



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ON SOME SUSPECTED PASSAGES IN THE POETICAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

ECCLUS. xi. 19.—Mr. G. B. Gray's note is so instructive, and his argument so thoroughly on critical lines, that I hesitate to declare myself unconvinced. Mr. Gray himself recognizes that such an early and isolated use of *קָוִים* for "God" was not to be expected. Nor does the context lead us to expect a reference to the Divine Being, and least of all a veiled reference. If the marginal reading *וּנְיָר* is correct, *מָקוֹם* is certainly incorrect. But no very easy correction occurs to me. *מְשִׁיחַ* would be very suitable in sense (cf. Dan. ix. 25), but the corruption of *ש* into *ק* would require two stages to complete. May not *מָקוֹם תְּנוּרָה* mean "the people of the place where thou dwellest"? Cf. *הִבֵּה עִיר לְפִי* *הַרְבֵּה* "he slew the people of the city," Judges xx. 37. In xlii. 1 the same phrase means "thy house." But the wider sense of "town," or "quarter of a town," is, of course, possible. *זֶרַח* can hardly be right. Mr. Gray's interpretation requires *וְזֶרַח*; that implied by the text-reading *גֹּל* (Bacher), or *שָׂר* (Halévy).

Ps. xxii. 9, *גֹּל אֶל-יְהוָה*.—Read *גִּבְעָתוֹ יְהוָה*, with Halévy (*Revue sémitique*). Some might prefer to read *גֹּל אֶל-*, with LXX, Pesh., Jer.; cf. Matt. xxvii. 43, *πέποιθεν*. But we can hardly dispense with an accusative, and however we point *גֹּל*, the sentence is rough, and the parallelism incomplete. *גֹּל* corresponds to *כִּי הִפְיָן בּוֹ*. Such a Deutero-Isaianic phrase as *גִּבְעָתוֹ יְהוָה* is just what we should expect, and the correction has numerous analogies elsewhere. If all Halévy's

corrections of the psalms were like this, he would be a public benefactor.

Ps. xxxvii. 5, גול עלייהוה ; Prov. xvi. 3, גל אלייהוה.—In both passages I hold it to be absolutely certain that גל אלייהוה is the right reading. Cf. Jer. xi. 20, xx. 12. LXX, Pesh., Targ. agree in supporting גל in the former passage ; not Jer., whom Bâthgen puts down on this side. I marvel that Grätz retains גול, and that Wildeboer admits גל in Proverbs.

Ps. lviii. 7, יִתְהַלְכוּ כִּמוֹ יִדְרֵךְ.—Wellhausen, . . . יתהלכו כמו, i. e. “let them disappear like . . . ;” the object of comparison is supposed to be latent in ידרך. This is an easy but scarcely a probable expedient. כמו, which occurs so often in this psalm, is not likely to have become corrupted into למו ; כמו would have been under the circumstances more probable. Besides, what could ידרך possibly have been corrupted out of, so as to make sense? Bickell much better, יתהלכו למדרך. I think the right reading may be יתהלכו למדבר “(like waters) which flow away into the desert.” Cf. Job vi. 18, הטה “to flow,” as Prov. xxiii. 31.

JOB xvi. 18—xvii. 5.—The difficulties of this section are obvious from the variations of the interpreters. In xvi. 20, 21, Duhm has rightly pointed out the inconsistency between רעי and רעהו. If the latter word is to be taken as synonymously parallel to אלוה, a reference to the three human friends of Job is unsuitable in the first line of the quatrain. מליצי רעי is altogether very questionable. Duhm has pointed the way to a plausible correction, but he has not gone very far on the road ; his own correction (see his book) is not altogether satisfactory. LXX, as I think, presupposes nearly the right text. It has ἀφίκοιτό μου ἢ δέησις πρὸς Κύριον, ξανατι δὲ αὐτοῦ στάζοι μου ὁ ὀφθαλμός. Duhm remarks that LXX needs some form of מַצֵּא, in the sense of “to reach” (cf. Aram. מַמָּא), and reconstructs the first clause רעי ימצא רעי, where רעי = my thought or my wish (Ps. cxxxix. 2). But the second word should rather be בעי (from בעה “to ask”). LXX had, for מליצי רעי, מליצי רעי ;

the perfects in this and the next line it violently renders as optatives. The true reading, however, is perhaps צָמָא לְאֵל בְּשָׂרִי. The last word became בעי in some MSS.; רעי in others. In xvii. 1, I follow Duhm in reading נַעֲוֹבִי and connecting it with לִי קְבָרִים. And though in general averse to transpositions, I propose to place xvi. 18-21 after xvii. 1. The sense is appreciably improved. Cf. Isa. xxxviii. 14, where דָּלַפּוּ עֵינַי לְמָרוֹם (cf. Job xvii. 3) comes directly after עָרַבְנִי (so read). Duhm seems to be right in omitting xvii. 4, 5, for reasons which I need not here reproduce. The connexion undoubtedly gains.

JOB xix. 25-29.—Enough credit has hardly been given here by any recent writer to Bickell's insight and critical sagacity. In the most important respects I follow him. I do not think, however, that he gives the third line of the first quatrain in the best attainable form; יָקָם עָרִי נִקְמַת זֹאת is not quite satisfactory. A few other improvements in his text may also, I think, be made. I venture to read thus:

1. וְאֲנִי יִדְעֵתִי נֹאֲלִי חַי
 וְאַחֲרוֹנָה עַל-עַפְרָיִקוֹם
 עָרִי יִפְסֵהוּ
 וּמִשְׂרָרֵי יֵאָחֶזֶה אֵלָהּ
 2. כָּלוּ כְלִי־תִי בְחֻקִּי
 כִּי תֹאמְרוּ מִה-נִרְדָּף-לִּי
 גֹדֵד לָכֶם מִפְּגִיחָרֵב
 כִּי חֲמָה עַל-עֹגְלִים

1. But I know that my Avenger lives,
 And that at last he will appear above (my) grave;
 My Witness will bring to pass my desire,
 And a curse will take hold of my foes.
2. My inner man is consumed with longing,
 For ye say, How (keenly) we will persecute him!
 Have terror because of the sword,
 For (God's) anger falls on the unjust.

ואחר is clearly a case of dittography; ואת not less clearly a fragment; ונקפּי an editorial guess. In the next line, it needs no showing that the מְשֻׁרֵי presupposed by LXX, and the מְשֻׁרֵי of the Mas. Text, could easily spring out of מְשֻׁרֵי. מְשֻׁרֵי lay specially near, because of its occurrence in ver. 22. עוֹרֵי, too, seems to have been facilitated by the עוֹרֵי in ver. 20. The passage has plainly been edited and re-edited to gratify the very natural longing of a later age for references to the resurrection of the body. Cf. Siegfried's note in his edition of Job (*Sacred Books of the O. T.*). For יִפֵּן "will bring to pass," cf. Ps. cxl. 9 (if the text is right), Isa. lviii. 10, and other passages.

PROV. ii. 7; JOB vi. 13. — Read in both places תְּשׁוּעָה. Job vi. 14 has been, I hope, already corrected (*J. Q. R.*, vol. IX, p. 576). תְּשׁוּעָה naturally springs out of this correction (so also Beer). Cf. Isa. xxxiii. 6.

PROV. viii. 21, לְהַנְחִיל יֵשׁ. — Nowack, Kamphausen, and Wildeboer all recognize a substantive יֵשׁ meaning "enduring possession"; LXX, ὑπαρξίω. Considering the many misfortunes of the text of Proverbs, I have no hesitation in correcting עֵשֶׂר; the parallelism requires this. "Enduring possession" is not at all wanted. Grätz, שֵׁי *res pretiosa*; but שֵׁי is only used in the sense of "present." Wildeboer supports יֵשׁ by a reference to Prov. ii. 7, but תְּשׁוּעָה can hardly be stored up. See following note.

ECCLUS. xlii. 3, נִתְּלָה וַיֵּשׁ. — Marg. reading וַיֵּשֶׁר; corrupted תְּשׁוּעָה. Bacher prefers וַיֵּרֶשֶׁה. But see preceding note.

PROV. viii. 24, מַעֲיִנוֹת נִבְרִי מִים. — מַעֲיִנוֹת is very suspicious; it is, at any rate, not the word or the form which we expect here. Grätz rightly נִבְרִי. This word occurs only in Job xxxviii. 16.

IBID. 26, רֵאשׁ עֲפֹרוֹת תְּבֵל. — The divergences of the commentators make one suspect the text. The correction lies close at hand. For וַיֵּרֶשֶׁה read וַיִּדְרֹשׁ, and in first stichus for הוֹצִיר read הוֹצִיר. Similarly Gunkel, *Schöpfung*, p. 93.

IBID. 31, בְּתַבְלֵי אֲרָצוֹ. As Wildeboer points out, LXX read τῶν ἀκουμένων συνετέλεσας). This suggests the

true reading במלאכה “in the business, or elaboration, of his earth”; cf. Gen. ii. 1. Cf. מלך in 1 Chron. xxi. 20, an error for מלאך. So in Ps. cxix. 96, Grätz is certainly right in reading מלאכה for the obscure and improbable תבלה. Symmachus, *πάσης κατασκευής*.

JOB xxxvii. 12, תביל ארצה. For ארצה read with Duhm תביל ארץ (Esth. i. 8). So the improbable phrase תבל ארץ is happily removed. See on Prov. viii. 31.

PROV. xxx. 1. — הַמִּשָּׁא ought surely to be הַמִּשָּׁל (Grätz), though Kamphausen (in Kautzsch's Old Testament) and Wildeboer do not even mention the correction. The former, however, admits that הַמִּשָּׁא is corrupt, but insists on having a statement of the tribe or people to which the author of the following poem belonged. On this matter I have nothing to add to what I put before students in 1887 in my work on the Wisdom-literature, pp. 149, 171. But I hope that I have a trifle to add on the first distich of the poem. This should probably run thus :

נָאֵם הַגִּבֹּר שְׁאַלְתוּ אֵל
שְׁאַלְתִּי אֵל וְלֹא אָבֵל

A solemn word of the man whose inquiry was for God.
I have inquired for God, but have had no success.

Bickell, in 1894, proposed לֵאמֹר אֵל “(the man) whose wearying was for God;” and continued, “I have wearied myself about God,” &c. But it is difficult to suppose that לֵאמֹר had an accusative after it, and in any case the expression is an improbable one. שְׁאַל, of course, can govern an accusative of the object asked for. He who asks, Where is God? or, Who is God? may surely be said in poetry to “ask for God.” Hitzig and others, who retain the received text, suppose אֵל to be a vocative; but that is most unnatural.

T. K. CHEYNE.