ heard, 7
 And delivered him out of all his distresses.
 The angel of Yahwè encamped 8
 Round about those who feared him and rescued them.
 Taste ye and see that Yahwè is good ; 9
 Happy the man that takes refuge in him.
 Fear Yahwè, O ye who seek him, 10
 For those who fear him suffer no lack.
 Those that deny come to poverty and are famished, 11
 20 But those that zealously approach him cannot lack any
 good thing.
 Come +my+ sons, hearken to me, 12
 The fear of Yahwè let me teach you.
 Is there any one that desires life— 13
 That covets days of enjoyment of happiness ?
 Guard thy tongue from evil, 14
 And thy lips from speaking guile.
 Shun evil and do good, 15
 Seek peace and pursue it.
 Yahwè's eyes are toward the righteous, 16
 30 And his ears toward their call for help.
 Yahwè's face is against evil-doers, 17
 To cut off their name from the earth.
 The righteous cry, and he hearkens, 18
 And rescues them out of all their distresses.
 Near is Yahwè to the broken-hearted ; 19
 He delivers those who are crushed in spirit.
 Many are the misfortunes of the righteous, 20
 But from them all Yahwè rescues him.
 All his bones Yahwè guards, 21
 40 Not one of them is broken.
 The expectation of the wicked shall perish ; 22
 The haters of the righteous shall be brought to ruin.
 Yahwè sets free the soul of his servants ; 23
 None shall come to ruin that takes refuge in him.

¹ Yahwè.

2. Israel's primary duty is praise ; cf. xxxiii. 1 (יְשׁוּעָה = Israel).

4 f. **The sufferers**, or, 'the humble.' But see on ix. 13^b. Are these עֲנִיִּים the individuals of whom זֶה עֲנִי (l. 11) consists? Or the members of the 'congregation' in the wider sense, *i.e.* all who frequent the temple and, with more or less strictness, recognize the obligations of 'righteousness'? The latter view is preferable (see introd.).—נִדְּלָה with ל; not so, lxix. 13 (accus.).

11. נָהַר, as Isa. lxx. 5. — זֶה is demonstrative. The 'sufferer' is not even primarily (Ol., Beer) the psalmist as an individual, εὐτελής ὄντα με καὶ προβατέα (Theodoret), but the inner circle of the pious, which has the position of a teacher towards Israel at large. See introd., and *Jew. Rel. Life*, p. 125.

13, 15. The protecting angel (יהוה) כְּלֹאֲךָ (יהוה) means here no more than this) has a host at his command, with which lately he *encamped* about Israel. טִיַּעַם = 'perceive,' as Prov. xxxi. 18.

17. The benefits of the 'fear of Yahwè' (*i.e.* religion) are attractively set forth, as in Proverbs. Those who take part in the cultus are here bidden to 'fear Yahwè,' *i.e.* to cherish such an

awe of God as influences the conduct, on utilitarian grounds. It is not enough to 'seek Yahwè' formally (cf. l. 16-20); those who are 'strong' or 'rich' (G) shall 'hardly enter the kingdom of God'; the gate is too strait for them. To be 'strong,' it would seem, is equivalent to being an oppressor. He who would seek Yahwè must 'shun evil and do good,' must 'seek peace (*i.e.* the welfare of the pious community) and pursue it,' as zealously as if it were his individual gain. Thus דָּרַשׁ (= בִּקְשׁ) comes to mean, in l. 20, 'to approach Yahwè in a spirit of holy fear.'

29-32. Many critics transpose the ע and the פ stanzas, in order to provide a suitable subject for צִעֲקוּ, 'they cry,' in l. 33, where, as M's text stands, 'evil-doers' ought to be (and yet cannot be) the subject. Such a transposition is possible, on the analogy of Lam. ii. iv. and the alphabetic poem in Prov. xxxi. (G). But there is no such transposition in the parallel 25th psalm, and it is more natural that God's favour for the righteous should be mentioned before his disfavour for the wicked. See crit. n.

29 f. Cp. xxxiii. 18a, xviii. 6b.—32. זָכְרָם, their name,' cp. ix. 7, xxx. 5.

35 f. Cp. li. 19, and especially Isa. lvii. 15.—41. See cxii. 10^b. The 'expectation' is the destruction of the righteous.

Critical Notes. Title. Critics have wondered at the 'substitution' of 'Abimelech' for 'Achish.' Surely we have found the key to the riddle. The titles which now refer to David, originally referred to something suggested by the contents of the psalm. The earliest editor considered Psalm xxxiv. to refer to some flight of the N. Arabian foes of the Jews. A corrupt form of the title was afterwards rewritten.

9. Read הַבִּיטוּ וְנַהֲרוּ, וְנִינְחָם (G 'A S J), with Ew., Hu., Bā., Du., &c., on account of אֵל in l. 10. [A is presumed for פְּנִיכֶם.]

11. M ויהוה שמע. Metre requires וַיִּשְׁמַע (cf. on l. 33).

13. M הִנֵּה, a participle, which acc. to Kön. (*Synt.*, § 149) the preceding virtual perfect (l. 12) shows to be a historical present. It is simpler to read הִנֵּה.

17. M קְדוּשֵׁי יָאֵל. In Eccles. xlii. 17 we have קְדוּשֵׁי יָאֵל (used of

pious Jews), and in Dt. vii. 6, עַם קְדוֹשׁ (cp. Ex. xix. 6, &c.). But the phrase is still peculiar; קְדוֹשִׁים in xvi. 3 is also very doubtful. Read probably בְּקִשְׁיִי [מָ].

19 f. M כְּפִירִים. What a strange antithesis to 'those who are zealous for Yahwè'! Street in 1790 proposed כְּפִירִים; so too independently the present writer and Winckler (*AOF*, ii. 246). This correction is plausible in lviii. 7; possibly too we should read כְּפִיר in Ezek. xxxii. 2. In our passage one MS. (Kenn.) has 'perhaps' כְּבִירִים. But the parallelism justifies us in preferring Duhm's correction, כְּפִירִים, the participle of an Aramaizing verb found in the Talmud (*e.g.* *B. Bath.*, 16*b*, in the sense of 'denying religion.' Cp. on xvii. 13; xxxv. 17; lviii. 7.—G inserts *διάψαλμα* after *v.* 11.

33. Prefix צְדִיקִים (Street, after G). Probably this was mistaken for a dittographed זְכָרִים.

41 f. M תְּמוֹתֵת רָשָׁע רָעָה, a strange expression. G S T presuppose תְּמוֹתֵת. Herz, תְּמוֹתֵת רָשָׁע רָעָתוֹ, hardly || to next line. Read תְּמוֹ רָשָׁעִים מְאָרָץ (cp. on xxv. 21). Read יִשְׁמוֹ (see *crit. n.* on Ps. v. 11).

PSALM XXXV.

PENTAMETERS. A prayer against the speaker's enemies (see on *l.* 1 f.), together a description of their cruel behaviour, and of the speaker's self-humiliation before his God. See on title of Ps. xxxiv. Again the question arises, is the speaker an individual or the inner circle of the Jewish community personified? Not a few have taken the former view. Thus Grätz describes our psalm as 'the complaint and prayer of a singer who was much respected and had a party of adherents (*v.* 27), occasioned by a false accusation brought against him'; and Duhm as 'the complaint of one of the "quiet in the land" who is maliciously persecuted by treacherous friends, together with a prayer for help.' But the individualizing expressions in *v.* 11-17 are not stronger than those in Ps. xxii.¹⁴, and the text which is brought out by the application of criticism is really very well adapted to be explained of the community, *i.e.* it describes the religious practices by which the afflicted Jews sought to propitiate their God, and the contempt with which 'men of Belial' watched their conduct. The phraseology is that which we find elsewhere in passages which refer to the community. For instance, *v.* 1 (רִיב) with xliiii. 1, Jer. *l.* 34; *v.* 12 with xxxviii. 21; *v.* 14 f. with xxxviii. 7, 18; *v.* 13 with lxix. 11 f.; *v.* 17 with xxii. 21; *v.* 18 with xxii. 23, 26, xl. 10 f.; *v.* 21, 25 with xl. 16, Lam. ii. 16. Note also מְרֹאֵךְ יְהוָה, *v.* 5, which also occurs in xxxiv. 8, for the angel who protects the community.

The points of contact with the Book of Jeremiah which have led some, with Theodore of Mopsuestia, to explain our psalm as referring to Jeremiah, are only fresh evidence of the interest aroused by the book which bears his name. (Cp. for instance *v.* 1 with Jer. xviii. 19 (יְרִיב), *v.* 12 with Jer. xviii. 20, *v.* 15 with Jer. xx. 10.) The psalmist is too imitative to be Jeremiah himself. Cp. Rahlfs, *עֲנִי und עָנָה in den Psalmen*, 45 f., 50 f.

The date of the psalm is in fact shown to be late by its imitativeness. We may perhaps draw a subsidiary argument from the loan-word סִכָּר (see on *l.* 3).

At any rate, the synonymous loan-word תרתה (תרתה) is only found in the late Book of Job (xli. 21). The ideas are characteristically post-exilic (see *e.g.* on *ll.* 5, 10, 11, 14, 15). In *OP* 232, which is followed by Beer (*Ind. u. Gem. Psalmen*, p. lxviii.), the time of Nehemiah is suggested as the date. Ol., however, prefers the Syrian period. He admits that there is no definite reference to non-Israelitish foes, but further criticism reverses this judgment.

The text is in parts singularly corrupt; from one of the most corrupt passages (*v.* 11) Duhm infers that the poet had been accused of malversation of money; cp. on Ps. lxix. There are also a number of interpolations, the removal of which considerably improves the text.

Of 'Arab-ethan.

- 1
- 1 Preserve me, O Yahwè! from the Arabians, | [from] the
host of Jerahmeel.
- Grasp the shield and the buckler, | and stand up as mine ally. 2
- Draw forth spear and javelin | to confront my pursuers; 3
- Say to me, [O Yahwè,] | I am thy deliverance.¹
- Be they like chaff before the wind, | and let Yahwè's
angel pursue them! 5
- Be their way in darkness, | and let Yahwè's terrors drive
them! 6
- For without cause they have hid for me a net, | they have
dugged a pit;² 7
- Let a pitfall take him unawares, | and in his own net³ let
him be caught!⁴ 8
- But my soul will exult in Yahwè, | will be joyous at his act
of deliverance; 9
- 10 My +whole+ frame will say, | 'O Yahwè, +how+ peerless
thou art!' 10
- [Yahwè] rescues the sufferer | from him that overmatches
him;
- He delivers * * * | and the needy from him that robs him.
- Arabia and Cush vent their rage upon me, | the Ish-
maelites plunder me; 11
- The Rehobothites requite me with evil, | they bring calamity
upon me. 12
- So for my clothing I took sackcloth, | my soul I humbled;⁵ 13
- With prayers unto [thee, O Yahwè!] | the roof of my
mouth became dry.

¹ Abashed and dishonoured be those that seek my life, 4
Let them retreat with shame that plot to harm me.

² Without cause, for my soul. ³ Which he hid.

⁴ In the pitfall; let him fall into it. ⁵ With fasting.

- Like bulrushes by the river's bank, | so did I bend the head ; 14
 Like reeds by the streams, | bowed down I went along.
- But at my wound my haters rejoice, | they gather together
 against me ; 15
- 20 Those of Jerahmeel surround me, | they cry, We have
 swallowed him up.
- At my supplications they deride [me], | they pour
 out scorning (?) ; 16
- They gnash their teeth upon me¹ | like a ravening lion. 17
- Draw back my soul from the wicked, | my life from those
 that deny !
- 2 * * * * * | * * * * *
- 18 Let not Arabia and Cush rejoice against me,³ | Ishmael
 [and] Amalek ! 19
- For it is not of peace that they speak | concerning the suf-
 ferers in the land. 20
- Like young lions they gnash their teeth, | and open their
 mouths wide ; 21
- They say, Aha ! aha ! | see ! we have caught him.
- Thou beholdest it, O Yahwè ! be not still ; | be not far
 from me ! 22
- 30 Rouse thee for my controversy, O my God,⁴ | awake, for my
 cause ! 23
- Do me justice, according to thy righteousness, O⁵ my God, |
 and let them not rejoice over me ! 24
- Let them not say, Aha ! we have caught him ! | [Aha !] we
 have swallowed him up ! 25
- ⁶Clothed with disgrace and infamy | be those that jeer
 at me ! 26*b*
- Let those sing aloud [together] for joy | that wish
 well to my righteous cause ! ⁷ 27*a*

¹ O Lord.

² I will give thanks to thee in the great congregation ;
 I will praise thee among a large concourse. 18

³ My causeless opponents. ⁴ And my Lord. ⁵ Yahwè.

⁶ Abashed and put to shame together be those that joy at my harm. 26*a*

⁷ Let them be ever saying, Great is Yahwè, who delights in the welfare of
 his servant. 27*b*

And my tongue will utter thy righteousness, in the great assembly thy
 renown. 28

1 f. The foes of the speaker are led, as usual, by foreigners (cp. *l.* 25). That their hostility takes the form of warlike operations, is not certain. They appear to prefer fraud to open assault, presumably because of a central authority, which, though it is weak or dilatory, they cannot venture to stir up. The psalmist himself knows but little of armed forces, or he would not combine the **כִּנְיָן** (shield) and the **צָנָה** (buckler).

—4. *To me*, lit. 'to my soul,' *i.e.* to mine innermost self.

5. **Yahwè's angel** is the leader of a host (cp. on xxxiv. 8). Swift is the wind, but swifter are the heavenly beings. It is an anticipation of the great judgment (i. 4; cp. Isa. xvii. 13), the hope of which pervades the later literature.

6. **Be their way**, &c. Darkness is an added horror; cp. **פַּחַד לַיְלָה**, xci. 5 (doubtful); Jer. xxiii. 12. Their fate shall be to them (full of) terrors (**בַּלְהוֹת**); they shall be thrust out into the gloom, and fall therein. See crit. n.

7. **A pit**, **יַשְׁחַת**, such as wild beasts are caught in. For the idea, cp. vii. 16 f., ix. 16.

10. **My + whole + frame**. Lit. 'my bones' Cp. vi. 3 (note), li. 10.—+ *How* + *peerless*, &c. Lit. 'who is like thee,' viz. among the superhuman, divine beings (see on lxxxvi. 8, and cp. lxxi. 19, lxxxix. 9, also Ex. xv. 11, and perhaps the names Micaiah, Michael).

11. **The sufferer**. A characteristically post-exilic term for Israel. Cp. lxviii. 5-7, cxlvi. 5-9.

12 f. **From him that robs him**, **כִּנְיָלוֹ**. The rich man has increased his wealth by despoiling the poor. Cp. lxii. 11, Isa. lxi. 8, iii. 14.—*Arabia and Cush*. Practically synonymous (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Cush,' § 2).

14. **My good . . . with evil**. Cp. xxxviii. 21, cix. 5. The pious had fulfilled the duty of brotherly love

(**הֶסְדָּר**) to all fellow-Jews, but their opponents of Jewish race had treated them far otherwise. A split in the Jewish community is presupposed, such as we know to have existed during the time of the struggle of strict Judaism for victory.—*Brought calamity upon me*. Calamity is expressed by the figure of stumbling. The received text is impossible; 'childlessness' (see crit. n.) was certainly not the fate of the pious community.

15-18. Sackcloth for clothing, fasting (note the gloss), prayers and litanies, these were the rites and customs by which the speaker sought to propitiate Yahwè. Cp. lxix. *ll.* 23-26. Observe that it was for himself, not for his enemies (an aimless and unparalleled form of charity) that the pious community fasted and prayed. Cp. 'the sackcloth of my petition' (Baruch iv. 20) and note that **עֲנָה נֶפֶשׁ** is a phrase characteristic of the Levitical law (see *e.g.* Lev. xvi. 29, 31); cp. Isa. lviii. 5, **יָבֵשׁ חֲבִי**; xxii. 16 (lxix. 4). *Like bulrushes*, *i.e.* with a movement backwards and forwards. Cp. Isa. lviii. 5, 'To droop one's head like a bulrush, and to make sackcloth and ashes one's couch,—wilt thou call this a fast, and a day acceptable to Yahwè?' See crit. n.

19 f. **At my wound**, **לִפְצְעֵי**; a figure for a national calamity, Isa. i. 6. Cp. *l.* 22; xxxviii. 11.—*We have swallowed him up*, as Lam. ii. 16.

21 f. See *Jewish Religious Life*, 119. The supplications are those referred to in *l.* 16. For *four out scorning*, cp. Job xxxiv. 7. *Gnash their teeth*, a sign of rage; so *v.* 21; cp. Lam. ii. 16, Job xvi. 9. **אֲרִיהַ טָרַף**, as xxii. 14.

23, 27. **The young lions**, **כַּפִּירִים**, as xvii. 12, xxii. 21 (corr. text), lviii. 7.

25. **קִרְוֵן עֵינַי**, as Prov. vi. 13, x. 10, cp. xvi. 30. But see crit. n.

Critical Notes. 1. **מִי אֶת־יְרִיבֵי** (**יְרִיבֵי** preceded by **פֶּסֶלֶךְ**). **יְרִיבֵי** also in Jer. xviii. 19, Isa. xlix. 25, where G supposes **יְרִיבֵי** **יְרִיבֵי**. On the analogy of xliii. 1, lxxiv. 22, read **לְתֵם אֶת־** **שְׂמִרְתֵּי יְהוָה מֵעֲרָבִים**.

לְחַמֵּי. לַחַם is not used in Kal. (see on lvi. 2 f.). Read probably כִּימְהֵנָה; the intermediate reading was perhaps כִּימְלֵחֹת.

3. M סָנַר. The vss. all regard this as an imperative, and since 'shut to meet' &c. is impossible, Schwally (*ZATW* '91, 258) proposed חֲנֵר, Halévy (*Rev. sémi.* iii. 47) עוֹרָה. Neither of these, however, is suitable. We expect the name of a weapon, not indeed the Scythian and Persian *σάγαις* (Kenn., Ew., Hu., Bi., We., Du., &c.; see Herod. i. 214, and Sayce *ad loc.*; Xen. *Anab.* iv. 4 &c.), but rather some Babylonian weapon. The *tartahu* (a light javelin) is mentioned in Job xli. 21 (read תַּרְתַּח), and probably in Ps. xlv. 4, lv. 22; we may here, with reasonable probability, read שָׁנַר, and find in it the Ass. *šukūdu*, a synonym of *tartahu*. See Delitzsch, *Assyr. HWB*, p. 656a.

4. Insert יהוה; 'fell out after נַפְשִׁי.—Omit v. 4 as a quotation from xl. 15 (Du.).

5 f. The text is in some disorder. Hu., Bi., Bā. are content with transposing דָּחָה (דָּחַם, Houb., Ol., &c.; G *ἐκθλιβων αὐτούς*) and רָדַפְּם; יִדְהוּ in fact occurs in Jer. xxiii. 12, which is || to l. 6. This view has been put in its most plausible form by Rahlfs, עֲנִי *und* עֲנֹו *in den Psalmen*, 44, and makes a possible text, but is nevertheless wrong. The unfortunates who are walking in dark ravines need no 'angel of Yahwè' to push them; unless an 'angel of Yahwè' bear them in his hands, they will certainly 'dash their feet against a stone,' and wound themselves. Nor, even apart from this, is the repetition of יהוה כִּלְאֵד at all probable. Rahlfs has also not investigated הִלְקִלְקוֹת. This word only appears elsewhere in Jer. xxiii. 12, where it occurs in the same singular combination with 'darkness,' and in Dan. xi. 21, 34, where (like הִלְקִלְקוֹת, v. 32) it seems to mean 'treachery' (cp. הִלְקָה, 'flattery,' Prov. vi. 24). If the word is rightly read in Ps. xxxv. 6 and Jer. xxiii. 12, it should mean there, not 'treachery,' but 'terrible,' 'distressful' (cp. Isa. viii. 22). But these duplicated forms are open to suspicion; עִקְלָלוֹת in lxviii. 14, and perhaps Judg. v. 6, are corrupt. In lxviii. 18 the unsuitable חִלְקוֹת has, by the present writer, long since been corrected into בִּלְהוֹת; can we be wrong in correcting חִלְקִלְקוֹת here and in Jer. *loc.* into בִּלְהוֹת, and 'ח' into בִּלְהוֹת? דָּחָה should not improbably be יִדְבִּיקֶם (*l.* 5*b*), and *l.* 6*b* should be תִּדְבִּיקֶם.

7. Transpose שַׁחַת and רִשְׁתֶּם, or rather רִשֵׁת (Bi.) with S, Houb., Hu., Bā., &c. In *b* omit חַנֵּם and נַפְשִׁי (metre).

8. For תִּלְחֲזֵהוּ שׁוֹאֵהוּ (against parallelism) read שׁוֹחָה, and for וּרְשִׁתוֹ תִלְכְּדוֹ read וּבְרִשְׁתוֹ יִלְכְּד. ת in תִלְכְּדוֹ comes

from ב, the ב in וברשתו; the final ו from י. Transposition.—For בשואה read בשוחה; like יפל־בה, it is a gloss.

11 f. Prefix יהוה (Du.).—ועני may be a corrupt fragment of כִּשְׁיֵעַ (ני = כ; ו = י). Something has fallen out.

13. M עֲדֵי הָחַסִּים, suspicious. Du. emends שְׁקָר עֲדֵי; cp. xxvii. 12. But xxvii. 12 is corrupt, and in both passages we should most probably read עֲרַב וְכוּשׁ יְקוּמוּן. For יְקוּמוּן read יְקוּמוּנִי (xxvii. 12).—M אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יָדְעָתִי יִשְׁאַלּוּנִי. But the witnesses (?) surely did not come forward to 'ask' things of the defendant, and still less 'things that he knew not.' The sense usually given is very inappropriate. The mention of 'robbing' in l. 12 suggests יִשְׁלֹנִי (cp. on lviii. 8). אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יָדְעָתִי comes probably from יִשְׁמִיעֵאלִים.

14. M תַּהַת טוֹבָה, most obscure. Read רַחֲבוֹתַיִם.—M שְׂכֹל לְנַפְשִׁי. But can 'bereavement (comes) to my soul' be equivalent to 'I was forsaken by all friends'? Can שְׂכֹל even mean 'bereavement'? Bā. renders 'childlessness (G ἀτεκνία) was my lot.' But this does not at all suit. T alone is correct; כִּתְקַל = בְּשׁוֹל, which Gr. actually reads. But נָתַנּוּ כְּשׁוֹל לְנִי is metrically too long. Read הִכְשִׁילוּ נַפְשִׁי (obs. that ה precedes). The next word ואני has after it Pasek, which indicates that the preceding words were imperfectly written in the MS.

15. M G ואני. Read וְאֶתְנָה; see lxix. 12, where the context shows that the trouble referred to was suffered by the pious Jewish community and not by its opponents. If, therefore, any one's "sickness" is referred to, it must be that of Israel, and we have to correct בחלותי. The present context, however, shows that the speaker at the time spoken of was able to move about. This leads us to suspect that the word may be intrusive; metrically indeed it is quite superfluous. G found even במחלותם troublesome; it gives εὐ τῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ παρενοχλεῖν μοι. But how shall we account for the assumed presence of בחלותי in the pre-Septuagint text? It undoubtedly arose out of a dittographed ותפלתי; observe that נפשי precedes ותפלתי, and that the same word in M is only separated from בחלותם by ואני, which, as the Pasek inclines us to suppose, was written indistinctly (it is a fragment of ואתנה). Another intrusive word is בצום, of which metre proves the superfluity. Plainly it is a gloss.

16. M ותפלתי על־חיקי תשוב. This is not enough for a line, and does not make sense. Bi., Che.⁽¹⁾, Now. correct תִּשָּׁב לִי, 'thou wilt requite to me,' and Bi. appends יהוה. But this implies an incorrect view of the context, and in any case does not produce a parallelism. Herz

would read, **בְּתַפְלוֹת יִלְיֶךָ יְיָ** . Better **וּתְפַלְתִּי עֲלֵיהֶם הַיְיָ תִיבֵשׁ** .
הַיְיָ (cf. xxii. 16).

17. M G **פָּרַע פָּאָה** ; Abbott **פָּרַע** (*Hermathena*, Feb. 1891, p. 69). But the descriptions in parallel psalms do not favour the reading. Herz's ingenious correction is **פָּרַע פָּאָחוּ** . It is some outward sign of humiliation before God which is required. But can **פָּרַע** mean 'to bow, or bend, the head'? Besides, to produce a hemistich of adequate length, something more had to be said connected with the **אָדוּ** . **כָּרַע** must, therefore, conceal **יָאֵר** . We must now extend our view. M continues **לִי הַתְּהַלְכָתִי** . This cannot contain the point of comparison between the speaker and the river-reeds. **הַלְכָתִי** must be put aside for the present; **לִי הַתְּ** comes from **עַל־שִׁפְתַי** (Gen. xli. 3, &c.). The right verb (instead of **הַלְכָתִי**) is **נִכְפַּתִּי** ; cf. Isa. lviii. 5. **כ** in M's **כָּרַע** is a fragment of **כֹּן** . Read **פָּאָחוּ עַל־שִׁפְתַי יָאֵר כֹּן נִכְפַּוֹתִי** . Cf. lxix. 11 (corr. text).

18. M **בְּאַבְלֵי־אֵם** , the objective genitive (cf. **אֲבַל עַל** , Hos. x. 5). So Kön., *Synt.*, § 336m, and most. Bā. (after 'A), however, 'as when a mother mourns.' More and more extraordinary. Is there no remedy? G *ὡς πενθῶν καὶ σκυθωπάζων* ; hardly **בְּאַבְלֵי וּכְאֲמֵלֵל** ; probably a guess. Herz ingeniously **בְּלֹא הַמָּה** (Job xxx. 28). But patience. What follows in M? **קָדַר יִשְׁחוּתִי** . Two mutually inconsistent symbolic verbs; elsewhere **קָדַר** goes with **הַלֵךְ** , not with **שָׁחָה** . Hence Riehm would transpose **הַלְכָתִי** and **שְׁחוּתִי** . The truth is that **קָדַר** represents a stray portion of the right word to correspond to **אָחוּ** ; **אֵם** which precedes represents another portion. In Sirach xl. 16, the *codex unicus* reads **עַל גַּפְתִּי נָחַל** , but **גַּפְתִּי** should probably be **שִׁפְתִּי** , and **נָחַל** should be **קָרוֹמְיֹת** ,¹ 'reed-stalks' (Cowley, Neubauer). The latter is a new Hebrew word (T. B., *Shabbath*, viii. 1; *Erubin*, xxii. 1). Bringing over **כ** from **כְּאֲבַל** , we obtain from M's text **כְּאֲמֵקָדַר** ; this should be **כְּקָרוֹמְיֹת** . **אֲבַל** has still to be accounted for. This, as the parallel line shows, represents a description of the position of the reed-stalks. They grew by water—**עַל־יְבֵלֵי מַיִם** . **אֵם** which follows **אֲבַל** in M does duty both for a portion of **קָרוֹ** and for **מַיִם** ; **מַיִם** in short dropped out from its resemblance to **מַיִת** , which was originally written where **אֵם** now stands. **יִשְׁחוּתִי** alone remains. This is not enough for a hemistich. At last we can make use of the second part of M's **הַתְּהַלְכָתִי** in *l.* 19. **יִשְׁחוּתִי** is a combination of parts of

¹ Bacher, however, defends the form with **ד** (*ZQR*, 1897, p. 559).

the two words, **שְׁחוּחַ הַלִּבְתִּי** (xxxviii. 7 'ה'; Isa. lx. 14 'ש'), which is the complement of **כִּקְּ עַל־יִבְלֵי נַיִם**. Observe that Ben Sira, who may allude to our passage in Sir. xl. 16, uses the phrase **עַל־יִבְלֵי נַיִם** in connection with the flower called *shushan* in Sir. xlix. 8. This writer is fond of the psalms.

19. For **יבצלעי** read **לִפְצָעַי** with Herz (cp. xxxviii. 18., and for **ונאספו** read **שָׁנְאֵי** (ש and ס confounded, י and ו; פ inserted). *G kai kat' éμou*, corrupted from *kai eis τραύματα éμou*. So Herz.

20. For M's **ולא ידעת נכים** (G **ננעים**, *μάστιγες*) read **בְּנֵי בְּתוּרֹנֵי יִרְחֵאֵל פְּתוּרֹנֵי** (cp. on *v.* 11*b*). The editor did his best with fragments of the text.—For **קראנו בלענוהו וואדמו** read **קָרָאנוּ בְּלַעְנוּהוּ**. Cp. *l.* 32 (*v.* 25). Lines 21 and 22, as restored, confirm one another. Ol., Bi., Che.⁽¹⁾, Bā., Kau. read for **נכים, נכרים**, but 'aliens' have no place in this context, nor can we easily, with Bertholet (*Die Stellung*, 185) illustrate **נכרים** by lxix. 9, where **נִכְרֵי** is clearly equivalent to **פְּנִכְרֵי** as if 'נ' could be applied to born Jews. On cxiv. 7 f., 11, see note.

21. For **מיעוג לעני בהנפי לעני** G apparently reads **לְעֵנִי לְעֵנִי** (or **לְעֵנִי**?) **לְעֵנִי**. Since **בהן** cannot mean 'to vex,' critics in general have at once rejected this, though Wellh. adopts **לְעֵנִי לְעֵנִי** (improbable). Herz proposes **בְּהֵנִי** (from **הנן**) which is scarcely possible. We., doubtfully, **מִיְחַרְפֵּי**. Read perhaps for *a* **לְעֵנִי לְעֵנִי** (cp. xxii. 8 f.). **לֵי** fell out, **ל** being liable to confusion with **נִי** (the letter which follows in M). For *b* I propose **יִבְיַעִי** [ביו]; the former word corresponds to **מִיְעוּג**, while **בוז** fell out through its resemblance to **בִּיעוּ**. This, however, is only a possible and suitable conjecture.

22. Omit **אדני** (*v.* 17), an editorial insertion, and for **כנה תראה** read **פְּנִי־אֲרִיָּה טִרְף** (xxii. 14); **ת** (= ט) may be a fragment of **טִרְף**. For **הרק** read **הֲרָקוּ** (Bi.). Cp. on xvii. 5.

23. M **מישׂאיהם**. Ol., Dy, Gr., Che.⁽¹⁾, We. trace here **שׂאֵנִי** 'to roar.' But it is quite as easy and produces a better sense to read **מִרְשָׁעִים**.—For **יהדתני** read **הִתְנִי** (see on xxii. 21), and for **פפירים** read **פְּפִירִים** (xxxiv. 11).

24. Verse 18 (a hexameter) in M supplies the place of a lost line.

25. The constructions **לֵי אִיבֵי שֶׁקֶר** and **שָׁנְאֵי הַנֶּם** are very questionable; the theories in Kōn., *Synt.*, p. 236, n. 1, are improbable. Read **אֶל־יִשְׁמַחֲרֵלִי עֶרֶב וְכוּשׁ יִשְׁמַעֲאֵל** [עמלק]. Cp. on xxxviii. 20, lxix. 5. Omit **ישקר שנאי**, based on a dittographed **ישקר שנאי**.

26. Omit וְ (Bi.), and read עֲנִי (lxxvi. 10); this was miswritten ונעי; hence רנעי. The improbable word רַנֵּעַ was unknown to the ancient interpreters (cp. S). נַנְעִי (Hal., *Rev. sé'm.* iii. 50 f.) is not suitable.

27. M דְּבַרֵי נְרִמֹת יַהֲשִׁבֹן. Bi. and Du. keep this, but it makes an unsuitable parallel to the next line. דְּבַרֵי too is suspicious; in the parallel instances (lxv. 4, cv. 27, cxxxvii. 3, cxlv. 5) it seems to be corrupt. Read בְּכַפְּרִים יַחֲרָקֵי שֵׁן (cp. Lam ii. 16). The elements have been ingeniously worked up, so that no single word of the corrupt reading corresponds to any single word of the Hebrew text.—Omit the superfluous יַעֲלֵי.

28. M רָאָתָה עֵינָיו. Not a natural exclamation for these ruffians. Read probably רָאָה הַתְּפִשְׁנוּהוּ; cp. *l.* 32.

30 f. For הַעֲרָה read עֲרָה. In *b* אדני (a gloss) has taken the place of הַקִּיצָה.—Omit יהוה.

32. מ אֱלֹהֵי־אֲנָרוֹ בְּלַעֲנוּהוּ (end of *v.* 25) is a correction of the corrupt אֱלֹהֵי־אֲנָרוֹ בְּלַבָּם. For the obscure נַפְשֵׁנוּ ('our appetite'?) read certainly with Houb., Lowth, Street, הַתְּפִשְׁנוּהוּ, a suitable || to בֹּל'. Metre requires הָאֵה to be supplied before בֹּל'.

33. M הַמְּגִדִילִים. Read certainly הַפְּלִעֵגִים (see on xxxviii. 17, lv. 13).—34.—In *a* insert יַחֲדֹו (metre). The insertions in *v.* 26*a*, *v.* 27*b*, and *v.* 28 (noticed by Du.) come from xl. 15 (שְׂמִחוּ for הַפְּצִי), xl. 17, and lxxi. 24 respectively. כִּלְהֵיִם should be בְּקֶהֱל רָב; cp. on lxix. 20, lxxi. 8, 15, 24.

PSALM XXXVI.—I.

A FRAGMENT of a psalm on the wickedness of Israel's oppressors. For its tendency, see the opening note. The text is specially corrupt, and the original meaning may have been further obscured by editorial manipulation. Still the parallel passages, x. 1-7 and xiv., enable us to correct the errors with considerable probability. Like Ps. xiv. the passage is in pentameters.

Deposited. Of 'Arab-athan.

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| | | 1 |
| 1 | No judgment [of Yahwè] for the prince of Jerahmeel, | 2 |
| | No God-given terror for the leader of Edom : | |
| | For Yahwè covers his eyes from the guilt of Ishmael. | 3 |

He speaks but of harm and deceit, | he has ceased to act
wisely :¹ 4
Harm [and sorrow] and violence | are all his devices, 5
He persists in every bad course, | he abhors not evil.

1-3. The statement that there is *no judgment* for the tyrant reminds us of the complaints in lxxiii. 11 ff. (reading וְאִמָּר). The psalmist is tempted to despair of a recompense for faith. Ps. xiv. is, therefore, only parallel in part, for there it is the oppressor who says that God is inactive—practically non-existent, but here it is a psalmist of Israel who, arguing from the experience of the moment, declares that there is no judgment. There too the psalmist points forward to a sudden terror (פַּחַד) which will beset the wicked, but here no such God-given terror is expected for the princes of Edom. So too in

x. 1 the psalmist does but complain to Yahwè that He covers His eyes, but here, forgetting his privilege of 'pouring out his complaint' to his God, the speaker lays it down as a fact that Yahwè has turned away, without attempting to alter the fact by the persuasions of believing prayer. *The prince of Jerahmeel* (cp. lxxviii. 22, cx. 6) is a personification of his people; cp. Isa. x. 12 ff. In lli. 3, 'Jerahmeel' is again personified; cp. also xiv. 1.

4-6. Cp. x. 4, 7.—לְהַשְׁכִּיל .
Cp. xiv. 2, יִתְנַצֵּב—הִישׁ מִשְׁכִּיל .
Cp. i. 1, עֵבֶד .

Critical Notes. 1 f. M נֶאֱמַר פִּשְׁעֵי, 'an oracle of rebellion'? But though נֶאֱמַר might, irregularly, introduce the title of a post-exilic prophecy, it is, from an exegetical point of view, not possible here; I marvel that Duhm should not see this. נֶעִים or נֵעִים (Kr., Gr., Diestel) however, is too slight a correction. Parallelism suggests that the initial נֶאֱמַר may represent אֵין; and the sense seems to require מוֹשֵׁפֶט [יְהוּדָה]. Cp. x. 5, 6).—M לְרָשָׁע בְּקָרֵב לְבִי . G S J, and two edd. of T, presuppose לְבִי, and a host of critics (Houb., Dathe, Lowth, Ew., Ol., Che.⁽¹⁾, Kau., Beer, We.) adopt this. This expedient, however, implies that the rest of the line is altogether, or nearly, correct, which is not the case. We shall find a number of cases in which לֵב conceals a fragment of יִרְחַמְאֵל (see on lxxiii. 1, lxxvi. 6); קָרֵב too (cp. בְּרִכְאֵל, Job xxxii. 2) probably represents a part of the same word. Read לְשֵׁר יִרְחַמְאֵלִים (cp. lxxviii. 22, cx. 6).—M לְנֶגֶד עֵינָיו . Weak. Read probably לְנֶגֶד אָדָם; כִּי = נִי .

3. M בִּיהַחֲלִיק אֱלֹהֵי בְעֵינָיו . Evidently corrupt; no help from the versions. What is the subject of 'הָ? Can אֱלֹהֵי mean 'with reference to Yahwè'? Palliatives are We.'s suggestion of אֲמָרוֹ (cp. Prov. ii. 16, vii. 5) and Buhl's of אֲלֵרֵעָהוּ (cp. Prov. xxix. 5), for אֱלֹהֵי (we might add אֱלֹהֵיהוּ, cp. cxlv. 12, lxxvii. 3). But בְּעֵינָיו is also suspicious, and the whole line has to be brought into fuller accordance

¹ To act well.

with lines 1 and 2. Remembering x. 1^b we can hardly help reading, **הַעֲלִים אֱלֹהִים [יהוה] עֵינָיו**. An imperfect ק might be misread as ס, and the corruptions of אֱלֹהִים in the Psalms are numerous.—**מִלְמִצָּה עֹנֵנו לְשֹׁנָה**. The first word or the third is clearly superfluous, and neither word suits the context. We.'s **לְמַד** is too remote; Herz's **לְאַמֵּץ** would require **לְבו**. Both **לְמִצָּה** and **לְשֹׁנָה** appear to represent an ethnic, and that ethnic is **יִשְׂמִיעֵאלִים** (cp. on **לְשׁוֹנָם**, lxiv. 9). Read **מִעֲוֹן יִשׂ**.

5. Sense and metre require **אָנוּ [וְעַמָּל] וְחָמָס כָּל־יְהוֹשִׁבְתָּנוּ**; note Pasek. Cp. lvi. 6.

6. Read **בְּכִלְדָּרָךְ** (G), with Herz, who also suggests **בְּרִיעַ** (B precedes).

PSALM XXXVI.—2.

TRIMETERS. A fragment of a meditation on Yahwè's lovingkindness and righteousness from which none are excluded (for God is the gracious Lord of the whole world), but which is specially to be felt in the temple. There faithful Jews can almost forget their perilous position; they are like guests at a rich banquet. But ere they depart, they pray for deliverance from their wicked oppressors, or, in other words, that lovingkindness and righteousness may still be displayed towards Israel. It is a mistake to suppose *v.* 13 has come from another context. In the true text the connexion is unbroken. Note the allusion to P in *v.* 7 (*l.* 4). Ps. lxiii. (corrected text) is parallel. This psalm supplements xxxvi.¹; see *l.* 5.

- | | | |
|----|---|----|
| 1 | Thy lovingkindness is as high as the heavens, | 6 |
| | And thy faithfulness as the skies. | |
| | Thy righteousness is like mount Jerahmeel, | 7 |
| | Thy justice is like the great abyss. | |
| | Edom and Rehoboth thou wilt subdue ; | |
| | How precious is thy lovingkindness, O Yahwè ! | 8 |
| | The sufferers of thy people sing for joy, | |
| | Under the shadow of thy wings they find refuge ; | |
| | They feast on the richness of thy house, | 9 |
| 10 | With the stream of thy delicacies thou refreshest them. | |
| | For beside thee is the fountain of life, | 10 |
| | By thy light we see light. | |
| | Preserve thy lovingkindness for those that know thee, | 11 |
| | And thy righteousness for the upright in heart. | |
| | Let not the foot of pride tread upon me, | 12 |
| | Nor the hand of the wicked put me to flight ; | |
| | Let the workers of harm fall, | 13 |
| 18 | Let them be thrust down, and not be able to rise. | |

1 ff. So lvii. 11, ciii. 11.—*Mount Ferahmeel*, i.e. the mountains of the Negeb. See crit. n. The received text, however, has 'God's mountains,' a fine phrase, though unsuitable in an address to Yahwè. Cp. xc. 2, Prov. viii. 25, Job xv. 7, Mic. vi. 2, Hab. iii. 6. The Elohim themselves dwelt on a mountain (Ezek. xxviii. 14, cp. Isa. xiv. 13), and mountain-tops were specially sacred, like the stars (Isa. xiv. 13) and the cedar-trees (lxxx. 11, civ. 16).—*Thy justice*. The traditional reading 'thy judgments' is obscure; it might mean either 'thy punishments' or 'thy decisions' (see crit. n.) How is God's justice like the *great abyss* (Gen. vii. 11, P)? Because it is unsearchable (Rom. xi. 33, where 'thy judgments,' plural, occurs; cp. Job xi. 9, 'deeper than Sheol,' of the divine wisdom)? Rather because the 'great abyss' is the source of all the regular, beneficent waters of the earth. Thus solidity and fulness are the two qualities predicated of the divine righteousness. This 'righteousness' (Street, 'bounty') may be viewed as the carrying out in act of 'lovingkindness.'—*Edom and Rehoboth*, &c. An allusion to xxxvi.⁽¹⁾ The editorial substitute, however, is fine, 'Man and beast thou dost deliver.' בְּהֵמָה here means the animal world in general (Gen. iii. 14, Prov. xxx. 30, Eccles. iii. 19, 21, Ps. xlix. 13 [plur.], but lxxiii. 22 is corrupt). But a reference to a concrete deliverance is required.

7. **The sufferers of thy people.** The text-reading, 'the human race' (see crit. n.), if correct, would have to be explained on the analogy of xii. 2b, xiv. 2a, where the Jews represent the human race, as being the central people; lxv. 3 and || passages, which are corrupt, cannot be quoted here. But so soon after l. 5, where אָדָם is used of men in general, without any implied reference to the privileged

position of Israel, this is not likely. Besides, on the analogies mentioned, the phrase בְּנֵי אָדָם would imply blame. See crit. n.

8. The spirit of Elohim is represented as if a great bird in Gen. i. 3; in Dt. xxxii. 11 f. Yahwè himself is likened to an eagle. Cp. xvii. 8, lvii. 2, lxi. 5, and the || passage lxiii. 7; also Ruth ii. 12.

9. See on xxiii. 5. דְּשֵׁן; cp. lxiii. 6, Isa. lv. 2, Jer. xxxi. 13.

10. נַחַל, a perennial stream (see v. 10a), metaphorically, as Mic. vi. 7, Job xx. 17. Cp. נַחֲרָר, xlvi. 5. *Thy delicacies*, שְׂקִינִים, as Isa. xxv. 6.

There is no reference to 'Eden,' as interpreters of M's text suppose.

11 f. **The fountain of life.** Cp. Jer. ii. 13, xvii. 13, Prov. xiii. 14, xiv. 27. The tree of life is not mentioned in the Psalms (but four times in Prov.). Both tree and river of life occur in Rev. xxii. 1 f. The Chaldaean legend says that Istar found it in the nether world when she returned to revive Tammuz (*Dû'ûzu*). *By thy light*, &c. Cp. iv. 7. Life and light are parallel; cp. Job iii. 16, 20, Ps. xlix. 20, lvi. 14. G finds the hope of immortality (*ὀψόμεθα φῶς*; cp. *Ps. Sol.* iii. 16), and no doubt there is a Messianic touch in the expression. It is but a foretaste of coming bliss that can as yet be enjoyed by the pious.

16. הִתְנַדְּנִי. To 'wander' is a vivid term for exile or dispersion (lix. 12, Gen. iv. 12, 14, 2 K. xxi. 8), which involved for individuals the danger of beggary (cix. 10, cp. Prov. xxvii. 8) and for the community religious inanition (cp. Hos. iii. 4).

17 f. See introd. and crit. note. The *workers of harm* are primarily the N. Arabians (see the parallelism in Ps. xiv., lines 7, 8).

Critical Notes. 1. M יהוה בהשמים. Here are two difficulties. 1. The unsynocopated ה, and 2. the omission of the 'tertium comparationis.' The parallels for the first (2 K. vii. 12, see Klo.; Neh. ix. 19) are very doubtful. lvii. 11 might suggest that נָדוּל had dropped out; but בה suggests that עַד has been lost, and that prefixed to עַד was נְבִיָּה (cp. ciii. 11). Psalm xxxvi.⁽²⁾ being a fragment, יהוה was prefixed by the early editor to clear up the sense.—3. M בְּהַרְרֵי יֵאֵל. Read בְּהַרְרֵי חַמָּאֵל.

4-6. Read probably **כִּי־שִׁפְטֶךָ**; cp. on lxxii. 1.—Read **כִּי־תִהְיֶה** [כִּי־], with Hal.; **כ** precedes.—M **תוֹשִׁיעַ**, a supposed allusion to the deliverance of Noah and his animals. But if **מִשְׁפָּטֶיךָ** were correct, and meant ‘thy punishments’ (see above), we should not expect to find deliverance referred to. Read probably **יְהוָה־תִּכְבֹּשׁ** (see xxxvi. ⁴).—**יְהוָה** at the end of *v.* 7 is a (correct) variant to **אֱלֹהִים** in *v.* 8.

7. M **וּבְנֵי־אָדָם**, spoiling the structure of the stanza. **וּבְנֵי** does double duty. As a whole it represents a missing verb—**רָנְנוּ** [י], while **בְּנֵי** represents a word in regimen with **אָדָם** (?). **בְּנֵי־אָדָם**, however, though retained by Du., cannot be original (see note above); **עַמִּי־עָמְדָה** is the most suitable correction. Gr. **בְּנֵי־אֱבִיוֹן**.

9f. Read probably **יִרְוֶינִי**.—M **עֲדָנֶיךָ**. **עֲדָנִים** only here. 2 S. i. 24, Jer. li. 34 need correction. ‘Very doubtful; perhaps connected with **עֲטִין**, Job xxi. 24’ (We.); but **עֲטִין** is even more doubtful. Read most probably **יִשְׁכְּנֶיךָ** (Isa. xxv. 6). See note above.

13. M **כִּי־שָׂדֶךְ**. It is usual to render ‘prolong,’ and to group this passage with lxxxv. 6, cix. 12, Jer. xxxi. 3, Neh. ix. 30. In lxxxv. 6 this sense is suitable, but in the other passages it produces a forced interpretation. What we require here (and similarly in cix. 12, Jer. xxxi. 3) is ‘Be faithful to thy covenant of lovingkindness, so that the arrogant and the wicked may not oppress me.’ It would be a poor expedient to reach the sense by invoking the aid of Arabic, and rendering **כִּי־שָׂדֶךְ** ‘make firm.’ Clearly we must read **נִשְׁכַּר**; **ש** and **כ** were occasionally transposed, so that **שָׂמַר** became **נִשְׁמַר**; then **ר**, naturally enough, was mistaken for **ך**. In Neh. ix. 30, too, the text must be corrupt; the various supposed ellipses are equally intolerable. Read **וַתִּתְחַסֵּם**.

15. M **תְּבוֹאֲנֵי**. Read **תְּבוֹסֲנֵי** (Gr., Hal.); cp. Isa. xli. 25 (*SBOT*).

17. M **נִשְׂם־נִפְלֹא**, **דָּחִי**, **יִכְלֹא**, either referring to an early experience of the sudden collapse of the seeming prosperity of the wicked (Ol.), or perfects of prophetic certainty (Del., Bā., Davidson), or precative perfects (Kön., *Synt.*, § 172b). Kön. advocates the third view, as producing a connexion with *v.* 12. Du. suggests that *v.* 13 may be a remnant of the continuation of *vv.* 2-5; metre, however, does not favour this view. The probability is that **נִשְׂם** is a remnant of **רִשְׁעִים**. The eye of the scribe may have wandered to the preceding line, in which **רִשְׁעִים** was rightly given. The verbs should probably be **יִכְלֹא**, **יִדָּחֵהוּ**, **יִפְלֹא** [cp. Kön.]. The corruption of **ר** into **שְׂם** would lead to the alteration of the imperfects into perfects, perhaps with a reminiscence of **יִשְׂם־פָּחַדוּ**, xiv. 5, where, however, **יִשְׂם** is certainly a corruption of **רִשְׁעִים**. The contrast between

l. 12 f. and *l.* 13 f. now becomes natural and striking. The psalmists constantly write, 'Let me be delivered, but let mine enemies be overthrown.'

PSALM XXXVII.

TRIMETERS. An alphabetical psalm (like ix.-x.), with only a few lacunæ. The four-line stanzas possess a pleasing symmetry, and warmth and sincerity of feeling. The psalm should be read with Pss. xxxix., xlix., lxxiii., cxi. f. Observe (1) the respect for poverty, unknown to the hymns of the Rig Veda, and (2) the insistence on the doctrine of earthly retribution, and on the imminence of a great and final judgment. Naturally there are points of contact between this psalm and the Books of Proverbs and Job. The awful mystery of Providence is, however, more superficially treated here than in Job. Like the author of Ps. xci. the psalmist sympathizes with the first speech of Eliphaz; hence perhaps his two references to personal experience (*vv.* 25, 35 f.; cp. Job iv. 12 ff., v. 3). Its alphabetic form, literary affinities, and didactic character alike prove it to be one of the later psalms. In three stanzas probably the Jerahmeelites are referred to by name.

On the treatment of the problem of retribution in Pss. xxxvii., xxxix., lxxiii. cp. Couard, *Th. St. u. Kr.* 1901, pp. 10 ff.

Of 'Arab-ethan.

- | | | |
|----|---|----|
| | | 1 |
| 1 | Be not incensed at evil doers, | |
| | Nor enraged at those who practice injustice ; | |
| | For they will quickly fade away like grass, | 2 |
| | And wither like the green herbs. | |
| | Trust in Yahwè, and take refuge in him, | 3 |
| | Seek lovingkindness and faithfulness ; | |
| | Then wilt thou have enjoyment of Yahwè, | 4 |
| | And he will grant thee thy heart's petitions. | |
| | Yahwè redeemeth the crushed, | 5 |
| 10 | Rely upon him and he will succour ; | |
| | He will make thine innocence as clear as the light, | 6 |
| | And thy just claim as the noonday. | |
| | Wait quietly on Yahwè, and patiently expect him, | 7 |
| | * * * * * | |
| | Be not incensed at one whose course prospers, | |
| | At the man who carries out +wicked+ devices. | |
| | Desist from anger, forsake wrath, | 8 |
| | Be not incensed at Jerahmeel ; | |
| | For evil-doers will be cut off, | 9 |
| 20 | The Jerahmeelites will be rooted out. | |
| | Yet a little while, and the wicked will be no more, | 10 |
| | When thou markest his place, he will be gone. | |
| | The sufferers will inherit the land, | 11 |
| | And will enjoy an abundance of peace. | |

	The wicked plots against the righteous,	12
	And gnashes his teeth at him ;	
	The Lord laughs at him,	13
	For He sees his day ⁺ of woe ⁺ coming.	
	The wicked draw the sword ¹	14
30	² To slay the upright in heart.	
	Their sword will pierce their own heart,	15
	And their bows will be broken.	
	Better is the little of the righteous,	16
	Than the great wealth of the wicked ;	
	For the arms of the wicked will be broken,	17
	But Yahwè upholds the righteous.	
	Yahwè regards the concerns of the blameless,	18
	And their possession will remain for ever ;	
	They will not be put to shame in the evil time,	19
40	And in the days of famine they will be satisfied.	
	For those who are blessed by him will possess the land,	22
	And those who are cursed by him will be cut off.	
	For ³ Yahwè's enemies will perish like locusts,	20
	All of them will be crushed like moths.	
	The wicked borrows and cannot pay,back,	21
	But the righteous shows pity and gives ;	
	* * * * *	
	* * * * *	
	The steps of the righteous are guided by Yahwè ;	23
50	He tests him, and searches out his conduct ;	
	Should he fall, he will not lie prostrate,	24
	For Yahwè upholds his hand.	
	I have been young and now am become old,	25
	And never have I seen the righteous forsaken.	
	The posterity of Cushan [will be cut off],	
	The posterity of Jerahmeel [will be rooted out].	
	Shun evil and do good,	27
	Seek peace [and pursue it],	
	For Yahwè loves justice,	28
60	And forsakes not his pious ones.	

¹ And bend their bow.

² To lay low the suffering and the poor.

³ The wicked.

- Those that practice injustice will be destroyed,
 And the offspring of the wicked will be cut off.
 The righteous will possess the land, 29
 And dwell therein for ever.
- The mouth of the righteous utters wisdom, 30
 And his tongue speaks what is right.
 The law of his God is in his heart, 31
 His foot will not waver.
- The wicked watches the righteous, 32
 70 And seeks +occasion+ to slay him.
 Yahwè will not leave him in his power, 33
 Nor condemn him when he is judged.
- Hope in Yahwè, and keep his way, 34
 He will exalt thee that thou possess the land;
 * * * * *
- When the wicked are cut off, thou shalt look on.
- I have seen a wicked man exulting, 35
 And shouting for joy at his treasure ;
 But when I passed by +again+ lo, he was gone 36
 80 When I sought him, he could not be found.
- Preserve blamelessness, attach thyself to uprightness, 37
 For there is a future for a man of peace.
 But transgressors are destroyed together, 38
 The future of the wicked is cut off.
- The deliverance of the righteous comes from Yahwè, 39
 He is their refuge in time of trouble.
 Yahwè helps them and rescues them,¹ 40
 He delivers them because they trust in him.

1 f. Almost a repetition of Prov. xxiv. 19; cp. also Prov. iii. 31 (תבחר) should, of course, be תתחר, Gr.), xxiii. 17, xxiv. 1, Ps. lxxiii. 3. Here, at any rate, the 'evil-doers' are the Jerahmeelite intruders in Judæa. Cp. // 18, 20, 56, 78.—אֱלֹהֵי־תִקְנָה. ק' means the glow of passionate excitement which would fain bring down fire

from heaven, and which, if unchecked, may lead to the denial of God's righteousness (see xlix. 6, 17, lxxiii. 3).

7. תתענג. So *L.* 24. Cp. Job xxii. 26, xxvii. 10, Isa. lviii. 14.

9. נִדְפָה; see crit. n. on Ps. ix.-x., *L.* 53. The third stanza is now consecutive.

11 f. Cp. Job xi. 17, Isa. lviii. 10.

¹ He rescues them from the wicked.

13. דָּוִם (for דָּוִם); cp. lxii. 2 (corr. text), 6.

18. **Who makes haste, &c.** See *v.* 16*b*, and cp. xlix. 16, lxxiii. 7 f. A distinct reference to the danger of seeking riches is indispensable in such a psalm. See crit. n.

23. **The sufferers, i.e.** 'the opposite party to the wicked,' as Joseph Mede (*Works*, 161) long ago saw. Cp. on ix. 13.—*Inherit the land.* Similarly *l.* 41, 63, 74. Cp. xxv. 13, 1 Chr. xxviii. 8 (Mt. v. 5).

28. **His day, i.e.** the day on which he was to perish; cp. Job iii. 3, 'the day wherein I was to be born'; xviii. 20. 'astonished at his day (of ruin).'

29 f. For the idea, cp. vii. 15 ff., ix. 16 ff., xxxv. 8.

43 f. See crit. n.—45 f. The wicked man is so straitened that he cannot pay his debts. The good man is so prosperous that he can afford even to give to the (righteous) poor.

49 f. A quotation from Prov. xx.

24; cp. Prov. xvi. 9, xxiv. 16, Jer. x. 23.—*He tests him.* Cp. xxvi. 2.—

נָּבַר is, of course, too large a term; the psalmist quotes a general statement, and then applies it to a special section of mankind.

53 f. Cp. Prov. x. 3, xiii. 25.—57 f. Quoted from xxxiv. 15.

69. צֹפָה; cp. ix.—x., *l.* 53 (x. 8, (corr. text).—72. *Nor condemn him.* It is the controversy of opposed nations, in which Yahwè is the Judge (so Ol.).

77–80. See introd. The N. Arabian oppressors are accused of enriching themselves by violence, as in lii. 9, lxii. 11 (corr. text). See crit. note.

82, 84. אֲהָרִית, rendered *ἐκγονα* by G in Prov. xxiii. 11, xxiv. 20. 'Future,' however, is probably the true meaning in the passages where it is usually rendered 'posterity.' 'The future . . . is cut off' (*l.* 84) is quite intelligible (so *cix.* 13; cp. Prov. xxiii. 18*b*). See Duhm's note, and Frankenberg on Prov. xxiii. 18.

Critical Notes. 5 f. M וְעִשְׂה־טוֹב (from *l.* 57). Read וְחִסְה־בו.—M שֹׁכֵן אֶרֶץ וְרַעַה אֲמוֹנָה. Del., We., Kau., Dri., 'Dwell in the land, and cherish fidelity.' Ew., Bâ., 'Then wilt thou dwell in the land, and have secure pasturage.' There is a similar division among the Greek interpreters. 'A S'. καὶ νέμουν πίστιν. S καὶ ποιμαίνου διηνεκάς. G, καὶ κατασκήνου τῆν γῆν και ποιμανθήσῃ ἐπὶ τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτῆς (cf. G, *v.* 16), which only differs from 'A Se. in the adoption of הַמִּוֹנָה for אֲמוֹנָה—a manifest error. In fact, 'A Se., Schultens, Ew., Bâ. give an interpretation not wholly without plausibility. The adverbial use of אֲמוֹנָה, 'securely,' presents no difficulty (Ges.—Kau., § 118 *q*), and the description of Canaan as a pasture is familiar to all (Ezek. xxxiv. 14 ff.; Mic. vii. 14). Del.'s view, on the other hand, supposes two quite dissimilar statements to be co-ordinated. Elsewhere in the psalm, 'dwelling in the land' is the happy prospect held out to the good; שֹׁכֵן אֶרֶץ, if correct, certainly ought to be a promise here. But, however plausible, Ew.'s explanation of רַעַה אֲמוֹנָה will not bear examination. If the image of a pasture had presented itself to the writer's mind, it would have found clearer expression (אֲמוֹנָה is vague) and much more elaborate treatment. There is a corruption of the text, and it can very easily be healed. Cp. xxxiv. 15*b*, and correct שֹׁכֵן אֶרֶץ accordingly into בְּקֶשׁ הַקָּד (cp. on *l.* 58). Similar letters in sound or appearance were

confounded. רעה is superfluous; it has arisen out of a dittographed חסד (ס and ע, ה and ה confounded).

9 f. M גול על־יהודה דרפק. One might plausibly read גל אל (cp. Jer. xi. 20, xx. 12?) with G S T. But, in the light of xxii. 9, we must read גאל יהודה לנדפה ו. גול in ובטח is a fragment of ה.—M יעשה. Read ישיע; see on xxii. 32b.

13. M ויהתהולל לו. The Hithpolel of הול occurs elsewhere only in (a) Job xv. 20, and (b) Jer. xxiii. 19. But in (a) read כתהילל with Beer, and in (b) כתגולל with Giesebrecht. If התה were correct, it should mean 'suffer pain.' Read והוהל; ה and ל were dittographed. So, too, I should read in Job xxxv. 14b (for תהולל), where Beer's תיחל seems less probable after דום (M רין).

18. M אף להרע, 'it tendeth only to evil-doing' (R.V., Driver). But the expression is 'very awkward' (Ol.), and it spoils the parallelism. Duhm (who renders 'only to one's own injury') compares the phrase in xv. 4c. The comparison is helpful, but only for emendation of the text. Read בירחמיאל. The letters are shifted up in M. The י dropped out; ב, ה and נ became כ, ה and ע respectively. ירה is, in fact, often mutilated thus. Halévy, אץ להרע.

20. M וקני יהודה המה יירשו ארץ. Too long for a trimeter, and an undue anticipation of l. 23. 'Jerahmeelites' has once more been broken up and transformed; the proper verb was also first misread, then broken up and expanded. Read וירחמיאלים ישרשו (cp. lii. 7).

29 f. Omit להפיל עני ואביון ודרכו קשתם and ישרידרף. Read with G and 18 MSS. of Kenn. and de R., לב (vii. 11); Jer. combines the readings. The corruption was easy.

34. M הכון; G πλοῦτον (πολύν). Read הון. B D B 'abundance, wealth'; cf. Eccles. v. 9, Isa. lx. 5. Siegfried (*Prediger*, 52) gives this sense to הכון in Ezek. v. 12 (read vii. 12), but S S and B D B propose 'multitude'; 'noisy throng' seems the meaning (so Isa. v. 14). In Isa. lx. 5 הכון ים should be הכון עפים (xvii. 12). In Eccles. v. 9 הכון is not a natural parallel to כסף; it is no doubt a *lapsus calami* for הון; the same correction is expedient in Ezek. xxix. 19, xxx. 4 (in interpolated clauses; see Co.), for what gain would there be in choosing a less natural expression? It is possible that in G's time הכון was already supposed to mean sometimes 'riches,' but this only shows how early הון and הכון were confounded by the scribes, just as פי became פני and (the reverse process) עינוד became ינוד. B D B, therefore, should

notice that the text is repeatedly very doubtful. Read here הוֹן.—M רַבִּים; unsuitable. The error was produced by המון. Read רב (G, We.).

37. M יְמֵי, an error produced by תְּמִימִים. Read דרכי (G, Gr., We.). Cf. *l.* 9; i. 6.

41 f. The transposition of *l.* 22 was suggested by Brüll.

43 f. 'The whole verse (20) is no doubt corrupt' (Dy.). First, as to פִּיקָר כְּרִים (point so; cf. Kön., ii. 1, p. 240). יִקָּר is an Aramaism (cp. Kön., ii. 1, p. 498) which occurs occasionally in late writings beginning with Jer. xx. 5, but nowhere again in Pss., except in xlix. 13, 21, where the text is corrupt. It is true, M points כ' פִּיקָר, *i.e.* it takes יִקָּר to be the constr. st. of the adj. יִקָּר. This implies the rendering, 'like the most precious part of the (sacrificial) lambs,' *i.e.* the fat (so Kenn. takes it, *Remarks*, 191). A most unsuitable sense here. But surely the artificial phrase 'like the preciousness of the meadows' is hardly more admissible. פָּרִים does not mean 'meadows' (see on lxxv. 14). Gr. proposes כִּירֶק הָרִים; cf. *ll.* 3, 4, and for הָרִים, cxlvii. 8. But the reference to 'smoke' in *l.* 42 conflicts with this. Hence Burgess (1879) and Wellh. propose פִּיקָד (Isa. x. 16), followed by פָּרִים, 'pastures' (Bur.) or פָּרִים, 'ovens' (We.). But is the sense produced natural? As soon as we have corrected *l.* 42, we shall see what the poet may have written in *l.* 41. We pass on, then, to פָּלוּ בִּיעֲשֹׂן פָּלוּ. The double פָּלוּ is very suspicious (cf. lxxviii. 3a); for the second we should have expected יְמִיהֶם (cii. 4). But is בִּיעֲשֹׂן right? Certainly בֵּ should rather be פֵּ (G S J, many MSS.), and in Isa. li. 6 כַּעֲשֹׂן is a mistake for כַּעֵשׂ; the verb which follows should be read נִדְפְּאוּ (see *SBOT*), and the same verb has probably been corrupted here into פָּלוּ. Read פָּלֵם בִּיעֲשֹׂן נ'. Now we see how to correct כִּיקָר כְּרִים; this should be כִּי יֵאָבְדוּ אֵיבֵי יְהוָה פְּדֹנָבִים. For parallels see crit. note on xc. 9b, and cf. *Enc. Bib.*, 'Locusts' and 'Moths.' Observe that the traditional rendering of the text is unknown to G (*ἄμα τῷ δοξασθήναι αὐτοὺς καὶ ἰψωθήναι*).

49. M כִּיצַעְרֵי־גֶבֶר פּוֹנְנוּ (cf. Prov. xx. 24), against context. צַעְרֵי here does double duty. It forms part of two distinct words which stood together, viz. כִּיצַע and צַדִּיק. ק in the latter word is represented by נ in גֶּבֶר. מִכִּיצַע בְּרִכּוֹנֵנוּ should be יִבְהַנְנֵנוּ, which belongs to *l.* 50.—M וְדַרְבּוֹ יִהְיֶה, a relative clause with אֲשֶׁר omitted (Bä.)? This seems to be against metre and parallelism. Perles, 'his way he makes straight,' com-

paring Job xl. 17 (?). Should we not read וְרָכְבוּ יַחְפֵּשׂ (Lam. iii. 40), with Herz?

55 f. The words וּזְרָעוֹ מִבְּקֵשׁ-לַחֵם make a fifth line to the stanza. Duhm supposes it to have been misplaced; he puts it between *v.* 20*a* and 20*b*. He has also a very plausible suggestion for *v.* 26*b*, which, emending זָרְעוֹ, he reads וּזְרָאוֹ לְבִרְכָה (rather short for a trimeter). He makes no objection to *v.* 26*a*, which describes the righteous man as constantly 'showing pity and lending,' though in *v.* 21 he is described as 'showing pity and *giving*,' and though after *v.* 25 we seem to require the mention of something more closely connected with the deliverance of the righteous from cruel enemies than the statement of the righteous man's constant compassionateness. But here, as so often, the most obvious solutions of textual problems are not the best. Possibly the editor had before him an already corrupted text. But he certainly wished, living perhaps long after the psalmist, to efface the indications of mere temporary national dangers, and it is possible that a more critical editor would still have discerned the ethnic 'Jerahmeel.' That לַחֵם, כְּלֵי-הַיּוֹם, and בְּרָכָה are elsewhere corruptions of יִרְחִמְאֵל is practically certain; לְבִרְכָה is still more plausibly viewed as a distorted 'ירח', and וּמְלוּוֹה may very possibly be another. As to מִבְּקֵשׁ, the ב may possibly have come from ר, and belong to לַחֵם (a fragment of 'ירח'), and מִקֵּשׁ = קֵשֶׁם (cp. מִשְׁקֵם in Gen. xv. 2) is very probably a corruption of בְּשֵׁם. חוֹנוֹן seems an insertion from *v.* 21. Read, therefore, comparing line 20—

זָרַע בְּשֵׁם [יִפְרֵת]
וּזְרָע יִרְחִמְאֵל [יִשְׂרָשׁ]

58. M וּשְׁכֹן לְעוֹלָם. Read בְּקֵשׁ שְׁלֹם [וְרִדְפֵהוּ]. Cp. on *l.* 6 From xxxiv. 15*b*.

61. M נִשְׁכָּרוּ לְעוֹלָם; so J S T. But the first word should begin with ע, and נִשְׁכָּרוּ is elsewhere reflexive. After *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα φυλαχθήσονται* G gives *ἀνομοὶ δὲ ἐκδιωχθήσονται* (so $\aleph^{c.34}$ A R T; B wrongly *ἄνομοι ἐκδικηθήσονται*), i.e. נִשְׁכָּרוּ לְעוֹלָם (cp. Job xxix. 7, G *παράνομοι*; so Houb., Kenn., Hu., Hi., Ley, Bā., &c.). This is too short for a line. Hence Bi., Che.¹¹, Du., Sievers insert לְעוֹלָם; לְעוֹלָם may have dropped out in M, לְעוֹלָם in G's text. But considering (1) that in *l.* 83 לְעוֹלָם does *not* occur, (2) that עוֹלָם in G generally = *ἄδικος*, once (Job xxix. 7) *παράνομος*, but never *ἀνομος*, and (3) that עוֹלָם nowhere occurs in Pss., while עֲשֵׂי עוֹלָה occurs in this very psalm (*l.* 2), Bö.'s suggestion to restore the latter phrase alone is to be preferred.

68 f. M G אֲשֶׁרִי . אֲשֶׁר being fem., אֲשֶׁר (sing.) is more natural. So Houb., Gr. Cp. Job xxxi. 7, אִם תִּטָּה אֲשֶׁרִי.—M צִוְּפָה. Frankenberg (*ZATW*, xv. 125) צִפּוֹן. But see on x. 8.

77 f. M עֲרִיץ, tautologically, for 'ע is a synonym for רִשָּׁע. G *ὑπερψούμενον*, perhaps נִעְלָה. Duhm's reading עֲלִיץ = עֲלִיז, or perhaps rather עֲלִיץ, seems better.—M וּמִתְעָרָה, 'emptying itself'? G S suggest מִתְעַלָּה (cp. יתעל, Jer. li. 3?) or מִתְנַשָּׂא. Herz remarks on the accumulation of ר, א, ע, ה, and ח in ll. 77 f., and suggests מִיִּשְׂרָיִשׁ. But since it is not the wicked *ἀπλῶς* whom at any rate the early psalmists denounce, but the N. Arabian oppressors, and since we have found the Jerahmeelites already spoken of (ll. 18, 20, 56), it is probable that מִתְעַרָּה is a corruption of יִרְחַמְאֵל (ל and ת are liable to confusion).—M בְּאַזְרָח רַעְנָן; J, 'sicut indigenam virentem'; A, *ὡς αὐτόχθων εὐθαλής* (Field); Σ, *ὡς ἐν δρυμῶ ὁ αὐτόματος ἀνατείλας εὐθαλής*. G has *ὡς τὰς κέδρους τοῦ Λιβάνου*; and so G in Aphraates (Bä.); J (*Anecd. Maredsol.* iii. 1, 43), 'sicut cedrum (Vg., cedros) Libani,' i.e. בְּאַרְז הַלְבָּנוֹן. So Hi., Dy., Gr., Bä., Che.⁽¹⁾, Kau., Du.; but We., Driv.(?), פְּאַרְז רַעְנָן. פְּאַרְז רַעְנָן is certainly an unfortunate word (see on lii. 10, xcii. 11), and some error is probable, but [ה]לְבָנוֹן is not the only possible one. If 'ומת' represents יִרְחַמְאֵל, clearly רַעְנָן must have come out of a participle, and עֲלִיץ, the adopted reading in l. 77, at once suggests כִּירְנָן (כ and ע easily confounded). בְּאַזְרָח presumably has come from בְּאַזְרָחָה (cp. lii. 9).

79. M וַיַּעֲבֵר. Read וַיַּעֲבֵר (G S J, Houb., Kenn., Hi., De., &c.).

81. Read יִשָּׂר תָּם (G S, Horsley, Street, Schorr, Kr., Gr., We., Du.).

85 f. Read תְּשׁוּעַת (S J, Gr., Bi., Che.⁽¹⁾, Bä., Kau., We.); also צָרָה הוּא, and continue יַעֲזְרֵם (Du.).

PSALM XXXVIII.

TRIMETERS. A psalm of complaint largely composed of reminiscences from Pss. vi., xxxi., xxxv., also from Isa. liii. (see on l. 25 f.). We can hardly say that a 'deep' sense of sin is expressed in it; the psalm is by no means entirely what we mean by 'penitential.'¹ The speaker does indeed admit himself to be guilty (ll. 7, 8), but he only infers his guilt from the magnitude of his affliction; he has no definite idea in what his guilt consists. He can only sigh and groan—he cannot truly 'confess' his sins (see on v. 19), and before uttering his last almost despairing cry he refers, quite simply and naturally, to his good deeds. The opposition of the Arabians, too, is a returning of evil for good (v. 21). That the speaker is the pious community is surely certain. The variety of the details of the description shows that it is allegorical, and this is confirmed by the closing

¹ *Christian Use of the Psalms*, 113 f.

stanza, which is a prayer, not for the healing of a malady, but for deliverance from enemies. That critical scholars like B. Jacob and Duhm should think otherwise is strange (cp. on Ps. vi.). It is *plausible* indeed to suppose that when לְהִזְכִּיר ('to bring to remembrance') was inserted in the title, the psalm was regarded as one suitable for a sick man to use in the confession of sin (B. Jacob, *ZATW*, xvii. 52, 63 ff.). If, however, we reject the ordinary view which finds a reference to the 'azkārū (Lev. xxiv. 7), it is best to explain לְהִזְכִּיר as a corruption of לְאֶזְרָחִי, 'of the Ezrahite,' and to suppose that there were two competing assignments of Ps. xxxviii., to David and to Ethan or Heman respectively. The case of Ps. xxxix. is exactly parallel. See also on Ps. lxx., title. In some MSS. of G. in the Syro-hex. text, and in the lately published Sahidic version, there is an addition to v. 21, which runs in the Greek thus, καὶ ἀπέριψάν με τὸν ἀγαπητὸν ὡσεὶ νεκρὸν ἐβδελυγμένον, whence derived we know not. See Field's *Hex.*, and Bā.'s note.

Marked: Of 'Arab-ethan: of [Ethan] the Ezrahite. Of the Ishmaelites.

- | | | |
|----|--|----|
| | | 1 |
| 1 | O Yahwè ! punish me not in thy +full+ indignation, | 2 |
| | Nor chastise me in thy +full+ fury : | |
| | For thine arrows have sunk into me, | 3 |
| | And upon me thou hast laid thy hand. | |
| | Nowhere is my body sound because of thy wrath, | 4 |
| | Nowhere is my frame healthy because of my punishment ; | |
| | For through my guiltiness my body is parched, | 5 |
| | Through my trespass my frame is become rotten. | |
| | My stripes are become noisome, | 6 |
| 10 | They fester because of my unrighteousness. | |
| | Through my guiltiness I am bowed down greatly, | 7 |
| | I walk about trembling continually. | |
| | For my loins are filled with anguish, | 8 |
| | [I have] no rest in my pangs ; | |
| | I am benumbed, I am crushed exceedingly, | 9 |
| | I groan because of the sighing of my heart. | |
| | Lord ! before thee is all my crying, | 10 |
| | My sighing is not hidden from thee ; | |
| | The strength of my right hand has left me, | 11 |
| 20 | And the light of mine eyes is no more with me. | |
| | Mine enemies stand to behold my stroke, ¹ | 12 |
| | And whisper [gathered together] at my calamity ; | |
| | Those that are intent on my harm speak insults, | 13 |
| | And talk of outrages continually. | |

¹ And my kinsmen stand afar off.

	But I am like a deaf man that hears not,	14
	Like a speechless man that cannot open his mouth ;	
	I behave myself as a man that is stupefied,	15
	And in whose mouth are no arguments.	
	Yea, for thee, O Yahwè, do I wait ;	16
30	Thou wilt answer, O Lord, my God ;	
	For I say, 'Lest they rejoice over me,	17
	And jeer when my foot falters !'	
	I +indeed+ am set +ready+ for wounding,	18
	Pains continually await me ;	
	Yea, I moan because of my stroke,	19
	I pine away because of my punishment ;	
	Those of Jerahmeel are strong,	20
	Ishmael and Cush are many in number ;	
	They recompense [me with] evil,	21
40	Those of Rehoboth are at feud with me.	
	Forsake me not, O Yahwè !	22
	O my God ! be not far from me.	
	Hasten hither to my help,	23
	O Lord, +hasten+ [to] my succour !	

1 f. A quotation from vi. 2.—3. *Arrows*. Cp. Job vi. 4a, xvi. 13.—4. *Thy hand*. Cp. xxxiii. 4a.—5 f. Cp. Isa. i. 5 f. (of Israel).

15. **Benumbed** (נפוגתי); cp. lxxvii., L. 11. — *Crushed* (נרכיתי). Cp. xlv. 19, and cp. on xxxvii., L. 9.

21. **My stroke**, נגעי; so L. 35; cp. lxxiii. 14. J *lepram meam*; see Lev. xiii. 3. Cp. the description in xli. 7 f.

25 f. Cp. Isa. liii. 7, where the servant of Yahwè (*i.e.* the pious kernel of Israel) is described. This casts a clear light on the question as to the speaker in the psalm and as to the date. For Isa. liii. must already have been some time in circulation to be referred to in this indirect way. Cp. also xxxix. 10, where, however, it is the patient endurance of God's chastisement which is referred to. Here it is the reproaches of the enemy which the speaker suffers in silence, waiting patiently for his God.

28. הנִּוֹכָחוֹת, 'arguments in self-justification,' as Job xxiii. 4.

29-40. The connexion of the distichs has caused some perplexity. Various proposals have been made (see Ol., Now., Du.), based on the supposition that here and there the poet mentally turns back and supports what he said before, but with insufficient explanation. The chief difficulty is caused by v. 19 (*ll.* 35 f.), which, in M, contains a declaration on the part of the speaker that he confesses his sins, *i.e.* (according to Ol.) is no longer an obstinate sinner as formerly. Ol. thinks that such a declaration is either to be connected with v. 16*b* (*L.* 30), or—a view which he seems to prefer—be intended as the justification of v. 18 (*ll.* 33 f.), 'I fear the worst and am full of grief, for I must confess that I have well deserved complete ruin.' Du. carries out these exegetical theories to their logical result, and makes the order of the verses, 16-19; 17-18; 20-21. Correction of the text, however,

permits, or rather requires, us to dispense with this. The course of thought seems to be this. The speaker makes no reply to his insulting foes because he waits for the divine interposition. To God, however, he *can* speak; God's honour is concerned. The calamity of Yahwe's servant will draw forth comments injurious to Him (cp. xiii. 5 [פִּן], xxxv. 24 f.). In v. 18 (*ll.* 33 f.),

which M again distorts, the speaker returns to himself and his sufferings, which have reached their extreme limit; he adds that the strong opposition to him has, from a human point of view, no moral justification (cp. introd.). Cp. xxxv. 12, cix. 5.

41-44. Cp. xxii. 12, 20, xxxv. 22, xl. 14, lxxi. 12, &c.

Critical Notes. Title. The triple assignment in the title is very remarkable. The third of the corrupt readings here represented is derived from G, which closes the title with *περὶ τοῦ σαββαίου*. I take it that G's Heb. MS. had *עַל-הַשְּׂמִינִית = עַל-הַשְּׁבַת* (= *לְיִשְׁמְעֵאלִים*). See introd., and on title of Ps. xcii.; so read also in Pss. vi. 1, xii. 1.

2 ff. Insert *אֵל*. That M's text is grammatical (Kön., *Synt.*, § 352 n) does not justify us in deviating from vi. 2 against metre.—Point *נָחַתוּ* (Du.).—For *וַתִּנְחַת* (very improbable after *נָחַתוּ*) read *וַתִּנְחַת* (Gr.); G *ἐπεσσηπίσας*.

5 f. M *כָּתַם*. Kön (ii. 1, p. 98) thinks the pointing influenced by the much more common synonym *תָּם*; according to rule, it should have been *כָּתַם*. Since, as Kön. himself holds, *כָּתַם* in Judg. xx. 48 is incorrect, the only proof-passages for *כָּתַם* are Ps. xxxiii. 4, 8 and Isa. i. 6. A scribe's error is the cause; read *תָּמִים*, and cp. *Isaiah* (Heb.), *SBOT*, pp. 110, 197.—M *הִטָּאתִי*, not quite suitable. Read either *תִּכְחַתִּי* or *הַבּוֹרֵתִי*. Cp. lxxiii. 14.

7. M *כִּי-עֹנֵתִי עָבְרוּ רֹאשֵׁי*. In lxix. 3, 16 and elsewhere, being submerged by a flood is a figure for the danger, in which Israel was, of being cut off by some great national calamity. If, therefore, *עָבְרוּ רֹאשֵׁי* is correct, *עֹנֵתִי* must be a corruption of *שְׂבָלִים*, 'floods,' or the like; the expression found in M is improper, even if, unjustifiably, we render 'עֹנֵי' 'my punishments.' The corruption, however, lies chiefly in 'ר'. The simplest correction is *כִּי-בְעֹנֵתִי חָרַב בְּשָׂרֵי*; ב easily fell out after כ. This, however, is not so certain as the correction of the next line.

8. M *כִּנְשֵׂא כָבֵד יִכְבְּדוּ כִּנְיִי*. This form of text is condemned by its inconsistency with the preceding line, however read. It also gives one beat too much; this, however, could be remedied by omitting *כָּבֵד* as an incomplete form of *יִכְבְּדוּ*. No one familiar with textual corruption can hesitate much as to the true reading which underlies the text; it almost certainly is *בְּאִשְׁמֵי יִרְקֶבוּ עֲצָמַי*.

9 f. The text is in some disorder. To produce two lines, we must transpose two words, reading **הַבְּאִישׁוֹ חִבּוּרָתִי | נִמְקוּ כִּפְנֵי עוֹלָתִי**. 'הב' gives two beats. **עוֹלָתִי** is an easy and necessary correction. Ges.-Bu. no doubt gives 'אֲוֹלָת', 2. godlessness, fault, Ps. xxxviii. 6 (cp. **נִבְלָה**, lxix. 6.) But to make 'godlessness, fault' even plausible it would be necessary to find a passage, the context of which was not corrupt, where this sense was probable. The context of both the passages referred to is adverse to the sense (or, the *senses*?) claimed by Ges.-Bu. In xxxviii. 6 a word meaning 'sin, transgression,' and in lxix. 6 a word meaning 'crying' or 'groaning' are indispensable. On **אָוִיל**, cvii. 17, Job v. 3 (interpreted similarly by Ges.-Bu.), see crit. n. on the former passage.

11. M **נִעֲנִיתִי**. Ges.-Bu. finds the sense 'to be bowed down,' 'to bow oneself down,' in Ps. xxxviii. 7, Isa. xxi. 3. But in Isa. xxi. 3, 'to become giddy' is clearly the right sense (see Di.-Ki.), and here 'inverted parallelism' suggests that we should read **כִּי־נִעֲנִיתִי** (We.) is plausible, but does not connect so well with *ll.* 9 f.

12. M **קָדַר**, generally rendered 'as a mourner.' Rather **חָרַד**, and so xlii. 10, xliii. 2, and in Jer. viii. 21, xiv. 2, **הָרַדְתִּי**.—M **הִלַּכְתִּי**; cp. 1 K. xxi. 27. But 'התה' is better (Gr.); cp. xxxv. 14.

13 f. M **נִקְלָה**. G **ἐμπαργμῶν**; A **Σ ἀτιμίας**; J **ignominia**; so Bā., *Schmach*. But this would be **קָלוּ**. T **קָדִידוֹתָא**, whence Gr. **דִּלְקָה** (= **דִּלְקַת**, 'a fever'). Most moderns, 'burnt' (partic.) = inflammation! Read **הִלְחָלָה** (Nah. ii. 11), or **חִילָה** (Job vi. 10).—M **וְאִין כַּתֵּם בְּבִשְׂרִי**, an editorial makeshift which does not even provide a complete line (see *l.* 6). Read perhaps **בְּצִירִי** [לִי] **כִּי־נִנְוָה**; cp. Jer. xlv. 3, Lam. i. 3. The parallelism is excellent (cp. Isa. xxi. 3).

16. M **כִּי־נִהַחְתִּי**. If this be right, we must read **לְבִיא** for **לְבִי** (so Hi., Ol., Gr., Bā., Kau., We., Du.); **נַחַח** specially means the growling of the lion (Isa. v. 29, Prov. xxviii. 15). But the combination of **שָׁאֵן** and **נַחַח** is very improbable; 'I roar louder than a lion's growling' is unsatisfactory. Read, with Herz, **כִּי־אֶנְחַח**; G **ἀπὸ στεναγμοῦ**. The repetition of **כִּי** in M illustrates the dittographic tendency. Note the good connexion with *ll.* 17 f.

17. M **תִּתְאוּרִי**; against parallelism. Read **שִׁוְעָתִי** (Herz); see on lxix. 6.

19 f. M prefixes **סַהֲרַרְהוּ** **לְבִי**, which, with **כְּהִי**, would give four beats. It is rendered, 'my heart beats violently.' But this sense of **ס** is purely imaginary. Gr.'s **הִכְרַבֵּר** is not very suitable, and

metre still protests. Looking closely at the preceding words, we see that לבסחרהר is an editorial patch on the basis of a corrupt dittogram לאנסתרה. Now turn to *l.* 20. M's נַסְדָּהֶם, in apposition to עֵינַי, is—in spite of the accents—impossible. Hos. xiii. 2, Am. ix. 11, Zech. viii. 10, quoted in illustration by Kön. (*Synt.*, § 349 i) are certainly all corrupt. Probably נַמְהֵם is a corruption of יְמִינֵי; נ comes from נ (repeated), the final נִי = נִי. Read in *l.* 19 בְּחַיְמֵי.

21 f. M אֶהְבֵּי | וְרַעִי. It is true that the unkind behaviour of friends is a recurring feature in the parallel descriptions (see on xxxi. 12). But here the poet is hampered by the structure of his poem, and he can only find room for the conduct of Israel's enemies in general, among whom he may include Israel's false friends. Certainly the force of the passage gains greatly by the correction and the omissions here proposed. Read אֶיְבִי, omitting וְרַעִי (note Paseḫ) and וְקִרְבֵי כֹרְחוֹק עִמָּדוֹ, as glosses on אֶהְבֵּי.—M מִבְּקָשֵׁי נַפְשִׁי | וַיִּנְקְשׁוּ. 'Laid snares' does not suit the parallelism, and נַקְשׁ is probably non-existent. P's. ix. 17, cix. 11 are treated elsewhere. In Dt. xii. 30 we should read תֹּקֵשׁ. In 1 S. xxviii. 9 כתַּנְקֵשׁ should be תַּתֵּן מִוִּקֵּשׁ. Read here וַיִּתְּלַחֲשׁוּ [יַחַד] לְמִכְשׁוֹל נַפְשִׁי (xli. 8, xxxv. 12).

23 ff. M הַהוֹת. Read חֲרָפוֹת. See on v. 10, lii. 4.—M מְרִמּוֹת. Read פְּלִמּוֹת.—M אֶשְׁמִיעַ. Read יִשְׁמִיעַ (Gr.).

27. M לֹא־שָׁמַע. Read שָׁמְכוֹן (Ezek. iv. 16, xii. 19).

32. Read וּבְכוֹחַ רִגְלֵי יַלְעִינוּ (G *kai*). M's יַלְעִי may be a fragment of יַלְעִינוּ, which word has become, in M, יַנְדִּילוּ (see on xxxv. 26, xli. 10, lv. 13).

33. M לְצַלֵּעַ; ל; dittographed. Read לְפַצְעַע (xxxv. 15); G *eis mástigas*.

35. M's יַעֲזִבֵנִי and חֲטָאתֵי are unsuitable. The latter should be תֹּכַחְתֵּי (see on *l.* 5 f.), the former probably נִנְעִי. M's אֶגִּיד (G *avaygelō*) should probably be אֶהְנֶה, and אֶדְאֵג (G *merimnēsō*) אֶדְאֵב.

37 f. M G חַיִּים. Most since Houb. and Lowth read חָנָם; both readings, however, spring from יִרְחַמְאֵלִים. Probably וְאִבִּי is also a fragment of this word. Comparing xxxv. 19 (corr. text), read יִרְחַמְאֵלִים יַעֲזְבוּ וְרַבּוֹ יִשְׁמַעֵאל וְכוּשׁ.

39. M וּמִשְׁלֹמֵי רַעַה. Read וּישְׁלֹמוּ עָלַי רַעַה (cix. 5a).—M וּבֹטְחֵי רִדּוּפֵי־טוֹב; תַּחַת טוֹבָה יִשְׁטַנּוּנִי תַחַת רַהֲבֹתַיִם. Read יִשְׁטַנּוּנִי רַהֲבֵי: cf. cix. 4a, 'Rehoboth and Maacath are at feud with me.'

44. Read לְתִשׁוּעָתִי (Hi., Bi.).

PSALM XXXIX.

Ps. xxxix. in its present form somewhat reminds us of Ps. xc.; in both psalms (see especially on Ps. xc.) the evidence of composite origin and of editorial manipulation is too strong to be disregarded. Ps. xxxix.⁽¹⁾ (pentameters) describes the mental agony of a large number of the more inquiring members of the pious Jewish community; xxxix.⁽²⁾ contains the tender pleadings of a member of a much less critical school of thought, inserted by the editor as an antidote to the dangerous freedom of the original psalm (xxxix.⁽¹⁾). The problem which troubled the original psalmist and those whom he represents was the inconsistency between the traditional orthodoxy and the facts of daily experience. It was an inherited belief that righteousness was attended by prosperity and wickedness by adversity, but the oppression of the pious community by N. Arabian and even Jewish tyrants seemed to many to give the lie to this doctrine. Thus Ps. xxxix.⁽¹⁾ is to be grouped, both as to the subject and as to the mode of treating the subject, with Ps. lxxiii. (zv. 11-14), and, as regards the subject, to some extent with Pss. xxxvii. and xlix. Parts of Pss. lxxxix. (zv. 47-50) and cxvi. (z. 11) are also closely parallel, and the curious points of contact between xxxix.⁽¹⁾ and Isa. lix. should not be overlooked. So much at least may be assumed, that Pss. xxxix.⁽¹⁾ and lxxiii. were not widely separated by the date of their composition. But we can go further than this. Both psalms are later than the dialogues of the Book of Job, for both have been influenced by them; indeed, Ps. xxxix.⁽¹⁾ is like an abstract of the most thrilling parts of the complaints of Job. It should be added that xxxix.⁽²⁾ (if the last two lines are not later insertions) must also be fairly late, for l. 7 comes from 1 Chr. xxix. 15, and l. 8, with slight alterations, from Job x. 20 f.

In 'A Study in the Criticism of the Psalms' (*Expositor*, April 1899, pp. 252-263) I pointed out that Ps. xxxix. is one of those psalms which gain most from a thorough textual criticism. Since that essay was printed Duhm has independently arrived at somewhat similar results, though his textual criticism appears very incomplete. He is of opinion that zv. 9, 11, 13, 14 were inserted in xxxix.⁽¹⁾ from another composition, and that they may originally have formed the continuation of Ps. xxxviii. After omitting these verses, he finds in Ps. xxxix. a wonderful expression of a longing after immortality, which could not justify itself logically, and sprang from the writer's deep sense of the reality of his communion with God. In z. 5b Duhm reads הֲחַדְלֵ אֲנִי , 'whether I must cease to be.' One may be allowed to doubt whether a keen criticism will permit us to adopt this view. כִּתִּי אֲחַדֵּל , 'when I shall cease (to be),' would furnish a better sequel to מִדַּת יָמַי ; indeed, Grätz actually gets this sense out of מִדַּת אֲנִי . But here, as in Isa. xxxviii. 11, חַדֵּל is certainly wrong (see crit. note). I fear it will have to be admitted that Ps. xxxix.⁽¹⁾ is as direct a denial of resurrection, and therefore also of immortality, as the 14th chapter of Job. No wonder that, partly by accident, partly by the skill of the ancient editor, this denial should have been veiled from later ages.

XXXIX.—1.

Deposited: Of 'Arab-ethan. Marked: Of 'Arab-ethan. 1

- 1 I said, 'Let me guard my words | that I sin not with my
tongue; 2
Let me put a guard on my mouth | while the wicked
confronts me.'
I was dumb, I kept silence continually, | but my pain
awaked +the more+. 3
For my heart was astounded, | my reins were horror-struck. 4

Then I spoke in my error, | * * * *

Make me, [I pray,] to know | the end of the Jerahmeelites. 5

Behold, my confidence thou hast overthrown, | my hope
[thou hast destroyed]: 6

My perfectness is as nothing before thee ; | surely a +mere+
breath is all piety !

Surely in gloom man goeth away ; | surely in darkness he
dies ; 7

10 He lieth down, [and will not arise,] | nor awake out of
his sleep.

[Some lines, say six, are wanting.]

In the midst of gloom I grope, | I am become like the owls ; 12

18 All my piety is like spiders' webs ; | surely a +mere +
breath is all piety !

[Conclusion wanting.]

XXXIX.—2.

Editorial substitutes for missing passages of xxxix.⁽¹⁾

1 And now, Lord, what wait I for ? | My hope is in thee. 8

From all my transgressions rescue me, | expose me not to
the insulting of the impious. 9

I am dumb, I open not my mouth, | for it is thou that
hast done it. 10

Remove from me thy stroke, | by the might of thy hand
I am terror-struck. 11

Hear my prayer, O Yahwè ! | hearken to my cry ; 13

Hold not thy peace at my tears ; | * * * *

For I am a sojourner beside thee, | one devoid of rights,
like all my fathers.

Avert thy frown, that I may be cheerful again, | before I
go hence and cease to be. 14

xxxix.⁽¹⁾ If. **I said**, &c. The speaker is constantly hoping for a just retribution to fall on the wicked (cp. Job v. 3). The longer it is delayed the more he murmurs inwardly against Yahwè. He strives, however, to restrain the expression of his thoughts, lest he should 'sin with his tongue,' and so cast in his lot with the transgressors.—4. Cp. lxxiii. 21, and see crit. n.—5. Cp. cxvi. 11.

6. The utterance begins in a tem-

perate style; presently, however, it will become intemperate.

7 f. Cp. Job iv. 6, 'Is not thy fear of God thy trust, And the perfectness [integrity] of thy ways thy hope?' Job ix. 22, 'He destroys the perfect and the wicked.' Ps. lxxiii. 13, 'Verily, I have cleansed my heart in vain.' Also cxvi. 11 (corr. text), 'I said in my haste, All piety is a lie (=disappointment).'²—9. Cp. on l. 17, also Job xix. 8, xxvii. 20.

10. Based upon Job xiv. 12 ; strange that this dark view has found expression even in a psalm, but not strange that an editor has corrected it.

17. A thrilling, even if not very poetical, expression of the psalmist's melancholy state of mind. Cp. Job v. 14, and especially Isa. lix. 10, 'We grope like blind men by the wall. . . We stumble at noonday as in the

twilight.'—18. *Spiders' webs*. In Isa. lix. 5 f. (part of an inserted passage) the same figure is used of the works of the wicked.

xxxix.⁽²⁾ 1. Cp. xxxviii. 15.—3. *I am dumb*. Cp. note on xxxviii. 14.—7. Quoted from 1 Chr. xxix. 15, though the reverse of this is, of course, not impossible.—8. Based on Job x. 20 f.

Critical Notes. xxxix.⁽¹⁾ 1. M דרכי, 'my conduct' (1 K. viii. 25)—too wide a term. Read דְּבָרַי (Gr., Hal.); cf. on xvii. 4.

2. M אשכרה a second time! Read אֲשִׁיכָה (cf. 2 K. xix. 28), with Ol., Dy., Bl., Gr., Che.⁽¹⁾, Bā., Kau., Hal., Herz. G ἑθέμεν.—M מַחְסוֹם, 'a muzzle' (ἀπ. λεγ.). Most unsuitable. Read שְׁמָרָה (cxli. 3a), with Herz. Cp. on ix. 21. As often, the two parts of the word are transposed; corruption followed.—M בַּעֲוֹר. Read בַּעֲמוֹד (Gr., Herz). G ἐν τῷ σὺστῆμαι. Cf. עַד for עֲבַד, 1 S. ii. 5; also on civ. 33, cxlvi. 2.

3. M דּוֹמָיָה, a non-existent word (see on xxii. 3); מִטּוֹב. Both are obviously miswritten for תְּמִיד. Cf. on cxxxi. 2. Hitz.'s ingenuity cannot rescue מִטּוֹב (a shortened formula!); cf. on xv. 4. Metre and sense gain.—M נִנְעָר, 'thrown into disorder.' Read נִנְעָר (נִנְעָר), the only suitable word, reserving כ (כי) for next line.

4 f. M's text might pass if we could only correct בהניני so as to produce a complete parallelism; הגני is non-existent (see on τ. 2). Of course, בהגני will not do, and Gr.'s בגוי (suggested by S) is a most unexpected Aramaism (= בקרבי); cf. G, xxiii. 4a. Let us then look a little more closely at the text. Is the figure of the fire quite a natural one? In Dt. xix. 6, Hos. vii. 7, Jer. xx. 9 (cf. vi. 11), it denotes a craving for vengeance. But here the danger in which the speaker felt himself to be was that of uttering sceptical words as to the value of piety (cf. lxxiii. 13, 14). It was not a sin to be angry with God's enemies; but it was a sin to envy their prosperity. We cannot therefore correct בהניני alone; we must correct the whole couplet (ll. 4, 5), and the way to do so is plain from lxxiii. 21. Taking up כ (כִּי) from l. 3, read כִּי יתמה רבי (לבבי) וכליותי אשתונם. כל כליותי יו; יתמה; ית fell away from קר. Thus l. 4a arose. בהניני is a dittogram of בקרבי, which a scribe manipulated to make a show of sense. אש and תונם were transposed. ו naturally became ב, and ס became ר. The change of נו into ע is rare: but an imperfect כ, in an older form of the square character, can easily be mistaken for a ע.—To l. 5 prefix או, for metre and sense; it fell out easily after אש (in M).—M בַּלְשׁוֹנִי. Read בַּשְׁלֹתִי, 'in my error' (Aram. שָׁלוּ, 'error'). Cp. Prov. i. 32, where שְׁלוּה is || מִשׁוּבָה, 'turning away,' 'rebellion,' and ascribed to כְּסִילִים.

6. Whether we assign *v.* 5 to xxxix.⁽¹⁾ or to xxxix.⁽²⁾, M's text is very unsuitable. Is it conceivable that the psalmist means to ask God how long he (or Israel) will live? His temptation is to believe that God is on the side of Israel's enemies (the Jerahmeelites and their allies). The exact duration of Israel's lingering death cannot be prominent in his thoughts. Besides, the phraseology is very strange; that *קִוּוּ* and *כִּי־יָדָה* are not parallel is obvious (see Hupfeld). Evidently the original text of the psalm had become in many parts very indistinct. The editor, discontented perhaps with what he could read, naturally 'restored' the indistinct parts in accordance with his own chastened feelings. *L.* 6 should probably run (inserting *נָא* *יְרַחֲמֵאלִים*, *קִוּוּ* | *יְהוָה* *נָא* *יְהוּדָה*). This assumes that *יְרַחֲמֵאל* was written twice over; the first time it became corrupted into *וְיִמְדַת*, the second into *יְמִי כִּי־יָדָה*. *V.* 5*b* may originally have run, *אֲדַעָה* [*קִוּוּ*] *יְרַחֲמֵאלִים*, a variant to our line 6. Critics have been much troubled by the text of M G. For *הִדְלַל* (arbitrarily rendered by many 'frail,' 'perishable') Hu. reads *חֲלַד*, rendering *quantilli sim air* (cp. the commentators on Isa. xxxviii. 11, and see *SBOT ad loc.*). *חֲלַד*, however, is a very doubtful word (see next note). On Duhm's emendation see introd.

7 f. 'Behold, thou hast made my days handbreadths, and my lifetime (?) is as nothing before thee' (M) is far from satisfactory. For *חֲלַדִּי* G rightly reads *תְּחַלְתִּי* (*ἡπόστασις μου*), and so in lxxxix. 48 (*ἡ ἡπόστ. μου*). In xvii. 14, xlix. 2 *חֲלַד* is equally doubtful (see notes), and in Job x. 20, xi. 17 we should read *חֲבִלִּי*, *חֲבִלָּךְ*. Thus *חֲלַד* disappears altogether both from our psalm and from the O.T. as a whole. If so, and if *קִצִּי יְמִי וְיִמְדַת* is wrong, we can have no interest in defending *טַפְחוֹת* (note Pasek). Probably the true reading is *בְּתִיחָתִי* (Isa. xxx. 15), and the context (*v.* 7) suggests *נִתְצַתָּה* for *נִתְתָּה*. Then as to *יְמִי*. If *אָדָם* should be *חָסֵד* (at any rate a probable correction), should not *יְמִי* be corrected into *תְּמִי*? *הֵם* and *חָסֵד* are perfect parallels, and *הֵם*, *תְּמָה*, and (adj.) *תָּם* are characteristic words of the Book of Job—the chief monument of the school of thought to which our psalmist belongs. Transpose *יְמִי* (*תְּמִי*) and *חֲלַדִּי* (*תְּחַלְתִּי*), and all becomes clear. The psalmist cannot have said, 'My hope is as nothing in thy sight,' but he may have said, 'My perfectness (*תְּמִי*) is as nothing in thy sight'; and if he wrote in *L.* 9*a*, 'My confidence thou hast overthrown,' it is presumable that *תְּחַלְתִּי* should find a place in *L.* 9*b*, combined with a verb such as *הִאֲבַדְתָּ* (Job xiv. 19).

8*b*. M *אֵף פְּלִי־הֶבֶל פְּלִי־אָדָם נֶצַב סֵלָה*. Omit the first *כֹּל*, with 'A *Σ* and many MSS. *כ* was dittographed (S, *כְּהֶבֶל*); then *ל* was

inserted under the influence of the כל before אדם. אדם, however, is deeply corrupt; as in Hos. xi. 4 (Gr.) and Ps. cxvi. 11 we should read הסד (ס and מ are pretty often confounded). The wrong reading אדם was suggested by lxii. 10. אַךְ בְּצִלְמֹת נִצַּב סֵלָה comes, probably, from אַךְ בְּצִלְמֹת, with which l. 5 should open. נִצַּב baffles all translators: a 'sort of copula between subject and predicate' (We.) it cannot be, and Duhm's עַל-הַקֶּבֶל (a further predicate to הַלְלֵה) is in the highest degree forced. Herz suggested נִצַּר.

9. M אַךְ-בְּצִלְמֹת יִתְהַי אִישׁ; W F, '(Man walks) but as an apparition'; De Witt, 'Only a shadow (each goeth about).' צֶלֶם, 'an unsubstantial image, as lxxiii. 20' (Bä.). But the text there is highly suspicious, and the only sure senses are 'image, sketch, model'; the etymology, too, is disputed (see the Lexx.). Nor is ב essential natural in connexion with הַלֵּךְ. Read אַךְ בְּצִלְמוֹת הַלֵּךְ אִישׁ. 'The error has arisen from a faulty concatenation of the letters and the change of ו into י. בְּצֶלֶם then coalesces with the ית of the following word to form 'צִלְמוֹת' (an anonymous writer in *Journ. of Sacred Lit.*, new series, iv. 328-343). This view is confirmed by my own independent correction of the text of ll. 13, 14. Ibn Janāh (*Book of Roots*, s.v.) gives the right sense בַּחֲשֵׁכָה יִתְהַלֵּכוּ, but obtains this (for בְּצֶלֶם) through Ar. كَلِمٌ, 'to be dark.' So Donash; Menaḥem ben Saruḡ, however, rightly explains צֶלֶם 'image.'—M אַךְ-הַקֶּבֶל יִהְיֶינָה. This does not suit the context. Something much more effective than a trite maxim on the vanity of human striving is required, even if we suppose 7-14 to have been written consecutively. First of all we want a parallel to בְּצִלְמֹת; next, a verb which shall explain הַלֵּךְ, and lead on to an adequate justification of פֶּלֶא-הַקֶּד. Read אַךְ-בְּאִפְלָה יִכּוֹת. Cp. lix. 9, and see exeg. note on l. 19.

10. M יִרְבֵּץ [וְלֹא-יָקוּם] וְלֹא-יֵדַע מִי-אֶסְפֶּם. Read probably [וְלֹא-יָקוּם] יִרְבֵּץ; cp. Job xiv. 12. רִבֵּץ of men, as Job xi. 19.

11 f. M's text may be rendered, 'With chastisements for guilt +when+ thou disciplinest a man, thou destroyest, like the moth, all that he prizes'—a very strange interruption of a fervent personal supplication. Let us consider the parts of M separately. And first, בְּתוֹכָחוֹת, עַל-עֵוֹן (note Pasek). Here the phrase עַל-עֵוֹן is very suspicious. There could be no doubt that the 'chastisements' were 'on account of guilt,' and in the parallel line we find a figure from the animal world. Somewhere in l. 13 there must once have been some very striking figure. Let us write the letters continuously as far as the Pasek, and scan them closely, בְּתוֹכָחוֹת-עֵלְעוֹן. Remembering what

goes before and what follows after, can we hesitate to read this (down to ל) בַּתּוֹךְ צְלֵמוֹת (ל) עוֹן remains. Connect it with the next group of letters, עוֹנִיכֶרֶת. This may represent מִשְׁשֵׁתַי; כו = נִי, ס and עו both = ש, ר = י. אִישׁ, however, is as yet unaccounted for. Next, then, take אִישׁ וְתַמְס פֶּעֶשׂ הַחַמּוּדוֹ. This is too much for *l. 11b*; the latter part of it must belong to *l. 12*. תַּמְס occurs once again in the Pss., viz. in *lviii. 9*. Both passages are figurative, and in both תַּמְס can only be explained as a slightly corrupted fragment of תַּנְשֵׁכֹת, 'screech-owls' (see on *lviii. 9*). In *Isa. lix. 10* the same word for owls has become אֲשֵׁנִיִּים, parallel to נִשְׁף, *i.e.* יִנְשָׁף. After making this correction, we see at once that ו אִישׁ can have arisen from נִמְשֵׁלְתַי לְ. We have now only to explain כַּעֵשׂ הַחַמּוּדוֹ. This is not quite long enough for *l. 12a*. G has *ὡς ἀράχνη* = כַּעֲכָבִישׁ. In truth, עֵשׂ is several times miswritten for עַכְבִּישׁ (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Moth,' 'Spider'). This puts us on the right track. Should not כַּעֵשׂ be עַכְבִּישׁ (cf. *Isa. lix. 5*; and see on *xc. 9*)? הַחַמּוּדוֹ should presumably be הַחֲסִדִי.

xxxix.⁽²⁾ 4. M בַּתְּנֶרֶת. 'תַּנ' should mean 'strife'; see T, xxxi. 21. But the word is not Hebrew. G ἀπὸ τῆς ἰσχυρῶς, *i.e.* מִגְבוּרַת (Schwally, *ZATW*, xi. 258 f.).—M אֲנִי כָלִיתִי. Read נִבְהַלְתִּי, a more natural verb (*vi. 2 f.*).

8. M הִשָּׁע, 'besmear,' or (Kön., i. 380) 'press-to (thine eyes).' Rather שָׁעָה (Hu., Gr., Bā., Beer, Du.). [So now We. (*Skizzen*, vi. 173).] Cp. *Job vii. 19, xiv. 6, and especially x. 20*, where read וְשָׁעָה with G, Gr.

PSALM XL.—I.

PENTAMETERS. A thanksgiving for a deliverance out of great national danger which forms the climax of a long series of divine lovingkindnesses. How shall the speaker (*i.e.* the inner circle of Israel) display his gratitude? To material sacrifices Yahwè is indifferent; his delight is in thanksgiving (*l. 14, 23*). Thanksgiving therefore has been the chief employment of the association of God's Poor; in the full assembly of Yahwè's worshippers he has declared God's righteousness with the eloquence of one who 'delights' in the wonders of Yahwè's purposes. In return, let not Yahwè restrain his compassionate impulse to befriend and protect Israel. Parallel passages are—*xxii.*⁽²⁾, *xxx. 2-5, xxxiii. 3, l. 8-13, li. 18, lxix., xcii. 6f., cxxxix. 18f.* *Jer. xvii. 7* is alluded to in a gloss (*v. 5*), and the supposed reference to *Jer. xxxi. 33* falls with M's incorrect text of *v. 8*. (It is on *v. 8* and *v. 3* that Hitzig bases his theory of Jeremiah's authorship; on *v. 3* see *exeg. note.*)

From this psalm and from *Pss. 1. and li. 3-19* we gather that there was a tendency in post-exilic Israel opposed to that chiefly represented by Ezra. It is not needful to suppose that the authors of these psalms were as violently opposed as Jeremiah to the sacrificial system; they may very possibly have held that sacrifices were provisionally enjoined for the 'hardness of men's hearts,' and

many members of the school doubtless dwelt with pleasure on the symbolic meanings which they were able to extract from the 'Mosaic' Law. Of this symbolism there is no trace in the three psalms here mentioned, and the attempt to symbolize, however inevitable, would ultimately have done much harm to Jewish theology but for the collapse of the entire sacrificial system at the fall of the temple. See further *OP*, 363-368; *JRL*, 250-257; Beer, p. xi.; Roy, 55; Smend, *AT Rel.-gesch.*⁽²⁾, 197 f.; Marti, *Gesch. der Isr. Rel.*, 262.

Roy's view that passages in Ps. xl. refer to the Jews of the Dispersion is attractive; Jews at a distance from the sanctuary would naturally be much comforted by v. 7. The speaker represents the strictest circle of Jews at Jerusalem, but he also addresses the 'anāvīm (v. 4b, corr. text) outside; these 'anāvīm are obviously Jews of the Dispersion. The Servant of Yahwè at Jerusalem has a mission of encouragement to faithful Jews at a distance from the temple, represented by those whose privilege it has been to come up as pilgrims to Jerusalem at the Feast. The correctness of Roy's view is not affected by his adherence to M's text of v. 4b. On this and other points of interpretation see *Christian Use of the Psalms*, pp. 123-141.

Deposited. Marked : Of 'Arab-ethan.

- | | | |
|----|---|---------------|
| | | 1 |
| 1 | I had waited longingly for Yahwè, [to him I cried,] | 2 |
| | He leaned [his ear] toward me, and heard my cry. | |
| | He brought me up from the pit of ruin, from the miry | |
| | bottom of the sea ; | 3 |
| | He planted my feet upon a rock, made firm my steps ; | |
| | In my mouth he laid a new song, a praiseful song to our | 4 |
| | God ; | |
| | Look hither, + ye humble, and be cheered, and trust in | |
| | Yahwè ¹ ! | |
| | Thou hast multiplied thy lovingkindnesses, O Yahwè ² ; | |
| | and thy purposes in our behalf ; | 6 |
| | If I would declare and utter thy wonders, they are too | |
| | many to recount. | |
| | In sacrifices and offerings if thou didst delight, fat ones | |
| | would I choose me ; | 7a, b |
| 10 | Burnt offerings and sin-offerings if thou didst demand, | |
| | surely I would bring them. | 7c, 8a |
| | In the wonderful things of thy purposes, O my God! | |
| | I delight, | 8b, 9a(part). |
| | That I may publish the awful deeds of thy righteousness | |
| | in thy habitation. | 9 |

¹ Happy is the man that makes Yahwè his trust, and does not turn to vanities, nor fall away to lies.

² My God.

I have heralded [thy] righteous dealing,¹ O Yahwè ! | my
lips I restrain not ; 10, 11

Thy lovingkindness and thy faithfulness I have not con-
cealed | from the great assembly.

Thou too, O Yahwè ! restrain not | thy compassion from me, 12
Thy lovingkindness and thy faithfulness, [O my God !] |
let them guard me continually.

3. Cp. lxi. 3, 15 f. Even if M were correct we could not explain realistically from the history of Jeremiah (Jer. xxxviii. 6-13). The next line proves that the language is metaphorical ; the story of Jeremiah says nothing about a rock. The 'pit' referred to is a figure for Sheol (so בּוֹר xxviii. 1, xxx. 4, &c.). The 'sea' (יָם, not יַיִן) is that which rolls above the world of the dead. שֵׁט הַיּוֹן and בּוֹר שְׁאוֹן are names of two of the seven hells in the Talmud (*Eruvin* 19a) ; cf. on lxxxviii. 12. The revival of Israel spoken of dates from the completion of the temple (B.C. 516) ; the psalmist idealizes, and only refers to present dangers in the last verse.

5. Yahwè's mercies are an inspiration to Israel ; but cp. Isa. li. 16, lix. 21. *A new song* ; see on xxxiii. 3.—6. See introd., and cp. lxi. 33 (corr. text). *Purposes* ; cp. xxxiii. 11, xcii. 5 ; Isa. lv. 8 f.

7 f. Cp. lxxxix. 2 ; Isa. lxiii. 7, and (*l.* 8) cxxxix. 18 f. The omission of *v.* 5 (cp. Jer. xvii. 7) as an individualistic application (see crit. n.) heightens the effect. Smend, however (*ZATW*, viii. [88] 108), regards *v.* 6 as the

explanation of *v.* 5 ; the 'man' who is there congratulated is the community, as xciv. 12. For הַבְּלִיִּים and כּוֹב cp. xxxi. 7. Idol-worship is referred to ; cp. Am. ii. 4 (כּוֹב).

9. The 'sacrifices and offerings' spoken of seem to be (or to include) thank-offerings ; but in *l.* 10 we read of propitiatory 'burnt-offerings and sin-offerings.' The psalmist implies that there were many Jews who conceived sacrifices of either class to be well-pleasing to God ; but he holds, with Jeremiah and other psalmists, that God is, not indeed hostile, but at least indifferent to them (see introd.). הַטָּהָה, here only, = הַטָּהָת, G [*τὸ*] *περὶ ἁμαρτίας*, recognizing no distinction between הַטָּהָה (or הַטָּהָת) and אֲשָׁם. On the archaeological points, see 'Sacrifice,' *Enc. Brit.*

12. Cp. xxvi. 7. נּוֹרְאוֹת ; see especially lxi. 6, cxlv. 6.—13 f. Cp. xxii. 23 ; lxxi. 15 (corr. text).

16. Cp. xxv. 21, xlii. 3, lxi. 8 ; also (יִצְרוֹנִי) xxv. 21, lxi. 8 ; cp. xxxiii. 6.

Critical Notes. 1 f. Insert אֱלֹהֵי שׁוֹיְעֵתִי.—3. M שְׁאוֹן. Read שׁוֹיְעָה in accordance with usage (Gr.).—M הַיּוֹן. יַיִן is inexplicable (see *BDB*). Read הַיָּם, and cp. Job xli. 22 f., where טֵיט and יָם occur near together.—6. M יִרְאֵה and יִירְאֵה, for which Du. compares Isa. xli. 5. Parallelism requires רְאֵה and נִהְרֵה (*S* vaguely 'shall rejoice'), and, for M's רְבִים, רְעוּיִים ; cp. lxi. 33 (corr. text), and (נִהַר) xxxiv. 6. For וּבִטְחוֹ read וּבִטְחוֹ.

Ver. 5, with its individualistic application (cp. xxxii. 1, 2) is a later

¹ In the great assembly.

insertion. Two errors may be noted. M's רַהָבִים is inexplicable; a mythological term (as if 'Rahabs,' Gunkel, *Sch.* 40) is surely quite out of place here. Read הַבְּלִים (xxx. 7) with Giesebr., *Gött. gel. Anz.*, Aug., '95, p. 40; *G ματαίστητας*.—M שָׁטִי. Read יִשְׁטֶה אֶל; so in the main Gunkel; note parallelism.

7 f. M רַבּוֹת עֲשִׂיתָ אֶתָּה יְהוָה. The last two words are enclosed by Pasek, but the whole clause is in a bad form. Du. would simply omit אֶתָּה עֲשִׂיתָ, but his justification is too far-fetched. Omit אֶתָּה as a corrupt fragment of a dittographed [ה] עֲשִׂיתָ and יְהוָה as a gloss on אֱלֹהֵי; and read הַרְבִּיתָ הַסְּדִיךְ. In a context like this הַסְּדִים is essential. Transfer נִפְלְאֶתֶיךָ to line 8, as a substitute for the miswritten אִין עַרְךָ אֱלֹיךָ (an editorial 'correction' of a *miswritten* נִפְלְאֶתֶיךָ; note Pasek).

9 f. For לֹא read לֹא = לוֹ; for אֹנִים read שְׁמִינִים (so, in 1 S. xv. 9, We., Gr., Bu. read for מִשְׁנִים), and for כְּרִית read either בְּרוֹתֵי (with Gr.) or בְּהֲרֵתֵי. G's *κατατίσω* suggests בְּרֵאתָ; but 'ears hast thou created for me' would only be tolerable if in the parallel half-line we were to read something like לְבֵי הַדְּשֶׁת. But a more probable view of the stanza can be obtained. G's *σῶμα* (not to be altered into *ῥῆμα*, which is given by 'A Σ Θ) represents עֶצֶם; now עֶצֶם can in a badly written MS. be confounded with שֶׁמֶן. (Gr. arrives at שְׁמִינִים somewhat differently.)—For אִין אֶתְּךָ הִנֵּה הִבֵּאתִי אִין אֶתְּךָ אֶתְּךָ אֶתְּךָ read אִין אֶתְּךָ הִנֵּה הִבֵּאתִי. Gr. keeps 'אִין אֶתְּךָ, and corrects בְּאֶתִי. But 'אִין אֶתְּךָ must certainly be cancelled. These words are a variant to לִי אֹנִים כְּרִית, as We. rather obscurely indicates. [Du. agrees.]

11 f. M אִין וְנֹר, which We. connects with אִין וְנֹר, rendering 'Mine ears hast thou opened by means of the book of the Law prescribed to me,' as if the psalmist meant that he found nourishment for his purified religious views in the sacred book of his people. The objection to this is threefold. 1, it implies the correctness of 'אִין וְנֹר; 2, it gives an unmetrical and prosaic sentence; and 3, the sense produced is not natural. Ol. and Abbott offer a different hypothesis. They regard the above words as a marginal note¹ either on רִצּוֹן (so Ol.), or on לִי in כְּרִית לִי (so Abbott, who interprets. 'In a manuscript is written עֲלֵי'; similarly Bruston in *Du texte primitif des Psaumes*, '73, p. 109; cp. *ZATW*, '97, pp. 193 f.). The form of the marginal note does not seem to me natural, and in any case such a hypothesis is only permissible as a last resource. Having regard to similar textual phenomena elsewhere,

¹ Duhm, too, finds a marginal note—'Beho! I, I have read it (בִּינֹתֵי) in a coll of a book copied out for me'; an allusion to Jer. vii. 21 ff., &c.

should we not read בְּנִפְלְאוֹת מִהִשְׁבְּתֵיךְ אֱלֹהֵי? Thus we get a point of contact with *L.* 7 which is of the utmost value for the ideal unity of the psalm. אֱלֹהֵי underlies *M*'s עָלַי (cp. on xlii. 7); the verb which is required to complete the clause is חִפְצָתִי, which in *M* is separated from עָלַי, *i.e.* אֱלֹהֵי, by לַעֲשׂוֹת רְצוֹנְךָ אֱלֹהֵי. What is the genesis of these last-quoted words?—אֱלֹהֵי, of course, is an early editor's correction of עָלַי. The two remaining words must be combined with וְתוֹרַתְךָ בְּתוֹךְ מִעֵי, which, now that this seeming parallel כָּתוּב עָלַי has been transformed, we see cannot be right (indeed, כָּתוּב בְּתוֹךְ מִעֵי ought of itself to have awakened suspicions). One of the words to be accounted for ought of course to be a parallel to נִפְלְאוֹת; we may probably find it in וְתוֹרַתְךָ, for which read נִרְאוֹת (see on xlv. 5*b*). כָּתוּב בְּתוֹךְ מִעֵי is to be explained on the analogy of סֵפֶר כָּתוּב; read בְּמִנְעֵכֶנִיךְ (cp. on xxvi. 6, 8). לַעֲשׂוֹת רְצוֹנְךָ has arisen partly by transposition, partly by corruption of letters. The whole line should run—בְּנִישׁ | נִרְאוֹת צְדָקֶךָ | אֱלֹהֵי.

13. *M* צָדֵק; read צְדָקָתְךָ (*Bi.* צְדָקָךְ); note *Pasek*, and see *v.* 11 (*ad init.*). *M G* insert בְּקֶהֱל רָב.—For יהוה הנה read יהוה.—16*a*. Insert אֱלֹהֵי (*metre*).

Verses 10, 11 contain a number of miswritten dittograms and variants. ידעת and perhaps, too, its complement אתה come from a mutilated צדקתך, and יד itself is a correction of צדק in *v.* 10. לֹא-כִסִּיתִי is a variant to לֹא-כִהַדְתִּי. לֹא-כִהַדְתִּי לְבִי comes, through editorial skill, from a miswritten variant בְּקֶהֱל רָב. אֶמְוִנָתְךָ וְחֶסֶדְךָ (so read) is a variant to חֶסֶדְךָ וְאֶמְוִנָתְךָ.

PSALM XL.—2.

PENTAMETERS. A fragment of a psalm of complaint and supplication, which may have been added in dark days as an appendix to the preceding psalm, to tone down its apparently too optimistic contents. It is separated from this psalm by a passage condensed from xviii. 5, lxix. 2-5, which can hardly be in its original state, and may perhaps have been nearly as follows:—

For floods of Deathland snatch me away | without number,
Jerahmeelites and Miṣrites, | Zarephathites and Arabians.

We are thus delivered from the exaggerated description of the sins and calamities of the speaker, and the passage is brought into line with many others. סְפוּנֵי לְרֵאוֹת, יִרְחַמְאֵלִים וְלֹא-יִכְלֵי, עָלַי רְעוֹת, שְׁבַלֵי מוֹת, אֶפְפִּי for מוֹשְׁעֵרוֹת, עִמְלֶךְ (?), עֲצָמוֹ for לְבִי and לְבִי for the same word repeated, מִצּוֹר for עֲרָבִים, עֲוֹנֵי for מִצּוֹר, and רֵאוֹת for עֲרָבִים are all possible and partly even probable errors (cp. lxix., lines 1-12). The psalm-fragment appears again as Ps. lxx., where the title (rightly read) assigns it to 'the Ethanite.' Lines 2 and 3 are parallel to xxxv. 4, 21, 26.

Critical Notes. 1, 3. Omit יהוה and לְסִפּוֹתֶיהָ (metre). For יִבְשֵׁי read יִשְׁבּוּ (vi. 11); parallelism.—4. M בְּשִׂתָּם. Read שִׂיחָתָם (Gr.); cp. Ezek. xxxv. 15. The ב in בַּשָּׂמַיִם is dittographed from עֲקֵב. Omit לִי, which does not suit הָאֵחָ, and is wanting in xxxv. 21, 25 (Hu., Bi., Du.).

6. מִיֵּי אֲרָבִי is not quite right, either as a parallel to כִּיבְקִישֵׁי or as connected with תִּשׁ. Read מִיֵּי אֲרָבִי; cp. cxix. 174, and continue יִשׁוּעֶיךָ (תֵּן comes from תֵּאֲבִי).

7. M יִחְשַׁב. Read הוֹשִׁיעָה (lxx. 6); so Gr. The idea of God's providence would have received more elaboration.

PSALM XLI.

TETRAMETERS. The people of Israel is likened to a man who is dangerously sick, and whose sore disease is taken by malicious neighbours as a proof that he is forsaken by God. The sufferer makes his plaint to God, who will save him even in this almost desperate condition. *l.* 13 contains a reference to the Messianic blessedness of Israel.

The psalm has received a liturgical preface from an editor (the editor of Book I.?), to adapt this psalm, or so much of it as he retained, or as had come down to him, to the wants of his own age. The connexion between the preface and the psalm has been variously interpreted. If we adhere to M, we must either suppose the congratulation of *vv.* 2 ff. to be addressed to the *foreigner* who takes notice of helpless Israel (cp. Smend, *ZATW*, iv. 173), or suppose them to contain a generalizing inference from the fact that the speaker of *v.* 5 ff. has himself been relieved in dire distress (Coblenz, 146). If, however, we adopt the corrected text, all becomes plain. *l.* 2-5 are parallel, not so much to xxxii. 1 f. as to xci., which most probably describes the security of the pious and believing community. However much Israel may be tried, he has an indestructible inward happiness, based upon his piety. The psalm is parallel to Pss. vi., xxxv., xxxviii., &c., in which the speaker is certainly the community; for *v.* 10 see also on *lv.* 13-15. Observe that in *v.* 6b the disappearance of the *name* of the speaker is hoped for; this suits the view here maintained much better than the view that some individual is intended, for on the latter theory we should expect to see a reference to the *posterity* of the speaker (cp. Smend, 111). Besides in *v.* 6a (the correction is certain) there is a point of contact with lxxxiii. 4. The parallelism between *v.* 9 (see note on *l.* 15) and the story of Job is remarkable. Job's sickness was, to some readers at any rate (see Job xlii. 12, and cp. Isa. lxi. 7), a type of Israel's undeserved calamity. Duhm finds in the psalm a most displeasing picture of the internal condition of the Jewish community; but this is because, like B. Jacob, he supposes the speaker to be an individual. As to the date of the psalm, it cannot be remote from that of *lv.* 13-15 and lxxxiii.

Depositd. Marked: Of Arab-ethan. 1

(*Liturgical Preface.*)

1	Happy is he who makes the Most High his confidence!	2
	In the day of trouble Yahwè will deliver him.	
	Yahwè will guard him and revive him;	3
	To the greed of his foes He cannot surrender him.	
	On his bed of sickness Yahwè will support him;	4
	His wailing +God+ will change for him into dancing.	

(Incomplete Psalm.)

	[Unto thee do I call,] O Yahwè, revive me ;	5
	Heal my soul, for unto thee do I sigh.	
	Mine enemies make a wily plot against me,	6
10	' O that he might die and his name vanish ' !	
	They come to behold, they speak falsehood,	7
	Against me they imagine evil.	
	They go abroad, they spread slander,	8
	My haters whisper againt me in unison—	
	' He has spread his bed in Sheol,	9
	From the couch of his bed he will arise no more.'	
	Even my friend takes pleasure in my stripes,	10
	My guest mocks at my wounds.	
	But thou, O Yahwè, revive me, and raise me up,	11
20	[And avenge me,] and give them their due !	
	By this I shall know that thou hast pleasure in me—	12
	That mine enemy does not triumph over me.	
	As for me, thou holdest me up continually,	13
	And causest me to stand in thy presence for ever.	

Doxology.

	Blessed be Yahwè, Israel's God,	14
	From the age +of the past+ to the age +of the future.	
	Amen, Amen.	

2-5. See introd.—4. אֱלֹהֵינוּ, אל expresses the strong personal interest of the speaker. Surely God cannot deliver up Israel to his foes. Cp. xxvii. 12, lxxiv. 19.—6. Cp. xxx. 12.

8 ff. There is no confession of sin here ; the speaker takes up the attitude of Job. 'Healing' is asked because of the soreness of Israel's calamity (cp. vi. 3 f., xxxi. 10 f.). Israel's 'sighing' is not 'hid from' God (xxxviii. 10). ll. 9 f. must be explained by lxxxiii. (see above). The *enemies* are the neighbouring populations of Palestine, certainly not Jews who were hostile to the writer (Duhm).

11 f. The power of the 'enemies' is restricted ; evidently there is a higher power, the Persian, which they can best

bring over to their side by slandering the Jerusalem community (cp. xxxviii. 13). The imaginary visit spoken of is not one of condolence but of malicious gazing (cp. xxii. 8, xxxviii. 21 f.). *Evil*, i.e. calamity.

15. **He has spread his bed, &c.** Israel, like Job, is to all appearance at the point of death. Correction of the text of ll. 15 f. not only produces a perfect parallelism, but improves the connexion between the psalm and the preface. See crit. n.

17 f. The cruellest pang of all comes from a treacherous friend. It is doubted whether the party of unfaithful, worldly-minded Jews, or some neighbouring people (Bä. suggests the Edomite-) is meant. The former view is preferable : (1) It accounts best for the phrase אֹכֵל לַחֲמִי ; (2) it is favoured by

the || passage, lv. 13-15; (3) it explains the separate mention of the offence referred to. Of course, the 'friend' (lit., 'man of my friendship') is a collective personality, like the speaker, and like the 'enemy' in *l.* 22 (cp. *l.* 9); see Ob. 7; Jer. xx. 10, xxxviii. 22. *Has eaten my bread*, i.e. has enjoyed my hospitality. The worldly-minded Jews referred to had in times past gone in and out among their brethren, receiving the ordinary kindnesses of daily life. Cp. on *lxix.* 9.

20. M has, 'Raise me up again that I may give them their due,' which

Critical Notes. 2. M מושכיל אלדל; G ὁ συνῶν ἐπὶ πρωχὸν καὶ πένητα, i.e. אביון ואלדל (כ; so Gr., Bi., Ley, Che.¹), Du. The difficulty of the sense (see introd.) is an objection to this. Read השם עליון כחסהו. The first step in corruption was the transposition of על and מוח, Then השם fell out through its likeness to מוחס. The suffix הו was indicated by a mark of abbreviation. Then the על in עליון was repeated thrice as יל, אל, and דל. It was natural that עליון should now be conjecturally corrected into אביון.

3 f. A variant יאשרהו (for ישמרהו) is half concealed in M's superfluous בארץ יאשר (Kr. ויאשר). G μακαρίσαι αὐτόν; T יומיביניה. Similarly Herz.—תתנהו should be יתנהו (G S S, Gr.). The address to Yahwè comes later.

5 f. M דוי כל. The supposed noun דוי in Job vi. 7 is corrupt (see Beer *ad loc.*). כל דוי means 'sick,' thrice, and always with לב. כל and וי belong together; ד is intrusive. Read הליו.—M מושבנו הפכת בחלו; most awkward. Cp. xxx. 12, and read למחול יהפך מוספדו יתפך.

7 f. M G begin אני אמרתני, probably an editorial alteration. The original may have had לך קראתני. Assume this, and *ll.* 7 f. become quite parallel.—M חגני. With Gr. read חגיני (*l.* 3; vi. 3); so *l.* 19.—M G לך הטאתני; surely not the true ground of the complaint (see note above). Read probably נאנחתני לך (cp. vi. 7, xxxviii. 10).

9 f. M יאמרו רע לי. Read יעריכו סר עלי (lxxxiii. 4). Transposition and corruption of letters.—M כתי ימות. כתי is an incorrectly written ימות; it has supplanted לו 'O that,' which fell out after לי. So virtually Herz.

11 f. M ואסבא ואם weakens the effect. Read באו, and afterwards ידברו.—M יקבץ. Read יחשב; M gives לי יחשבו רעה לי at end of *v.* 8; it is a variant to our *l.* 18.

Bishop Perowne naturally finds offensive, and which Bā, unhappily illustrates by M's text of cxxxvii. 8 f. Contrast Dt. xxxii. 35; Isa. xxxv. 4.

21. בואת ידעתי, 'ex hoc cognoverim.'

23 f. Upholdest, as xxxvii. 24; continually, as lxxiii. 23; in thy presence, cp. xi. 7, xvi. 11, xvii. 15.

25 f. Cp. the doxologies after lxxii., lxxxix., cvi. Probably such formulæ were used in the liturgy at the end of every psalm that was sung (cp. Neh. ix. 5).

15 f. M בְּלִיעַל דְּדָבָר; so again in M in ci. 3. Does it mean moral or physical evil? G, λόγον παράνομον; but most explain 'a sore disease.' Lag. would read, 'דְּדָבָר ב'; cp. דְּדָבָר הַוּוֹת, xci. 3. But xci. 3 needs correction (see *ad loco*); and plausible as it may seem to render 'דְּדָבָר ב', 'an incurable plague,' and to see an allusion to an etymology of בְּלִיעַל ('no coming up' = 'no cure'), the improbability of יִצּוֹק בּו (which follows), and the want of a fit parallel for l. 16 bid us look more closely into the text. No doubt we should read, comparing cxxxix. 9 and especially Job xvii. 13 (? יִצּוּעִיו) רִפְדוּ בְּשָׂאוֹל מִשָּׁפְכוֹ (יִצּוּעִיו) and in the next line, for the very poor מִיִּעֲרֵשׁ מִשָּׁפְכוֹ וְאִשֶּׁר שָׁכַב, we should read מִיִּעֲרֵשׁ יִצּוּעִי. Cp. cxxxii. 3.

17. M אִישׁ שְׁלוֹכִי בּו, a poor paraphrase of אִשֶּׁר־בְּמַחְתִּי בּו. ll. 17 and 18 must be taken together. הַגְדִּיל עָלַי עֵקֶב (G ἐμεγάλυνεν ἐπ' ἐμέ περριισμόν; cp. 2 K. x. 9) is impossible. הַגְדִּיל always means 'to act proudly.' Hence We. suggests taking עֵקֶב adverbially like יֵעֵקֶב. But such an appendage is not required, either for sense or for metre. Du. would transfer עֵקֶב (עֵקֶב 'reward') to the end of the next line but one. But clearly הַגְדִּיל should be הִלְעִין (as xxxv. 26, xxxviii. 17, lv. 13), and עָלַי עֵקֶב comes from לִמְכָּאֲבִי (כ' and ע, כ' and ק confounded). Then it becomes plain how the second half of l. 17 should run,—רָצָה בְּחַבּוּרָתִי.

19. M הִנְנִי. With Gr., read הִינִי (see on l. 7 f.).—After הִקִּינִי insert וְהִנְקִסֵּלִי (Jer. xv. 15), which very easily fell out.—M אִשְׁלָמָה. Read probably וְשִׁלְמָה (Gr.). The alternative is to read וְאִנְקָמָה וְאִשְׁלָמָה.

23. M בְּתַמִּי. If correct, this is the first reference to the speaker's integrity. The reference would hardly have been isolated, and it is not favoured by the || line. תַּמִּיד suggests לְעוֹלָם, a rather favourite word of the psalmists in such a connection (see xvi. 8, xl. 12, lxxiii. 23).

BOOK II.

PSALMS XLII. AND XLIII.

PENTAMETERS. In feeling this is surpassed by none of the Temple-psalms, in perfection of form it is equalled by few. To make the right number of psalms it was broken into two parts; but the identity of subject, metre, and refrain, the interlacing repetitions, and the want of a heading to Ps. xliii., combine to prove that xlii. and xliii. formed originally a single psalm. The setting of historical circumstance in the psalm seems to be purely imaginary. The poet thinks himself back into the period which followed the great catastrophe, when the Edomites were establishing themselves by degrees in the Negeb (southland) of Judah, and displayed undying animosity to their Jewish kinsfolk. The Edomites are called here Jerahmeelites, partly from a love of archaism (see on lxxxiii.), partly because the large district formerly occupied by the Jerahmeelites was passing into the possession of the Edomites, who, for their part, were forced to this migration by the conquest of Seir by the Nabateans.¹ Pss. lxiii., cxx., cxxxvii., cxl., are exactly parallel. In cxxxvii. and hardly less certainly in lxiii. the speaker (*i.e.* in cxxxvii. a band of temple-singers) imagines himself to have been carried captive into the Jerahmeelite (*i.e.* Edomite) region to the S. of Judæa, where Yahwè was not acknowledged. In Pss. cxx., cxl. the speaker (the Jewish community) is in his own home, but his happiness is marred by the neighbourhood of the treacherous Jerahmeelites and Arabians, who are ever seeking to entangle the Jews in strife (cp. xlii. l. 16). All these three psalms express vindictive feelings; Ps. xlii. in this respect pleasingly contrasts with them. The speaker (*i.e.* a company of Jews dwelling among Jerahmeelite oppressors) only craves the divine guardianship and restoration to the house of God. Cp. on Ps. lxi.

It is obviously unnecessary to discuss theories of the occasion of our psalm which presuppose an uncorrected, or an imperfectly corrected, text. Ewald held that the psalm was the melodious farewell of the royal exile Jehoiachin, as in B.C. 597 he was being carried away beyond the ridge of Hermon. J. P. Peters considered the basis of the poem to be a psalm of the old temple of Dan (*New World*, June '93, p. 103). Hitzig (followed in 1891 by the present writer, *OP*, 114 f.) ascribed the psalm to a Jew taken captive by Scopas, an Ætolian mercenary in the service of Egypt, and delivered by Antiochus the Great on his victory over Scopas at the sources of the Jordan. Hitzig (followed by Duhm) even names the writer; he was the high priest Onías III., who suffered enough from 'men of guile and injustice' (xliii. 1, in M), and who would, of course, be prominent in processions to the temple (Hitzig, but not Duhm, retains אֲדַרְדֵּם in xlii. 5). All these theories, however ingenious, have to be abandoned.

As to phraseological points of contact with other poems, some, *e.g.* that supposed to exist in xlii. 7 (וְהָרַ כִּצְעִיר, 'thou little mountain,' according to Hitzig and *OP* 115, 317), compared with lxxviii. 16 f., and in xlii. 7, 8, compared with Jer. ii. 4, 8, disappear, as a result of textual emendation. But one of the most interesting parallels remains, cp. xlii. 5, 9, xliii. 3 with lvii. 4. Fresh parallels

¹ See *Introd. to Bk. of Isaiah*, 210 f., with the literature there cited; Torrey, *JBL*, '98, pp. 16-20; Cheyne, *ib.*, 207 f.

now appear between xlii. *8a* and lxxxiii. 4, cxi. 3; between *v.* *8b* and lxix. 10^b; and between *v.* 10, xliii. 2 and xlv. 25. Psalms xxvii. (note *v.* 13), lxi., lxiii., and lxxxiv. will also naturally be compared.

According to Roy (49 f.), Pss. xlii., xliii., lxi., lxiii., and lxxxiv. were produced by Jews of the Dispersion, who longed to become pilgrims to Jerusalem. This view is plausible, but hardly necessary. Many pious Jews of Palestine might, in difficult times, be prevented from resorting to the temple, and it is generally presupposed in the Psalter that visits to the temple are for the purpose of thanksgiving for national mercies.

Deposited. Of the sons of Korah.

- 1
- 1 Even as the hind crieth in pain | towards running streams, 2
 So in pain my soul crieth | toward thee, O Yahwè !
 Thirsty is my soul for Yahwè, | for the God of my life ; 3
 When shall I go in and behold | the face of Yahwè ?
 My tears have been to me +as+ food | by day and by night, 4
 While they say to me continually, | Where is thy God ?
 Send forth thy lovingkindness, and thy faithfulness, | O
 Yahwè, let them lead me, 5
 Let them bring me in the midst of the singers | to the house
 of God,
 With ringing cries of thanksgiving, | the jubilation of
 keepers of the feast.
- 10 Why faintest thou, my soul ? | why frettest thou within me ? 6
 Wait on for Yahwè, that he may cause me to see | the
 habitation of God.
- Preserve me, [O Yahwè] my God, | from the tribe of the
 Arabians, 7
 From the race of the Jerahmeelites | rescue thou me.
 Rouse thee, O God of my succour ; | why dost thou forget
 me, 10
 While I walk tremblingly, | the Arabians pressing me hard ?
 They stir up wars continually | to consume thy guarded ones ; 8
 The mockeries of those that insult thee— | upon me have
 they passed.
- As with arrows in my bones | the Mişrites insult me, 11
 While they say to me continually, | Where is thy God ?
- 20 O Yahwè ! command thy lovingkindness, | and send forth
 thy faithfulness. 9
 Why faintest thou, my soul ? | why frettest thou within me ? 12
 Wait on for Yahwè, that he may cause me to see | the
 habitation of God.

Preserve me, [O Yahwè] my God, | from the people of the
 Arabians, xliii. 1
 From the race of the Jerahmeelites | grant me to escape,
 Awake, O God, my stronghold ; | why dost thou spurn me, 2
 While I walk tremblingly, | the Arabians pressing me hard ?
 [While they say to me continually, | Where is thy God ?]
 Send forth thy lovingkindness and thy faithfulness, | O
 Yahwè, let them lead me, 3
 Let them bring me to thy holy mountain, | to thy habitation ;
 30 Then will I go in to the altar of Yahwè, | to the God my
 redeemer, 4
 And will chant hymns to thee and thank thee on the
 lyre, | O Yahwè my God.
 Why faintest thou, my soul ? | why frettest thou within me ?
 Wait on for Yahwè, that he may cause me to see | the
 habitation of God.

2-7. Debarred from attendance at the festival services of the temple, the speaker has a keen inward pain like that of the hind in the hot summer-tide when the ordinary water-courses are dry. Communion with God is more to him than meat and drink ; this is the boon which fully justifies the title applied to Yahwè of 'God of my life' (cp. on lxxxiv. 3). At present, however, the stimulating sympathy of fellow-worshippers is exchanged for the derisive cries of unbelieving foreigners. But when God manifests himself as the Faithful One (expressed symbolically by 'Send forth thy lovingkindness,' &c.), all will be changed. Surrounded by the temple-singers, and led by invisible angels (חסד and אמת), he will once more move in procession to the sanctuary. Why then despond ? God will yet cause him to see His habitation ; wait His time.—2. גער. See crit. n., and cp. lxi. 3, lxxxiv. 3 (הי אֵל or הַי אֵל?). Cp. מִקּוֹר חַיִּים, xxxvi. 10. Ben Sira (xxiii. 4) has 'Father and God of my life.'—3. אבנא 'go in,' viz. to the temple.—6. Where is thy God ? The words are most forcible if we suppose the speaker to be a captive in a strange land.—7. On personification of attributes, see *OP*, 322, 334, and cp. lvii. 4.—9. הַכִּינּוּן of music, as Am. v. 23, Ezek. xxvi. 13.

12-22. Here the poet enters more into detail, both naming and describing the oppressors.—*Arabians*, i.e. N. Arabians. Cp. Lam. v. (on the text, see 'Lamentations, Book of,' *Enc. Bib.*), Neh. ii. 19, iv. 7 [1], vi. 1.—*Jerahmeelites*. See introd., and cp. 'Amalek,' lxxxiii. 8. Observe that in 2 K. xxiv. 2 we should probably read, 'the bands of the Cushites, and of the Aramites, and of the Misrim (people of Muşri), and of the bnè Amalek.' Cp. on Pss. lxxiv., lxxxiii.

16. Cp. lxxxiii. 4, cxl. 3, and especially cxx. 5-7.—17. Cp. lxix. 10*b*.—18. *Thy guarded ones* = thy remnant. Cp. Isa. xlix. 6 (נצורי ישראל).

23-33. The same petitions and descriptions as before, but with fuller details of the expected happy return. Then the speaker will resume his lyre : he could not sing 'songs of Yahwè on foreign ground' (cxxxvii. 4). Theodoret has already made this remark ; he thinks that the psalmist assumed prophetically the standpoint of the Babylonian exile.—25. זִנְהָ. Again, in xlv. 10, 24, lx. 3, 12 (cviii. 12), lxxiv. 1, lxxvii. 1, lxxxviii. 15, lxxxix. 39, Lam. ii. 7, iii. 17, 31. Though also found in Hos. viii. 3, 5, Zech. x. 6, it is specially a psalmist's word. On usage, see crit. n. on xlv. 10, 24.

Critical Notes. For אלהים read יהוה, almost throughout (see General Introd.).

1. M כַּאֵיל. Read כאילת (Ol., Bö., Bi., Sta., Che., We., Du.). ת follows.—M תַּעֲרַג. G ἐπιποθεῖ; cp. T כִּרְגַג (see on lxxxiv. 2). Σ σπεύδει ('A ὡς αὐλῶν πεπρασιασμένος); cp. S' and J ('sicut areola,' &c., as if ערוגה, 'areola'). S, however, מִגִּיִּם, 'mugiens.' This sense is required by Joel i. 20 (תַּעֲרוּגוּ, of cattle); the same word may be used of a stag and of cattle (Bochart). In Joel the vss. again differ; G ἀνέβλεψαν, T מִסִּבְּרָא, 'A ἐπρασιώθη, J suspexerunt. J comments thus, 'quasi areola sitiens imbrem. Hoc enim uno verbo significat Aq., dicens ἐπρασ.' S as in Ps. Rödiger (Ges. *Thec.*) admits that 'mugiens' is plausible, but prefers 'desiderans' because עֲרַג can thus be connected with ערוגה. But ערוגה, if a genuine word, comes from עָרַג, 'to ascend' (so the Lexicons). If genuine, I say, because such a root is very doubtful, and how can ערוגה really mean 'a flower-bed in the form of a terrace' (see *JQR* xii. 380. on Cant. v. 13)? At any rate, we need not be exercised about תַּעֲרַג. Transposition makes all plain. Read, with Herz, תַּגְעַר. תַּגְעַר is, no doubt, commonly used of the divine rebuke or threat, but even here the original sense of 'cry' pierces through; and besides the Ethiopic cognate, we have Ar. حَار (see Ges.), 'mugivit, altâ voce rogavit, supplicavit cum gemitu et planctu' (*Koran*, Sur. xxiii. 6). See on the parallel passages, lxi. 3. lxxxiv. 3.—M עֵל. Read אֵל. The confusion is frequent.

3 f. M לֵאֵל הָי; so lxxxiv. 3 (but see note), cp. Josh. iii. 10, Hos. ii. 16. Read, with Duhm, הָי, metre improved and sense fuller.—M אַרְאָה; so G J. But S T, and some MSS. and edd., אַרְאָה. So rightly Bâ., We., Du. See on lxxxiv. 8, and *SBOT* on Isa. i. 12.

6. M בַּאֲמַר. Read בַּאֲמַרְם (ז. 11); so Kenn., Ol., Bi., Gr.; cp. S.

7. (From אֵלֶּה to נַפְשִׁי). The two Pases warn us of uncertainty. Note first the impossibility of אֲשַׁפְּכָה עָלַי. Elsewhere the phrase (שִׁיחִי לְבִי, שִׁפְךָ נַפְשִׁי) is followed by 'לִפְנֵי י', not by עָלַי (see lxii. 9, cii. 1, cxlii. 3, I S. i. 15, Lam. ii. 19). אֵלֶּה אֲזַכְּרָה is also very awkward. The doubts of scholars as to the rendering of the cohortative (see Hitz.; Driver, *Tenses*, § 51 f.) were very natural; editorial makeshifts are, of course, often very difficult to render. For a makeshift the reading before us certainly is. The true reading will appear through the manipulated text as soon as we have noticed the plan of interlacing the strophes by repeating certain passages (not only the refrain) either in the same or in a varied form. It is this, יְשַׁלַּח חֲסִדְךָ וְאַמְתָּךְ אֱלֹהִים [יהוה] יְבִיאֹנִי.

This approaches the traditional and agrees with the corrected text of xliii. 3a; it also approaches in some degree the corrected text of xlii. 9.

(From **פִּי אֵינְבֵר** to **אֱלֹהִים**). Again notice Pasek. Read probably **יְבִיאֹנִי בְּתוֹךְ מְשֻׁרְרִים אֱלֹהִים**. This differs from xliii. 3b except in the first word; the sense in part agrees, in part it is fuller. We should never have guessed **בְּתוֹךְ מְשֻׁרְרִים**; the general sense is suggested by l. 9, and the form by the necessity of finding a phrase out of which M's **בְּסֶךְ אֲדָדֶם** might have become corrupted. Let us now consider this strange expression. It is at once clear that **אֲדָדֶם** (Ba. Kau. **אֲדָדֶם**, cp. ἸΑ, *προβιβάζων αὐτούς*) is a mere editorial guess, like **אֲדָדָה** in Isa. xxxviii. 15 (see *SBOT, Isa.*). **דָּדָה** *sensim ducere* is no doubt a late colloquial word (see Levy). G, ὅτι διελεύσομαι ἐν τόπῳ σκαρῆς θαυμαστῆς (= **אֲדָדִיר**, so G in viii. 1, xcii. 6; Θ in xv. 3, lxxv. 5); from G and a few MSS., Kenn. and Bp. Horsley derive the reading **בְּסֶךְ אֲדִירִים**;¹ so too Bredenk. (*Gesetz u. Proph.* 143). But what does **סֶךְ** mean?² The present writer formerly (*Exp. Times*) proposed **בְּסֶדֶר אֲדָרֶם** (cp. lv. 14 f.); after which he found that Gr. had suggested **בְּסֶדֶר מְשֻׁרְרִים**. Certainly **מְשֻׁרְרִים** is plausible; **בְּסֶדֶר** does not, however, go well with **כִּישׁ'**. We must therefore try another explanation. Since **ת** and a sibilant may be confounded, and the context favours this, let us read **בְּתוֹךְ מִשׁ'** 'in the midst of the singers' (cp. lxviii. 26). Otherwise we might suspect **בְּסֶךְ** to be a corruption of **קֶדֶשׁ**, and boldly adjust to xliii. 3b.—**אֲדָדֶבִית** is better than **עַד־בֵּית**. **עַד** comes from **עַל** (influenced by **אֲדָדֶם**), and **עַל** from **אֵל**.

9. Read **הַכּוֹן** (G S; Gr. Du.). **חֹוֹגֵג** is a collective.—10. M **כִּה־תִּשְׁתַּחֲוִי**, with Pasek. The reduplicated form is improbable. xliv. 26 and Lam. iii. 20 might suggest **תִּשְׁחַוִּי**, but this would hardly have expanded so much. Read perhaps **מִה־תִּתְעַטְפִּי**; the changes are regular. Continue **וּמִה־ת'** (v. 12; xliii. 5). So Kōn. § 366 n, after G S S J.

11. Duhm remarks that the distich containing the refrain has in each stichos one beat too many. But this is due to corruption of the text. **עוֹד** is clearly a dittogram, and so, less clearly perhaps, but not less certainly, in **פָּנָיו**. Between these two words comes **יְשׁוּעוֹת**, each part of which phrase is questionable. The hope which sustains the

¹ Bp. Horsley's theology is not very critical: he considers **אֲדִירִים** to be a title of the **אֱלֹהִים**, 'the persons of the Godhead.'

² Dr. J. P. Peters (*JBL*, '93, p. 57), reading as above, finds a reference to the Feast of Booths.

speaker is too briefly expressed in the single word אֲדַבֵּר; not without exegetical reason did AV render, in *v.* 6, 'I shall yet praise him *for* the help of his countenance,' but (on grammatical grounds) with an alternative version, '... his presence is salvation,' suggested by G's version, alike in *ver.* 6 and in *ver.* 12 and xliii. 5, σωτήριον (ἡ σωτηρία) τοῦ προσώπου μου ὁ θεός μου (apparently this is the refrain of the anticipated thanksgiving). The right correction is that of Herz—יִרְאֵנִי. 'ישׁ' this scholar leaves: but the object of the verb should certainly be מִשְׁפַּנּוֹת אֱלֹהִים. It is superfluous to attack פָּנֵי יְשׁוּעוֹת; the critics who adopt this reading from xlii. 12. xliii. 5, would hardly do so except from textual conservatism. If פָּנֵי were correct, it would be combined with נְשִׂיא. It was at any rate critical to re-attach אֱלֹהֵי [ו] to *v.* 6. But פָּנֵינוּ is certainly a corruption of כְּנוֹת, a fragment of 'כִּישׁ', and אֱלֹהֵי = עֲלֵהֵי = אֱלֹהֵיכֶם.

12 f. The text of MG is hard to translate and still harder to expound; the climax of unintelligibility, however, is reached in כִּהָר כִּצְעָר. But we must remember that the O.T. is in many parts very much like a palimpsest. Underneath this extraordinary passage we may very probably see corrupt fragments of the following (cp. on *ll.* 23 f.) :—

שְׁמֵרְנִי [יְהוּדָה] אֱלֹהֵי | מִמִּשְׁפַּחַת עַרְבִים
 כְּזָרַע יִרְחֵמְנֵי | [תְּפִלְמֵנִי]

The same distich, with one slight variation, and in a more complete form, appears as the opening distich of the third strophe according to our revised text. It is more easily recovered there, but it is certainly plausible to suppose that if יִרְדֵּן וְהַרְמוֹנִים in our passage is corrupt, and if some local or ethnic name is required, the best reading is יִרְחֵמְנֵי. Now it can hardly be doubted that those two place-names (if יִרְחֵמְנֵי can be called a name at all) which are so strangely coupled *are* corrupt. What can 'the land of Jordan and the Hermonim' mean? 'The land of Jordan' should be equivalent to 'the land across Jordan.' But why should 'the Hermons' (?) be added? Even Delitzsch, who can plausibly explain 'the land of Jordan' by 2 S., xvii. 27 (David at Mahanaim), is obliged to put considerable pressure on 'the Hermonim' to extract a sense from it. That כִּהָר כִּצְעָר is corrupt was seen long ago by Olshausen, but his ingenious correction הַר מוֹעֵד (also Gr.'s) is useless, because the passage is not adapted for superficial emendation. If, however, מוֹרֵעַ יִרְחֵמְנֵי is a correct restoration, we cannot doubt that כִּהָר כִּצְעָר is a second attempt of the early editor to make sense of a corruption of these two words (כִּהָר = מוֹרֵעַ, and כִּצְעָר = יִרְחֵמְנֵי), which has resulted in the omission of the verb תְּפִלְמֵנִי (restored from xliii. 1). (It may be admitted that the correction הַר כִּצְעָר, 'thou little mountain,' *i.e.* Zion [see introd.], is also plausible; but it is equally marked with superficiality, and the phrase is not in itself a natural one.)

It will be remarked that the unexpectedness of the names 'Arabians' and 'Jerahmeelites' led the scribe, in both cases, into dittography. עַרְבִים is perhaps miswritten twice, as עַל־כֵּן and as אֶזְכְּרֶךָ, and יֶרְחַמְעֵלִים certainly twice, as יֶרְדֵּן and חֶרְמוֹנִים. For שִׁמְרֵנִי = נִפְשֵׁי תִּשְׁתַּוְּחָה (cp. on xxv. 1, though the penultimate reading of the verb in *l.* 12 may have been שִׁפְטֵנִי (cp. xliii. 1), in which case the initial ת in תִּשְׁתַּוְּחָה may belong properly to the same group of letters as נִפְשֵׁי (ת for ט): That the initial כּ in כִּי־מִשְׁפַּחַת was lost is not surprising; when the same letter is repeated, one of the two often falls out. It is clear that the arrangement of this strophe (2) was disturbed. A regard for sense, and for the arrangement of str. 3 will enable us to remedy this.

14. M אֹמְרָה (with Paseḳ). xliii. 2 (*l.* 25) has כִּי־אָתָּה (again Paseḳ). Both readings are corrupt; in *l.* 14 read עֵנְרָה, in *l.* 25, הִקְצֶה (cp. xliv. 24).—M לֵאמֹל סִלְעֵי. The three לs awaken suspicion. xliii. 2 (*l.* 25) has אֱלֹהֵי מַעְוֵי. Read here אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׁעֵי (xviii. 47, xxv. 5, xxxvii. 9). Cp. on *l.* 20.—15. קָדַר. Read הִרְד; so too *l.* 26. Cp. on xxxviii. 7.—M אֹיֵב. Read, for consistency, עֲרָבִי; cp. vii. 6, xviii. 1, lxxiv. 3, 10.

16. M קוֹרָא תְהוֹם אֶל־תְּהוֹם קוֹרָא (תְהוֹם masc.; see Albrecht, *ZATW*, xvi. 62). J 'abyssus abyssum invocat.' Fine; but the credit belongs to the editor. Unless *ll.* 14, 15 be excised as an editorial substitute for the true text, *ll.* 16, 17 cannot originally have agreed with the text of *v.* 8. A lover of vague but grand poetry may regret this. Read מִלְחָמוֹת יִגְרוּ (cp. cxl. 3^b).—M לְקוֹל צְנוּרִיד. What can צְנוּר mean? In 2 S. v. 8 it is perhaps a corruption of צִיּוֹן (see *Crit. Bib.*). Frd. Del. (*Proz.*, '86, 165 n. 1^b) compares מְנָרָא (Tg., Talm.), 'stone, rock'; but most explain 'channel' from New Hebrew. G's καταρρακτῶν (Gen. vii. 11) is obscure. Read perhaps לְכַלּוֹת נְצוּרִיד.

17. M כָּל־בְּשָׁרִיד וּנְגִידִיד. Three difficulties, 1. the tautology; 2. the extreme doubtfulness of מִשְׁבְּרִים, 'breakers' (see on xviii. 5); and 3. the connexion. Omitting כָּל as a dittogram, and assuming a transposition, I am compelled to read לְעֵנִי מְחַרְפִּיד (cp. lxix. 10^b).

18. M בְּרָצָה (Paseḳ); 'ר here, as in Ezek. xxi. 27, is corrupt. Read כְּרָקֵב; cp. lxiv. 3. A less easy and suitable correction is כְּרָקֵב (Ol., Gr., Che., Kau., Du.). Herz בְּרָצִין (or כְּרָ): G ἐν τῷ καταθλάσθαι.—M צוֹרֵי. Read מְצָרִים (vi. 8).—M אֹיֵב. Read עֲרָבִי, restoring historical colour.

20. Evidently the text of *v.* 9 is in disorder (note two Paseḳs). Ol. and We. omit *v.* 9 as being unsuitable, and not required in a strophe of

'six verses.' But the metrical arrangement requires another line, and we expect a reference to Yahwè's חֶסֶד and אֶמֶת as in the two other strophes (rightly read). Besides, *v.* 9 as it stands is too odd for an interpolator to have invented. Removing the dittographed accretions, and correcting gently, we get צִוְיָה יְהוָה חֶסֶדְךָ | וְשִׁלַּח אֶמֶתְךָ יוֹכֵם. is a corruption of a dittographed יְהוָה (suggested by בְּלִילָה); it is, however, the second יְהוָה which is superfluous. The י in צִוְיָה comes from י = יְהוָה. יְהוָה חֶסֶדְךָ should be חֶסֶדְךָ, as in the other strophes. בְּלִילָה comes from אֱלֹהִים (as in lxxvii. 3), a variant to, or correction of, יְהוָה. שִׁירָה comes from שִׁלַּח, while עֵנְי תֵּפֶ is probably a corruption of אֶמֶתְךָ, and לָהּ is dittographed from לֹא in לֹא לֵאלֹהֵי. לֹא לֵאלֹהֵי סְלֵעֵי (see on *l.* 14). The *δηλωσει* of the common text of G comes from *ῥῆμα αὐτοῦ* (cod. A); so Bruns.

23 f. See on *ll.* 12 f. שִׁפְטָנִי should be שִׁמְרָנִי; שִׁמְרָנִי (Pasek precedes) comes from מְגוּרֵי עֲרָבִים. The traditional reading is hard to interpret; גּוֹי לֹא־חֹסֵד should mean the unfaithful section of the Jewish people in Palestine. But it is plain from xlii. 11, &c., that the enemies referred to are foreigners. We expect the ethnic name of the foreigners to be given. 'Hermonim' cannot be the name; surely לֹא־חֹסֵד can only come from יִרְחֹמְאֵלִים; parallels are not scarce. And just as מְגוּרֵי follows the disguised עֲרָבִים, so מְגוּרֵי in disguise follows יִרְחֹמְאֵלִים though it may (strangely enough) with equal truth be said to precede it. The disguise of מְגוּרֵי is מְגוּרֵי; that of the dittographed יִרְחֹמְאֵלִים is יִרְחֹמְאֵלִים.

25. For כִּי־אָתָּה read הִקְיָצָה (ק and ת confounded). See on *l.* 14.—27. The line could not have been omitted, and it just completes the strophe.

26. M צוֹרְרֵי. Again read מְצַרִּים cp. on lxxiv. 5.

28. M אֹרֶךְ. Read חֶסֶדְךָ (so *ll.* 7, 20); ח and א confounded, as often. Lag. ingeniously, אֹרֶךְ וְתִמְיָד, which might favour Duhm's hypothesis (?).—M הִפָּה. Read יְהוָה (*l.* 7).—M וְנִהְיִי. Some MSS. יִנְחַמְנִי (cp. on xxiii. 4).

30. M אֱלֹהֵי שִׁמְחָתִי אֲנִילָה. Duhm, אֱלֹהֵי שִׁמְחָתִי גִילִי. But אֱלֹהֵי is not a probable phrase, nor is אֲנִילָה a synonym of אֹרֶךְ. Read אֱלֹהֵי גִילִי וְאֹרֶךְ.

PSALM XLIV.—I.

TRIMETERS. Probably the preface to a lost historical psalm: cp. lxxviii. The speaker is pious Israel (see on *v.* 5). Note point of contact with Ps. lvi. (note

on *v.* 9) and Ps. lxxx. (on *v.* 2). The division of Ps. xlv. into two parts is not only Bickell's; it was made independently in India by Rev. Jacob Thompson. *Psalms of the Sons of Korah*, Cottayam, Travancore, 1892, p. 16. Bickell has conjectured that between *vv.* 10-27 a leaf fell out, so that xlv.⁽¹⁾ lacks the end, and xlv.⁽²⁾ the beginning. The hypothesis, however, implies what we can hardly assume, viz. that the MS. was written on leaves.

Deposited. Of the sons of Korah. Deposited.

		1
1	O Yahwè! we have heard with attention, Our fathers have recounted unto us, The deeds thou didst perform in their days, The works of thy hands in the days of old.	2
	? [Thy people thou broughtest out of Egypt]? Nations didst thou drive out, and those didst thou plant in; ? [And when their enemies oppressed them,]? Peoples didst thou shatter, and those didst thou rescue.	3
10	For not by their sword did they conquer the land, Nor did their own arm bring them victory, But thy right hand, and thine arm, And the light of thy face, because thou favouredst them.	4
	It is thou who art my King and my God, The author of Jacob's victories :	5
	With thee can we butt our foes, With thy name trample down our assailants.	6
	For it is not in my bow that I trust, My sword cannot bring me victory ;	7
20	It is thou that dost deliver us from our foes, And puttest those that hate us to shame.	8
	Continually we make our boast of thy name, To the Most High we perform our vows. [In thee we are fearlessly confident ; What +indeed+ can earth's race do unto me ?]	9

Conclusion lost.

5 f. Cp. lxxviii. 55, lxxx. 9.—9, 17. Cp. xx. 8, xxxiii. 10, 1 S. xvii. 45.—11. The synonyms, as in lxxiv. 11, cp. Sirach xxxiii. 7.—12. *My king*, i.e. Israel's king, cp. *l.* 13, and see on *v.* 3.—14. *Jacob*, i.e. Israel. So lxxvi. 7, lxxxiv. 9, lxxxv. 2, lxxxvii. 2, but not

xxiv. 6 (see note).—15. *Can we butt*; for the metaphor, see Dt. xxxiii. 17, 1 K. xxii. 11, Dan. xi. 40.

16. **With thy name** = with thy Presence; cp. *l.* 21, and see 'Name,' *Enc. Bib.*—21. Cp. lvi. 11 (corr. text).

Critical Notes. 1-4. M אלהים. Read יהוה.—M בימי קדם: (note Pasek). Read אַתָּה יָדִיד (note Pasek). Read מַעֲשֵׂה יָדֶיךָ בְּיָמֵי קֶדֶם. Transposition of the two halves of the line; מ in מעשה overlooked, owing to the preceding מ.—Lines 6 and 8 gain in effect through being viewed as the second lines respectively of two successive couplets. For תרע read תָּרַץ, and for תְּשַׁלְּחֵם (the sense of which is not clear) read תְּהַלְּצֵם. Some reference to the troublous side of Israel's early history is surely to be expected.

13 f. Read וְאֱלֹהֵי (G, Bi.).—צוה. Read כִּי־צוּהָ (G, Kenn., Bi., We.). Cp. lxxiv. 12b.

21 f. M באלהים; read בְּלִי־הַיּוֹם (dittographed). M וְשָׂמַךְ (with Pasek); read שָׂמַךְ. See on lvi. 11, and cp. lxxix. 31.—M לְעוֹלָם נֹדֵדָה סֵלָה. Read לְעֵלְיוֹן נִדְרֵינוּ נְשַׁלֵּם. See on lxi. 10.—Supplement from lvi. 12.

PSALM XLIV.—2.

TRIMETERS. A prayer of the innocent martyr-nation (*vs.* 18, 19, 21). The situation is briefly this. The Davidic king has been set aside, and further resistance has become hopeless. There is no security for life in the land of Israel; Israel is mocked by all, and captives or fugitives of its race are scattered everywhere. 'Where is thy God?' is the blasphemous cry of the Arabians and Jerahmeelites (cp. on xlii.—xliii.. lv. and lxxiv.). Israel has not deserved such a fate; it is true—sincerely true—to its legal obligations; indeed, it is its religious strictness which so exasperates its enemies. How can Yahwè be angry with his people? Israel is down-trodden—is even nigh to death. An appeal to the divine lovingkindness is its only hope. The (assumed) background, therefore, is, not the time of Hezekiah and Sennacherib (cp. Lag., *Mittelalt.*, ii. 377), but that of the Exile.

The psalm is strikingly parallel to Pss. lx. and lxxxix.⁽²⁾; indeed, it is as closely related to them as Ps. lxxiv. is to Ps. lxxix, and the same circumstances are presupposed in it as in Pss. xlii.—xliii. There is a strong imaginativeness in the assumed background, but the voice of conscious innocence, which demands a just retribution, is that of the *hasidim* throughout the period which opens with the establishment of the Law. In fact, the doctrine of retribution in this life lies at the root of the psalmist's complaints, and leads to the intemperate cry, 'Awake, O Yahwè,' which (see on l. 27) John Hyrcanus criticized.

Our view of the date and meaning of Ps. xlv.⁽²⁾ is closely connected with text-critical considerations. If we venture on no important corrections of the text of M G, we shall probably incline to a Maccabean date, for which the present writer has strongly argued in *OP*, 91-95. For this view there is both ancient and modern authority. Theodore of Mopsuestia,¹ Theodoret, Chrysostom conceived Ps. xlv. to be a prophecy of the Syrian persecution, and this view early became naturalized in England through the commentary on the Psalter (*In Ps. Librum Exegesis*) which was once assigned to Bede, and from which are derived the arguments prefixed to the psalms in the Anglo-Saxon version commonly known as the Paris Psalter.² Calvin and Bossuet inclined to it, and many moderns, including Hitzig, Bähgen, Buhl,³ Wellhausen, Duham, and Kautzsch, have

¹ See Bähgen, *ZATW*, vi. 273.

² See J. D. Bruce's able dissertation, Baltimore, 1894.

³ *Zt. f. d. kirchl. Wiss.*, '83, p. 226, note (referring to I Macc. vi. 28-54). In *OP*, 93, I have referred to this passage and to I Macc. ix. 18 (death of Judas) as supplying fit occasions for the psalm (see also note *j*, p. 103).

accepted it in the more natural form that it is the expression of Jewish feeling under the Syrian persecution (see *OP*, 91-93). Those, however, who feel the difficulty of supposing a Maccabean psalm were provided with a critical refuge by Ewald (*Dichter*, ii. 353 ff.; cp. *Hist.*, v. 120 note), and especially Robertson Smith (*OTJC*², 438), whose view the present writer has repeatedly (e.g. *Kohut Memorial Volume*, '97. p. 115) endorsed, and in Germany Professor G. Beer (*India. u. Gem. F.* p. lv.).

Certainly persecution of the Jews under Artaxerxes Ochus, such as Robertson Smith supposes, would plausibly explain a good number of psalms, and especially xlv., lxxiv., lxxix. Unfortunately, the evidence for it is but slight, and, according to Willrich (*Judaica*, 1900, pp. 35-39), there is no reason to suppose that the good relations between the Jews and the Persian kings were ever disturbed. It is true scholars like Nöldeke and Judeich have expressed an opposite view.¹

A theory like that of Professor G. A. Barton (*Amer. Journ. of Theol.*, iii. [99]. 744 ff.), who analyzes Ps. xlv. into three strophes, representing three different periods: (1) a song of triumph from the pre-exilic age, (2) a portion called forth by the defeat of the national armies in the time of Judas Maccabæus, and (3) a complaint occasioned by a religious persecution in the days of Bagoses, is liable to attack from several sides, and is really less plausible than any one of the chief competing hypotheses.

The most important of the new textual emendations relate to *ll.* 2, 16, 31. The first cuts away one of the chief grounds of the Maccabean theory, viz. that the national armies had been recently defeated; the second points to the Arabians and Edomites as the chief enemies of the Jews; the third removes the reference to jackals, which Hitzig adduces as favourable to his theory that a defeat of the Jews near Jamnia (1 Macc. v. 56-62) was the occasion of the psalm (cp. 'Fox,' col. 1563, *Enc. Bib.*).

The objection to the new theory (apart from its textual basis) is that it implies a representation of the sufferings of the captivity, which is opposed to that of the late prophetic school of writers. Those sufferings were, from a theological point of view, occasioned by the sins of the former generations—their idolatry and their other illegalities. But Ps. xlv. and the related psalms expressly claim for the Jews the possession of legal righteousness. The psalmists, however, are neither prophets like Jeremiah nor church-historians like the Chronicler. Avoiding all distinct reference to contemporary history, they are obliged to adopt a more or less imaginary historical background, but the essential part of their poetical productions is not the assumed background, but the very real ideas and aspirations of the pious community which is the speaker. They could think themselves back into the external surroundings of an earlier age, but they could not, at the dictates of literary consistency, cease to be themselves. Bredenkamp's argument (*Gesetz u. Propheten*, 127, note) for an exilic date is therefore more ingenious than successful. The psalm must be post-exilic, and though a date in the late Persian period may (in spite of Willrich's criticism) not be impossible, it may appear safer to refer the psalm to the early Greek period, perhaps to the time when Palestine suffered so terribly from the first Ptolemy (cp. Willrich, *Juden. u. Griechen*, 24).

The points of contact with Pss. lx. and lxxxix. (see on *ll.* 1, 2, 5) are noteworthy. See also on Pss. lv., lxxiv.

Some stanzas lost.

- | | | |
|---|--|----|
| 1 | But now thou hast cast off our king, | 10 |
| | And succourest not in our distresses ; | |
| | Thou causest us to turn back from Mišsur, | 11 |
| | Those that hate us take spoil at their pleasure. | |

¹ See Nöldeke, *Enc. Brit.*, xviii. 580: *Aufsätze zur pers. Gesch.*, 78; Judeich, *Studien*; Cuneve, *Intr. Is.*, 359.

	Thou givest us up to Cushan, to Jerahmeel,	12
	And scatterest us among the nations ;	
	Thou sellest thy people cheaply,	13
	And gainest nought by the purchase money.	
	We are become a taunt to our neighbours,	14
10	A scoff and a jeer to those around us ;	
	Thou makest us a byword among the nations,	15
	A thing for the peoples to shake the head at.	
	My disgrace is before me continually,	16
	The shame of my face covers me,	
	The mockery from Zarephath and Gebal,	17
	From the sons of Arabia and of Amalek.	
	All this has befallen us, but we have not forgotten thee,	18
	We have not been false to thine ordinance ;	
	Our heart has not turned back,	19
20	Our steps have not swerved from thy way.	
	If we had forgotten the name of our God,	21
	Or stretched out our hands to an alien god,	
	Would not Yahwè search this out,	22
	For he knows the secrets of the heart ?	
	Nay, for thy sake Jerahmeel has killed us,	23
	We are reckoned as sheep for slaughter.	
	Rouse thee, why art thou angry, O Lord ?	24
	Awake, cast not off thy pious ones !	
	Wherefore hidest thou thy face,	25
30	Forgetting our misery and oppression ?	
	For thou hast made us to dwell in dark places,	26
	And enveloped us in gloom +of Deathland+.	
	For our soul is bowed down to the dust,	26
	Our body cleaves to the ground,	
	Arise to be our help,	27
	Set us free for thy lovingkindness' sake.	

1-4. Cp. lx. 12, lxxxix. 39, 43 f., lxxx. 13.—5-8. Cp. lx. 6, cvi. 27, Dt. xxxii. 30, Isa. lii. 3.—9. Cp. lxxxix. 4, lxxx. 7.—קָלַם, a late word (Jer. xx. 8 only), cp. קָלַסָה (Ezek. xxii. 4), and the late verb קָלַס.

11 f. קִישָׁל, cp. Dt. xxviii. 37.—**בִּינוֹר**; cp. crit. n. on lxxx. 7.—17 f. Cp. xlii. 4, 7, lxxiv. 18, and see introd. The Arabians and Amalekites or Jerahmeelites, with Zarephath and Gebals represent those neighbouring people, which, even before the end, had (as

it seems) been encouraged by Nebuchadrezzar to invade Judah (2 K. xxiii. 2; see on Ps. lxxxiii.).—17–24. Cp. Job's protestations (Job xxxi.).—18. **שָׁקַר בְּ** as lxxxix. 34.—25. Cp. xlii. **שֶׁב** (corr. text), lxix. 8, 10. This consciousness of legal righteousness is not confined to the psalms often regarded as Maccabæan (see e.g. Pss. iv., v., vii., xvi.—xviii., xxxv.).—26. **כִּצְאוֹ טִבְחָה**; cp. Jer. xi. 19, xii. 3, Isa. liii. 7.—27. Cp. vii. 7, lix. 6 (xlii. 10, xliii. 2). A vigorous criticism of the (traditional) reading, 'why sleepest thou'

(**לִמָּה תִישָׁן**), was made by 'the high-priest Johanan' (i.e. John Hyrcanus), who is said (*Sota*, 48a) to have abolished the daily liturgical use of *v.* 24 by Levites called **מְעוֹרְרִים** ('wakers'), 'Has God sleep? Does not the Scripture say, Behold the keeper of Israel neither slumbers nor sleeps?' Johanan added, however, that the words had a temporary justification with reference to the trouble of Israel as contrasted with the ease and prosperity of the nations of the world.—30. **לֶחֶן**. So xlii. 10, xliii. 2.—33 f. Cp. cxix. 25.

Critical Notes. 1. M **אֵף** G *vivi* δέ. Read **וְעַתָּה**.—M **וְהַתְּבַלְיִמֵנוּ**. The absolute use of **זָנָה**, though possible, is not probable. Read **אֵת־מְלִפְנֵינוּ**. See on lxxxix. 39, lxxiv. 1.

2. M **וְלֹא־תִצָּא בְּצַבָּאוֹתֵינוּ**. On this passage is based the theory that Ps. xliv. was written after a defeat of the Jews in the Maccabæan wars (see introd.). Comparing lx. 12 f., however, it becomes more than probable that we should read **וְלֹא־תִשְׁעַ בְּצַרוֹתֵינוּ**.—3. Read **מִמְצָר** (**נִי = מִ**).—5. 'Sheep of eating'? Read **תִּתֵּן צֹאנְךָ לִירְחֻמָּאֵל**. Cp. lx. 6a (corr. text).

8. M **רַב־בֵּית**. Read **הַרְבֵּית** (Gr.). Cp. Prov. xxii. 16a.—9. For **תְּשִׁימוֹנוּ** (copied in error from *l.* 11) read **הִינֵנוּ** with Duhm. See lxxix. 4.

15. M **מִקּוֹל מִחֲרָף וּמִגִּדְרָף**. **קוֹל** is too weak, and we require ethnic names in this distich. Read **קָלִים מִצְרַפֶּת וּמִגְּבָל**.

16. M **מִפְּנֵי אוֹיֵב וּמִתְנַקֵּם**. An earlier form of the text, however, gave **וּמִתְקוֹכִים**; the line, thus read, would contain an allusion to viii. 3 (see note). But the original reading is probably very different, viz., **מִבְּנֵי עָרֵב וְעִמְלִק** (cp. lix. 2).

25. M **הוֹרַנְנוּ כְּלֵי־הַיּוֹם**, an odd expression. **כְּלֵי־הַיּוֹם** is one of the disguises of **יְרַחֲמָאֵל** (so e.g. lvi. 2). Read **הִרְנַנְנוּ יְרַח**.—27 f. M **לְפָה תִישָׁן**, preceded and followed by **פֶּסֶק**. Read **תִּישָׁן** (similar case in lxxx. 5). **תִישָׁן** weakens the sense; we want a parallel to **תִּזְנַח**.—M **אֶל־תִּזְנַח לְנֶצַח נֶצַח**. **חֶסֶד** and **חֶסֶד** can be confounded (see on xiii. 2, xvi. 11, xvii. 15). Read **אֶל־תִּחְסִידֶךָ**.

31. M **כִּי דָפִיתָנוּ**. Del., '(We have not become apostates from thee) so that thou shouldst therefore have brought upon us our present

misfortunes'; so Driver, *Tenses*, § 398, Obs. Kön. (*Synt.* § 394g) thinks that this is one of the cases in which a causal clause, through connection with a negative statement, has become concessive ("not . . . on the ground that" = "in spite of the fact that"). All very acute, but unconvincing. כִּי preceding a statement respecting God's severe treatment of his people cannot be so explained; see lxxxviii. 4-10. Verse 23 was omitted in error, supplied in the margin, and at length inserted in the text at the wrong point. דַּכ, however, cannot be the right word. Nothing else in the psalm indicates that Yahwè himself had taken an active part in breaking Israel to pieces. The complaint of the community is simply that Yahwè had permitted the enemies of Yahwè's religion to decimate the adherents of that religion, and so had enveloped Israel with a cloud of death-like gloom. The right verb can only be restored when we have corrected the startling phrase which follows.—M בְּמִקּוֹם הַתַּנִּים, 'in a place of jackals,' Σ ἐν τόπω ἀουκίτην; cp. Jer. x. 22. But how can this be harmonized with דְּרִבִּיתָנוּ? We should rather expect, 'Thou hast given us up as a portion for jackals' (lxiii. 11). Hitz., it is true, takes the phrase מִקּוֹם תַּנִּים topographically, and thinks of the neighbourhood of Jamnia, where Joseph and Azarias were defeated (1 Macc. v. 56-62), and where jackals are said by travellers to abound. But the jackal is common (at the present day) throughout Palestine, and, the rest of the description being quite general, we are bound to ask whether Palestine, or the land of the Jews, may not be meant. The objection is that nothing has been said of the devastation of Palestine; the psalmist would surely not have passed this over. Thus none of these explanations is satisfactory; it remains to be considered whether the text is correct. One might first of all suspect תַּנִּים, which word, in Ezek. xxix. 3, xxxii. 2, is obviously miswritten for תַּנִּין, 'dragon.' With Ols. (1853) we might make the same correction here, and explain מִקּוֹם on the analogy of בְּמִן אֲשֶׁר in Hos. ii. 1, where it is explained by Kimhi as = תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר (so recently Nowack, and Kön., § 393). The sense produced is, 'instead of (= as if we were) the dragon.' Israel's affliction will then be compared to the vengeance taken by the God of light on the dragon of chaos (cf. lxxiv. 13 f., lxxxix. 11, and see 'Dragon,' 'Rahab,' *Enc. Bib.*). It is Gunkel's merit (*Schöpfung*, 70 f.) to have stated this view forcibly; Olsh. had thought of the crocodile as the תַּנִּין. But in lxxiv. 13 f., lxxxix. 11, Rahab or Leviathan and the dragons symbolize the opponents of Yahwè, and Israel could not be classed among these. It is also extremely doubtful whether מִקּוֹם will bear to be rendered 'instead of.' We cannot (with Now. on Hos., *loc.*) defend this rendering by Isa. xxxiii. 21; the phrase in this passage is explained better by König (see Isaiah, Heb., *SBOT ad loc.*), and in Hos. ii. 1 מִקּוֹם = in the place of exile (cp. מִדְּהָרָא, Hos. ii. 2). Putting

aside theories about the chaos-dragon (however sound these may be¹) let us seek some other way of correcting the text. What word will supply the most natural parallel to זלמיות (l. 48)? Pss. lxxviii. 7 (corr. text). cvii. 10, 14, Job iii. 5, x. 21 give the answer; it is either חֶשֶׁד or מִחֶשֶׁד. For 'במ' ת' read, beyond doubt, בְּמִחֶשֶׁשִׁים (lxxxviii. 7). We can now perhaps solve the problem of דִּפְתָּה; should we read הוֹשִׁבְתָּנוּ (cxliii. 6, Lam. iii. 6)?

PSALM XLV.

TETRAMETERS. This is at once a coronation and a marriage song. It is the second Solomon whom the poet, conscious of a specially strong inspiration, sets himself to celebrate, drawing attention successively to the king's singular wisdom and eloquence (cp. 1 K. iv. 29-33, x. 6 f., 23 f.), to his success in warfare (2 Chr. viii. 3), and to the righteousness of his rule (1 K. iii. 16-25). All these endowments are the gifts of God; the chief of them, however, is the king's inflexible justice, which is the cause and origin of his political influence, of his extensive commerce and vast supply of gold (1 K. x.). It is the crown of his felicity that he has for his principal queen an Egyptian princess (cp. 1 K. iii. 1, xi. 1-3), whose beauty and rich apparel are admiringly described, and to whom a patriotic exhortation is addressed by the poet. Lastly, the king is encouraged by the prospect of a family of sons, whom (with an allusion to 1 K. iv.) he may place over the provinces of Palestine, which is in the narrower and stricter sense his kingdom. Each stanza contains six lines.

The psalm is parallel to Ps. lxxii. The peculiarity of it is that the king (the Messiah) is represented as *merely* an idealized Solomon, and the poet even follows his model by mentioning a royal harem. It is not altogether surprising that some have called the writer a court-poet, and compared him to Theocritus.

In spite of this it is no mere poetic illustration of a biography of Solomon that we have before us, but really a Messianic psalm; the king, as the Targum says, is 'king Messiah.' Just as the life of David contributes elements to the description of the idealized people of Israel, which is the speaker in Ps. xviii., so, but in much larger measure, the life of Solomon supplies a basis for the description of the ideal king in Ps. xlv.

Credit is due to Giesebrecht for his reassertion (*ZATW*, i. [181], 318) of the Solomonic reference of the psalm combined with that of its post-exilic date. He has also called attention to the parallelisms between Ps. xlv. and the Song of Songs, and if one of these (v. 9, מֶרַח וְאֶהְלֹת, cp. Cant. iv. 14) has now disappeared, the other (xlv. 10, 15, cp. Cant. vi. 8) acquires additional force through textual emendation. It now becomes superfluous to look for a contemporary king as the hero of the poem, whether one of the Ptolemies (e.g. Philadelphus, see *OP*, 166-174, but cp. *JRL*, 106 f.; *Christian Use of Psalms*, 154 f.), or one of the Asmonean princes.

It is remarkable how little reality there is either in Ps. xlv. or in Ps. lxxii., except in the cry for justice which is audible in both. Did the Messianic hope burn more brightly in the hearts of the people than it seems to have done in those of the religious poets? We have to face the fact that the poet regards the conventional picture of Solomon as not unfit to be applied to the Messiah. It is true Solomon was not really a great conqueror, but the poet fancies that he was, and it is a painful reflection that the benefit of being subject to the Messianic king, typified (as was believed) by Solomon, has to be purchased by the 'nations' so dearly. 'How strongly this contrasts with the first of the great prophetic descriptions of the Servant of Yahwè (Isa. xlii. 1-4)!' See *Christian Use of the Psalms*, 145-158. Prof. W. S. Pratt, 'A Comparative Study of Ps. xlv.,' *JRL*, xix. [1900], 189-218, advocates a theory of composite structure, the nucleus

Gunkel, *Schöpf.*, 70f., refers to our passage in support of such a theory.

being *vv.* 9, 10, 13, and isolated words, &c., elsewhere. The textual basis, however, has not been made secure. Dr. Paul Reuben, who specially devotes himself to the textual basis, comes to very different results. 'Four stanzas, each of four stichi, written originally *βουστροφηδόν*. The main difficulty is a Pharisaic, anti-martial, addition in *v.* 5.' On the heading, see *Introd.*

Deposited. For the Cushanites. Of the sons of Korah.

Deposited. Marked : of 'Arab-ethan.

- | | | |
|----|---|----|
| | | 1 |
| 1 | My mind is devising goodly words ; | 2 |
| | I bend mine ear +upwards+ to a new lay. | |
| | Thou art wise with more than human wisdom, | 3 |
| | Poured upon thy lips is graciousness ; | |
| | Therefore Yahwè blesseth thee for ever, | |
| | * * * * * | |
| | Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O thou hero! | 4 |
| | Draw forth the javelin, and grasp the buckler. | |
| | (?) Yahwè thy God will make thy course to prosper,(?) | 5 |
| 10 | Because of his faithful and righteous covenant ; | |
| | He will answer thee with the glorious deeds of his redressing
right hand, | |
| | Yahwè lifts thee up for ever and ever. | 7a |
| | Upon those that hate thee, O thou hero ! thine arrows will
descend, | 6 |
| | They will fall upon the men of Arabia and Jerahmeel. | |
| | A sceptre of justice is the sceptre of thy kingdom, | 7b |
| | Righteousness thou lovest, iniquity thou hatest ; | 8 |
| | Therefore peoples do homage unto thee,
[All] kindreds of the nations serve thee. | |
| | Full of gold are all thy store-chambers, | 9 |
| 20 | Minas of Carchemish they bring unto thee ; | |
| | A daughter of kings stands +ready+ as thy consort, | 10 |
| | In the midst of court-women without number. | |
| | * * * * * | |
| | * * * * * | |
| | Hearken, O Egyptian maiden ; lean thine ear ; | 11 |
| | Forget thine own people, and thine own father's house : | |
| | For the king longs deeply for thy beauty ; | 12 |
| | For he is thy lord, [and Yahwè's anointed] : | |
| | And unto thee will they bow down, O Egyptian maiden,
with gifts, | 13 |
| 30 | The richest of [all] people will sue for thy favour. | |

Upon her neck a wreath of coral ;	14
Brocade of gold is her raiment ;	
To the king she is brought, her companions following her, ¹	15
² With exultant joy they enter the palace. ³	16
The crown of thine old age will be thy sons,	17
Whom thou wilt set as princes throughout the land.	

Appendix.

I will celebrate thy name from age to age,	18
So that peoples shall magnify thee for ever and ever.	

1. See introd., and cp. lxxviii. 2. The close of *v.* 2 runs in M G, 'My tongue is the pen of a practised (or, swift, G *ὀξύγραφου*) scribe,' as if the psalm were an improvisation. This agrees with the common view of the meaning of *l.* 1, 'My mind bubbles up,' &c., but the poet is far from denying that his heavenly message has received a skilful setting from human art.

3 f. The wisdom of the king is necessarily prominent. The supposed parallel (Isa. xxxiii. 17) for the traditional reading, in which the king's beauty is extolled, is highly doubtful (see *SBOT, Isaiah*, Heb. text, p. 196). The eloquence of Solomon was also a part of the tradition. The Messianic king is to charm all who hear him as Solomon charmed the queen of Sheba. See introd. *Therefore*. Pleased with the worthiness of his chosen one, Yahwè solemnly grants him perpetuity of rule. Cp. on *l.* 17.

7-12. This address to the king, who is imagined as present, is in the strongest degree prophetic. Nominally it is the Messiah (cp. cx.) who takes judicial vengeance on Israel's enemies, but the all-subduing energy comes from Yahwè. The language in *ll.* 7 f. is partly modelled on that of xxxv. 3 (see crit. n.), which is an address to Yahwè.

גִּבּוֹר (hero) too is applied elsewhere to Yahwè (cp. xxiv. 8, bis). *Covenant* reminds us of lxxxix. 29, 35, 40, and the whole line of Ps. cx., *l.* 8. *He will answer thee*, pointing to the constant prayers of the community for the day of Yahwè. *Glorious deeds*, **נִרְאָה** in its

derived sense, lxxv. 6, cxxxix. 14, &c. *His redressing right hand*; cp. Isa. xli. 10. *Lifts thee up*; cp. iii. 4, xxviii. 9.—13 f. A special proof of the king's love of justice.

15. On the unexpected words, 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever,' see crit. note.—*A sceptre of justice*. It is equally justice which destroys the wicked with a 'sceptre of iron' (ii. 9), and which tends Israel with a pastoral staff (xxiii. 4). On *v.* 7a (in M) see crit. note.

17. **Therefore**, &c. Does this mean that the vassalage to which the other peoples of the earth are reduced is the divine reward of the king's justice, or that the peoples will hasten to proffer obedience to so righteous a ruler (cp. xcvi. 10-13)? Ps. lxxvii. 8-11 is parallel. Few will regret the mysterious passage about being anointed with the 'oil of joy,' a phrase which should be metaphorical (as Isa. lxi. 3), but which the context (*v.* 9 in M) would almost require us to take literally. And who are the 'associates' (**חֲבֵרִים**) to whom M makes the poet refer? Are they the other members of the royal caste? or are they the 'friends' of the bridegroom, usually called **מִרְעִים**?

18 f. Again a great improvement in the text. M makes the poet abruptly turn aside to describe the bridegroom's perfumed dress. We then hear of 'ivory palaces' (why the plural?) and welcoming music, by which the law of parallelism is strangely violated, and at the same time pressure is put upon

¹ Brought unto thee.

² They are brought.

³ Of the king.

Hebrew usage. The revised text implies a reference to 1 K. x., and notice that in 1 K. x. 17 we hear of *manehs*, i.e. minæ, of gold. The mina of Carchemish was a standard weight.

21 f. **A daughter of kings.** If we kept the reading of M G ('daughters'), the phrase would be parallel to the 'queens' (מלכות) of Cant. vi. 8. But it is not likely that the inferior wives of the king should have this honorific title rather than the principal queen. Besides, the word in the next line, usually rendered 'the queen' (שֶׁנָּה), is really a fragment of *plagšim*, 'concubines,' so that the queen must be referred to in *l.* 21. There is an allusion to 1 K. iii. 1, and, in *l.* 22, to 1 K. xi. 3 and Cant. vi. *Sb* and *c.* For *thy consort* cp. Mal. ii. 14. The last two lines of strophe 4, relating probably to the queen, are not extant.

25. **O Egyptian maiden.** The reading has less certainty here than in *l.* 29, but there is nothing better to offer. See introd.

27 ff. Two reasons why the foreign princess should identify herself with the land of Israel, 1. the king is in love with her, and 2. he is her lord and master (אֶרְנִיף; cp. Gen. xviii. 12).

We might have expected a further reason to be given, viz. that the gods of Egypt have been abased before Yahwë. But it is only added by way of encouragement that gifts will flow in from all parts to the consort of the king.

31 f. See 'Pearl,' 'Ouches,' *Enc. Bib.* 3—3. *Her companions*, i.e. the bride's attendants.

35 f. The king is addressed. Cp. Prov. xvii. 6, 'Children's children are the crown of old men.' See introd.

37 f. This couplet is outside the strophic division. As we see from this and from the use of הוֹכִיר (cp. lxxi. 16, lxxvii. 12 (Kt.), Isa. lxiii. 7), it is the community which speaks, not the poet (as in *ll.* 1, 2). Presumably, therefore, it is the name of Yahwë which is to be celebrated. Possibly two lines, in which Yahwë was mentioned, have fallen out; cp. cxxii. 18 f.

Critical Notes. 1. M רַחַשׁ. G ἐξῆρεύξαστο; W F, 'overflows (with).'

The sense 'to seethe' is supported by מַרְחֶשֶׂת, a cooking-vessel (? G, ἐσάραπα), Lev. ii. 7, vii. 9, but is unproven. Better, Driver, 'is astir (with)'; so Bā. But the true sense is 'swarms.' Now in no language could it be said, 'My mind swarms with goodly words.' If ר were right, it would have to be followed by לְשׁוֹנִי (Talmudic Hebrew would allow this). Herz, חַרֵּשׁ; cf. Prov. xiv. 22, but חַרֵּשׁ can only be used of evil devices. Read חֲשֵׁב, which corresponds to the artistic character of the poem.—M דְּבַר טוֹב. W F, 'a theme that is good'; Driver, 'a goodly matter.' But *l.* 3 shows that words are meant. We might read, for clearness, דְּבָרִים טוֹבִים.

2. אֶמְרָ אֲנִי, a second Aramaism, followed by a word in an un-Hebraic sense (מַעֲשֵׂי, Θ τὰ ποιήματά μου, as if 'my poems'), which also lays too much stress on the personal feelings of the writer. Comparing xlix. 5 we should read אֶמְרָ אֲנִי לְמַשֵּׁל חָדָשׁ. ע in מַעֲשֵׂי is a corruption of or substitute for ל; י is a fragment of the closing ל. לְמַלֵּךְ in לְמַלֵּךְ comes from לְמַשֵּׁל. The final כ with the following לֵשׁ represents חָדָשׁ; שׁוֹנֵי עֵט comes from אֶמְרָ אֲנִי, which phrase was written twice over. סוֹפֵר מְדוּר represents הוֹסֵפֶת הַכְּתוּבָה (see on *l.* 3). Thus we are free from the singular comparison of the tongue to a pen.

3. M's **יִפְיִית** has arisen out of a dittographed **הוֹסִפֶּת** (see on *l.* 2). For the phrase **הוֹסִי' הַכְּנִיָּה**, cp. 1 K. x. 11 (Solomon). Wisdom and eloquence are rightly combined; against the ordinary view, see exeg. note. On **יִפְיִית** see Kön. i. 584. G S 'A S E', however, presuppose **יִפִּי יִפִּית** (so too Bā.; Du., **יִפּוּ**). Ges., Ol., Hu., Kau., We., **יִפִּית**; Now., Haupt (see *SBOT*), **יִפְיִית**.

7—9. Read **יִרְכֵךְ** (G S, Gr.), and, in *l.* 8, **הִרְק תִּרְתַּח וְהִחֹק צָנָה**, comparing xxxv. 2 f., where we read **שָׁכַר**, probably a synonym of **תִּרְתַּח**, 'javelin' (see on xxxv. 2, *lv.* 22). The corruptions are very obvious; note that **צָלַח** does double duty—for **צָנָה** and for **יִצְלִיחַ**. (Observe the *Pasek* before **צָלַח**.) M's text suggests that **הוֹד וְהוֹדֵר** was the name of the king's Excalibur, which is, of course, absurd. What follows is uncertain. **רַכֵּב** may have various origins. Coming after **צָלַח** one may think first of **דִּרְכֵךְ**. To 'ר' prefix **אֱלֹהֵיךָ**, which fell out owing to its resemblance to **הוֹדֵךְ וְהוֹדֵךְ**. For **רַכֵּב**, however, G apparently reads **כִּלְיָךְ** (*βασιλευε*), unless indeed *βασ.* represents a variant which fixed itself in the text beside **צָלַח**. At any rate, some statement bringing *Yahwè* into relation to the king's conquests seems to be required (cp. cx. 5). **רַכֵּב** cannot be right; there is no parallel for the pregnant sense 'ride into battle' (*Siegfr.-Sta.*), and horses and chariots were opposed to the theocratic ideal (see on xx. 7, and cp. *Zech.* ix. 9). G's *ἐντεινον* implies **וְהִרְרֵךְ** (*Jer.* ix. 2), which Horsley and Hitzig adopt; but would not such an exhortation be premature (see *l.* 13)? It is, however, at any rate, an error to regard the second **וְהוֹדֵךְ** as a mere dittographic echo (Ol., Del., Hu. ?; Kön., *Styl.*, 302).

10. M **עַל־דְּבַר אֱמֶת וְעֲנוּה־צֶדֶק**, i.e. 'for the cause of faithfulness and humility, (and) righteousness' (Bā.), 'for the protection of faithfulness, and for answering righteousness' (Du.), 'for truth and meekly-gotten victory' (King, *Asaph-psalms*, 25). First, as to **עֲנוּה־צֶדֶק**. Observe the similar asyndeton in *v.* 9, where (as also here) it is not recognized by G. The pointing, however, implies **וְעֲנוּת צֶדֶק** ('*A. και πραύτητος δικαίας*)—an impossible phrase. T **וְעֲנוּה וְצֶדֶק**; G **וְצֶדֶק וְעֲנוּה** (*κ. πραύτητος κ. δικαιοσύνης*). Stade and Kau. omit **צֶדֶק**; but this makes the line too short. Ol., Bi. follow G, but omit the first **ו**. But can **עֲנוּה** and **צֶדֶק** be combined thus? Is there not a redundancy? So at least thinks Wellh., who further remarks that **עֲנוּה** seems to conceal some term analogous to the preceding **דְּבַר**. But the only such term is **עֲנִין** 'business,' 'matter,' an Aram. word in *Koheleth*. Duhm takes **עֲנוּה** to be *Infin. Kal.* with fem. ending. But the word is surely corrupt; the word which it represents belongs to the next line (see next note). And what of **עַל־דְּבַר**? Clearly it is too prosaic a phrase (cp. on cx. 4).

The requisite word is ברית (cp. lxxxix. 4, 35, 40). For metre's sake, read עֲלֵי בְרִית.—Next as to אָכַת and צָדָק. The object of the king's expedition is supposed to be the maintenance of the *cause* of fidelity and righteousness (perhaps also of humility), i.e. of the cause of the king's faithful and righteous subjects (the עֲנוּיִם or צְדִיקִים). Ges., however (*Thes.*, s.v.), takes אָכַת to mean the king's fidelity to his promise. But however we explain the phrase, it is an unnatural one. We require in this context a reference to God's 'fidelity' and 'righteousness,' and such a reference exists if we read עֲלֵי בְרִית אֲכַתוֹ וְצָדָקוֹ, or, as lxxxix. 34 suggests, וְחֶסְדּוֹ (צָדָק and חֶסֶד are liable to confusion; cp. *ασσεδ* and *ασσεδεκ*, rival readings of G in Isa. xix. 18, and a note on cxliv. 2). Cp. Ps. cx., l. 8.

11. וְיַעֲנֶנָּה in וְעֲנוּהָ'צ' (see above) is a corruption of וְיַעֲנֶנָּה וְתוֹרֵךְ (like וְתוֹרֵךְ in xl. 9b) is a corruption of נֹרְאוֹת (dittographed), unless indeed both 'תוֹר' and 'נֹר' are corruptions of נֹרְאוֹת.—For יְכוֹנֵךְ read יְכוֹן צָדָקוֹ (cp. xlvi. 11, Isa. xli. 10). צָדָק fell out through its resemblance to חֶסֶד which follows. ך arose from assimilation of יְכוֹן to חֶסֶד. Clearly Yahwè's right hand, not the king's, must be referred to (cp. xviii. 36, xx. 7, xlvi. 11, liv. 7, lx. 7, &c.).

12. The sixth line of str. 2 is produced by the transference of the first half of v. 7, which in M is בְּסֶאֱפָא אֱלֹהִים עוֹלָם וְעַד, a corrupt passage which is most easily corrected into נִשְׁאָף וְגו' (see on l. 15).

13 f. שְׁנוֹנִים and עֲנוּיִם may both represent [ב]ִּישְׁנוֹנָיִךְ, dittographed. תַּחֲתֶיךָ possibly comes from יִנְהַתֶּנִּי (xxxviii. 3). Add [ה]ִּנְבוֹר; G *dúvare*.—In l. 14 we must surely restore בְּלִבְ עֲרָבִים וִירַחֲמֵאֱלִים probably = ב[ע]רַב. אוֹיֵב constantly represents עֲרָבִי or הַמֶּלֶךְ as commonly is a distortion of יִרְחַמְאֵל.

V. 7a seems at first like an insertion; it makes strophe 3 too long by one line. Those who either disregard structural considerations altogether, or (like Duhm) make the strophes virtually tristichs, will disallow this objection. The fact, however, remains that v. 7a is inconsistent with the context, which is an address to the king. Hence Saad., quoted by Ibn Ezra, paraphrases, 'God shall establish thy throne for ever and ever,' and Street (1790) and Ol. (1853) would prefix הַכִּין or the like. Lag. and Driver (*Tenses*, § 194), however, prefer to change וְעַד into סָעַד, while Bi. and Che.¹ suppose v. 7a to contain parts of two lines, which in the usual parallelistic form express the eternal duration of the king's dynasty. Any one of these views seems to me more plausible than the very simple expedient suggested by Bruston (so too Matthes, Giesebrecht, Wellh., Eerdmans (*Th. Tijdschr.* '94, p. 277), Duhm) of putting

the very weak word יהיה for the divine name, יהוה (substituted correctly, for the editorial reading אלהים), or of omitting אלהים, as suggested by Nöldeke (*ZATW*, '88, p. 156 f.). Still, we do not expect the eternal duration of the dynasty to be referred to; the poet is absorbed just now in the thought of the king's perfect righteousness. The line might be the pious ejaculation of an early reader (cp. Lam. v. 19) who considered Yahwè to be the all-sufficient king of Israel (cp. xliv. 5). Hort's explanation (note on Heb. i. 8), 'God is thy throne,' and Hupfeld's, 'Thy throne is [a throne of] God' (defended by König, § 277 f.) are at any rate too difficult. All this speculating, however, is rendered unnecessary by the correction proposed above (on *l.* 12).

17 f. We have seen (see exeg. note) how improbable M's reading is; note also the Paseḳ after על־כן. Read probably יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לְךָ. For the confusion between לְאֲמִים and לְאֲמִים, and continue כְּשִׁפְחוֹת עַמִּים יַעֲבֹדוּךָ. For the confusion between כִּישַׁחַד and יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה cp. a parallel in *l.* 28 f.

18. In M, the plur. form בְּגֵרֹת, and the asyndeton (קְצִיעוֹת without ו, but G inserts καί; cp. on *l.* 10) are suspicious. Note too that קְצִיעָה (sing.) only occurs once elsewhere—as the name of one of Job's daughters (Job xlii. 14), and that there it must be corrupt (see 'Kezia,' *Enc. Bib.*). Bi. and Du. omit; Herz, most ingeniously, reads הוֹצֵק (עַל); cp. *l.* 4. But there is deep-seated error. Read כִּילָאוֹת חֲרוּץ כָּל־מִגְרָתֶיךָ.

19. יִנְיֵי cannot mean 'harp-strings.' It is true Driver and Cowley refer to our passage in their note on Sirach xxxix. 15 (Heb.), but G there must be right against the Heb. text. The versions found no reference to music. היִכְלֵי שֵׁן too is peculiar (see exeg. note). Bp. Horsley, 'from cabinets of ivory of Armenia'; similarly Kay, except as regards 'Armenia' (cp. T). Read probably כִּינֵי כְרֶמְנִישׁ יוֹבְלוּ לְךָ; cp. on lxviii. 31 f.

21. M בְּנֹת מַלְכִים. Against this, see exeg. note. Read בַּת מַלְכֵי.—M בְּיִקְרוֹתֶיךָ, Baer and Ginsb. (Ben Asher), or (cp. Kön. ii. a, 275, 489) בֵּיקַן (Ben Naftali), as if 'among thy beloved ones' (i.e. the women of the harem?) but none of the versions sanction this. See Bā., who proposes בְּיִקְרוֹתֶיךָ 'within thy walls.' Duhm, בִּיקְרוֹת נָצְבוּ, 'come forward in jewels.' Much better Grätz, לְקָרְאֶתְךָ (cp. Ex. v. 20, vii. 15, Num. xxii. 34). Best of all (with בַּת מַלְכֵי) is probably חֲבֵרֶתְךָ (cp. Mal. ii. 14).

22. M שִׁנְגֵל לִימִינְךָ בְּכַתֶּם אוֹפִיר. שִׁנְגֵל of the Persian queen, Neh. ii. 6; cp. Dan. v. 2 f., 23 (Aram.). But we expect an allusion to the story of Solomon, whose principal wife is nowhere called שִׁנְגֵל, and we do not just yet expect a reference (unsupported by parallelism) to the splendid dress of the queen. The expression בְּכַתֶּם אוֹפִיר is also too vague.

G apparently read **כָּסַת** (*ματισμῶ*); Grätz, **בְּכַתֵּר** (so Che., *Enc. Bib.* i. 962; Herz). But we should certainly read (remedying the disarrangement of the letters), **בְּתוֹךְ פִּילִגְשִׁים אִין כּוֹסֶפֶר**; cp. 1 K. xi. 3, and especially Cant. vi. 8*b* and *c*.

25. M **וּרְאִי**. Read **בֵּת מְצַרִּים** (see on *l.* 29).—27 f. Prefix **כִּי** with G^B (*ὅτι*); the *καί* of G^{N^aAT} seems a wrong correction; note that **כ** precedes. For **וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוּ לָהּ** read **יִתְאַוְּהָ**. For **וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוּ לָהּ** read **וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוּ לָהּ**. **לָךְ** became **לוֹ** when the words were wrongly attached to *v.* 12. Really it is the obsequiousness of foreigners to the great king's spouse that is referred to; the words should introduce *l.* 29. In their place, as the close of *l.* 28, read probably **וּמִשִּׁיחַ יְהוָה** (cp. 1 S. xxvi. 16*a*), which fell out owing to its resemblance to **וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוּ** (for a parallel see on *l.* 17).

29. Read certainly **וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוּ לָךְ בְּתִמְצָרִים**. G *καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν αὐτῇ θυγατέρες Τύρου* (so G, but closing *l.* 28 as in M). Gr. follows S; Herz prefers to read (*l.* 28 f.) **וְהִשְׁתַּחֲוּ לָהּ בְּתִמְצָר**. But a satisfactory view of the whole stanza has to be obtained. **צַר** from **מִצַּר**, as in lxxxiii. 8. lxxxvii. 4 (see notes).

30. M **עַם**. Read **עַמִּים**, or (Herz) **פְּלִיעִים**. **כֹּל** perhaps fell out through the proximity (in M) of **כֹּל-כַּבּוֹדָה**.

31. M **פְּנִימָה בְּתִמְצָרָה**. Bā., Kau., &c., 'All splendour is the king's daughter within (the palace).' But the vague 'ב' **נִי**, the form **כ**, and **פְּנִימָה**, unsupported by a verb, are all equally improbable. The latter word Krochmal, Grätz, Che.⁽¹⁾, We. correct into **פְּנִינִים**—an improvement (wrongly questioned by Pratt), but insufficient. Read probably **עַל-פְּרָגְרִתֶּיהָ עֲנֵק פְּנִינִים**; cp. Prov. i. 9, Ex. xxviii. 22, 24, Prov. iii. 15 (Kt. **פְּנִינִים**). Note the corruption of *ἔσωθεν* in G (B **א**) into *εἰσέβων*, which Duhm strangely traces to **חֲשִׁמֵּל**.

32. Read **מִשְׁפָּצוֹת**; initial **נ** in M is a dittogram. With Herz, read **לְלִבוֹשָׁה**.

33 f. Read **לְמַלְכָּה תוֹבֵל אַחֲרֶיהָ וְיַעֲוֶתֶיהָ** (W F, 'on parti-coloured +cushions₄) has arisen out of **לְמַלְכָּה תוֹ**; **תוֹבֵל תוֹ** out of **תוֹבֵל תוֹ**; rampant dittography. **לְמַלְכָּה תוֹבֵל תוֹ** an editorial supplement.—M inserts **תוֹבֵל תוֹבֵל** and **מַלְכָּה**.

35. M **תַּחַת אֲבֹתֶיהָ**. This does not make sense. In *l.* 36 it is said that the sons shall be made princes or governors by their father; we should therefore have expected **אֲבֵיהֶם**. Herz corrects **תַּחַת בְּיָתֶד** or **תַּחַת שִׁיבֹתֶד**. No doubt 'ש' is right; the sibilant **ש** easily fell out after **ת**. But **תַּחַת** is hardly correct; read **עֲמָרַת** (Prov. xvii. 6).

38. For **יְהוֹדוּךָ** read **יִגְדְּלֶךָ** (cp. on xxviii. 7).

PSALM XLVI.

TETRAMETERS. The companion-psalms are xlvi. and lxxvi. The psalmist imagines himself in the midst of the events preceding the great judgment. He writes in the spirit of Isa. viii. 8-10, which is the insertion of a later editor in a prophecy of Isaiah. It may even be from this passage that he derives the עִמָּוְנִי

of the refrain; certainly another prophecy (Isa. xvii. 14) has influenced *l.* 12. The picture in the first stanza is that of a great upheaval of the powers hostile to Yahwè, symbolized by the ocean, and especially of the Jerahmeelites or Arabians (*l.* 20). Pious Israel remains unshaken and dauntless; it rejoices in the sense of its security, even when the tide of invasion (cp. Isa. viii. 8) comes close up to the walls of Jerusalem. It knows that Zion is in no real danger. The darkest night has its appointed limit; with the dawn Yahwè (invisibly present throughout) will appear (cp. xxx. 6, xc. 14). Then, with a mighty peal of thunder, the divine judgment will take place (lxxvi. 9 f.). This occupies the first two stanzas. In the third the feelings of the rescued people of Yahwè are described (cp. Isa. xxxiii. 18-21). They go out (cp. Isa. lvi. 24) and watch the destruction of the implements of war—a scene suggested no doubt by Isa. ix. 5 [4]. Universal peace is now the prospect for the future—a leading feature in a Messianic description (see lxxvi. 4, Isa. ii. 2-4, Mic. iv. 1-4). Should the survivors of the hostile nations cherish the idea of rebellion against Yahwè (cp. ii. 1), they are warned by a divine oracle to desist.

The psalm is strongly Messianic (Stade, *Akad. Reden*, 67 f.), cp. Ps. lxxv. Neither the deliverance from Sennacherib, nor any other event in Israel's history, could suggest the idea of an endless and universal reign of peace (*zv.* 9 f.). To assign Pss. xlvi. and xlvi. to the time of Isaiah (Ew.) is, therefore, impossible (cp. on xlvi.). It is possible, however, that some temporary deliverance of the Jews in post-exilic times may have added fuel to the flame of the Messianic hope; the successes of Alexander may have seemed to some a foretaste of the fulfilment of the promises (cp. Isa. xxv. 1-5?). Cp. Beer, *Indiv. Ps.*, p. xlv.

The titles of God in this psalm deserve attention—Yahwè Sebaoth (xxiv. 10), Jacob's God (xx. 2), Elyon (xxi. 8), all favourites of later writers.

Deposited. Of the sons of Korah. Of Salmah. Marked. 1

- | | | |
|----|--|---|
| 1 | Yahwè is unto us a refuge and a rock, | 2 |
| | He is found continually a help in troubles. | |
| | Therefore have we no fear, though the earth rock, | 3 |
| | Though the mountains tumble into the ocean's midst : | |
| | The billows of the sea may roar, | 4 |
| | The mountains may quake at the insolence thereof, | |
| | [Yahwè Sebāōth is] on our side, | 5 |
| | Our sure retreat is Jacob's God. | |
| | Let the city of our God [Yahwè] rejoice— | |
| 10 | The holy dwelling-place of the most High. | |
| | God is in the midst of her ; she cannot totter ; | 6 |
| | God will help her at the turn of the morn. | |
| | Nations roar, kingdoms show enmity ; | 7 |
| | He utters his voice ; +then+ the earth rocks. | |
| | Yahwè Sebāōth is on our side, | 8 |
| | Our sure retreat is Jacob's God. | |

Go, look at the wonderful works of Yahwè, 9
 Who has extinguished Jerahmeelites to the end of the land ! 10
 He breaks the bow and snaps the spear,
 20 [The shield of] Jerahmeel he burns with fire.
 'Desist ; assure yourselves that I am God, 11
 +That+ I am sovereign among the nations, sovereign over
 the earth.'
 Yahwè Sēbāōth is on our side, 12
 Our sure retreat is Jacob's God.

2. נִצָּן strictly, 'he lets himself be found,' *i.e.* by those that seek him (2 Chr. xv. 2).—5. There may be here a distant echo of the myth of the dragon (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Dragon'). So Gunkel.—9. One regrets to resign the supposed parallel to Isa. xxxiii. 21 which M's text apparently provides (see Del.); but textual criticism compels us. Nor is it possible to arrive at any agreement as to the right translation of M ; critics

will differ everlastingly, because the text is corrupt. See crit. note.

12. לְפָנוֹת בִּקְרָה. Duhm rightly compares Isa. xvii. 14, and sees an allusion to the story of the destruction of Sennacherib's army. See on Ps. xlvi.

17. The same exhortation in lxvi. 5. See introd.—19 f. See lxxvi., ll. 5, 6.

22. רוֹם, 'to show oneself supreme or victorious'; cp. xxi. 14, lvii. 6, 12.

Critical Notes. 1 f. M עֵז. Read either מָעֵז or (better) צָר. See on xxviii. 8.—M כָּאֵר. Read תְּמִיד (S, Gr.) ; cp. on ix. 10, cxii. 1, cxix. 4.

3. M בְּהִמְרֵהוּ. The intrans. use of הִמְרֵהוּ is far from probable. Ol., 'when he (God) changes the earth' ; but we should then expect בְּהַחֲלִיף (cii. 27). The final ר seems influenced by ר in אֶרֶץ. Read probably בְּהִמְוֹג (Kr., Gr.) ; cp. *l.* 14. *G* ἐν τῷ ταράσσεισθαι. The verb ταρα. occurs four times in this psalm in *G*. Here, however, we should do best to correct ἀλλάσσεισθαι. The τ is influenced by τω ; ρ and λ confounded phonetically.

5. M מִיָּמֵינוּ. Read נִלְיֵינוּ (cf. lxv. 8). Herz, מִי יָם.—Omit יַחֲכֵרוּ, a faulty variant to יִהְיוּ ; cf. lxxv. 19, where חֲכֵה is miswritten חֲכֵר.

7-9. M נְהַר פְּלִגְיֵי יִשְׁמָחוּ עִיר-אֱלֹהִים. What can this mean? Hitz. renders ll. 9, 10, "The Holy One of the dwelling-place of the Most High is a river," &c. But what circuitous phraseology ! and what a strange comparison ! xlvi. 2 will not justify the one, nor Isa. xxxiii. 21 the other, for both these passages are in disorder. Shall we, then, prefix חֲסִדוֹ (Bi.⁽¹⁾, Che.⁽¹⁾), or the like ? But that would be violent, and the result not adequate. Very possibly the above words represent the greater part of the refrain of the psalm. It is true, many since Ew. have

restored this refrain at the end of the first stanza. But they have not noticed that a part of it may exist in a distorted form in the text. The first elements that strike us are **שנ** and **גיו**, which clearly make up **משנב**. We can then perhaps recognize **[ינ]מנו** in **נהר**, and **לנו** in **פל** (**נו** more obviously = **מ**, but **נ** and **פ** are frequently confounded). **הו עיר אלהים** is a similarly distorted form of **אלהי יעקב**. Transpositions both of words and of parts of words are by no means uncommon in the traditional text. Hence **יעקוב** (the less common form of **יעקב**) became **קויעב**, and **אלהים** (written 'אלהי') was placed after the miswritten **קויעב** (which by corruption became **עיר** (**הו עיר**)). But **ישמחו** 'עיר-אל' has to do double duty. It stands in the second place for *l. 1* of stanza 2. Correct the first word into **תשׁמח** (cf. *xlvi. 12*), and read **יהוה אלהינו**. **סלה** (*v. 4*, end) is probably a corruption of **אלהים**; the **סלה** in *v. 8, 12* is an unintelligent assimilation to *v. 4*. *G*, however, has none in *v. 12*.

10. *M קדש משׁפני עליון*. Σ τὸ ἄγιον τῆς κατασκευῆς τοῦ ἱψίστου; *J sanctum tabernaculum altissimi*. But this rendering would require **קדש משׁכנו** or **קדש משׁכנו**, because *1. קדש* is an adjective; and *2. משׁכנים* (masc. pl.) only occurs once again—in *Ezek. xxv. 4*, and there means the tents of nomads). *Bä.*, therefore (so too *Now.*, *Bertholet*, and *Herz*), adopts *G*'s text, ἡγίασε τὸ σκῆμα αὐτοῦ ὁ ἕψιστος = **קדש משׁפנו** **עליון**. But this does not give the most appropriate sense. The declaration of Zion's inviolableness naturally begins with the statement, 'God is in the midst of her'; indeed, **בְּקִרְבָּהּ** suggests, if it does not necessarily imply, that **עיר** (fem.) immediately precedes. Read, therefore (transposing; see last note), **משׁפנו קדש עליון**.

13. *M כִּטּוֹ*. If this is right, the 'tottering' of the kingdoms is the result of the 'roaring,' *i.e.* the hostile demonstrations, of the nations. But the psalm suggests (cp. *lxxvi.*) that Judah is the object of attack. Read perhaps **שׁטְנו** (cp. on *lv. 9*). If so, *l. 14* gains in force.

17. *M כִּפְעֹלוֹת*. Read **נפלאות** (*lxvi. 5*). See on *xlvi. 2*.—*M* inserts **אֲשֶׁר־שָׁם שְׁמוֹת בְּאֶרֶץ**; so too *G*, except that *τέρατα* implies **שְׁמוֹת**, which *Lagarde* adopts, instead of the unique plural **שְׁמוֹת**. The clause, however, is suspicious, on account 1. of the prosaic **אֲשֶׁר־שָׁם**, and 2. of its metrical superfluity. It seems to have grown out of **שְׁמוֹת**, which is properly a variant to **נפלאות**. The expander may have modelled the clause on *lxxviii. 43*. Probably he read **שְׁמוֹת**: **שְׁמוֹת** is dittographed. *Herz*, less suitably, **משׁפנו**.

18. *M כִּלְהֵנוֹת*. But it is not the thought of the tranquillity of distant lands which lifts up the speaker's consciousness. Read

יְרַחֵמֵנוּ, and see on the || passage, lxxvi. 4.—20. Read probably [כִּנְנוּ] יְרַחֵמֵנוּ; cp. lxxvi. l. 6. M עֲגָלוֹת ‘waggon’s.’ G *θυρεούς*; T עֲגָלִין ‘shields.’ Hence Bā., Kirkpatr. עֲגָלוֹת. But in Num. xxxi. 50, Ezek. xvi. 12, עֲגָל = ‘ring.’ Most probably, however, עֲגָ comes from יְרַחֵמֵנוּ.

PSALM XLVII.

TRIMETERS. A summons to all peoples to pay homage to Yahwè, whose capital is Jerusalem, but whose realm is the world. It has a real though secondary connection with Pss. xlvi. and xlvi. (cp. ‘Jacob,’ v. 5, xlvi. 8, 12; ‘a great king,’ v. 3, xlvi. 3; ‘the Jerahmeelites,’ v. 4, xlvi. 5; ‘greatly to be revered is our God,’ v. 10, xlvi. 2; cp. also v. 2 with xlvi. 3). But it is more closely related to the other coronation or accession psalms (xcv.—c.; see *OP*, 163; Briggs, *Messianic Prophecy*, 456). It has also points of contact with Ps. xviii.; cp. especially v. 4 with xviii. 48, and note that vv. 2 and 10 imply the same idea as xviii. 45^b (‘aliens sought me eagerly’). Duhm speaks satirically of the ‘astounding naïveté’ imputed to the Jews by the received text of vv. 4, 5, and accordingly emends the text. But the naïveté is found elsewhere (*e.g.* in Isa. lx. 14), and was a necessary consequence of the combination of particularistic and universalistic elements in early Judaism. The psalm is as strongly Messianic as Pss. xlvi. and xlvi. The poet projects himself into the Messianic future, when Israel’s foes, represented by Edom, will have been crushed (cp. ii. 10, xviii. 39, 48^b, lxx. 6 ff., Mic. iv. 13). It is true we might, with Ol., regard the subjugation and forcible conversion of the Idumæans by John Hyrcanus (cp. Beitholet, *Stellung*, 239) as the occasion of the psalm. Simon’s league with the Romans (1 Macc. xiv. 24, 26, 40), if historical, might also be thought of. But these are makeshift theories. The Messianic key fits the lock better than any historical one. There are some bad corruptions in the text, which, of course, have led to faulty exegesis. The supposed parallel in v. 6 to lxxviii. 19 disappears, but in compensation we get two fresh parallels in v. 10 (*ll.* 19 f.) to lxxix. 8, 19. On the period and ideas of the psalm, cp. Diehl’s dissertation.

Deposited. Of the sons of Korah. Marked.

- | | | |
|----|--|---|
| | | 1 |
| 1 | O all ye peoples, clap your hands, | 2 |
| | Shout ye unto God with ringing cries ; | |
| | For Yahwè is most high and terrible, | 3 |
| | A great king over all the earth. | |
| | The Edomites he crushed under us, | 4 |
| | The Jerahmeelites under our feet ; | |
| | He liberated for us his inheritance, | 5 |
| | The ornament of Jacob whom he loved. | |
| | Praise ye God with shouting, | 6 |
| 10 | Yahwè with the sound of the horn. | |
| | Make melody to our God, make melody, | 7 |
| | Make melody to our King, make melody. | |

For Yahwè is the King of all the earth,	8
Make melody to our King, [make melody;]	
Yahwè reigns over the nations,	9
Yahwè is seated on his holy throne.	
Bless our King, O ye peoples,	10
Praise our God, O ye peoples ;	
For Yahwè is unto us a shield,	
20 Greatly to be revered is our God.	

4, 13. **All the land.** Or, possibly, 'all the land (of Canaan).' Cp. xcv. 3 (corr. text).

7. **The ornament** (נְאֻן) : cp. Isa. xiii. 19, and, for the idea, Jer. iii. 19.

17 f. The suggestive phrase, 'the

God of Abraham' (cp. Gen. xvii. 4), must reluctantly be given up. See crit. n.

19 f. **Unto us a shield.** So lxxxix. 19.—*Greatly to be revered.* See lxxxix. 8, and cp. the similar form of xlvi. 2 (l. 1).

Critical Notes. 5. M יִדְבֵר. G ὑπέταξε, rightly as regards the tense (Kön. § 194 f.). Read, however, יִדְבֵא, as in xviii. 48 (see note). This fits the reference to the Edomites.—For עַיִמִים read אֲדָמִים (as xlix. 2), and for לְאֻמִּים read יִשְׁמִיעֵאלִים. There is now no inconsistency with v. 2.—M closes v. 5 with סֵלָה; so G (B, but not A T). סֵלָה, however, is either a corruption of לֹלָה i.e. הִלְלוּ (see next note), or transferred from v. 4 (end), in which case it would come from נוֹאֵל (see last note).

7. M G יִבְהַר; 'chose anew' ?? Read probably יִפְרֹק; cp. cxxxvi. 24.—Read נַחֲלָתוֹ (G; Du.).

9. M עָלָה. Why the completion of the work for Israel described in II. 5-8 should be marked by Yahwè's ascent (whither?) amidst shouting, is not plain. Duhm is obliged to suppose that עָלָה was a technical term of the sacrificial cultus. But עָלָה is simply a corruption of a dittographed סֵלָה (see last note).

11 f. Read אֶלְזִינֵנוּ with Diehl, after G.—M מִיִּשְׁכִּיל. 'The superscription of many psalms; according to 2 Chr. xxx. 22 a term for a particular kind of musical performance' (Duhm)? Read לְמִלְכָנוּ (ש) became נו). Cp. 'Maschil,' *Enc. Bib.*—Insert זַמְרֵנוּ (metre).

17 f. The narrative statement in M is very strange, nor is the sense plain. R.V. renders, '... (to be) the people of the God of Abraham.' The phrase would imply that distinctions of peoples were henceforth abolished. But this would go beyond Ps. lxxxvii. (cp. Isa. xix. 24 f.), and is in itself doubtful. The grammatical basis of the rendering (נֹאסֵף

hardly admits an accus.) is also insecure. G S read עַם (so Cappellus, Ew., Dy., &c.); Hi., Ol. (formerly), Lag., Bi., Che.¹³), and Du. suppose that עַם dropped out before עַם; but what does עַם mean—'with' or 'equally with'? Gr. reads אֱלֹהֵי עַם. The phrase 'Abraham's God' is also unexpected here; we expect 'Jacob's God.' Lastly, the psalm should close, as it began, with a summons to praise Yahwè. There must be deep corruption. Read אַבְרָהָם בָּרַכְנוּ עַמִּים מִלְפָּנָיו שִׁבְחוּ עַמִּים אֱלֹהֵינוּ. אַבְרָהָם has sprung out of a dittographed אֱלֹהֵינוּ. אֱלֹהֵינוּ is made up out of נו, the last syllable of כִּלְכְנוּ, and a corruption of שְׁבַחוּ. For כִּלְכְנוּ we might read נִלְכְנוּ, but *ll.* 12, 14, 17 dissuade from this.

19. M כִּי לְאֱלֹהִים מְגִינֵי-אָרֶץ. What can the 'shields of the earth' mean? Stade's proposal (*ZATW*, '94, pp. 322 ff.) to read שְׁלִיטֵי is ingenious but very far-fetched. The right solution follows from our correction of M of lxxxix. 19. Read כִּי יִהְיֶה לָנוּ; כִּי יִהְיֶה לָנוּ belongs to the next line.

20. M כִּי יִהְיֶה לָנוּ. Gr., Bi., Du. insert יִהְיֶה לָנוּ-כִּי (xcvii. 9). Read rather (taking over M's אֶרֶץ, אֶרֶץ); cp. lxxxix. 8, and *exeg.* note.

PSALM XLVIII.

PENTAMETERS. Anticipations of triumph over Israel's foes. The psalm should be read with Ps. xlvi., Ps. xlvii. being inserted between them by an editorial afterthought (see *introd.*); also with Ps. lxxvi. The points of contact between xlvi. and xlvi. are obvious. In *ll.* 1, 10, 'the city of our God'; so xlvi., *l.* 9. In *l.* 2 Yahwè's 'wondrous deeds'; so xlvi. 17. In *l.* 4 כִּי שָׁנַב, so xlvi., *ll.* 8, 16, 24. In *l.* 12 'to the ends of the earth'; so xlvi., *l.* 18 (sing.). In *ll.* 3, 13 'let mount Zion rejoice'; so xlvi., *l.* 9 (a synonym for 'mt. Zion'). xlvi., *ll.* 15 f. contain a summons to make a close inspection of the delivered city, such as is expressed more shortly in xlvi., *l.* 17. Lastly, the idea of xlvi., *l.* 18a, is the same as that of xlvi., *l.* 2 ('continually'). In fact, Ps. xlvi. expresses by anticipation the feelings of the citizens of Zion after the assault of the foes here represented by the Jerahmeelites (cp. also Ps. xlvi.) has been repelled. There may possibly be an allusion to the traditional failure of the Assyrians to take Jerusalem (cp. Isa. xvii. 13 f., xxix. 7 f., xxxiii. 3, 14a, which may perhaps have suggested the description in *ll.* 6, 7. To suppose, however, that the psalmist is a contemporary of Isaiah would be very unnatural (see *OP*, 164). It is the pious post-exilic community which speaks; in no other age indeed than the post-exilic did Israel assume the duty of praising Yahwè 'to the very ends of the earth' (*l.* 12). To the same age we are also pointed by the reference to the 'assembly' in *l.* 11 (cp. xxii. 23), and by the mention of the duty of handing on the Gospel of Yahwè's deliverance to the next generation (cp. xxii. 32, xlv. 2, lxxviii. 4). It has sometimes been held that this is a pilgrim-psalm (cp. *OP*, 164, 176; Duhm). It was hardly written with this object, though, of course, pilgrims may have used it. The key to *ll.* 15, 16 (which suggested the theory) is furnished by Isa. xxxiii. 17-21. There is no valid reason for separating *vv.* 10-15 from the rest of the psalm, which Winckler grievously misunderstands (see on *l.* 3).

Marked : Of the sons of Korah.

1

- 1 Great is Yahwè and highly to be praised | in the city
of our God ; 2
His wondrous deeds [on] his holy mountain | are the
whole earth's joy. 3
Let mount Zion rejoice and exult, | the city of the great King;
In the towers thereof has Yahwè | been known as a sure
retreat. 4
For behold, those of Jerahmeel | and Arabia came together, 5
When they saw its towers, they were amazed, | in confusion
they fled. 6
Shuddering seized them and horror ; | agony as of one in
travail ; 7
The Jerahmeelites thou didst scatter, | the tribes of Asshur. 8
Thou didst scatter the hosts of the Arabians, | O Yahwè
Sēbāōth! 9
10 The city of our God doth Yahwè | establish for ever.
I will extol thy lovingkindness, O Yahwè, | in the midst of
thine assembly ! 10
All thy famous deeds will I publish | to the ends of the earth 11
Full of justice is thy right hand, | let mount Zion rejoice ! 12
Let Judah's daughters exult | because of thy judgments !
Walk around Zion, make a full circuit, | reckon up its forts, 13
Mark well its castles, | explore its towers ; 14
Relate to the next generation | that Yahwè has brought
deliverance, 15
Our God for ever and ever — | he †alone† is our shield.

2. **The whole earth's joy.**

Not as in Lam. ii. 15, a title of Jerusalem.

3. The text has here greatly exercised the ingenuity of commentators. Bredenkamp (*Gesetz u. Propheten*, 145) thought that 'the extreme north, the city of the great king,' could only mean Nineveh, in whose palaces the news of the overthrow of Sennacherib had produced a deep impression. Halévy (*Rev. archéol.*, juillet, '82, p. 52), that the Israelites regarded Mount Zion as a miniature of the immense world-mountain (cp. on Isa. xiv. 13) of Babylonian mythology, crowned as it

was by the sanctuary of Yahwè, and having at its feet the valley of Hinnom, the supposed entrance to the nether world. Winckler (*Gesch. Isr.* ii. 129), that the passage describes how the mountain of the north (Isa. xiv. 13) shudders at the assault made upon its angelic defenders by the 'king of contention' (בֹּלֶךְ רִיב). Yahwè (coming from the south). Yet the text is manifestly overgrown by corruption, and it should not be hopeless to cure it. See crit. note.

4. אַרְכִינֹת, as cxxii. 7 (only here in Pss.); G ἐν ταῖς βάρεσι αὐτῆς

(βάρις = בִּירָה). Jerusalem, then, was well fortified in the psalmist's time. But, he says, Yahwè was the effectual succour, not the forts. Cp. Isa. xxxiii. 18, 21.—נודיע, cp. lxxvi. 2.

6. תבנה. Cp. lxx. 9^b (corr. text), Isa. xxix. 9, Hab. i. 5.—For

the flight of the enemy, cp. lxxvi. 6 (corr. text).

14. Repeated xvii. 8. The daughters of Judah (cp. lxxix. 36) are the provincial towns; cp. Ezek. xvi. 48.—18. Our shield. Cp. xlvi. 10 (corr. text) lxxxiv. 12.

Critical Notes. 2. With Houb. read [ב]הר קדשו. For יפה נוף read נפלאותיו (transposing). ל dropped out; תו became פה. See on xlvi. 9, and note the complete consistency of the stanza. E' 'A J make נוף = 'a branch' (as in Mishna and T); cf. G εὐρίζω. So Dunash (Mt. of Olives) Gr. Herz, יפה ענף; cf. Ezek. xxxi. 3 (a tree is spoken of). Those who defend text compare Ar. *nâfa* 'to tower (above), to be long, or high.' But the word has no affinities in Heb., Aram., or Ass. [Duhm retains נוף, and even finds here a trace of the poet's knowledge of Greek; cf. καλλικολώνη.]

3. M הר־ציון יר־בתי צפון. Is this a reference to the northern mountain of the Elohim? See *OP*, 317, and *Enc. Bib. s.v.* 'Congregation, Mount of.' But how can 'the recesses of the north' be equivalent to 'a mountain like that mythic one in the far north'? Hence formerly (1888) I supposed that the words were the gloss of a scribe, who inserted in the margin two words from Isa. xiv. 13. But יר־בתי צפון is simply קרית קרית, a variant to הר ציון, which has probably supplanted ישֻמָּה ותִגַּל. The latter words were misplaced, and had become illegible. Read ישֻמָּה הר־ציון ותִגַּל; cf. *H.* 13f.

5 f. Read יהִפָּה רָאוּ בּוֹ. —M בִּיהִנֶּה יִרְחֹמֵנִי אֱלֹהִים וְעַרְבִים נֹעְדוּ. Not one word is free from difficulty. הִמָּה, but why a demonstrative? רָאוּ; but what did they see? Herz, רָאוּ; Lag. בָּאוּ. בּוֹ, to express the synchronizing of two circumstances (*Ges.-Kau*, § 164^b, n. 1). But this would have been sufficiently done by an asyndeton. The style is wooden. Read אֲרַכְּנִתְיָהּ רָאוּ יַחְדָּו. (v. 5, end) contains elements of אֲרַכְּנִתְיָהּ.

7 ff. M שָׁם. Read וְשָׁמָּה. Herz, שְׁמִכּוֹ, with הָלוּ for הָיָה. In *Z.* 8 אֲנִיּוֹת תַּרְשִׁישִׁי has caused much perplexity. Duhm thinks that Tarshish ships are mentioned, because the writer had found them in Isa. ii. 16, and inferred that they must have some cryptic reference to Jerusalem. Sharpe (*Hist. of the Hebr. Nation*, 131) sees an allusion to the destruction of the Tyrian ships which carried supplies to the Assyrian army before Pelusium (cp. Herod. ii. 141). Others take 'ships of Tarshish' to be an allegorical phrase (cp. Isa. xxxiii. 21). All most

unnatural. With regard to Isa. ii. 16 see *Crit. Bib.* It is true, בְּרוּחַ קָדִים is only less suspicious; what has the 'east wind' to do here? If a storm were introduced at all, would the description be so condensed? Read probably יִרְחַמְאֵלִים פְּזֵרַת אֲשׁוּר אֲשׁוּר. So Isa. lx. 9. תְּרַשִׁישׁ is most easily explained as a development of אֲשׁוּר, Asshur = Ashhur or Geshur. See *Enc. Bib.*, 'Tarshish,' and *crit. n.* on iii. 8.—9 f. מִבְּעִיר רָאִינוּ בְּעִיר כְּאִשֶׁר שָׁמְעֵנוּ | כִּן רָאִינוּ בְּעִיר. Very prosaic. The Pasek warns us to criticize. The key to the problem is in the first two words. כְּאִשֶׁר שָׁמְעֵנוּ is the editor's reconstruction of a corruption of שִׁבְרַת נִחְנוּת. כִּן רָאִינוּ is his reconstruction of a corrupt יִרְחַמְאֵלִים. We have here a case of the rhetorical figure Anadiplosis (cp. Kōn., *Styl.*, pp. 300 ff.), but בְּעִיר = 'עַרְבִים (עַרְבִים) is probably more correct than 'ירח', and פְּזֵרַת should probably, as in *l.* 8, be restored for שִׁבְרַת.—For the second בְּעִיר read עִיר. The סֵלָה in *v.* 9 (end) comes from עֵלָם (dittographed).

11. M דְּפִינֵנוּ. G ὑπελάβωμεν; Σ εἰκάσαμεν; J *estimavimus*. See Isa. x. 7 (הִשָּׁב), xiv. 24 (|| יַעֲזֵן). So Num. xxxiii. 56. Judg. xx. 5, 'to mean, purpose.' Clearly wrong. Gr. doubtfully קִוִּינוּ. But the speaker's tone is not that of waiting expectation. An easier change too is desirable. Read אֲרוֹמִם (= נוּ), and of course יִהוּה.—M בְּקֶרֶב הַיְכָלָךְ; a superfluous statement. G ἐν μίσφῳ τοῦ λαοῦ σου (? Herz *vaot*). Read קְהָלָךְ; see xxii. 23.

12. M בְּשִׁבְךָ אֵל כִּן תִּהְלֹתָךְ. How unnatural! שִׁבְךָ is as certainly corrupt here as in cxxxviii. 26. We require a verb, || אֲרוֹמִם. Read אֲשִׁמְיַע פְּרַת־אֱלֹהִים (from *l.* 11). This suits עֵל־אָרֶץ 'rather אֵל or עַד'; see Isa. xlvi. 20. כִּן for כָּל offers no difficulty. The initial כ in כִּשְׁבֶךָ has *not* arisen out of א: as in the corresponding case in *l.* 11 the initial א of the verb was lost. Then, to make sense, the editor prefixed כ. The final כ, however, has no doubt arisen out of ע (cp. עֵל for כָּל). [*Perles. Anal.* 62. בְּשִׁבְךָ.]

16. M לְהִילָה: Pasek precedes. Softened Mappik before פ (Ges.-Kau., § 91c)? But there is strong authority for הִילָה. The chief difficulty, however, is in הִיל: G εἰς τὴν δύναμιν αὐτῆς; Σ εἰς τὸν περίβολον αὐτῆς. The moderns follow Σ, but this gives no parallel to אֲרַכְנֹתֶיהָ; הִיל and הוֹנִיָה would have been satisfactory (Isa. xxvi. 1, Lam. ii. 8). Read הִיכְלִיָה (same error as in cxxii. 7a, and perhaps in Zech. ix. 4).—M פָּפְגֵנוּ. Ludovicus De Dieu, 'walk between the palaces in all directions.' This implies deriving from פָּסַג 'to divide'; cp. M H פָּפְגֵנוּ 'to cut across (a vineyard, where there is no road). Read חֲפִשָׁנוּ (1 K. xx. 6).

17. For $\text{לִמְעַן תִּסְפְּרוּ}$ read סִפְּרוּ (metre). לִמְעַן תִּ comes from a dittographed אֲרַמְנָת .—M כִּי זֶה , with Pasek. זֶה 'such a one'? So at least Hitz., Del.; cp. xxiv. 6, Job xiv. 3. But no description of Yahwè has preceded. For the solution see xxii. 31 f. The subject of the message to posterity is that 'Yahwè has delivered.' Read certainly $\text{כִּי יְהוָה הוֹשִׁיעַ יְהוָה}$, though G omits אלהים .

18. M יִנְהַגְנוּ . This does not suit the parallelism. Read, with Gr. (alt.), כִּנְגְנוּ . See exeg. n., and observe that the figure of the shield is Korahite.—M appends עַל-מוֹת , 'to death'?—'beyond death'? Most unsuitably. G read עַל־מוֹת (*ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος* [B]; *αὐτὸς ποιμανεῖ ἡμᾶς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* [N]; *αὐτ. π. ἡ. εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας* [ART]). But עַל־מוֹת must originally have stood at the end of xlix. 1; it was supplied in the margin of the archetype, and intruded into the text of xlvi. 15. עַל־מוֹת comes from שַׁלְמָת 'Salmath'; prefix לְ . 'Of Salmah' should stand in the title of Ps. xlix.

PSALM XLIX.

TRIMETERS. Verses 1-5, as read in M's text, apparently stand apart from the rest of the psalm. They have the disadvantage of exposing the psalmist to the charge (see Duhm, p. 141) of causeless grandiloquence. What follows is indeed of much importance for pious Jews, but is too directly concerned with Jewish circumstances to claim the attention of all peoples and all classes. There is, however, a strong probability that vv. 1-5 consist partly of a quatrain re-written by the editor, partly of a newly-composed passage suggested by lxxviii. 2, and that the original first quatrain or stanza of the psalm was an address to the Edomite enemies of the Jews in the spirit of the warning in ii. 9, and designed ostensibly to move them to a change of course. It is far too startlingly explicit in its accumulation of descriptive terms, but certainly forms an effective introduction, and the unexpected discovery of it some time after the rest of the psalm had been finished, seems to the present writer to confirm the general view of the poem. The psalms most parallel to Ps. xlix. are xxxvii., lxii.⁽²⁾, and lxxiii., but the references to Jerahmeelites and Ishmaelites, to 'impious ones,' to 'deniers of God,' and 'insulters of Israel,' bring the psalm into close relation to Pss. l.⁽²⁾, lii., liii. (= xiv.), lviii., lxxxii. As to Ps. lxxiii., however, it should be noted that there is no parallel in xlix.⁽²⁾ to the failure of faith which the other psalm records. The close of Ps. xvi. is also partly parallel; cp. xlix.⁽²⁾, ll. 23 f., with xvi., l. 5; xlix.⁽²⁾, ll. 25 f., with xvi., ll. 16-20.

If M's text is correct, Ps. xlix. is also precisely parallel to Enoch cii. f. These passages contain a protest against a notion of the nether world which encourages the party of the wicked rich in their oppression of the righteous poor. Just such a protest M's text supplies in Ps. xlix. 'The rich man who hews out for himself a grand sepulchre, considers that he will have a correspondingly grand resting-place in Sheol. Of punishment for his oppression of the poor he does not dream. In life and in death he will be equally the spoiled child of fortune, the heir of all such good things as are to be had. To this the psalmist is made to reply that the wicked rich man is profoundly mistaken. The relative position of his own class and of the righteous poor will be inverted. The rich man will go down to join his fathers in Sheol, but without his pomp, while the poor, upright man will

be rescued from the grasp of Sheol, and the company to which he belongs will trample on the graves of the wicked when the dawn of the greatest of days appears.¹

A keen textual criticism, however, shows that this view of the meaning is not entirely correct. The contrast is not between the fate of all wicked rich men as individuals and that of all poor righteous men as individuals, but between that of all individuals in the former class without exception and that of the community of the pious at the opening of the Messianic age. Of the fate of the individual poor man nothing is said.² Whether he is to be raised from the dead, should he have died before the Messianic age arrives, and whether, in the Messianic age, the righteous man is to live as long as Methuselah and then pass gently away, or, like the pious community, to live for ever, is here left undetermined. We cannot venture to infer from the refrain in our revised text that those Jews who are not 'traitors' and 'impious ones' will be brought up, if need be, from Sheol (cp. Isa. xxvi. 19), because in Ps. ix. 18 f.—a closely parallel passage—it is evidently the class of the pious as a whole which the psalmist opposes to all individual wicked men. That later on, when individualistic aspirations began to be recognized, the psalm may have been infused with a fuller meaning, is probable enough, but the law of analogy forbids us to pick out two or three psalms, and interpret them in a sense which is plainly unsuitable for other psalms of the same group. It must also be pointed out that in xlix. 16 it is not said, 'He will take thee (the individual Israelite) from among the dead,' but 'He will take me from the land of Sheol,' *i.e.* 'He will save me from dying.'

To us it may perhaps appear strange that pious Jews should have had more definite ideas as to the fate of the wicked as individuals than as to that of the pious as individuals. But we know that those for whom the psalmists speak pos-sessed in a high degree the quality of self-forgetfulness. It was enough for them that the community would live on, even if all its present members were to pass away, and it was an object of hope with individuals to live to share the gladness of glorified Israel in the Messianic age (cvi. 4 f.). Thus we have every reason to suppose that in xlix. 16, as well as in xvi. 10, the speaker is not any individual, but the pious community.³

The view expressed in *OP*, 381 ff., that the speaker in *τ.* 16 is any and every pious Israelite, must, therefore, I fear, be abandoned, while, on the other hand, the view put forward in p. 406 of the same work that xlix. 15 refers to the punishment of the wicked in Sheol is in accordance with the most thoroughly revised form of the text. It is the justice of God which enables Jewish believers to resist the temptation to murmur at their present lot; that divine justice will be manifested in the punishment of all the wicked oppressors as individuals, and in the final deliverance and glorification of the pious community in the Messianic age. Cp. Charles (*Eschatology*, p. 74), who agrees with the author as to the penal character of Sheol, but prefers to explain *τ.* 16 as an assertion of the immortality of the pious individual, in accordance with the view taken in *OP*, 381 ff. So also Duhm, pp. 146 f., who holds (again in accordance with *OP*, *l.c.*) that the psalmist had also very definite ideas as to the place to which the pious man was removed by God after death.

According to Duhm, the psalm must have been written by a man of Pharisaic tendencies, and be very late. It should be noted, however, that Duhm denies that xvi. 10 (which most will at once see to be parallel to xlix. 16) expresses the hope of immortality. All that we can say is that Ps. xlix. is of earlier date than the Wisdom of Ben Sira, for Sirach xiv. 15 is based on part of Ps. xlix. 11 (see crit. note on *ll.* 11, 12). Like so many other psalms, Ps. xlix. is influenced by the dialogues of Job, which is a better argument for a late date than that offered by Duhm. For German discussions of its contents see Ol-hausen, Klostermann, Hupfeld-Nowack, Smend (p. 111), Baethgen, Coblenz (p. 122). Note the two equal strophes with refrain.

¹ *JRL*, 236 f.; cp. *OP*, 381 f., 413 f.

² The allusion which M's text of *τ.* 10 suggests to the death of 'wise men' (*i.e.* presumably, righteous men) is not sanctioned by a keen textual criticism.

³ נְפִישִׁי in xi. 1 also refers to the pious community, as an organic whole.

Deposited. Of the sons of Korah : marked. Of Salmah. 1

- 1 Hear this, all ye Edomites, 2
 Attend, all ye of Ishmael,
 Both traitors and deniers, 3
 The wicked and the impious together.¹
- Why should I be incensed at evil-doers, 6
 + Or+ enraged at the prosperity of the wicked,—
 Of those that trust in their wealth, 7
 And boast of the abundance of their riches ?
- Surely the wicked will be unransomed, 8
 10 No purchase-money will be given for him to God ;
 All too dear is his life's ransom, 9
 Present and bribe come short. 10
- Never will he see the dawn,
 For the light of life is sealed up ; 11
 The caterpillar gnaws his treasures,
 He resigns his wealth to the swarming locust.
- Their glory is a portion for the greedy locust ; 12
 Their stores for the leaping locust ;
 [The feet of sheep and] oxen
 20 Trample where stood their castles.
- Traitors will not come up from Sheol,* 13
The impious are destroyed in Deathland.
- This is the fate of those that deny God, 14
 The latter end of those that insult Israel.
 For ever they will be prostrate in the pit, 15
 They will seek earnestly in the darkness for daybreak ;
- The pangs of Death will affright them,
 The terrors of Sheol will take hold of them,
 +But+ surely my soul God will ransom, 16
 30 From the hand of Sheol he will take me.

¹ My mouth utters perfect wisdom, 4
 The musing of my mind is full of insight ;
 I incline mine ear to +hear+ true things, 5
 I pour out right things with the lyre.

- +Then- be not thou incensed when a denier waxes rich, 17
 When the glory of his house becomes great,
 For none of that will he take away when he dies, 18
 His glory will not descend in his train.
 Even if he trusts in his wealth, 19
 And boasts in the abundance of his riches,
 To the leaping locust he will resign his treasures, 20
 To the swarming locust his stores.
Traitors will not come up from Sheol, 21
 40 *The impious are destroyed in Deathland.*

(Gloss in *zv.* 4 f.). *I incline mine ear.* Cp. the Arabian notion that poets are visited by *jinn*, and Plato's phrase for poets (*Phaedr.*, 262) *Μουσῶν προσηται*. The assertions in *zv.* 4 are from this point of view tolerable. 'Glory' belongs 'to him that gives wisdom' (Sirach li. 16 f.).

5 f. Cp. xxxvii. 1, lxxiii. 3.—*That trust in their wealth*, because a rich man can offer costly and abundant sacrifices, and may hope, at any rate, for a semblance of distinction in the nether world. A premature death, regarded as a divine judgment, would destroy this illusion.

9. **The wicked will be unransomed.** There are times, at least according to Elihu, when an angelic being can say that he has found a man's purchase-money (כֶּצְאָרְתִּי כֶּצְאָרְתִּי, Job xxxiii. 24). But this ransom, which is repentance, only postpones the last day of life. Cp. Koran, Sur. ii. 117. The unfortunate fiction of a 'brother' in M's text throws the whole passage into obscurity. The speaker (*i.e.* Israel) expresses his convictions piece-meal, and each fragment is introduced by the particle אֲדָא, 'surely,' or 'nevertheless.' Surely no wicked man can escape the law of death (*l.* 5). Surely my soul God will ransom (*l.* 25).

13 f. **The dawn.** 'Blackness of darkness' (Jude 13; cp. Job x. 22) is the leading feature of Sheol. Never will light dawn on its inhabitants (contrast Isa. ix. 1, lx. 1, 2). It is not the dawn of a special day—the day which, according to Targ. Jon. (on Ex. xii. 42), will follow the fourth of the extraordinary nights—the day of Messianic deliverance.—*The light of life.* Light and life are parallel (see on xxxvi. 10).—*Is sealed up.* An allusion to Job ix. 7, 'Who commands the sun, that it rise not, and seals up the stars.'

15 f. אַרְבָּה and חִסִּיל as lxxviii. 46; cp. Sirach xiv. 15 (based on our passage). See 'Locust,' *Enc. Bib.*, and crit. note.

17 f. One cannot help regretting the apparent parallel to Eccles. xii. 5, 'man goes to his everlasting house.' But the writer is really perhaps imitating Joel i. 4 (rhetorical catalogue of locusts).

19 f. Cp. Isa. v. 17, xxxi. 14.—21 f. *Traitors*, cp. ix. 18.—*The impious*, cf. xiv. 2, l. 18a (corr. text), and note that the wicked here referred to are such as denied God (*l.* 19; cp. ix. 18, l. 23a, corr. text).

26. בְּיִשְׁרָאֵל, lxxxviii. 7, 19, cxliii. 3, Iam. iii. 6.—27 f. Cp. Job xvii. 11, 14, xxiv. 17. Here, however, the pains of Sheol appear to be referred to. See introd.

Critical Notes.—See crit. n. on xlvi. 18. 1—4. The names of peoples and classes were partly corrupt when rewritten by the editor. בְּנֵי-אָדָם comes from אֲדָמִים יֹשְׁבֵי (as often) from יֹשְׁבֵי-אֲדָמִים; בְּנֵי-אָדָם from

בְּגִדִים (cp. on *l.* 21); from בְּנֵי־אִישׁ (see *l.* 23); עֵשִׂיר from רְשָׁעִים; אֲבִיו from נִבְלָיִם. We can now see the origin of חֶלֶד, which is, here at any rate, simply a corrupt fragment of יִרְחֵמְנוּ אֱלֹהִים. All the supposed occurrences of חֶלֶד need careful testing. Cp. *SBOT* (Heb.) on Isa. xxxviii. 11.

Gloss. M לְמִשְׁלַח חִדְתִּי. Both words are difficult. 'I incline mine ear to wisdom' is intelligible, but why 'to a similitude' or a 'poem'? The contents may be suggested from on high, but the words are the poet's own. And why a 'riddle'? In the sense in which the words of the wise are חִדּוֹת, it is not likely that the poem of which xlix. ¹⁾ was the prologue, was a חִדָּה. The same difficulties will recur in lxxviii. 2, and the two passages need the same emendation. Read כִּי־יִשְׁרִים (see Prov. viii. 6, 9) and נִכְחוֹת; and for אֶפְתָּה (too vague a word) read, not אֶפְתָּר (cp. on cxix. 130), but אֲבִיעָה (lxxviii. 2).

5 M אִירָא בֵּינִי רָע; partly unsuitable, partly too vague. Bā., אִירָא, Bu. אִרְאָה (comparing lxxiii. 3). Read certainly אֶתְחַר אֶפְתָּרֵיכֶם (xxxvii. 1, Prov. iii. 31, Prov. xxiv. 19). Cp. on lxxiii. 3, xciv. 13.—M עֵוֹן עֲקָבִי יִסְבְּנִי; almost so G. At once obscure and against parallelism. Small corrections (see Gr., Bā., Du.) are therefore useless. Read וְאֶמְנָא שְׁלוֹם רְשָׁעִים. The first two words changed p'aces. Cp. lxxiii. 3, Prov. iii. 31, xxiv. 1, 19.

9 f. M's אָח is impossible (see exeg n.). Six MSS. of Kenn. and de R. read אָח; two of de R., אָח. אָח is clearly right (see *l.* 25). Houb., Ew., Bā., We., Du. agree, mostly reading יִפְדָּה. But this Nifal form is passive, and, as We. (*Skizzen*, vi. 174) remarks, requires to be followed by יִתֵּן. We. has not noticed, however, that, as the connexion shows, אִישׁ is a corruption of רָשָׁע. Omit פָּדָה (dittographic).

11 f. M נִפְשׁוּ. Read נִפְשׁוּ.—M וַיִּחִיעֵדוּ לְעוֹלָם: Inexplicable. Nor will any gloss-theory, nor the transposition of *vv.* 9 and 10, avail to cure the evil. Read וַיִּחִידוּ שְׁלָמָה וַיִּשְׁחָדוּ.

13 M לֹא יִרְאֶה הַשְּׁחָת לֵ. לֵ in M belongs to *v.* 10a, and this has caused interminable perplexity. Independently, Duhm has also seen that לֵ goes with לֹא יִרְאֶה, but he does not suspect the deep corruption of the following lines. He renders, 'Should he never see the pit? Nay, he sees it. Wise men die; together the fool and the dull-witted perish.' &c. But what have the wise and the foolish to do here? For הַשְּׁחָת read הַשְּׁחָר. See exeg. note.

14. M **כִּי אֹר** **כִּי יִרְאֶה הַכְּמִים יָמוּתוּ** (Pasek after יראה). Read **כִּי אֹר** **הַחַיִּים יִהְיֶה**. Nif. of **הָתָם** as Esth. iii. 12, viii. 8. Cp. Job ix. 7.

15. M **יַחַד פָּסִיל וּבַעַר יֵאָבְדוּ**. Weak, and not to the point. Read **יַעֲרֹק הַסִּיל צְבוּרָיו**. The **ח** in **הַסִּיל** fell out after **כ**, which has taken the place of **ק**: **הַר** for **עַר**, quite regularly. In **וּבַעַר יַע** has replaced **צ**: in **יֵאָבְדוּ**, which represents a dittographed **צְבוּרָיו**, **א** has done the same thing. **הַסִּיל** is an unfortunate word; it has been misread again and again (cix. 23, Job xiii. 28). See next note and cp. 'Locust,' *Enc. Bib.*

16. M **וַיַּעֲזֹבוּ לְאַחֲרֵים הַיָּלָם**. Again a weak statement, lacking the symbolism in which the O.T. poets never fail to enwrap the facts of sad experience. Lines 11, 12 are imitated in Sirach xiv. 15, where underneath **גֹּרֵל לַיּוֹדֵי** it is easy to recognize **יֵאָכֵל הַרְגֵל**. Consequently another word for 'locust' must underlie **אַחַר** in the preceding line; the required word is plainly **אַרְבֵּה**. So too here **לְאַחֲרֵים** comes from **לְאַרְבֵּה**. Read **וַיַּעֲזֹב לְאַרְבֵּה הַיָּלָם**.

17 f. This passage has been misunderstood owing to the plausibility of G's *οἱ τάφοι ἀτῶν*, i.e. **קְבָרִים** (**ק** collectively; cp. ST). But a reference to the tombs as man's everlasting home does not come in well between that to the locusts and that to the sheep and oxen. In spite therefore of the almost universal consent of critics since Cappellus (not, however, including Hitzig), I conclude that we must look further; indeed, the Pasek after **בְּתִיכֹו** seems to indicate some worse error than a slight transposition of letters. *V.* 18 suggests that **כְּבוֹד** ought to come in, and Ben Sira's substitution of **הַרְגֵל** for **הַסִּיל** in his imitation of lines 11, 12, suggests that **הַרְגֵל** may perhaps be expected here. Read certainly (see next note). **כְּבֹדֶם מִנֵּת לְסֻלְעִים וַיִּנְסַבְּנָתֶם לְהַרְגֵל**. For **סֻלְעִים** and **הַרְגֵל** see Lev. xi. 22.

19 f. M **קָרְאוּ בְּשִׁנוֹתֶם עָלַי אֲדָמוֹת**. This is insufficient for two lines. In 1st ed. I inserted **יִשְׁכְּחוּ אֲשֶׁר**, following Bickell; Duhm suggests **אָבָד וְזָכַרְם** (ix. 7). But the description of the rich man given in M is very difficult to explain (see Ol.), and however explained is not quite suitable here. Besides, **אֲדָמוֹת** (plur.) occurs nowhere else. Read **תָּם וַיִּרְמִסוּ עַל־אֲרָמְנוֹתֶם**. **רְגֵלִי** easily fell out after **הַרְגֵל**; **תָּם** is partly concealed under **קָרְאוּ**; **בִּשְׁמוֹ** covers over **יִרְמִסוּ**; **בָּקָר** and **אֲדָמוֹת** represent **אֲרָמְנוֹתֶם**.

21 f. Line 21 in M cannot be right. (1) It produces a bad antithesis to the parallel line. (2) The phraseology is unnatural; **יָקָר** is very uncommon; **יָלִין** is too poetical, and the position of **בִּיקָר** produces ambiguity. **יָבִין** (v. 21), though adopted by Dathe and Ew. (following G S),

is a weak and inadequate though early emendation. Herz acutely suggests **נְמִישָׁל כְּבַהֲמֹת בַּפּוֹת נְדָמוּ אָדָם מִקְבְּרוּ בַל יַעֲלוּן**. This makes *l.* 22 too long. We might, of course, omit **נְמִישָׁל** as an incorrect gloss (cp. G), but we are learning to be sceptical as to so many glosses. As to *l.* 21, the phraseology is not satisfactory; **מִקְבְּרוּ** can hardly in such a passage be substituted for **כִּשְׂאוֹל**, and instead of **אָדָם**, Herz's **יַעֲלוּן** being clearly right, we expect some plural noun. Now it so happens that **אָדָם** sometimes arises from corruption. In correcting it here we must have regard to the general tenor of the psalm. Upon the whole, it seems that **בְּנָדִים** is the best critical emendation for **וְאָדָם** here; **בִּיקָר**, which follows **וְאָדָם**, is probably a corruption of **בְּנָדִי**, either dittographed, or a correction of **וְאָדָם** (?). **[נ]כִּשְׂאוֹל** almost certainly = **כִּשְׂאוֹל**: the opening **נ** is dittographed. There remains for *l.* 18 only **כַּבְּמוֹת נְדָמוּ**. The former word must therefore be corrupt and represent two words. In fact, we do not expect the beasts to be mentioned here; the beasts, surely, do not go to Sheol! Read **נְבָלִים נְבָנוּת נְדָמוּ**. Now the refrain regains its colour and appropriateness. It is the 'deniers' of God (*l.* 23) and the 'traitors' among God's people to whom this stern truth is applied.

23. M **זֶה-דְּרָפָם בְּסָל לָמוּ**. Wellh. and Duhm rightly see that **דְּרָף** here must mean 'fate,' but wrongly keep the suffix. G, however, appears to have read **זֶה דְּרָפָם מִכְּשׁוֹל לָמוּ**, which suggests that the final **מ** in **דְּרָפָם** is dittographed. **כָּסַל** 'folly' is suspicious; in Eccles. vii. 25 read **סָכַל** (x. 6). **כַּסְלָה**, too, in lxxxv. 9 is corrupt. Read **זֶה-דְּרָפָם מִכְּחַשֵׁי יְהוָה**, and cp. on *ll.* 1-4, 31, ix. 18, l. 23.

24. M **וְאַחֲרֵיהֶם בְּפִיהֶם יִרְצוּ סָלָה** (Pasek after 'ואח'). Herz, **וְאַחֲרֵיהֶם בְּפִיהֶם יִרְצוּ**, 'and with their talk they conciliate others.' Wellh. and Duhm correct **וְאַחֲרֵיהֶם**. Read **וְאַחֲרֵיהֶם מִחֲרָפֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל**. **יִרְצוּ** and **סָלָה** represent fragments of **יִשְׂרָאֵל**.

25. M **כִּצְאֹן לְשֵׂאוֹל שְׂתָמוּ**. 'Like sheep' suits 'death tends them,' which follows presently in M. But we expect a different verb; **שְׂתָמוּ** (G *ἔθρο*) is clearly impossible. 'Like sheep' suggests 'they are driven.' In the Hamāsa (p. 375) a plague-stricken Arab tribe is compared to a herd of camels, whose herdsman is death, 'to whose stall they must all come home, some sooner, some later.' The emendations **שְׂתָמוּ** (cp. xlv. 26 and Prov. ii. 18, where G's *ἔθρο* presupposes **שְׂתָמוּ** [see Wildeboer]), adopted by Gr., Bā.⁽¹⁾, Kau., Bevan (*J. of Phil.* xviii. 143), and **יִחְתָּמוּ** (Bā.⁽²⁾, We.⁽²⁾) are therefore out of the question, unless, with We.⁽²⁾, we omit **כִּצְאֹן** as an explanatory gloss to **יִרְעָם**, or, with Herz, transfer it to the

preceding line—resources of despair. Duhm is equally arbitrary—**לשׂאול שׂתו**, according to him, is a gloss. The truth is that, as in lxxx. 2, **כצאן** is corrupt. It is an error suggested either by **כבהניות** or by **ירעם**. The poet wrote **לְנִצַּח** (cp. *l.* 9); **ל** dropped out, and **נצה** became **יְהִלְשׁוּ בְשַׁחַת**. **לשׂאול שׂתו** is also corrupt. Read **יְהִלְשׁוּ בְשַׁחַת** (cp. Job xiv. 10). **יה** fell out after **ח**; **לשו** became **לשׂאול**. A very pretty corruption.—M's **מֵוַת יִרְעַם** (G. *θάνατος ποιμαίνει αὐτούς*) interrupts the direct narrative. Such an 'accompanying clause' is not indeed bad Hebrew (see Kōn. § 368*d*) but in the present case is destructive of the parallelism, however we may read *v.* 15*a*. Let us temporarily put it aside, and attack the problem presented by **וַיִּרְדּוּ בָם יִשְׂרָאֵל לְבַקֵּר**, a reading which is evidently very questionable, as indeed the Pasek after **ישׁ** suggests. Hu.-Now. remarks, 'This cannot mean that the righteous shall rule over the rich men in Sheol.' Yet this is just what the context suggests; we cannot compare Mal. iii. 21, for there the context is different. Hence Street (1790) reads, **וַיִּרְדּוּ כְמוֹ יִשְׂרָאֵל לְקַבֵּר**. 'They descend, as well as the righteous (?), to the tomb.' So too independently von Ortenberg, *Klost.*, Abbott (*Hermathena*, Feb. 1891, pp. 171*f.*), Cheyne (*OP*, inserted note), Polenaar (*Th. Tijdschr.* 1893, p. 57), Ginsburg (*Bible*), and Duhm, except that they read **בְּנִי־יִשְׂרָאֵל** 'smoothly' (cp. Cant. vii. 9). The objection to this is twofold. 1. To a Hebrew a 'smooth' passage to Sheol would be no curse but a blessing (Job xxi. 13), and 2. a parallel line is wanting. The error in the text lies deeper; we have to settle the text of *ll.* 23*f.* before we can decide as to *l.* 22. Taking this preliminary as accomplished (see next note), and having regard to *ll.* 9 and 34, it is probable that we should read **וַיִּרְדּוּ בְּנִי־יִשְׂרָאֵל לְבַקֵּר**; in several scripts an imperfect **כ** might be mistaken for a **ר**. Wellh. adheres to MG, but relegates **וַיִּרְדּוּ בָם יִשׁ** to the margin, as implying the later eschatology; like Ew. and Hi. he connects **לְבַקֵּר** with **וְצוּרָם**. Why he retains **לְבַקֵּר** (weakly rendered 'soon'), is not obvious. At the close he reads **שְׂאֹל זָבֹל לָנוּ** an improvement doubtless on **שׂ זָבֹל לָנוּ**, which is read by Lo., Ew., Hi., von Ortenb., Riehm, Abbott), while Bi., Che.⁽¹⁾, Duhm still more plausibly read **שְׂאֹל לְעוֹלָם זָבֹל לָנוּ**. There is no safeness in such superficial emendations of a thoroughly corrupt text. See next note.

27 *f.* Combine **מֵוַת יִרְעַם** and **וְצוּרָם**, but correct this into **יְבִיעָתוֹם** **בְּלָהוֹת** and the remainder (**לְבָלוֹת שְׂאֹל זָבֹל לָנוּ**) into **בְּלָהוֹת** **שְׂאֹל תִּאֲחִיזִים**. In the first of these **ר** becomes **ב**, and **נו** becomes **ת**—no violent changes; **י** is added (restored). The key is supplied by Job xviii. 11, 14, xxiv. 17. See also Job xviii. 9, where **צַמִּים** should perhaps

be **וצירים לבלהות** (*JQR*, '97, p. 578). Herz independently, **לשאול יובילם צירים** (*cp.* Job xxi. 30. 32).

30 f. **סלה** is here probably a corruption of a dittographed **שאול**.—Read **אל־תִּתְחַר** (see on *l.* 3).—For **איש** read certainly **נִכְהַשׁ** (*l.* 23).

35–38. *V.* 19 begins thus, **בִּי־נִפְשׁוּ בְּחַיּוֹ יְבָרֶךְ**. This is very unlike the clear style of the rest of the psalm, and the next line is even more obscure, while the reference in *v.* 20 to the 'generation of the fathers' of the wicked man, as if they had all been cut off in their sins like himself, is embarrassing. The alternating second and third persons are also very puzzling. A keen glance at the words, however, reveals the underlying original. For the key see *ll.* 3, 4. Read *ll.* 35–38 thus:—

[גַּם]־כִּי בִּעֲשָׂרוּ יִבְטַח
 וּבִיב חֵילוֹ יִתְהַלֵּל
 יַעֲזֹב [לְ]־חַרְגָל צְבוּרָיו
 [וְ]־מִסְפֹּנֹתָ[יו] לְאַרְבֵּה

The accumulation of corruptions is strange, but far from unparalleled. **עדידור** for **הרגל** reminds us of **לדור ודך** in *v.* 12. **ויודך** arose out of a transposition of the letters of **חילו**. In **כי**, the **כ** is dittographed, while the **י** goes with the following **ת**. **יט**, which follows, comes from a dittographed **ית**. **לך** must have been originally **לה** (*G. alτφ*): **הלל**, with transposed letters, became **בלה**; remove the upper stroke from **ל**, and it approaches **ב** (see 2 *S.* xix. 1, **בלכתו** for **בבכתו**).

PSALM L.—I.

TRIMETERS. The introduction to a psalm on the Messianic judgment, the rest of which has been lost. Yahwè appears: his 'lips are full of indignation' (*Isa.* xxx. 27). The nations which have said, 'Come, let us destroy them' (*lxxxiii.* 5), shall receive their sentence, not in words, but in acts. Meantime, the loyal Israelites, gathered together from all parts, will look, with calm satisfaction, at the patiently waited for retribution (*lii.* 8, *liv.* 9, &c.). According to *Ol.* and *Duhm*, the writer of *Ps.* l. makes 'much ado about nothing,' or, at least, about nothing worthy of such an elaborate 'fiction' as that in *vv.* 1–6. Not relying on the weight of his own authority, he represents the following admonitions on the right kind of sacrifice and on the right rules of human intercourse to have been uttered by the divine lips amidst convulsions of nature. This view, however, is by no means a just one. It is true that the post-exilic writers sometimes begin in a key which they are not able to preserve long (see *e.g.* *Isa.* lviii.), but such a fiasco as *Ol.* and *Duhm* suppose is surely incredible. If it is true that not a few psalms are of composite origin, why should not *Ps.* l. be included in the number? It so happens that *Ps.* lxxxi. is exactly parallel. *Vv.* 7–15 of that psalm were certainly not written as the continuation of *vv.* 1–6; in short, *Ps.* lxxxi. is composite. So also is the psalm before us, and some may even be tempted to point to the 'Selah,' at the end of *v.* 6, and again (in *G.*) after *v.* 15, as favouring this view. That

Ps. l.⁽¹⁾ is a psalm of the post-exilic community, which delighted in descriptions of theophanies, and lived in the constant hope of the divine judgment, can hardly be denied. The parallelism between l. 3 and Lam. ii. 15 (Isa. xxxiii. 17) is significant; cp. 1 Macc. ii. 12. All these passages presuppose the post-exilic idealization of the Holy City.

Marked: Of Asaph. Of Salmah.

		1
1	Yahwè speaks, the earth trembles From utmost east to farthest west. From Zion, the perfection of beauty, The glory of our God shines forth.	2
	Before him a fire consumes, Around him a tempest rages. He summons the heavens above, And the earth, in the presence of his people.	4
	His loyal ones gather before him,	5
10	Those that are plightèd to him assemble themselves ; And the heavens declare his righteousness, That he is a God of justice.	6

3 f. Zion idealized. See introd., and note on xlvi. 3. It is touching to see how a decided opponent of the theory of the divine origin of the sacrificial ritual still adheres to the belief in the special presence of Yahwè in Zion (against Roy, *Die Volksgemeinde*, 46, n. 2).—**הוֹפִיעַ** is the usual word for theophanies, as lxxx. 2, xciv. 1, Dt. xxxiii. 2, but seems to be a variant to **יָפַי** (see crit. n.).—Cp. l. 4 with Isa. lx. 16.

7. Heaven and earth are summoned as witnesses (Isa. i. 2).

9 ff. The 'loyal ones' to whom God has given his *b'ērith*, or pledge, on certain moral conditions, and who represent the true Israel, assemble to witness the divine act of judgment on their wicked oppressors. Such appears to be the true meaning. The ordinary

view, however, which presupposes M, is that the nominal members of the pious community are brought together to have their piety tested (cp. Roy, *Die Volksgemeinde im Psalter*, 37). It has to be ascertained whether they are really entitled to call themselves *hāsīdīm* (cp. Isa. xlvi. 1 f.), and the reference to the sacrifices with which a *b'ērith* is in usage accompanied (**עֲלֵי-זֶבַח**) is thought to prepare the way for the instruction on the true nature of sacrifice which follows. Unfortunately, this instruction can by no means be said to be of the nature of a test, and the strange phrase in *ṣ. 5b* may safely be regarded as corrupt.—*The heavens*, i.e. the heavenly ones, the angels (cp. lxxxix. 5). *His righteousness*, i.e. that God will do justice to his people.

PSALM L.—2.

TRIMETERS. A restatement of the true law of sacrifice, promulgated by Yahwè at the Exodus (Jer. vii. 22-24). The opening agrees with lxxxix. 9. The only important part of the ritual is stated to be prayer and thanksgiving—important, because alone ordained by God. Cp. on xl. 2-12, li. 3-19. It is implied that

even in the age of Ezra the gross theory of sacrifices as the food of God was still in existence. No wonder, when we read Isa. lxx. 3 f., lxxvi. 3, passages which cannot refer solely to the Samaritans, or consider the lodgment effected by that gross theory in the later Avesta of Zoroastrianism. It should also be remembered that the efficacy of sacrificial blood in maintaining the connexion between Yahwè and Israel is distinctly implied, not only in the Levitical law, but by the late prophetic writer of Zechariah ix. 11. Note the sympathetic interest in the animal creation, which is hardly quite reconcilable with the view that after all the psalmist had no objection to animal sacrifices in themselves, but only to the gross theory which he criticizes (Duhm). The correction in *l.* 5 is important; the psalmist's view now becomes consistent. Cp. xl. 7, li. 18.

- 1 Hear, O my people, and I will admonish thee ; 7
 O that thou wouldest hearken unto me, O Israel !
 I +who speak+ am Yahwè thy God,
 [Who brought thee up out of Egypt's land].
- None of thy sacrifices [do I desire], 8
 And thy burnt offerings which are continually before me ;
 I accept no bullocks from thy house, 9
 Nor he-goats from thy folds.
- For mine is every beast of the forest, 10
 10 I raise up the strong among the oxen ;
 I know all the birds of the sky, 11
 And the trees of the uplands are in my mind.
- If I were hungry, I would not tell thee, 12
 For the world is mine, and all that is therein :
 Am I to eat the flesh of bulls, 13
 Or drink the blood of goats?
- Sacrifice unto God thanksgiving, 14
 And pay to the Most High thy vows,
 And invoke me in time of trouble, 15
 20 I will rescue thee, and thou shalt honour me.

6. **Continually before me.** עֲלִית הַתְּמִיד, 'the continual offering,' means the regular morning and evening sacrifice of a lamb.

9-12. Cp. Ps. civ., and note the gains from textual criticism. *The trees of the uplands*, cp. Isa. xl. 16, 'Lebanon is not sufficient to burn.' שָׂדֵי = Ass. *šadû* (see 'Field,' *Enc. Bib.*).

18. 'Sacrificing' and 'vowing' have become symbolic phrases. Cp. Hos. xiv. 2[3], a late passage, where 'so will we pay the fruit (read פְּרִי

as G S) of our lips' means 'so will we pay our vows,' and the next verse shows that the phrase simply means obedience. Bredenkamp (*Gesetz. u. Propheten* [81], 64) and B. Jacob (*ZATW*, xvii. [97], 273 ff.) argue at length against this view. 'To sacrifice thanksgiving' must, they think, be taken literally; זָבַח is not and cannot be used metaphorically. There is no 'must' about the matter; B. Jacob falls into a fundamental error, both as regards this phrase and as regards Ps. l. The context must decide. See on cvii. 22, cxvi. 17.

PSALM L.—3.

TRIMETERS. Yahwè speaks again, not this time dialectically, but in the tone of stern rebuke. He addresses himself, as the interpolated introduction to v. 16 rightly says, 'to the wicked,' *i.e.* not to imperfectly moral members of the orthodox community (so *e.g.* Duhm), but to hypocrites, who pretended to be adherents of the law, but were really in league with the chiefs of that 'impious' faction, which Ps. xxvi. denounces with such keenness (see also Ps. Sol. iv.). The description in i. 1 might be applied to them if the negative particle were omitted. They professed to be *ḥasīdīm* (pious) when it suited them; at other times they were close friends of the anti-legal party. They are, therefore, threatened with the fate of the 'traitors that deny God' (ix. 18, xlix.), also called *nēbālīm* and *ḥānēphīm* (see on ll. 5, 6). Soon 'shuddering will surprise the *ḥānēphīm*' (Isa. xxxiii. 14). Let these hypocrites take warning in time. Cp. on Ps. lii.—The 'Selah' in G, at v. 15, may suggest that what follows is an editorial addition, but this is hardly the best view (see crit. note). The appendix (v. 23) was doubtless added to relieve the gloom of v. 22; cp. vv. 14 f.

- 1 ¹What right hast thou to rehearse my statutes, 16
 Or to utter aloud mine ordinance,
 When +thou showest that+ thou hatest discipline, 17
 And castest my words behind thee?
 Thou connectest thyself with the assembly of the impious, 18
 And throwest in thy lot with the unholy:
 With thy mouth thou whisperest malignity, 19
 And to thy neighbours thou utterest deceit.
 Thou speakest a shameful thing against thy brother, 20
 10 Thou revilest the son of thy mother.
 Yahwè thou hast tempted and hast provoked, 21
 Thou hast defied the law of thy God.
 For thy perfidy (?) I will punish thee,
 And set in order [thy ways?] before thee.
 Mark this, ye that deny God, 22
 Lest I tear +you+ in pieces, and there be none to rescue.

Appendix.

- Sacrifice thanksgiving and honour me, 23
 And pay thy vows to the Most High.

3. **Discipline**, כִּנּוּקָר, *i.e.* right self-guidance, Prov. i. 2, xxiii. 23, &c. —5 f. See especially xxvi. 5, and on the class-name נְבָלָ note on xiv. 1. As to חֲנֹף; (a) the noun חָנָף means one who, either from his very birth or by a treasonable act has no standing in the community of the Supreme God (Job xiii. 16). Like the נְבָלָ (Isa. xxxii. 6), he 'speaks' impiety (נְבָלָה, Isa. ix. 16), and this impious speech is closely connected with wicked actions, *e.g.* the violation of the marriage-bond (Jer. iii. 2), murder (Num. xxxv. 33, Isa. xxiv. 5 [cp. Gen. ix. 5 f.], Ps. cvi. 38), and apostasy (Dan. xi. 32). As applied to a community, חָנָף indicates

¹ But to the wicked God says.

that it is not under the protection of Yahwē (Isa. x. 6, Mic. iv. 11), having collectively broken the fundamental religious precepts (Isa. ix. 16, cp. xxiv. 5 xxxiii. 14 f.). As a class name, חַי is late (eight times in Job, once in Prov., once in a very late part of Isaiah); חַיִּי only occurs in Isa. xxxii. 6 (late). חַיִּי a'so no doubt underlies the ἀνθρωπάρεσκος(-οι) of G Ps. liii. 6, and of the Greek Ps. Sol. iv. title, 7, 8, 19. (b) The verb חַיִּי is also rather late in use. In Jer. iii. 1, 2, 9, xxiii. 11, Mic. iv. 11 (not Micah's), it clearly means 'to be polluted.' See also Num. xxxv. 33,

Ps. cvi. 38, Isa. xxiv. 5, Dan. xi. 32; all post-exilic. On the origin of the word, see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Hypocrite.'

6-8. Prov. xi. 9 is exactly parallel. —*Thy brother*, i.e. any fellow-Israelite; for the term 'mother,' see on li. 7. Probably, just as the person addressed is a collective person, so the 'brother' spoken of is the whole body of Jews faithful to their religion.

11 f. Cp. lxxviii. 10, 18, 56, and see crit. note.—*Ye that deny God*, a good paraphrase of נְבָלִים (see crit. note).—16. See on Ps. vii. 3, and cp. Hos. v. 14, vi. 1, xiii. 7 f.; Job xvi. 9. —17 f. See introduction.

Critical Notes. 1.⁽¹⁾ The title must be enriched at the expense of *v.* 1 (see next note).

1. M אֱלֹהִים יְהוָה; J, *Fortis deus dominus* (similarly 'A Σ Θ), G Θεός Θεῶν κύριος. But this would only be possible in prose (Josh. xxii. 22, very late). אֱלֹהִים (note Pasek) is probably a corruption of עַל־עַלְמוֹת, i.e. לְשִׁלְמֵית (see on x. 1). To transfer אֱלֹהִים to line 4 (Duhm) is only possible if the opening words of *v.* 3 are omitted (so also We.) as the ejaculatory prayer of a pious reader.—וַיִּקְרָא אֶרְצוֹ. But the verb should state the consequence of Yahwē's speaking (cp. Hi.). Read וַתְּהִלְהָ אֶרְצוֹ (xcvii. 4), and for כִּבְאוֹ (*l.* 2) read כִּבְאָה (We.). —4. אֱלֹהִים הוֹפִיעַ seems to be a variant to מִכְּלָל־יִפִּי, which may have been written indistinctly, so that a marginal note was made suggesting this alternative. The title מִכְּלָל יִפִּי seems also to occur in the true text of Isa. xxxiii. 17 (see *SBOT, Isaiah*, Heb., *ad loc.*, and cp. Marti). For יבֹא read פָּכַד; omit ואלֵי as a dittographed אֱלֹהֵינוּ, and for חַרֵּשׁ read זָרַח.

7 f. M מִעַל. Read מִמַּעַל (Houb., La., We.), and also in Gen. xxvii. 39, xlix. 25.—M לָרִין. Read לִנְגַד; more natural.

9 ff. Read לוֹ חֲסִידוֹ, בְּרִיתוֹ, after G (Bi., Du.).—Point וַיִּגִּידוּ (G, Gr., Du.).

12. M אֱלֹהִים שִׁפְטוּ (note Pasek). Read אֱלֹהֵי מִשְׁפָּט. סְלָה in M comes from a dittographed אֱלֹהִים.

1.⁽²⁾ 3 ff. An allusion to Ex. xx. 2. Read therefore יְהוָה (which the editor avoids) for אֱלֹהִים, and supply || line by the help of Ex. xx. 2b, Ps. lxxxii. 11b.—Read זִבְחֵיךְ [אֶחָפֶץ] לֹא; לֹא וּכְיַחַד [א] is a dittogram of זִבְחֵיךְ.

10. M's **בְּהַרְרֵי אֶלְפֵי** has caused much perplexity. 'On the mountains of the thousand' (A J, Bā.)? We should have expected **בְּהַרְרֵי בִשְׁן**. G *ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι καὶ βόεσι* = **בְּהַרְרֵם וְאַלְפֵם**. Du., **בְּהַרְרֵם אֶלְפֵם** 'on a thousand hills.' Ol., Bi., We., **בְּהַרְרֵי אֶלְ**; cp. xxxvi. 7. Critics, however, have omitted to ask whether the corruption may not extend to **בְּהַמֹּת** (corrupt in xlix. 13, 21, lxxiii. 22). To obtain a satisfactory sense, read **הַכְּנָתִי אֶבְרִי אֶלְפִים**.

11. M **הַרִים**, a scribe's error produced by **הַרְרֵי**. Read **שְׁמַיִם** (so Street and Duhm) after G S T. One MS. of Kenn. has **הַשְּׁמַיִם הַרִים**.

12. M **זֶן שְׂרֵי** (as in lxxx. 14*b*), *i.e.*, according to most since Bochart, 'all that stirs in the field (or plain).' Too vague. Franz Del. compared Ass. *sizānu*, 'worms,' or (Frd. Del., *Ass. HWB*, 282*a*, but cp. 572), 'an animal like a locust.' Cp. also **זֶן** 'mite, spider.' Too mean. Both here and in Ps. lxxx. the word is certainly corrupt. G here *ὠραιότης ἀγροῦ*, *i.e.* either Aram. **זֶן** 'brightness,' Dan. ii. 31 (some MSS. read **זֶן** for **זֶן** in Isa. lxvi. 11), or **זֶן** 'flower' (lit. something bright); Herz would even read **זֶן**. The most probable correction is **עֲצֵי** 'the trees of (the) uplands.' Cp. lxxx. 14; also *SBOT, Isaiah*, Heb., p. 165.

20. G's *διὰ ψαύμα*, *i.e.* **סֵלָה**, comes from a dittographed **אֱלֹהִים**.

1.³¹ 5 f. According to M, the crimes imputed to the bad Israelites are thieving and adultery—a rather commonplace description. The language too is not natural; 'when thou sawest a thief, thou hadst pleasure (?) with him.' The use of **רָצָה** with **עִם** is also questionable (Job xxxiv. 9?); but the **וְתָרַץ** of G S J (Saad. Gr. Bā) is not very plausible. Read **עַם-עֵדֶת נְבָלִים תִּצְמַד**. The initial **ו** in **וְתָרַץ** probably represents the **ל** in **נְבַל**; **עָמוֹ** probably comes from **צַמַד**, a fragment of a dittographed **תִּצְמַד**.

7 f. M **שָׁלַחַת**, an odd expression. Read probably **לְחַשֶׁת** **בְּפִיךָ**; that **לַחֵשׁ** (M H, Aram., 'to hum, to whisper') is not found in Kāl, is no strong objection.—M **לְשׁוֹנֶךָ**. Read **לְשׁוֹנֶיךָ** (see lii. 6*b*).—M **תִּצְמַד**. Read **תִּנְצָא** (Frankenberg, *Psalmen Sal.*, 20). **נִד** arose from dittography.

9 f. M **תִּשָּׁב**. Rather **בִּשְׁת**, Kr., Gr., Herz.—M **דְּפִי**; G *ἐτίθεισ σκάνδαλον*; a guess? In M H **דְּפִי** = 'blemish, reproach'; cp. *Yoma* 22*b*, 'no reproach (ד) rested on Saul's descent.' It occurs in Sirach xlv. 19 mg., but the text-reading (confirmed by S) is **כִּיֹם**. Read **תִּגְדֹּף**. **גִּדְּף** generally denotes blasphemy against God, but cp. xlv. 17, and note the wider use of **גִּדְּפִים**. The construction **בְּ גִדְּף** is Talmudic.

11. M **אֱלֹהֵי יְעִשִׂית וְהַחֲרַשְׁתִּי** (note Pasek); very obscure. It was

ot true that Yahwè 'kept silence,' *i.e.* took no notice of the offences. Nowack takes the clause to be virtually interrogative; Kön. (§ 390 r) explains, 'as often as I was silent.' Parallelism is opposed to all these; we require הַהֲרִשָׁתָּה, which, however, will not make sense. We have no option but to seek for suitable words which, on the analogy of similar errors elsewhere, the scribe may have corrupted into 'אלה עשית והח' (for the whole clause is unnatural in form and contents). Not improbably read יהוה נִסִּיתָ וְהִכְעַסְתָּ; this prepares the way for the strong phrase in *l.* 15 (*v.* 22a). אלה represents אלהים (substituted by the editor for יהוה).—M דְּמִית הַיּוֹת אֱהִיָּה כְמוֹךָ; G ἵπέλαβες ἀνομίαν (הַיּוֹת) ὅτι ἔσομαι σοι ὅμοιος; "Ἄλλος gives ἀνομιε. First of all, הַיּוֹת אֱהִיָּה excites suspicion; the supposition that two readings are combined is too easy, considering that, in the next place, the whole clause is neither clear in itself, nor suitably placed. How did the wicked faction suppose that God was like itself? The characteristics of the wicked of which we have just heard are incapable of being ascribed to God. Had the phrase been, 'thou thoughtest that a bribe would appease me,' we might have let it pass. What we require is a suitable climax for the list of the offences of the wicked—something equivalent to 'thou hast denied God' (cp. *l.* 15; *v.* 22a). Read probably כִּרְיִת תּוֹרַת אֱלֹהֶיךָ; thus parallelism is thoroughly satisfied. The three final letters in M (כוּרֶךְ) may be added to the material for the next line.—M אוֹכִיחֶךָ (כוּרֶךְ). The general sense is clear, but the right way of expanding this scanty material is not clear. Read perhaps, עַל־כִּיעֲלֶךָ אוֹכִיחֶךָ (cp. *Ezr.* ix. 4, x. 6), if this is metrically sufficient.—After וְאֵעֲרֹכָה insert דְּרַכֶּיךָ. The recurrence of רכ might account for the omission.

15. M שִׁכְחִי. Read certainly כִּי־שָׁחִי (see on ix. 18).

Appendix. The difficulties are—(1) יִכְבְּדֵנִי (double נ), (2) וְשֵׁם דֶּרֶךְ (meaning), (3) the excessive length of the second line. The second of these has been met in different ways. Many (Bp. Hare. Street. Geiger (*Jüd. Zt.* v. 113), Gr., Che. (ed. 1), Kau., Bevan (*Crit. Rev.*, April, '96), Herz) read וְתִסְדְּרֶךָ; Lagarde [*Mittheil.* ii. 378], and nearly so We., כִּישְׁלֵם נְדָרָךְ. Σ paraphrases M, καὶ ἐντάκτως ὁδεύοντι. The meaning of the consonants of the text, however, is probably given by G. καὶ ἐκέῃ (וְשֵׁם) ὁδὸς ἣν δέλεω αὐτῶ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ Θεοῦ. But is either G's view or Lagarde's satisfactory? No; for (1) both readings are unmetrical, and (2) the payment of vows should follow and not precede the sight of Yahwè's deliverance. The three difficulties must, therefore, be met differently. Read thus (cp. *ll.* 17, 18, 20),—

זְבַח תּוֹרָה וְכִבְדֵנִי
וְשֵׁלֵם נְדָרֶיךָ לְעֵלְיוֹן

The second נ in יִכְבְּדֵנִי seems to have been detached from נִדְרָ[נִי]. M's addition בִּישַׁע אֱלֹהִים has arisen out of two miswritten forms of וְשָׁלַם; cp. שְׁלָמִים for אֱלֹהִים in the title of Ps. l. אֲרָאֵנוּ comes from לַעֲלִיזָן.

PSALM LI.

TRIMETERS. Pious Israel, still suffering acutely from calamities which are a proof of God's wrath, but not now in exile (see on *ṣ.* 13*a*), craves pardon for sins which it cannot indeed fully understand, but which it assumes to be as great as the punishment. The author of the appendix supposes the psalm to have been written during the exile, for in the prayer, 'Build the walls of Jerusalem' (*ṣ.* 20*b*), he throws himself back imaginatively into this period. In other words, this later writer wishes to add a qualification to a passage (*ṣ.* 18) liable, as he thought, to be misunderstood, but not to frame it in such a way as to spoil the harmony of the composition. Another writer, to whom *ṣ.* 2 must be assigned, so entirely missed the object of the psalmist that he picked out a scene in the life of a historic personage which seemed to him to present the occasion of the psalm. The lateness of his date, however, is sufficiently shown by the fact that this historic personage is David, whose name only got into the original title (*ṣ.* 1) by corruption of the text (the psalm being really Ethnic). The acquaintance of the psalmist with Isa. xl.-lxvi. is a cogent proof that he too is by no means an early writer; at any rate, he cannot be placed earlier than the close of the Persian period. To suppose a reference to the colossal troubles commonly (but perhaps wrongly) assigned to the times of Artaxerxes Ochus is hazardous, however. The poet seems rather to sum up all the many troubles of the period which began with the fall of Jerusalem, and never actually ended till the great Maccabees arose.

That the speaker is the pious community is beyond reasonable doubt. To suppose that the psalm was originally meant for an individual, but afterwards adapted to the use of the community, or that the psalmist is not quite sure himself whether he would prefer the speaker to be an individual, or to represent Israel (cp. Coblenz, p. 85), needlessly impairs the harmony and consistency of the poem. The Hebrew writers so strongly realize the organic unity of Israel that they fall into the use of language which is sometimes startling to Western readers (see on xxxii.¹, and cp. Isa. liii.). The expression 'deliver me from bloodshed' (*ṣ.* 16*a*) is quite capable of explanation on the nationalistic theory. To the innocent blood which was shed by Manasseh (2 K. xxiv. 3 f.; cp. Ezek. vii. 23, xxii. 2-4) the captivity of Judah is expressly assigned, and it can be shown that that old Semitic passionateness which led to sins of bloodshed was by no means purged away from the later Jews (see e.g. xxvi. 9, lix. 2, cxxxix. 19, Isa. lix. 3, 11,¹ and note that the whole of Isa. lix. is like a commentary on Ps. lix.⁽¹⁾) But it is more than probable that כִּדְרָמִים is corrupt (see on *l.* 29), so that the long dispute between the friends and the foes of the Davidic authorship loses its chief starting-point.

It is true there is another starting-point—the title. Can the circumstantial statement in *ṣ.* 2 really have been woven out of the obscure words, 'Rescue me from bloodshed'? Probably the title can be accounted for on a quite different theory. On the analogy of Pss. vii. and lii., it would seem that *ṣ.* 2 is an editorial expansion of the misread words 'to Bathsheba,' and it is possible that the psalm was originally described as a Sabbath-psalm (see crit. n. on title).

Deposited. Marked: of Arab-ethan. For the Sabbath (?). 1, 2

- 1 Have pity upon me, O God! according to thy great kindness; 3
Thy compassion being so large, blot out my transgressions.
As with fullers' soap wash me from my guilt, 4
And purify me from my sin.

¹ *Aids to the Study of Criticism*, 207-210.

- My transgressions I do indeed acknowledge, 5
 Of my sins I am ever conscious.
- Against thee alone have I sinned, 6
 Displeasing to thee +alone+ is that which I have done,
 That thou mightest be +proved+ righteous in thy sentence,
 10 That thou mightest be +proved+ blameless in thy judgment,
 Surely in guilt was I brought forth, 7
 In sin did my mother conceive me.
- Surely thou carest for truth more than for offerings, 8
 Make me, then, to know the secrets of wisdom.
 Besprinkle me with hyssop, that I may become pure ; 9
 Wash me, that I may become whiter than snow ;
 Satisfy me with mirth and gladness, 10
 That the frame thou hast crushed may thrill with joy.
- Hide thy face from my sins ; 11
 20 My guilty acts—blot them all out.
 A pure heart create for me, O God ! 12
 A constant spirit produce within me.
 Cast me not forth from thy presence ; 13
 Thy holy spirit take not from me.
- Gladden me again with thy succour, 14
 And sustain me with a zealous spirit.
 Then will I teach thy ways to apostates, 15
 So that sinners return to thee.
- Rescue me from the Edomites, O Yahwè ! 16
 30 That my tongue may cause to resound thy righteousness.
- O Yahwè ! open my lips, 17
 That my tongue may publish thy praise.
 For thou carest not for sacrifices, 18
 Offerings and burnt sacrifices thou dost not desire.
 Yahwè's power is a spirit that is broken, 19
 A heart that is² crushed³ thou dost not despise.

Appendix.

- Be pleased to show kindness to Zion, 20
 Build thou Jerusalem's walls.
 Then wilt thou care for the right sacrifices ;
 40 Then will bullocks be brought to thine altar.

¹ My succouring God.

² Broken and.

³ O God !

3. פָּבַס, G Σ $\pi\lambda\acute{o}\nu\omicron\nu$. The same figure in Jer. iv. 14, Mal. iii. 2.—6.

לִנְגִידִי 'in my consciousness' (l. 8).—

7. *Against thee alone, i.e.* not against the Babylonians (Theod. of Mop.) or any other human party in the cause. Cp. Hab. i. 4, 13, Isa. xxxiii. 1. Why against Yahwè? This is inferred from the national calamities.

9. **That thou mightest, &c.** The 'sentence' or 'judgment' has been declared in Israel's recent history; Babylon (?) and Persia have executed it as God's instruments. The successes of these earthly powers were fore-ordained (cp. Isa. xxxvii. 26 f.). If so, the rightness of these successes (so harmful to Israel) had to be proved, and Israel had to sin that no shadow of blame might rest on Yahwè (cp. Isa. lxiii. 17).

11. **In guilt, &c.** The speaker belongs to an erring race. Cp. Job xiv. 4 (even if an interpolation¹), Isa. xlvi. 8, Ezek. xvi. 8. The 'mother' means the race; cp. xxii. 10 f., l. 20, lxxi. 6, Isa. l. 1.

13 f. Israel has made its confession; it may now look for a cheering response (xxxii. 5, Hos. xiv. 2-4 [3-5]). But to show that its penitence is not superficial, a further petition is added. Israel knows that obedience is the true sacrifice, and that the first step in the path of obedience is confession of sin. For each further step special wisdom or insight is required, *i.e.* ability so to frame one's conduct as to please Yahwè. God alone can give this wisdom, the secrets of which are 'marvels' (Job xi. 6). Hence, the speaker adds, since *thou carest for truth (i.e. sincerity, cp. cxlv. 18, 1 K. ii. 4) more than for offerings (xl. 7)*—and I have given a first proof of 'truth' by my free confession—*make me to know* those secrets. In Ps. xc. a prayer for pardon and a prayer for wisdom and for joy are again combined.

14. **Besprinkle me:** lit. 'free me from sin,' G, $\rho\alpha\pi\tau\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$. Notice that Heb. סָלַח 'to pardon' = Ass. *salihu* 'to besprinkle.' As in Ezek. xxxvi. 25, one of the traditional rites is interpreted symbolically. Possibly the symbol implies the comparison of the nation to a

leper (cp. Isa. liii. 4b).—*Wash me, &c.* Cp. Isa. i. 18, Job ix. 30. For the idea, cp. Jer. ii. 22, xiii. 23.

18f. **Thou hast crushed** (דָּכִיתָ), pointing on to l. 36. Cp. xxxviii. 9, xliv. 20.

21 f. Clément Marot finely renders, 'O Créateur, te plai-e en moy créer | Un cœur tout pur, une vie nouvelle.' For the key to the meaning see Ezek. xi. 19 f., xviii. 31, xxxvi. 26 f., where a 'new heart' or a 'heart of flesh' is promised to Israel, so that he may walk straight forward in God's ways. To render לֵב טָהוֹר 'ein lichte Bewusstsein' (Hitz.), or 'a joyous spirit' (Wellh.), is therefore impossible. Hitz. appeals to Prov. xxii. 11a, but the omission of י' (= יְהוָה) in v. 11a, and the loss of 11b (cp. G) have obscured the meaning of that passage. It is 'one who is pure in heart' that Yahwè loves, and this is a synonym of 'blameless' ($\zeta\alpha\omega\mu\omicron\iota$) in b. It is not merely a joyous heart, or a temporarily 'clean' heart, that the speaker desires. A 'clean heart' had often been subjectively possessed for a time by the early Israelites, after the due performance of sacrificial rites. It is a heart, not only clean, but able to guard itself against future pollution which is sought for; בָּרָא is therefore the right word, and חֲדָשׁ is its synonym. Such a 'new heart' is described as רוּחַ נָכוֹן, which is not merely a courageous, confident spirit = לֵב נָכוֹן (lvii. 8, cxii. 7), but a steady impulse towards all that is good = רוּחַ נְרִיבָה (l. 26). If there is any doubt about this, lxxviii. 8, 37 ought to remove it. Cf. on cii. 19.

23. **Cast me not forth . . .** 2 K. xxiv. 3 says, 'By Yahwè's command came this upon Judah, to remove them out of his sight, for the sins of Manasseh.' It is first of all exclusion from the land of Canaan which is thought of. But such exclusion is chiefly painful because it means the cessation of the privileges of worship in the temple—the house, not so much of sacrifice, as of prayer. Even if a new

¹ Cp. *J. Q. R.*, '97, p. 577.

conception of God's presence is being formed (see on xxiii. 6), it cannot as yet supplant the sublime and tender associations of the material temple. And how is the right of access to God's presence to be preserved? Only by righteousness (v. 6, 8), and persistent righteousness can only be had through the *holy* (or divine) *spirit* dwelling

within Israel. The workings of this spirit are seen (1) in the right guidance of the people of Israel (Isa. lxiii. 10, 11, 14) and (2) in the right religious teaching of Israel (Neh. ix. 20). Both kinds of operation are implied here; the former in lines 25, 29, the latter in lines 14, 27.—39. *The right sacrifices*, legally right. See on iv. 6.

Critical notes. Title. The statement in *v.* 2 is perhaps an expansion of אֱלֹהֵי-בֵּית-שֶׁבַע, for which, however, we should perhaps read אֱלֹהֵי-הַשֶּׁבֶת, omitting all the rest of *v.* 2. See introd., and cp. on lii. 2.

1. M פְּחֻסָּדָה. G κατὰ τὸ μέγα ἔλεός σου, i.e. פְּנִדָּל ח' (Num. xiv. 19), which Bi. restores. Note parallelism, and cp. lxxix. 11, כְּנִ' זְרוּעַד. יהוה (יה) is absorbed by חֲנִנִי; thus the line is still a trimeter. כְּרַבְרַחֲמֶיךָ in *l.* 2 presents one beat.

3. M הַרְבֵּה (Kt.) or הָרַב (Kr.). Superfluous and unpicturesque. Read פְּבַרִית (Jer. ii. 22, Mal. iii. 2). Grätz, who reads הָרַב (פְּשָׁעֵי), sees the problem, but not the solution.

9 f. M בְּדַבְּרֶךָ, to produce an assonance with בְּשִׁפְטֶךָ. Rather point בְּדַבְּרֶךָ, but as the sing. (S), not the plur. (G Σ J). In *l.* 10 read בְּמִשְׁפָּטֶךָ (Gr.). G ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε = בְּהַשְׁפָּטֶךָ.

13 f. The rendering of this distich given in the Wellhausen-Furness Psalter is so remarkable that I give it here.

Yea, faith and trust—it is these that thou lovest.

Grant me, then, insight into the mystery.

The accompanying note runs thus,—‘It troubles him to be obliged to acknowledge God's righteousness without understanding the reason therefor. If he could but get an “insight into the mystery” his faith would be strengthened (cp. xc. 8).’ In the following note it is further stated that ‘by the “clean heart” is meant a joyous spirit, assured of the divine favour (*v.* 12). The opposite to this is the troubled, not the impure heart.’ This is partly the same as the view of Hitzig, who, like We., explains ‘a pure heart’ (לֵב טָהוֹר) as = ‘a consciousness untroubled by the loss of communion with God,’ but supposes the ‘hidden thing’ (סֵתֶם) to be Israel's uncertain future. Both take אֲנִיָּת to be a synonym of אֲמוּנָה in the sense of πίστις, and בְּטַחֲוֹת (Job xii. 6 ἄπ. λεγ.) in the similarly subjective sense of ‘trust’; of the latter rendering, however, We. indicates the doubtfulness. The explanation is in a high degree forced, but it expresses a needed protest against the traditional view. A middle position is taken up by Bâ. His version is,—

Truly thou hast pleasure in firmness of heart,

Therefore make known wisdom to me inwardly.

That is, he agrees with the traditionalists that טחת and סתם are both designations of the inner man, but he admits that טחת at any rate is as yet philologically obscure. He is also dissatisfied with the common explanation of אִנְיָ as sincerity or honesty, and discovers a new and subtle sense for it—'das fest in Gott gegründete Wesen (1 K. ii. 4).' My own position is this. If the generally received view of the sense of *l.* 13 f. is right, בַּטְחוֹת and בְּקָתָם must contain designations of two of the inner parts of the body: they must be equivalent to בְּלֵב and בְּכַלְיוֹת (see references in note on vii. 9). Unfortunately there is no philological means of proving this. It is mere trifling to say that the 'reins' are called טְחוֹת, because 'smeared over' with fat, and in Job xxxviii. 36, where the same sense is given to טְחוֹת [ב] by Tg. and the Rabbins, we should certainly read תַּרְתַּח, the 'lance-star,' Antares (cf. on lv. 22). The sense 'secret place.' = 'heart,' for קָתָם is less arbitrary, but still not probable. The word only occurs once elsewhere in plur. for 'secret' (Dan. xii. 9), and there קְתָנִים is explained by חֲתָנִים 'sealed'; כָּל־קָתָם in Ezek. xxviii. 3 is doubtless corrupt (Cornill; *Crit. Bib.*). Now let us turn to G. This version makes sense by disregarding the two ב, —*ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἀλήθειαν ἠγάπησας, τὰ ἄδηλα καὶ τὰ κρύφια τῆς σοφίας σου ἐδήλωσάς μοι.* Apart from the wrong tense, this gives probably the right meaning of *l.* 14 (see above). But we cannot ignore the two ב, and our experience both with טחת and with סתם warns us to look out for corruption of the text. Assuming G's view of the general meaning, there is only one word from which סתם can have sprung; it is תַּעֲלָמוֹת (xliv. 22, Job xi. 6, xxviii. 11), which was perhaps G's reading (cf. G, xliv. 21). And how shall we correct בטחות? With sound linguistic perception MT recognizes in the initial ב a preposition. But if G's view of *l.* 14 is correct, the required preposition is כִּן; 'thou carest for sincerity more than for' anything which can be done with formal accuracy without sincerity. Now we can see what is required. Comparing lines 33 f., xl. 7, and especially Hos. vi. 6b, we may with a near approach to certainty restore מִכִּינְחוֹת; the corruptions and omission implied were easy.

18. תִּשְׁבִּיעֵנִי (S, Bruston, Bā.). M תִּשְׁמִיעֵנִי. Unnatural. It is the psalmist who is to sing aloud.

29. M כִּדְבָרִים. Read כִּי־דְבָרִים (see on v. 6, lv. 24).

34. וּמִנְחָה (cf. on *l.* 13), M וּמִנְחָה. After מִנְחָה had been mis-written מִנְחָה, it was easy to correct מִנְחָה into מִנְחָה. Perles (*Anal.* 88), וּמִנְחָה. Duhm וּמִנְחָה, as the protasis to *v.* 18 b, *i.e.* 'and were I to give burnt offerings.' This, however, is not natural. By reading וּמִנְחָה וּמִנְחָה we make lines 33 and 34 quite symmetrical.

PSALM LII.

TRIMETERS. A prophetic denunciation of the Jerahmeelite people as a leading element in the 'league' of the 'impious,' with which, as we gather from some of the psalms (e.g. xxvi., l. (3)) a Jewish faction was associated. The psalm is parallel to others in which the sharp tongues of the Arabian enemies are spoken of (cp. e.g. lv. 22, lix. 8, lxiv. 4, cxx. 4)—parallel also to that strange 49th psalm in which the 'traitors,' the 'impious,' the 'deniers of God,' the 'insulters of Israel,' are condemned to everlasting confinement in Sheol, while the true Israel—the community of pious observers of Yahwè's Law—will live for ever in the enjoyment of God's favour. Both in Ps. xlix.⁽²⁾ and in Ps. lii. it is characteristic of the opponents of this true Israel that they trust in their riches rather than in the one true God—that All-righteous One, who is not to be bribed by costly sacrifices to protect or to favour immoral deniers of his Law and insulters of his faithful servants. The Jerahmeelites or N. Arabians, then, would appear to be primarily meant in Ps. xlix.⁽²⁾ Our psalm supplies just that historical definiteness which is required to make Ps. xlix.⁽²⁾ thoroughly intelligible. Not only are individual wicked men—whether of Jewish or Jerahmeelite origin—to be hurried off to Sheol, leaving their ill-gotten wealth to the locust, but the whole Jerahmeelite community in Palestine is soon to meet with a violent end, presumably at the coming judgment. The vehement language of v. 7 casts a bright light on l. 22, where 'tearing in pieces' relates especially to the destruction of the Jerahmeelites as a community (cp. ii. 9). On the 'league of the impious' (l. 1) see xxvi. 4 f., l. 18, lxxxii. 1 (cp. lviii. 2). The psalm seems to have suggested Ps. iv. in the Psalter of Solomon, which is a Pharisaic attack on the Sadducees. Cp. *OP*, 121. It has also a singular resemblance to Isaiah's diatribe against a certain Cushite or Jerahmeelite *parvenu* at Jerusalem, whom the prophet threatens with expulsion from Judah (Isa. xxii. 15-18). See *Amer. Journ. of Theol.*, v. [1901], 442 ff.

Deposited. Of 'Arab-ethan. Against the house of Jerahmeel. 1, 2

1	Why ragest thou in the league of the impious,	3
	[And insultest,] O Jerahmeel, continually ?	
	Insults dost thou plan for thy neighbours,	4
	Thy tongue is like a whetted razor.	
	Thou lovest tricks and falsehoods	5
	More than words of righteousness and peace ;	
	Thou lovest all words that destroy,	6
	To thy neighbours [thou utterest] deceit.	
	Therefore God will pluck thee up for ever,	7
10	Will seize thee and tear thee up, O Jerahmeel,	
	* * * *	
	And from the land of the living will uproot thee.	
	The righteous will see it, and will triumph,	8
	[They will rejoice,] and will laugh at his fate,	
	'Behold, the impious one [who raged,]	9
	Who made not Yahwè his stronghold,	
	But trusted in the abundance of his wealth,	
	And exulted in the glory of his house.'	

And as for me, bowed ₊by suffering₊ and poor, 10
 20 * * * * *
 I take refuge in the goodness of Yahwè,
 I trust in the lovingkindness of my God.
 I will thank thee for ever, because thou hast delivered, 11
 And will sing praise, for thy lovingkindness is good.

1 f. See introd. *Insultest . . . continually.* Cp. xlii. 11, xliv. 17, lxxiv. 10 (corr. text). The 'insult' is, 'Where is thy God?'—4. Cp. lv. 22, lix. 8.—5. מַרְכֹּת x. 7, xxxv. 20, xxxviii. 13; שְׁקָרִים, ci. 7.—7. בְּלִיעַל. See on xviii. 9—12. See on ii. 9, and cp. Isaiah's threat, Isa. xxii. 17 f.; also Ps. xxxvii. 35 f.

16. **Who made not Yahwè, &c.** Cp. liv. 5 c, 'they have not set thee, O Yahwè! before them.' The religion of the Jerahmeelites, being low and formal, is worthless. They know not the 'right sacrifices,' iv. 6 (see note).

17 f. See introd. and cp. xlix. 7.—

19. Most scholars find a contrast between the luxuriant olive-tree planted in the temple-courts, and therefore specially flourishing, and the uprooted tree which symbolizes Israel's enemy. But (1) the description of the olive-tree is singularly cramped, and (2) to infer from lxxxiv. 4, xcii. 14, Zech. i. 8, and 2 Macc. xiv. 4 that trees grew in the sacred precincts in ancient times, is excessively bold. None of these passages will bear the stress laid upon them. The contrast is a finer one than has been supposed; it is between the proud self-confident Jerahmeelite and the humble Israelite, whose refuge is Yahwè's lovingkindness.—23. *Thou hast delivered.* Strictly, a future perfect (cp. liv. 9, lvi. 14).

Critical Notes. Title. The reference of the title to Doeg the Edomite is so absurd that one looks out for a motive. The motive is a misunderstanding of the (probably) true title, viz. עַל-בֵּית יְרַחְמֵאל, which was misread אֶל-בֵּית אַחִיכֶלָה, and set the editor thinking how to expand it.

1. M הַנְּבוֹר, enigmatical. And why בְּרָעָה? To suit תַּתְּהַלֵּל? But does any one 'boast' of his 'wickedness'? In the light of parallel psalms read certainly בְּקִשְׁר הַנְּבֹל. For other disguises of נבל see xxvi. 4, lviii. 2, lxxxii. 1. רָעָה comes from a corrupt form רַגְשָׁה (lxiv. 3). For 'תת', see the error in x. 3, and cp. on lxviii. 22.—2. For אֶל הַסֵּד הָאֵל Houb., We., and Du. (after S) ingeniously read אֶל-הַסֵּד. But the corruption of אֶל יְרַחְמֵאל into לֹא הַסֵּד in xlvi. 1 suggests a better correction. Read יְרַחְמֵאל (vocative), and prefix וַתְּהַרְרָה. See exeg. note.—3. M הַיּוֹת. Too strong: read חֲרָפוֹת. See on v. 10, and cp. on lxii. 7. 3.

3. M לְשׁוֹנֶךָ (so G). Does the tongue think? xxxv. 28 is no justification. Read לְשִׁכְנֶיךָ. Same error in xv. 3; cp. on 7. 8.

4. M יַעֲשֶׂה רְכִיזָה. The true reading is לְשׁוֹנֶךָ, but when this word had come by corruption into 7. 3, the ancient editor had to emend

it in *l.* 9. A reminiscence of *ci.* 7 may have suggested the alteration; cp. also *l.* 8. Thus once more the gloss-theory is superfluous.

7. M בִּלְע, nowhere found as a noun. Read בְּלִיעַל (cp. lviii. 3, corr. text). [So already Brüll.]

8. M לְשׁוֹן מְרֻכָּה. Read לְשׁוֹן מְרֻכָּה תִּצְיָא (see on *l.* 3). The line now coincides with *l.* 19*b* (corr. text).

10. M יַחְתֵּד. But חתה means 'to rake, or hold, together.' We would derive from חתת. Read rather יַחְטִפְדָּ (x. 10, Judg. xxi. 21). ת for ט as Job ix. 12, Prov. xxiii. 28 (read חתף).—M מֵאָהֶל. A suffix is required; Σ S Houb. supply 2 m. s.; Gr. Dyo. 3 m. s. But many analogies suggest that the true reading is יִרְחֲמֵאל (see on *l.* 2). The סלה at the close of *l.* 7 represents the same word (a marginal correction of מֵאָהֶל?).

13 f. M וַיִּירָאוּ. Read either וַיִּרְעוּ (xli. 12) or (xl. 4*b*?) וַיִּנְהָרוּ. S (very paraphrastic in this verse) 'shall rejoice.'—Read וַעֲלִיו [יִשְׂמְחוּ] וַיִּשְׁחָקוּ. The two verbs look very much alike; hence one fell out.

15. M הַגִּבֹּר. Read הַנָּבֵל (see on *l.* 1), and insert הַמֵּתְהַלֵּל.

17. M יַעֲזוּ בְּכַבֹּד. Plainly a mutilated phrase. Read יַעֲזוּ בְּכַבֹּד וַיַּעֲזוּ בְּהַבִּילוֹ (xlix. 17). G ἐδυναμώθη ἐπὶ τῆς ματαιότητι αὐτοῦ, *i.e.* יַעֲזוּ בְּהַבִּילוֹ. S T presuppose בְּהוֹנוֹ, which La., Gr., Bi., Bā., Du. adopt. Herz, יַעֲזוּ בְּהוֹנוֹ. M's ותו is a fragment of בִּיתוֹ; for יַעֲזוּ, see ix. 20 (corr. text).

19 f. M וַאֲנִי פְצִית רַעְנָן (Pasek after ואני). Very improbable (see exeg. note). כזית is a corruption of חסיתי, which is indispensable as a parallel to בטחתי, and is misplaced. רענן is again corrupt in xxxvii. 35. Read here וַאֲבִיוֹן and prefix עֲנִי, which fell out after ואני. The next line is wanting.

21. Read חֲסִיתִי בְּטוֹב יְהוָה (parallelism). טוב and בית confounded (liv. 8).—22. Omit עוֹלָם, a corrupt dittogram of אלהים, and ועד as a dittogram of אור in אורד. But אֱלֹהֵי is preferable to אלהים.—23. M עֲשִׂיתָ. Read הוֹשִׁיעָתָ (see on xxii. 31).

24. M אֶמְנָה. Hu., אֶסְפְּרָה; Hi., Gr., Dy., Bi., Driv., We., Du., אֶחְוָה (xix. 3). Neither verb is a good parallel to אֶזְכְּרָה. Lag. *Ps. juxta Hebr. Hier.*), אֶיִּקְרָה (1 S. xviii. 30)?? Surely we should read אֶזְמַר. ז and נ were transposed; then ז became ו and נ - ק (cp. on lxxiii. 27*a*). שִׁנְךָ, which follows, represents זִכְרֵךָ, a fragment of אֶזְכְּרָה, written as a correction of אֶקְוָה. Omit נגד (editorial insertion), and read הֶסְרְפְּךָ.

PSALM LIII.

AN Elohistie edition of Ps. xiv., placed after Ps. lii. on account of the reference to נָבֵל, 'the impious,' with this composite heading, 'Deposited. Of Salmath. Deposited. Of 'Arab-ethan.' Street suggested that the variations might be intentional, the psalm having been retouched to adapt it to some recent event. But the ordinary causes of corruption sufficiently account for the textual phenomena. That the last editor read נָבֵל, does not prove this to be right.

PSALM LIV.

TRIMETERS. Exposed to the assaults of wicked men, foreigners, pious Israel appeals to its God. Duhm supposes an individual to be the speaker, but even if we adopt זָרִים, 'proud ones,' in v. 5, it will be too bold in an individual to appropriate phrases elsewhere, and much more fittingly, applied to the community. Cp. Smend, 116, who, however, underestimates the historical colouring of the psalm. The foes of the speaker being named in other psalms of this group, we need not hesitate to read ethnic names in v. 5 (see crit. note). As in the case of li., lii., lvi., lvii., lix., lx., we seem to get a clue to the origin of the very unpalatable title in the traditional text.

Deposited. Of the Ishmaelites. Deposited. Of 'Arab-ethan. 1, 2
[Concerning] the Zarephathites.

1	Succour me, O Yahwè ! by thy right hand,	3
	And right me by thy strength.	
	O Yahwè ! hearken to my prayer,	4
	Listen to the words of my mouth.	
	For those of Zarephath assail me,	5
	Misřites seek after my soul ;	
	[Thy judgments they do not fear,]	
	They have not set thee, O Yahwè ! before them.	
	Be a helper unto me, O Yahwè !	6
10	Redeem me from those that seek my soul.	
	Let the evil return on the Ishmaelites,	7
	For their wickedness do thou extirpate them.	
	With the lyre will I chant hymns unto thee,	8
	And give thanks in thy house to thy name, ¹	
	Because from all distress thou hast rescued me,	9
	Mine eye sees the fate of mine enemies.	

1. **By thy right hand.** Cp. cxxxviii. 7. 'By thy name,' i.e. 'by thy glory' (Isa. xxx. 27), is not natural here. Duhm's explanation ('by a manifestation of thy presence in the temple') is far-fetched. Not so in l. 14.

5. **Those of Zarephath.** This old name too was affected by the psalmists (cp. lxxxiii. 8, lxxxvii. 4, xciv. 20). The editor who expanded the heading probably found 'Şefathites' — a shorter form of Şarephathites, and

¹ Yahwè.

confounded it with 'Ziphites.' A league of tribes is supposed.—8. Note that Abraham does not expect to find 'the fear of God' in Gerar, according to Gen. xx. 11.

13 f. Imitated in Jon. ii. 10. Observe that Yahwe's 'name' is his *numen*, the divinity resident in the temple, and apprehended in the cultus.

Critical Notes. 1. M בְּשִׁבְיָךְ. Read בְּיִמְיִנְךָ (Gr.); note parallelism.

5 f. M זָרִים (Pasek follows), עֲרִיצִים. T and several MSS. (Kenn., de R.), besides the || passage, lxxxvi. 14, read זָרִים. Ol. (doubtfully), Gr., Smend, Duhm, Bertholet, prefer this. But if עֲרִיצִים is right, we expect זָרִים (Isa. xxv. 5, xxix. 5, Ezek. xxxi. 12). Consistency, however, requires the corrections מִצָּרִים, צָרְפָתִים. See introd.

7. Inserted by pure conjecture.—8. Read שְׂמוֹךְ (Gr.); as lxxxvi. 14.

9. M אֲדֹנָי בְּסִמְכֵי נַפְשִׁי. But surely after II. 1—8 a fervent petition is indispensable. Add to this that M's text is untranslatable. Most take ב for the *Beth essentia*, and סִמְכֵי for a case of the intensive plural (Kön., § 338 β). But the plural is as unnatural here as in cxviii. 7a (see note); בְּסִמְכֵי would be better (cp. Moore on Judg. xi. 35), but what of נַפְשִׁי? Read נִפְשֵׁי מִמְּבַקְשֵׁי נַפְשִׁי. The corruptions and transpositions of letters are obvious.

11. The יָשׁוּב of Kt. and T is correct. K̄r. יִשְׁיב, though all the vss. but T, many MSS. and several editions, also Hitz. and Del., prefer it, is an unnecessary conjecture.—M לְשִׁרְרִי. Read לִישְׁמֵעָאֵל (cp. on v. 9, lix. 11b).

12. M בְּאַמִּתְךָ. But הצְמִיתִם follows. 'In thy faithfulness deliver us,' would be more possible. The metre too is not satisfied. Read וּבְרַעְתָּם (xciv. 23); cp. on xxv. 5b. Ordinary transposition and corruption of letters (cp. next note).

13 f. M בְּנִדְבָה. G (cp. T) ἐκουσίως; in Num. xv. 3 'בִּנְ' clearly means 'spontaneously.' But we should expect נִדְבָה, 'freewill offerings,' with אֲזַבְחָה. Even so there would be a want of parallel passages in the Psalter. Gr. reads אֲזַמְרָה, rightly, for אֲזַבְחָה. But this is not enough. For 'בִּנְ', read בְּכִנּוּר. This is paraphrased in Jon. ii. 10 (where אֲזַבְחָה should be אֲזַמְרָה) by בְּכִי־טוֹב—בְּקוֹל תּוֹדָה (cp. lii. 11) comes in rather awkwardly; contrast cxxxv. 3. Read בְּבִיתְךָ. בֵּית וְטוֹב are elsewhere confounded. Omit יְהוָה (gloss).

15. M הִצִּילָנִי. Are not we commentators too ready to accept such incongruities? Read הִצִּילָתָנִי (G S, Gr.).

16. Read בְּאִיבֵי (without ו), for metre, with Grimme.

PSALM LV.

PLAINLY this is a composite psalm. 17. 20(end)-24 cannot be conveniently interwoven with the rest of the psalm. They are also in a different metre. Ps. lv.⁽¹⁾ consists of trimeters; Ps. lv.⁽²⁾ of pentameters. Both, however, have the same theme—Israel's danger from the hostile neighbouring populations. We have already met with specimens enough of this kind of psalm. Except in Ps. xlv., however, we have not found references to such glaring outrages as are apparently mentioned in the true text of *v.* 5, which reminds us of Pss. lxxiv., lxxix., and the second of the Lamentations. The loud cries of the foreigners produced a deep impression on the Jews (cp. lxxiv. 4, Lam. ii. 6 f.); they were the accompaniment of the destruction of the temple and palaces of Jerusalem (cp. lxxix. 1*b*, xciv. 20). This is what the psalmist really, or in imagination, has just witnessed. No wonder that pious Israel (who is the true speaker, should fall into the deepest despondency, and seem to himself to be at the point of death. Gladly would he find refuge in the rocky homes of the wild doves (see on *v.* 8), for he fears these violent men, whose various nationalities, as usual, he enumerates. He prays that a speedy death may put an end to their mischief. He knows that the prayers of the congregation will be answered. The plans of the Jerahmeelites (here as elsewhere the heads of a league of peoples) will be frustrated.

To this is appended a description of the godlessness of the Jerahmeelites (cp. *v.* 10), which may be illustrated by the story of the murder of Gedaliah in Jer. xli. For the Ishmael, whose violation of the bond of guestship by a cold-blooded murder is there related, was no Jew, but, as we are distinctly told, of the race of Jerahmeel,¹ a mercenary soldier, employed at first by Zedekiah, but afterwards by the king of the Ammonites. And it is possible that, just as Ps. lv.⁽¹⁾, like the kindred psalms (see on Ps. xlv.⁽²⁾), is probably based on the tradition in 2 K. xxiv. 2 (see corrected text), so Ps. lv.⁽²⁾ may be a poetic commemoration of the murder of Gedaliah by this Jerahmeelite. That either poem is contemporary with the events referred to is not to be supposed. Whether it is history or imagination that the N. Arabians took part in the destruction of the buildings of Jerusalem (cp. Pss. lxxiv., lxxix.), we cannot tell for certain, but the persistence of the belief that they did so is in favour of an affirmative answer. To quote from the psalms is needless, but we may compare the psalms, as here given, with the post-exilic passages, Amos i. 11 f., Obad. 11. In the former passage the pitiless persecution of Israel by Edom is punished by the destruction by fire of the palaces of Bozrah, and the law of 'like for like' suggests that Edom had first of all destroyed, or joined in destroying, the palaces of Jerusalem. In the latter Edom is represented as having been as one of the foreigners who 'entered Jerusalem's gates, and cast lots upon it.' With this we should (see *Crit. Bib.*) compare Joel iv. (iii.) 3 ff., where Musur and Midian and all the districts of Şarefath are denounced for 'casting lots' for Yahwē's people and for carrying Yahwē's silver and gold into their temples or palaces. We have no reason to suppose that such warlike peoples and such enemies of Israel as the Edomites and N. Arabians would content themselves with 'looting' the Jewish capital, and we may probably assume that there was a N. Arabian as well as a Babylonian invasion (cp. *Crit. Bib.* on 2 K. xxiv., xxv.). It was the havoc wrought by these men of kindred race which affected the Jews of the post-exilic age more than any cruelties of the Babylonians, because it was recalled to their recollection by the bitter hostility still shown to them in word and deed by the 'sons of Esau.' The unwarlike spirit of the writers, however, forbids us to bring these psalms down as late as the Maccabean rising, in spite of the striking parallel in 1 Macc. v. 1-4. The parallelism is, in fact, when we look into it, very incomplete.

Thus the historical situation of the psalm (as well as the other members of the group, liv.-lix.) is transformed. There is a large amount of poetic imagination in it, but the passion, at any rate, is not simulated; the psalmists are thinking of

¹ In Jer. xli. 1 both נְלוּכָה and רַבִּי הַנִּלְךְ are corruptions of יִרְחַמְעֵאל, 'Jerahmeel.' Cp. 'Jerahmeel,' *Enc. Bib.*, also *Crit. Bib.* on Jer. *l.c.*

the present quite as much as of the past. Earlier theories need not here be criticized. The speaker in Ps. lv. is not the pious high priest, Onias III., who being filled with horror at the wickedness of Jerusalem, and knowing that there are designs on his life, meditates flight (so virtually Theod. Mops., see Bâ. in *ZATW*, v. 88, vi. 276 ff.). Nor is he the prophet Jeremiah—a view much older than Hitzig (see *OP*, 122)—whose character was not so soft—not to say weak—as this theory implies. See ‘Jeremiah,’ *Enc. Bib.*, where the real Jeremiah and the real prophecies of Jeremiah are indicated, and notice that all important phraseological points of contact with the Book of Jeremiah disappear in a corrected text (cp. on *vv.* 7-9). Whether even the editor, in rewriting *vv.* 13-15, thought of Jeremiah’s priestly opponent Pashhur (Pedahzur), may well be doubted.

Deposited: of the Ishmaelites. Deposited: of ‘Arab-ethan. 1

LV.—I.

- | | | |
|----|---|----|
| 1 | Hearken to my prayer, O Yahwè ! | 2 |
| | And hide not thyself from mine entreaty ; | |
| | Attend unto me and answer me. | 3 |
| | My body trembles, and I am astonished— | |
| | At the mockery of [the Jerahmeelites and] Arabians, | 4 |
| | At the cries of the sons of Asshur. | |
| | For my palaces they have swallowed up, | |
| | My habitations they have destroyed. | |
| | My heart is anguished within me, | 5 |
| 10 | Terror has fallen upon me ; | |
| | Fear and trembling enter into me, | 6 |
| | And gloom +of Deathland+ envelopes me. | |
| | And I think, ‘Oh, that I had wings ! | 7 |
| | Dove-like would I flee away and find rest ; | |
| | Yea, I would fly afar off, | 8 |
| | And lodge in the desert of rocks.’ | |
| | I will take refuge in God mine asylum | 9 |
| | Because of Jerahmeel and Mişsur. | |
| | Those of Edom have annihilated my sanctuaries, | 10 |
| 20 | The Arabians have destroyed my palaces. | |
| | Jerahmeelites and Asshurites, | 11 |
| | Ammon and Amalek lay waste ; | |
| | Rehoboth and Ishmael lay waste, | 12 |
| | Moab and the house of the Hagrites. | |
| | For the Arabian insults me and the Ishmaelite, | 13 |
| | They that hate me jeer at me ; | |

	Thou too art in the cabal of my haters,	14
	O thou mine associate and acquaintance ;	
	Together we took sweet counsel,	15
30	And praised in the house of God.	
	Let Death overmaster them in a moment,	16
	Let them go down alive into Sheol,	
	The Jerahmeelites and the Şarefathlites,	
	The Rehobothites and the Hagrites !	
	As for me I call upon Yahwè ;	17
	He will deliver me from the Arabians.	
	In the assembly of the pious I make my plaint,	18
	I moan, he will hear my voice ;	
	He will set me free from Ishmael,	19
40	From the league of those of Jerahmeel ;	
	The Ishmaelites he will humble,	20
	The Jerahmeelites he will put to shame.	

LV.—2.

1	Void of piety is the house of Jerahmeel ; they fear not God.	20b
	He has laid hands on one at peace with him, desecrated his covenant.	21
	Smoother than butter is his face, but his heart is a grave ;	22
	Softer than oil are his words, but sharper than javelins.	
	Corrupt are the deeds which he practises, and yet he prosper,	23
	Never does he see [evil], his ancles waver not ;	
	But thou, O Yahwè ! wilt bring them down in a moment to the pit,	24
	[To] the Ishmaelites ¹ their days will be short, but I myself trust in thee.	

4. **I was astonished**, *i.e.* at Yahwè's apparent desertion of his people. Cp. lxxiii. 21, lxxvii. 4.—5 f. Cp. //, 21—25, 32—34, 39—42, xliv. 17, lxxiv. 4 f.—7 f. Cp. especially lxxiv. 9a, lxxix. 1b, Lam. ii. 5, 7, Isa. lxiv. 11 [10].—12. Note the parallelism of xliv. 20.

13—16. **Oh that I had wings!** Cp. cxxxix. 10a, where the poet imagines himself flying on the wings of the sun ; xi. 1b is only parallel in M. The supposed parallel in Jer. ix. 1 [2] is not worth much. There the prophet wishes he could leave his own people and lodge

¹ Edomites, Jerahmeelites.

in the wilderness. Here, however, it is the people itself which speaks, and its longing is to be able to fly not into any ordinary wilderness, but to the rocks, where the wild doves have their home (cp. Cant. ii. 14, Jer. xlviii. 28, Ezek. vii. 16)—say those near En-gedi, where Robinson the traveller (*BR* ii. 245) found multitudes of pigeons enjoying their nests undisturbed. The speaker in the psalm was not a wild dove, but a tame one. On the symbolic use of the dove for Israel, see note on lxxviii. 14.

17, 18. **I will take refuge.** A resolution, not a contingency.—*Mine asylum*; cp. xviii. 2.

21—24. The usual list of enemies (see on lxxxiii. 7—9). The combination of Jerahmeel and Amalek (which originally meant the same people) shows how conventional the list is.

27 ff. The hostility of the former

'acquaintances' of Israel is repeatedly referred to; disloyal Israelites are meant. The description in M is due to the editor, who based his pathetic picture on the fragments of a hardly legible text (see crit. note). Apparently the seductions of so-called progress were not slight among the post-exilic Israelites.

31. **Death.** Sheol (= Death, see on vi. 6) is here personified as a creditor or taskmaster.

37. The reference to the hours of daily prayer is as inappropriate in this moment of excitement as in v. 6 (see crit. note there). Cp. *E. Bib.*, 'Prayer,' § 3.

lv.⁽²⁾ 1. See introd. Schultens and Ewald tried to get the requisite sense out of חליפות, but too violently. See crit. note.—3 f. Cp. v. 10.—6. Cp. x. 6.—8. Cp. Prov. x. 27.

Critical Notes. 4. אָרִיד בְּשִׁיחַ וְאֹהֶימָה, is very suspicious. (a) As to אָרִיד. Σ J (κατηρέχθη, *humiliatus sum*) imply אָרַד; cp. יָרַד in Isa. xv. 3. Now יָרַד in Isa. *l.c.* is corrupt; indeed, the supposed √רוד cannot be shown to exist. From Isa. xxii. 4 some (Gr., Che. [*SBOT*, 'Isaiah,' Heb. 119], Du.) have been led to suggest אָמַר or אָמַר. But we should expect בְּבָבִי to follow (Isa. xv. 3). (b) As to אֹהֶימָה. This is defended by Kön. (i. 464) and Nöld. (*ZDMG*, xxxvii. 540), but from a text-critical point of view it is very improbable. Grätz would read either אֹהֶימָה (v. 17) or וְאֹהֶימָה (lxxvii. 4). Lag. prefers the former, Ol. and Bā. the latter alternative. Duhm, however, prefers אֹהֶימָה; in fact, the ἐταράχθη of G seems to presuppose this; cp. Σ Dt. vii. 23. There is so much corruption, however, in v. 3 that we may justly feel uneasy. Critics should have taken our passage in connexion with lxxiii. 21 (וְיִתְחַנֵּן) and especially lxxvii. 4; see notes on those passages. They would then have seen that the most probable reading is וְאֹתְמָה. Returning now to (a), we see that the root אָרַד is not the most suitable one. Herz has acutely suggested אָחַרַד instead of אָרִיד, but does not go further. Comparing cxix. 120, should we not emend בְּשִׁיחַ into בְּשָׂרִי, and read, as *l. 4*, וְיִחַרְדּוּ בְּשָׂרִי וְאֹתְמָה? The reading אֹהֶימָה perhaps arose under the influence of יִרְחֹמְאֵלִי in *l. 5*; *l.c.* 'יר was written before, instead of after נִקְלָם (see next note), and the two words אֹתְמָה and 'יר became fused.

5 f. Read נִקְלָם [יִרְחֹמְאֵלִי] עֲרַבִי | כִּצְעַקְתָּ בְּנֵי אֲשׁוּר; cp. xlv. 17. On the omitted 'יר see preceding note. M's נִקְוֶל is too weak as a

parallel to עקת or (as Ol. acutely corrects) צעקת. G. Hoffmann (*ZATW*, iii. 100) defends עקת as meaning 'clamour,' though a root עוק, 'to cry out,' only exists in Arabic. The vss. make עיק = ציק. Herz reads עקשות רשע. אשור is not uncommonly a substitute for אבדו.

7 f. M's ימיטו (cp. cxi. 11, Kt.) is troublesome. G ἐξέκλιαν = נטו (cp. xxi. 12, M G). Σ ἐπέρρασαν; J *proticerunt*. The true reading underlies ימיטו and און. The || noun is concealed under ישטמוני באף, corrupt, as in lvi. 8. Analogy favours reading thus:—

כִּי אֲרַמְנוֹתַי בְּלֵעֵי | וּמִשְׁפְּנוֹתַי אֲבִדוּ.

10. M אימות כּוֹת. Read simply אימה כּוֹת. (G θανάτου) is an expansion of כּוֹת (dittographed). The plurals אימים and אימות occur only in corrupt passages.

12. M פּלצות. G S presuppose צלמות, which is no doubt right (so Gr.). The same corruption in Ezek. vii. 18.

16. M G אלוּן בַּמִּדְבָּר סלה. אלוּן is metrically insufficient. Something would be gained by reading וְאֶתְלוּן (xci. 1). Unfortunately, במדבר is also doubtful. 'Doves do not fly into the wilderness' (Duhm), at least unless there are rocks in the wilderness (see exeg. note). Duhm omits כיונה as a gloss. Surely we should read בַּמִּדְבָּר סלעים (see exeg. note). This involves taking סלה into our critical material, but this we have again and again already had occasion to do. סלה may represent סלם (an imperfectly written סלעים), cp. אביה and אבים, נכריה and נכרים.

17. M אחשה, intransitively and without אל. G (followed in ed. 1) has προσεδεχόμενυ τον θεον (so א^r. T) τον σωζουτά με, = אחשה לי לאל מפלט לי, i.e. 'I would wait in silence for the God,' &c. But comparing xviii., l. 2 (corr. text), it is better to read כּוּפֶלֶט, and אחשה should clearly be אחסה. Read probably בְּאֵל מִפְּלִטִי. לי in M may be a distortion of אל. Herz suggests לִי חוֹשֶׁה מִפְּלִטִי לִי, which strikes me as too mechanical a correction; Gr., inadequately. אֲבַקְשָׁה.

18. M כִּירוּחַ סִעָה מִסְפֵּר. But the dove wishes to leave something behind it. The idea of l. 18 is altogether wrong; it is useless to correct סעה into סופה (Hu., Gr., Bi.). And why the double phrase? Parallel passages suggest כִּירַחֲמֵנִי וּמִיֵּאשׁוּר; cp. M 5 f.

19 f. The petition, 'Confound their speech' (cp. Gen. xi. 7) is not natural here. And what of בלע? Is it a synonym of פלג 'to cleave' (so Schultens)? And if בלע here = בלל (cp. Barth, *Beitr. zur Erklärung des Jes.*, p. 4), what becomes of פלג? In l. 20 ראיתי is plainly a

bad editorial conjecture, while חנוס is impossible as a parallel to ריב. And what a descent *v.* 10*b* is after *v.* 10*a*! Comparing lxxiv. 9 (corr. text), Lam. ii. 6*f.*, read—

בְּלָעוּ אֲדָמִים מִקֶּדְשִׁי
אֲרָמוֹתַי שְׁחָתוּ עֲרָבִים

עֲרָבִים = תש=מס; ריב and בעיר are, of course, duplicates of עֲרָבִים.

21-24 were grievously misunderstood by the editor. Analogous corruptions elsewhere enable us to read underneath—

יִרְחַמְאֵלִים וְאֲשׁוּרִים
עֲמוֹן וְעַמְלֹק הַחֲרִיבוּ
רְחֹבוֹת וַיִּשְׁמְעֵאל הַחֲרִיבוּ
מוֹאָב וּבֵית הַגְּרִים

The extreme ingenuity of the editor—working with a preconceived idea of the meaning—will be admitted. Beginners who have followed me hitherto will see how in each case he came to err. על־חומתיה is a transformation of a duplicate of ירחמאל און. און is either און or עמון.

25-27. 'For it was not an enemy that insulted me.' But this contradicts *v.* 4. Nor is the sense clear. Does the speaker really mean that the insults of enemies were tolerable, or that he could have hidden himself more easily if his mocker had not formerly been his friend? The Pasek after כִּי, and the frequency with which אויב has displaced עֲרָבִי should put us on our guard. In reality, *v.* 13-15 are not a digression containing a rather sentimental description of a friend's ingratitude, but a continuation of what precedes. Read (omitting the first לא and כִּי־ננו as inserted by the editor, on a false hypothesis, to make sense)—

כִּי עֲרָבִי יְחַרְפְּנִי וַיִּשְׁמְעֵאלִי
כִּי־שָׁנְאֵי עָלַי הִלְעִינוּ
וְאַתָּה בְּקֶשֶׁר שׁוֹנְאֵי

Thus the two linguistic puzzles הגדיל עלי (cp. on xli. 10) and כיערכי disappear. — 28. Read perhaps מודעי (Gr.); cp. Isa. xii. 5 Kr.; Ruth xi. 1 Kr.

30. M נהלך (with ב). Read נהלל. ל became כ, cp. on lxxviii. 22*b*.

31. M ברנש, a non-existent word (cp. on ii. 1, lxiv. 3). Read ברנע, and connect it with *v.* 16 (Lag.). Cp. lv.⁽²⁾, 7. — M ישיכות (Kt.), or ישיכות (Kr.; also given as Kt.); Pasek follows. So Ginsb.; Baer ישיא. Both readings are highly questionable. ישיא in lxxxix. 23 is corrupt;

יְשִׁיבוֹת is only known by Beth-jeshimoth (?). Read יְנִיחֵם כְּוֹת (cp. on lxxxix. 23). Herz, however, יִסְעֵי כְּוֹת לָנוּ, or יִשְׂאֵם כְּוֹת עוֹלָם. Wellh. remarks, 'Kethib is at least right so far as this—that it regards יִשׁ as a single word.' Why?

33. M's עלינו is a corruption of ירחמאלים, which, however, should of course come after היום. The speaker pleases himself by repeating the names of the doomed peoples. The next name is probably וְצָרְפָתִים, which underlies כִּידְרֵוֹת (כ for פ; cp. פִּירוּ for כִּירוּ, Job xxi. 20).

34. M בְּמִגּוֹרָם בִּקְרָבָם. בְּנִי is very odd; G ἐν ταῖς παροικίαις αὐτῶν, as if יָהֵם; cp. Job xviii. 19. Most explain as if בְּמִגּוֹרָתָם 'in their store-house,' and render בִּקְרָבָם 'in their heart'—a forced climax. Considering the likeness of בְּמִגּוֹרָם to מִרְחָבָה in 7: 12, we should probably read רַחֲבֹתֵימָם; 'בִּקְר' should be וְהִגְרִים (lxxxiii. 7).

36. M עָרַב. Read מְעַרְבִים or מִיַּעֲרָבִים. See exeg. note.

37 f. M וְצִהְרִים וְבִקְרָא. Read בְּקִהְלָה חֲסִידִים (cxlix. 1). — Point וַיִּשְׁבִּיעַ.

39. M בְּשָׁלוֹם פָּדָה בְּשָׁלוֹם. Read יִפְדֶּה מִיִּשְׁמֵי־עָלָה. י was absorbed (see 7. 38).

40. Read מִיַּחֲבֵר יִרְחַמְאֵלִים. What follows מִיַּחֲבֵר (מִיַּחֲבֵר) consists of two corruptions of ירחמאלים.

41 f. Note the three Paseks, and read יִשְׁמֵעֵאלִים יַעֲנֶה | וְיִרְחַמְאֵלִים יִבְיִישׁ. To suppose a *Beth essentie* in בְּרַבִּים is most far-fetched. Gr., פָּרָבִים. יִשָּׁב קָדָם is too bold a phrase; G paraphrases; Σ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς.

lv.⁽²⁾ 1. M אֲשֶׁר אֵין חֲלִיפוֹת לָנוּ. Critics have been in sad want of a clue. Read אֲוִי־חֶסֶד לְבֵית יִרְחַמְאֵל. Such condensations do occur. חֲלִיפוֹת might indeed come from חֲמִלָה = חֲמִלָה. cp. Job xiv. 14 (end), where read חֲמִלָתָךְ. Gr. suggested חֲמִלּוֹת. But לָנוּ and אֲשֶׁר have to be adequately accounted for. חֲלִי does double duty; it represents primarily יַרְחָה, but לְ also stands for the preposition in לְבֵית.

2. M בְּשָׁלְחָיו. An adj. שָׁלוֹם, however, is non-existent (cp. Ges.-Bu. and Cornill on Jer. xiii. 19). We have to read either בְּשִׁלְחָיו = בְּשִׁלְחָיו (see Bā. on vii. 5) or, better, בְּאִישׁ־שָׁלְחָיו (xli. 10). Cp. on lxix. 23.

3. Read חֲלָקוּ מִחֲמָאָה פָּנָיו. So Bā.; cp. Gr., Ol., We. Note Pasek in M; the points ignore the old ending ת־. G implies פָּנָיו; cp. Prov. xv. 14, K_r.—M וְקָרַב. Read וְקָרַב (cp. 7. 10). The passages with קָרַב need testing; cp. on lxxviii. 31, lxxviii. 9.

4. M וְהִמָּה פְתַחֹת. Read וְחִדּוֹ מִתְרַתְּחִים. תרתח is a loan-word (cp. Ass. *tartahu*, 'javelin' [Del.] or 'lance' [Jensen]) which also occurs under a disguise in Micah v. 5. Job xxxviii. 36, xli. 21, and perhaps in Jer. ii. 34 (for M's מִחַתְרַת). Cp. *JQR*, July, 1898, and *Crit. Bib.* G βολίδες; 'A λόγχοι; E' in Mic. παραξίφεισιν. But cp. Kōn. § 305c.

5 f. 'Between 22b and 24a,' says Duhm, 'a marginal quotation has intruded. It is a general statement like xxxvii. 5, which does not, however, quite suit the case of the poet, since he does not elsewhere fear for his life; least of all has he anxiety about food.' Of course, if the text is correct; but ought not יִהְיֶה to awaken suspicion (see Kōn. ii. 141, note)? And have not many supposed glosses turned out to be simply misread passages of the text? One can hardly doubt that לְצַדִּיק after מוֹט is a corruption of קְרִסְלָיו (see on xviii. 37b). Probably x. 6 is parallel, and we may read somewhat as follows (note Pasek in M):—

הַשְּׁחִית עֲלֵילוֹת דְּרָכָיו | וְהוּא יִשְׁבִּיל
לֹא-יָבִיט [רַע] לְעוֹלָם | [לֹא יִ]מְטוּ קְרִסְלָיו

7. M אלהים. Read יהוה.—M לְבָאֵר שֶׁחַת. More plausibly 'לְבוֹר שֶׁ'. But the phrase is tautological. Read probably בְּרַנֵּעַ לְשֶׁחַת.

8. M אֲנָשֵׁי דָמִים וּמְרֻמָּה לֹא. Ethnic names disguised, as so often. Read ישמעאלים וירחמאלים. The two latter names are glosses. To ל prefix ישכ', and retain in the text. M יַחְצוּ, 'divide'?? Read probably יִקְצְרוּ (Prov. x. 27). Thus we get for a—לישמ' יקצרו—מייהם.

PSALM LVI.

TRIMETERS. The psalm is like a continuation of Ps. lv.; for phraseology and ideas cp. also liv., lvii., lix.

Deposited. Of the Ishmaelites. Of the Korahites. Of 'Arab-ethan.
A supplication. On beholding the Zarephathites (?). 1

1 Pity me, O Yahwè! the Ishmaelites crush me, 2
Those of Jerahmeel press me hard. ¹
They are in excitement, they array themselves against me, 6
All their devices aim at evil.

¹ Words are here repeated from // 13-18.

Behold, the Arabians watch me,	7
The Asshurites lie in wait for me ;	
Zarephath [and] Jerahmeel join together ;	8
Cast down the Arabians, O Yahwè !	
My sighs, O Yahwè ! thou hast counted,	9
10 Thou hast laid up my tears in thy store-chamber.	
The Arabians will be put to flight,	10
The Jerahmeelites [will stumble].	
I am sure that Yahwè is for me ;	
Continually do I boast of his promise.	11
In Yahwè I am fearlessly confident,	12
What +indeed+ can earth's race do to me ?	
I will praise thee, O Yahwè ; with the lyre,	13
I will give thee the due thank-offerings ;	
For thou hast rescued me from Deathland,	
'That I may walk +in safety+ before Yahwè.	

Title. See *Enc. Bib.*, 'Psalms,' § 26, 11: 'Jonath-elem-rechokim.' Cp. also the corrupt **ים רחקים**, lvi. 6.

7. **Join together.** Cp. lxxxiii. 9a.—8. **בַּאֲרֵי**, corrupt, as in lv. 4.—*Cast down*, i.e. into the abyss (lv. 24).—9. It is a fine idea—that of God's counting the sighs which, though many (Lam. i. 22), are 'not hid' from Him (xxxviii. 10), and which He carefully notices (xii. 6, 2 K. xx. 5). Cp. Matt. x. 30, and George Herbert's line, 'I

have not lost one single tear.' But the figure supposed in M's reading ('into thy bottle') is grotesque. See crit. note.

12. **Will stumble.** Cp. lv. 24, end (corr. text).—14. *His promise*, i.e. the great Messianic prophecy of Israel's deliverance and glorification; cp. cxix. 74, cxxx. 5.—16. Cp. cxviii. 6.—17. Cp. liv. 8 (corr. text).—19 f. Cp. cxvi. 8 f., where the suggestions of our psalm are expanded.

Crit. Notes. Title. Nowhere does tradition more urgently need revision. Analogy requires ethnic names here as elsewhere. **עַל־יוֹנָת** should most probably be **עַל־נִינָת**, and **בְּנֵת** (end) should be **בְּנִינָת** (cp. liv., lv.). **אֵלֶם רַחֲקִים** comes from **עַל־הַקְּרָחִים**. As soon as the corrupt **לְדוֹד** had arisen, it became natural to interpret the other parts of the corrupt title so as to suggest an episode in the life of David. On Neginoth see Introd.

1. **אלהים**. Read **יְהוָה**, which was joined in pronunciation to **הַנְּנִי**. 'Non **שָׁאֵף** and **שָׁף** poeta voluerat' (Lag.). So lvii. 4. Now., Bā., and Ges.-Bu. agree. Cp. the proper names **חִילָאֵם** and **טִילָאֵם**, and **שָׁאֵפִים** in Am. ii. 7. Cp. Bleek-Wellh., *Eintl.* ⁰, p. 636.—M's reading **אֲנִישׁ**, and even Herz's **שׁוֹנֵא**, are surely too vague. **שְׁנָאִי** (an earlier reading) is a variant to **שׁוֹרְרִי** (now found in *v.* 2); for which cp. v. 9 (crit. note), xxvii. 11, liv. 7, lix. 11 (note). Read **יִשְׁמְעֵאלִים** (cp. on xc. 3).—2. M

θεῶ ἐπαπέσω τοὺς λόγους μου, where ὁλην τὴν ἡμ. occurs to be a variant, to ἐν τῷ θεῶ. Cp. crit. n. on xlv. 9.

17. עָלַי and still more נִדְרִי are peculiar. It is not enough to read נִדְרִי (S, Gr.). Read certainly יְהוָה בְּכַנּוּר אֶהְלֵךְ יְהוָה בְּכַנּוּר.

19 f. Omit הלא, i.e. אלהים, as a superfluous insertion; also רנלי כודה and באור החיים (?) as late interpolations from cxvi. 8 f.

PSALM LVII.—I.

TRIMETERS. Pious Jews have to live among unbelieving and hostile Arabians and Jerahmeelites (cp. xlii.—xliii., cxx.), but the plots of their enemies will be frustrated. The insertion of a passage from lvii.⁽²⁾ as τ. 6—as if a refrain—breaks the connexion. Cp. Duhm.

Deposited. Of Ethan the Ezrahite. Of 'Arab-ethan. A supplication. When the sons of Ishmael and the Arabians drew near (?). 1

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| 1 | Pity me, O Yahwè ! pity me, | 2 |
| | For the Jerahmeelite crushes me, | |
| | And through the presence of the unholy I tremble, | |
| | Through those of Arabia and Rehoboth. | |
| | I call upon Yahwè the Most High, | 3 |
| | Upon God who shows kindness to me ; | |
| | Yahwè will reach forth from heaven, | 4 |
| | He will rescue me from Deathland. | |
| | I dwell in the midst of Arabians, | 5 |
| 10 | Beside the sons of Jerahmeel, | |
| | Whose teeth are spears and arrows, | |
| | And their tongue a sharp sword. ¹ | |
| | The Ishmaelites prepared a net, | 7 |
| | They longed to catch my soul ; | |
| | They digged before me a pit, | |
| | Into it the impious ones have fallen. | |

2-4. Cp. lvi. 2; xlii. 10^b; cx. 7 cp. vii. 18, lxxviii. 56-7 f. Cp. xviii. (corr. text, 'Rehoboth'). Cp. 'Rehoboth,' *Enc. Bib.*—5. 'Yahwè Elyon,' 17; lvi. 14.—9. Cp. cxx. 4-6; lviii. 7.

¹ *I.* 12 wrongly inserted as a refrain (τ. 6).

Critical Notes. Title. See introd. The close originally ran בְּקִרּוֹב בְּנִירִישְׁמֵעָל וְעִרְבִים (cp. *l.* 13). To suit the life of David this had to be transformed. Some such solution as this seems necessary.

2 f. M בְּי בְּדִּי הַסִּיָּה נִפְשִׁי. But (1) we expect after הַנְּנִי a description of the sad condition of the speaker, and (2) for the so-called 'archaic' form הַסִּיָּה (Ol., *Lehrb.* 480) there is no complete parallel. lvi. 2 supplies the clue. Read וּבְצִל־נִפְיָךְ אֶחְסֶה.—M אַחְסֶה. וּבְצִל־נִפְיָךְ אֶחְסֶה. אחסה after הַסִּיָּה! Read וּמִלִּחַי הַנְּפִים אַחֲרָד (cp. on xlii. 10b).

4. M עֲדִיעֵבֶר הַוּוֹת. Bi., Du. עֲדִיעֵבֶרְנָה. But the phrase is at once so vague and so peculiar, and metre is so definitely violated that we ought to investigate the reading. הַוּוֹת has already proved doubtful in lv. 12 (cp. also lii. 9). Read מִעֲרָבִי וְרַחְבּוֹתִי.—6. M גָּמִיר. Read גָּמִיר (Luzzatto, Gr., Bi., Che.⁽¹⁾, Perles, Du.; cp. G).—7. Insert אֱלֹהִים after יִשְׁלַח, represented by סִלָּה (corrupt) and אֱלֹהִים in the same verse (4). Omit יוֹשִׁיעֵנִי, a corrupt variant to כּוֹשֵׁמִים.

8. M הֲרָף שֶׁאִפִּי, parallel to חֲסָדוֹ וְאִמְתּוֹ נִפְשִׁי. Both readings represent the complete metrical line יִחַלֵּץ נִפְשִׁי מִיָּמּוֹת. Possibly (but see above) סִלָּה = שֶׁאִל (= כּוֹת). Note Pasek after נִפְשִׁי (*z.* 5, misplaced). Cp. G, *καὶ ἐγγύστατο τῆς ψυχῆς μου ἐκ μέσου σκύμων*. Previous emendations are most disappointing.

9. Read בְּתוֹךְ עִרְבִים שְׁכַנְתִּי. M's אִשְׁכְּבָה probably comes from שְׁכַנְתִּי (constructed with נִפְשִׁי, as cxx. 6), and this from שְׁכַנְתִּי.—10. יִם in בְּנִי־אָדָם לַהֲטִים probably represents עַם (cxx. 5 f.). לַהֲטִי and בְּנִי־אָדָם make up בְּנִירִישְׁמֵעָל הַט; הַט comes from חָנּוּ.—13. M לִפְעֻמִּי. Read לִחְטֹף נִפְשִׁי כְּסָפּוֹ (x. 9, xvii. 12).—15. M בְּתוֹכָהּ סִלָּה. Read בְּתוֹכָהּ נְבִלִים.

PSALM LVII.—2.

TRIMETERS. This little hymn of praise occurs again as cviii. 2-6; *z.* 11 is taken almost verbatim from xxxvi. 6. 'A new song' (*l.* 4) as in xxxiii. 3 (see note), xl. 4, and four times afterwards. Observe that *z.* 9c disappears, and with it the reason for calling this a morning-psalm.

1	My heart is ready, O Yahwè!	8
	Unto thee will I sing and make melody.	
	Awake, my harp and my lyre!	9
	I will sing a new song.	

I will thank thee, O Yahwè ! among the peoples, 10
 I will make melody unto thee among the nations.
 For thy lovingkindness reaches the heavens, 11
 Thy faithfulness the skies.
 Exalt thyself, O Yahwè ! above the heavens ; 12
 10 +Be+ thy glory above all the earth.

Critical Notes.—1. Omit the second **נכון לבי**, as in cviii. 2 (M, but not G), and substitute **לך**. This **לך** was misread **לבי**; hence the repeated phrase.—3. Read **בְּנוֹרֵי** (xxx. 13).

3 f. Omit **עורה כבודי** (cviii. 2 'אֶרְכ־): a scribe in error made the lyre precede the harp, and left the wrong words undeleted. But **כבודי** enables us to restore **בְּנוֹרֵי**; **הַנְּבִלִי** should be **נְבִלִי**; ה is due to ditto-graphy.—**אֶעֱרֶה שַׁחַר** reminds us of Milton's 'cheerly rouse the slumbering morn,' but, however beautiful, is a misreading. First, it is against the parallelism: the dawn cannot be parallel to harp and lyre. Next, the two words 'ש' 'א' are not enough to make a line. G's *ἐξέγειρο-θήσομαι ὄρθρον*, **אֶעֱרֶה שַׁחַר**, is a poor conjecture. The right reading must be **אֶשְׁרֶה שִׁיר הַדָּשׁ**. [Duhm is content with correcting **עורה** in *τ.* 9*a* into **אֶתָּה**.]

PSALM LVIII.

TETRAMETERS. The psalm has been greatly misunderstood owing to the errors of the text (see on Ps. lxxxii.). It is simply a description of the unworthy character of the judges, who belong to a wicked race—doomed to destruction when the day of judgment comes. The tone is bitter, but less bitter than M represents, and even the later insertion in *trimeters* (with which compare the inserted passage, Isa. lix. 5-8) is comparatively temperate. Compare, besides Ps. lxxxii., the strong, yet not exactly intemperate, language of Pss. x., xiv., xciv., and note the parallelism between *l.* 14 and Ps. xlix. 12 (corr. text). The mention of the Edomites in *l.* 2 does not exclude the possibility that renegade Jews may also have been represented among the wicked judges. On title (*τ.* 1) see introd.

*Deposited. Of Ethan the Ezrahite. Of 'Arab-ethan.
 A supplication.*

1 Do ye, O impious ones ! give just sentences ? 2
 Do ye judge uprightly, O ye sons of Edom ?
 Only deeds that bring ruin do ye perform in the land, 3
 By false witnesses ye overthrow the righteous.

* * * * *
 * * * * *

- The wicked become apostates from the birth, 4
 From their first breath they err, they speak lies.
 A poison is theirs, like a serpent's venom, 5
 10 Yea, like +that of+ a deaf adder, which stops its ears,
 Which hears not the voice of charmers, 6
 The spells of a skilful magician * * .
- O Yahwè ! subvert the dwellings of the insulters ! 7
 Beat down the castles of the deniers, O Yahwè !
 The righteous will rejoice that he has seen vengeance, 11
 His feet will trample on the castles of the wicked ;
 He will say, Verily expiated is the shed blood of the
 righteous ; 12
 Verily, there is a God who decides their cause with justice.

Later insertion.

- Let them dwindle like water in the desert, 8
 Like grass let them fade away,
 On the highway let them walk in obscurity, 9
 Like owls which never see the sun.
 Before they perceive +their danger+ let them be destroyed, 10
 From their place let the storm-wind drive them away.

1. **O impious ones.** Cp. lxxxii. 2, and note on xiv. 1.—*O ye traitors.* Cp. lxxxii. l. 15.—3. *Deeds that bring ruin.* Cp. lxxxii. l. 14; ci. l. 4, and on xviii. 9-12.—7-10. *They err,* תָּעוּ, in a religious sense. Cp. תּוֹעָה, Isa. xxxii. 6, and תָּעָה to practise idolatry.—*Like a serpent's.* Cp. Sirach xxv. 15, and, on serpent-charming, Jer. viii. 17,

Eccles. x. 11, Sirach xii. 10. An Arabic proverb for obstinate resistance is, 'Answer not, serpent' (Meidani).

13-18. As so often, the moral crudity of M is due to corruption of the text. *Subvert the dwellings, &c.* A similar fate is foreseen for the castles of the rich in xlix. 12.—*The righteous, i. e. faithful Israelites* (xxxii. 11, xxxiii. 1, lxviii. 4, and often).

Critical Notes. 1 f. M עֵלְם; 'A ἀλαλία 'in dumbness.' G J אֵלֶם; Σ φῶλον (Field) = לָאֵם; S omits. Most print אֵלֶם (Lowth, Dathe, Ew., Ol., Del., Geiger, Gr., We., &c.); cp. Job xli. 1, JQR, '97, p. 579; v. 17, Gu., Schöpf., 55; Houb. אֵלֵהִים; Herz בְּאֵלֵהִים. But the obscurity of the sense produced is against it. In אֵלֵהִים הַנְּבִלִים read אֵלֵהִים הַנְּבִלִים. A close parallel for נְבִלִים = נְמַעֲלִים in xxvi. 8.—M בְּנֵי אָדָם. Read בְּנֵי אָדָם (cp. lxxxii. 15).

3 f. For אָף read אָךְ (Gr., Che.¹), Herz); see II. 17 f. For בִּלְבָב read רִי=ת: דְּבַרִי בְלִיעֵל יְעוֹלָת (ci. 3). ב and ת are relics of דְּבַרִי: רִי=ת. We., strangely, בְּלִבּוֹל 'confusion,' an abstract form from בִּלְבַל, cp. Aram. *bulbál*; Schwally (*ZATW*, xi. 259) בִּתְיָבִל; Duhm בְּלִט 'in secret'.—M's יָדִיכֶם does double duty for צְדִיקִים and for הַנְּבִיאִים [בְּעֵדֵי הַנְּבִיאִים]. Cp. Ex. xxiii. 1, 8.

7 f. For זָרוּ read perhaps נְזָרוּ אַחֲרָי, completing the tetrameter, and removing the difficulty of זָרוּ. See *SBOT*, 'Isaiah,' Heb., note on i. 4. For דְּבַרִי read דְּבָרִי (G, Bi.).

9. 'כדמות' is impossible Hebrew. The two only instances of the adverbial use of the word (Is. xiii. 4, Ezek. xxiii. 15) refer to something which has a form; it is nowhere used of an abstract idea, which I take to be the case here. That there is something wrong with M. is evident from the facts that G does not represent the second הַנְּבִיאִים, and that אָטֵם only occurs elsewhere as a participle. G, *καὶ βουλήσῃς τὰ ὄρα αὐτῆς*. I take the second הַנְּבִיאִים to be a correction after כְּמִרְרָת had been corrupted into 'כדמות' (Herz). Read כְּמִרְרָת omit second הַנְּבִיאִים, and read וְאָטֵם אֲזַנִּי.

12. Read הַבְּרִי חוֹבֵר הָכֶסֶד; parallelism gains. G *φαρμάκου τε φαρμακευομένου παρὰ σοφοῦ*. A word must have fallen out.

13 f. M הִרְסֵנִי בְּפִינִי; what crudity! Read יְהִי הָרֶס יְהִי הָרֶס. —M כִּשְׂפָנוֹת מְחַרְרָר. Read אֲרַמְנוֹת פְּפָרִים. For כְּפָרִים see on xxxiv. 11.

16. Again frightful crudity. For יִרְחֹץ בְּדָם הָרָשָׁע read יִרְמֶסוּ אֲרַמְנוֹת; cp. Isa. xxvi. 6, and crit. n. on lxviii. 24. אֲרַמְנוֹת became mutilated through the vicinity of וַיֹּאמֶר אָדָם.

17 f. The awkward אָדָם needs correction. But so also does the vague פָּרִי. Read אֲדִיבְכֶם לְדָם צְדִיקִים.—For שְׂפָטִים read שְׂפָטֵם, after G., with Gr., Herz, who stop short here, however. For בָּאֲרֶץ read בְּצַדֵּק (cp. I. 1); cp. on cxii. 8.

Insertion (cp. Isa. lix. 5-8). *Vz.* 8-10 should perhaps run thus:—
 יִמְסוּ כְּנִים בְּמִדְבָּר | כְּנִי חֲצִיר יִמְלֵךְ | בְּמִסְלָה יְהִלְכוּ בְּאֶפְלָ |
 בְּתַנְשִׁכֹת בְּלִחְזוֹ שְׂכִישׁ | בְּמָרָם יִבְנוּ יִשְׁמְדוּ | כִּמְקוֹמוֹ קָדִים יִשְׁעָרִם:

The received text burdens a psalmist with the most repulsive words imaginable; it is also ungrammatical in form. And yet the fact that G knew nothing of the meaning 'snail' (*ὡσεὶ κηρὸς ὁ τακείσ* are its words), should have suggested hesitation in appealing to the Targumic and New

Hebrew vocabulary, and the application of the passage, in its traditional form, in *Bereshith Rabba* (c. 51, beginning), to illustrate the fate of Sodom should have warned critics against a form of text which lent itself to such a use. No image, it was thought, could be low enough to represent the fate of such hateful sinners; so the snail (שֶׁבֶלֶל) is followed by the 'abortion' (נֶפֶל), and this by the 'mole' (אֵשֶׁת or אֵשֶׁת), which T marks off from נֶפֶל by ן. The analogy of other cases in which the received text gives some intolerably coarse or mean expression leads us to expect errors in the text. And we are not mistaken. The evidence of transposition and confusion of letters, and of dittography, is irrefragable. Notice especially the abundance of ל, and the repetition of כּם, כּם. The mysterious שֶׁבֶלֶל comes from מִסְלֹל (Isa. xxxv. 8), which is itself corrupt, and should be מִסְלָה (see *SBOT* on Isa. *l.c.*). The latter point (״שׁ from מִסְלָה) was first seen by Herz; the vicinity of יְהִלֵּךְ places it beyond doubt. Herz also saw that נֶפֶל must be a corruption of some word suggesting the same idea as בַּל הוּזוּ שְׂכִישׁ in the parallel line.¹

To proceed. There should be only one כּמו—that in *v. 8b*, which is required by the metre. The כּמו in *v. 8a* is a dittogram. That in *v. 9a* comes from בּמ in בּמסְלָה (the original of שֶׁבֶלֶל); מ is also represented dittographically by ב. The two in *v. 10*, together with the כּם in סִרְתִּיכֶם, are fragments of כּימְקוּמוּ. For the faulty spelling יכּאסו compare יכּאס, Job vii. 5 (see Budde). For בּמִדְבַּר, cp. Job vi. 18; for 'יכּוּר יכּוּר', cp. note on xc. 6; for באֶפֶל, cp. xci. 6, and especially Isa. lix. 9. [יְהִלְכּוּ and יְהִלְכּוּ] are variants. תִּכּוּס has a very singular origin. As in xxxix. 12 it is a fragment of תִּנְשׁוּת, the name of a species of owl mentioned in Lev. xi. 18, Dt. xiv. 16. When תִּנְשׁוּת had become corrupted past recognition, it was natural for the new exegetical tradition (Targ.; *Moed K. 6b*; *Ber. Rabba*, 51) to explain אֵשֶׁת as 'mole,' and B. Jacob (*ZATW*, '98, p. 292) revives this view, see 'Mole,' 'Owl,' *Enc. Bib.* סִרְתִּי and אֶטֶד are probably fragments of יִשְׁמְדוּ. On 'כּוּר see above. חֲרוֹן is probably a miswritten קָרִים; ח and ק confounded, as in 1 S. viii. 16. The close of the description seems to be modelled on Job xxvii. 20 f.; cp. also lxxxiii. 14. We are thus relieved of the troublesome 'pots' and 'thorns,' to which Houb., Gr., and Du. add the 'thistle' (חֲרוֹל for חֲרוֹן). In confirmation of one part of this view, see on xxxix. 12 and Isa. lix. 10 (*SBOT, Isaiah*, Heb., 201 f.; cp. *JQR*, Oct. '97, p. 14).

¹ Herz's restoration of the whole passage is:—

יְדַרְךָ חֲצִיזוֹ בַּמּוֹת יְמוּלְלוּ | בְּכִי שֶׁבִיל וּמִסְלוֹת יְהִלְכּוּ אֶפְלוֹת בַּל הוּזוּ
שְׂכִישׁ | בְּמַרְסָם יְבִיגוּ סוּד יַפֵּם אֶטֶד בְּכִי חֲפֵם וְחֲרוֹן יִשְׁעָרוּ :

PSALM LIX.

TEMETERS. Again a much misunderstood psalm. Cp. Pss. lv., lvii.⁽¹⁾, also lxxxiii. (see below on *vv.* 12, 14); note also the parallelism between *ll.* 15, 21, 23 and *ii.* 4, 5. It is evident that the seemingly unequal struggle between the Jews and the Edomites was regarded as typical of the great contest at the 'end'; see Ps. ii. in the corrected text, and cp. Isa. xxxiv. Observe that the reference to Israel's innocence (*vv.* 4*b* and 5*a* in M) disappears from our text; it was enough that freedom from guilt should be implied. Unless innocent, Israel could not have ventured to pray thus (cp. v. 8, lxxvi. 19).

*Deposited. Of Ethan the Ezrahite. Of 'Arab-ethan. A supplication.
Concerning the Ishmaelites and the house of Jerahmeel (?).* 1

- | | | |
|----|--|---------------|
| 1 | Rescue me from the Arabians, O my God ! | 2 |
| | Put me in safety from those of Jerahmeel, | |
| | Snatch me from the workers of harm, | 3 |
| | Deliver me from the men of blood. | |
| | For behold the Arabians crush me, | 4 |
| | They are enraged, they array themselves against me ; | |
| | The Ishmaelites and Jerahmeelites, | |
| | Those of Edom and Miššur prepare themselves. | 5 <i>a</i> |
| | But thou, O Yahwè! Šebaoth ! | 6, 5 <i>b</i> |
| 10 | Awake +to come+ to meet me, and behold. | |
| | Rouse thee to punish all the traitors, | |
| | Pity not the workers of harm ² . | |
| | Behold, the Arabians insult me, | 8 |
| | Those of Jerahmeel, Zàrephath, and Ishmael. | |
| | But thou, O Yahwè! laughest at them, | 9 |
| | Thou mockest at all the traitors. | |
| | O my Rock! to thee will I chant hymns, | 10 |
| | For thou, O Yahwè! art my safe retreat. | |
| | O my God! let thy lovingkindness come to meet me ; | 11 |
| 20 | O Yahwè! cause me to behold the fate of Ishmael. | |
| | Affright them, and they will eagerly seek thy face ; | 12 |
| | By thy terrors make them fugitives ; | |
| | Pursue the traitors, O Lord, | |
| | Those of Jerahmeel and Zarephath ; | 13 |

¹ Elohim.

² Asshur, Arabia, Jerahmeel (*v.* 7).

Let the traitors be taken [in their own net],
 And Ishmael be caught in his own snare,
 That they may perceive that the God of Jacob 14
 Rules to the +very+ bounds of the earth.¹

And I will chant hymns to thy righteousness, 17
 30 And sing aloud at daybreak of thy lovingkindness,
 For thou hast proved to me a safe retreat,
 A refuge in my day of distress²

1-3. Similarly lvi. lines 1-3. In *workers of harm* and *men of blood* there is a covert allusion to the ethnic terms 'clans of On' and 'Edomites.' Cp. on xiv. 4, li. 16.—9. *Yahwè Sebaoth*. The forms, *Yahwè Elohim Sebaoth* (so M here, and in lxxx. 5, 20, lxxxiv. 9), and *Elohim Sebaoth* (M in lxxx. 8, 15), are of course due to the editor; *Elohim* is a correction of *Yahwè*.—10. *Awake*. Cp. on xliv. 24.—*Traitors*. See on ix. 6, and cp. l's. lxxxii. 8, where the wicked judges are perhaps called 'traitors'

(בגדים).—15. *Laughed at them*. Cp. ii. 4.—21-24. More parallels to Ps. ii. (see introd.). For parallels to 'eagerly seek thy face' see Ps. xviii. lines 101-104, and lxxxiii. lines 32-36 (just before, note רדף and בהל); ii. 10-12 is also virtually parallel.—27 f. Cp. lxxxiii. 19.—30. *At daybreak*, לבקר. Cp. xxx. 6. Trouble is 'darkness'; prosperity is 'light' (Isa. ix. 2).—31. Cp. xlvii. 2.

Critical notes. Title. The odd historical reference in the present title seems to have grown out of עַל-יְשַׁמְעֵאל וְעַל-יִרְחֵמְאֵל. Note the three or (virtually) four ל, and the three ש.

1. Read הִלְצֵנִי כִּיעֲרָבִים (see l. 3). G varies the verbs; ἐξέλου here, ῥύσαι in l. 3). Note Pasek.

5. M אָרְבוּ לְנַפְשִׁי. Read עֲרָבִים שְׁפוּנֵי; cp. lvi. 2.

6. M יָגוּרוּ עָלַי עֵינִים. Read probably יִרְגְּזוּ עָלַי יִתְעַצְבוּ (see on lvi. 6).

7 f. יְשַׁמְעֵאלִים וְיִרְחֵמְאֵלִים should be יְשַׁמְעֵאלִים וְיִרְחֵמְאֵלִים. The editor constantly does his best to disguise these names. יהיה בלי (note Pasek) is another corrupt duplicate of יִרְחֵמְאֵלִים. עֵן יִרְצֹן should be אֵדָם וְכִצְרוֹ. Omit following ו.

9 f. Omit the glosses אלהים and אלהי ישראל, and transpose עורה לק' וראה.

11 f. Read הַבְּגָדִים (see on ix. 6); so l. 16. בְּגָדֵי should rather be פְּעֵלֵי (l. 3); so G J. Observe that M recognizes ב, but in the wrong place. בגדי was probably a marginal correction of הַגָּדִים, which

¹ Verses 7, 8 repeated.

² 'O my Rock . . . thy lovingkindness' (ll. 17-19).

ultimately lost the mark of abbreviation, and displaced פִּעְלִי in the text. סִלָּה is a corruption of יִרְחֵמְאֵל, which (cp. on *l.* 25 f.) stood in the margin as a correction of the miswritten עִיר (for 'ירח) at the end of *zv.* 7.—The much disputed *zv.* 7 reveals its secret. עֲרַב, כִּכְלָב, and יִסּוּבּוּ (see on *lv.* 11) are transparent. Rendered literally, the true text is 'Asshur, and Arabia, and Jerahmeel, and Asshur, and Arabia.' The two last names are dittographed. The three first are perhaps variants to those in *l.* 14; or it may be a gloss on *ll.* 11, 12.

13 f. M נִבְיַעֲזוּ בְּפִיהֶם. Both We. and Du. question the verb, but בְּפִיהֶם is also doubtful. Read most probably עֲרָבִים הִרְפֹּנִי (corruptions all paralleled). Cp. on *xciv.* 4 (also corrupt). What follows in M is a singular transformation of יִרְחֵמְאֵלִים וְצַרְפְּתַיִם וְיִשְׁמִיעֵאלִים. Cp. *zv.* 16, which shows that הַרְבֹּת comes from יִרְחֵמְאֵל.

17 f. The Vss. and most moderns, עֵינִי (*zv.* 18). But כִּי־עֵינִי will hardly pass. צָרִי is indispensable (see on *xxviii.* 7).—M אֲשַׁמְרָה. Read אֲזַמְרָה (S, Houb., Kenn., Ol., Bi., Gr., Che.⁽¹⁾, Kau., Bā.). Read אֶתְּנָה כִּי אֶתְּנָה (S, Gr.); also of course יְהוּה.

19 f. Neither אֱלֹהֵי הַסְּדֵרוֹ (Kt., G, ἄλλος, JS) nor אֱלֹהֵי הַסְּרִי (Kt., T, as *zv.* 18) is satisfactory. Read אֱלֹהֵי הַסְּדָדָד. For idiom cp. *lxxix.* 8.—Read הִרְאֵנִי (S), and, for בִּישְׁמִיעֵאל, בִּישׁוּרְרִי (*v.* 9), or less probably בְּאִשׁוּרִים.

21. M אֶל־תִּהְרַגְם פֶּן־יִשְׁכַּחוּ עִמִּי (note Pasek after 'אֶל־תִּהְרַגְם'). A *crux interpretum*. Shortly after, M gives 'Consume (them) in wrath,' which is the contradictory of 'אֶל־תִּהְרַגְם'. Apart from this, how strange is the prayer that God would not slay the enemy lest the event should be forgotten! The plural יִשְׁכַּחוּ is also unexpected. Most suppose that 'at once' is to be supplied mentally; Duhm compares *lviii.* 8-9 (insertion). The sense is not improved by G. B. Gray's thoughtful suggestion (*JQR*, '97, pp. 183 f.) אֶל־תִּהְרַגְם תִּהְרַגְם 'make no delay in slaying them.' and metre is opposed to it. Let us turn then to the versions. Jerome (*Ep. ad Sun. et Fred.* 33) says, 'In Græco scriptum est, legis tue; sed in LXX. et in Hebræo non habet populi tui, sed, populi mei, et a nobis ita versum est.' But in the commentary in *Anecd. Maredsol.* (iii. 1) he renders, *ne forte obliuiscantur nominis tui* (applying it to the Jews), and G^{86a} actually reads μή ποτε ἐπιλάθωνται τοῦ ὀνόματος σου. G^B, however, has . . . τοῦ ἔμμου σου, while S has . . . ὁ λαός σου, and 'A Θ give . . . τοῦ λαοῦ μου (al. σου). νόμου seems to be better than λαοῦ; it is a corruption of ὀνόματος. *lxxxiii.* 17 is manifestly parallel; cp. also *ll.* 30 f. of the same psalm. I do not indeed think that שִׁכַּח (for עִמִּי) is correct. The accus. of the verb underlies, not עִמִּי (which comes from הִנֵּיעִמּוּ), but פֶּן. Read תִּבְהַלֵּם וְיִשְׁהָרוּ כִּנְיָד (cp. *lxxxiii.* 17).

22 ff. M בְּחִילָךְ הִנֵּיעֵנוּ. But חֵיל is nowhere applied to Yahwè, and the words will hardly make a trimeter. Read בְּבִלְהִתִּיךְ.—M וְהוֹרִידְנוּ מִגִּנְנוֹ. ‘Our shield’? And before ‘Adonai’? הוֹרִיד is also too strong. Read וְתִרְדֹּף בְּגָדִים. Cp. בְּגָאוֹנָם. The verb as in lxxxiii. 16.—וְיִרְחַמְעָאֵלִים יִרְחַמְעָאֵלִים (cp. פָּחִים, xi. 6), and וְצִרְפָּתִים דְּבַר־שִׁפְתֵינוּ from צִרְפָּתִים. Cp. on *l.* 7 f.

25 f. There is no parallel for M’s text. Read בְּגָדִים [בְּרִשְׁתָּם] יִלְ בְּמוֹשָׁאוֹ בְּמִוֹשָׁאוֹ יִתְפַּשׁ. סֵלָה (v. 14) = יִרְחַמְעָאֵל = מִלַּח, a variant to ‘יש’. How can אֵלֵה and כַּחַשׁ be parallel, and סָפַר mean ‘to speak’?

27 f. Read בִּי־אֱלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב מִיֵּלֵל ל (metre). M’s opening words כִּי אֱלֹהִים כָּלָה בַּחַמָּה כָּלָה וְאִינָנו come out of כִּי אֱלֹהִים written twice too soon. *Vv.* 15 f. repeat v. 7, and (in a mutilated and still more corrupt form) v. 8.

29. M יִצְדָּק. Read probably צִדְקָה (cp. on xviii. 3). צ and ע, ז and ד confounded.—*F.* 18 repetition (see above).

PSALM LX.

TRIMETERS. The contents remind us partly of Ps. xlv.² and lxxxix.² 39 ff., partly of the glowing pictures of the conquest of the N. Arabian border in Pss. ii. and xviii.; cp. also Am. ix. 11 f., Obad. 18–21 (note ‘Zarephath’—the southern city of that name is meant; see ‘Zarephath,’ *Enc. Bib.*). The enormous corruptions of the text have caused great obscurity. Many critics since Ewald have supposed a composite origin of the psalm. So lately Duhm and especially Winckler, who (*Alttest. Unters.* 4, note; *AOF* i. 195; *Gesch. Isr.* ii. 204 ff.) divides the psalm into two parts—the former (made up of conventional phrases) due to a later writer called the Yahwist, the latter to an old Elohistic writer who was acquainted with the old historic tradition relative to David’s conquests and in *v.* 8–12 (apart from two small later insertions) gives what might be David’s song of triumph over Aram-Zobab. In *v.* 8 ff. he finds three N. Israelitish places, viz. Kadesh in Galilee, Shechem in Gilead (Num. xxvi. 31), and Emek-succoth (also trans-Jordanic). Cp. crit. note on *l.* 11. The inconsistencies of the psalm, however, are illusory. As to the date, Duhm disagrees with Ewald and Winckler, who find a pre-exilic element in the psalm; he refers both parts to the time of John Hyrcanus (a view which by anticipation is criticized in *OP* 96). In *OP* the present writer argued for an early Maccabean date (cp. Wellh. *Sitzber.* vi. 176), and if the Massoretic text could on the whole be trusted, it would be difficult not to accept this view or Duhm’s, in spite of the objections urged by Beer (*Indiv.-ps.* p. lv.). The new position here taken up, however, precludes any such theory.

Deposited. Of the Ethanites. [Of] ‘Arab-ethan. At the oppression of Israel by Aram-ferahmeel and Aram-missur.

1	O Yahwè! thou hast cast us off and broken us,	3
	Thou art wroth with the remnant of thy people;	
	Thou hast made the land quake, thou hast bruised it,	4
	Its rents do thou repair, for it totters.	

	Thy people thou hast sated with strong drink,	5
	Wine that bewilders thou hast given us for a potion.	
	Thou hast given us up to the Jerahmeelites,	6
	Thou hast put us to shame because of the Cushites.	
	Redeem us from the oppression of the Aramites,	7
10	Deliver us from those of Jerahmeel.	
	For with thee I shall break Cush,	8
	I shall divide Cusham and Maacath : ¹	
	I shall measure out ² Mişşur and Asshur,	9, 10
	I shall cast the cord upon Aram. ³	
	Yahwè will conduct me +in triumph+ to Mişşur,	11
	Yahwè will lead me +victorious+ unto Aram.	
	But now, O Yahwè ! thou hast cast us off,	12
20	Thou succourest not in our distresses.	
	Do thou grant us help against Mişşur,	13
	Do thou become our succour against Aram.	
	With Yahwè we shall have the pre-eminence ;	14
	It is he who will tread down the Mişrites.	

2. Cp. lxxx. 5^b (corr. text).—4. *Its rents*. Cp. Isa. iii. 6 f., xxx. 13.—6. *Wine that bewilders*. A conventional figure : cp. lxxv. 9, Isa. li. 17, Jer. xxv. 15-17, xlix. 12, li. 7, Ezek. xxiii. 32-34, Zech. xii. 2.—7 f. There is no reference to a 'banner' : the text is urgently in need of correction (see crit. n.). As usual, the N. Arabian

populations are the aggressors (cp. on Pss. xliv., lv., lxxxiii.).—11 ff. An allusion to ii. 9, xviii. 30, 49 (corr. text).—14. *Cast the cord*, as a form of lot (Mic. ii. 5).—17 f. Israel will 'lead captive its captors.' See introd.—20. So xliv. 10.—23. Idiom, as in cxviii. 15, 1 S. xiv. 58.

Critical notes. Title. See General Introduction. The contents of the psalm are so inappropriate that we have to account for the historical combination in the title, and we must do this on the basis of a *corrected* text. Originally the title must have referred, not to 'Aram-naharaim' and 'Aram-zobah,' but to Aram-jerahmeel and Aram-mişşur. The confusion of Zobah and Mişşur has also most probably been made in 2 S. viii., x., and it may be that the same writer is responsible for this in both cases. At any rate, the title of Ps. lx. has been harmonized with the later form of the story of David's war with Hadad-ezer. Probably this harmonizing was suggested by the form of the original title. **בַּהֲצִיטוֹ** (Paseḳ) must be a corruption of some other word, not of **בַּהֲפֹתוֹ** (Klost., Wi.), for the **צ** is attested by G's *ἐπιπέσειν*, but of some more suitable word. Read perhaps **בַּלְחָץ** ; if **ל** became effaced, it was possible to regard **בַּהֲצ** (**בהצ**) as shortened from **בַּהֲצִיטוֹ**, 'when he strove.' The initial corruption **לְדוֹר** having

¹ For Gilead, for Manasseh and Ephraim.

² Jerahmeel.

³ On Zarephath.

already taken place, it was natural to read what followed in the light of the recast narrative in 2 S. viii., x.

2. M אַנְפַּת בְּנו וּתְשִׁיבֵנו אַחֲרָהּ = אַנְפַּת תְּשׁוּבָה לָנוּ (cp. Bā.). But is this possible? Most indeed take לָנוּ תֵּשׁ as a prayer, but this violates parallelism. The case (so far as 'תֵּשׁ' is concerned) is parallel to that of תַּפְּלַת in lxxx. 5 (see note). Read בְּשִׂאֲרֵיתָ, and for לָנוּ read עֲפָדָה (ע became ל, נו became נו). אַנְפַּת should perhaps be תַּאֲנַף.

3 f. M פָּעַעְתָּהּ, 'hast cleft it'?? G *συνετίραξας αὐτήν* = פָּעַעְתָּהּ? Cp. lxxxvii. 5, Gen. xli. 8 (*ἐτάραχθη*). Rather פָּעַעְתָּהּ. Herz, פָּעַעְתָּהּ שְׂמִיתָהּ.—M רָפָהּ. Read רָפָהּ (xli. 5), with Houbigant.

5. M הִרְאִיתָ. Read הִרְוִיתָ (Zweifel, Gr., Lag., Du.). M קָשָׁה, not || to יָוִן. Read יָשָׁרָהּ.

7 f. Evidently נִס, לְהַתְנַס, and קָשָׁה are wrong. Independently of v. Ortenberg, I formerly corrected נִס into כִּס; cp. כּוֹס for נִס in cxvi. 13. See Jer. xxv. 15 f., which also suggests לְהַתְהוּלָה for 'להתנ'. G (?) Σ J take קִשָּׁה as = קִשָּׁה 'bow'; cp. Palmyrene קִשָּׁה 'archer,' and see Kön. ii. 26. Lag., יָשָׁרָהּ; Wi., קָשָׁה (cp. 7. 5, M). But we expect an ethnic name; cp. Lam. v. 9, where חָרָב should be עֲרָבִי. Read, comparing xliv. 12, הִבִּישׁוּתֵנוּ כִּפְנֵי כּוֹשִׁים נִתְתַּנּוּ לִירְחֵמָאֵלִים. קִשָּׁה comes from כּוֹשָׁה, originally a marginal correction of קִשָּׁה. ל may be the separated final of 'יר, but note that, as elsewhere (e.g. lix. 6, 14) סָלָה here represents כִּאֵל or כִּאֵלִים in 'יר. ט for נו was an easy error of the scribe.

9. M G יִחַלְצוּן יְדִידֶיךָ. Against parallelism. Read גְּאֲלָנוּ כַּלְחֵן אֲדָמִים.

10. M הוֹשִׁיעָה יְמִינְךָ וַעֲנֵנוּ אֱלֹהִים. Kr. עֲנֵנוּ. After אֱלֹהִים (misplaced in 7. 8) stands Pasek. יְמִינֶיךָ is a riddle. In S. ix. 4 יְמִינֵי represents יְרַחֲמֵאֵלִי. Similarly here read כִּירַחֲמֵאֵלִים (cp. on lxxx. 7. 35, xc., 7. 23). The proof is the occurrence of אֱלֹהִים just afterwards, which throws 7. 8 into confusion, and (as sometimes elsewhere) is a miswritten יְרַחֲמֵאֵלִים. וַעֲנֵנוּ is a fragment of הוֹשִׁיעָנוּ (correction). Note the three נ near together, which ought to awaken suspicion.

11. M דַּבֵּר בְּקִדְשׁוֹ אֵילֹהִים אֲחַלְקָהּ (Pasek after 'אל). A combination of difficulties. בְּקִדְשׁוֹ 'in his sanctuary'? or 'in his holiness'? or '(swearing) by his holiness'? אֵילֹהִים; what is the subject of the verb? Yahwè (Ol., Hu., Bā.)? or David (Del.)? or the people? And

can אֵילֹהָ be rightly conjoined with אַחֲלָקָה and אַמְרָד? Clearly there is corruption. Lag. proposes אֵעֲזָה; but this is not enough. Winckler, בְּקִרְשׁ אֶהְזָה, 'I will seize Kadesh.' David, he thinks, is boasting of his victories, and tells us that by his war with Zobah he became master of Kadesh (in Galilee), and secured his possession of Manasseh, Gilead, and even Ephraim. Would not מְקִרְשׁ אֵעֲלָה. 'I (Israel) should go up from Kadesh (in the south)' be more plausible? Kadesh is not mentioned in the account of David's wars in 2 S. viii., x., but the southern Kadesh is mentioned in that of Israel's early migration. This Kadesh, too, would harmonize with Miššur and Edom in 7. 11 (if correctly read). The truth is, however, that the later editor made a colossal mistake, which can only be rectified by applying to this psalm the same key which has been so successful elsewhere. It will be simplest to give the results of a keen textual criticism connectedly.

פִּי־בָד אָרֶץ בּוּשׁ
 אַחֲלָקָה בְּשֵׁם וּמִנְעֵבֶת
 אַמְרָד כִּצְוֹר וְאַשּׁוּר
 אֲשִׁלֶּךְ חֶבֶל עַל־אֲרָם
 יִהְיֶה יוֹבְלָנִי עַד־כִּצְוֹר
 יִהְיֶה יַנְחֵנִי עַד אֲדוֹם

As in the case of 'Asshur, Arabia, and Jerahmeel' in Ps. lix., the proper names here have been repeated in different forms by puzzled scribes. Note, however, first that the key to בְּקִדְשׁוֹ אֵעֵל is furnished by lxxiv. 3 (וכּוּשׁ = בְּקִדְשׁ). כִּנְעַבֶּת represents a twice-written מִנְעֵבֶת. Then follows a gloss, 'for Gilead, for Manasseh and Ephraim' (read לְגִלְעָד), i.e. for tribes of Israel so-called. כִּצְוֹר is repeated afterwards as מִצְוֹר; יִרְחַמְנָאֵל = אִשּׁוּר (variant); יְהוּדָה and כִּחְקָקִי are corruptions of יִרְחַמְנָאֵל, written perhaps in the margin as a gloss upon אִשּׁוּר. מִנוֹאֵב (M) is followed by Pasek; as sometimes in Samuel it is miswritten for כִּצְוֹר, of which name (or else of the synon. אִשְׁחֹר) סִיר רַחְצִי are also corruptions. בְּנֵעֵלִי, as parallelism suggests, comes from חֶבֶל (see Mic. ii. 5). הַתְּרוּעִיעַ (in Ps. cxviii. אַתְּרוּעִיעַ) comes from צִרְפָּתִים, a gloss on פְּלִישַׁת, i.e. צִרְפָּת, itself a gloss on אֲרָם (see 'Zarephath,' *Enc. Bib.*); parallel in lxx. 14. We thus get rid of the problems of 'Shechem' and the 'valley of Succoth' (G τῆν κοιλάδα τῶν σκημῶν), also of the enigmatical 'washpot' and 'casting out of the shoe,' which Del. and others wildly support by a Persian and an Abyssinian custom respectively. See 'Shoe,' 'Shechem,' 'Succoth,' *Enc. Bib.* Note that G could make no sense of סִיר רַחְצִי; λέβητος τῆς ἐπιπέδος μου implies that

רחץ is used *Aramæicè* for בטה (perf. in T, cxv. 10 f.; cxviii. 10 f.); עיר קצור for עיר-קצור is required by the sense; also עיר קצור (in Ps. cviii., עיר קבצר). The latter is due to Wi. (cp. on xxxi. 22), and ינחני (for נחני) to Ol.: G ὀδηγήσεται με.

19 f. Read עֲתָה יְהוּה זָנְ (עֲתָה) (cp. on lxxxix. 39). הלא is miswritten for אלהים: the first scribe wrote it too soon, and left the word undeleted: there is also a superfluous אלהים in v. 12^b. In l. 20 read תִּשְׁעֵי בְּצַרְתֵּינוּ as in xlv. 10^b.

21. Read כִּי־מִצָּר.—22. Read וְיִהְיֶה תְּשׁוּעָתֵנוּ כִּי־אָרַם. 24. Read מִצָּרִים.

PSALM LXI.

Ps. lxi. appears to be composite. The situation presupposed in vv. 2 and 3, and also the metre, differ from those in vv. 6–9. Ps. lxi.¹ consists of pentameters. It is a short wail of persecuted Jews who long for the joy and the safety of Yahwè's sanctuary, but are at present in the 'land of the Jerahmeelites.' Ps. lxi.² is composed of trimeters. It is spoken by the congregation which worships in the temple, and expresses its gratitude for a past deliverance from the Jerahmeelites and a sure confidence that while Israel will be preserved for ever its foe Jerahmeel will be destroyed. The psalm as a whole would possess unity of thought, were it not for the perfect in v. 3; it might then be compared with Pss. xlii.–xliii. and lxiii. The prophecy of the destruction of Jerahmeel agrees with ii. 9, lxiii. 12, ex. 5–7; that of Israel's perpetual duration with xxi. 5, xci. 16, ex. 4.

Textual criticism has to a great extent transformed this psalm. Critics have wondered who the king in this post-exilic poem (v. 7 in M G) can be. Sellin (*Serubbabel*; cp. *Studien*, 1901, pp. 187 ff.) thinks of Zerubbabel, who for a time (according to him) assumed the royal title; Hitzig of Seleucus Nicator; the present writer (*OP* 99) of Jonathan or rather Simon the Maccabee; Giesebrecht (*ZATW*, i. 326) of Aristolulus; while Beer (*Indiv.-ps.* xlix.) holds that some non-Israelitish king, and Duhamel that some Asmonæan king is meant. It has also been questioned whether the persecuted Jews for whom the psalmist speaks were sojourning in a distant land like Lydia or Phrygia (*Jos. Ant.* xii. 3, 4) or in some part of Palestine which was then in heathen occupation. The former view is the more plausible. It is true the phrase chiefly relied upon ('from the end of the earth,' v. 3, M) happens to be corrupt, but if we take Ps. lxi.¹ together with Ps. xlii.–xliii. we shall see that the real or assumed situation of the speaker is that of an unwilling sojourner in the far south of Palestine in Jerahmeelite (*i.e.* Edomite) territory. For the interesting theory of Koy, as well as on other important points, see introd. to Ps. xlii.–xliii. Notice also the parallelism between v. 1 (בְּעֵר) and xlii. 2, lxxxiv. 3, between v. 2 and xliii. 1, 3 (corr. text), and between v. 7 and xliii. 3a; also between v. 1a and xvii. 1, cxlii. 7; between v. 4 and xv. 1, xxvii. 10; between v. 5^b and xxi. 3^b, ii. 8 (שִׁאֵל); between v. 7 and ii. 9, lxxxiii. 7, 8, 10, ex. 5–7, and between v. 9^b and l. 23 (corr. text).

LXI.—I (*a fragment*).

Deposited. Of the Ethanites. Of 'Arab-ethan.

1 Hear my wail, O Yahwè! | attend to my prayer. 2
I cry in pain toward thy sanctuary, | toward thy habitation.
From the land of the Jerahmeelites | do thou lead me, [O
Yahwè!]

* * * * *

LXI.—2 (*a fragment*).

1	For thou hast proved a refuge to me,	4
	A strong tower against the Arabian.	
	May I be a guest in thy palace, O Yahwè !	5
	May I find refuge in the covert of thy wings !	
	For thou hast heard my wail,	6
	Thou wilt grant Israel's request.	
	He will shatter Jerahmeel and Zarephath,	7
	He will beat them down like Moab and Midian.	
	He will abide before Yahwè for ever,	8
10	Lovingkindness and faithfulness will preserve him.	
	I will chant hymns to thy name for ever,	9
	Performing my vows to Yahwè.	

Critical Notes. (lxi.¹). 2. The enigmatical מִקְצֵה הָאֲרָבִים (Pasek follows) should, as the || passages show, be מִקְדָּשֵׁךָ [אֵל] (or לְ); transposition of letters. אֲקִרָא should be אֲנִיעֵךְ (see crit. n. on xlii. 2). —M בִּיעֲמֵךָ לְבִי; too vague. Read לְמִשְׁבְּנֹתֶיךָ. ש = ע; נו = בי; פ = נ; ת = ט; כ = ב. Cp. xliii. 3, lxxxiv. 2.

3. M בְּצִוְרֵי־רוּם כִּמְנִי; clearly impossible. If this were not a prayer, we might read כִּמְצֹר יִשְׁמְרֵנִי; cp. on xxvii. 5*b*. A not less easy and more suitable correction is כִּמְצֹר יְרַחֲמֵאֱלֹהִים; see introd. G S imply תְּרוֹכְמֵנִי; is not this a conjecture? Insert י (יהוה), now absorbed in תְּנַחֲנִי.

(lxi.²). 2. מִיֵּב אֹיִב should, as often, be יֵעָרְבִי. —3. M בְּאַהֲלֶךָ. Read בְּהִיכָרְךָ; see on xv. 1, xxvii. 5.—M עֲלֵמִים, as in lxxvii. 6, 8, cxlv. 13. The sense here is not good: protection, not protection for ever, is in the writer's mind. סֵלָה, at the end of v. 5, represents אֱלֹהִים. and this (or rather יהוה) is the right reading. אֱלֹהִים and עֵוִלִם are elsewhere confounded.—5. M נִדְרֵי. Rather רִנָּתִי. The 'wail' or 'cry for help' was extorted by Israel's sufferings from the Jerahmeelites. It was accompanied by a request for the final subjugation of Israel's enemies in the Messianic age.—6. M נְתַתְּ. Rather תִּתֵּן.—M יְרֵשֶׁת, 'possession': Kr., Bi., Che.¹. אֲרֵשֶׁת. But אֵר in xxi. 3 is corrupt. Read כִּישָׁאֲלֶת.—M יִרְאֵי שְׂכָרְךָ. The expression produces a tetrameter. For יִרְאֵי read יִשְׂרָאֵל. The ש dropped out owing to ש in שְׂכָרְךָ. See next note.

7. M **עַל־יְמֵי־מִלְחָה תוֹסִיף**. The opening of *v.* 7 is strangely expressed; contrast *xxi.* 5. Read **יִמְחֵז יִרְחֵמְאֵל וְצָרְפֶת**. Cp. *lxiii.* 12, *cx.* 6, *lxxviii.* 22, *ii.* 9 (corr. text).

8. M **שְׁנוֹתָיו כְּבוֹדֵר וְדוֹר**, not natural. Read probably **יִתְצַם** **כְּבוֹדָב וְכְבוֹדָיו** (**נו** = **כו**).

10 f. M **בֵּין יִנְצְרוּהוּ**. None of the ancients connected **בֵּין** with **כִּנְה**. It probably comes from a dittographed **כְּבוֹדָיו**. **כו** in *v.* 9 seems to be a conjectural correction of **כֵּן** from the margin, and **יוֹם יוֹם** (separated by *Pasek*) to be a corruption of **לְאֱלֹהִים**, which in turn is an editorial substitute for **לְיְהוָה**.

PSALM LXII.

PENTAMETERS. Pious Israel is weary of incessant insults, and of the violent contrast between its own moral ideas and those of its opponents. It waits patiently on Yahwè. The great day of retribution is at hand; then, its enemies will vanish. Scepticism is earnestly deprecated ('let it not goad your heart' cp. *lxviii.* 21) on the ground that Ishmael's punishment will be according to his deserts. The five times repeated **אֵךְ** ('only,' *i.e.* 'absolutely, altogether') is not merely an external characteristic of this psalm (cp. *xxxix.* 12, *lxviii.* 13); it points to a peculiar spiritual quality. Israel's religion is absolute devotion to God; it is marked by *πληροφωρία* of faith and hope (*Heb.* *vi.* 11; *x.* 22).

Reuss is the only critic who has applied the personification-theory here. Even Smend (p. 120) thinks that some leader of pious Israel must be intended, because of *vv.* 4 f. in M's text. But a thoroughly corrected text justifies Reuss. The psalm is parallel to *Pss.* *lii.*, *lv.*, except that the expression of feeling here is calmer: also to *Pss.* *iv.* and *v.* Duhm would even assign *Pss.* *iv.* and *lxii.* to the same author—a high priest. On *Ps.* *lxii.*, see further *OP*, 121, 134.

Deposited. Of Arab-ethan. Marked.

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | Wait altogether on Yahwè, my soul, for from him +will
come+ my expectation : | 2 |
| | He altogether is my rock of deliverance, my retreat
+where+ I am secure. | 3 |
| | How long will ye meditate insults, will ye whisper together
against the pious ? | |
| | Your heart is as an open sepulchre, though flatteringly
ye talk. | 4 |
| | Altogether deeds of guilt do they plan, though they love
to flatter; | 5 |
| | With the mouth they bless their companion, but
inwardly they curse. | |

Wait altogether on Yahwè, my soul, | for from him +will
come+ my expectation : 6

He altogether is my rock of deliverance,—my retreat +where+
I am secure.¹

Altogether vanity are the sons of Jerahmeel, | an illusion
the sons of Ishmael ; 10
10 When Jerahmeel prevails, | let it not goad your heart.² 11b

Be not ye incensed at the oppressor, | and rage ye not
against the robber, 11a

For the Lord [Yahwè] will requite | Ishmael according to
his work. 13

1. אָדָּ. See introd.—דָּמִי. Rest
in the hope of the 'end' (Messianic) ;
'quiet as a nun breathless with adora-
tion' (Wordsworth). Cp. xxxvii. 7,
Lam. iii. 26.

2. **Rock—retreat.** Cp. lix. 10,
17.—3-5. Cp. iv. 3, v. 10, xxxviii. 13,
xli. 8, lii. 3, 4, 9, lv. 12, 22.

6. **They curse.** Cp. cix. 18-20.
—9. *Vanity.* Elsewhere this is applied
to man in general (xxxix. 6(?), cxliv.
4); here, to the Jerahmeelite community,

which is to be annihilated in the Mes-
sianic age (ii. 9, &c.).

10. **Goad your heart,** viz. to
give up the fear of God (cp. xxxix.,
lxxiii., cxvi.).

12. **Incensed** (תתחרר), as in
xxxvii. 1, 7, 8, Prov. xxiv. 19.—*Rage*
not. Cp. Eccles. vii. 7.—*Robber* (גזל);
cp. Ezek. xviii. 18, Eccles. v. 7.—12.
According to his work. Cp. Obad. 15,
'As thou hast done, it shall be done
unto thee,' cxxxvii. 7 f.

Critical Notes. 1 f. Read אָדָּ-לִיָּהּ (cp. ט. 6).—M הַיְמִיָּה. Read
דָּמִי (Bi., Gr., Che.⁽¹⁾, We., Du.), supply כִּי, and read הַתְּקוֹתִי (ט. 6); יֵשׁ
came from ט. 3.—Read צוֹר יִשׁוּעָתִי (so *l.* 15).—M G's רַבָּה (ט. 3, end)
is wrong, 'r being nowhere used as an adverb. See next note.

3. M עֲדָאֲנָה הַהוֹתָתוּ : רַבָּה (Pasek after אָנָה). Combine רַבָּה
with הוֹתָתוּ, and seek for the underlying words. The most probable
result is תַּהֲנִי הַרְפּוֹת, cp. הִנֵּה, xxxviii. 13); however, comes
to us through an intermediate הוֹתָת (see on v. 10, lii. 3).—M תַּרְצָחוּ
(Paer, Gi.), or תַּרְצָחוּ (Bä., Dri.), plainly corrupt. We.'s תַּרוֹצְצוּהוּ is no
more than ingenious. We must take the word together with עַל-אִישׁ,
which is also wrong. Parallelism and kindred passages (see exeg. note)
guide us to עַל-חֲסִיד תַּתְּלַחֲשֵׁנוּ.

¹ Yahwè is my deliverance, my glory : | my rock of refuge is Yahwè. 8
Trust in him at all times, ye sufferers ! | our refuge is God. [Pour out your
heart before him.]

² Jerahmeelites and Ishmaelites are one and the same thing.

4. M פְּלִקְכֶם פְּקִיר נְטוּי נָדָר הַדְּחִיָּה. According to the ancients, a prediction of the punishment for the wicked (cp. Isa. xxx. 13). This is against the context. The parallel part of the next stanza (*l.* 6), however, has been neglected. *Now* we see that there is an allusion to v. 10. נָדָר is an interesting corruption of גְּרִנְכֶם, and כִּלְכֶם (misplaced) of לְשִׁנְכֶם through גִּשְׁלֶכֶם. Read בְּקִבְר פְּתִיחַ גְּרִנְכֶם [כֶּם] תַּחֲלִיקוּ לְשִׁנְכֶם גִּשְׁלֶכֶם.

5. M כִּשְׂאֵתוֹ; G τὴν τιμὴν μου (= שְׂאֵתִי), rejecting נו because it was noticed that להֲדִיחַ had no suffix. This observation is important; it throws suspicion on the text (Pasek follows 'כִּש'). Gunkel (*Schw.*, 33) reads כִּשְׂאֵתוֹ; too strong, also too uncommon a word. Read אֲשִׁמּוֹת. —M לְהֲדִיחַ, no suffix; besides, more suitable when divine judgments are spoken of (v. 11). Read לְהַחֲלִיק (cp. on *l.* 4).

6. פְּזָב. Insight into metre helps us here. פְּזָב should be the object of יִבְרַכּוּ. Read חֲבַר; כ and ח, ז and ר confounded. In G read, not ἐν δὲ ψεί, but ἐν ψεύδει (Ens.).—M בְּפִיָּה. Read בְּפִיָּה (see on v. 10).

Verses 8, 9 are a later homiletical insertion; indeed, the bracketed words, which in the Hebrew are metrically incorrect, seem to be a still later interpolation. G's *πᾶσα συναγωγή λαοῦ* (cp. Bā.) suggests כְּלִיעֹת עַם, which several (*e.g.* Bā., Bertholet) accept. But it is עַם, which is wrong (note Pasek); read עֲנִיִּים. In v. 8 omit עַל (from a dittographed אֵל), and עֲנִי—a variant to צָרִי. Read, however, צוֹר (*l.* 3). סִלַּח comes from אֱלֹהִים, the place of which was variously given.

9. M בְּנֵי־אִישׁ, בְּנֵי־אָדָם, 'mean men,' 'great men'? The maxim produced is trite and unsuitable. Read יִשְׁמַעְאֵל, בְּנֵי יִרְחֵמְאֵל. יִרַח in יִרְחֵמְאֵל is, in fact, preserved at the end of v. 10, for the words במֵאוֹזִים לעֲלוֹת הֵמָּה מֵהַבֵּל יָחַד are a very corrupt dittogram of מֵהַבֵּל = בְּנֵי הֵמָּה = שׁ = ז, נִי = נו. בְּנֵי יִשְׁמַעְאֵל בְּנֵי יִרְחֵמְאֵל = יִרַח = יָחַד, מֵאֵל. The text as it stands gives no sense. G ἐν ζυγοῖς τοῦ ἀδικῆσαι (לְעֹלָה); J in *stateris dolosis*. Why did they not guess כִּי עָלְ מֵעֲלוֹת (cp. Isa. xxxviii. 8)?

10 f. Transposition of v. 11a and v. 11b, to improve connexion. M חֵיל פִּי יָנוּב (Pasek after חֵיל); G πλοῦτος ἐν ῥέῃ (= יָנוּב). יָנוּב again in xcii. 15, Prov. xxxi. 10, and (Pilel) Zech. ix. 17, but suspicious in each case. In Prov. *l.c.* read יַבִּיעַ (Gr.; cp. G), and in Zech. *l.c.* יִנְבֵּר (as in x. 6, 12). Read here יִרְחֵמְאֵל פִּי יִנְבֵּר. יִרְחֵמְאֵל has a two-fold representation, 1. by תַּהַבְלוּ, which is a confusion of תַּהַוְלוּ (see presently) and רַחֲמַיִם (a mutilated רַחֲמַיִם), 2. by חֵיל.—M אֱלֹהֵי־שִׁיתוֹ לֵב;

extremely weak. Read אֶל־תִּסֵּית לְבָבְךָ.—M אֶל־תִּבְטְחוּ; influenced by *v.* 9, or by Isa. xxx. 12? Read אֶל־תִּתְחַרְרוּ (xxxvii. 1).—M עֵשֶׂק, תִּהְבְּלוּ, גִּזְלוּ. Read עֵשֶׂק, גִּזְלוּ, תִּתְהוֹלְלוּ (see last note but one).

V. 12 is a gloss. Read אַחַת יִרְחֹמְאֵלִים וַיִּשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים. again and again stands for מֵאֱלֹהִים or מֵעֲלֵימֵם. Afterwards (*v.* 13*a*) וַיִּרְחֹמְאֵלִים comes in once more, a corrupt dittogram. Can the usual translation of *v.* 12 commend itself to any one?

12. M כִּי־אֲתָה. Read כִּי־אֲדַנִּי (cp. on xci. 9).—M תִּשְׁלֹם. Read יִשְׁלֹם.—M לֵאשִׁישׁ. Read לֵיִשְׁכֵּי־עַל מוֹעַל; לֵיִשְׁכֵּי־עַל fell out owing to יִשְׁלֹם close by.

PSALM LXIII.

TRIMETERS. Again a much misunderstood psalm, from the title onwards, though the misunderstanding does not at all affect the leading idea, which is that pious Jews, at a distance from the sanctuary, and in peril of their lives, call upon Yahwè to restore to them their priceless spiritual privileges. Only at the close of the psalm does their spokesman refer to the Jerahmeelites and the misery which they cause, and the vehement language which the common text ascribes to him gives place in the true text to a simple assertion that Yahwè will certainly annihilate this dangerous people, and that Israel will praise its God for His goodness in the temple. The psalm is parallel to Ps. xxxvi.², to Pss. xlii.—xliii. (though that psalm describes more acute sufferings), and to Pss. lxi. and lxxxiv.

As in Ps. xlii.—xliii. the speaker is, not any individual, but a company of Jews living (really, or in the poet's imagination) among Jerahmeelite oppressors. *l.* 7 (*l.* 11 f.), which may appear opposed to this view (cp. Coblenz, 86), is parallel to passages in xlii.—xliii., and only shows the strength of the personification (cp. Smend, 121). The unity of feeling in any representative company of faithful Jews is such that any experience common to all its members in virtue of their religious standing as Israelites can be and is ascribed to the company.

It is a beautiful though by no means original psalm, and benefits much from textual criticism. The excision of the violent expressions respecting the slaughter of the enemies should be a great relief to readers. The removal of 'the king' in *v.* 12*a* (see crit. n. on *l.* 12) is also no small gain. If correct, it would have to be a reference to the Messiah; a reference to some member of the Asmonean family is not, in our present stage of critical study, defensible. See *Jew. Rel. Life.* 105 (but cp. *OP* 99); Toy, *JBL*, xviii. (99), 162, who admits the 'reality' of the 'king' in Ps. lxi., but not in Ps. liiii.

Marked: *Of Arab-ethan. At the goings up to the house of Yahwè. 1*

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | O Yahwè! for thy courts I seek, | 2 |
| | My soul thirsts for thy habitation; | |
| | As a gazelle longs for running streams, | 3 |
| | +So+ long I for thy glorious courts, | |
| | For thy lovingkindness is better than wine, | 4 |
| | And thy faithfulness than all spices; | |
| | For beside thee is the fountain of life, | 5 |
| | With the stream of thy delights thou wilt refresh me. | |

	For thou wilt satisfy my longing with fatness,	6
10	And wilt fill me with a feast of delicacies ;	
	As for me, I think of thee upon my couch,	7
	I muse upon thee in the night-watches.	
	Thou hast proved thyself a helper unto me,	8
	And under the shadow of thy wings I shall abide.	
	Eagerly does my soul run after thee ;	9
	Let thy right hand uphold me !	
	O Yahwè! the Ishmaelites crush me,	10
	The hosts of Mišsur trample upon me ;	
	Those of Jerahmeel are enraged at me,	11
20	Those of Maacath and of Ishmael.	
	Yahwè will shatter the Jerahmeelites,	12
	* * * *	
	Every one that swears by Him will triumph,	
	For he will celebrate His work in the sanctuary.	

Critical Notes. Title. The very inappropriate title may have for a basis יהוה בֵּית יְהוּדָה בְּמִינְעוּלוֹת (or בְּהִלְכוֹת). The *ιδουμαϊας* of G B and Θ is miswritten for *ιουδαϊας*.

1. Read יהוה לְהַצְרֹתֶיךָ אֲשֶׁחַר. M's אֵלֵי אַתָּה is plausible (cxl. 7), but the stichus produced is not symmetrical with the rest. Note Pasek after אֱלֹהִים.

2. Read לְכִוְשׁ־פְּנֵי־תֶיךָ צָמְאוּהָ נִפְשֵׁי. M's כְּנֹה לְךָ בִּשְׂרֵי is an editor's attempt to make sense of an indistinctly or imperfectly written לְכִוְשׁ־כְּנֹתֶיךָ; note Pasek after the first לְךָ. A verb כָּמָה would be a *ἄπ.* λεγ. with no derivatives. A connection is fancied with Ar. and Syr. roots meaning 'to be pale-faced, weak-eyed, or blind.' G Θ E' do not recognize the root, and vocalize כָּמָה. T רַגִּינִי; cp. on xiii. 2; Σ *ἰμείρεται*; J *desideravit*, representing a second not less faulty tradition.

3. Read כְּצִבְיָה לְאַפְיָי מִים (cp. xlii. 2). 'צב' as in Cant. iv. 5, vii. 4. לְאַפְיָי became in M וְעִפְלֵי; כְּצִבְיָה became בְּאַרְץ and also צִיבָה ('צ' was dittographed, and both forms became corrupted). Houb.'s correction, בְּאַרְץ for בְּאַרְץ, is too superficial, and unless, with Gr., we arbitrarily read עִיפָה, we have still the difficulty of a masculine adjective (according to the common view of צִיבָה) coupled with a fem. Of the passages quoted in Ges.¹²⁶ (§ 132*d*) to justify this, three (1 K. xix. 11, 1 S. xv. 9, and the present passage) should certainly be corrected. The fourth (Jer. xx. 9) stands apart, יַעֲזָר not having a prefixed ו. Nor is the

difficulty of the phrase lessened by the admission that צִיָּה is not an adjective, but a substantive ('dryness'). If we might, with Duhm, excise יָצָה as a variant to צִיָּה (a most arbitrary proceeding), we might read, for בלי מים, ליבלי מים. But we certainly *expect* some animal to be mentioned; צִבְיָה is our imitative psalmist's substitute for the אֵילַת of xlii. 2.

4. Read נִכְסַפְתִּי לְחֻצְרוֹת פְּבוֹדָד. M's לראות עוד arises out of לרותחצד; בקדש חזיתך presents three superfluous letters—a second sibilant (ז), a second palatal (ק), and a ד. Apart from these superfluities (partly due to scribes, partly [ד] to an editor), we find a close approach to the letters of נִכְסַפְתִּי. כּוּן is here omitted as dittographic (נכ follows).

5. M כִּדְוִיִּים. The sense generally given to this statement (not congenial to Jewish thought) has no ancient support; T discovers a contrast between the *eternal* life of the righteous and that of the wicked. Read certainly כִּיָּוֶן (Cant. i. 2, iv. 10).

6. M שִׁפְתַי יִשְׁבַּחֲוֶנָּה. The connexion is rough; the idea poor. Note also the masc. verb with the fem. noun. Read most probably וְאִמְתָּךְ מִפְּלִבְשָׁנִים (cp. Cant. iv. 10). If נִכְל was written in error after בִּשְׁמִים, נוּ would easily fall out. ל remains unaccounted for; it must have become effaced.

7 f. M בְּנו אֲבָרְכֶךָ בְּהָי. Sense and parallelism disappoint us again. Read פִּי עֲמָד מְקוֹר חַיִּים (xxxvi. 10a). The skill of the editor was great; he produced an edifying though not a perfectly suitable sense.—M וְנִחַל שְׁמִינִיד תִּשְׁקֵנִי. Read probably וְנִחַל שְׁמִינִיד תִּשְׁקֵנִי וְנִחַל שְׁמִינִיד תִּשְׁקֵנִי. Read probably וְנִחַל שְׁמִינִיד תִּשְׁקֵנִי וְנִחַל שְׁמִינִיד תִּשְׁקֵנִי. Read probably וְנִחַל שְׁמִינִיד תִּשְׁקֵנִי. Cp. xxxvi. 9, lxx. 10, xxiii. 5.

9 ff. M בְּנִי חֶלֶב וְדָשֵׁן תִּשְׁבַּע נִפְשִׁי. Long and tautological. Read פִּי מִחֶלֶב תִּדְשֵׁן נִפְשִׁי. Cp. on xxiii. 5.—M וְשִׁפְתַי רִנְנוֹת וְשִׁפְתַי רִנְנוֹת. רִנְנָה is not used in plural. Strange and tautological. Read וְשִׁפְתַי רִנְנוֹת וְשִׁפְתַי רִנְנוֹת. (see Isa. xxv. 6).

13-16. Omit כִּי, due to dittography.—M אֲרִנֶּנּוּ, unsuitable. Read אֲתִלְוֶנּוּ (xci. 1), with Gr. Du., infelicitously. אֲקַבְּנוּ.—M דְּבַקָּה. But בָּ should follow. Read דְּלָקָה (1 S. xiv. 22).—M בִּי תִכְבֶּה. Read בִּי יִתְכַד. Similarly Gr.

17-24. וְהִכָּה לְשׂוֹאָה is obscure. G εις μάτην = לְשׂוֹאָה; improbable. וְהִגִּיר? וְהִגִּיר, 'to deliver up,' is suspicious. וְהִפְלִיד? If the general form of the passage is right, some word descriptive of personal character

is to be expected. Gr. proposes $\epsilon\gamma\beta\eta\rho\delta$; Toy, $\epsilon\gamma\beta\eta\kappa$. But the whole passage is suspicious. Evidently the editor has reconstructed it, either because he wished to get rid of the historical colouring, or because the passage was indistinctly written, or perhaps for both reasons. The following may be a near approximation to the true text, judging from many analogous passages :—

17	יהוה [אלהים] יִשְׁמְעֵאלִים שְׁפוּנֵי	10
	יְבוֹסוּנֵי מִחֲנוֹת מְצוּר	
	יִרְגְּזוּ עָלַי יִרְחֲמֵאלִים	11
	מִנְעֻבְתֵיךְ וַיִּשְׁמְעֵאלִים	
	יִרְחֲמֵאלִים יִמְחֹן יְהוה [אלהים]	12
	* * *	
	יִתְהַלֵּל כְּלִדְהַנְשֻׁבַע בּוֹ	
24	כִּי יִזְכֹּר פִּעְלֹו בְּמִקְדָּשׁוֹ	

PSALM LXIV.

TRIMETERS. Fresh complaints and anticipations of the day of retribution. Those of the Jerahmeelites (surely no mere slanderers, but skilled archers) who survive are to repent. Cp. Pss. vii., x., xi., li., lviii., lxxxiii. end; the phraseological points of contact are obvious (see crit. notes).

Deposited. Marked: Of 'Arab-ethan. 1

1	Hear my voice, O Yahwè ! in my complaint, Protect me from the sword of the Arabian ; Hide me from the violence of evil-doers, From the raging of workers of harm.	2 3
	The Ishmaelites sharpen their sword, The Arabians bend their bow ; They lie in wait in coverts for the upright, Suddenly they shoot at him, fearing not.	4 5
10	The Jerahmeelites speak of wicked things, The Ishmaelites plan impious deeds ; The Ishmaelites curse God, And say, ' Who sees us ? '	6 7

	So Yahwè will shoot at them with an arrow,	8
	Suddenly will their strokes come.	
	Yahwè will bring the Ishmaelites to ruin,	9
	All who behold them will wag the head :	
	And those of Jerahmeel will fear,	10
	Those of Ishmael will discern Yahwè's work ;	
	But the righteous will rejoice in Yahwè,	11
20	And all the upright in heart ¹ will triumph,	

Critical Notes. 2. מִפֶּחַד אֹיִב ; too vague. Read מִחָרֵב עֲרָבִי (cp. xci. 5, Lam. v. 9).—M הָיִי ; superfluous. It seems to come from יִרְחֵם = יִרְחֵם אֱלֹהִים, a gloss on פִּעְלֵי אֹן in *z.* 3 (end).—3. M מִסֹּד . Read מִשֹּׁד (מִשֹּׁד) .—4. M רְנִישָׁת . See on ii. 1, lv. 15, and read רְנִיֹּת . Cp. lix. 4, יִרְגֹּזוּ . חִי (see on *l.* 2) also represents this word.—5. M's אִשֶּׁר spoils the style. Like לְשׁוֹנִים (a reference to cruel speeches is not enough, see *z.* 4, 7) it is a fragment of יִשְׁמַעְאֵלִים . כְּחָבֵב is surely an editorial alteration of חֲרָבִים (which restore).—6. M חָצִים . But חִין דֶּרֶךְ חִין is not Hebrew (lviii. 8 is corrupt). Read קִשְׁתָּם (so G).—M כָּר . Read עֲרָבִים (cp. Gen. xxi. 20).

7. M יִאֲרְבוּ לְיִשָּׁר . Read probably לִירוֹת בְּמִשְׁתָּרִים תָּם . Misarranged letters led to corruption. 'Lying in wait' and 'coverts' naturally go together ; 'suddenly do they shoot at him' now comes in more naturally.

9 f. M יִחַקֹּד-לָמוֹ (Pasek follows). Read יִרְחֵם אֱלֹהִים . ר and ז, מ and ק confounded.—M דָּבַר רֵעַ . Read דָּבְרוּ רֵעוֹת .—Read יִשְׁכְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים נִבְלֹת יִחְשְׁבוּ . יִשְׁ underlies יִסְפְּרוּ ; יִחְ underlies יִחְשְׁבוּ . לְמִטְוֵן מִוִּקְשִׁים . *l.* 6 in M opens with two dittograms, viz. יִחְפְּשִׁי (נִבְלֹת יִחְשְׁבוּ) and תִּמְנִי חֶפֶשׁ מִחֶפֶשׁ (יִחְשְׁבוּ נִבְלֹת) . *i.e.* יִחְשְׁבוּ נִבְלֹת . יִחְשְׁבוּ (יִחְשְׁבוּ נִבְלֹת) . The readings לָנוּ (S) and תִּמְנִי (MSS) are mere guesses. Cp. the corrupt חֶפְשִׁי in lxxxviii. 6.

11. M קָרַב אִישׁ וְלֵב עֲמֹק . A Jeremianic commonplace (Jer. xvii. 9) is unexpected. It is possible that it covers over some painfully frank description of Israel's enemies. Remembering 1. the disguises of מִכְחֵשִׁים in Ps. xlix ; 2. what appears the deliberate substitution of בָּרְכוּ for נִעְצִי in Job i. 5 ; 3. the editor's habit of breaking up יִשְׁמַעְאֵל and יִרְחֵם אֱלֹהִים, and 4. the many corruptions of אֱלֹהִים in the Psalter, we

¹ All who take refuge in him.

can hardly hesitate to read (אלהים) יהוה נִאָצַו יִשְׁמְעֵאלִים יהוה. Nevertheless, the editor has left נִאָץ in x. 3, 13, lxxiv. 10, 18 in the sense of 'blaspheming (Yahwè).'

13-18. Point with simple ו (cp. vss., especially S T), and for הִיוּ read יְהִיוּ (Gr.).

15. מַלְּשׁוֹנֵי עֵינֵינוּ וַיִּכְשִׁילֵנוּ. The sing. suff. is unexpected, and עלינו is altogether unintelligible. עֵלְמוֹי, 'tricks' (Hi.), is imaginary. עֵמְל would be too easy and give an imperfect sense. Very probably הוּ comes from יהוה, and עלינו and לשונם are two corrupt forms of יִשְׁמְעֵאלִים (cp. on xxxvi. 3).

17. Σ and Gr. read יראו, but ייראו (with simple Waw) is correct. כָּל־אָדָם, which follows, can hardly be right; it is superfluous after כָּל־רָאָה בָם. What we expect (cp. lix. 14, lxxxiii. 17, 19) is a reference to the effect of the judgment on the surviving enemies. יגידו, too, is not natural, and Duhm well corrects into יִבְרִי. He keeps the very difficult הַסְכִּילוּ, but omits כָּל־אָדָם וַיִּירָאוּ as a gloss on v. 9b. This is hardly right. הַסְכִּילוּ combines two fragments of יִרְחֲמֵאלִים, and כָּל־אָדָם is a corruption of יִשְׁמְעֵאלִים, which is a correction of the corrupt word read as וּמַעֲשָׂהוּ. Read, therefore,

וַיִּירָאוּ יִרְחֲמֵאלִים
וַיִּבְרִי פַעֲלֵיהֶּ יִשְׁמְעֵאלִים

19. Read וַיִּשְׂמַח; ו precedes. Bi., Du. omit בּוּ וַחֲסָה בּוּ as a mere amplification. It may, however, represent כָּל־חֲסִי בּוּ, a variant to כָּל־יִשְׂרָיִל בּוּ. Cp. v. 12.

PSALM LXV.

PENTAMETERS. Pious Israel, at the time of the 'end,' gives thanks to Yahwè for its privilege of drawing near to God (cp. v. 8), and for the destruction of its enemies, represented by the Jerahmeelites. So at least according to the revised text. The common view, based on the received text, is different. The mention of the pastures, the flocks, and the corn (זר. 13 f.) is thought to point to the Passover season, and that of Yahwè's subjugation of turbulent elements in the non-Jewish nations (זר. 6, 8 f.), to some recent deliverance of Israel. Parallelisms between Ps. lxxv. and Pss. xlvi. and lxxvi. seem to Del. and Kirkp. to connect the former with the deliverance of Jerusalem from Sennacherib. We have seen, however, that Ps. xlvi. is no mere 'historical lyric,' but a great eschatological prophecy clothed in poetical form; and such Pss. lxxv. and lxxvi. should also be. But then, why the abrupt introduction of references to the natural blessings of spring-tide, which are by no means to be expected after the introductory stanzas? A close inspection of the text reveals many points of affinity to passages containing transformations or corruptions of names like 'Jerahmeelites,' &c. Bâ. himself points out that the text of this psalm varied in ancient times (cp. *J. prot. Theol.* '82, pp. 640 f.).

Deposited. Marked: Of 'Arab-ethan.

- 1 To thee let praise be chanted, | O Yahwè! in Zion ; 2
 To thee let vows be performed | in Jerusalem.
 To thy holy place, let men come | with the sound of the 3
 horn,
 Let them chant thy mighty deeds | with the sweet notes 4
 of their lyres.
 Israel thou didst choose and bring near | to dwell in thy 5
 courts ;
 With the boons of thy house we will fill ourselves, | with 6
 the delicacies of thy temple.
 Glorious art thou in righteousness, | O God, who art our 6
 succour,
 Who didst deliver us from the Mişrim, | and from those of
 Jerahmeel,—
 +A God+ who setteth fast the mountains by his power, |
 glorifying himself with prowess, 7
 10 Who stills the booming of ocean, | the tumult of its billows! 8
 The Jerahmeelites were afraid of thee, | the inhabitants of
 Zarephath, 9
 Mişsur and Rehoboth were amazed at thee, | Arabia and
 the Hagarites.
 Thou hast taken heed of the land and restored it, | thou 10
 hast succoured greatly,
 The Jerahmeelites are swallowed up, | their pride is cut off.
 Broken are the walls of the Arabs, | and their habitations ; 11
 Thou hast shattered Rehoboth, thou hast destroyed | the
 dwelling-places of Zarephath. 12
 Their palaces are burned with fire, | the castles of Mişsur¹ ; 13

* * * * *

1 f. **In Zion, &c.** For the summons is addressed to the whole people ; 'Open ye the gates, that the righteous nation may enter' (Isa. xxvi. 2). The 'song of praise' and the 'performance of vows' are parallel, as in xxii. 26, l. 14, lxi. 9, cxvi. 17 f.

5. Israel's ideal is involved in the

great fact of its election—it is to 'dwell in Yahwè's courts' (xxiii. 6, xxvii. 4, &c.). 'Paradise Regained' is there ; a heavenly feast is prepared for Israel in the temple (xxxvi. 9 f., lxiii. 6, &c.).

7-10. The psalmist calls to mind the great primeval war of supernatural beings, when the ocean was quelled,

¹ Jerahmeel. Hagarites. Ishmaelites. Mişsur. Amalekites. Zarephathites. Asshurites.

and Rahab(?) was broken in pieces (lxxxix. 9 f., Isa. li. 9 f.; cp. Isa. xvii. 12 f.). Then the great earth-mountain, or, as the later writers said, the mountains, could be planted (cp. Prov. viii. 25). Sea and mountains, as they now exist, are alike proofs of Yahwè's 'prowess,' and not inferior evidence will be his predicted victory over all

hostile powers in the time of the 'end.' Cp. xlvii. 3 f.

11 f. Parallels, xlvi. 5-7, lxxxiii. 6, &c.

14. The pride of the Edomites is specially mentioned (Obad. 3).

15-17. Cp. ix. 7, Am. i. 12. On the list of names in the note, see crit. note.

Crit. Notes (cp. Ruben, *Critical Remarks*, '93, p. 23).

1. M דְּמִיָּה, a non-existent word (see on xxii. 3). G *πρέπει* (so S), hence Hitz., Ew., Bâ., Che. (Ps.¹¹ and *JBL*, xvii. 207), Ruben, We. (doubtfully), Du., read דְּמִיָּה, 'is fitting.' Cp. שָׁוָה, 'to be suitable' (Esth. iii. 8, and i. 22?). But if the psalmist had meant this, he would have used another word—נִאוּה (xxxiii. 1), which indeed Gr. reads here. And what would 'seemly for thee' mean? 'Seemly for thee to offer' (see again xxxiii. 1)?! Read תִּזְמַר, although the Pual is not found in M. דְּמִיָּה would easily be misread רְמִיָּה.

2. The second hemistich is בִּירוּשָׁלַם (so G^{ERT}, Vg.). בִּיר fell out after דָּר, and שָׁלַם became שָׁמַע (v. 2), i.e. שָׁמַע (G S J), or שָׁמַע (M). Observe too the nearness of יִשְׁלַם. Parallelism and metre are now satisfied.

3. M תִּפְלֵה עִרִיד, which comes out of קַמְלֵד שְׂרִיד, i.e. לְמַקְדָּשִׁיד. To complete the hemistich transfer יִבֹּאוּ.—M כָּל־בְּשָׂר. Some explain (so *OP*, 292; Bertholet, *Stellung*, 191, 220), by comparing the bold universalism of Mal. i. 11; cp. v. 9. But the stress laid in *ll.* 1, 2 on Zion and Jerusalem is adverse to this. Might we then, comparing Joel iii. 1, Isa. lxvi. 23, suppose 'all flesh' to mean only the congregation of Israel together with the proselytes? So Bickell, Duhm. But this is improbable; in P (who is surely strict enough as an Israelite) כָּל־בְּשָׂר has no such limitation; it even includes the lower animals (Gen. vi. 12 f., vii. 15 f., ix. 11, 15). In Joel iii. 1 we should probably read עַל־כָּל־בֵּית־יִשְׂרָאֵל, and in Isa. lxvi. 23, and in our own passage שׂוֹפֵר.

4. M begins, דְּבַרֵי עֲוֹנוֹת, on which Dathe remarks, 'Vocabulum דְּבַר redundat uti sæpe.' Recent scholars, however, find a periphrasis to express manifoldness. Very prosaic and improbable (cp. on xxxv. 20^b). G *λόγοι ἀνύμων*. But surely דְּבַרֵי עֲוֹנוֹת comes from יִזְמְרוּ (ב and ע both represent כ, ז and ד are phonetically akin). גְּבוּרַתִּיד = נַת גְּבוּרוֹ.—M כִּנְיֵי. Gr., Du. כִּנְיֵי (after G), but this is a mere patch on a faulty text. Read כִּנְיֵי; cp. on cl. 4. M's פִּשְׁעֵינוּ, which follows, is probably due to editorial manipulation of the same word, indistinctly

written (נו = כו). אתה תכפרם is evidently a corruption of פְּנִיתִיהֶם; the parallelism is now perfect. Cp. lxxxi. 3 f., xcvi. 5 f.

5. The want of consecutiveness in *τ.* 5 is remarkable. תבחר is also the wrong tense. *G indeed gives *ὃν ἐξέλεξω καὶ προσελάβου*. This is perhaps arbitrary, G's text being on the whole identical with M's, but it expresses a right feeling. אשרי sometimes is a corruption of ישראל. It is so here; observe the Pasek, and note that the mention of Israel corresponds to that of Zion and Jerusalem. Read יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּחַרְתָּ. 'וְהִתְקַרַּב לְשִׁפְנוּ בְּחַצְוֹ'. The continuity of the stanza is now restored.

6. M קדש; G קדש. T has קודשא. But parallelism requires בְּדָשׁ (xxxvi. 9); so Gr.

7. Again a warning Pasek. נִוְרָאוֹת | בְּצֶדֶק, a second accusative to תַּעֲנֵנּוּ. But the construction is unexpected, and בצדק is ambiguous. And why the imperfect? G *θαυμαστός ἐν δικαιοσύνη*; does this imply simply נִוְרָא? At any rate, it does not help us much. But our course is clear, without the versions. Read נִוְרָא אֶתָּה בְּצֶדֶקָה. The ת (= ה) in תַּעֲנֵנּוּ belongs to צדק. עננו has sprung out of יִשְׁעֵנּוּ (written too soon).

8. Again a strange want of consistency in M's text. Duhm remarks, 'Certain as it is that only the Jews can be meant in *τ.τ.* 3b and 6a. the poet can believe in some connexion of all mankind with Elohim (cp. Gen. ix. 1 ff.) and in an obscure attraction of the heathen towards the true God (cp. *τ.* 9).' It is wonderful that no one has attempted to disintegrate the psalm because of this inconsistency. Nothing important for the sense is won by reading אֵיִם (Gr., Che.⁽¹⁾, We., Du.; cp. T) or גִּוִּים (Weir; cp. S) for יָם. What we require is a definite mention of the past danger. Read כִּיפְלִטֵנוּ כִּימְצָרִים | וִירַחֲמֵנוּ אֱלֹהִים. The present text, however, gives us a pleasing idea of the religion of the editor.

9. M נֶאֱדָר. Surely unnatural. Read either נֶאֱדָר (Gr.). cp. Ex. xv. 6, and see on xciii. 1, or נֶהֱדָר.

10. M כִּי־שָׁבִיחַ, 'who stills'? But a שִׁבַח II. 'to still,' is unproven. In lxxix. 10, for תִּשְׁבַּחֵם G perhaps reads תִּשְׁקִיט (*καταπραΰνει*; cp. G, xciv. 13). In Prov. xxix. 11, שִׁבַּח (G strangely *ταμείεσθαι*) should be חֶשֶׁךְ (Bi., Frankenb., Toy). Here G has *ὁ συνταράσσων* = כִּוְרָנִי (cp. lxxvii. 17, G). Read rather תִּשְׁקִיט. Note Pasek.—M וְהִמְנוּ לְאֵמִים. Kön., § 375*f.* finds here the Waw 'adaequationis': if the text is right, it is rather the Waw of explanation, common in glosses. In fact, ל' ו' might be a scribe's explanation of the 'roaring of the ocean,' suggested by Isa. xvii. 12. לֵאמִים, however, is one of the possible corruptions of

ירחמאלים (see *Enc. Bib.*, art. 'Leummim'), and a comprehensive study of this passage in its context suggests that 'ירח' is the true reading here (see next note).

11. יִשְׁבִי קְצוֹת, *οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὰ πέριπα*. An unexampled expression. **מֵאוֹתֵיךָ**; *i.e.*, says Duhm, at the comets, eclipses, tempests, &c.; or, as Ol. and most, at the judicial acts of Yahwè in history. Note, however, the facility of corruption in **מֵאוֹתֵיךָ** (see lxxiv. 4, 9). Let us transfer the suffix in this suspicious word to the opening verb, and take in 'ירח' from *v.* 8 (see last note), and read **וַיִּרְאוּ יְרַחֲמָאִלִים | יִשְׁבִי** צֶרֶפֶת.

12. M G **מִוֹצְאֵי בְקָרָךְ וְעָרְבֵךְ**. What can this mean? Is it equivalent to **מִזְרָח וּמַגְרָב**, 'east and west'? And if so, does it mean the regions of east and west or their inhabitants? These unnatural explanations can hardly be right. Hence König (*Stylistik*, 28) explains 'the outgoings' as = 'those who go forth,' *i.e.* caravans, which often set out in the evening. M **תְּרַנִּין**; G *τέρψεις*. Whether the form **הֲרַנִּין** exists is more than doubtful (see on xxxii. 11). König, 'thou makest to exult by the shining forth of sun, moon, and stars.' Gr. conjectures **מִוֹצְאֵים**, with an allusion to the deliverance from Babylon. Applying our historical key, and remembering the tendency of editors to confound **עָרְבֵךְ** with **עָרְבֵךְ**, we should probably read (cp. xlvi. 6),—

יִתְמְהוּ מִצֹּר וּרְחִבַת | וְעָרְבֵךְ וְהַגְרָיִם :

13. M **וַתִּשְׁקָקָה**, from **שׁוֹק**, Joel ii. 24, iv. 13 (Hifil). G prefers **וַתִּשְׁקָה**; cp. T **וַאֲשַׁקִּיתָהּ** (so G Σ J). Rather **וַתִּשְׁבְּבָהּ** (lx. 3).—M **הַתַּעֲשֶׂרְנָה**, surely not with **רַבַּת**? The general sense of the psalm requires **הַשְּׁעָרָה**. G nearly as M.

14. M **פָּלַג אֱלֹהִים כִּלְיָא מִיָּם**. This ought to mean a metaphorical stream defending Jerusalem, symbolic of the favour of Yahwè (cp. xlvi. 5?—Isa. xxxiii. 21). As the context now stands, we can only interpret it of the rain (cp. Job xxxviii. 28?—reading **טַל**); **בְּפָלַג** or (Ruben) **כִּפְלָג** would, however, be an improvement. But, as Grätz and Ruben have noticed, the context is not free from corruption. In accordance with analogy let us read **נִבְלְעוּ יְרַחֲמָאִלִים**. **מִלָּא**, **אֱלֹהִים**, **תִּכְוִן דְּגַגְגַּם** (מִלָּא), and **כִּיָּם** are all regular corruptions of 'ירח'.—M **דְּגַגְגַּם** **תִּכְוִן תִּכְוִנָּה**. Even if the blessings of agriculture are referred to, **דְּגַגְגַּם** is unexpected. Ruben **כְּזוֹנָה**; G *τῆς τροφῆς αὐτῶν*. Cp. G, 2 Chr. xi. 23. Read **נִכְרַת גְּאֻנָּם**. **כִּיָּכֹן ת'** is dittographic.

15. M תִּלְקִיָּה רִיָּה. An editorial adaptation of a miswritten correction ירחמאלים (see *l.* 14). The inf. absol. רִיָּה and נָחַת are unexpected. That נָחַת in the sense of 'washing down' is very strained. is pointed out by Hupfeld. Does such a Piel exist? See on xviii. 35.—M נָחַת נְדוּדָה, to which we must add בְּרִבִּיבִים. Read נָחַתוּ נְדוּדוֹת בְּרִבִּיבִים (cp. on רִבִּיבִים, lxxii. 6).—M תִּמוֹנְנָה, but G ἐφραθήσεται. Read probably וּמִשְׁכּוֹתֵיהֶם.

16. M צְמָחָהּ, תִּבְרַךְ. Read מִחֲצַת רַחֲבַת.—M עֲשֶׂרֶת יָשְׁנָה. An unexampled expression. If the ordinary view of the psalm be retained, we might read with Gr., עֲשֶׂרֶת, and with Herz תִּבְוֹאֶתָּהּ; we might perhaps omit שְׁרַת (so read for שְׁנָת) as a ditto-gram. But there is a better remedy for the faults of the text. Read אֲבִדְתָּ מִשְׁכַּנְתָּ צָרְפֶת.

17. M וּמִעֲנָלָיִךְ יִרְעֲפוּן דָּשֵׁן. The expression 'the paths of Yahwè' has been much admired. But it is strange that the figure should be so obscurely expressed. וּפְלָאִיךְ would be more natural (cp. *l.* 11, and Job xxix. 6). But the passage has been editorially manipulated. Read probably הִיכָלֵיהֶם נִשְׂרְפוּ בְּאֵשׁ.

18. ירעפו is dittographed. For נְאוֹת מְדַבֵּר read אֲרֻכְנוֹת מְצוּר. The rest of the stanza (and psalm?) is lost. What follows appears to be the composition of the editor, based on a string of names, ירחמאל, הגרים, ישמעאלים, &c. (as above), appended by a learned scribe in illustration of the circumstances referred to in the psalm. One is sorry to lose almost the only passage in which laughter is used as 'the symbol of innocent, refreshing hilarity of spirit' (cp. *Spectator*, Jan. 19, 1889).

PSALM LXVI.—I.

TRIMETERS. Certainly a 'new' or Messianic psalm, though 'Yahwè reigns' does not occur in the extant portion of our psalm. The title in G has been thought to imply that *z.* 9a was explained of the resurrection of the nation. This, however, is most unlikely. Any one could have seen that the image presented was not that of a dead body raised to life, but that of a living organism supernaturally protected amidst crushing pain and ordeals of fire and flood. Literally speaking, the painful purifying process is not yet ended, but faith supports itself by imagining the happy goal to have been reached. The poem is not original. Literary reminiscences or commonplaces abound. Cp. *z.* 1 with xevi. 1, xcvi. 4; *z.* 7^b with xi. 4, Prov. xv. 3, also Ps. lxxviii. 7, 19; *z.* 10 with Isa. xlvi. 10, Jer. ix. 7, Zech. xiii. 9, Mal. iii. 3 (see also notes). The Arabians, Ishmaelites, &c., are mentioned as representatives of Israel's foes. It is a part of the psalmists' eschatology that the survivors of the conquered nations will be won over to a sincere obedience to Yahwè.

lxvi.² is also in trimeters. It may have been written as an appendix to lxvi.¹, after the original close of that psalm had been lost, or if this closing portion was omitted by design, as a substitute for it. In the stress which it lays

upon sacrifices it reminds us of the brief appendix to Ps. li. (*zv. 20 f.*), which, by the way, may also very well be a substitute for the original close of that psalm. This will account for the absence of any description of the past affliction of the speaker. And who is the speaker? Surely not an individual; surely this is not a liturgical form for the special use of any pious Israelite who had vowed a sacrifice and came to the temple to fulfil his vow (Jacob, *ZAV*, xvii. [197], 68). That even Duhm should hold this improbable view, is strange. What individual could offer the large sacrifices described in *z. 15*? 'Probably the formula was variable,' says Duhm. This is altogether against sound criticism. The psalm fragment may indeed have been appropriated by individuals; and the bare possibility exists that individuals dealt freely with lines 5-9, omitting or altering (?) them. But it can only have been written for a Person capable of offering all the sacrifices here described, and that Person is the community of temple-worshippers (cp. Isa. i. 11). The passage is exactly parallel to xxii. 23-27, except that it is doubtful there whether the feast spoken of is partly material or wholly spiritual; also to Ps. cxvi. Certainly the persons addressed in the second stanza (seen in its emended form) are not merely the worshippers who had come to the temple to partake of a private sacrificial feast, but pious Jews everywhere; as in xxxiv. 12, the psalmist thinks of the wider audience reached by the written word. That 'my soul' can be said by the personified community is proved by Isa. xxvi. 9; Jer. iv. 31; Lam. i. 16; we need not therefore assume, with Beer, that the psalmist in *z. 16* distinguishes himself from the community.

Nor is it only on sacrifices that the psalmist lays stress; how indeed could this be? He is not, like the author of Ps. l., of the school of Jeremiah, but he regards sacrifices, not as mere forms, but as symbolic of obedience. 'Under the lips' of the speaker there is 'no guile' (cp. Isa. liii. 9^b). To obey the law of sacrifice and not the law of civil justice would be inconsistent with such a statement. In no single respect has the speaker been 'disloyal' to Yahwè's *b'èrith*. Had it been otherwise, God would have searched this out and punished it. But so far from this being the case, he has heard Israel's prayer; he has made good his plighted word (*ll. 17 f.*). Cp. Ps. xlv, 17-21.

LXVI.—I.

Deposited Marked: A song of praise.

		1
1	[Sing unto Yahwè a new song,] Shout unto Yahwè, all ye upon earth. Chant hymns to his glory, O ye of Ishmael ; Chant hymns, O ye of Jerahmeel.	2
	Say, Greatly hast thou exalted thyself ! All thy foes do homage unto thee ; The Arabians seek thee eagerly, The Ishmaelites chant hymns unto thee.	4
	Come ye and see his wonders—	5
10	+How+ terribly he dealt with the traitors ! The Ishmaelites and Hagarites were routed, The Arabians and the Jerahmeelites.	6
	He rules the peoples by his might ; His eyes keep watch over the nations ; Let the sufferers rejoice in him, Let the upright chant hymns unto God.	7

	Bless ye our God, O ye suffering ones,	8
	Make the sound of his praise to be heard,	
	Who has kept our soul in life,	9
20	And has not suffered our feet to tremble.	
	For thou, O God, hast proved us,	10
	Thou hast smelted us as they smelt silver ;	
	Thou broughtest us into the abyss,	11
	Thou didst put us in the depths of water ;	
	Thou didst lift up the head of our haters,	12
	* * * * *	
	Through fire and through water did we pass,	
	But thou broughtest us into an ample space.	

LXVI.—2.

1	I will enter thy house with burnt offerings,	13
	I will pay unto thee my vows,	
	Those which came forth from my lips,	14
	And my mouth uttered, when I was in straits.	
	Burnt offerings of fatlings will I bring up to thee,	15
	With [fat] of the kidneys of rams ; ^a	
	I will place bullocks [upon thine altar],	
	I will bring up lambs [and] he-goats.	
	Come, hearken, let me recount	16
10	What he has done for myself.	
	If I had cried unto him with my mouth,	17
	When under my lips was guile,	
	If in my heart had been no honesty,	18
	The Lord would not have hearkened [to my voice] ;	
	But God has hearkened,	19
	He has listened to the voice of my prayer.	
	Blessed be God, who has not withdrawn	20
18	His pledge of loving-kindness and faithfulness !	

7 f. Similar sympathetic language is found elsewhere (see on xviii. 45).

9. Cp. xlv. 9.—10. *With the traitors.* See on ix. 6.—14. *Keep watch* ; cp. Prov. xv. 3. Retribution, though delayed, is certain ; hence the summons to rejoice in *ll.* 15 f.—19 f. Cp. cxvi. 8.

21 f. **Hast proved us,** &c. Cp. xii. 7, xvii. 3, xxvi. 2.—23 f. Cp. lxix. 3.

27 f. **Fire** and **water** are images for the extremes of peril ; cp. Isa. xliii. 2. So *an ample space* means freedom and ease (xviii. 20).

Critical Notes. Title. G ἀναστάσεως = תְּחִיָּה, perhaps a corruption of תְּהִלָּה; cp. l. 18.

1 ff. Insert שִׁירוֹ לַיהוָה שִׁיר חֲדָשׁ (xcvi. 1); parallelism requires this. Here and elsewhere we must read יהוה for אלהים.—For כְּבוֹד־שָׁמוֹ, as in xxix. 2a, read כְּבוֹד יִשְׁמַעְאֵלִים. Cp. on l. 8.

4. M שִׁמוֹ, an error caused by the preceding שָׁמוֹ; but cp. also lxviii. 5. M's reading cannot be defended by Josh. vii. 19, Isa. xlii. 12, where לַיהוָה follows. Read, not שִׁירוֹ (Gr., Du.) nor שִׁיחוֹ (Perles), but זְמוֹרֵי (S); ז became ש, ר became י.—M כְּבוֹד תְּהִלָּתוֹ. Clearly something is amiss. Gr., We., Du. point כְּבוֹד. But 'the glory of his praise' is tautological. כְּבוֹד represents one of the current distortions of [רחמאלים]; תהלתו, too, probably represents 'רחמלי'.

5. M מַּה־נּוֹרָא; G ὡς φοβερά (plur.; a guess). Read (for לאלהים למה־נורא נִעְלִיתָ כִּי־אֵד (cp. xlvii. 10).

6. M G מִעֲשֵׂיךָ בְּרַב עֲוֹן. Clearly wrong. Read יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לְךָ צָרִיךְ. (transferred from τ. 4, corr. text, where it was dittographed; note Pasek).

7. M יִכַּחֲשׂוּ. Read יִשְׁחָרוּ (see on xviii. 45).—M אִיבִיךָ. Read עֲרַבִים (one of the regular corruptions or alterations).

8 ff. M's יִשְׁמַעְאֵלִים סֵלָה יִזְמְרוּ שְׂמוֹךְ סֵלָה comes from a dittographed יִשְׁמַעְאֵלִים.—M מִפְּעֻלוֹת אֱלֹהִים. Read נִפְלְאוֹתָיו.

10. M עַל־בְּנֵי אָדָם. There are perhaps some passages which favour the view that the Jews more and more regarded themselves as the true human kind, all else having become corrupt. But it would be neither in accordance with M's representation of the context nor with that given in our text to include this passage among them. Read עַל־בְּנֵי־אֱדָמִים (cp. lviii. 2).

11 f. M לִיבְשָׁה יָם | הִפְךָ יָם; so G. But, in accordance with xlvi. 9, we expect a reference to something of contemporary interest, and Pasek warns us to distrust the text. לִיבְשָׁה יָם conceals one tribal name, and בְּנֵהָר (M G) another. Read הִפְכוּ יִשְׁמַעְאֵלִים וְהַגְּדִים.—M יִעֲבְרוּ בְּרִנָּל. Read עֲרַבִים וִרְחַמְאֵלִים. עֲרַבִים has two beats.—On close of τ. 6 see next note.

13. M עוֹלָם; note preceding Pasek. G ἐν τῇ δυναστείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος αὐτοῦ. עוֹלָם never means 'the world' in Biblical Hebrew (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Eternal'), nor could the ideas of eternity and omniscience be combined in the same line. Read לְאֵמִים.

15. M שם נשמה בו (supported by G), at end of v. 6, as if referring to the crossing of the river, &c. Bâ. explains שם, 'on the occurrence of such events,' and regards the drying up of the sea and the crossing of the river on foot as symbolical expressions for frequently occurring manifestations of God's care for Israel. Duhm connects the words with נושם in the next verse, and alters שם into שמה (inf. abs.), but 'heals' the 'hurt' of the text too 'lightly.' Surely the passage is the missing line of the next quatrain, and should run עניים ישמחו בו (the נ in נשמה comes from עניים).

16. M אליריכו לכו סלה, הסוררים, which Duhm renders, 'rebels cannot lift themselves up' (*i.e.* triumph); the ה in הס is, of course, dittographed. The only modern scholar who has questioned סוררים is Street (1790). Both here and in lxviii. 7, 19 he gives ס the sense of 'exiles,' comparing סורה. Isa. xlix. 21, which, however is non-existent (see *SBOT. Isa.*, Heb., 145). Certainly 'rebels' is unsuitable to the context both here and in Ps. lxviii. לכו יריכו לכו (K. ירוכו) is also very improbable; where is the object? Note the warning Pasek. Read ישרים יזמרו אלהים אל, לכו, סלה, and סלה are all fragments (ס comes from ס) of אלהים.

17. M עמים; unsuitable. Note Pasek, and read עניים (ני = נו).

19 f. M השם: obscure. Read השמר (Gr.).—Read למוט (Hi., Du.); but cp. Kôn., *Synt.*, § 200c.

23. M בפיצודה; obscure. Read, not בפיצורה (Gr.; Σ πολιορκία), but בפיצולה (lxviii. 23, lxix. 3).—M שמת מועקה בכתנינו. Herz suggests מוצקה (cp. G S); but we should have expected הלחלה or שמתנו במועקתנו (cp. Isa. xxi. 2, Nah. ii. 11). Read almost certainly שמתנו במועקתנו. See exeg. note.

25. M הרפבת אנוש לראשנו. G ἐπιβιβασας; J *imposuisti*. The sense is not clear, nor is Isa. li. 23 phraseologically parallel. Read הרכות ראש לשנאינו (cp. lxxxix. 43a). The parallel line has dropped out.

28. M לרויה. G (εἰς ἀναψυχήν) and all the vss. presuppose לרוחה (cp. xviii. 20). See Bâ., *J. Prot. Th.*, '82, p. 641. So most moderns.

lxvi.⁽²⁾ 3. M אשר פצו שפתי. Is שפתי the subject or the object? At any rate, פצה is an unsuitable word, for it implies *inconsiderate* speech (Judg. xi. 35 f., Job xxxv. 16). Read, of course, אשר יצאו מִשְׁפְּתַי (cp. Judg. xi. 36).

5 ff. M **מִי־חַיִּים**. A non-existent word. Read **מְרִיאִים** (see *SBOT*; Heb. on Isa. v. 17 [Engl. ed. p. 83]).—Insert **הַלֵּב**, and for **קִטְרַת** read certainly **כְּלִיֹּת** (Isa. xxxiv. 6).—M **אֶעֱשֶׂה**. The context suggests **אֶשָּׂא** (Herz); cp. xcvi. 8. Insert **עַל־מִזְבֵּחַךְ**; cp. Isa. lx. 7.—M **עַם־עֲתוּדִים סֵלָה**. Read **כָּרִים וְעֲתוּדִים אֶעֱלֶה**; cp. again Isa. xxxiv. 6, and Ps. lxix. 32 (corr. text). **סֵלָה**, as so often, replaces a word of the original text. **ע** and **ס** are often confounded.

11 f. M **אֱלֹוֹי אֱלֹוֹי פִּי־קָרָאתִי וְרוּחִם תַּחַת לְשׁוֹנֵי**. Read **אֱלֹוֹי [אִם] אֱלֹוֹי וּמְרַמָּה ת' ל' אֵין**, taking over **אֵין** from next verse. See also Ruben, *Crit. Remarks*, 18).

13 f. M **אֵין אִם־רָאִיתִי בְּלִבִּי**. A most improbable use of **רָאָה**. Read **אִם אֵין יֵשֶׁר בְּלִבִּי**.—Insert **קוֹלִי** (Bi.); metre.

17 f. Omit **אֶשֶׁר**.—M **תַּפְלַתִּי**. Read, not **תַּחֲנַנְתִּי** (Du.), but **בְּרִית**. The corruption is analogous to that of **קִטְרַת** from **כְּלִיֹּת**.—M **וְחִסְדּוֹ כִּי־אֲתִי**. Read **חִסְדּוֹ וְאִמְתּוֹ**. A self-evident but quite overlooked correction.

PSALM LXVII.

TRIMETERS. An anticipation of the full sovereignty of Yahwè. The psalm consists of three strophes; (2) and (3) have an initial refrain. In *ll.* 1-3 there is an echo of part of the high-priestly blessing (*Num.* vi. 24 f.).

Deposited. For the Ishmaelites. Marked.

		1
1	Let [Yahwè] our God have pity upon us,	2
	Let him bless us and have compassion upon us,	
	Let him make his face to shine upon us,	
	That thy way may be known upon earth,	3
	Thy deliverance among all nations !	
	Let the peoples give thanks to thee, O Yahwè !	4
	Let the peoples, all of them, give thanks to thee,	
	Let the nations rejoice with loud acclaim,	5
	For thou wilt rule the peoples justly,	
10	And lead them in the right paths.	
	Let the peoples give thanks unto thee, O Yahwè !	6
	Let the peoples, all of them, give thanks unto thee,	
	[For] righteously thou wilt judge the world.	
	Let Yahwè our God bless us,	
	And let all the ends of the earth revere him !	

1 f. Read יהוה אלהינו (l. 14).—Insert וירחמינו; G (Sc.A-B-a) καὶ ἐλεῆσαι ἡμᾶς.

10. M בארץ, ולאמים. Parallelism is wanting. בארץ is otiose; the suffix in תנהם is unnecessary. Note Pasek, and read וּבְמַעְנֵי צֶדֶק (xxiii. 3). ארץ and צדק are liable to confusion (like חזק and צדק).

13 f. M ארץ נתנה יבולה. Miserably poor. It is usual to compare lxxxv. 13^b, but (1) v. 13^a prepares for *b*, and (2) v. 13 is an interpolation. The text is corrupt. Read כִּי־צֶדֶק תָּרִין תִּבֶל (xcvi. 13, xcvi. 9).—Omit second יברכנו אלהים (dittogram).

PSALM LXVIII.

PSALMS lxxviii.⁽¹⁾ and lxxviii.⁽²⁾ are in different metres, the one consisting of trimeters, the other of tetrameters. Both, however, are composed of pentads, and from the many points of affinity between the two poems we may assume that the second was written as a supplement to the first. The main idea of both poems is the near termination of Israel's misery and the reestablishment of the divine kingdom on Mount Zion. It is the retrospect in lxxviii.⁽¹⁾ which is referred to when the second poet speaks of the 'recounting of all Yahwè's wonders' and the praising of Yahwè as the 'Marshal of Israel' (ll. 11-20). The 'wonders' are the progress of Yahwè at the head of his people from Edom to Mount Zion, which is regarded as a type of the restoration of the Jewish exiles from captivity in Edom, and of Yahwè's second and definitive occupation of the holy mount of Zion (cp. xxiv. 7-10). Special use is made of the song in Judg. v., whose reputed author (Deborah) is apparently referred to as a 'prophetess.'

With regard to the date of Ps. lxxviii. (or rather, one ought to say, of lxxviii.⁽²⁾) it has been thought that the mention of 'Bashan' in v. 23, of the four tribes which correspond to the two provinces of the Palestinian Jewry in v. 28, of the 'beast of the reeds' and of the 'quarrelsome peoples' in v. 31 point to some part of the Greek period, viz. either the period of the havoc wrought in Palestine by the first Ptolemy (B.C. 320?) or one of the later periods (between 220 and 217 or between 203 and 198 B.C.) when the prospect of the downfall of Ptolemaean rule may have excited Messianic expectations (see *OP*, 192). Wellh. (*Skizzen*, vi. 177) and Smend (*Rel.-gesch.*⁽²⁾, 265, 368) even think of the age of Judah the Maccabee (cp. 1 Macc. v.), while Duhm regards our psalm as a celebration of the enterprises of Alexander Jannæus (B.C. 104-78). According to the traditional text the two first-mentioned views appear to be the most tenable. W. R. Smith, however, thought it safer not to rely on these supposed historical indications, and inclined (doubtfully) to refer Ps. lxxviii. to the time of the overthrow of the Persian empire (*OZ/C*⁽²⁾, 440). All that we can say is that the Jerahmeelite or Edomite oppression was not yet over, that the temple was rebuilt, and that pious temple-worshippers were looking out for a speedy divine interposition to complete what was lacking in Israel's deliverance. Among the phraseological parallelisms in lxxviii.⁽²⁾, observe especially v. 23 and Zech. x. 10. Isa. xxvii. 13; v. 24 and Isa. lxiii. 1, 3, 6; *zz*. 29, 31 and passages in Pss. xxii. and xlii.-xliii., and of course note the connexion between Part ii. and Judg. v.

Dr. J. P. Peters, who has already recognized the composite character of the psalm, assumes a considerable interval between the component parts of the work (*New World*, ii. [96], p. 301). There is, from our point of view, no valid reason for such a theory. The imitative style of Ps. lxxviii.⁽¹⁾, and its view of Israel as God's poor (note the phrase 'the orphans,' ll. 11, 30 ff.) exclude a pre-exilic date, while Ps. lxxviii.⁽²⁾, which presupposes lxxviii.⁽¹⁾, has late characteristics of its own in abundance.

LITERATURE (A SELECTION).

Ed. Reuss, *Der 68 Ps., ein Denkmal exegetischer Noth u. Kunst* ('51).

Ch. Bruston, *Un chant de guerre du temps de Josué* ('66).

J. P. N. Land, 'Drie Psalmen verklaard,' *Theol. Tijdschr.*, '72, 540 ff.

J. Grill, 'Der achtundsechzigste Psalm' ('83).

J. Halévy, 'Le Ps. lxxviii,' *Rev. des études juives*, xix. ('89), 1-16.

A. Hilgenfeld, 'Die Schlacht bei Issos im A. T.,' *Zt. f. wiss. Th.* xxx. ('86), 91 ff.

J. W. Pont, *Ps. lxxviii. Eene exegetisch-kritische Studie* ('87).

Isid. Loeb, *La Littérature des Pauvres* ('92), 69, n. 5.

M. Noordtzij, *De 68ste en de 16de psalm vertaald en verklaard* (1900).

LXVIII.—I.

Deposited. Of 'Arab-Ethan. Marked. 1

Part I.

- 1 Yahwè arises, his enemies scatter, 2
 Before him his haters flee,
 Like smoke which [the wind] dispels; 3
 As wax melts before the fire,
 +So+ perish the wicked before Yahwè;
 But let the righteous rejoice, exult, 4
 Before Yahwè let them triumph in +their+ joy:
 Sing unto Yahwè, chant unto him, 5
 Praise him who rides upon the clouds,
 10 Glorify Yahwè, exult before him.
 A father of the orphans and the sojourners 6
 Is God in his holy habitation;
 Yahwè makes the outcasts his house-mates, 7
 He brings forth the prisoners according to his righteousness;
 Surely the upright shall dwell in his courts.

Part II.

- ¹When thou wentest forth before thy people, 8
 When thou marchedst from the highlands of Aram,
 The earth quaked, the heavens swayed to and fro,² 9
 [The clouds also dropped water,]
 20 At thy presence, O God of Israel.
 With the treasures of heaven [above] 10
 Thou didst bless thine inheritance, O Yahwè,
 And all that it contained thou madest ready:
 With thy corn they were satisfied therein, 11
 In thy goodness thou didst prepare for the people.

¹ O Yahwè.

² At the presence of God, this Sinai.

- Yahwè gave a prophetess 12
 Who brought glad tidings of great booty :
 ' Kings of armies [have fled,] 13
 The Lord [has succoured] his beloved ones ;
 30 His dove shall divide the spoil.
- ' Though she dwells among the ashmounds, 14
 Her wings will he overlay with silver,
 And her pinions with gold ;
 In the pavilion of the kings shalt thou sit, 15
 [O folk of Naphtali] and Zebulon.'
- O mountain of Jerahmeel, mountain of Cushan, 16
 O mountain of Gebalon, mountain of Cushan,
 Wherefore skippest thou, O mountain of Gebalon, 17
 Because of the mount wherein Yahwè would fain dwell,
 40 Yea, wherein Yahwè will for ever abide ?
- The league of the Jerahmeelites thou hast scattered, 18
 The clans of Cushan at Kadesh ;
 Thou hast gone up to the height of the Jebusite, 19
 Hast allotted the castles of Jerahmeel ;
 Surely +there+ the upright shall abide.

LXVIII.—2.

- 1 Blessed be Yahwè, +even+ God, our redeemer, 20
 Yahwè hath delivered us, the God who is our succour, 21
 It is he who gives great might to his people ;
 Surely, God shatters the prince of the Arabians, 22
 Yea, the leader of Seir who rages in his guilt.
- The Lord said, From Cushan I will restore [thee], 23
 I will restore [thy sons] from Mişsur and Teman,
 That thou mayest trample on the palaces of Aram ; 24
 10 That thou mayest tread with thy feet on the castles of the
 Arabians.
- * * * * *
- They recount all thy wonders, O Yahwè, 25
 They praise thee, O my God, O my king, in the sanctuary !
 Princes go before, minstrels follow,
 In the midst of damsels playing on timbrels and dancing.
- * * * * *

- Within his temple they bless God, 27
 They extol Yahwè, the Marshal of Israel,
 The princes of little Benjamin, +God's+ beloved ones, 28
 The princes of great Judah, the blameless ones,
 20 The princes of Zebulun, the princes of Naphtali.
 Give charge, O Yahwè, to thy faithfulness and thy loving-
 kindness, 29
 Let them, O God, preserve that which thou hast wrought
 for us.
 Do thou quell the wild beasts of pointed horns, 31
 The troop of wild oxen, the mighty lions,
 Do thou scatter the peoples that delight to quarrel.
 Let all the Ishmaelites kneel to thee, 30
 Let the Jerahmeelites bring thee tribute,
 Let the Zarephathites do homage with store of silver, 31b, 32
 Let Cushites and Mişrites make offerings of gold,
 30 * * * * *
 O ye kingdoms of the earth, sing ye unto God, 33
 [Praise Yahwè!] chant hymns unto Yahwè!
 Praise him who rides on the heights of the skies, 34
 [Glorify Yahwè, exult before him],
 When he utters his voice, lo, the earth is in pain.
 Ascribe prevailing might to Israel's God, 35
 Whose majesty and prevailing might reach the skies.
 Majestic is Yahwè in his holy dwelling, 36
 It is he who gives great might to his people,
 40 Blessed be Yahwè, the Redeemer of Israel.

1 f. Alluding to Num. x. 35.—4. Cp. Mic. i. 4.—5. *The wicked*; see on ix. 5, lviii. 11.—9. *Rides upon the clouds*. Cp. xviii. 11, civ. 3, Isa. xix. 1.—11, 13, 14. A series of figurative terms for Israel. *Orphans and sojourners*; cp. x. 14, xciv. 6. *Prisoners*; as lxix. 34, lxxix. 11, cii. 21, cvii. 10. Cp. also cxlvii. 2, 'outcasts of Israel.'

16-20. Imitating Judg. v. 4 f. Yahwè leads forth his people from Sinai, which is to be placed in the neighbourhood of Kadesh, in the highlands of Jerahmeel (cp. II. 36 f.). In Judg. v. 4 it is probably best to read

כַּמְצוֹר, 'from Missur,' and מִשְׂדֵּה אֲרָם, 'from the highland of Aram

(Jerahmeel).' See *Enc. Bib.*, 'Field,' 'Moses,' 'Sinai.' See Moore on Judg. v. 4. He denies that v. 4 can refer to Mt. Sinai or Horeb, Horeb. at an rate, being in the land of Midian.

21. Cp. Dt. xxxiii. 13. The 'treasures of heaven' are rain and dew.

26 ff. Here begins a scene from the early warfare of Israel. The restoration is only probable. The *prophetess* is Deborah. The *glad tidings* are those of the victory described in Judg. v. *His dove*—not the 'mother of Sisera'—*shall divide the spoil*. According to MT, תְּהַלֵּק, being || to יִדְרוֹן, must refer to the

past. This, however, does not suit **נִבְשָׁרֹת**. Duhm, therefore, makes **נִבְשָׁרֹת** historical. But 'the great host of **נִבְשָׁרֹת**' (so MT, Du., &c.) seems rather neglected by him, and the address which he supposes to **אֲדֹנָי** ('O Lord') is unexpected. *His dove*: a term of endearment (Cant. ii. 14), adopted by later writers for Israel (cp. *Enc. Bib.*, 'Jonah, Book of,' § 3¹¹): C. II. H. Wright, *Biblical Essays*, 45.

31. **The ashmounds.** The *mazbala* is meant—the place outside the Arab villages where the dung and other rubbish is thrown. Cp. Wetstein in Del.'s *Job* (Germ. ed., 62). Cp. cxiii. 7.—32 f. The *overlaying* of the dove's wings with silver and gold may be illustrated by 2 S. ii. 24. 'ye daughters of Israel, weep for Saul . . . who decked your raiment with gold.'

34 f. **Pavillon** (Jer. xliii. 10): on **שְׁפָרַי** see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Pavilion.'—*Naphtali and Zebulun*; cp. Judg. v. 18.

36 f. **The mountain of Jerahmeel, of Cushan, of Gebalon,** are most probably alternative designations for the sacred mountain of Sinai or Horeb. The idea of the later Jews apparently was that Yahwè transferred his abode from Horeb (refusing to dwell any longer beside those who injured and oppressed his people) to Zion. This makes a good connexion with the next stanza. The confusion between 'Lebanon,' the great northern mountain-ranges, and 'Gebalon,' the mountain-ranges of Jerahmeel and Edom, seems to have obscured the meaning of several passages in the O.T. Hiram, for instance, is represented as having a free hand in Lebanon; but 'Hiram' is a corruption of 'Jerahmeel,' and 'Tyre' (**צָר**) of Mišsur (**מִצְרָר**). This king was lord of the Negeb, and had command of the mountains of the far south of Palestine, not of Lebanon. But see also on xxix. 5 f.

41 f. **The league of the Jerahmeelites and the clans of Cushan** are the enemies who were conquered, according to the original form of the tradition in Judg. iv., at the southern Kadesh (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Sisera').

43 ff. Cp. xxiv. 7, 9, 'ye portals of Jerahmeel.' The original population

of Jerusalem was represented as Jerahmeelite (on text of 2 S. v. 6, 8, see *Crit. Bib.*); Isaiah, in xxix. 1 f., 7, probably called Jerusalem, not 'Ariel,' but 'Jerahmeel' (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Loruhamah'). The ascent of Yahwè to the 'height' refers to the transference of the ark to the city of David (2 S. vi.). The *height*, **בֵּירוֹם**, i.e. Zion, as Jer. xxxi. 12, Ezek. xvii. 23, xx. 40. See crit. note.—**שָׁכֵן** used absolutely, as cii. 29; cp. l. 40.

lxviii.⁽²⁾ 4 f. Cp. ex. 5 f. No hint of any change in the usual political horizon of the psalmists.—6 ff. *The Lord said.* Alluding to Zech. x. 10, which appears originally to have run, 'and I bring them out of the land of Mizrim, and out of Asshur (Geshur) will I gather them'; Isa. xxvii. 13, 'and they shall come who were lost in the land of Asshur (Geshur), and who were outcasts in the land of Mizrim.'—9. *Castles.* Cp. ix. 7 (note); xlix. 12.

11. **Wonders** usually means Yahwè's great deeds in history (e.g. xl. 6, lxxviii. 4, 11, cvii. 8, 15, &c.). In ix. 2, however, the (anticipated) overthrow of Israel's hated foes, the Jerahmeelites, is included among the 'wonders' for which the psalmist gives thanks. It may be so here, still it is a sufficient explanation to suppose a reference to such great events in the remote past as are described in lxviii.⁽¹⁾

13 ff. A procession is described. First come the tribal chiefs; in the next stanza those of Benjamin, Judah, Zebulun, and Naphtali are mentioned—the two latter simply in order to connect the present with the past, Naphtali and Zebulun having been foremost in the ancient battle referred to in lxviii.⁽¹⁾ (l. 35). Next come the minstrels, surrounded by damsels who play the part of Miriam and her companions; cp. Ex. xv. 20, 'with timbrels and with dances.'

17. **The Marshal of Israel.** Cp. Isa. xxxiii. 22 (Ps. lxxxi. 5).—18, 19. *Beloved ones*, cp. Dt. xxxiii. 12.—*Blameless ones*, i.e. faithful to God's law (cxix. 1).

21. **Give charge to**, &c., alluding to xlii. 9 (and || passages); cp. xliv. 5, cxxxiii. 3.

23 f. **Wild beasts of pointed horns**, &c., alluding to xxii., ll. 26,

37 f.; xxxv. ll. 22 ff. In all these passages the fierce Jerahmeelites or Edomites are referred to. Indeed, **יִרְחַמְאֵלִים** suggests **רְאֵמִים**.

25. **That delight to quarrel.** It is not the Ptolemies and the Seleucidae who are referred to, but the N. Arabian populations — 'men of strife' (xxxv. 19); cp. cxx. 7.—26—29.

Cp. lxxii. 9 f., lxxvi. 19—22, and see crit. note.

31 ff. Full of this happy prospect, the poet calls upon all nations to join him in a song of praise.—*On the heights of the skies.* Cp. lxxiii.⁽¹⁾, l. 9, Dt. xxxiii. 26, Isa. xiv. 14.

38. **Majestic; נֹרָא** in such a context is more than 'terrible' (lxvi. 3, 5; Ex. xv. 11).

Critical Notes. 1. Read **יָקָם**. So G (Vg. J). Hence the Wycliffite version, 'God rise up, and his enemies be scattered; and they that hate him flee from his face. As smoke faileth, fail they; as wax flecteth from the face of fire, so perish sinners from the face of God.' Cp. the opening of lxvii. The sense is far finer thus. **יָקָם**, 'will arise,' is cold by comparison.

3. M **בְּהַגְדָּךְ**, *i.e.* the choice is left open between **בְּהַגְדָּךְ** and **בְּנִדְרָךְ** (Kön. ii. 554). **תִּגְדָּךְ** is more difficult. J. W. Pont corrects it into **מִפְּנֵי רוּחַ**; so after him We. Just possible, but not probable. Beyond doubt **תִּגְדָּךְ** comes from **תִּדְפְּנֵנוּ**; **הַנְדָּךְ** is a dittogram. Read **בְּעֵשֶׂן תִּדְפְּנֵנוּ [רוּחַ]**.

1, 5, 7, 8, 10, 16, 20, &c., restore **יְהוָה** for **אֱלֹהִים**, or, sometimes, for metre's sake, **יָהּ**.—7. Read **יִשְׁשׁוּ** (without **וְ**); cp. G.—8. Read **זִמְרוּהוּ**. M's **שָׁמוּ** is a corrupt dittogram of **זָמְרוּ**; cp. on lxvi. 2.

9 f. For **סִלְּוָךְ לְרִיב** read **הִלְלוּ רִיב** (cp. on lxviii.⁽²⁾, l. 33). **סִלְּוָךְ** ('cast up a way') is unsuitable (see S T). **ב** is dittographed. For **עֲרֵבוֹת** read probably **עַל־עֲבוֹת**. For **שָׁמוּ בֵּיתָה שְׁמוֹ** read **שָׁבוּ יָהּ** (**יָהּ** absorbed). Krochmal corrects 'ש' **ב** into **הַשָּׁמַיִם** (following T's interpretation of **עֲרֵבוֹת**); Abbott into **בִּישְׁכֵּן** (a gloss). Gr. reads **בָּרוּךְ שָׁמוּ**. Bp. Hare, and long after him Reifmann, Dy., Hilgenf. read **בֵּיתָה שְׁמוֹ**.

11. M **וּדְרֵי אֱלֹהִים**. This makes the line a tetrameter; **דֵּין** only occurs again in 1 S. xxiv. 16, and is improbable. To a practised eye **אֱלֹהִים** is only a corrupt form of **בְּמַעַן** (l. 12). **וּדְרֵי** must represent a second plural to **יְתוֹמִים**. Read **וְנָגִידִים** (cp. xciv. 6), omitting **אֱלֹהִים**.

13 f. I return to M's reading **מְנוּשֵׁב** (Ol., Lag., Du., &c., **מְנוּשֵׁב**); see l. 15. Point **בֵּיתָה**, and for **יְהוּדִים** read **נְדָחִים** (2 S. xiv. 13). **יְהוּדִים** cannot mean 'desolate' (see on xxv. 16); so independently Herz. For **בְּפִשְׁרוֹת** read **בְּצִדְקָתוֹ**. M's reading is not very suitable,

and is an Aramaism (see *ZAT*, i. [81], 131).—M's אֲדָרִי־סוֹרְרִים יִשְׁכְּנוּ has caused much trouble, and צְהִיחָה is a *ἀπ. λεγ.* (G S, 'grave,' whence S. Rau, 1764, inferred צְהִיחָה¹). Read אֲדָרִי־יִשְׁרָיִם יִשְׁכְּנוּ הַצְרִי.

16. Omit אֱלֹהִים (metre).

17. For בִּישִׁימוֹן (a corruption of מִישִׁמְעֵאל) read either מִשְׁדָּה אֲרָם or מִשׁ אֲדוּם . אֲרָם is preferable (see exeg. note).

18 f. For נָטְפוּ read נָטְפוּ (Loeb); see Judg. v. 4, corrected text. From the same source insert נִשְׁמְעֵי־נְטָפֵי נַיִם. Omit מִפְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים מִפְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים, introduced by a scribe from an already interpolated form of the Song of Deborah (cp. Moore's comm.). Observe Patek after רִיעֵשָׁה. The MS was imperfect, and the scribe who, in obedience to the note סֵלָה (rather לִישָׁלֵם), supplemented it from Judg. v., did not choose quite the right words. (Or is not סֵלָה here, as in other cases, from יִרְחֵמָאֵל?).

20. Read מִפְּנֵיךָ, and omit אֱלֹהִים (metre).

21 f. M גִּשְׁמֵם גְּדֻבּוֹת, 'a rain of generosity' (cx. 3²), referring to the manna (Ps. lxxviii. 24; Kenn., Ol., Hu.) or to literal rain (Hitz., Che., Bā., Kön., Du)? In either case, the expression is improbable, and considering that much besides in the stanza is suspicious, and that we have to get a clear and connected view of the stanza as a whole, correction of the text is indispensable. Read מִמְּגֵדֵי יִשְׁמִים [מֵעַל]; a quotation from Dt. xxxiii. 13. גִּשְׁמֵם became מִשְׁמֵם: hence arose גִּשְׁמֵם (ג for מ, as in Isa. lix. 10). מִמְּגֵדֵי became גְּדֻבּוֹת: hence גְּדֻבּוֹת מֵעַל dropped out. Singularly enough גִּשְׁמֵם is at once a corruption and an explanation, like מִטָּל in Dt. (see Di.). For תִּתֵּן read, not תִּתֵּן (Lag., Gr., Now., Du.), but תִּתְּנֶךָ (cp. Dt. *l.c.*).

23 ff. Superficial corrections are useless. For וּנְלָאָה read וּנְלָאָה (Krochm., Gr.), and for הִתְּנָךְ (surely not='thy band') read לְחִתְּנָךְ: Canaan is called אֶרֶץ לְחָם, Isa. xxxvi. 17: cp. Gen. xli. 54. For יִשְׁבּוּ and לְעֵנִי read יִשְׁבְּעוּ (Ps. cxl. 14) and לְעֵם² (Gr.). Omit אֱלֹהִים, a variant to אֲדָנִי.

26 ff. This stanza can no doubt be translated, but not satisfactorily. The chief difficulties are (a) אֲמַר, (b) מִבְּשָׂרוֹת, (c) יָדָדוּ (twice), (d) נֹת־בַּיִת. (a) Promise? Song of triumph? (b) A 'host' of singing women? (c) The archaic affirmative? Why twice? (d) Does a word

¹ Mentioned by Moore, *Judges*, p. 266, note [.

² So also lately Du.; Gr. is unmentioned.

נוֹה, נוֹה exist? If so, what does it mean? *Hausfrau* is too bold. No ancient interpreter found this sense (G *ὠραιότητι*; J *fulchritudo*). Utilizing all the letters of the text, and applying the usual methods, read perhaps thus,—

נְבִיאָה נָתַן אֱלֹהִים
 מִבְּשֶׁרֶת בָּצַע רָב
 [בְּרָחוּ] כִּלְכִי צְבָאוֹת
 [הוֹשִׁיעַ] אֲדָנִי יִדְרוּ
 וַיִּזְנְתוּ תַּחֲלֹד שָׁלָל

In *l.* 1 either אֲדָנִי or אֲמִר must represent some fem. substantive, to which מִבְּשֶׁרֶת (sing.) refers. אֱלֹהִים is so often corrupted that we shall do best to suppose אֲמִר with the following ה to represent אֱלֹהִים, and to seek an underlying fem. subst. in אֲדָנִי. The larger context suggests 'Deborah a prophetess' (Judg. iv.) as the person intended: read נְבִיאָה. נָתַן for יָתַן is due to Gr. So also Herz, who observes that נִ precedes. He also proposes אֲמִירָה מִבְּשֶׁרֶת, but בִּשְׂר implies a human agent. צְבָא רָב has not been questioned. But the context requires בָּצַע רָב (cp. Judg. v. 19). בְּרָחוּ easily fell out after רָב; some verb seems to be required, for one of the two יִדְרוּ is surely יִדְרוּ; cp. G *τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ*. The second יִדְרוּ must surely come from אֲדָנִי; the true verb should be either הוֹשִׁיעַ or some synonym. Reading וַיִּזְנְתוּ (cp. Cant. ii. 14) we obtain a connexion with the next stanza. בֵּית (נֵית) is dittographed. Gr., however, יִזְנְתוּ בֵּית.

31 ff. Scarcely any sound work has been done on this stanza, and yet under methodical treatment it yields up its secret. The key to the main difficulties is to be found in Judg. v. 16. where render, 'Why sittest thou among the ash-mounds (reading as p. 292, *l.* 5), to hear the mockery of the Arabians (שִׁרְקַת עֲרָבִים),' and *l.* 18. where Zebulun and Naphtali are eulogized for their heroism. The riddles of *ll.* 33, 34 are solved by remembering two of the very commonest sources of error in transcription. repetition and transposition of letters. Read:—

31 אִסְדֹּתֶי שָׁכַב בֵּין שְׂפָתַיִם
 32 כְּנַפְיָהּ יַחֲפֶה בַּפֶּסֶף
 33 וְאַבְרֹתֶיהָ בְּחָרוּן
 34 בְּשִׁפְרִיר כִּלְכִים תִּישַׁב
 35 [עַם נִפְתָּלִי] וּזְבֻלוֹן

In *l.* 31 בֵּין תִּשְׁכַּבְבִּין was originally בֵּין תִּשְׁכַּבְבִּין dittographed). Almost

so Gr. (he reads תשכן). M's שִׁפְתַיִם is certainly wrong, so far as the dual goes. Probably we should read שִׁפְתַיִם or אִשְׁפַּתוֹת would be more correct (cp. Kön. iiα, 184, top), but since the true text in Judg. v. 16 is probably צִפְתַיִם (Zephathites), it is hazardous to alter the ending. Probably the late psalmist took שִׁפְתַיִם to mean 'ash-mounds'; cp. cxiii. 7. In l. 32 יונה seems to be a (correct) gloss. The נ became dittographed in נחפה; the subject of יחפה is of course 'Yahwè.' בִּירְקֶק (with greenish or yellowish) will surely not do. בִּירְקֶק comes from חר in הרוץ twice repeated in error. In l. 34 M's בְּפָרֵשׁ שְׂדֵי is unsuitable. 'Shaddai' does not occur elsewhere in Ps. lxxviii., nor at all in Judg. v.; פֶּרֶשׁ means 'to spread out.' It would seem that some letters of the text must have dropped out owing to the operation of the opposite to the dittographic principle. The above restoration is suggested by Judg. v. 18. Of earlier corrections the most plausible is Krochmal's צִלְמֵיִת זַלְמוֹן derived from T. Duhm ('like snow on Zalmon') overlooks the dubious character of 'Zalmon' in Judg. ix. 48; so also does Lagarde (בְּהַר הַשְּׁלֵג = 'on Hermon,' opposed to 'on Zalmon'). See 'Zalmon,' *Enc. Bib.*

36 f. For אלהים read ירחמאל. The 'mount of God,' acc. to the poet, is Zion. Indeed, הַר אֱלֹהִים, a title applied to Horeb (Ex. iii. 1, &c.), is probably a corruption of הַר ירחמאל. For בִּישָׁן (unexpected and difficult) read פִּישָׁן. G's ὄρος πῖον (*i.e.* הַר דֶּשֶׁן; G xxii. 13), gives no help. Read גְּבֻלוֹן (see on xxix. 5f.) for גְּבֻנְגִים (twice) G ὄρος τετυρωμένον, ὄρη τετυρωμένα ('Α ὄφρυωμένα). גְּבֻנָּן is supposed to mean a conical peak with a flattened top (Wetzstein). Del. imagines a contrast between the sombre majesty of the boldly formed rocks of the Bashan mountain-range and the softer formation of the porous limestone rock of Zion. This is highly precarious. The form גְּבֻנָּן too is uncertain; and even apart from this we have no reason to expect such a peculiar phrase. Nor is it probable that the psalmist would have chosen the mountains of Bashan rather than the sacred mountains of the south (Horeb or Sinai was originally placed in the Negeb) as rivals to Zion. Read הַר הַנֶּנֶב. The final נ should be attached to הַר.—For תִּרְצָדֹן, a ἄπ. λεγ., hazardously explained from the Arabic, read תִּרְקָדֹן (cxiv. 4, Kā), with Gr., Loeb, or rather, for metre and for consistency with l. 36, תִּרְקָד, with הַר גְּבֻלוֹן.

41 ff. The traditional text of ττ. 18, 19 is unintelligible. G begins τὸ ἄρμα τοῦ θεοῦ μυριοπλάσιον, χιλιάδες εἰθηρούοντων. רַבְתַּיִם 'many myriads'? So Kautzsch (*Theol. LZ*, '84, p. 131; Ges.²⁰¹, § 97*h*), who thinks that אֶלְפֵי שְׁנָאן (for יִשְׁנִין) is a gloss which decides רַבְתַּיִם to

be in sense multiplicative, not dual. But שנין does not occur, and the ancients had a different text. G read שְׁאַנְנִים; 'A S presuppose שְׁאַן, which Bā. even adopts ('Tausende lauten Getümmels'). Kön., We., &c. agree with Kautzsch as to שְׁנֵאן, but Lag., Nestle, Bi., Hilgenf. read יִשְׂרָאֵל, Gr. ישורון; cp. Num. x. 36. Clearly we should read פּוֹשֵׁן.

The closing words of v. 18 are a *crux interpretum*; G translates, but does not interpret (*ὁ κύριος ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐν Σινα, ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ*). The correction בַּא מְסִינִי (Pott, Ol., Kau., We., &c.), cp. Dt. xxxiii. 2, is too superficial. The hardest word to correct is רבתים, but when the rest of the passage has been set in order, a possible correction will occur. אדני במ is almost certainly a corruption of ירחמאלים, which in turn is a correction of אלהים (cp. on l. 36).—G continues, *ἀναβὰς εἰς ὕψος ἡχμαλώτευσας αἰχμαλωσίαν. ἔλαβες δύματα ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ, καὶ γὰρ ἀπειθοῦντες τοῦ κατασκηνώσαι*; but S in the last line makes Yahwè the subject—*ἔτι καὶ ἐν ἀπειθοῦσι κατασκηνώσαι*. שְׁבִי שְׁבִית שְׁבִי satisfies neither sense nor metre. מִתְּנוֹת is not used elsewhere for 'tribute' (cp. S T, and Eph. iv. 8), and בְּאֶרְם after לְקַחַת is very improbable. We might indeed read בְּאֶרְכָּה, with Gr., but the rest of the stanza is so corrupt that we cannot safely accept this. What can be the meaning of וְאֶף סוֹרְרִים לְשֹׁכֵן יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים? Observe the warning Pasek. The versions give no help. לֹא שִׁכְנו (Land, Dys., We., Du., after S) is suggested by a too optimistic view of M in v. 7. We have the key, however, and know that the Jerahmeelites are still referred to; יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים is a corruption of ירחמאלים. For וְאֶף סוֹרְרִים read אֶף יִשְׂרָיִם (cp. l. 15), and for לְשֹׁכֵן read יִשְׁכְּנו. לְקַחַת should probably be חֲלַקַת (so Morinus, on account of the *ἔδωκεν* of Eph. iv. 8). It is now time to emend the improbable רבתים; a verb is required, read בְּנִרְתָּ. The whole stanza may be restored nearly thus:—

חֲבֵר יִרְחַמְאֵלִים בְּנִרְתָּ
 אֶלְפֵי כּוֹשֵׁן בְּקֶדֶשׁ
 עֲלִיתָ לְמָרוֹם יְבוֹסִי
 חֲלַקַת אֶרְמְנוֹת יִרְחַמְאֵל
 אֶף יִשְׂרָיִם יִשְׁכְּנו

lxviii.² 1. For אדני read יהוה, and for the first יום (note Pasek) read אלהים (see on xcv. 7). The second יום is a dittogram. In ס יענים, ס is a dittographed מ יענ; = אימ = אלהים, the לה having been expelled by לנו which follows. לנו itself is a fragment of גְּאֲלָנו; Schlögl, יענים יעלנו, not keen enough. הַאֵל יִשְׁעָתָנו, which follows in MT, is misplaced. סלה is a corruption of אלהים, which should stand at the head of l. 2; read, however, יהוה.

2 f. M האל לנו. Read probably הַצִּילֵנו. The improbable לְמוֹשָׁעוֹת should be יְשׁוּעָתָנו; it was corrupted under the influence of לְכוֹת תּוֹצְאוֹת, itself doubtless corrupt. וְלִיהוֹה אֲדָנִי is non-existent in genuine Hebrew. The four other *supposed* occurrences are *ex.* 21, *exl.* 8, *cxli.* 8, *Hab.* iii. 19. The true text of *Ps.* 21*b* can be recovered by the help of the corrupt word לְמוֹשָׁעוֹת, which does duty both for יְשׁוּעָתָנו and for תַּעֲצָמוֹת. לְעָמוֹ לְעָמוֹ was miswritten לְמוֹ (cp. *xxviii.* 8). Then a mark of abbreviation was imagined (לְמוֹ)—the reverse of the error in *Isa.* liii. 8. The words underlying לִיהוֹה אֲדָנִי will now be clear. Read *ll.* 1—3 thus:—

בְּרוּךְ יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים גָּאֲלֵנו
 יְהוָה חֲצִילֵנו אֵל יְשׁוּעָתָנו
 אֱלֹהִים הוּא נָתַן לְעָמוֹ תַּעֲצָמוֹת

4 f. M ראש איביו. Read שֵׁר עֲרָבִים ו (cp. on *xxxvi.* 2, *cx.* 6*b*).
 -M קָדְקֵר שְׁעָר מִתְהַלֵּל. Read [בְּ]גִיד אֲשׁוּר מִתְהַלֵּל. For שְׁעָר,
Hal. שְׁנֵעַר; *Kr., Gr., Dy.,* רְשֵׁעַ; *Burgess* שְׁעִיר.

6 f. M כִּבְשָׁן אֲשִׁיב. The sense required by the context is this,—Israel, oppressed and well nigh extinct, is to be gratified by the spectacle of the supernatural destruction of his foes. But why is Bashan specially mentioned? Contemporary history has been thought to supply an answer. The reference might be to the dispersion of Israelites consequent on the war between Antiochus III. and Ptolemy IV. (cp. *OP* 114 f.), or to the existence of Jewish proselytes beyond the Jordan in the Greek period (We., *I/G*, 163); Duhm even goes so far down as the time of Alexander Jannæus, who extended his conquests as far as Lake Huleh. But a parallel passage in *Amos* (ix. 3) is conclusive against such interpretations. Whoever wrote כִּבְשָׁן אֲשִׁיב had in his mind a divine judgment on the foes of Israel, and if this view will not suit the context, כִּבִּישׁ must be a scribe's error, and must be corrected. (It will be remembered that elsewhere—*xxii.* 13 and *lxviii.* 16—'Bashan' has been introduced by an error.) Lagarde (*Semit.* i. 52) proposes כִּבְבִּישָׁן 'from the smelting-furnace,' cp. *xxi.* 10, *Dan.* iii. 6, 11; also *Ps.* *lxvi.* 12, *Isa.* *xliv.* 2. But the figure of smelting would certainly have received some development; note also that כִּבִּישׁ only occurs in *Gen.* *xix.* 28, *Ex.* *ix.* 8, 10, *xix.* 18. The true reading is כִּבְשָׁן (cp. *Ps.* 16); continue אֲשִׁיב, and in *l.* 7 אֲשִׁיב בְּגִיד (metre). In *l.* 7 note also מִצְלוֹת; cp. *lxvi.* 11*a* (corr. text), *lxix.* 3. In *l.* 7 read אֲשִׁיב בְּגִיד מִפְּצָר וּמִתִּיכֹן; so metre and exegetical consistency are satisfied.

8 f. That תִּבְהִיז is unsuitable (note Patek), has long been seen; to suppose a new sense 'to drench' (cp. *Ass. mahâsu* II.), with *Frd. Del.*

(*Prol.* 69 ff.), and Ruben (*Crit. Rem.* 19) is hazardous. But the whole of *v.* 24 is open to question, and a thorough revision of the text becomes necessary. Neither תִּרְחֹץ (G S T J?—Hare, Kenn., Street, Bö., Ol., Che.³), Bā., We., Du.), nor תִּחְמִץ (Kr., Hi., Gr., cp. *Ḳimḥi*), nor תִּחְמִץ lends itself to any plausible interpretation. The corrected text of *ll.* 4 f. suggests לִמְעַן תִּרְמַס הַיְכָלִי אָרֶם, and for the detestable clause which now forms *v.* 24^b, לָבוֹס בְּרַגְלֶיךָ אֲרַמְנוֹת עַרְבִים. The scribe seems to have confused the two words בְּרַגְלֶיךָ and הַיְכָלִי. The coherence of this part of the poem now becomes visible.

11 f. M רָאוּ הַלִּיכוֹתֶיךָ. G, however (and so Street, Du.), גָּרְאוּ. But the difficulty of the next word remains. Hab. iii. 6^b may seem to be parallel, but Hab. iii. is full of corrupt passages, and *v.* 6^b seems to be one of these. The right reading in *l.* 11 seems to be סִפְרוּ כָל־נִפְלְאוֹתֶיךָ יהוה ('יהוה is a combination of כל with a fragment of a word ending in ותיך).—M הַלִּיכוֹת. Read הַגְּלוֹךְ; ת is an expansion of a fragmentary ל. Cp. on lxxi. 22.

13 f. M שָׁרִים. Read שָׁרִים (G; Gr.); see *v.* 28.—Read מִנְגִּנִים.—To תוֹפּוֹת add כִּהְלֹלֹת, which in MT (cp. G) appears as מִקְהָלוֹת [ב].

16 f. M's בְּמִקְהָלוֹת does double duty (see last note). Here it stands for בְּבוֹדֵהֶיכֶלָּו.—Point בְּרַכּוּ (Ew., Gr., Du.).—M's אֲדָנִי does double duty for יְרוֹמְנוּ (cp. on cxviii. 2) and for יְהוָה.—M כִּימְקוֹר; read כִּיהוֹקֵק (*Ps.* lxxxi. 5, corr. text: *Isa.* xxxiii. 22?), with Gr.

18. Note Pasek, and read שָׁרֵי בְּנִימִין הַצֵּעִיר יְדִידִים. For יְדִידִים (*Herz's* suggestion for the impossible רָדִם, G *ἐν ἐκστάσει*), cp. *Dt.* xxxiii. 12. Schnurrer (*Animadvers.* 308) thought of דָּדִם—not so far wrong. *Herz's* reconstruction of *v.* 28 is as follows, שָׁם בְּנִימִין צֵעִיר | יְדִידִים שָׁרֵי | יְהוּדָה | תִּרְנִים כִּשְׂרֵי זְבוּלוֹן. For תִּרְנִים he refers to *Gen.* xlix. 13.

19. Read שָׁרֵי יְהוּדָה הָרַב תְּמִימִים. The last two words replace M's רַגְנֹתָם. The correction רַגְשָׁתָם would be unsuitable, even if the occurrences of רַגֶשׁ elsewhere were trustworthy. J's 'in purpura sua' is a mere guess, though as such not bad. תְּמִימִים is highly probable; ג and כ, ר and ת are often confounded.

21 f. M's view of *v.* 29 is no better than a makeshift: hence *ll.* 21, 22 must receive radical but not arbitrary corrections, among which, however, we need not include צָוָה for צָוָה (vss., and most moderns).—M אֲגַדְּךָ עֲנֶה. Read אֲכַתֶּבְךָ וְחִסְדְּךָ, and prefix יהוה (for אֱלֹהִים, represented, equally with אֲמַתְךָ, by אֱלֹהֶיךָ). Cp. on xlii. 9.—M עֲנֶה. Read perhaps יִשְׁכְּרוּ (cp. *lxi.* 8); ע = י, ז = ר, ה = כ.

23. מ גַּעַר חַיִּת קָנָה (Street גַּעַר). This is not self-evidently wrong; Job xl. 21 suggests a reference to Behemoth as a symbol of the Egyptian power (see 'Behemoth,' *Enc. Bib.*). But this is against the usage of the psalmists; we expect either 'Leviathan' or '*tannin*' (cp. lxxiv. 13*f.*), and the parallelism shows that a plural noun must have been intended. What the original phrase was, depends on the true reading of *l.* 27. We shall see presently that the writer is thinking of Ps. xxii., and that he has this before him, in a more correct form than that presented by M. We may therefore safely read גַּעַר חַיִּת קָרְנֵי הַשָּׁן (see Ps. xxii., *l.* 26).

24. מ בַּעֲגָלֵי עֲמִים | עֲדַת אֲבִירִים; note Pasek. The emendation בַּעֲגָלֵי עֲמִים (Bishop Hare and Kennicott, and independently Matthes, followed by Che. '88) is plausible; cp. Isa. xvi. 8. But this leaves ג unaccounted for, and the corruption in *l.* 31 is so deep that we cannot but fear that a more radical correction is required. Almost or quite certainly the poet has Ps. xxii. in his mind, and the right reading is (עַדְנֵי רֵאמִים לְבָאִים אֲבִירִים?) (on xxii. *ll.* 37 *f.*).

25. מ בָּנָר. Read פָּנָר (cp. liii. 6 & c.); G S J support an imperative. —M קִרְבֹּת; suspicious (see on lv. 22). Nestle renders 'offerings'; Duhm, 'visits to the temple.' But we should probably read הַתְּנָרוֹת (construction as in Job xiii. 3).

26 ff. Corruption and dislocation have almost ruined the sense. No slight corrections are adequate. Thus Nestle's corrections בשִׁנְיִים (for חֲשִׁנְיִים) and מִתְּרַפֵּס (for כִּתְרַפֵּס), in *JBL*, x. 151, accepted by the writer in *JBL*, xi. 125, and Hitzig's תָּרִים for תְּרִיץ must be declined. We have first to deal with *l.* 30, the former part of which is hardly translatable. That it is misplaced, seems to be clear; the bringing of tribute naturally comes after the 'menace' (גַּעַר, *l.* 31) has produced its effect. The passage should therefore be parallel to lxxii. 9*f.*; at any rate, we may fitly take an idea from this passage. מִהִכְלָךְ ought to conceal some verb; lxxii. 9 suggests יִכְרְעוּ. Cases of the confusion of כִּי and עֵי have come before us already; and an imperfect הִ might be mistaken for ר. That עַל and כֹּל can be confounded, is also well-known, and it is plain that יִשְׁמְעֵאל might as easily be miswritten for יִשְׂרָאֵל as for יִשְׂרָאֵל. Lastly, מִלֶּךְ is one of the commonest disguises of יִרְחִמְאֵל. Read therefore:—

יִכְרְעוּ לְךָ כָּל־יִשְׁמְעֵאֵלִים
לְךָ יוֹבִילוּ יִרְחִמְאֵלִים שִׁי

We have next to deal with מִתְּרַפֵּס בְּרִצִּי־כֶסֶף. The presumption is that כֶּסֶף conceals an ethnic name parallel to those in the above two lines. Nestle's מִתְּרַפֵּס suggests פְּתַרְסִים, a name which actually

occurs in M, Gen. x. 14, where it stands amongst various descendants of **מִצְרַיִם**, *i.e.* Mišrim (in N. Arabia), not Mišraim (Egypt); see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Mizraim.' We can hardly doubt, however, that for **פְּתָרִים** both in Gen. x. 14 and (*ex hyp.*) in our psalm we should read **צָרְפָתִים**; 'Zarephathites' and 'Jerahmeelites' were closely related peoples. **בְּרָצִי** should of course be **בְּאוֹצֵר**. The missing verb stands in M at the head of *v.* 32, though more probably, since **אַתָּה** is not a word of the psalmists, **יִשְׁתַּחֲוּ** should be corrected into **יִשְׁתַּחֲוּ**. The rest of *v.* 32 contains in a corrupt form the tetrameter corresponding to **בְּאוֹצֵר צָרְפָתִים** (*l.* 28, just recovered). The last word, however, may be omitted; **לְאֱלֹהִים** is a corruption of **יִרְחַמְאֵלִים**, which is a gloss either on **בְּשֵׁים** or on the corrupt **נִלְכִים** of *l.* 27 (*v.* 30*b*). **הִשְׁכִּינִים** has grown out of **כִּנְיִמְצָרִים** out of **וּמִצְרַיִם**, and **תְּרִיץ** out of **חֲרוּץ** (lxxii. 10), **יְדִיו** out of **יִקְרִיבוּ** (*ibid.*). Line 29 therefore becomes **בְּשֵׁים וּמִצְרַיִם חֲרוּץ יִקְרִיבוּ**. [Gunkel, *Schöpfung*. 67, reads in *v.* 31*a* **כִּימְצָרִים צָרְפָתִים**, 'the troubled sea be made purer than silver,' a phrase for a judgment upon the warlike peoples?]

32. Prefix **יְהִי**, which first became indistinct and then, through its resemblance to **לְאֱלֹהִים**, which precedes, dropped out. For **אֲדָנִי** read **יְהוָה**.

33. MG **סֵלָה** (*v.* 33, end). Hu. rightly saw that **סֵלָה** = **סֵלוּ** (*l.* 9), but not that **לְסֵלוּ** comes out of **הִלְלוּ**. G, feeling the need of a verb, prefixes **ψύλατε τῶ θεῷ** = **זָמְרוּ אֱלֹהִים**, which Ley adopts (except **אֱלֹהִים**); cod. A, however, omits.—M **שְׁמַיִם שְׁמַיִם**. Lag., Now., omit the second **שְׁמַיִם** as a dittogram. **שְׁמַיִם שְׁמַיִם** is a possible phrase. But there is here no special sense in referring to the heavens as primæval. We should rather expect to hear of the God of primæval times, as in Dt. xxxiii. 27. Correct M's reading into **בְּמַתֵּי שְׁחָקִים** (see lxxviii. ¹¹ *l.* 9 and cf. Dt. xxxiii. 26, Isa. xiv. 14; also Ps. lxxvii. 18).

34 f. Insert from lxxviii. ¹¹ *l.* 10. For **קוֹל עֵז** read **תְּחִילַת אֶרֶץ**.

36. Omit **עַל**, from **אֵל**, a fragment of **אֱלֹהֵי** (which read for **אֱלֹהִים**).

38 f. Note two Pasesks. M **כִּימְקֹדְשֵׁיךָ**; not quite natural. Read perhaps **בְּנוֹהַ קְדֹשׁוֹ** (Ex. xv. 13); **ה** fell out; **כִּי** = **נִי**. Omit **וְעֵז**, and read **לְעֵמּוֹ**. Transfer **אֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל** to end of psalm, reading **נְאֻם**. So the line and the psalm are fitly completed.

PSALM LXIX.—I.

TRIMETERS. The pious kernel of the community (the Israel within Israel) complains of its sufferings. The N. Arabian foes continue their outrages, and renegade Jews have dissociated themselves from their brethren, afraid of the

insults which fall so plentifully on those who are zealous for Yahwè's house. The psalm is artificial and imitative: the use made of Pss. xviii., xxii., and xxxv. in stanzas 1, 2, 5, 7, 10 is specially remarkable, but cp. also references in the notes to par. passages in Pss. xxxviii., xlv., and Jer. xv. 15 (in a passage surely of post-exilic origin). The curse in *77*. 23-29 reminds us of those in *lviii*. 8-10 (corr. text) and *cix*.¹ The text has in parts suffered considerably, and it is precisely some of the most corrupt portions which have served as the chief supports of the erroneous view that the speaker of the psalm is an individual. Duhm, for instance, observes on *v*. 5 (end) that the enemies of the poet seek to ruin him by accusing him before the judge of peculation; a similar explanation is given by this critic of Ps. xxxv. (see introd. to this psalm). He assigns the psalm to an Asidæan opponent of Alcimus (1 Macc. vii. 5-18); see crit. n. on *ll*. 51 f. At an earlier date Hitzig induced a number of critics to assign Ps. *lxix*., as well as Pss. *xxx*., *xxxv*., &c., to Jeremiah. Consistent criticism, however, enables us to form a much more probable view both of Jeremiah and of his writings than was formerly possible (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Jeremiah').

Deposited. Of the Ethanites. Of 'Arab-ethan.

- | | | |
|----|--|----|
| 1 | Deliver me, O Yahwè [my God] ! | 2 |
| | For [the floods of] Deathland have overwhelmed me. | |
| | I sink into [the midst of] the ocean, | 3 |
| | Into an abyss where there is no ground, | |
| | I am come into depths of water, | |
| | And the flood [of Deathland] overwhelms me. | |
| | With my crying my throat is parched, | 4 |
| | Mine eyes look longingly for my God : | |
| | Zarephath and Asshur are in great number, | 5 |
| 10 | Ishmael and Jerahmeel are many. ¹ | |
| | O Yahwè ! thou knowest mine anguish, | 6 |
| | My groans are not hidden from thee. | |
| | Let not those that hope in thee ² be shamed | |
| | Let not those that seek thee ³ be disgraced in me ! | 7 |
| | For on thine account do I bear insult, | 8 |
| | Contumely covers my face ; | |
| | I am become a stranger to my brothers, | 9 |
| | An alien to the sons of my mother, | |
| | Yea, zeal for thy house has consumed me, | 10 |
| 20 | The insults of those that insult thee have fallen upon me. | |
| | I bowed down my head like a bulrush (?), | 11 |
| | And it brought insults upon me. | |
| | I took sackcloth for my clothing, | 12 |
| | And made myself their byword ; | |
| | Those that hate me condemn me in the gate, | 13 |
| | And oppose me with lying words. | |

¹ The Ishmaelites, the Arabians, the Cushites, the Jerahmeelites, the Asshurites.

² O Lord, Yahwè Sebaoth.

³ O God of Israel.

- But as for me, unto thee, O Yahwè ! is my prayer ;¹ 14
 Do thou succour me with thy delivering right hand !
 Rescue me from the mire that I sink not, 15
 30 Let me escape² from the depths of water.
 Let not the flood of Deathland overwhelm me, 16
 Let not the abyss [of the sea] swallow me up,
 * * * * *
 And let not the pit shut its mouth upon me.
 Answer me, O Yahwè ! according to thy gracious
 kindness, 17
 According to thy plenteous compassion turn towards
 me.
 Hide not thy face from thy servant ; 18
 For I am in distress—do thou answer me speedily.
 Draw near to my soul and release it, 19
 40 Because of mine enemies set me free.
 Thou knowest my contumely, 20
 My shame and my dishonour are before thee.
 The assembly of my foes have insulted me, 20 end, 21
 Those that hate me have broken my heart :
 I looked for one to condole, but there was none,
 For comforters, but I found them not.
 They give kicks to my stripes, 22
 And strike me in my wounds.
 Let their paths be wrapped in gloom, 23
 50 In deep gloom and darkness ;
 Let their eyes become dark that they see not, 24
 Their loins make thou to shake continually !
 Pour out thy fervent wrath upon them, 25
 Let thy hot anger overtake them ;
 Let their castles be desolate, 26
 Let there be none to dwell in their palaces,
 For they persecute those whom thou hast smitten, 27
 And add to the pain of thy pierced ones.
 Do thou put on more guilt to their guilt, 28
 60 And let them not enjoy the the sight of thy righteous-
 ness.

¹ In an acceptable time, O God ! in thy plenteous kindness.

² From Ishmael and.

Let them be wiped out of the book of life,
And not be enrolled with the righteous.

29

As for me, I am poor and in sore pain ;

30

Let thy deliverance, O Yahwè ! set me on high.

2 ff. The sea meant is that which rolls above the world of the dead. Cp. xviii. 5 f. (already corrupt?), xl. 3, lxxxviii. 6 f., Lam. iii. 54.

7. The same line recurs in the true text of xxii., *l.* 35. Cp. also xxxv., *l.* 16.

9. The speaker's courage fails at the sight of the N. Arabians—a sign perhaps of the conventionality of the description. (See xxvii.¹, *ll.* 3-6, xxxv. *ll.* 9-14, for a contrast.)

11 f. See crit. n.—*Thou knowest.* An appeal to God's omniscience. See *l.* 43; Jer. xv. 15, xvii. 16, xviii. 23.—*In me, i.e.* in my person. The speaker is himself a representative of the class of those that hope in Yahwè and that seek him.

15 f. **On this account.** So xlv. 23^a; Jer. xv. 15.—*Covers, &c.* Cp. xlv. 16.

17 f. Cp. xxxi. 12, xxxv. 13 f., xxxviii. 12.—19. *Zeal for thy house, i.e.* for the temple, the cultus of which was despised by the enemy; or possibly (Hit.) for the ordering of thy household (Num. xii. 7), *i.e.* the land and people of Israel.—*Has consumed me.* Cp. cxix. 139.

20. **Of those that insult thee,** *i.e.* specially the N. Arabians (xlv. 17, lxxiv. 10).

21 ff. See crit. notes, and cp. xxxv., *ll.* 15-18 (crit. and exeg. notes).—34. *The pit, i.e.* the grave (see on xl. 3).

43. **The assembly, &c.** Cp. יְעִדָה נו', xxvi. 5; יְעִדָה נו', xxii. 17; also vii. 8, lxxxvi. 14.

45 f. **For one to condole, &c.** Cp. Job ii. 11, and crit. n.—47 f. The reference in the traditional text to gall and vinegar is difficult. In Jer. viii. 14, ix. 14, xxiii. 15, 'water of gall' (רָאשׁ) is mentioned as a conceivable drink (cp. the Arabic parallel quoted by Bâthgen); in the two latter passages 'wormwood' (לְעֵנָה) as a food that might be eaten. Here, however, the text speaks of 'gall' (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Gall') as eaten, and of 'vinegar' (חֲמִץ) as a drink. But the text is corrupt; the true text can be restored in the light of xxii.⁽¹⁾, *l.* 40. See crit. n., and cp. below on *l.* 60.—49 f. For the figure of darkness, cp. lviii. 9 (corr. text), xxxv. 6^a.

55. **Their castles.** Cp. on ix. 7.—57. *Smitten, i.e.* chastised. Cp. 'my stripes,' 'my wounds,' *l.* 47, and note on *l.* 63.

60. See crit. n.—61. *The book of life.* Cp. Ex. xxxii. 32. Mal. iii. 16, Dan. xii. 1. The image is derived from the civic lists which, from the end of the ninth century, seem to have been kept as a security against aliens (Bertholet, *Stellung der Israel. zu den Fremden*, 80).—63. פְּאוֹב; cp. בְּכָאוֹב. *l.* 60. There we hear of sufferers, here of a sufferer (*i.e.* Israel).

Critical Notes. 1. Insert אֱלֹהֵי (as *l.* 8), for metre.—2. מִי בָאוּ כִּיִּים יַעֲדֵנָפֶשׁ. בָּאוּ was produced by the editor out of the fragments of אֶפְפוּ (M. xviii. 5), which has come out of שִׁטְפוּ כִּיִּים. שִׁטְפוּ has come from מוֹת (which G¹ reads, 2 S. xxii. 5); יִשְׁבְּלִי (see *v.* 16) has dropped out. The passage is dependent on xviii. 5; cp. xl. 13 (a more corrupt form). יַעֲדֵנָפֶשׁ seems to have developed out of יִשְׁטָפוּנִי.—3. מִי בָּאוּ. Read בְּלִבְבֵי יָמִים (Jon. ii. 4; cp. Prov. xxiii. 34).—4. מִי צוֹלָה. Read בְּמִצּוֹלָה. מִי צוֹלָה and יָם go together; cp. lxxviii. 23, Ex. xv. 4 f.—6. Insert מוֹת (metre and sense); xviii. 5 f. was already

corrupt.—7 f. Omit **יגעתי**, a corrupt dittogram of **בקרתי**, and **כניחל**, a corruption of **אלהים** (a variant of **אלחי**).

9 f. I read **רבו צרפת ואשור | ישניעאל וירחמאל עצמו**. M is full of difficulty. 'My causeless haters are more than the hairs of my head' is surely intolerable. We might indeed emend **משיערות ראשי** into the more poetical **כִּרְסִיסִים** (cp. on lxv. 11, lxxii. 6), but the hyperbole would still remain. **כִּזְמִיתִי** is equally suspicious, (1) because parallelism requires that *l.* 10, like *l.* 9, should contain a figure, and (2) because of the repetition of the letters **כ** and **צ** in this and in the preceding word (**יִצְמִי**). Hare, Kenn., Street, Ew., and Gr. read **כִּזְמִיתִי** or **כִּזְצִיתִי**, 'præ comâ meâ,' but **צָמָה** means rather a woman's veil, and, apart from this, the sense would be too tautological. S implies **כִּזְעִמִּיתִי** (so Ol., Hu., Dy., Bi.⁽¹⁾, Che.⁽¹⁾, Kau., Bâ.); cp. Job iv. 14 (?). But this seems to produce an anti-climax. **אִיבֵי שֶׁקֶר** is also very questionable (see on xxxv. 19), and the sense of the last clause is most improbable (cp. **גֹּזַל** in xxxv. 10). The case seems to be like that of the names of the sons of Heman; see 1 Chr. xxv. 4, where the names from Giddalti onwards seem to form a (rather poor) poetical couplet, but only if we work upon a corrupt text (see *Enc. Bib.* 'Heman'). The skill of the editor who produced *v.* 5 in the traditional text (M G) may be admitted, but the result of his work is most unsatisfactory. Slight attempts to improve it, like Lagarde's **אֲנִי** for **אֵז** &c.), are useless. Most probably we may read as above. Then follows a conventional list of names. I need hardly give the Hebrew (cp. on xl. ²).

11 f. M **וְאֶשְׁמֹתִי, לְאֹלֹתַי**. 'The poet seems to have been imprudent, and to have been guilty of some irregularities' (Duhm). Surely most inappropriate. Neither here nor in the || Psalm xxii., is confession of guilt intended. Nor does **אֹלֹת** mean 'imprudence in moral action' (Σ here *ἀπειρίαν*); see **אֵן** xxxviii. 6. Read either **חִלְחֹלֹתַי** or **חִלְתִּי**, and **שִׁוְעֵתִי** (see on xxxviii. 8, 10).

13 f. Omit as glosses **אלהי ישראל** and **צבאות**.

21. M **וְאֶבְפָּה**. G^B *συνέκαμψα*; G^S corr. *συνεκάλυφα*. The former points to **כָּפַף** (lvii. 7 G; cp. Isa. lviii. 5, G); the latter to **חָפַה** (2 S. xv. 30, Jer. xiv. 3 G). Herz, with more insight than most, decides for **וְאֶכְפָּה** (cohort. of **כָּפַף**). He refers to lvii. 7, and to S, which has, in our passage, **כַּכְכּוּס**, *i.e.* **וְאֶכְפָּה** (cp. Syr. Hex. Isa. lviii. 5), not **וְאֶכְפָּה** (as Mich., Lag., Now.). The former reference is not valid, lvii. 7 being corrupt. The latter is cogent; a verb **כָּכַה** (assumed by Lag.) is not found in the O T. But Herz retains **נַפְשִׁי**, which seems to produce an unnatural expression. It is more satisfactory to read **וְאֶכְפָּה כְּאֶנְכוֹן** **רִאשִׁי**. The suitability of this will be clear from xxxv. 14 f. (corr. text) and Isa. lviii. 5, where 'bowing down the head as a bulrush' is parallel to

'spreading sackcloth and ashes under him' (cp. *l.* 24). The apparent parallelism of xxxv. 14a suggested to many critics (Ol., Dy., Bi., Gr., Che ⁽¹⁾, We., Kau., Du.) to emend **וּבַבְּכָה** into **וְאֶעֱנֶה**; Kenn. (*Remarks*, 253) and Perles (*Anal.*, 51), however, prefer **וְאֶדְבֶּה**. Neither of these is probable; the corruption must lie deeper. It is quite true that the correction here proposed is not in all respects obvious. **נַר** [אֶשֶׁי] might indeed become **נַפְשִׁי** (see on xxxiii. 5), but **כְּאֲנֹכִי** is far from **בְּצוּם**. It is possible, however, that the true reading became indistinct, and that the editor manipulated it (not too dexterously) with some reference to xxxv. 13a. [**וְאֶחָפֶה** * **רֵאשִׁי** is less satisfactory.]

25 f. **נְנִינָה** does not mean 'jesting ditty,' and does not occur in the plur. (iv. 1, vi. 1, &c. are corrupt): **שִׁיחַ בְּ** 'to make the subject of talk' is improbable. Read, comparing xxxi. 19,—

יִרְשִׁיעֵנִי שִׁנְאֵי בְּשִׁיעַר
וַיִּשְׁטַנְנֵנִי בְּשִׁפְתֵי יִשְׁקַר

Duhm provides an inadequate remedy, changing **יִשְׁחֹו בִי** (*z.* 13a) into **וַיִּשְׁחֹק**.

27 f. Omit **יַעַת רְצוֹן אֱלֹהִים בְּרַב־חֶסֶדֶד**, a scribe's amplification (Isa. lxi. 2) which spoils the metre [**רִצְיָה נָא**, Herz]. For **עֲנֵנִי** read **הוֹשִׁיעֵנִי**, and for **בְּאֶמְתִּי יִשְׁעֶדָּה** read **בְּיִמּוֹן יִשְׁעֶדָּה**.

30-34. Omit **כִּי־שִׁנְאֵי ו** (rather **כִּי־שִׁמְעֵאל ו**).—For **כִּי־מֵים** read **כִּי־וֹת** (see on *l.* 2).—Read **כִּי־צוֹלֹת יָם** (cp. *ll.* 3 f.; lxxviii. 23).—Line 23 has dropped out.—For **תִּתְאֶמֶר** (*ãπ. λεγ.*) read **תִּתְאֶתֶם** (Gr.).—For **בְּאֶר** read **בּוֹר = בּוֹרַר** (as *lv.* 24).

35. For **כִּי טוֹב** read **כִּי־טוֹב** with Street (1790), Gr., We.

42 f. Here a metrical arrangement has to deviate from that in M. Duhm thinks that **בְּשִׁתִּי וּכְלִמְתִּי** has intruded from the following verse, where he would replace it ('und unheilbar ist meine Schande und Beschämung'). Thus we get the couplet, 'Thou knowest my contumely; before thee are all my foes.' A poor parallelism, and opposed, as to *l.* 45, by the par. passage xxxviii. 10. Still less acceptably Altschüller. *Z.ATH.*, 1886, p. 212, and Wellh. 'נָגַד כְּלִצְ' . It is much better to read *l.* 44 as in M, taking **כְּלִצְוֹרִי** into *l.* 45, which we may plausibly read thus, **קָהַל צ' חֲרַפּוֹנִי**; the Pasek after **חֲרַפּוֹה** may indicate a doubtful text. See on xxxv. 18, and cp. next note.

44. M **יִשְׁבְּרָה לִבִּי וְאֲנֹשָׂה**. The ordinary view (which prefixes **חֲרַפּוֹה**) is 1. opposed to metre, and 2. based on the assumption of a *ãπ. λεγ.* **נֹשָׂה = אֲנִישׁ** 'to be weak or sick.' G gives (*ὀνειδισμὸν*) *προσεδόκησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου καὶ ταλαιπωρίαν*, where *προσεδ.* = **יִשְׁבְּרָה** and *ταλαιπ.* probably =

אָנוּשָׁה. an assumed noun, which is recognised also by Wetzstein (in Del. *Psalmen*⁽¹⁾, 883 ff.) in the sense of ‘friendliness’ = great calamity (euphemistically). For M’s pointing at any rate there is nothing to be said, but who will accept Wetzstein’s arbitrary conjecture? Observing that in two passages (Isa. xvii. 11, Jer. xvii. 16) אָנוּשׁ is more than probably corrupt (see *SBOT*, ‘Isaiah,’ Heb. ed., 195), and that one of the words which are specially liable to be misread is שְׁנֵאִי (שְׁנוּאִי), and having due regard to *l.* 44, I think we may, provisionally at least, read יִשְׁבְּרוּ לְבִי שְׁנֵאִי, an expression akin to those in Job xix. 1, *a* and *b*. [Tg. implies וְאָנוּשָׁה, *i.e.* ‘and it (my soul) is sick’; ¹A Σ J agree with M. Weir (*Acad.* 1870, p. 257). וְאָנוּשׁ הוּא קָוָה; cp. Jer. xvii. 9.]

45. M לְנוֹד G *συνλυπούμενον* = לָנֶד (¹A Σ J S T). So Bā., Du.—
49 f. See exeg. n. 5. Read,—

וַיִּבְעֲטוּ בְּהַבּוֹרֹתַי
וַלְפָצְעַי יִמְחָצוּנִי

The couplet is suggested by xxii. 18*b* (corr. text). The corruptions are extremely pretty. ראשׁ springs out of a fragment of חֲבוֹרֹתַי just as חֲבִיץ comes from a fragment of יִמְחָצוּנִי (M יִשְׁקוּנִי).

49 f. Note first that an adj. שְׁלוֹם is non-existent (see on lv. 21), and next that a ‘table’ cannot be said to become a ‘net.’ Duhm, it is true, suggests that the reference may be to a sacrificial meal, and is thus enabled to improve at once the Hebrew and the parallelism, reading for שְׁלוֹמִים, שְׁלֹמִים ‘peace-offerings.’ He remarks, ‘The enemies appear to have been zealous sacrificers or even priests,’ and hence explains the reference to a ‘net,’ *i.e.* to deceit (1 Macc. vii. 14?). ‘Peace-offerings,’ he thinks, are mentioned because when Alcimus had become high priest, there was of course no stint with such offerings. The psalmist, however, disparages sacrifices, not upon purely rational grounds, but because he, with the other Asideans (see introd.), has been expelled by Alcimus’s party from the temple. Apart from other considerations, it is decisive against this view that any reading of this couplet which retains a reference to feasting is inconsistent with the following couplet. It is true. Duhm finds in τ . 24 an allusion to the palsy of Alcimus (1 Macc. ix. 55). But no one reading τ . 23 and 24 as they stand in M would naturally fall on Duhm’s explanation. The truth is that the text is corrupt, and that no patch-work emendation will suffice. G’s וַלְשֹׁלְמִים (*καὶ εἰς ἀνταπόδοσιν*; cp. S J, Rom. xi. 9) is of no use. Remembering many parallels, let us read (see exeg. n.),—

יְדוּ שְׁבִילֵיהֶם לְאַפְלָה
וַלְצִלְכוֹת וַלְמִחָשָׁךְ

55 f. Duhm regards this couplet as a quotation. But the text plainly needs emendation. טִירָתֶם should mean 'their nomad encampment' (Gen. xxv. 16); G ἡ ἔπαυλις αὐτῶν. But the worst enemies of the Jews were no mere wandering shepherds. Street, with sound insight, gives, as *v.* 26*a*, 'Let their palaces be desolate.' This seems to be a paraphrase; in *v.* 26*b* he retains 'tents.' Having regard to ix. 7, xlix. 12 (corr. text), we need not hesitate to read בִּירָתֶם. בִּירָה is here used collectively, there being no proper plural (בִּירָנוֹת is used twice in Chron. instead), In *l.* 58 M's אֱהָלֵיהֶם should certainly be הִכְלֵיהֶם (see crit. n. on xv. 1).

57 f. M אֶתָּה. Read אֵת (Perles, Duhm).—M יִסְפְּרוּ. But אֶל after סִפֵּר is impossible. G προσέθηκαν, i.e. יִסְפְּרוּ (Ew., Ol., Bi.), or יִסְפוּ (Kenn., Street, Gr., Du.), or יִסְפֵּי (We.).

PSALM LXIX.—2.

TRIMETERS. Perhaps an appendix, composed as a refreshing contrast to the preceding poem. The psalmist places himself in the hoped-for day of restoration. Verses 36 and 37 may perhaps, as Dalman has suggested (*TLZ*, Oct. 14, 1893), be a later addition, but this is not a necessary view—the passage may be simply explanatory. The corruption in *v.* 32 has given a false colouring to the whole of the appendix. It is the anticipated relief from N. Arabian oppression which is spoken of. Duhm's view that the circumstances implied are those in 1 Macc. ix. 72 will not agree with our revised text. Cp. xxii. 23-31; also xl.⁽²⁾ and cii.⁽²⁾, with the respective introductions.

- | | | |
|----|--|----|
| 1 | I will praise the name of my God with song, | 31 |
| | And magnify him with thanksgiving ; | |
| | For Yahwè has disappointed Mişşur, | 32 |
| | He has brought to shame Jerahmeel and Ishmael. | |
| | Look up, ye poor, and rejoice ; | 33 |
| | O ye seekers of Yahwè ! [praise him]. | |
| | For Yahwè has hearkened to the needy, | 34 |
| | And has not despised his prisoners. | |
| | Let heaven and earth praise him, | 35 |
| 10 | The sea, and all that moves therein. | |
| | For Yahwè will deliver Zion, | 36 |
| | And build the cities of Judah ; | |
| | [The righteous] will dwell there, | |
| | And possess the [land for ever]. | |
| | The offspring of his servants will inherit it, | 37 |
| | Those that love his name will abide therein. | |

3. Praise, the acceptable sacrifice (l. 14, 23).—5 f. Cp. xxii. 27.—7 f. **His servants**, *i.e.* faithful Israelites (xxxiv. 23). Cp. xxii. 25.

Critical Notes. 1. Read אֱלֹהֵי, which is confounded with אֱלֹהִים = אֱלֹהִים. G (א^a R^b) τοῦ θεοῦ μου.

3 f. M פֶּר מִקְרָן כִּפְרִים (ומִפְרִים), 20 MSS. Kenn., 13 MSS. and 6 edd. de R, G S J). The description of the steer as having horns and claws (see Siegfr. Sta.) is highly superfluous. מִפְרִים might come from מִצְפִּיר. But most probably the whole distich is corrupt. Comparing xxii. 27–30 (corr. text) read something like this,—

פִּי הִבִּישׁ יְהוָה מִצֹּר
הַחֲפִיר יִרְחֲמֵאל וַיִּשְׁמָעֵאל

5. M וַיִּשְׂמְחוּ, *i.e.* *videntes mansueti lætabuntur* (J ; so Del., Bā. &c.). Kön. would read וַיִּשְׂמְחוּ (so 28 MSS., 7 edd. Kenn. ; *plurimi*, de R.), supposing that ו dropped out after מ, owing to similarity of sounds (*Synt.*, §§ 162, 330 p.). But comparing xxxiv. 16a (and xxii. 27, xl. 4, corr. text), we should certainly read וַיִּשְׂמְחוּ, רָאוּ (cp. G S). So Gr., Du.—6. M's יחי לבבכם is a corruption of ירחמאלים (xxii. 27), a gloss on ll. 3, 4, which has expelled the right reading הַלְלוּהוּ (*ib.*).—7. Read שָׁבַע (We.).

13 f. Insert צַדִּיקִים, and לְעֵב [הָ] אֶרֶץ; cp. xxxvii. 29. So Duhm.

PSALM LXX.

IDENTICAL with xl. 14–18 (which see), save that the opening word רִצָּה is here omitted. See also on Ps. lxxi. The title here runs, 'Deposited. Of 'Arabethan. Of [Ethan] the Ezrahite.' On להזכיר (again in xxxviii. 1) see *Intro.*

PSALM LXXI.

TRIMETERS. Largely based on other plaintive psalms, especially xxii., xxxi., xxxv., xl., like which it is Deutero-Isaianic. An editor seems to have prefixed to it a fragment, which now (in an incorrect form) constitutes Ps. lxx., and a prayer from xxxi. 2–4a. These additions did not at all improve the psalm. They weaken the effect of the appeal in v. 5, which is appropriately supported by petitions based on xxii. 10 f. Verses 12 and 13 also appear to be an insertion, the former from xxxviii. 22. The latter is an imitation of xxxv. 26, xl. 15 (Duhm). But the psalm is not devoid of genuine feeling (see especially ll. 7, 8, corr. text). The speaker is the Jewish community (so G, Θ, Theod. Mops., Theodoret, Barhebræus, Ol., Smend, Bā., Beer, &c.), or rather the inner circle of that community

(see *ll.* 35 f.). This association of earnest believers, who are not to be turned aside from their faith by the sorest troubles, has all along been the true Israel, which Yahwè has trained up to be agents in the conversion both of the nominal Israelites (the outer circle) and of the nations outside. According to Duhm, who regards the psalmist's description as autobiographical, the speaker boasts that, though not versed in apocalyptic writings (see on *l.* 28), he has been a life-long disciple of Yahwè, and will never give up prophesying the future. Such a clairvoyant would naturally appear a 'prodigy' (*zv.* 7, **מוֹפֵת**) to many; his predictions might, in fact, become very embarrassing. Textual criticism must decide on the correctness of this startling theory.

1	O my God ! rescue me from the hand of the wicked,	4
	From the grasp of the unjust and the violent.	
	For thou art my hope, ¹ O Yahwè!	5
	My confidence from my youth.	
	Upon thee have I stayed myself from my birth ;	6
	Thou hast been my refuge from my mother's womb. ²	
	Almost had I gone down to the grave,	7
	But thou, in thy lovingkindness, heldest me back.	
	My mouth shall be filled with thy praise,	8
10	* * * * *	
	That unto thy glory I may chant hymns,	
	Unto thy splendour in the great assembly.	
	Cast me not away in the time of old age,	9
	Now that my strength fails forsake me not.	
	For against me mine enemies form a wily plot,	10
	Those who lay wait for my soul take counsel, ³	
	'God has forsaken him, set on,	11
	Seize him, for there is none to rescue.' ⁴	
	As for me, I trust in Yahwè,	14
20	And stay myself on my God.	
	My mouth shall tell the glad news of thy righteous	
	dealing,	15
	Of thy deliverance in the great assembly.	
	I will abundantly utter thy might, O Yahwè !	16
	I will celebrate thy righteousness and thy glory.	
	Thou ⁵ hast trained me from my youth,	17
	To this day I make known thy wonders ;	

¹ O Lord.² In thee is my hope continually.³ Together, saying.

⁴ O Yahwè ! be not far from me. My God ! hasten to help me. Be they put to shame and dishonour who oppose my soul. Be they covered with contumely and disgrace who seek my hurt (*zv.* 12 f.).

⁵ O God.

So then in the time of old age and gray hairs, 18
 O Yahwè ! do not thou forsake me,
 Until I can make known thine arm to the assembly,
 30 To the generation of thy servants thy might.

* * * * *

And thy righteousness, O Yahwè ! to the height. 19
 * * thou hast done great things ;
 O Yahwè ! who is like thee ?
 Many troubles hast thou made me see, 20
 But now thou wilt comfort me again.

From the lowest parts of the earth thou wilt bring
 me up,
 From depths of water wilt thou draw me. 21
 I will thank thee among the peoples, O Yahwè ! 22
 40 With the sound of the harp I will praise thy faithfulness ;
 I will chant hymns to thee with the lyre,
 The Holy One of Israel * *

My lips will sing for joy unto thee, 23
 And my soul which thou hast set free.
 Yea, in the great assembly my tongue 24
 Will sing of thy righteousness, [O Yahwè !]
 Because [those that opposed my soul] are put to shame,
 Because those that sought my hurt are abashed.

5 f. Cp. xxii. 10.—7 f. Cp. xciv. 17, xxxviii. 17.—12. Cp. xxii. 26, xl. 11.—13. So *l.* 27. Cp. Isa. xlvi. 4 (of the people of Israel).—27. שִׁיבָה ;

so Isa. *l.c.*, Hos. vii. 9.—30. Cp. cii. 19^b.—31 f. Cp. xxxv. 6.—34. Cp. xxxv. 10, lxxxvi. 8.—37. תַּחַת הָאָרְצַי ; *i.e.* the underworld (see crit. n.).

Critical Notes. 2. מ הוֹכִיץ, acc. to Ges. *Theol.*, = הַכֹּיץ Isa. i. 17. Probably both הוֹכִיץ and הַכֹּיץ should be חַכִּים, which Herz replaces here. Cp. G ἀδικούντος ; T הַטֹּרֵף.

6. M גְּזִי. Read בְּחַסֵּי (see on גַּחֵי, xxii. 10). G (B N R^a) μου εἰ σκεπαστής ; cp. Glxi. 5, σκεπασθήσομαι = אֶחֱסֶה. G (R*) εἰ ὁ ὑπερωπιστής μου = כִּיעֲזִי, an easy corruption of בְּחַסֵּי. Σ σὺ ἐπέιδές με. For closing words of *v.* 6 see next note.

7 f. M כְּמוֹפֶת הַיָּתִי לְרַבִּים. Who are the 'many'? and why is the speaker a 'prodigy' or 'warning' to them? Duhn's answer (see introd.) depends on the correctness of his view of *v.* 15^b (which is

corrupt). Beer thinks 'מ' can mean here 'a riddle' (for the heathen and for bad Jews). But surely we should emend, **בְּמַעַט יִרְדְּתִי לְקָבֶר**. The closing words of *v.* 6, **בְּדָ תְהַלְתִּי תַמִּיד**, are a variant to **כְּמוֹפֶת הַיָּתִיב**—another attempt to make sense of a half illegible passage.—M **וְאַתָּה מַחְסִי עֵז**. A conventional tag. The editor drew together the legible fragments of an indistinct passage. Read **וְאַתָּה חֲשַׁבְתָּנִי בְּחֶסֶדְךָ**. **עֵז** comes from **הַס**. Some letters fell out. Surely the couplet gains greatly. Cp. Isa. xxxviii. 17.

10 ff. Parallelism requires something like **וְלֶךְ תִּרְנְנָה שְׁפָתַי** (cp. *l.* 28). Insert **לְמַעַן אֲזַמְּרָה כְבוֹדְךָ** (following G^{B S c. a}), with Bi. [and now Du.].—M **כָּל־הַיּוֹם**. Read **בְּקֹהֶל רַב** (see on xxxv. 18). So *ll.* 22, 45; lxix. 20.

15 ff. M **כִּי־יַעֲרִימוּ אוֹיְבֵי לִי**; very weak! Read **כִּי־יַעֲרִימוּ אוֹיְבֵי לִי** (cp. *l.* 28). Insert **לְמַעַן אֲזַמְּרָה כְבוֹדְךָ** (following G^{B S c. a}), with Bi. [and now Du.].—M **כָּל־הַיּוֹם**. Read **בְּקֹהֶל רַב** (see on xxxv. 18). So *ll.* 22, 45; lxix. 20.

15 ff. M **כִּי־יַעֲרִימוּ אוֹיְבֵי לִי**; very weak! Read **כִּי־יַעֲרִימוּ אוֹיְבֵי לִי** (cp. *l.* 28). Insert **לְמַעַן אֲזַמְּרָה כְבוֹדְךָ** (following G^{B S c. a}), with Bi. [and now Du.].—M **כָּל־הַיּוֹם**. Read **בְּקֹהֶל רַב** (see on xxxv. 18). So *ll.* 22, 45; lxix. 20.

19 f. Most unsatisfactory in M. First, **וְאֲנִי תַמִּיד אֶחֱלֶה** here, as often, is evidently corrupt. Read not improbably **וְאֲנִי בְטַחְתִּי בִיהוָה**. Next, **וְהוֹסַפְתִּי עַל־כָּל תְּהַלְתֶּךָ**. Read **וְהוֹסַפְתִּי עַל־אֱלֹהֵי**. **וְהוֹסַפְתִּי עַל־אֱלֹהֵי** and (cp. *l.* 40, and on lxviii. 25) **אֱלֹהִים** are very liable to corruption. For the change of the verb cp. xxii. 11a (**הַשְׁלַכְתִּי** has become **נִסְמַכְתִּי**).

21 f. M **יִסְפָּר**. Read **אֲבַפֵּר** (xl. 10).—M **כָּל־הַיּוֹם**. See on *l.* 12. Verse 15 in M closes with **כִּי לֹא יִדְעוּתִי סְפָרוֹת**. The vss. presuppose these consonants, but fail to make any good sense of them; J's *non cognovi literaturas* is delightful. The moderns either render, 'I know not the numbers (thereof),' or else, like Wellh., despair. [Duhm, however, 'die Schriften'; see introd.] The origin of the clause, however, can probably be determined. It is a second attempt of an editor to read the indistinct words which ought to be read **בְּקֹהֶל רַב תְּשׁוּעָתְךָ**.

23. M **אָבִיא בְּנִבְרוֹת**. Instead of going to the Arabic Lexicon for a parallel idiom, read with Gr. **אָבִיעַ בְּנִבְרָתְךָ** (cp. cxlv. 7). The three **ב** so near together are suspicious. Against the plural form (M) note that the vss. imply the singular. See also *l.* 30. Omit **אֲדַנִּי**=**יְהוָה**.

24. M **לְבַדְּךָ**, superfluous. Read **וּכְבֹּדְךָ**. **ל** is a development of **ו**; **כ** dropped out before **ב**. Cp. cxlv. 11 f. (**כְבוֹד** and **נְבוֹרָה** parallel).

27. M יַעַד; note the two Paseḳs. Read יַעַת (see *l.* 13).—29 f. M לְדוֹר לְכָל־יְבוּא כָל, as elsewhere (*e.g.* *ll.* 12. 45) comes from קָהַל, and יְבוּא from עֲבָדִיד (see on xxii. 31). Read therefore לְקָהַל (end of *l.* 29), and לְדוֹר עֲבָדִיד. To omit לְכָל, with S, Bā., Beer, Cobl., is inadequate. G πᾶσιν τῇ γενεᾷ, *i.e.* לְכָל־הַדּוֹר (so Du.).

31. Insert perhaps יְהוָה חֲסִדֶּיךָ עֲרֹשְׁתֵּיכֶם (xxxv. 6).—33. אֲשֶׁר here, as in *v.* 20 (*l.* 35), seems to be an editorial patch, unless indeed it be a corruption of לְאַרְצֶיךָ. G'A S J make ע' אֲשֶׁר 'ג the subject to עֲד־כִּמְרוֹם! —35 ff. Thrice K_r. is preferable to Kt. Almost all vss. agree. Though J begins with *mihī*, it continues with *nos*; 'A gives the first person throughout. Omit אֲשֶׁר (see last note).—M וְרַעוּת, influenced by רַבּוֹת? Read probably וְעֵתָה; sense and metre gain. ה and ר are often confounded.—M תִּשׁוּב תִּחְיֶינִי. Later on we find the variant תִּשׁוּב תִּנְחַמְנִי. No doubt the right reading is תִּשׁוּב תִּנְחַמְנִי; G J S do not support תִּשׁוּב.—M וּכְמִתְהוֹכִיחַת הָאָרֶץ, an unexampled phrase. Read perhaps מִתְהוֹכִיחַת הָאָרֶץ (Isa. xlv. 23, and (?) Ps. lxxiii. 10, cxxxix. 15. [So I find already Lagarde and Duhm; Olshausen too makes the two phrases synonymous.] As *l.* 38 וְתִשְׁנִי כִּמְעַמְקֵי מַיִם (cp. xviii. 17), is a possible and suitable reading. תִּשְׁנִי may be latent in תִּשׁוּב, מַיִם in תִּנְחַמְנִי, and מַיִם in מִאֲנִי (relic of מִאֲנִי). This assumes that תִּשְׁבּוּב תִּשׁוּב does double duty; such phenomena are not uncommon. Cp. lxix. 3, 15, and note Paseḳ after אֲנִי גַם. M's תָּרַב נְדָלְתִי (G [ε̄] πλεόνασας τὴν δικαιοσύνην σου) is probably from רַבּוֹת וְגַדְלוֹת (corresponding to רַבּוֹת וְרַעוּת in *v.* 20).

39 f. After אֲוִדֶיךָ insert יְהוָה בְּעַמְּיָם; so Bā., Beer, Roy (p. 45); G (Lucian) has ἐν λαοῖς κύριε. [So now We., *Skizzen*.]—For כְּלִי read קוֹל; cp. xlvii. 6. For אֱלֹהֵי read אֱהַלֵּל (cp. on *l.* 19 f.).—42. Insert perhaps וְנִאֲלוּ (Isa. xli. 14, &c.).—45. M בְּלִדְהוּם. See on *l.* 12.—46 f. Insert יְהוָה and שְׁמִי נִפְשִׁי (metre).

PSALM LXXII.

TRIMETERS. Predictions of the happy and beneficent reign of the 'king' or the 'king's son,' *i.e.* the Messiah, the son of David. The psalm should be read in close connection with Ps. xlv., and part of what has been said on that psalm is again applicable here. In both psalms the Messiah is represented as a second Solomon. Two points may be specially mentioned here. 1. An initial act of judgment on the part of Yahwē is desired as the preliminary to the rule of the ideal king. And 2. though the royal personage addressed is distinguished from the *'anuyyim* and from the people, the closing stanza shows by its allusion to Gen. xii. 2, 3, xxii. 18,

xxvi. 4, that the Messiah is but the leader and representative of Yahwè's people. In short, as was noticed on Ps. xlv., there is very little reality in the conception of the Messiah as set forth in the psalms. It was so long since there had been a native Israelitish king that the Messianic hope in the post-exilic pre-Maccabæan period could not have much vitality.

Ps. lxxii. is also parallel to the well-known Messianic passage in Zech. ix. (זצ. 9, 10). It is true that Ps. lxxii. 7^b, 8, is an interpolation suggested by that prophecy, but the interpolator displayed a sound insight into the mutual affinity of both passages. He was also right in his belief that the king referred to was the Messiah, and not an imaginative representative of the pious community of Israel. We may also compare the fine Messianic prophecies in Isa. ix. and xi., which, as has been shown, are of post-exilic origin.

According to Grätz, the hero of Ps. lxxii. is the young prince Hezekiah, and the psalm expresses the hopes and vaticinations of the devout Levites, who, as he thinks, were the 'anāvim (or 'anīyyim), 'the meek and lowly ones,' so often referred to in the psalms; he compares Isa. xiv. 30, 32, which, however, is in a post-exilic passage (see Marti); Hitzig, Reuss, and formerly the present writer (*OP*, 144 ff., 155) thought of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and really, if the present text of זצ. 15 is on the whole correct, and if a historical king is desired, it is difficult not to be attracted towards this hypothesis. Duhm, it is true, prefers some Asmonæan king, and Weissmann ('Der 72 Ps. kritisch erläutert u. übersetzt,' *Jüd. Litteraturblatt*, 1886, pp. 20-22) even selects Queen Salome. But a Maccabæan psalm in the second book of the psalms is not to be expected. Duhm is also of opinion that Ps. lxxii. was originally without זצ. 5-11, which contain 'wishes presupposing the Messianic eschatology.' This is an extension of Giesebrecht's and Bähgen's view that זצ. 8-11, which 'interrupt the connexion,' are a later interpolation, and that the rest of the psalm was a glorification of some Israelitish king.

It would seem that a keener criticism of the text removes the basis of all these theories, and that the Messianic interpretation of the Targum is correct. Cp. Stade, *Zt. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, ii. 386 (= *Akad. Reden*, 53). The doxology in זצ. 18 f. closes the second book of the Psalms. See Introduction.

Of Salmah (or, Ishmael).

- | | | |
|----|--|---|
| | | 1 |
| 1 | O Yahwè! display thy judgments for the king,
Thy righteous acts for the king's son! | |
| | He will rule thy people with righteousness,
Thy sufferers with justice. | 2 |
| | Thy mountains will bear welfare,
And the hills righteousness; ¹ | 3 |
| | He will do justice to the sufferers of thy people,
He will succour the race of the poor. | 4 |
| | He will crush the folk of Cusham, | 5 |
| 10 | And destroy the race of Jerahmeel;
He will bring down Maacath and Amalek,
Those of Rehoboth and of Zarephath. ² | 6 |

¹ Righteousness will flourish in the land (זצ. 7a).

² He will bring down Ishmael and Jerahmeel, | From the river to the utmost parts of the land (זצ. 7b, 8).

	Before him the Mišrites will bend the knee,	9
	The Arabians will lick the dust ;	
	The Asshurites ¹ will bring gifts, ²	10
	Those of Sheba ³ will offer gold. ⁴	
	He will snatch the needy from the oppressor,	12
	The sufferer who has none to help him ;	
	He will feel for the wretched, the needy,	13
20	The lives of the innocent he will save.	
	From Maacath ⁵ he will deliver their souls,	14
	Precious will their blood be in his sight ;	
	He will rescue his servants from Edom,	15
	He will deliver them from those of Jerahmeel.	
	Justice will revive in the land,	16
	Like the pine of the mountains will it strike root ;	
	Like the cedar in Lebanon will it spring up,	
	And flourish like the wild herbage.	
	For ever let him be blessed,	17
30	Before thee let his name endure ;	
	Let all kindreds bless themselves by him,	
	Let all nations call him happy.	

Doxology.

	Blessed be Yahwè, Israel's God,	18
	Who alone does wondrous things ;	
	And blessed be his glorious name for ever,	19
	And let the whole earth be full of his glory. Amen, Amen.	

Subscription.

End of the praise-songs of David, son of Jesse.

1 f. **Display thy judgments,** 'spirit of judgment' is substituted for &c. Most render 𐤇𐤍, 'give,' and 'spirit of wisdom.' But the phrase 'give thy judgments,' or, as some prefer to read, 'thy judgment,' is not very natural. In lxxxvi. 16, 'give thy strength' (or 'thy help'?) means 'display thy strength in act' (parallel

¹ Jerahmeelites.

² That is, one will give him of the gold of Sheba (*v.* 15*a*).

³ And Seba.

⁴ All kings will do homage unto him, | all nations will serve him (*v.* 11).

⁵ And from Cusham.

'deliver'). Perhaps the psalmist means 'perform judicial acts,' or (*l.* 2) 'acts of righteousness' (1 S. xii. 7).—*The king's son*. A phrase suggested by the coronation of Solomon during David's lifetime.

3 f. The connexion is, 'Do thou, O Yahwè! interpose for Israel's expected ideal king, for he will answer all the high requirements which thou wilt make. His only aims will be justice and the national welfare.'—*Thy sufferers*. Cp. *l.* 7, 'the sufferers of (*i.e.* constituting) thy people.' 'Aniyyim is a title for the pious community as a whole (cp. ix. 13, lxxviii. 11).

5 f. Cp. lxxv. 11, Isa. xlv. 8.—9 ff. See ii. 9, xviii. 38 ff., lxxviii. 22 (corr. texts). To understand these passages, read Lam. v. and Obadiah. See crit. notes.

12. The gloss which forms *צט*. 7*b*, 8, does not describe the world-wide rule of the Messiah (any more than ii. 8, Zech. ix. 10 do); the conquest and absorption of the troublesome N. Arabian border-land is referred to. See crit. note, and cp. Sirach xlv. 21.

14. **Lick the dust.** To 'kiss the ground' was both in Egypt and in Assyria an expression for the deepest obedience; the parallel phrase 'to eat the dust' in Assyrian meant the utmost

conceivable humiliation (Winckler, *Altor. Forsch.*, i. 291).

15 f. Cp. xviii., *ll.* 101–104, lxxvii.⁽²⁾, *ll.* 26–29.

17–20. Virtually equivalent to *ll.* 7, 8. The poet felt that to make the frequent repetition of the N. Arabian ethnic names less glaring, it was desirable to repeat the reference to the compassionateness of the king, who had to crush the oppressors in order to deliver the oppressed and to save them from a renewal of their miseries.

22. Cp. on cxvi. 15. *Precious*, *i.e.* too precious to be given up to violent men—אַנְשֵׁי דְּבָיִים, cxxxix. 19.

23 f. Alluding to the captivity of Jews in Edom (see lxxviii.⁽²⁾, *ll.* 6 f., cxxxvii., corr. texts). The removal of the reference to intercession for the king (see crit. note) has important critical consequences. See introd.

25 ff. A fine passage if it were not so plainly imitative. For the quatrain as here restored, cp. Isa. xxvii. 6 (פָּרַח = תְּנוּבָה, יִצְיִן, יִשְׂרָאֵל), Hos. xiv. 5 f., Ps. xcii. 8, 13. Cp. also *Enc. Bib.*, 'Cedar,' 'Fir.'—Doxology, *l.* 4. Taken from Num. xiv. 21. See crit. note.

Critical Notes. 1. M כִּשְׁפָטִיךְ. G S T J כִּישְׁפָטִיךְ; so Gr. Bā., We., Du. Plausible, cp. on xxxvi. 7*b*. See, however, exeg. note.—In *l.* 2 read probably צְדָקְתֶיךָ (ciii. 6).

5 ff. M לִינֶכָּ. Omit (לֹום) dittographed).—M בְּצִדְקָה. Read צְדָקָה. The ב came in through בצדק in *τ.* 2*α*.—Read יַעֲמִיךְ.

9 f. At first sight one might suppose M's וידכּה עוֹשֶׁק to be a corrupt duplication of the opening words of *τ.* 5. It is clear, however, that G (καὶ συμποραμένει) represents a variant ויארִיךְ (cp. Eccles. vii. 15), which Lag., Bā., Brüll (*Jahrb. f. jüd. Gesch. u. Lit.* 1885, p. 71), Che.¹, and Now., prefer to M's יִרְאוּךְ. Certainly עִם שְׂמִישׁ is difficult; is the object God or the king? Gr. and (in ignorance of Gr.) We. would read יִרְאוּרוּ. This cannot be right. 'They shall fear him,' is not tolerable, wedged in between couplets in which the subject of the verbs is, not the Israelites, but the Israelitish king, while Grätz's rendering 'that they may revere him (*i.e.* the king)' is a mere makeshift. Then, is Lagarde to be followed? But who can say that the statement, 'he shall live as long as the sun endures,' is probable either between *τ.* 4 and *τ.* 6, or even

(if we follow Duhm, and regard *עז*. 5—11 as a Messianic interpolation) as a prefix to *עז*. 7—11? A statement of the king's eternity (cp. 'aeternitas tua,' Plin. *Ep.* x. 87, addressed to Trajan) would come naturally either at the beginning or at the end (cp. *עז*. 17) of the psalm, not—even if Duhm's view were correct—in the middle. If *ויאריך* be adopted, we ought to regard the distich (*עז*. 5) as a variant to *עז*. 17, and therefore to remove it to the margin as a note on *עז*. 17. Another critical course must therefore be taken. Sometimes *שמש* is found to represent *כָּשֶׁם* (see e.g. lxxiv. 16, cxxi. 6. and the place-name which passes as Beth-shemesh, cp. also *סוס* for *כוש*, Isa. lxi. 20, &c.). This reading will suit perfectly, if we point *עם*, and further adopt the reading *ידכא* instead of *ייראוך* or *יאריך*. In a psalm which contains so many names of countries, we cannot be surprised to find the name of such an important N. Arabian people as Cush or Cusham, and the anticipation that Cush shall be broken to pieces is paralleled by the statement in lxxxix. 11a (corr. text). Thus *ידכא עושק* is a variant to *ייראוך עם־שמש*, which enables us to restore one important word with absolute correctness. *עושק*, as we can now see, represents [עם כושם]. It should be added that *שמיש* represents not only *כשם* but also the verb required for *ל. 10* (= *עז*. 5b), viz. *ישמיד*, which fell out through its containing the letters *שכו* which enter into *שמיש*. The last two letters of *ישמיד* became *ול*, and were combined with *פני* (miswritten for *בני*) to make *לפני ירה* = 'ירח' = 'ירחמאל' (cp. 'Jerah' in Gen. x. 26). Read therefore,—

יִדְכָא עַם כְּשֶׁם
וּשְׁמִיד בְּנֵי יִרְחַמְאֵל

11. MG *יִרְד* : *דִּרְדֵּרִים*. A careless scribe's three attempts to write *יִרְדֵּר*.—M *כְּכַמְטֵר עֲלֵגֵנוּ*. According to Duhm, this is Messianic. 'The verse says of the Messiah the same that in Hos. vi. 3b is said of Yahwè.' There, however, the verb is *יָבֹא*; here it is *יִרְד*. Is the Messiah anywhere said to 'come down'? And what of *גֵּז*? It is usual to render 'mown grass,' and to compare Am. vii. 1; G *Σ* J, however, render *πόκον, vellus*. See also G. Hoffmann, *ZATW*, 1883, p. 117, who is controverted by Hupf.-Nowack, ii. 201. On the whole question see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Mowings.' The text (here and in Am., *l.c.*) is corrupt. In this context we surely require ethnic names. Read probably *כִּיעֲבַת* *וְעִמְלֵק*. The first *ע* dropped out, and *ת* became *ט*. *ק* became *ג*, and a mutilated Aramaic *כּ* became an Aramaic *ז*. See exeg. note.

12. First, as to *זִרְזִיף*. The word is not at all a probable one. It occurs once (= 'overflow') in post-Biblical literature (*Yoma*, 87a); the verb *זִרְזִיף* is also found (Midr. on Cant. i. 3). J. Kennedy (*Heb. Synonyms*, 111) groups *זִרְזִיף* with *סַגְרִיר* (Prov. xxvii. 15), but this word is also an improbable one; read *שְׁעִירִים* or *רְסִיסִים* (cp. on civ. 13).

Since 'like showers, an overflow (on) the land' is impossible, Hu., Bi., Che.⁽¹⁾, read יַרְיָה, and Duhm זְרִיפּוּ (*G στράγγουσαι*), but such Aramaic coinages are very improbable. Next, as to the entire line. If זְרִיפּוּ is corrupt, how can we safely trust כְּרִבִּיבִים (see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Rain') and אֶרֶץ? As in *l.* 11, we expect, not a figure from nature, but ethnic names (cp. on רִבִּיבִים, *lxv.* 11). It is not the gentle descent of rain but the destruction of hostile powers that we expect in this context. אֶרֶץ might, as elsewhere, come from מִצָּר. More probably, however, זְרִיפּוּ and אֶרֶץ should be taken together, and the line should be read רַחֲבוֹתַיִם וְצִרְפָּתַיִם, which is amply sufficient to form a trimeter.

Glosses. Verses 7, 8 are entirely composed of glosses, and three small glosses occur in *τ.* 10. To understand the former, the text of *τ.* 7, 8 must be closely examined. That צִדִּיק should be צִדָּק (*G S J*; 3 MSS. Kenn.; Secker, Street, Kr., Lag., Gr., We., Du.) few will doubt. ביִמְיוֹ has escaped criticism. It is however otiose, whereas 'in the land,' or the like, is to be expected. Verses 7, 8, as we shall see, are so deeply corrupt that it is reasonable to look for the word which comes nearest to ביִמְיוֹ, and to emend accordingly. The right word is בְּאֶדְמָה (cp. *lxxxv.* 12). We next ask, Is *τ.* 7*b* correct in its present form? רַב שְׁלוֹם is suspicious; רַב is otiose with יִפְרָה. Suspicious again is עֲדַבְלֵי יָרֵחַ; why should the flourishing of prosperity have a term set to it? Parallel passages in *τ.* 5 and 17 can be shown to be corrupt, and in one of these verses יִרְחַ is a mutilated form of יִרְחֵמָל. The analogy of Zech. ix. 10 (to be referred to again) warrants us in reading (for *τ.* 7*b*), וַיְרִיד יִשְׁמַעְיָאֵל וַיִּרְחֵמָל. Now we turn to *τ.* 8. That there is an allusion to Zech. ix. 10. has long ago been noticed. It has not, however, been observed that Zech. ix. is a highly corrupt section, and that in its original form it related throughout, not to Damascus, Tyre, Philistia, Greece, but to the N. Arabian neighbours of the Jews (see *Crit. Biblica*, 186). Omitting the opening words, Zech. ix. 10 should almost certainly run thus.—וְהִכְרִיתִּי קִשְׁתֵּי יִרְחֵמָאֵל וְהוֹרִיד יִשְׁמַעְיָאֵל וַיִּרְחֵמָאֵל מִנְהַר עֲדָ—וַיְרִיד יִרְחֵמָאֵל מִנְהַר עֲדָ—וְהִכְרִיתִּי אֶפְסֵי אֶרֶץ אֶרֶץ, and that the first two words should be expanded by the insertion of וַיִּשְׁמַעְיָאֵל; iv. 8 and Zech. ix. 10 have in fact been harmonized. On the glosses in *τ.* 11 see below.

13. M צִיִּים. Ol., Dy., Bi., Gr., Che.⁽¹⁾, We., Du., read צָרִים. But we need an ethnic name. G gives *Aithiopes*, but this, as *lxxiv.* 14 (*τοῖς Αἰθίοσι = לְצִיִּים*) shows, is a paraphrase, not a translation. Read מְצִרִים.—
14. M וְאַבְיוֹ. Read וְעֲרָבִים.—15. M G's text is evidently too long, nor is either 'Tarshish' or 'the coast-lands' appropriate here; 'kings'

too is unexpected. The remedies are suggested by experience elsewhere. Read **ירחמאלים וְאֲשׁוּרִים כְּנַחַח יִשְׁבוּ**, but here **ירחמאלים** may be omitted as an incorrect variant to **ואשׁ**.—16. Omit **וסָבָא** as an interpolation, read **שְׁבָאִים**, and for **אֲשַׁחַר חֶרְץ אֲשַׁכַּר** read **חֶרְץ אֲשַׁחַר** (חרץ, written 'חר, fell out); **אשׁ** a gloss on **תְּרִישׁ אֲשַׁכַּר**. **אֲשַׁכַּר** occurs again in Ezek. xxvii. 15, but read **סַחֲרִיד**. Omit **כֹּלְכִי** (ditto-graphed).

Gloss. In *v.* 11 note **כֹּלְכִים**, presupposing the faulty reading **כֹּלְכִי** in *v.* 10. The influence of lxviii.⁽²⁾, *ll.* 26 f. may also be suspected.

17. M **שׁוּעַ** T **שׁוּעַ**. Read **יַעֲוִשׁ [ק]**. G S J **שׁוּעַ** (Isa. xxxii. 5, Job xxxiv. 19); less probable, though still defensible (cp. Sirach xiii. 18).—20. M **אֲבִיוֹנִים**. Parallelism requires **נְקִיִּים**; cp. Jer. ii. 34, where **אֲבִיוֹנִים** and **נְקִיִּים** are variants.—21. M G **וּכְחִסִּים**; too vague, also too long. **כְּחִסִּים** is an unusual form (though some read it in x. 7, lv. 12). **כְּחִסִּים** and **כְּחִסִּים**, however, are equally uncertain (cp. on x. 7, lv. 12), and **תַּכְּכִים** in Prov. xxix. 15 is at any rate doubtful. It is an ethnic that we expect here. We may take our choice between **כְּעֵנַת**, which is probably represented by **תוֹךְ**, and **כְּשָׁם** (see on xviii. *l.* 98), which has become **חַמִּס**. 'Cusham' seems to be a gloss on **כְּעֵנַת**.

Gloss. In *v.* 15 **וַיְחִי** is a variant to **יְחִי** in *v.* 16 (see on *l.* 25). The next words are a paraphrase of *v.* 10*b* (*l.* 16). **כְּיִהְיֶה** is important as showing that the glossator understood the meaning of the now misread second part of *v.* 10.

23 f. G J give plural verbs, which Duhm prefers, but wrongly. The passage is deeply corrupt, though it has now become easy to correct it. For **כְּלֵהִיּוֹם וְגו'** read **וַיִּפְּלִיט עֲבָדָיו כְּאָדוֹם**, and for **כְּלֵהִיּוֹם וְגו'** read **כְּלֵהִיּוֹם וְגו'**. **כְּלֵהִיּוֹם** and **כְּלֵהִיּוֹם** frequently conceal different words.

25. M **בְּאַרְצוֹ** | **יְהִי פֶסֶת בְּר**. **פֶסֶת** is generally rendered *expansio*, *diffusio*, but the philological basis is insecure. **Σ** gives *ἔχθος* = **פֶסֶת** in Targ. and Talm. (Herz). *G* *σπῆγμα*; *ἄκρον* seems to have fallen out; **T** has **סִנְיָה לְהַמָּא**. Is this a pure guess? It hardly presupposes **כְּשֵׁנַת**. Lag., Gr., Che.⁽¹⁾, We., **שֵׁנַת** (cp. Job xxii. 11). Quite independently, Herz and Duhm have proposed **כִּסְת** (an Aramaism). But as the next words in M are, as Duhm says, 'mere nonsense,' we may well look further for the truth. P^{asek} warns us against **בְר**, which is in fact miswritten for **בְּאַרְצוֹ**. For **פֶסֶת** read probably **כְּשֵׁנַת** (cp. Isa. xxxii. 16); **יְחִי** should be **יְחִי** (*v.* 15, **וַיְחִי**).

26. The prevalent error respecting **בְר** generally results in placing corn-fields on the top of the mountains. To avoid this W F bring out

this rendering, 'The mountain-tops rustle like a Lebanon of fruit'; certainly very hyperbolic indeed! ירעש, 'rustle,' would be strange anywhere (though note Del.'s Arabic parallel). In such an unadorned poem as Ps. lxxii. it is inconceivable. G ἵπεραρθήσεται ὑπὲρ τὸν Λιβ., *i.e.* ינְשֵׂא מִלְּבָנוֹן—a pure conjecture. Read יִשְׂרֹשׁ; the corruption was partly caused by the proximity of בראש (cp. Ewald, 'es gipfle,' from ראש!). For בראש read פְּכָבוֹשׁ. See exeg. note.

27 f. M's פְּרִי פְּלִבְנוֹן is too short for a line: כארו must have fallen out, owing to the resemblance of ארו to ירעש. Read פְּאָרוּ פְּלִבְנוֹן פְּרָה (xcii. 13).—M וַיִּצְיֹנוּ מִיַּעַר וְנוֹ'. Read certainly וַיִּצְיֹן פִּיעֶשֶׁב וַיִּצְיֹן הָאָרְצִין, omitting מעיר (though G read it) as a corruption of יערים, which is manifestly a variant to הרים (l. 26).

29. M ישנו, followed by Pasek. G, however, has ἔστω τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ εὐλογημένου εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, where, as Duhm points out, τὸ ὄν. αὐτ. (*i.e.* ישנו) is a correction based on M, and εὐλογ. represents the true reading פְּרוּף.—30. In לפני־שמש (M G) שמש is but a distortion of שמו (written too soon). Read לְפָנֶיךָ. Next as to ינון. The Kr. is ינון, which is not Niphal of נין (?), but a corruption of יפון (so G J S [?] T [?]; 1 MS. de R.). So Street, Bā. (?). Ges.-Bu. (pp. 526a, 173a, however, infers from G's διαμερεῖ the reading ידון, but can we rely for this on M's text of Gen. vi. 3? Duhm, ינין, an improbable Aramaism.—31. A parallel to כל־נוים is wanting. Insert כָּל־יִשְׁפָּחֹת (Bi.): nearly so Street, Bā., Du., following G's πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς.

Doxology, l. 4. Read וַיִּכְלָא, Geiger, Kautzsch (Ges.²⁰, § 121c), following G Num. xiv. 21 (ἐμπλήσει).

Subscription. M תְּפִלוֹת. G οἱ ὕμνοι αὐτοῦ. Read תְּהִלוֹת (Kr., Gr., Abbott). So perhaps in Hab. iii. 1. read תְּהִלָּה.

PSALM LXXIII.

TRIMETERS. A psalm of struggling but victorious faith. A slight rearrangement of stanzas 8–11 greatly improves the effect. The psalm opens with a statement of the finally attained conviction that in spite of appearances Yahwè's favour is for Israel and his wrath for Israel's foes (ll. 1, 2). Then begins a most affecting description of a period of mental agony. The speaker says that for a moment he had fallen headlong into a 'pit' (l. 4). He saw a body of persons enjoying an uninterrupted course of prosperity (ll. 5–10), and as a consequence so possessed by pride that they stopped at no blasphemy, and as it were drank up treason (ll. 11–20). The peoples to which they belonged were of N. Arabia: Arabians, Cushites, Jerahmeelites, Ishmaelites are the names given to them. In ll. 23 f., however, they are simply called 'the wicked' and 'the unrighteous': we may perhaps infer that they were not invaders, but permanent settlers, and that lawless

Jews had joined them. Even over the pious community—the true Israel—a wave of scepticism passed at the sight of such an apparent failure of retribution. Some of its members actually questioned God's capacity of discernment, and pronounced the moral discipline to which they had subjected themselves of no avail (*ll.* 21-28), and since the words used are, 'my feet gave way' (*l.* 3), and 'I said' (*l.* 21), we may conclude that among those whose faith gave way were many of the leading Jews. It was with the deepest pain that they became unbelievers, but for a time they were (from the Hebrew point of view) no better than atheists, for they 'denied' God's lovingkindness and faithfulness, on which hitherto they had rested their whole religion. Looking back upon this, they saw how foolish they had been, and recognized that they had missed the only possible explanation of the facts, viz. that when God's time (the Messianic judgment) has come the wicked will be suddenly swept away like grass (*cp.* *xcii.* 8?). Pious Israel recovered its balance, and the joyous consciousness of the divine Companion returned to it. The path on which Israel walks is the path to glory. No inward temptation nor outward misfortune can cause him to stumble. He longs for Yahwè—the peerless God—to reveal himself as Israel's eternal portion. No more will he give way to doubt; the denial of God leads to ruin. *Cp.* *Jewish Religious Life*, 238-240, 246 f.

There is a close parallelism between this psalm and *xlix.*, where, however, there is no reference to any wavering on the part of Israel, and a still closer resemblance to *Pss.* *xxxix.*⁽¹⁾, *xciv.*⁽¹⁾, and *cxvi.* (see introductions). *Pss.* *xxxvii.* and *xcii.* (see below, on *ll.* 5, 35) are also parallel. It is plain that the speaker is no individual—no Hebrew Pascal—but the community, or, at least, the 'dullards among the people,' mentioned in an explanatory passage of the parallel *Ps.* *xciv.* Smend's remark (*p.* 124) that, in spite of the apparent references to the experience of an individual, the psalm may yet have been composed for public worship, is fully justified by the revised text. The features which seem to point in an opposite direction (*vv.* 15, 17) are due to corruption of the text. (*Cp.*, however, *Coblenz*, pp. 176 ff.; *Roy*, pp. 63 f.) If so, it becomes impossible to quote this psalm as an evidence of the rising hope of personal immortality. On the basis of the traditional text, one might indeed do this; Charles thinks this justified ('Eschatology,' *Enc. Bib.*, col. 1367), and so formerly thought the present writer (*OP*, 390, 422; *Ps.*⁽¹⁾ on *Ps.* *lxxiii.*). Nor can we venture to say with Laue (*Comp. des B. Hiob*, 82, note) that *Ps.* *lxxiii.* is only intelligible as a Maccabæan psalm.

Marked: of Asaph.

		I
1	Surely Yahwè is good to Israel, Those of Jerahmeel [he abhors]. But as for me, my feet gave way ; As I trod, I stumbled at a pit.	2
	For I was enraged at the impious, I was incensed at the prosperity of the wicked ; For of stripes they have no experience, Continually they see prosperity.	4
	In the day of desolation they are safe,	5
10	In the day of calamity they are not smitten : Therefore pride possesses them, With the garment of violence they clothe themselves.	6
	They increase their strength by their iniquity, They prevail by the devices of their hearts ; They crush thy people, O Yahwè !	8
	+Even+ Arabia, Cusham, and Jerahmeel.	

	The Cushites subvert thy possession,	9
	Thine inheritance the Ishmaelites break to pieces ;	
	Therefore they deny Yahwè,	10
20	And treason they swallow greedily.	
	Then I said, ' How can God have noticed anything ?	11
	Has the Most High the power to discern ?	
	Behold, the wicked prosper,	12
	The unrighteous amass wealth.	
	How vain it is to cleanse my heart,	13
	And to desire the dwelling-place of his glory,	
	When strokes fall upon me continually,	14
	And stripes every morning.'	
	And shuddering took hold of me	
30	At the iniquity of those of Jerahmeel ;	16
	For my heart was astonished,	21
	And in my reins I was horror-stricken ;	
	I myself rejected wisdom,	15
	Thy lovingkindness and faithfulness I denied ;	
	I became a dullard, I was ignorant,	22
	I lacked discernment respecting thee,	
	Until I gave heed to the judgments of God,	17
	And discerned the future of those men :	
	How ₊ suddenly ₊ calamities overtake them !	18
40	Thou castest upon them gloom ₊ of Deathland ₊ !	
	How are they brought to ruin in a moment,	19
	Swept clean away are the impious ones !	
	Jerahmeel and Cusham are destroyed,	20
	The Arabians and Miṣrites thou sweepest away.	
	But as for me, I rejoice evermore ;	23
	Thou hast hold of my right hand :	
	According to thy purpose thou ledest me,	24
	And makest known to me the path of glory.	
	Whom has Yahwè ₊ for a peer ₊ in heaven ?	25
50	Or who upon earth is like God, my stronghold ?	
	My flesh and my heart pine for him—	26
	My Rock and my Portion for ever.	

Truly those will perish who insult thee, 27
 Every one that blasphemeth thy name thou wilt extinguish.

But as for me, I cleave unto my God, 28
 I trust in Yahwè¹ my Refuge.²

1. אֶף טוֹב, less probably 'only good,' *i.e.* even when as now the wicked seem to be God's favourites. As in xxxix. 6, lxii. 2, &c., renderings vary. Adopting the secondary adversative sense, J gives *attamen*; Σ πλὴν ὅντως; Calvin *atqui*. Marot finely 'Si est ce que Dieu est très doux.' אֶף belongs to

the whole sentence, including the statement of God's abhorrence of Jerahmeel. —3. *My feet gave way*. As we shall see presently, it was the prevailing might of the Edomite oppressors which led a section of the pious community into grievous sin, denying Yahwè's lovingkindness and faithfulness (*l.* 34). Another psalmist, qualifying a similar confession which might scandalize the community, represents this 'giving way of the feet' as merely an apprehended danger. 'If I say, My foot gives way, | Thy lovingkindness, O Yahwè! holds me up.'

5. **The impious** were a continual eyesore to the pious. 'Let me put a guard on my mouth,' says one of their representatives, 'while the wicked confronts me' (xxxix. 2). Intercourse with them was a sin (xxvi. 4b, l. 18); but even to be *enraged* at them (see on xxxvii. 1, xlix. 6) was only too likely to lead to sin. Hence the need of frank declarations like the present and the parallel psalms. —7. *Stripes,*

תְּבוֹרוֹת. Metaphorically, as *v.* 14b, xxxviii. 6; cp. Isa. i. 6, liii. 5. For the idea of *ll.* 7, 8, cp. Job xxi. 9, 'Their houses are prosperous, without fear, | Neither is the rod of God upon them.'

15-18. Parallel passage, xciv. 4 f. —19. *Deny Yahwè*, as xlix. 3, 14, 17, l. 22.—20. It is treason, מֵעַל, even for Cushites to violate holy persons or things on Yahwè's land.—*Swallow greedily*. Cp. Job xxxiv. 7, '(Job) who

drinks up scorning like water.'—21-28. *Then I said*, &c. Parallel passages, xciv. 7, 'And I said, Yahwè doth not see, Jacob's God doth not observe'; x. 4, 11, 13; Job xxii. 13.—*How vain is it*, &c. Parallel passages, xxxix. 9b, cxvi. 11; Job xxi. 15, xxii. 13. In his consternation (cxvi. 11) the speaker contradicts the finest of the Hebrew psalms (*e.g.* xxvi.).—*To cleanse my heart*, *i.e.* to keep it free from the sense of guilt (cp. Prov. xx. 9).—29 ff. See crit. notes.

33-36. See introd., and crit. notes. True wisdom consists in knowing that God is a rewarder of those that seek him (xxiv. 5 f.). *A dullard*. Cp. xcii. 7 f., xciv. 12 f.—37. *The judgments of God*, *i.e.* how God manifests his justice in act. M, 'the sanctuaries of God,' which most, very unsuitably to the context, take to mean the temple (cp. lxxviii. 36). Some, however³ (Ol., Ew., Hi., Wellh., Duhm), explain, 'God's secrets, or mysteries' (Wisd. ii. 22), the divine plans or principles of action being like the inner sanctuary of the temple, and requiring a special preliminary purification. Duhm even thinks that this peculiar phrase may refer to the Pharisaean doctrine of immortality, which was at first esoteric, and only propagated with caution. The sense produced by this rendering is good, but the Hebrew has to be forced. Consequently the text must be wrong. See crit. note.—40. *Gloom (of Deathland)*. Cp. lv. 6b. The 'gloom' is that of sudden calamity; see next stanza.—42. *The impious*, as *l.* 5.—43 f. The renewed reference to the offending peoples by their names shows the art of the poet; stanza 11 corresponds to stanza 4. For a time Jerahmeel and Cushim, Arabia and Misrim seemed gods upon earth, and crushed Yahwè's poor without mercy. Now the retaliation arrives; Yahwè crushes his people's enemies. The traditional text is obscure and scarcely

¹ The Lord.

² To rehearse all thy wonders.

³ So, before the moderns, Vatablus (*Crit. Sacr.*, 1660, iii. 3837).

intelligible. The editor evidently intended a parallelism of expression between הָלוֹם and צִלְכֵם. But no exegesis will succeed in producing a parallelism of thought. 'Their phantasm' (צִלְכֵם) can only mean 'their semblance of life'; but 'a dream' (חֲלוֹם) has reference to the impression produced on an observer by the sudden destruction of living persons (cp. Job xx. 8). The one records an objective, the other a subjective fact. The verb תְּבוֹהָ too is most unsuitable. Men do not despise their dreams; indeed, the ancients ascribed to them a prophetic significance. Nor can Yahwē be said to 'despise' those whom he sweeps away as by a destructive flood.

45. Stanza 12 corresponds to stanza 1. Now that the speaker sees that God is just—stem to the transgressors,

but good to the upright—he can take up again the וַאֲנִי ('as for me') of l. 3, and give it a happier setting. 'As for me'—whose feet but lately gave way—'I rejoice evermore' (תְּכוֹיֵד). And then follows a striking and felicitous repetition of the substance of xvi. 7-9 and 11 (see notes).

49 f. Israel's 'goodly heritage'—to be united to the God of gods. Even now, he is conscious of this happiness, but the full enjoyment of it will be in the near Messianic future. The 'king of glory' (xxiv. 7-10) has not yet made his triumphant entrance into his sanctuary. See introd.

53. It is no vague anathema against the wicked in general. The inveterate and incorrigible enemies of Israel and Israel's religion are the objects of the speaker's wrath. Cp. xlv. 17, lxxiv. 18.

Critical Notes. 1. Why, inquires Duhm, should 'Israel' be mentioned as a people, when no reference is made in the sequel to non-Israelites? Besides 7: 1a seems to be too short. Hence Schorr, Grätz, Perles, and Duhm read אַךְ טוֹב לְיִשְׂרָאֵל, and draw אֱלֹהִים over to l. 2. But the distich thus produced is not a good one, and the sequel rightly read leads us to expect a reference to non-Israelites. In lxxvi. 6 אֲבִירֵי לֵב has taken the place of יִרְחֲמֵאֵלִים; it is probable that the same word should be substituted here for the traditional reading לִבְרֵי לֵבָב. A word has fallen out before 'ירח'; it is יִתְעַב, the resemblance of which to טוֹב in l. 1 may have led to the omission. Read therefore—אֶךְ טוֹב לְיִשְׂרָאֵל יִהוּהוּ יִתְעַב יִרְחֲמֵאֵלִים.

3 f. M פְּכִיעַט נָטוּי (Kt.) or נָטְוִי (K̄r.). Bā. defends נָטוּי. But a participial clause like this at the opening of a narrative is very unlikely. K̄n. (§ 348 e β) thinks that the position of the י may be influenced by רָנְוִי. But the words are certainly corrupt. 1. כְּמִיעַט is a needless qualification: the speaker, as we shall see, had not almost, but altogether slipped. 2. It is metrically superfluous. 3. נָטָה, 'to swerve,' should be followed by מְאָרָה, or the like (xlv. 19). Gr., for a reason of his own, reads נָטָוּ, but keeps כְּמִיעַט. But this word, not less than נָטוּי, represents נָטָוּ; נ=כ, ע has grown out of a misplaced ו. In נָטוּי וי is a fragment of נִי; ו has dropped out.—M שִׁפְכָה אֲשַׁרִי (Kt.) or שִׁפְכֵנו (K̄r.). K̄r. has very little support from MSS. Del. and Bā. defend שִׁפְכָה grammatically, but there is a most important previous question: can שִׁפַּךְ mean 'to slip'? A Latin parallel (*fundere, effundere*) is

worthless. כַּאֲשֶׁר is also suspicious; nowhere else does this mean 'almost.' Read נִכְשְׁלִי בְּפִחַת אֲשֶׁרִי.

5 f. M בַּהוֹלְלִים. Read בִּנְבָלִים (see on v. 6, lxxv. 5). The same word (נ) in another corrupt form occurs in *v.* 19 (*L.* 42).—M שְׁלוֹם, אֲרָאָה. Read בְּשָׁלוֹם, אֶתְחַר (cp. on אִירָא, xlix. 6).

7 f. M חֲרָצְבוֹת. Cp. Isa. lviii. 6, where the lexicons give the Arabic sense of 'bands.' There, however, read מַעֲנֵדוֹת (and אָסִיר for רָשִׁעַ). In our passage read חֲבֵרוֹת. Less probably Gr., ἐνצֵבֹת. G has ἀνάνευσις (ἀναρώσις?).—M לְמוֹתֵם וּבְרִיא אוֹלָם. But a reference to euthanasia is out of place. Most read לָמוֹתֵם (Moerlius in 1737, Street, Ewald, Hitzig, Wellh. &c.). But תָּם and בְּרִיא do not go well together. A more thorough correction is required. G ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτῶν (attached to α) καὶ στερέωμα ἐν τῇ μάστιγι αὐτῶν (בְּנִגְעֵם וְאֶבִיר בְּנִגְעֵם). Read תְּכַיֵּד רָאוּ שְׁלוֹם.

9b. M בְּעַמְלֵי אָנוּשׁ אֵינֵינוּ. Strange. 'They are not in the trouble of men'! In the form אֵינֵינוּ Kōn. (ii. 446) finds the influence of forms like אֵלֵינוּ (ii. 5) and עֵלֵינוּ (v. 12). Read בְּיָוֵם שְׂאוֹן יִשְׁלָמוּ. The ל was inserted to make sense after יי had been corrupted into ע. אָנוּשׁ for שְׂאוֹן, as perhaps in Jer. xvii. 16 and Isa. xvii. 11 (see *SBOT*, Heb., pp. 90, 195, but also *Crit. Bib.*, pp. 24, 62). וְיַעֲמֵד אָדָם. Read וְיָבִיחַ אֵיד (cf. Dt. xxxii. 35. Job xxi. 30).

11 f. M עֲנַקְתֵּנוּ. 'All the Vss. except T have misunderstood the word,' says Bā. Rather, all the Vss., incl. T, except G, misunderstand. Σ ἠμφίλασαντο; J nutriti sunt (אֵינֵנוּ); T עֲטַרְתָּנוּ (surrounds them). Three guesses. The modern view is also a guess. G has the true text; ἐκράτησεν αὐτούς, i.e. אֶחָזְתֵנוּ. אָחַז became אָקַנ.—M שִׁית (שִׁית has been suggested). Cf. סוֹת (from סוּוֹת, Bö.), Gen. xlix. 11. Both שִׁית and סוֹת should be corrected בְּסוֹת (so Gr., Ball in Gen.), and in Ex. xxxiv. 33 כִּסּוֹת should be כִּבְסָה. Correct שִׁית also in Prov. vii. 10. *L.* 12 as a whole should run thus, בְּסוֹת חָמִסִּים יִעֲטְפוּ לָמוֹ. So virtually Herz. If חָמִסִּים לָמוֹ belong together (T and accents), יִעֲטֵף has no object. Note plur. verbs in G S.

13. M יִצָּא מִחֶלֶב עֵינֵינוּ. G ἐξελεύσεται ὡς ἐκ στόματος ἢ ἀδικίας αὐτῶν, which Suidas explains, 'With all security they will speak unrighteousness.' ἢ ἀδικ. (so S) is of course right, as Bp. Horsley, Hi., Ew. and most agree. But חֶלֶב as a mere synonym for לֵב is very doubtful; is there any reason for emphasizing insensibility here (it is otherwise in xvii. 10)?

Herz suggests, **יַעֲצֵמֵי הַלֵּב בְּעֵינָיו**. But **עַצַּם** means to close the eyes; we hardly dare extend the reference. Better, **יֵאֲמְצוּ הַיָּל בִּעְוָה**: cf. **אֲמִין בַּח**, Am. ii. 14, Nah. ii. 2, Prov. xxiv. 5.

14. M's **מִיַּטְבוֹת** should mean 'imaginations' (so S), but cannot be so rendered. Prov. xviii. 11 is certainly corrupt. There has been both transposition and corruption. Read perhaps **יִגְבְּרוּ בְּמַחְשְׁבוֹת קָבֶם** **לְבַהוֹן**.

15 f. M **יִמְיָקוּ**, an Aramaizing *ἀπ. λεγ.* of unsuitable sense. Note Patek. Then follows **וַיְדַבְּרוּ בְרָע**; clearly wrong. Wicked men do not 'speak concerning evil': they speak evil, and then they act evil. M's division of the verse too is against the Vss., except S and perhaps J (see Lagarde). The key is supplied by a parallel psalm (xciv.). Read perhaps **עֲפִיךָ יוֹהוּ יִדְבְּרוּ** (xciv. 5*a*). **ברע** is no doubt from **עָרַב** (cp. **בַּעִיר**, *v.* 20).— M **יִדְבְּרוּ כִפְרוֹם**; *G* *ἀδικίαν εἰς τὸ ὕψος* (cp. S) *ἐλάλησαν*. For **עֵשֶׂק** we should expect **עָתַק**, always used with **דָּבַר** (xxxii. 19, lxxv. 6, xciv. 9, 1 S. ii. 3). Or we might read **עֲקָשׁ** (Buhl, 'for **עֲקָשׁ**'); cp. *SBOT* on Isa. xxx 12). Both inadequate corrections. Note repeated **יִדְבְּרוּ**. Siegfr.-Sta. remark, p. 379, 'In Ps. x. 5, lvi. 3, xcii. 9, perhaps textual error.' They might have added lxxiii. 9. Read certainly **פִּוְשֵׁם יִרְחַמְיָאֵל** (**עָרַב**). **ירח** is represented both by **כִּמְרוֹם** and partly by **יִדְבְּרוּ** (*i.e.* by **יִדַּב**).

17 f. M **שֵׁתוּ בְּשָׁמַיִם פִּיהֶם**; a strange phrase, however interpreted! The editor has cleverly made an external parallelism between **בְּשָׁמַיִם** in *a* and **בְּאָרְץ** in *b*. But xciv. 5*b* supplies the true key, which also solves the problem of the next line, where the tongue is represented as a roving brigand (**תַּהֲלֵךְ**; Lag., Now., We. **כִּתְהַלֵּךְ**; Tg however **כַּצְּלָהֵבָה**, *i.e.* **תַּהֲלֵב** [Herz], or **תַּלְהֵט** [lxxxiii. 15]). Read *H.* 17 f.,—

**יִרְשָׁתֶךָ פִּוְשֵׁי יַהֲפֹכוּ
יִשְׁכְּעֵי אֱלֹהִים נַחֲלָתֶךָ יָרֹצוּ**

Observe here that **יִרְשָׁתֶךָ** must have been written **וַיִּרְשָׁתֶךָ** attached itself to a misplaced fragment of **יִרְחַמְיָאֵל** (*viz.* **ירח** = **ידב**).

19 f. M **לִכְוֹן | יֹשִׁיב עַמּוֹ הַלֵּם**. So Kt.; but K_r. **יֹשִׁיב**, which the Rabbis and most moderns prefer. *G* *διὰ τοῦτο ἐπιστρέψει ὁ λαός μου ἐνταῦθα*, *i.e.* **יֹשִׁיב עַמִּי** (cp. S). There is deep corruption. Houb., Lag., Perles **יִשְׁבְּעוּ ל' לִכְוֹן יִשְׁבְּעֵינוּ לָחֶם**; Gildemeister (*ZDMG* xiii. 530) **יִשְׁבְּעוּ ל' לִכְוֹן יִשְׁבְּעֵנוּ לָחֶם**; Herz. **הַיֹּשִׁיבוּ עָתִל**. But, as the parallel psalms show, a reference to

deniers of God is to be expected. Read certainly—**לְכֹן יִכְהַשְׁנוּ אֱלֹהִים** (יהודה).—M **וְכִי כִלְיָא יִמְצְאוּ לָמוֹ**. 'Quite obscure' (Kautzsch). Bread (? *l.* 19) and water, the rewards of impiety? Or (apart from *l.* 19) can 'water' mean 'doctrine' (cp. *Pirke Aboth* i. 4, 11). So perhaps Σ, *καὶ διαδοχῆ* (? *διδασχῆ*) *πληγῆς*. G *καὶ ἡμέραι πλήρεις* = **וַיִּמְיֵם כִּלְיָא יִם**. G Σ J read **יִמְצְאוּ**. Budde, Wellh. **מִים כִּלְיָאִים**. Herz, **וַיִּמְיֵם יִמְצְאוּ**. **רָכִו**. Such groping is quite ineffectual. As a parallel to *l.* 19 read, **וַיִּמְיֵם יִמְצְאוּ לָמוֹ**; cp. Isa. lxvi. 11 (**תִּכְבְּצוּ**). See exeg. note.

21. M **וְאָמְרוּ**; G *καὶ εἶπαν*. Read certainly **וְאָמַר** (see *l.* 25); for a parallel, see on xciv. 7. G's *καὶ εἶπα*, at the head of *v.* 13, may have been a marginal correction of *καὶ εἶπαν*.

23 f. M **אֱלֹהִים**. Probably a fragment of **עֲוֹלִים** written by error instead of **רשעים**. M's **וַיִּשְׁלֹו** is no doubt from **וַיִּשְׁלֹו**. G *ἰδοὺ ἁμαρτωλοὶ καὶ ἐύθιμοῦνται*.—M **עֲוֹלִים**. Read **וְעֲוֹלִים** (very nearly so Gr.).

25 f. For G, see on *l.* 21.—In *l.* 26 the editor recast an indistinctly written passage on the model of xxvi. 6 (also corrupt). Read **וְאֶחָפֶן וְאֶחָפֶן**. See on xxvi. 6.

27 f. M **וְאֱהִי נְגִיעַ**; a good construction (Kön. 239^b), but against parallelism. Read **וַיְהִי נְגִיעַ**.—M **וְתוֹכְהִי**; G *καὶ ὁ ἔλεγχός μου*. Read **וְהַבֹּרָתִי**. Cp. *l.* 7.

29 f. M **וְאֶחָשְׁבָה**, or rather, —ן, as some MSS. give, and as is implied by G'A S J T; so Now., Bā., Kau., We., Kön. (§ 200^b). The natural sequel, however, of an exclamation like that in *ll.* 21—28 is not beating one's brains to solve the intellectual problem of the prosperity of the wicked, but first a natural horror at the dreadful alternatives presented to one, and next a step forward into the untried land of denial. Cp. Job xxi. 6. So too in *l.* 30, how weak and how obscure is the traditional reading, **הִיא בְּעִנְיָ** [Kr. **הוּא עֲבִל**! Which does **עֲבִל** mean—'difficulty,' or 'misery,' or 'perniciousness'? Experience warns us to expect that partly accident, partly editorial regard for edification, has transformed the text, not however so far as to destroy the traces of the original text. Read probably,—

וְתִאֲחֲזִי תִרְעָלָה
בְּעִוֹ יִרְחַמְאֵלִים

31 f. **יִתְחַמֵּן** 'was embittered'?? G *ησφράνθη* = **יִשְׁכַּח**; but Syro-Hex., Compl., Ald. read *ἐξέκαύθη*, Vg. 'inflammatum est,' *i.e.* **יִתְחַמֵּם** (cp. xxxix. 4). Possibly the text had **יִתְחַמֵּן**, which could be explained

either as יתחנמ or as יתחנין. But neither will suit. Read יתַנְיָה or אַתַּנְיָה (Hab. i. 5), out of which came G's reading?—M אֲשַׁתּוֹן 'pungerer'? Read either אֲשַׁתּוֹכִי or יִשְׁתּוֹכִי (Gr.). See cxliii. 4.

33 f. Corrupt but not 'desperate' (Kau.). (1) Del. gives the sense as follows,— 'For such persons (*i.e.* those who uttered the words of *vs.* 11—14) doubt has become the passage to apostasy.' But the poet has won quite a different solution of the enigma of human lots. 'If I had ventured on such reasoning,' he thinks, 'I should have broken the covenant and given up the fellowship of God's children; I should consequently have lost the blessings which they enjoy.' But the mode of expressing this ascribed to the psalmist is very unnatural. (2) Hitzig explains, 'If I had attempted to realize the entire amount of these chastisements (*v.* 14) by counting up the separate instances, I should have been overpowered, and been driven into apostasy.' (3) König (ii. 250) takes כָּנִו to be an adverb (G *oûτως*; J *sic*). (4) Following S T, and perhaps A Θ (*τοιῦτα*), Bö., Gr. read כְּמוֹהֶם. (5) Ew., We., after Saad., כָּנִו הִנֵּה. (6) Klost., כְּמוֹהָ. (7) Bâ., however, takes the first step towards a true comprehension of the passage. He omits אִם in אִם־אֶמְרָתִי (אִם written at the end of a line to fill up a gap, and then mistaken for an independent word), and would adopt either Klost.'s כְּמוֹהָ or הִנֵּה הִנֵּה. He also denies that *v.* 15*b* is a hypothetical clause. This gives the sense, 'I said, "Such [facts opposed to a belief in the divine justice] will I count up; yea, I have broken faith to the generation of thy sons.'" But surely 'such will I count up' and 'broken faith to the generation' &c. cannot be right. A radical and yet not arbitrary treatment is absolutely necessary. We. omits אֶמְרָתִי (an expansion of אִם); plausibly no doubt, but how are the remaining difficulties to be got over? WF's translation, even in the light of the note, is impossible. Gr. suggests אֶדְבַּרָה for בְּגַדְתִּי, דּוֹר בְּנֵיךְ for הַדָּר פְּנִיךְ, אֶסְפְּרָה (*Anal.* 41), כְּמוֹ הַנְּהָה for הַכְּנָה. Of these suggestions the two latter are the only useful ones. אֶדְבַּרָה is not very near אֶסְפְּרָה, and the phrase 'I denied the glory of thy face' is unparalleled. Let us keep before us Bâ.'s view of the construction of *v.* 15, and the correction, already made, of *v.* 11*a* (*l.* 21), and we shall probably read thus,—

אֲנִי כֹאֲסֵתִי הַכְּנָה
חֶסֶדְךָ וְאֶמְרָתְךָ בְּחַדְתִּי

35. M ואני־בער. However we interpret כי ית' in *l.* 33, ואני is not what we expect. Probably it arose under the influence of ואני in *v.* 23 (M). G has κατὰ ἔξουδερωμένος, *i.e.* וְאֲנִי נִבְזָה (cf. G, *v.* 20). Read probably וּנְבִיעַרְתִּי (Jer. x. 14, 21; li. 17, Isa. xix. 11). This may have been written וּנְבִיעַר' n would easily become expanded into אֲנִי. Cp. on xvii. 4*b*.

36. M בְּהֵיכָל הַיְיָ, 'I passed into the category of "brutes," i.e. sank to their level' (Kön. *Synt.* § 264*d*). Unconvincing. It is an individual who speaks; why, then, the plural? We., בְּהֵיכָל; but this is arbitrary. Besides, it should be בְּבֵהֵיכָל (Job xviii. 3). Read תְּבוֹנֹת הַכְּרָתִי (Gr.), and so obtain a perfect parallelism (see xcii. 7). The words became half effaced, and the scribe thought of xlix. 13, 21 (בְּהֵיכָל).

37. M אֶל־מִקְדָּשֵׁי־אֵל; G ἕως εἰσέλθω εἰς τὸ ἁγιοστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ. But see exeg. note. Read יַעֲרֵא־אֲשֶׁפִּיל אֶל־מִשְׁפְּטֵי אֵל. אל drove out יל; כ became ב; ש became וּא.

39. M אֵד בְּחֻלְקוֹת תְּשִׁית לָנוּ. G πλὴν διὰ τὰς δολιότητας ἔθου αὐτοῖς; לנו is not recognized as the object. Reserve לָנוּ, and read אֵד בְּלָחוֹת לָנוּ (cp. Job xxvii. 20, and see on xxxv. 6). אֵד, see *l.* 41; so S, Gr.

40. M הַפְּלִתָם לְמִשׁוּאוֹת. G ἐν τῷ ἐπαρθῆναι = לְמִשְׁאוֹת; see Bā., who, however, reads לְמִשְׁאוֹת (Zeph. i. 15, Job xxx. 3); so Klo., Now. Inadequate; why has the frequent occurrence of צְלָמוֹת in Job been forgotten? Read הַפְּלִתָ צְלָמוֹת [עַגְיָהֶם]; cp. lv. 5.

42. M כִּי־בִלְהוֹת, 'in consequence of calamities'? G διὰ τὴν ἀνομίαν αὐτῶν = כִּי־עוֹלָתָם. The true reading is נִבְלָהִים; cp. *l.* 5. הוֹת is editorial.

43 f. M בְּחֵלוֹם־זִמְהָקִיץ אֲדָנִי (we disregard Athnah). The first suspicious word is זִמְהָקִיץ. G ἐξεγειρομένον = זִמְהָקִיץ (so S & J); the next אֲדָנִי (Budde אֲיָנֶם). But the whole of *l.* 20 is uncertain; how can בעִיר | צְלָמִים תְּבוּזָה (note Pasek) be right? צְלָמִים ought to be a class-name or ethnic, and כְּחֵלוֹם ought to be parallel to it. Similarly, אֲדָנִי ought to be a verb corresponding to תְּבוּזָה (or rather the verb out of which 'ת' has sprung). We have a right to presume ethnic references, and experience elsewhere permits no doubt as to the particular references. Read—

יִרְחֹקֵאל וְכוּשֵׁם נְדָבִי
עָרַב וַיִּשְׁמַעֲאֵל תְּסַפֵּה

For צְלָם = וַיִּשְׁמַעֲאֵל, cp. Am. v. 26, Ezek. xxiii. 14.

45. M עַמְּךָ. But a verb is wanted (cp. xvi. 8); xvi. 9 suggests אֲשִׁיחָה.

48. M וְאַהֲרָ כְבוֹד תִּקְהַנִּי. To render 'thou wilt lead me to (the goal of) glory' (Zech. ii. 12) is impossible, and to assume with König (§ 319 m, s) the double influence of ב is unnatural. Moreover, if כְּבוֹד

meant the divine glory, a suffix was desirable, and to avoid misunderstanding כבוד should have followed תִּקְחֵנִי. Besides, the idea of entrance into God's glory would have needed amplification; it is hazardous to assume in the poet a sudden flash of intuition. Gr., We. (but cp. *Skizzen*, vi. 79) emend into בְּיַד תִּקְחֵנִי. But 'fetched thee after me with the hand' is tautological. The key to the passage is xvi. 11 (cp. note on l. 45); the true reading must be וְאָרָה כְּבוֹד תִּדְעֵנִי. ד and ק, י and ה confounded. So *Jevo. Rel. Life* ('98), p. 240. Beer's suggestion (*ZATW*, xxi. [1901], 77 f.), וְאָרָה הַיָּם תִּעֲלֶינִי, confirms the first part of this, but 'תַּעֲ' is clearly no improvement. G neglects אָדָר—καὶ μετὰ δόξης προσελάβου με.

49 f. כִּי־יָלִי בִשְׂמִיךְ; an obscure and imperfect line. Bruston כִּי־יָלִי; Gr. אֵלֵי לִי. Read 'יִדְמֶה] לַיהוָה בִּשׁ' (lxxxix. 7).—M וְעַמֶּיךָ לֹא־הִפְצַתִּי. וְעַמֶּיךָ is not natural. Read probably כִּי־אֵלֵךְ כִּיעֲזֵי בְּאֶרֶץ בְּאֶרֶץ.

51 f. Read פָּלָה לוֹ (cp. lxxxiv. 2); also צוּרֵי, omitting the second לַבְבִי, which arose out of a mental confusion between צוּרֵי and שְׂאֵרֵי. Omit אֱלֹהִים as a rival reading to לְעוֹלָם (a not unfrequent phenomenon).

53 f. M רְחַקְךָ. Read certainly כִּי־רָפִיד; the Jerahmeelites and their abettors are meant. Gr. כִּי־רָחֵקְךָ.—M כְּלִזְוֹנָה מִפֹּךְ; very harsh. Read כִּי־נִנְאֵן שְׂכֵךְ (lxxiv. 18).

55 f. M קִרְבַּת אֱלֹהִים; vague. G τὸ προσκολλᾶσθαι = דַּבְקָת (Herz). Read לִי־טוֹב שְׁתֵּי, בְּאֵדְנִי יְהוָה, דָּבַקְתִּי בְּאֵלֹהֵי. לִי is a fragment of אֱלֹהִים (ditto-gr.). בְּטַחְתִּי טוֹב שְׁתֵּי comes from אֱלֹהִים. Close the line with יְהוָה. לִסְפֵר וְגו' is an arbitrary amplification. For מִלֵּאכֹתֶיךָ read certainly נִפְלְאוֹתֶיךָ (xcvi. 3).

PSALM LXXIV.—I.

TETRAMETERS. The first part of this composite psalm is parallel to xlv. 2ⁱ, lxxix., lxxxiii., lxxxix., and Isa lxiii. 15—lxiv. 11. The psalmist throws himself back in imagination to the time of the N. Arabian invasion, when Jerusalem and even the temple were destroyed. He hears the Miṣrites and Jerahmeelites raising shouts of triumph on the sacred site, blaspheming the name of Yahwè, and singing praises to their own idol-god. Deeds of violence are being committed throughout the land, and it seems as if Israel (personified) were about to become a prey to ravening lions. *Quousque, Domine!*

The psalm has been variously assigned to the Chaldean period ('everlasting ruins,' v. 3a; 'they set on fire thy sanctuary, v. 7a), and to the Syrian or Maccabean ('the synagogues,' v. 8; 'no more any prophet,' v. 9; 'blaspheme thy name, v. 10). It has been said that 'only a premature decision as to the history of the origin of the Canon makes it intelligible that so many commentators have here been able to close their eyes to the light of truth' (Olshausen, 1853); also that 'the date of Ps. lxxiv. (between 168 and 165 B.C.) is so plain that it is superfluous to count up the grounds over again' (Duhm, 1899). But the fact remains

that 1 Macc. iv. 38 only speaks of the gates of the sanctuary as having been burned (cp. 2 Macc. i. 8; viii. 33), and it must be pointed out that no critical theory can be relied upon which is not based on a thoroughly revised text. If, therefore, it is correct that the reference to synagogues in *l.* 9 depends on a questionable interpretation of a phrase which has been introduced by corruption, and that the reference to the cessation of prophecy in *l.* 9 occurs in an incorrect gloss on already corrupt words at the end of the same verse, also that, according to numerous parallels in other psalms, the true text of our psalm contains references to N. Arabian peoples as the enemies of the Jews, it follows that the current theories must be abandoned, and a new one devised, and that the hesitation of Delitzsch was more reasonable than the dogmatism of Olshausen. We may admit that the invaders spoken of were hostile to the religion as well as to the nationality of the Jews; and that we have no reason to suppose that the Babylonian warriors would even take the trouble to blaspheme the name of Yahwe, or to destroy consistently all his sanctuaries. But it was quite otherwise with the Jerahmeelites or Edomites, who are more than probably referred to in this psalm. As linguistic evidence of a late date note **לְשִׁיר** (*l.* 14).

We have already compared this psalm with Pss. xlv.⁽²⁾ and lxxxix.⁽²⁾. It is true, nothing is said in our psalm respecting the defeat of Jewish armies (cp. xlix. 11a, lxxxix. 44), but this omission in a psalm which was written long after the time professedly referred to need not be a stumbling-block. Besides, Ps. lxxiv.⁽¹⁾ may very possibly be incomplete. Certainly the mention in *l.* 8 of the Jerahmeelites, the Arabians, and the Cushites as the wicked neighbours who lay waste the land of the Jews reminds us forcibly of 2 K. xxiv. 2 (see *Crit. Bib.*), where the names of the enemies of the Jews near the close of the Jewish state are given as Cushites, Jerahmeelites, and Mişrites. That 'Mişrites' and 'Arabians' are virtually synonymous needs no showing (cp. *l.* 21 f.). One may conjecture that Pss. lxxiv.⁽¹⁾ and lxxix. are about contemporary with Isa. lxiii. 15—lxiv. 11, and that all these works were originally designed as lamentations on the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple. For parallelisms cp. Isa. lxiv. 11 f. with Ps. lxxiv. 7 and lxxix. 1; also Isa. lxiii. 15 with Ps. lxxiv., *l.* 29, and *ev.* 18 f. with Ps. lxxiv., *l.* 31. It also seems probable that all these works were edited and modified for liturgical purposes. Cp. *Enc. Bib.*, 'Isaiah, Book of,' § 21 (col. 2207).

Deposited. Of Asaph.

1

- 1 Wherefore, O Yahwè ! spurnest thou thy pious ones?
 †Wherefore† smokes thine anger at the flock of thy tending?
 Remember the community which long ago thou didst
 acquire, 2
 [Thy people which] thou redeemedst as the tribe of thy
 heritage ;
 [(?) Pity the place which thou didst choose for thy
 name, (?)]
 The mountain of Zion whereon thou hast dwelt :
 Hide thy poor from the wickedness of their neighbours, 3
 Of those of Jerahmeel, Arabia, and Cush.
 The Mişrites roar within thy sanctuary, 4
 10 [They cry] in the midst of thy dwelling-place ;
 (?) As on a festival-day the Jerahmeelites shout, 5
 The Ashhurites praise their idol (?)

- They have destroyed the gates, broken the bars, 6
 Striking with two-edged axes ;
 They have set on fire thy sanctuary, 7
 They have thrown down and defiled the dwelling-place of
 thy name.
- They have said in their heart, Come, let us extinguish them. 8
 Let us sweep the name of Israel from the land.
 Our palaces they have annihilated, 9
 20 ¹And there is no longer among us any sanctuary.
- How long shall the Miṣrite insult, O Yahwè ? 10
⁺How long⁺ shall the Arabian blaspheme thy name ?
 Wherefore drawest thou [back] thy hand 11
 From the sword of [Rehoboth] and Jerahmeel.
- Ashhur and Arabia insult thee, O Yahwè ! 18
 Gebal and Ammon blaspheme thy name.
 Deliver not to the lions the soul of thy loyal one, 19
 The life of thy sufferers forget not perpetually.
- Look [and see from thy] mansion of glory ! 20
 30 The land is full of the deeds of violence.
 Let not the crushed one withdraw [from thee] disgraced ! 21
 Let the sufferers and the poor praise thy name !
- [See my] disgrace, O Yahwè ! [from] the Arabians ; 22
 Think how I am insulted by Kenaz and Gebal.²
 Neglect not the sound of my cry, 23
 Let the shriek of the sufferer present itself before thee !

1. רָבִי . See on xlvi. 2.—2. Cp. Dt. xxix. 19, and see on lxxx. 5. Ps. xviii. 9 explains the figure.—4. Cp. Dt. iv. 20, Isa. lxiii. 17. On the text of Jer. x. 10, li. 19 see Giesebrecht, *Jer.*, p. 65.—6. *Thy poor*. So lxxxiii. 4 (corr. text); cp. xii. 6, lxix. 34, cxxxii. 15. 9. *Roar*. An expression for the battle-cry (Isa. v. 29, Jer. ii. 15). So in Lam. ii. 7, of the same foes as are referred to here, 'They have uttered their voice in the house of Yahwe as on a festival-day.' Cp. l. 11. — 10. M's enigmatical reading has

caused much discussion. If the words, 'They set up their signs for signs,' suited the parallelism, it would be best to see in them a reference to consecrated symbols, such as abounded in all eastern religions and superstitions. Most, however, think of military standards (cp. *Enc. Bib.*, 'Ensigns,' § 1). Jerome, 'posuerunt signa sua in tropæum'; Athanasius, τὰ καλούμενα παρὰ τοῖς στρατιώταις σιγία. Grätz at one time thought of statues; Duhm suggests 'signs of supremacy, heraldic arms, Greek inscriptions and the like.'

¹ There is no prophet any more.

² Jerahmeel.

All based on a mutilated and corrupt text. See crit. note. The 'signs' in *z.* 9 are equally fictitious.—13—15. See introd. The burning of the temple can only be proved for the Chaldaean (and Jerahmeelite?) period; see 2 K. xxv. 9.—17 f. Cp. lxxxiii. 4.—19 f. See crit. note and cp. Lam. ii. 5, 7, also Isa. lxiv. 10 [11], where the 'precious things' spoken of may be traditional sacred spots both in and out of Jerusalem.—21 f., 25 f. Cp. xlii. 11, xlv. 17 (corr. text), also Isa. lii. 4 f., where, in the most probable text, the Jerahmeelites are spoken of as blaspheming the name of Yahwè (see *Crit. Bib.*).

23. Generally the complaint is that Yahwè hides his face (cp. xlv. 25). The conception here is bolder. The idea is that the sword of the Jerahmeelites is dealing such havoc that Yahwè draws back his hand in stupefaction. See Lam. ii. 3, and cp. Isa. li. 9.

25. **Ashhur**, &c. N. Arabian ethnics. See xlv. 17 (corr. text). lxxxiii. 8 f.—27. Cp. xxxv. 17 (corr. text), where (as here) נפש and היה are parallel (cp. lxxxviii. 50, cxliii. 3).—29. Cp. Isa. lxiii. 15, and see introd.—33 f. Cp. ll. 21 f, 25 f. *Kénaz*, as *z.* 17^b.

Critical Notes. 1. M לנצה. Parallelism and the analogy of xiii. 1 &c., require הסידך. Moreover זנה without an accus. is improbable (cp. on xlv. 10).—4. Insert עמד (parallelism and metre).—5. Insert something like רחם מקום בהרת לשכך (similarly Bi.). Two Paseks in *z.* 2.—7. M הריכה פניכיה למישאות נצה. 'Lift up thy steps (or, feet)' is intolerable. *G* ἔπαρον τὰς χεῖράς σου; ὁ τὸ ὑψωμα τῶν ποδῶν σου. Gr., 'מהרה פ'. All inadequate. The next phrase is equally suspicious. 'Everlasting ruins' would be הרבות עולם. The nearest possible correction is הסתר אביוניך מרשעת שכניך (cp. on lxxxiii. 4).—8. The poverty of M's text should awaken suspicion. Read ירחמיאלים ועיבבים ומכשבים.—9. Read כוצרים for צורריך (vi. 8, xlii. 11), and מקדשיך (lxviii. 36) for כועדיך 'thy meeting-place,' Kau.; 'thy assembly,' *BDB*; τῆς ἐοπτῆς σου, *G*). כיעדו in Lam. ii. 6a should be corrected accordingly. T and many MSS, יך—.

10. M שמו אותתם אתות (so probably *G*). Grimme appends יהודה, while Woods (*Hebraica*, 1887, p. 261) omits אתות and יודע (*l.* 11) as interpolated from *z.* 9, where he takes עדניה to be also an interpolation. Herz reads שם שמו איתתם אתות, 'there they have placed their axes (?) as ensigns.' Read probably, בתוך משכנתיך [קריעו]; 'אתות' is represented in M by שמו and אותת; בתוך by אתות.

11 f. M may be grammatical, but is it translatable? כיבא יודע (why not כניף?), לכיעדה, and בסבך-יען are all very suspicious. For יודע T has יצלה, whence Bâ. and Herz ירעו 'they destroy:.' Du. ירצעו (Ex. xxi. 6); Gr. ירעיו; Hal. ירע. For כניבא, *G* 'A S O S J imply כמבוא or 'ב. Comparing Lam. ii. 7b it is plausible to read שבהו יצצבם. For *l.* 12 we may read ירעיו פיום מעד ירחמיאלים

אֲשֶׁהוּרִים. The letters of the first two words were mixed up, and corruption followed. In קָרַד, ק seems to have come from ד, ה from ו; ות is dittographic (ויעת follows).

13. Kt. ויעת. K̄r. ויעתה (so some MSS. and edd.). G (S), ἐξέκοψαν or (S*) διέκοψαν. Probably G read נַתְצוּ, which is right (so first Herz); the Greek verb had to suit ἀξίως.—M פְּתַחְיָהּ. G S פְּתַחְיָהּ; so Rashi, Gr. But the suffix is unaccountable (see De Jong, 15). Read פְּתַחְיָהּ.—M יַחַד בְּכִשִׁיל. יַחַד בְּכִשִׁיל is a not very common Aramaic word (plur. in T; see next note). Read בְּרִיחִים שִׁבְרוּ (Lam. ii. 8). Sense and metre gain.

14 f. M וְכִיפִית׃. An unproved word. New Heb. כּוּלֵף = 'a plane;' כּוּלֵב, T, 1 S. iii. 20 = Heb. קָרַד. T here has כּוּפְסַלַת דּוּסְנַר ' (with) a double-edged cutting instrument,' which points to כּוּפְסַלַת or כּוּפְסַלַת 'ב' (Isa. xli. 15; cp. Ps. cxlix. 6). So first Herz. To this, however, we must prefix כּוּפְסַלַת. כּוּפְסַלַת fell out owing to כּוּפְסַלַת which preceded it; כּוּפְסַלַת in T Jer. xlv. 22 corresponds to Heb. קָרַד (plural).—Read כּוּפְסַלַת with some MSS. and edd. (l. 9).

17. M נִנְּם יַחַד (cp. G T; absurdly wrong; but cp. Kön. i. 580). G ἡ συγγένεια αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, δεύτε, i.e. נִנְּם לְכֹוּ. No doubt this is partly correct. לְכֹוּ in M has become כָּל־. After לְכֹוּ we expect some verb, 1 plur. imperf. with suffix. Gr. reads נִנְּם; Brüll, נִנְּם; Herz, נִנְּם. But the critics have not seen that יַחַד is a misplaced part of the verb, so that we *must* read נִנְּם יַחַד. We find the same phrase 'נִנְּם לְכֹוּ' in lxxxiii. 5.

18. M בְּאַרְצֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל כָּל־מוֹעֲדֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל. G (S) καταπαύσωμεν τὰς ἐορτὰς Κυρίου ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, i.e. נִשְׁבִּית פְּרִי־מוֹעֲדֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל כָּל־אַרְצֵי; in S (?) too read καταπαύσωμεν for κατακαύσωμεν, cp. the same error in G 2 K. xxiii. 5, 11. That נִשְׁבִּית and אַרְצֵי are correct, is plain; parallelism requires this. But what are the מוֹעֲדֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, which both M and G adopt? According to most, the synagogues ('A S, Del., Bā., We., Du. &c.). It is doubtful, however, whether synagogues could have been called מוֹעֲדֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל. בֵּית וַעַד מוֹעֲדֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (Sota ix. 15) is a synonym for בֵּית כְּנֶסֶת, which cannot mean 'God's meeting-place'; indeed T gives בֵּית הָעֵם for the הָעֵם of M, Jer. xxxix. 8. One might plausibly suggest מוֹקְדֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל (cp. l. 9), but having regard to lxxxiii. 5 we should most probably read שֵׁם יִשְׂרָאֵל. The enemy's ultimate object was to destroy, not Israel's sanctuaries, but Israel itself. Observe that נִשְׁבִּית in נִשְׁבִּית was corrupted into שִׁרְפוּ;

ישראל became עֲרִיאל; שם is only represented by כָּל; כָּל (see above) comes from לָכֵן.

19. M אֶת־וַתִּינֶנּוּ, *i.e.* 'signa cultus Mosaici, furore fanatico deleta.' (De Jong, 20). Most improbable. Remembering Lam. ii. 5, 7, read certainly אֶרְכֹּנֹתֶינִי אֶרְ. 'אֶר' is very often corrupted, both in the Psalms and elsewhere.—M לֹא־רָאִינוּ. Here נו is dittographic. בִּלְעִי = לֹא־רָאִינוּ (Lam. ii. 5).—M's אִין עוֹד נְבִיא is a gloss on the following (partly mis-read) words.

20. M's עַד־כִּתִּי is dittographic; עַד־כִּתִּי follows. יוֹדֵעַ, though supported by M's אִין עוֹד נְבִיא (see on *l.* 19), is corrupt. Read certainly כִּי־קִדְשׁ (parallelism and context).

21 f. M צָרָה צָר sometimes represents כִּצְרָה (see on lxxxiii. 8), sometimes כִּצְרִי (xxvii. 2).—M אוֹיֵב. Read עֲרִיבִי (vii. 6, &c.).

23 f. Insert אָדוֹר (Lam. ii. 3), with Bi. [so now Du.], for the metre.—M וַיִּמְיֹנֶךָ כִּי־רָב הוֹקֵךְ כָּלָה; Kr. הִיִּקֵּךְ. The theory, presupposed by M, that וַיִּמְיֹנֶךָ is a rhetorical expansion of יוֹדֵךְ, is superfluous (xliv. 4 is not parallel). It forms part of the material for *l.* 24, and Bickell naturally enough proposes the gentle correction, וַיִּמְיֹנֶךָ בְּקֶרֶב הִיִּקֵּךְ תִּכְלָה. The statement, however, is both ill expressed and superfluous. Similarly Street (1790), Duhm. As generally in this psalm, the corruption presumably lies deep. Starting from this, יִמְיֹן at once suggests יִרְחִמְאֵל ('אִישׁ יִמְיֹן in I S. ix. 1 represents 'אִישׁ יִרְח', see *Crit. Bib.*). Remembering כִּפְנֵי אוֹיֵב in Lam. ii. 3, read probably יִרְחִמְאֵל [] כִּי־רָב. The missing name may very well be רְחִיבֹת; רָחַב fell out after חָרַב הוֹקֵךְ (cp. הַבְּקוֹק) and כָּלָה both represent fragments of יִרְחִמְאֵל. For כָּלָה, Wellh. gives the impossible rendering 'draw forth,' while Derenbourg (*ZATW*, 1881, p. 333), Gr., and B. Jacob (*ZATW*, 1896, p. 131) read סָלָה. G has εἰς τέλος, which S' constantly gives for סָלָה.

25 f. Error lies, not only in זָכַר (Lag. בָּכַל), but in זָאת. G^B gives a double rendering, ταύτης = זָאת (so א T), and τῆς κτισέως (κτισεώς) σου = אֶת־הָאָדָמָה (Gu.). Both readings, and also זָכַר, arose out of אֶשְׁהוֹר; cp. the name אֶהוֹזֵר, and אֶהוֹזֵר in xxxviii. 1. וַיִּעַרְבֵם should be וַיַּעֲרֹב וַעֲסֵם נ' should be גָּבַל וַעֲמִינֹן (lxxxiii. 8). The change of meaning is certainly great, but the present text is very unsatisfactory. For הָרָף read הִרְפּוֹף.

27. M לְחַיִּית. G J, De Jong, We., Du. לְחַיִּית; Bā. לְחַיִּית (old fem. ending); Lag. לְחַיִּית־שֵׁן (cp. T, and Sirach, xxxix. 30, Heb.); Street (1790), Schrader, Gr. לְמֹת; Kr. לְשֵׁחַת; Grimme לְהוֹת. But xxxv. 17,

suggests לִפְפִּירִים; cp. on xxii. 21. הֵיט is a merê slip.—M תוֹרֵךְ, 'thy turtle-dove,' i.e. Israel. Unparalleled. S (Field), ἡν ἐδίδαξας τὸν νόμον, with an allusion to the תורה (so T J)—a playful attempt to explain the inexplicable. G (S) ἐξομολογομένην σοι = הַתּוֹרֵךְ; so Street, Gunkel; cp. vi. 6. Plausible, but not favoured by parallelism. We expect הַסִּידֵךְ; perhaps ס fell out, and הַיֵּדֵךְ became תוֹרֵךְ.

29. M הֵבֵט לְבְרִית. 'The expression is strangely short, which beside the parallel member is not effective' (Ol.). The *bērit̄h* is supposed to be the pact between Yahwè and Israel. But this is here unsuitable. Bi., following G S, reads ה—(see next note). Hence Gu., לְבְרִיתֶיךָ (cp. אֱלֹהִים בְּלִבְרִית in Jewish liturgy¹). Du., less happily, לְבְרִית, 'auf die Gemästeten.' The best remedy is indicated by lxxxix. 40 (see crit. n.); ברית comes from תפארת. Comparing the parallel passage, Isa. lxiii. 15, read הֵבֵט וְרָאָה כִּיזָבֵל תִּפְאָרְתֶךָ. ל in לברית is a fragment of כִּיזָבֵל. See next note.

30. Street (1790) was on the right track; כִּיזָבֵל (?) has got out of its place. So Herz. But the material in M G is too much for a tetrameter. Duhm carries up כִּיזָבֵל into the preceding line, which in M G is too short. But 'look on the fatted beasts, for they are full' is a detestable sense. Beyond reasonable doubt, as in lxxv. 13, lxxxiii. 13, נאות comes from כִּישְׁכָנֹת, and most probably כִּיזָבֵל has grown out of a miswritten כִּישְׁכָנֹת. כִּישְׁכָנֹת seems to be a scribe's conjectural variant to כִּיזָבֵל. Omit the initial כִּי or כ, which either represents or is a dittogram of the suffix in בריתך.

31. הֵיט is certainly wrong. In ix. 10, x. 18 we read הֵיט. But the corruption lies deeper. הֵיט after יֵשֵׁב is superfluous: the whole line is too vague and indefinite. We expect a closing reference to the temple and the N. Arabians, and this is confirmed by Isa. lxiii. 15-19—a passage which was certainly in the mind of the psalmist (see introd., *ad fin.*). Even M's text of Isa. lxiii. 18 will show this, but if we criticize this text at all keenly, the confirmation becomes still stronger. Read most probably as 77. 18, 19—

לְמַה יִרְמָסוּ רְשָׁעִים כִּישְׁכָנֹתֶיךָ
צְרִינוּ בּוֹסְסוֹ מִקְדָּשְׁךָ
אֲדַנִּינוּ יִרְהַמְאֵלִים לְאַמְשַׁלְתָּ בָם
לְאַנְקָרָא שִׁמְךָ עֲלֵיהֶם

Now that we have a clue, we can more safely proceed to apply critical methods. We may appropriately read *l.* 31 thus—אֲלֵיבֶם מִקְדָּשְׁךָ—

¹ Cp. also Hillel's saying, 'Be of the disciples of Aaron . . . loving thy fellow-creatures' (הַבְּרִיּוֹת). Similarly Grimme, *Psalmenprobleme*, p. 77.

- Thou that didst shatter the heads of Leviathan, 14
 And gavest up his carcase as food for the jackals ;
 Thou that didst clear a way for fountain and stream, 15
 Thou that madest to burst forth the rivers of Ethan.
 Thine is Jerahmeel, thine also is Ishmael, 16
 10 It was thou that didst establish Mišsur and Cusham ;
 It was thou that didst fix all the bounds of the land ; 17
 Kenaz and Rehob—thou didst form them.

1. **My king.** See on xlv. 5. *From of old*, for Israel's origin is traced back to the Creation.

2. יְשׁוּעוֹת 'deeds of succour'; cp. xlv. 5*b*. The Exodus may be referred to; cp. Ex. viii. 18[22], where Mišraim (Mišrim) is referred to as בְּקֶרֶב הָאָרֶץ, 'in the midst of the earth.'

3 ff. Cp. Isa. li. 9*f*. *The sea . . . the waters*, i.e. the primæval ocean, of which the dragon Tīamat was the mythic symbol. The dividing of the sea (cp. Gen. i. 6*f*.) was the equivalent of the mythic dividing of Tīamat. See *Enc. Bib.* 'Creation,' § 21. *The dragons*, i.e. the monsters which took the side of Tīamat in the mythic war of creation.—*The heads of Leviathan.* A Babylonian tradition (a distant echo of which is traceable in Rev. xii. 3) gave twin heads to the mythic dragon. See *Enc. Bib.*, 'Dragon,' 'Leviathan.'—6. On the double representation of the punishment of Tīamat, 1. as consisting in her destruction, and 2. as consisting in her being placed in confinement in the ocean, i.e. the ocean which is coiled (עֲקָרְתָּנָה; Isa. xxvii. 1) round

the earth, see *Enc. Bib.* as above.—7. *The rivers of Ethan.* Cp. GRT H_θou. It is here assumed that Ethan is the name of a region, viz. the Ethan te or Jerahmeelite country in the N. Arabian border-land where, according to the most plausible hypothesis, the Hebrew tradition placed the primæval Paradise with its rivers. That 'Ethanites' and 'Jerahmeelites' are the names of closely related peoples, if we should not rather say, that the Ethanites were 'one Jerahmeel' (cp. 1 K. iv. 31 [v. 9], where 'Mahol' comes from Jerahmeel),

can hardly be disputed; for the evidence in favour of the rest of the hypothesis referred to, see *Enc. Bib.*, 'Paradise.' It is not impossible that עֵדֶן, 'Eden,' may be an artificial modification of אֵיתָן, 'Ethan,' and

that 'fountain' (בְּעֵינַי) may refer to the fountain-head of the rivers of Paradise.¹ Gunkel's view is only superficially different. According to him, the 'perennial' rivers or streams are those of the primæval ocean (cp. xxiv. 2, יַבַּיִם, 'ocean,' || הַנְּרוֹת 'rivers'; see *ad loc.*). For the streams of Paradise were originally the ocean-streams (see *Enc. Bib.* as above). The alternative renderings are 1. that supported recently by Gunkel and Duham—'perennial rivers'; 2. that of J and EV—'mighty rivers'; both these presuppose that אֵיתָן is an attributive genitive (Ges.²⁶, § 128, 2*w*). The first is the more plausible; the rendering 'mighty' for אֵיתָן is not to be supported by

Gen. xlix. 24, Jer. v. 15, Mic. vi. 2, since אֵיתָן in all these passages is open to grave suspicion. It should be noted, however, 1. that the three other passages of the Psalms quoted in Ges.²⁶ for the attributive genitive (lxxiii. 10, lxxviii. 49) are corrupt, and 2. that the occurrence of הַנְּנוֹן and לְאֵיתָן leads us

to expect some equally traditional word to define the nature of the rivers. It has often been held that by the 'rivers' the Jordan is meant (Del. and others). The dragon or Leviathan becomes Pharaoh, the fountain and river have to be explained by Ex. xvii., Num. xx. But the Jews knew by tradition of primæval divine acts, of which

¹ Possibly for עַר in Gen. ii. 6 we should read עֵין 'fountain.' See, however, *Enc. Bib.*, 'Paradise,' § 5; *Crit. Bib. ad loc.*

the wonders of the Exodus (cp. on viii. 3) were but an echo or reflexion.

9-12. The lands with which ancient Israel was so often at war, and parts of which were so much venerated and indeed often occupied by Yahwē's people, belong to Israel's God, and owe

their delimitation to Him. Cp. lxxxix. 12, xcv. 5, in revised text.—*Boimds*, נְבוֹלוֹת, or perhaps 'territories' (cp. נְבוֹל, Gen. x. 19, &c.).—*Rehob*, another form of 'Rehoboth.' Cp. on lxxxvii. 4; also on lxxxix. 11.

Critical Notes. 1. Read אֶתְהָ יְהוָה (Gu.) ; cp. ll. 3, 5, &c.—3. מ פּוֹרְרֵת (xxiv. 19, corrupt?). T גּוֹרְתָהּ, which seems right (cxxxvi. 13). G ἐκκραίωσις?—4f. M רֵאשִׁי. G in l. 4 gives τὰς κεφαλὰς, which is at any rate necessary if we read תְּנִינִים. In l. 5, G (B^{ab} mg inf R) has τὰς κεφαλὰς, but G (A T) τὴν κεφαλὴν, i.e. ראש, which, however, is unnecessary (see exeg. note).—6. Read probably תִּתֵּן נְוִיתוֹ. נו became נו; יתו fell out. Hence M's reading.—M לֵעֵם לְצִיִּים, on which cp. Kön., *Synt.*, p. 246, n. 1. On the vss. see Bāthgen, *JPrTh* 1882, *ad loc.* Duhm would omit either לעם (so already Bi.) or the following ל. Hitz. and Wellh. emend לעם into לעס ('frass'??). Surely the right reading is clear. לעם and לציים (לשויים) both represent fragments of לשעצלים (lxiii. 11).

8. M. הוֹבֶשֶׁת. 'What the writer has in his mind we do not know, but if he went about a little, he might become acquainted with dried-up river-beds.' So Duhm, more plausibly than Delitzsch and the earlier commentators, who see a reference to the drying up of the Jordan (Josh. iii. 14 ff., iv. 23). Parallelism, however, suggests the correction הַצְּבֵת.

9f. For יום and לילה read probably ימין (= ירחמאל) and ישביעאל ; cp. lxxxix. 12, xcv. 5. Ordinary corruptions.—M כָּאוֹר וְשֶׁכֶּשֶׁת. The Vss. differ widely. G^B ἥλιον καὶ σελήμην. Probably an arbitrary alteration ; G^B read, not שֶׁכֶּשֶׁת וְיָרַח, but transposed 'כ and 'ש, and interpreted כָּאוֹר to mean 'the moon.' G^{S^c.a.T}, however, has φαῖσιν κ. ἥλιον (so Complut. Ald. Theodoret). 'Α Σ φωστῆρα [Syro-Hex., 'Α φωστῆρας, Field] κ. ἥλ. Θ φῶς, Ε' φῶτα κ. ἥλ. S' σελήμην κ. ἥλ. ; T סיהרא ושכישא ; S לנסון ונסון ; J *luminaria et solem*. Cp. also l. 23 of an African magic text, redacted by a Jewish hand, ὀρκίζω σε τὸν φωστῆρα καὶ ἄστρι ἐν οὐρανῷ ποιήσαντα (Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, 43 f.). But כָּאוֹר, though afterwards accepted as a term for the moon, cannot be right here, nor is it any gain to read סהר (cp. שהרונים) with Gunkel, (1) because סהר was not in use in literary Hebrew, and (2) because mention of the heavenly luminaries is not to be expected here (see the context). The latter consideration is also adverse to the correction כָּאוֹר וְשֶׁכֶּשֶׁת.

The context seems to require **כִּצִיר וְכֶשֶׁם**. צ became א, as in Isa. i. 13 (און from אום); for כשם cp. lxxii. 5, cxxi. 6.

11 f. **גְּבִילוֹת**, *G τὰ ὄρμα*, seems to be right. Gunkel proposes **גְּבִירוֹת**, a term for the constellations as influencing the seasons (cp. Job xxxviii. 33). But we should have expected **שָׁמַיִם** as the complement (cp. Mt. xxiv. 29). —M **קִיץ וְחֶרֶף**, a strange parallel to **גְּבִילוֹת הָאָרֶץ**, as Gunkel felt. Most probably ethnics lie concealed (cp. lxxxix. 13^b). Read **קִיץ וְרַחֵב**.

END OF VOL. I.



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100



BS1430.C531 v.1

The book of Psalms translated from a

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00044 9944